

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with approval of Specific Design Plans pursuant to Part 8, Division 4 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on November 17, 2005, regarding Specific Design Plan SDP-0402 for Maryland Science and Technology Center, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The purpose of this specific design plan is for a 40,440 square-foot, one-story flex-office building and a 22,000 square-foot, two-story office building on Lot 5, Block 4, consisting of 5.56 acres in the E-I-A Zone. The Planning Board previously approved a specific design plan for infrastructure (SDP-0203) for the site.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	E-I-A	E-I-A
Use(s)	Vacant	Office
Acreage	5.56	5.56
Lots	1	1
Parcels	N/A	N/A
Square Footage	0	62,440
Parking Spaces:	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Office	139	178
Of which are HC spaces	5	5
Van-Accessible Spaces	2	4
Loading Spaces:	4	16

3. **Location:** The Maryland Science and Technology Center is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Crain Highway (MD 3) and John Hanson Highway (US 50). The site is located at the intersection of Melford Boulevard and Telsa Drive.
4. **Design Features:** The site is located in Pod 4, which is designated for technology support in the comprehensive design plan. Lot 5 is the last lot to be developed in that block. The proposal consists of two separate buildings—a one-story, primarily brick with standing-seam metal roof, flex office building consisting of 40,440 square feet and a two-story, all brick with standing-seam metal roof, office building consisting of 22,000 square feet. The applicant has also revised the

alignment of Melford Boulevard with this application and proposes a new traffic circle at the intersection of Melford Boulevard and Telsa Drive. The two-story office building will front on the traffic circle and the flex-office building will front on Melford Boulevard.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

4. **The Approved Basic Plan:** On January 25, 1982, the District Council approved Zoning Map Amendment Application and Basic Plan A-9401 for the subject property, with ten conditions (Zoning Ordinance 2-1982). The zoning map amendment rezoned the property from the R-A and O-S Zones to the E-I-A Zone. The specific design plan is in conformance with the approved basic plan.
5. **The Approved Comprehensive Design Plan:** On July 7, 1986, the District Council approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-8601, affirming the prior Planning Board decision (PGCPB No. 86-107), for the Maryland Science and Technology Center, with 27 conditions and two considerations. The proposed specific design plan (SDP) is in conformance with all aspects of the approved comprehensive design plan (CDP). The CDP designated Pod 4 (Block 4) as the location in the center for technology support which is commonly referred to as flex-office space.
6. **Preliminary Plan, 4-98076:** The preliminary plan was approved by the Planning Board on September 28, 2000 (Resolution PGCPB 99-28(A)). The specific design plan is in conformance with the preliminary plan. For further discussion of environmental and transportation conditions of the preliminary plan, see Findings 10 and 11 below.
7. **The Zoning Ordinance:** The specific design plan is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-501 of the Zoning Ordinance governing development in the E-I-A Zone and the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.
8. The development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities either shown in the appropriate Capital Improvement Program or provided as part of the private development. See Findings 11 and 12 below for a discussion of transportation and public facilities adequacy.
9. Adequate provision has been made for draining surface water so that there are no adverse effects on either the subject property or adjacent properties. The lot has an approved stormwater management concept plan (FWA 88390.60) by the City of Bowie.

Referrals

10. In a memorandum dated November 1, 2005, the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comments:

The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the above referenced specific design plan and the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/36/99-05), stamped as received on October 26, 2005. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of SDP-0402 and TCPII/36/99-05.

Background

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed Basic Plan A-9401 and Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-8601. The Environmental Planning Section also previously reviewed the area that is the subject of this application as part of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98076, Specific Design Plan SDP-0201, and Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/44/98. All of these plans were approved.

A Type II tree conservation plan was approved for the entire site in 1999. The approved TCPII was intended to show all the environmental features or existing features on the site associated with the scope of review in 4-98076 (generally the area west of Curie Drive). The subject revision to TCPII/36/99 is the 2005 revision.

The current SDP application is for Lot 5 of Block 4. This application is for the construction of two buildings; a one-story, 40,000 square foot office identified as Building "H" and a two-story flex-office building totaling 22,440 square feet shown as Building "I."

Site Description

Lot 5 of Block 4 is located in the southwest portion of the 466.62-acre Maryland Science and Technology Center site that is zoned E-I-A. Lot 5 of Block 4 totals 5.56 acres and is located along the south side of Melford Drive, the west side of Curie Drive, and the north side of Telsa Drive. The larger Science and Technology Center property is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of US 50 and US 3/301. Based on available information, there are no regulated natural resources such as a stream, areas of 100-year floodplain and wetlands associated with Lot 5 of Block 4. Based on 1998 air photos and shortly thereafter, when a forest stand delineation was prepared, the subject site is not wooded. Two nearby highways, US 50 and US 3/301, are transportation-related noise generators; however, no adverse impacts to the use are anticipated in this application in relation to US 301 because the site is a considerable distance from this highway. Noise impacts in relation to US 50 are anticipated depending on the uses of the flex-office building. The predominant soils found to occur, according to the *Prince George's County Soil Survey*, include four types within the Collington fine sandy loam series. There are no development constraints associated with the Collington soils based on the proposed land use. According to available information, Marlboro clay is not found to occur in the vicinity of this property. Based on available information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program publication entitled "Ecologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George's Counties," December 1997, there are no rare, threatened and endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. There are no designated scenic or historic roads in the vicinity of this property. The site drains to an unnamed tributary in the

vicinity of the site and directly to the Patuxent River to the east. The property is in the Bowie and Vicinity Planning Area and in the Developing Tier in the 2002 adopted General Plan.

Environmental Conditions of Approval to be Addressed at Specific Design Plan

The approval of the comprehensive design plan by the District Council, and the approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision by the Planning Board, included numerous conditions, several of which dealt with environmental issues to be addressed during subsequent reviews. One environmental condition to be addressed during the review of the specific design plan is listed below. This respective condition is in bold type; the associated comments and recommended conditions are in standard type face.

Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-98076; PGCPB No. 99-28

4. With the approval of specific design plans, a Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved.

A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/36/99, was approved for the entire 466.62-acre property following a clearing violation that occurred on a portion of the site several years ago. At that time, generalized limits of disturbance were identified for the parcel in this application. One revision needed to SDP-0402 is addressed in the environmental review section of this memorandum.

Comment: Three other environmental-related conditions associated with previous plan approvals are associated with the overall site. However, two of these conditions are parcel or pod specific, and do not relate to the area within SDP-0402. A third condition relates to wetlands associated with the overall site; however, the area within SDP-0402 does not have regulated features, such as wetlands, associated with it.

Environmental Review

As revisions are made to the plans submitted, the revision boxes on each plan sheet shall be used to describe what revisions were made, when, and by whom.

1. This portion of the overall site was included in a forest stand delineation (FSD) submitted in conjunction with the review of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98076. Parcel 5 of Block 4 is not a wooded area of the overall site.

Comment: No further information regarding the FSD is required.

2. This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because tree conservation plans have been previously approved that cover the overall property. A Type II tree conservation plan is required with the

approval of a specific design plan. A revised TCPII has been submitted and reviewed. This application represents the “-05” revisions to TCPII/36/99.

The proposed TCPII includes acreage in Phase I of the overall site that has been previously calculated in a phased worksheet. Because the subject portion of the overall site does not have woodland associated with it, the development proposal is generally consistent with the site’s overall Type I tree conservation plan. A site visit was conducted as part of this review and to date the site has been cleared in conformance with the previously approved TCPII.

Comment: No additional information is required with regard to the TCPII at this time.

3. The site is located inside the City of Bowie’s stormwater management review authority. A copy of stormwater management concept approval 02-0103-207NE15, issued in March 2002, was included in the submittal.

Comment: No further information regarding stormwater management is required.

11. In a memorandum dated August 31, 2005 (Masog to Wagner), the Transportation Planning Section offered the following comments:

The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the specific design plan application referenced above. The subject property consists of approximately 5.56 acres of land in the E-I-A Zone. The property is at the northeast corner of MD 3 and US 50 within the City of Bowie. The plan proposes offices and a training center on Lot 5 of Block 4. Specifically, the plan proposes 62,440 square feet of office and light industrial space within two buildings.

The transportation staff has reviewed issues regarding the development of the subject site and the larger Maryland Science and Technology Center (total of 466 acres) in conjunction with A-9401, CDP-8601, and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-88030. Since those plans were approved, there has been considerable development within the Maryland Science and Technology Center. The preliminary plan and CDP approvals established a square footage cap for the initial phase of 1.95 million square feet. Preliminary Plat of Subdivision 4-98076 affirmed a trip cap of 2,200 AM and 2,605 PM peak-hour vehicle trips for all remaining development on the site.

There are a number of transportation-related conditions on earlier development review stages; these are reviewed in detail below:

CDP-8601:

- Condition 3. Required upgrading of MD 3/Belair Drive/Melford Boulevard prior to development, up to a maximum of 400,000 square feet. The intersection has been replaced with an interchange. OK.

- Condition 4. Required an interchange at MD 3/Belair Drive/Melford Boulevard for development beyond 400,000 square feet and up to 1,950,000 square feet. The interchange is complete and open to traffic. OK.
- Condition 5. Required new traffic study after 1991 or after completion of improvements to US 50. A new traffic study was prepared in 1998 and reviewed in conjunction with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98076. OK.
- Condition 6. Established dedication widths for internal streets. All streets have been dedicated in accordance with this condition. OK.
- Condition 7. Required that the impact of development along Belair Drive be minimized. This has been done by limiting access to Melford Boulevard. The plan does propose access onto Medford Boulevard. A past plan for this same site showed multiple access points onto Medford Boulevard, and the comment was made at that time that one driveway would be acceptable but that additional driveways would need to be relocated or closed. In consideration of the past comments, the driveway shown is acceptable. OK.
- Condition 8. Required the completion of documents establishing legal access to the property. This was done prior to the initial development on the property. OK.
- Condition 9. Required setbacks to accommodate planned US 50 improvements. All improvements to US 50 have been constructed. OK.
- Condition 20. Established requirement for a new traffic study prior to Stage 2 development. The subject development is within Stage 1B, and, therefore, this condition does not apply.
- Condition 21. Restricted the Beech Tree Lane access to a right-in right-out. This condition is complete.

Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98076:

Condition 17: Established a trip cap for remaining development based upon roadway improvements that existed in 1998 and 240,000 square feet of then-existing development, of 2,200 AM and 2,605 PM peak-hour trips. Since that time, the following approvals have occurred:

SDP	Location Lot/Block	Development Quantity	Status	AM Trip Generation	PM Trip Generation
Pre-1998		240,000 sq. ft.	Built	119	112
SDP-0103	Lot 4/2 Lot 1/4	153,250 sq. ft.	Built	112	115

	Lot 2/4				
SDP-0104	Lot 1/3 Lot 2/3	300,000 sq. ft.	Approved	600	555
SDP-0201	Lot 3/4	83,680 sq. ft.	Built	127	118
SDP-0203/1	Lot 2/2 Lot 3/2	81,600 sq. ft.	Under Construction	163	151
SDP-0405	Parcel 2E	125,000 sq. ft.	Approved	250	231
SDP-0405	Parcel 2E	156-student training center	Approved	26	31
Total		1092530 sq. ft.		1,397	1,313

The subject application is for a total of 62,440 square feet, with 48,286 square feet of office space and 14,154 square feet of warehouse space. The resulting peak-hour trip generation for the office component would be 97 AM and 89 PM trips. The resulting peak-hour trip generation for the warehouse component would be 6 AM and 6 PM trips. With the subject application and the previous approvals, the site would generate 1,500 AM and 1,408 PM peak-hour trips. This remains within the cap.

Vehicular and pedestrian access within the site is acceptable. Adequate right-of-way in accordance with the master plan exists along MD 3 and US 50.

As noted previously, the subject property is part of a larger project that has completed Stage 1B roadway improvements in the area pursuant to a finding of adequate public facilities made in 1988 and in 1998 for Preliminary Plans of Subdivision 4-88030 and 4-98076. Insofar as the basis for those findings is still valid, and in consideration of the materials discussed earlier in this memorandum, the transportation staff finds that the subject property will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with transportation facilities that are existing, programmed, or will be provided as a part of the development if the development is approved. Furthermore, the submitted plans are in conformance with previously approved plans, including the approved comprehensive design plan.

12. In a memorandum dated August 18, 2005 (Izzo to Wagner), the Public Facilities Planning Section offered the following comments:

The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed the specific design plan and concluded the following:

The existing fire engine service at Bowie Fire Station, Company 39, located at 15454 Annapolis Road has a service response time of 6.28 minutes, which is beyond the 3.25-minute response time guideline.

The existing ambulance service at Bowie Fire Station, Company 39, located at 15454 Annapolis Road has a service response time of 6.28 minutes, which is beyond the 4.25-minute response time guideline.

The existing paramedic service at Bowie Fire Station, Company 43, located at 16400 Pointer Ridge Road has a service response time of 5.85 minutes, which is within the 7.25-minute response time guideline.

The existing ladder truck service at Glenn Dale Fire Station, located at 11900 Glenn Dale Boulevard, has a service response time of 11.09 minutes, which is beyond the 4.25-minute response time guideline.

The adopted and approved FY 2005-2010 CIP contains a project LK510650 for a new fire station to be constructed in the City of Bowie. This proposed station is planned to open in 2011 and will serve this development within the recommended response times

The above findings are in conformance with the *Approved Public Safety Master Plan* (1990) and the *Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities*.

Police: The proposed development is within the service area of District II-Bowie. As of 1/2/2005, the county had 1,302 sworn officers and 43 student officers in the academy, for a total of 1,345 personnel, which is within the standard of 1,278 officers. This police facility will adequately serve the population generated by the proposed development.

13. In a memorandum dated August 23, 2005 (Bienenfeld to Wagner), the archeology staff offered the following comments:

Phase I (Identification) archeological investigations are recommended on the above-referenced property. Over one dozen prehistoric and historic archeological sites surround the parcel. These include: Site 18PR167 and Site 18PR153, to the south; Site 18PR164, to the north (historic Melford), and sites 18PR28, and 18PR29, to the east of the property.

Phase I archeological investigations should be conducted according to Maryland Historical Trust (MHT) guidelines, *Standards and Guidelines for Archeological Investigations in Maryland* (Shaffer and Cole, 1994), and report preparation should follow MHT guidelines and the *American Antiquity* or *Society of Historical Archaeology* style guide. Archeological excavations shall be spaced along a regular 15-meter or 50-foot grid and excavations should be clearly identified on a map to be submitted as part of the report.

14. In a memorandum dated October 11, 2005 (Mayor Robinson to Chairman Hewlett), the City of Bowie recommends approval of the specific design plan subject to conditions, which have been included in the recommendation section below.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCP/II/36/99-05), and further APPROVED Specific Design Plan SDP-0402 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification, the following revisions shall be made:
 - a. On the two-story office building, the applicant shall provide an entrance feature on the rear elevation fronting on the Melford Boulevard/Telsa Drive traffic circle. A sidewalk shall be provided to connect the front and both sides of the office building with the parking area in the rear.
 - b. The architecture shall provide brick colors identical or complementary to those used for the newer R&D buildings along Melford Boulevard (Block 4, Lots 3 and 4).
 - c. The location, fixture details and pole height of the proposed parking lot lighting shall be provided. The applicant shall provide the same lighting fixtures as provided elsewhere on the MSTC site. General Note 16 shall be revised to state that timing devices will be installed.
 - d. All downspouts shall be covered with material matching that of the building and all roof-mounted HVAC equipment be completely screened from view.
 - e. The landscape plan shall be revised to include the following:
 - i. The white pine shall be replaced with red cedar.
 - ii. The Foster holly shall be replaced with American holly.
 - iii. The pin oaks located along the sidewalk of Telsa Drive shall be replaced with willow oaks.
 - f. The applicant shall provide signage details for both buildings. Staff and the applicant shall work together to develop an acceptable signage package for the site prior to signature approval of the SDP.
 - g. The site data notes shall be revised to reflect the accurate building square footages.
 - h. Roll-up door materials shall match roof materials in color (green patina).
 - i. The replacement of garage doors with tinted glass windows is encouraged.
 - j. The following note shall be placed on the site plan:

“An automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all proposed buildings.”

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board’s action must be filed with the District Council of Prince George’s County within thirty (30) days following the final notice of the Planning Board’s decision.

* * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Squire, seconded by Commissioner Eley, with Commissioners Squire, Eley, Vaughns and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, November 17, 2005, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 17th day of November 2005.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:GW:rmk