



Note: Staff reports can be accessed at www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm.

Specific Design Plan

SDP-0511/01

Application	General Data	
Project Name: Collington Center Lots 23, 24, and 25, Block C Location: Southwestern quadrant of the intersection of Queens Court and Crain Highway (US 301) Applicant/Address: Collington Center DE, LLC 729 East Pratt Street, Suite 401 Baltimore, MD 21202	Staff Report Date:	07/17/2009
	Date Accepted:	02/04/2009
	Planning Board Action Limit:	N/A
	Plan Acreage:	51.4536
	Zone:	E-I-A
	Dwelling Units:	N/A
	Gross Floor Area:	526,222 sq. ft.
	Planning Area:	74A
	Tier:	Developing
	Council District:	04
	Election District:	07
	Municipality:	N/A
200-Scale Base Map:	202SE14	

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates	
Industrial warehouses with ancillary office space and commercial retail.	Informational Mailing:	12/24/2008
	Acceptance Mailing:	08/14/2008
	Sign Posting Deadline:	06/30/2008

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Ruth E. Grover, A.I.C.P.	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Specific Design Plan SDP-0511/01
Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/52/06-01
Collington Center, Lots 23, 24, and 25, Block C

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the specific design plan for the subject property and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of APPROVAL as described in the recommendation section of this report.

EVALUATION

The specific design plan (SDP) was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of the following sections of the Zoning Ordinance as indicated:
 - (1) Section 27-515 regarding uses permitted in the E-I-A Zone.
 - (2) Section 27-501 regarding regulations in the E-I-A Zone.
 - (3) Section 27-528 regarding required findings in specific design plan applications.
- b. The requirements of Basic Plans A-6965-C and A-9397-C.
- c. The requirements of Comprehensive Design Plans CDP-8712, CDP-9006, CDP-9006/01, and CDP-9006/02.
- d. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-88074.
- e. The requirements of Final Plat REP 207 @ 12.
- f. The requirements of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.
- g. The requirements of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- h. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

Based upon the analysis of the subject application, the Urban Design staff recommends the following findings:

1. **Request:** This application requests the approval of a complex of seven buildings for industrial warehousing and retail use, with the retail use limited to the two buildings fronting on US 301.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	E-I-A	E-I-A
Use(s)	Vacant	Industrial Warehousing with ancillary office and Commercial Retail
Acreage (in the subject SDP)	51.4536	51.4536
Lots	3	3
Square Footage	0	526,222

	REQUIRED	PROVIDED
Total parking spaces	682	1,123
Handicap Spaces	22	56
Loading Spaces	14	14

3. **Location:** The subject site is located in the Collington Center, a 708-acre employment park in the E-I-A Zone, which is part of a larger 1,289-acre employment park comprising Collington Corporate Center and Collington South. More specifically, the subject property is located in the southwestern quadrant of the intersection of Queens Court and US 301 in Planning Area 74A, Council District 4, and the Developing Tier.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject property is bounded to the north by two warehouse buildings; to the south by two warehouse buildings; to the east by US 301, with agricultural use beyond; and to the west by Prince George’s Boulevard with vacant land beyond.
5. **Previous Approvals:** On October 28, 1975, the District Council adopted the 1991 approved Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville and vicinity master plan, which rezoned approximately 875 acres to the E-I-A Zone through Basic Plan A-6965-C. On November 23, 1981, the District Council approved Basic Plan A-9397-C for rezoning of approximately 8.16 additional acres of land to the E-I-A Zone. The approximate total size of the Collington Center project is 1,289.85 acres. The District Council approved Basic Plan Amendments A-6965 and A-9397 on May 21, 1990 for Collington Center. The Planning Board approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-8712 (PGCPB Resolution No. 88-224) on May 19, 1988 for the Collington Center.

On November 8, 1990, the Planning Board approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9006 (PGCPB Resolution No. 90-455), which revised CDP-8712, subject to 16 conditions. On May 17, 2001, the Planning Board approved CDP-9006/01 (PGCPB Resolution No. 01-95) to eliminate the requirements for the provision of recreational facilities in CDP-9006, Collington Center. On March 31, 2005, the Planning Board approved CDP-9006/02 (PGCPB Resolution No. 05-83(C)) to add residual acreage from the vacation of Willowbrook Parkway to the comprehensive design plan.

On June 16, 1988, the Prince George's County Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-88074 (PGCPB Resolution No. 88-287) for 65 lots and three parcels on 936.61 acres within Collington Center. Plat of Correction VJ 157 @ 99 was recorded on April 11, 1991 for Collington Center Lot 4, Block D to correct curve data shown on the original plat, which was recorded at NLP 157 @ 22. The subject SDP has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 25298-2008-00, which is valid through October 2, 2011. Specific Design Plan SDP-0511 was approved for the subject property on June 1, 2006, with PGCPB Resolution No. 06-126 being adopted by the Planning Board on June 22, 2006, formalizing that approval for the construction of a 457,500-square-foot warehouse including 30,000 square feet of retail and ancillary office space for the Marlo Furniture Company.

6. **Design Features:** Although the subject property has frontage on US 301, the project has no direct access to that major thoroughfare and is instead accessed from two points along its Queens Court frontage on the northern side of the project site and at two points from Prince George's Boulevard along its western/rear boundary. The two buildings that front on US 301 are proposed to accommodate retail serving the employees of Collington Center and the remaining five buildings will provide industrial storage with ancillary office space.

Parking is provided on all four sides of the two retail buildings fronting on US 301 and on three sides of the proposed warehouse buildings so as to dedicate the fourth side of each of the remaining buildings to loading, except for proposed Warehouse "A," which fronts on Queens Court, is smaller in size, and provides more adjacent parking than the remaining four warehouses. Two of these four larger warehouse buildings are parallel, and two are perpendicular to, the project site's southern boundary. A large area of environmentally-sensitive floodplain is being retained in the northwestern portion of the site, with a smaller similar area retained on the western side of the eastern access from Queens Court. Landscaping is otherwise provided for the project along its three road frontages and throughout the parking areas in accordance with the requirements of the Landscape Manual.

The architecture of the warehouse buildings in the project (Buildings A, B, C, F, and G) are rectilinear and composed primarily of painted concrete panels. The buildings are long and low and uniformly one-story in height. All of the buildings utilize a thin stone veneer at their base and partially up the pilasters that flank the building's entrances. An entrance feature, with a slightly elevated roofline articulates each main entranceway to the buildings. Additional fenestration and architectural differentiation includes aluminum storefront glazing in the entrances and in some cases, flanking the entrances, the use of different colors of concrete, and the scoring of concrete. Sunshades run above each building's main entrances and sometimes to each side. The side façades of the buildings are less articulated with stone veneer on the watertable and on the entranceway if one is provided. Rear façades are utilitarian with some color differentiation, but fenestration is limited to roll-up doors and smaller doors for pedestrian accessibility.

As to materials, the applicant has specified the following:

- Paint color—three of Sherwin Williams grey paints (Repose, Dorian and Dovetail)
- Masonry—County Materials Corporation Thin Veneer (Castleridge)
- Glass—AFGD Comfort low E Glass, blue green in color
- Sunshade—CS Group Aluminum Sunshade with a Clear Anodized Finish

The architecture for the two retail buildings along the project’s US 301 frontage has been removed from the subject application. This architecture will be re-evaluated by the applicant and will be resubmitted for Planning Board approval at a later date.

The proposed use and square footage for each building proposed for the project are as follows:

Industrial Warehousing

Building A	52,654
Building B	102,873
Building C	77,225
Building F	109,042
Building G	111,333
Total	453,127

Retail Commercial

Building D	30,070
Building E	43,025
Total	73,095

Industrial Warehousing	453,127
Retail Commercial	73,095
Grand Total	526,222

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with Section 27-515, Uses Permitted, and Section 27-501, Regulations, of the Zoning Ordinance. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-515, which governs permitted uses in the E-I-A Zone. Footnote 6 of the use table limits commercial retail use in the E-I-A Zone to “convenience commercial establishments to serve other uses (and employees) in the zone.” As mentioned above, the architecture for the proposed retail buildings will be submitted later as a revision to the subject application. It may be appropriate at that time for the applicant to identify proposed tenants or types of tenants. On April 27, 1992, John W. Rhoads, then Chairman of the Prince George’s County Planning Board, issued a memorandum that sought to broaden the land uses permissible in Collington Center by establishing a process for Planning Director evaluation and approval of additional land uses for the center, with appeals going to the Planning Board. The applicant may seek to avail themselves of this process to get some specific uses approved for the two buildings that front on US 301.

The project is also in conformance with Section 27-501 regarding regulations in the E-I-A Zone.

8. **Amended Basic Plans A-6965-C and A-9397-C:** Staff has reviewed the subject project against the conditions and considerations of the relevant basic plans and find the project to be in compliance.
9. **Comprehensive Design Plans CDP-8712, CDP-9006, CDP-9006/01, and CDP-9006/02:** The proposed specific design plan is in conformance with the requirements of CDP-8712, CDP-9006, CDP-9006/01, and CDP-9006/02. Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9006/02 established a cap on development. Please see discussion of referral comments offered by the Transportation Planning Section regarding the cap.
10. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-88074:** On June 16, 1988, the Prince George's County Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-88074 (PGCPB Resolution No. 88-287) subject to nine conditions, none of which is applicable to the subject specific design plan. As indicated by the Subdivision Section, the subject specific design plan is in conformance with 4-88074.
11. **Record Plat 207 @ 12:** In a memorandum dated February 27, 2009, the Subdivision Section stated that the final plat was approved on June 17, 2005 and contains two plat notes. Further, they stated that the plat was prepared and approved pursuant to Section 24-108(a)(3) of the Subdivision Regulations and that the plat accomplished a lot line adjustment of underlying Lots 9 and 20 and Parcel Block C to create the current configuration of Lots 23, 24, and 25, Block C that are the subject of the current specific design plan. They mentioned that the plat also incorporated portions of the Willowbrook Parkway (A-44) into the limits of the subject property which was formally vacated pursuant to Vacation Petition V-05001. In closing, the Subdivision Section stated that the proposed plat is in general conformance with the record plat.
12. **Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The proposed development is subject to the following parking lot requirements of the *Prince's George's County Landscape Manual*: Section 4.2 Commercial and Industrial Landscaped Strip Requirements; and Section 4.3(a) Landscaped Strip Requirements, (b) Perimeter Landscape Requirements, and (c) Interior Planting. The plan was evaluated by the Urban Design staff for conformance to the approved comprehensive design plan and the above-relevant sections of the Landscape Manual. It was found to be in conformance, provided a single condition is attached to the approval. That condition would correct the calculation of shade trees required in the parking area to one per 300 square feet of parking provided. Since that condition is included in the recommendation section of this report, provided the project is approved as recommended, it may be said that the plan conforms to the approved comprehensive design plan and the applicable standards of the Landscape Manual.
13. **Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** The property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because there are previously approved Tree Conservation Plans, TCPI/59/95 and TCPII/67/96-03. The Environmental Planning Section has evaluated the proposed project's conformance with the requirements of the ordinance and has recommended approval of the project, subject to two conditions that have been included in the recommendation section of this report. Therefore, it may be said that the proposed project is in accord with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance.

14. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

Historic Preservation—In comments dated February 10, 2009, the Historic Preservation Section stated that the proposed plan will have no effect on historic sites, resources, or districts.

Archeology—In a memorandum dated March 6, 2009, the archeology coordinator stated that a Phase I archeological survey would not be recommended for the site because the property has been graded and the probability of finding archeological sites within it is low. However, she stated that the applicant should be aware that there is one archeological site, five historic archeological sites, and three multicomponent prehistoric and historic sites within a one-mile radius of the subject property. In addition, she stated, there are two County historic sites, Beechwood and Montpelier of Mores Plains, and one historic resource, Buck-Nicholson House, within a one-mile radius of the subject property. In closing, she mentioned that Section 106 review may require archeological survey for state or federal agencies. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties, to include archeological sites, when state or federal monies, or federal permits are required for the project.

Community Planning—In a memorandum dated March 9, 2009, the Community Planning North Division stated that the application is not inconsistent with the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan* Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier and that it conforms to the 2006 *Approved Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A, 74B* land use recommendation for employment land uses.

Transportation—Noting that the proposed project must conform to the requirements of CDP-9006 and A-6965 as amended and the requirements of Preliminary Plan 4-88074, the Transportation Planning Section, in a memorandum dated June 10, 2009, stated that no square footage nor trip cap requirement was established in the approval of the preliminary plan and that a new analysis was done as part of CDP-9006/02. Condition 6 of the approving resolution for CDP-9006/02 allowed 5.2 million square feet within the central section of the Collington Center, after which a southern vehicular connection to Leeland Road (offering a vehicular alternative to the US 301/Trade Zone Avenue intersection) must be constructed. Further, they stated that Condition 7 of that same resolution requires that every specific design plan within the central section of the Collington Center must include a tabulation showing the gross square footage approved and the status to ensure compliance with Condition 6. Though the limit set by Condition 7 might not have been exceeded, no such table has been included on the plans. Such table, last included in approved SDP-8509/02, should be updated and placed on the plans, including gross floor area approved and built. The applicant has since revised the plans to include the appropriate and updated chart.

Subdivision—In a memorandum dated February 27, 2009, the Subdivision Section stated that the property is subject to the requirements of Preliminary Plan 4-88074, which was approved by the Planning Board on June 16, 1988, with the resolution adopted the same day. A final plat for the property was approved on June 17, 2005 and is recorded in land records as REP 207 @ 12 with two plat notes. This plat adjusted the lot lines of underlying Lots 9 and 20 and Parcel B, Block C, to create the current configuration of Lots 23, 24, and 25, Block C that are now the subject of the subject specific design plan. This plat also incorporated portions of Willowbrook Parkway (A-44) into the limits of the subject property which was formally vacated pursuant to Vacation Petition V-05001. A cap was set forth in PGCPB Resolution No. 05-83, (CDP-9006/02). The Subdivision

Section concluded that the subject specific design plan is in general conformance with the approved final plat and offered the following plan comments:

- a. The plan demonstrates number references around the boundary of the site which appear to relate to a curve table. However, no curve table was located on the submitted plan that corresponds with these numbers.
- b. The general notes on the submitted SDP should include information on the underlying preliminary plan, adopted resolution, and final plat.
- c. The property/lot lines shown on the submitted specific design plan are difficult to distinguish from the rest of the graphics shown on the plan because they appear to be drawn using the same font used throughout the rest of the plan. This is especially true for the lot lines internal to the site. The property lines of all three lots should be shown using a bolder font for clarity purposes.

The issues raised by the Subdivision Section have been addressed in the recommended conditions below.

Trails—In a memorandum dated March 6, 2009, the trails coordinator stated that there are no master plan trails issues identified in the adopted and approved Bowie and Vicinity master plan that impact the subject site. Further, he stated that since all roads in the vicinity of the subject site are closed section with no sidewalks and there are no properties with sidewalks that abut the subject property, it is not practical to require sidewalks along the frontages of the subject site.

Permits—In a memorandum dated February 18, 2009, the Permit Review Section offered numerous comments that have either been addressed by revisions to the plans or in the recommended conditions below.

Special Projects Section—In a memorandum dated March 19, 2009, the Special Projects Section stated that they had determined that the proposed project is within the required seven-minute response time for the first due fire station, Bowie, Company 43, using the *Seven Minute Travel Times and Fire Station Locations Map* provided by the Prince George's County Fire Department. Additionally, they stated that as to fire and rescue services, the approved Capital Improvement Program Fiscal Year 2009–2014 contains funding to construct a new fire station approximately two and one-half miles from the subject property on Leeland Road. The design of the new station, to be called “Beechtree Fire/EMS Station,” which will include two-bays and full service, is slated to commence in FY 2012. Further, the Special Projects Section offered the following:

Police Facilities

The Prince George's County Planning Department has determined that the subject property is located in the service area of District II, Bowie. Police facilities have been determined to be adequate.

Public Schools

The subject development is not residential and therefore will not impact public school capacity.

Water and Sewerage

The proposed development is in water Category 3 and sewer Category 3, Community System, which, as confirmed in an email dated March 20, 2009, are the appropriate categories for the subject project. They suggested, in that email, that the applicant coordinate hook-up with Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) when they get further along in the development process.

Environmental Planning Section—In a memorandum dated June 26, 2009, the Environmental Planning Section stated that they reviewed a revised specific design plan and Type II tree conservation plan for the subject project, received May 21, 2009, and conducted a site visit on June 23, 2009 to evaluate the placement of the proposed outfalls to minimize the environmental impacts. As background, they offered:

- This site was previously reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section in conjunction with the Basic Plans A-6965, A-9284, and A-9397; Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9006 and subsequent revisions; Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-88074; the associated Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/59/95; and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/67/96 with subsequent revisions; all of which were approved. Specific Design Plan SDP-0511 and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/052/06, which proposed the development of warehouse buildings and ancillary office space on three lots totaling 52.40 acres in the E-I-A Zone, were approved by the Planning Board on June 1, 2006 subject to conditions contained in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-126. The current application proposes a revision to the specific design plan and tree conservation plan to expand warehouse and office space on the subject property from 457,500 square feet to 522,100 square feet.

Comment: The subject plan is a new project and site layout than the originally submitted Specific Design Plan (SDP-0511) which was completed for Marlo Furniture. The current site plan SDP-0511/01 was revised from the layout that was originally submitted at the Environmental Planning Section's request in deference to environmentally-sensitive features on-site so as to lessen the environmental impacts of the project.

The Environmental Planning Section, in their memorandum dated June 26, 2009, offered the following environmental site description:

- A review of the available information indicates that streams, wetlands, and the associated buffers for these features are found to occur within the limits of this application. Transportation-related noise impacts associated with US 301 have been identified. The Westphalia fine sandy loam soils found to occur according to the *Prince George's County Soil Survey* have no significant limitations that would affect the development of this property. According to available information, an evaluation area for Marlboro clay underlies the western portion of this property. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program, this site does not contain sensitive species protection review area and there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. There are no designated scenic and historic roads in the vicinity of the lots included in this application. This property is located in the Collington Branch watershed of the Patuxent River basin and in the Developing Tier as reflected in the adopted General Plan. According to the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan, this site contains regulated areas, evaluation areas, and network gaps.

Comment: Regarding their review of prior conditions of approval applicable to the subject property, the Environmental Planning Section stated that there were no environmentally-related conditions in the approval of the rezoning case by the District Council and all subsequent approvals, including PGCPB Resolution No. 06-126, which approved SDP-0511.

Specific Design Plan SDP-0511 is not relevant to the current approval. The subject approval is a different site plan offered by a new applicant.

In their memorandum, the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comments on the subject project:

- a. The detailed forest stand delineation (FSD) was previously reviewed and found to address the criteria for a FSD in accordance with the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Technical Manual.

Discussion: No additional information is required with respect to the forest stand delineation.

- b. This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because there are previously approved tree conservation plans, TCPI/59/95 and TCPII/67/96-03, encompassing the parcel included in this application, including the vacated right-of-way for Willowbrook Parkway. A total of 22.91 acres of the vacated right-of-way has reverted to the ownership of Prince George's County, and contains no proposed woodland conservation areas. A 6.95-acre portion of vacated Willowbrook Parkway has reverted to Safeway, Inc., which owns the property located to the south.

This application was evaluated for conformance with the woodland conservation requirements established for this lot by TCPII/67/96. The Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/052/06, previously approved for this site was in conformance with the requirement of 9.61 acres of woodland preservation required for this property. A revised Type II tree conservation plan was submitted and reviewed with this property, which increased the on-site clearing and off-site clearing associated with this development. As a result, an additional 0.30 acre are required due to the removal of woodlands, for a total woodland conservation requirement of 9.91. The revised plan proposes to meet the requirement by providing 9.29 acres of on-site preservation and 0.62 acre of on-site afforestation.

The area of additional clearing includes 0.25 acre of existing woodlands containing wetlands and wetland buffer which were previously shown to be preserved. A field visit was conducted to evaluate the areas of the wetland buffers that are proposed to be impacted by the revisions to the plan. It appears that the added areas of wetland buffer impacts are related to the increased building footprints and the resulting expansion of the limits of disturbance. Some of the affected areas contain significant trees that should be protected during the placement of the outfalls.

Because of the way the outfalls are designed, they could be field placed to ensure that the impacts are minimized. Staff recommends that a field meeting be conducted to place the outfalls at the locations of least impact and that during that field walk, the appropriate edge treatments shall be identified to eliminate invasive plant species.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the specific design plan, the SDP and the TCPII shall be revised to show the modified field locations of the outfalls as presented on applicant's Exhibit A, received June 23, 2009.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the specific design plan, the TCPII shall be revised to include an invasive plant removal plan that addresses the removal of invasive plants within 25 feet of the limit of disturbance. An implementation timeframe shall be provided on the TCPII.

- c. The protection of wetlands and the required 25-foot-wide wetland buffer is required by the Subdivision Regulations. A variation request for temporary and/or permanent impacts to wetlands and buffers must be approved by the Planning Board in conjunction with preliminary plan approval. No such request was made as part of the preliminary plan approval for this site, and the TCPI indicated that the wetland areas would be left undisturbed.

The Subdivision Regulations mandate that the sensitive environmental features of the site be preserved to the fullest extent possible. Staff generally recommends approval of environmental impacts for unavoidable impacts such as the installation of public road crossings and public utilities, if they are designed to preserve the environmental features of the site to the fullest extent possible. Staff generally does not recommend approval of environmental impacts for the creation of lots, construction of structures, or other clearing and grading when alternative designs would reduce or eliminate the impacts.

The applicant has obtained a Letter of Authorization 09-NT-0055/200960557 from the Maryland Department of the Environment, Water Management Administration, which authorizes 7,828 square feet of impact to the 25-foot nontidal wetland buffer, associated with nontidal wetlands that discharge into Collington Branch, a Use I waterway, for the construction of the development. No nontidal wetlands are authorized to be disturbed.

Comment: The recommended pre-certification joint field visit will confirm that no nontidal wetlands, and only buffer areas, will be impacted by the proposed development.

- d. Lots included in this application are located adjacent to US 301, which has been identified as a transportation-related noise generator. The Environmental Planning Section noise model calculated a noise level of 78.6 dBA Ldn at 50 feet from the roadway. This noise is reduced to approximately 75 dBA Ldn at the property line that falls within the acceptable range for commercial and industrial development in accordance with state noise standards.

Discussion: No further information is required with respect to potential noise impacts.

Comment: The above two conditions have been included in the recommendation section of this report.

Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department—In a memorandum dated May 15, 2009, the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department offered information regarding needed accessibility, fire lanes, the location and performance of fire hydrants, and private road design.

Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)—In a memorandum dated March 11, 2009, the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) outlined improvements that would be required along County-owned and maintained Queens Court and

Prince George's Boulevard frontages. In addition, with respect to stormwater management planned for the site, they stated that the proposed site development is consistent with approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 15918-2003, dated February 15, 2007. With respect to the sensitive environmental features on the site, they stated that existing and proposed floodplain approval and U.S. Corp of Engineers, Maryland Department of the Environment, approvals would be necessary, the latter with respect to the proposed wetland crossing.

State Highway Administration (SHA)—In comments received March 6, 2009, the State Highway Administration (SHA) stated that they had no objection to approval of the subject specific design plan.

Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)—As of the writing of this staff report, staff has not received comment from WSSC.

Verizon—In an email dated March 19, 2009, Verizon, while stating that they would not comment on the project, also commented that all of the on-site improvements required by Verizon would be paid for by the developer.

The Collington Center Association, Inc. Architectural Review Committee—In a letter dated April 3, 2009, the Collington Center Association, Inc. Architectural Review Committee stated that they approved the current plans as they were presented to the Committee. Specifically, they referenced Drawing 6.098-Z, dated July 2008 and ten sheets of renderings and elevations dated March 31, 2009 as the materials upon which they based their decision.

15. Section 27-528 of the Zoning Ordinance sets forth the following required findings for approval of a specific design plan:

(a) Prior to approving a Specific Design Plan, the Planning Board shall find that:

(1) The plan conforms to the approved Comprehensive Design Plan, the applicable standards of the Landscape Manual, and except as provided in Section 27-528(a)(1.1), for Specific Design Plans for which an application is filed after December 30, 1996, with the exception of the V-L and V-M Zones, the applicable design guidelines for townhouses set forth in Section 27-274(a)(1)(B) and (a)(11), and the applicable regulations for townhouses set forth in Section 27-433(d) and, as it applies to property in the L-A-C Zone, if any portion lies within one-half (1/2) mile of an existing or Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Metrorail station, the regulations set forth in Section 27-480(d) and (e);

Comment: The subject plan conforms to approved CDP-9006, as revised, and the applicable standards of the Landscape Manual. See Findings 8 and 11 for a more detailed discuss of that compliance.

(2) 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;

Comment: In a memorandum dated March 19, 2009, the Countywide Planning Division stated that the development would 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. In particular, noting that the project is nonresidential and would not impact the capacity of public schools, the Countywide Planning Division individually addressed fire and rescue service, police, and water and sewerage facilities.

In a memorandum dated June 10, 2009, the Transportation Planning Section stated that the site was initially subjected to and passed a test of transportation adequacy in 1988 and again when the CDP was revised for a second time in 2005, and that insofar as the basis for the finding is still valid that the subject property will be adequately served within a reasonable time with transportation facilities which are existing, programmed, or which will be provided as a part of the development if the development is approved.

(3) Adequate provision has been made for draining surface water so that there are no adverse effects on either the subject property or adjacent properties; and

Comment: In a memorandum dated March 11, 2009, the Department of Public Works and Transportation stated that the proposed site development is consistent with approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 15918-2003, dated 2007. Therefore, one may conclude that adequate provision has been made for draining surface water so that there are no adverse effects on either the subject property or the adjacent properties.

(4) The plan is in conformance with an approved Tree Conservation Plan.

Comment: In its memorandum dated June 26, 2009, the Environmental Planning Section did a thorough evaluation of the project's compliance with the requirements of Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/52/06-01 (Formerly TCPII/67/96-04) and recommended approval subject to conditions, which have been included as necessary in the recommendation section of this report. Therefore, it may be said that the plan is in conformance with an approved tree conservation plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Specific Design Plan SDP-0511/01 for Collington Center, Lots 23, 24, and 25, Block C, and TCPII/52/06-01 subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certificate approval of this specific design plan, the applicant shall make the following revisions:
 - a. The general notes shall be revised to refer to the adopted resolution for the preliminary plan approval and to the recorded plat.
 - b. The property/lot lines shall be revised so that it is easy to distinguish them from the rest of the graphics shown on the plan. The property lines of all three lots shall be shown using a bolder font.
 - c. The specific design plan and the Type II tree conservation plan shall be revised to show the modified field locations of the outfalls as presented on applicant's Exhibit A, received by the Environmental Planning Section on June 23, 2009.

- d. The Type II tree conservation plan shall be revised to include an invasive plant removal plan that addresses the removal of invasive plants within 25 feet of the limit of disturbance. An implementation timeframe shall be provided on the Type II tree conservation plan.
- e. The applicant shall add notes to the plans that the approval of the architecture for Buildings D and E, the two retail buildings, along the project site's US 301 frontage shall be separately approved by the Planning Board in a future revision to the specific design plan.
- f. The applicant shall include the correct ultimate right-of-way line for US 301 frontage on the plans.
- g. The applicant shall add the following note to the general notes on the cover sheet of the subject specific design plan:

“All structures shall be fully sprinklered in accordance with National Fire Protection Association Standard 13 and all applicable County laws.”
- h. The applicant shall recalculate the number of shade trees to be provided in the parking areas pursuant to the requirement in the Landscape Manual at a rate of one shade tree per 300 square feet of parking area provided, not the number of square feet required.
- i. A note shall be added to the plans that trees in the parking areas shall be trimmed to approximately six to seven feet above the ground.
- j. The applicant shall revise the architecture for the buildings included in the architectural approval for the subject specific design plan (i.e. Buildings A, G, F, B, and C) to show the use of masonry (Castleridge stone) material on the watertable of all four sides of the buildings and on the entrance features extending up over the buildings' flat roofline, on all entranceways on the front and side façades, where applicable. The Urban Design Section shall approve the final elevation drawings as designee of the Planning Board.