

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Detailed Site Plans pursuant to Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on April 19, 2007 regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-06086 for Brandywine Crossing, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject detailed site plan (DSP) application is for approval of a 166,396 square-foot integrated shopping center in the C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) Zone.

The proposed shopping center covered in this application is a small part of a larger integrated shopping center known as Brandywine Crossing with a total gross floor area (GFA) of 478,561 square feet. The larger part (with a GFA of 312,165 square feet) of Brandywine Crossing will be reviewed under DSP-06077.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	C-S-C	C-S-C
Use(s)	Vacant	Integrated Shopping Center
Acreage	21.31	21.31
Parcels	4	4
Building square footage/GFA	-	166,396
Of which Building 1-COSTCO	-	148,896
Building 2-Retail	-	6,000
Building 3-Retail	-	7,500
Building 4-Bank	-	4,000

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Total Parking Spaces	666	812
Of which handicapped spaces	14	20
Loading spaces	4	6

3. **Location:** The subject property is located on the east side of US 301/MD 5, on the south side of Matapeake Business Drive, in Planning Area 85A and Council District 9.

4. **Surroundings and Use:** The site is bounded to the north by the right-of-way of Matapeake Business Drive and to the west by the right-of-way of US 301/MD 5. Further across Matapeake Business Drive to the north is the other portion of the Brandywine Crossing shopping center, which is included in DSP-06077. To the east and south of the site are properties in the I-1 (Light Industrial) Zone.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The 1978 Brandywine-Mattawoman Sectional Map Amendment (SMA) rezoned the subject site from the R-R (Rural Residential) Zone to the E-I-A (Employment-Industrial-Area) Zone. In 1982, the District Council granted approval of Special Exception SE-3272 on the northern portion of the Brandywine 301 Industrial Park for the excavation of sand and gravel. At that time, the southern portion was already an active sand and gravel operation under Special Exception SE-3064. In 1985, the site was rezoned with conditions through Zoning Map Amendment A-9502-C from the E-I-A Zone to the I-1 and I-3 Zones. The 1993 Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Subregion V, Planning Areas 81A, 81B, 83, 84, 85A, and 85B retained this property in the I-1 Light Industrial Zone as previously approved by application A-9502-C (Zoning Ordinance No. 16-2006) in 1985. On September 18, 2006, the District Council approved Zoning Map Amendment A-9980-C to rezone a larger property of approximately 52.7 acres, including the subject property, from the I-1 and I-3 Zones to the C-S-C Zone. The subject site was part of a larger subdivision known as Brandywine 301 Industrial Park (approximately 176.44 acres), which was approved (Planning Board Resolution PGCPB No.98-84) as Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-97124 in 1998. A new Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06131 for the subject site was approved by the Planning Board on March 8, 2007. The subject site also has Stormwater Management Concept Approval 5831-2006-00.
6. **Design Features:** The subject site is the southern portion of the Brandywine Crossing shopping center. The site has an irregular shape with a shorter side fronting US 301/MD 5 and longer side along Matapeake Business Drive. The site has two access points off Matapeake Business Drive. The two access points are aligned with those to the northern portion of Brandywine Crossing shopping center. Four buildings have been proposed on the site. One large COSTCO building is located in the southeast corner of the site together with three small buildings, of which two buildings, Building 2 and Building 3, are for retail use and one building, Building 4, is for a future bank. The three small buildings are clustered in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of US 301/MD 5 and Matapeake Business Drive. Between the large COSTCO building and three small buildings are surface parking lots and a proposed gas station fronting Matapeake Business Drive. A gas station is a permitted use in the C-S-C Zone through a special exception. The applicant will apply for a special exception for a gas station and therefore the gas station is not included in the subject DSP.

The applicant has submitted complete design guidelines that will be applied to the entire Brandywine Crossing shopping center, including the subject DSP. The intent of the design guidelines is to develop a framework for an integrated retail development made up of different buildings of varying size and scale. The design of the shopping center draws heavily from the design principles found in the twentieth century retail architecture of the surrounding

metropolitan area, such as the Art Deco style, which has been followed in regard to scale, massing, and materials. Exterior finishing materials include brick, precast masonry, stone, cementitious stone, colored concrete block with split face, EIFS (exterior insulation and finish system) wood, and composite products. Store fronts will be clear glass in aluminum frames.

The proposed COSTCO wholesale building is a regular prototype building with a rectangular footprint and building height of approximately 31 feet. The building is designed with a higher split face base, a middle section decorated with accent panels and bands of color, and a flat roof with metal coping. The standard COSTCO identification sign with spotlights is planned for the two elevations that can be seen from Matapeake Business Drive. The three small buildings clustered in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of US 301/MD 5 and Matapeake Business Drive are for retail and bank uses. The buildings have a rectangular shape with a building height of approximately 20 feet. No architecture has been proposed for Building 4, which will be subject to future review by the Planning Board or its designee. The elevations proposed for Buildings 2 and 3 are comparable in detail and decoration to the COSTCO building and are acceptable.

The applicant has also submitted complete signage design guidelines for the entire shopping center. The signage package includes freestanding signs, building mounted signs, monumental entry signs, directional signs, and banner signs. The sign package in general is attractive and presents a unified and consistent graphic image for the shopping center. However, the sign package does not specifically show the required sign face area or what is proposed for each type of sign. A condition has been proposed in the Recommendation section requiring the applicant to provide the information prior to certification.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance No. 16-2006 (A-9980-C):** Zoning Ordinance No.16 was adopted by the District Council on September 18, 2006, approving Application No. A-9980 to rezone a larger property, including the subject site, from the I-1 and I-3 Zones to the C-S-C Zone with the two following conditions that are applicable to review of this DSP:

1. **Development of this site shall be in conformance with the approved Tree Conservation Plans (TCPI/26/91 and TCPII/133/91).**

Comment: Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/133/91-06 has been submitted with this DSP. The Environmental Planning Section, in a memorandum dated February 12, 2007 (Finch to Zhang), concluded that the proposed Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/133/91-06, which has been revised concurrently with TCPI/26/91, meets the requirement of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of TCPII/133/91-06 with three conditions that have been incorporated into the Recommendation section of this report.

2. **Detailed Site Plan approval shall be required prior to the issuance of any building or grading permit, to ensure compatibility with the surrounding industrially zoned**

properties as well as conformance with the purposes of the C-S-C Zone.

Comment: The subject DSP has been filed to meet this condition. However, Urban Design staff believes that the proposed integrated shopping center would be a great aesthetic improvement over the existing industrial landscape.

8. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the C-S-C Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - a. The subject application is in general conformance with the requirements of Section 27-461 (b) of the Zoning Ordinance, which governs development in the commercial zones. The proposed integrated shopping center is permitted in the C-S-C Zone.
 - b. The DSP shows a site layout that is consistent with Section 27-462 regulations regarding building setbacks. The DSP is also in general conformance with the site design guidelines.
9. **Preliminary Plans of Subdivision 4-06131:** The Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06131 and the resolution was adopted on April 5, 2007. Previously, Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-97124 for Brandywine 301 Industrial Park, which includes the subject property, governed the subject DSP. The Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-97124 with 22 conditions, several of which were carried forward in the approved 4-06131. The conditions of approval attached to 4-06131 that are applicable to review of this DSP are discussed below. Other permit related conditions will be enforced at time of issuance of the respective permits.

2. The following note shall be placed on the final plat of subdivision:

“Development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/26/91-01), or as modified by the Type II tree conservation plan, and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. This property is subject to the notification provisions of CB-60-2005. Copies of all approved tree conservation plans for the subject property are available in the offices of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Prince George’s County Planning Department.”

Comment: TCPI/26/91 is being revised under the current application to include an additional area and to show how the woodland conservation requirement will be met for the entire acreage included in pending Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06131. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/133/91-06 has also been submitted with this DSP. The Environmental Planning Section, in a memorandum dated February 12, 2007 (Finch to Zhang), indicated that TCPII/133/91-06 for this DSP is consistent with TCPI/26/91 and has satisfied the Woodland Conservation and Tree

Preservation Ordinance.

5. Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan 18772-2006 and any subsequent revisions.

Comment: The subject DSP has approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 5831-2006-00, which was approved based on the previously approved stormwater management concept plan. However, at the time this staff report was written, the Department of Environmental Resources (DER) had not responded to the referral request. A condition has been proposed in the Recommendation section to require the applicant to provide evidence that the subject DSP is consistent with the approved stormwater management plan prior to certification.

6. An automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all new buildings proposed in this subdivision, unless the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department determines that an alternative method of fire suppression is appropriate.

Comment: The applicant proposed to develop the subject site as part of a larger shopping center. The above condition will be carried forward as condition for this DSP.

7. Direct vehicular access to US 301/MD 5 shall be prohibited from all lots.

Comment: There is no direct access to US 301/MD 5 from the subject site. Two accesses to the subject site are from Matapeake Business Drive.

12. Total development of the overall Brandywine 301 Industrial Park site (the areas covered by Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-97124) shall be limited to uses that would generate no more than 794 AM and 1,440 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Areas containing C-S-C zoning as of the date of the resolution approving this plan shall be limited to uses that would generate no more than 250 AM and 896 PM peak hour vehicle trips. Areas containing I-3 or I-1 zoning as of the date of the resolution approving this plan shall be limited to uses that would generate no more than 544 AM and 544 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein above shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.

Comment: The Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06131 has proposed adjusting the overall trip cap for the site. The Transportation Planning Section, in a memorandum dated February 13, 2007 (Masog to Zhang), indicated that with the approval of this DSP, the number of trips generated would still be within the trip cap. However, since this DSP is only a small part of a larger shopping center, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that this DSP cannot be approved without approval of the pending preliminary plan. A condition has been proposed in the Recommendation section of this report, requiring that the applicant obtain signature approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06131 prior to certificate approval of this DSP.

- 13. As a means of ensuring that the revision of the trip cap, as understood on the date of the plan approval, is properly applied to all portion of lands covered by Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-97124, at the time of the final plat for the subject plan, Condition 12 above shall be added as a note to all future site plans within Brandywine 301 Industrial Park (plats 191-098, 195-006, 198-028, 198-051, 203-050, and 203-051) with an indication that this condition supersedes Condition 11 of Prince George’s County Planning Board resolution number 98-84.**

Comment: In accordance with this condition, Condition 12 will be carried forward as a site plan note to be placed on the subject DSP prior to certification.

10. ***Landscape Manual:*** The proposed development for an integrated shopping center is subject to Section 4.2 Commercial and Industrial Landscaped Strip Requirements; Section 4.3 Parking Lot Requirements; and Section 4.7 Buffering Incompatible Uses of the *Landscape Manual*.

a. Section 4.2 Commercial and Industrial Landscaped Strip Requirements, specifies that in all commercial zones a landscaped strip shall be provided on the property adjacent to all public rights-of-way. The subject DSP has two portions that are subject to this section: the site’s frontage along US 301/MD 5 and the site’s frontage along Matapeake Business Drive until the first access to the site from Matapeake Business Drive. The landscape plan provides a schedule for the frontage along US 301/MD 5 that will be substituted 100 percent by the existing woodland. But the Landscape Plan does not provide any Section 4.2 landscape strip for the frontage along Matapeake Business Drive. A condition has been proposed to require the applicant to provide the landscape strip and corresponding landscape schedule on the landscape plan prior to certification.

b. Section 4.3(a), Landscape Strip Requirements, requires a 10-foot-wide landscaped strip between the parking lot and public right-of-way to be planted with one shade tree and 10 shrubs per 35 linear feet of parking lot perimeter adjacent to the right-of-way, among other landscape strip treatments. The landscape plan has identified the entire frontage along Matapeake Business Drive as the Section 4.3 (a) landscape strip, which is not correct. The above Section 4.2 landscape strip should be excluded from the Section 4.3 (a) landscape strip and the schedule should also be revised accordingly prior to certification.

Section 4.3 (c), Interior Planting, requires that a certain percentage of the parking lot be interior planting area with one shade tree for each 300 square feet of the planting area. The landscape plan identifies three parking lots which require 5, 8, and 10 percent of parking lots to be interior planting areas. The landscape plan has provided the required interior planting areas and the required schedules.

c. Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, requires a landscape buffer to be placed between two adjacent incompatible land uses in all conventional zones. In this case, the

subject site is surrounded to the east and south by I-1 zoned properties, but the uses on the properties are not compatible with the proposed integrated shopping center. The landscape plan provides a 423 linear foot Section 4.7 bufferyard along the southern boundary line and no bufferyard along the eastern boundary.

When Section 4.7 requirements are applied, the *Landscape Manual* treats the entire site as a whole. Since an integrated shopping center is defined as a high-impact use, the entire site should be deemed a high impact use for the purpose of applying Section 4.7 requirements. For the eastern boundary line, since the abutting use is an automobile dealership without repair, known as Brandywine Auto Parts, a Type B bufferyard, which is a minimum 20 foot-wide landscape bufferyard to be planted with 80 plant units per 100 linear feet of property line is required. A condition has been proposed in the Recommendation section to require the applicant to provide the Section 4.7 bufferyard and schedule prior to certification.

In addition, Section 4.7 further prescribes that in all commercial and industrial zones, if the developing use is high or medium Impact, the abutting vacant property will be deemed to be the same category as the developing use. For the southern boundary area, there is one vacant lot adjacent to the eastern part of the southern boundary area. According to Section 4.7, no bufferyard is required for that portion of the boundary area. However, for the western part of southern boundary, an automobile related use is shown. A section 4.7 bufferyard should be provided. A condition has been proposed in the Recommendation section to require the applicant to provide the Section 4.7 bufferyard and schedule prior to certification.

11. **Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet, there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland, and there is an approved Type I tree conservation plan (TCPI/26/01) for this site.
 - a. Signed Natural Resources Inventory NRI1/158/06 was submitted with the pending preliminary plan of subdivision for this site. The TCP I and the preliminary plan show all the required information in conformance with the signed NRI. No further action is required with regard to the natural features of this site.
 - b. Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/133/91-06, submitted with this application, has been reviewed and was found to require significant revisions. A review of the Type II tree conservation plan by the Environmental Planning Section indicates that the TCPII is in general conformance with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance, subject to several conditions.
12. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

- a. The Community Planning Division, in a memorandum dated February 2, 2007, noted that the application is consistent with the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan* Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier and is in conformance with the land use allowed in the C-S-C Zone in accordance with Zoning Map Amendment Application A 9980 C, approved by the District Council on September 18, 2006. But this application does not conform to the recommendations of the 1993 Subregion V Master Plan and SMA for employment-industrial land use.

The community planner also discussed the intent of the master plan to ensure that the aesthetic appeal of the area remains intact. Specifically, with respect to Employment Area "C" the 1993 plan text (p. 81) states: "every effort should be made to ensure that only high image development takes place along the regional highway corridor."

Comment: As discussed above in Finding 6, additional architecture review is required for the future bank site by the Planning Board or its designee.

- b. In a memorandum dated March 2, 2007, the Subdivision Section staff provided a comprehensive background review of this site and identified all applicable conditions attached to previous approvals. (See above Findings 7 and 9 for a detailed discussion). The Subdivision Section staff noted a new preliminary plan of subdivision is currently pending.

Comment: The Planning Board approved the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06131 on March 8, 2007 that supersedes the previously approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-97124 for this site. See above Finding 9 for a discussion on the applicable conditions attached to the approval of 4-06131.

- c. The Transportation Planning Section, in a memorandum dated February 13, 2007, provided a complete review of the subject DSP's conformance with transportation-related conditions attached to the approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-97124 as carried forward in the approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06131. The transportation planner concluded that the access and on-site circulation within the site are acceptable and recommended approval of this DSP.

In a separate memorandum from the Transportation Planning Section dated February 15, 2007, on detailed site plan review for master plan trail compliance, the Trails Planner noted that the Subregion V Master Plan and SMA recommends a master plan trail along Timothy Branch. The approved preliminary plan of subdivision accommodated this master plan trail through the provision of a trail easement. The DSP does not show the complete easement. The trail planner recommends one condition that has been incorporated into the Recommendation section of this report.

- d. The Environmental Planning Section, in a memorandum dated February 12, 2007, indicated that the plans as submitted have been found to address the environmental constraints for the site and the requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance. The staff recommends approval of this application subject to three conditions that have been incorporated in the Recommendation section of this report.
- e. The subject application was also referred to the Department of Environmental Resources (DER). At the time the staff report was written, DER had not responded to the referral request.
- f. The Permit Section, in a memorandum dated December 27, 2006, provided 11 comments and questions that have been addressed in the review process.
- g. The Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) in a memorandum dated January 16, 2007, noted that US 301 is a State-maintained roadway, and coordination with the Maryland State Highway Administration is necessary. DPW&T also indicated that further review of access from the county-maintained Matapeake Business Drive is required.
- h. The Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), in a memorandum dated February 27, 2007, indicated that only one access point (the current access to the site provided at Matapeake Business Drive) should be allowed onto US 301. Allowing additional access points would be counter to the plan of providing a freeway through this section and would exacerbate current traffic congestion issues through this corridor.

Comment: The comments provided in the SHA memorandum cover the subject site and the site to the north across Matapeake Business Drive that is included in DSP-06077. For the subject site plan, two access points have been shown from Matapeake Business Drive. No additional access directly from US 301 has been provided for this DSP.

- i. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC), in a memorandum dated January 8, 2007, stated that water is available for the development. Sewer extension will be required. The reviewer also indicated that a minimum 20-foot-wide right-of-way for the proposed relocation of sewer main is required and additional on-site review is needed.

Comment: The requirements prescribed by WSSC will be enforced at time of permit review by the respective office of the WSSC.

- j. The Division of Environmental Health, Prince George's County Health Department, in a memorandum dated January 16, 2007, noted that all abandoned vehicles (one truck and three trailers) found on the property must be removed and properly disposed of.

Comment: According to the applicant's engineer, the abandoned vehicles have been removed and properly disposed of.

- k. The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), in a memorandum dated December 27, 2006, provided no comments on this DSP.
 - l. The subject DSP has also been referred to the adjacent Charles County Government. In a memorandum dated January 16, 2007, the Office of Planning and Growth Management, Charles County, provided no comments on this DSP.
13. **Urban Design Review:** In addition to the above findings and discussion, the Urban Design Section has the following findings:
- a. The subject DSP includes a gas station that is located between the COSTCO wholesale building and three small buildings. The proposed gas station is permitted in the C-S-C Zone; but it is subject to a special exception approval. Therefore, the DSP should be revised to exclude this gas station. A condition has been proposed in the Recommendation section of this report requiring the applicant to either graphically delineate the gas station site and label it as not included in this DSP or to remove it completely.
 - b. The DSP provides the required parking spaces for the physically handicapped (HC). However, the dimensions of the parking spaces should be provided on the site plan. In addition, the site plan shows many HC spaces sharing access aisles. For the regular handicapped accessible spaces, sharing a common access aisle is allowed by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The van accessible spaces should not share access aisles with other accessible spaces. A condition has been proposed to require the applicant to revise the layout for van accessible spaces to provide an access aisle to be used exclusively by the physically handicapped citizen who drives a van.
 - c. Pedestrian connectivity has been a focal point in the design of this shopping center. However, the pedestrian path provided in the DSP is not part of a network and does not provide a connection between COSTCO and the three small buildings close to US 301/MD 5. The Urban Design Section believes that a connection is necessary to provide better circulation options for shopping center patrons. In addition, all pedestrian crossings over the driveway should be clearly provided on the site plan. A condition has been proposed in the Recommendation section to require the applicant to provide a connection in the form of a pedestrian boulevard with shade trees on both sides between the east and west parts of the shopping center. The connection should start around the main entrance area of the COSTCO building and end at the front of the proposed Building 2 site. Additional connections along the south side of Matapeake Business Drive, and along the west side of parking lots in front of the COSTCO building should also be provided.
 - d. As discussed previously, a complete sign package has been provided with this DSP. But the site plan and landscape plan do not clearly label the location of the signs.

A condition has been proposed in the Recommendation section of this report to require the applicant to do so prior to certification.

14. As required by Section 27-285(b), the detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

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 (TCPII/133/91-06) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-06086 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certificate approval of this detailed site plan, the applicant shall:
 - a. Obtain signature approval for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06131 and the revision to Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/26/01. Any conditions that may affect the subject DSP shall be reflected on the plans.
 - b. Revise signage design guidelines by providing the required sign face area and the provisions for each type of sign.
 - c. Either graphically delineate the gas station site and label it as not included in this DSP, or remove it from this DSP completely.
 - d. Revise the landscape plan as follows:
 - 1) Provide an additional Section 4.2 landscape strip and corresponding schedule.
 - 2) Revise Section 4.3 (b) landscape strip and schedule to exclude Section 4.2 strip.
 - 3) Provide a Section 4.7 bufferyard along the site's eastern boundary area and along the western part of the southern boundary area. Section 4.7 schedules shall be provided on the landscape plan.
 - e. Provide evidence that the subject DSP is consistent with the approved stormwater management concept plan for this site;
 - f. Revise the Type II tree conservation plan to show a permanent tree protection device to be placed around the woodland preservation area and any adjacent expanded buffer area located next to US 301. A corresponding graphic shall be added to the legend. A detail for the permanent tree protection shall be provided.
 - g. Provide a pedestrian connection starting at the main entrance to the COSTCO building and ending at the front of the proposed Building 2 site and additional connections to be reviewed by the Urban Design Section.

- h. Label all proposed signs on the detailed site plan and landscape plan.
- i. Provide all pedestrian crossings on the site plan.
- j. Add a site plan note as follows:

Total development of the overall Brandywine 301 Industrial Park site (the areas covered by Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-97124) shall be limited to uses that would generate no more than 794 AM and 1,440 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Areas containing C-S-C zoning as of the date of the resolution approving this plan shall be limited to uses that would generate no more than 250 AM and 896 PM peak hour vehicle trips. Areas containing I-3 or I-1 zoning as of the date of the resolution approving this plan shall be limited to uses that would generate no more than 544 AM and 544 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein above shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities. This trip cap condition supersedes Condition 11 of Prince George's County Planning Board resolution PGCPB No. 98-84.

- 2. All structures shall be fully equipped with a fire suppression system built in accordance with National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard 13D and all applicable county laws and regulations.

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 Clark, with Commissioners Squire, Clark, Eley, Vaughns and Parker voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, April 19, 2007 in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 3rd day of May 2007.

R. Bruce Crawford
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

RBC:FJG:HZ:bjjs