

Case No.        DSP 13027  
                     SP-130004  
                     Longfellow Street Property

Applicant:      Lilian Y. Koo

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE’S COUNTY, MARYLAND,  
SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

ORDER OF DISAPPROVAL IN PART, and APPROVAL IN PART

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, after review of the administrative record, that the applications to approve a detailed site plan and special permit, respectively, for conversion of a one-family detached dwelling to a building containing up to three dwelling units (not considered as a two-family, three-family, or multifamily dwelling), for property described as 0.132 acre of land in the R-35 (One-Family Semidetached, and Two-Family Detached, Residential) and D-D-O (Development District Overlay) Zones, located on the northeastern side of Longfellow Street approximately 440 feet southeast of its intersection with Queens Chapel Road, with street address of 3516 Longfellow Street, Hyattsville, Planning Area 68, in Council District 2, be and the same is hereby DISAPPROVED IN PART, and APPROVED IN PART. The application to permit conversion of a one-family dwelling to a building containing up to three (3) dwelling units is APPROVED subject to the conditions set forth herein for two (2) dwelling units as a use contemplated within Traditional Residential Neighborhood (“TRN”) character area table of permitted uses applicable to the subject property, but DISAPPROVED as to the request for three (3) dwelling units, as recommended in PGCPB No. 14-121.

As the basis for this final decision, and as expressly authorized by the Regional District Act, within Title 22 and Title 25 of the Land Use Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, and the Zoning Ordinance of Prince George’s County, Maryland, being also Subtitle 27 of the

Prince George's County Code.<sup>1</sup> Except where otherwise stated, we hereby adopt the findings and conclusions set forth in PGCPB No. 14-121 within the administrative record, as if fully stated herein, as the District Council's findings of fact and conclusions of law.

### PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On or about July 7, 2014, the Development Review Division of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission accepted, as filed and for review, detailed site plan and special permit applications DSP-13027 and SP-130004, respectively, requesting approval for conversion of a one-family detached dwelling to a building containing three (3) dwelling units (not considered as a two-family, three-family, or multifamily dwelling), for property described as 0.13 acre of land in the R-35 (One-Family Semidetached, and Two-Family Detached, Residential) and D-D-O (Development District Overlay) Zones, with designated street address of 3516 Longfellow Street, Planning Area 68, within the corporate boundaries of the City of Hyattsville. On October 3, 2014, after completing its review of the subject applications in accordance with §§ 27-284 of the Zoning Ordinance, Technical Staff of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission issued a Technical Staff Report as to DSP-13027 and SP-130004 in accordance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, and recommending approval of the proposed applications. *See* 10/3/2014 TSR, at 3. On October 30, 2014, Planning Board conducted a public hearing on the subject proposal in accordance with §§ 27-285 and 27-548.25 of the Zoning Ordinance. After considering the testimony and other evidence in the record, the Planning Board adopted PGCPB No. 14-121 at its November 20, 2014, meeting,

---

<sup>1</sup> References to the Zoning Ordinance of Prince George's County, Maryland, being also Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, §§ 27-101 (2011 Ed. & Supp. 2014), *et seq.*, are styled "the Zoning Ordinance" and cited "§ 27- \_\_\_, PGZO" herein. References to the Regional District Act within Md. Code Ann., Land Use (2012 & Supp. 2014) are styled the "Regional District Act" or "RDA," and cited "§ \_\_\_ of the RDA" herein. References to the Development Review Division of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission are styled "Technical Staff" herein. References to the record applicant, Lillian Y. Koo, regarding applications DSP-13027 and SP-130004 are styled "Applicant" herein. Lastly, citations to specific exhibits within the administrative record for DSP-13027 and SP-130004 are styled "Ex. \_\_\_" herein.

stating its favorable disposition of approval as to DSP-13027 and SE-130004 embodied therein, pursuant to § 27-285 of the Zoning Ordinance. *Id.*

On November 25, 2014, Technical Staff issued notice regarding Planning Board's disposition in PGCPB No. 14-121 to all persons of record and transmitted same to the Clerk of the District Council. *See* § 27-290, PGCZO. On January 26, 2015, the District Council elected to make the final decision as to DSP-13027. *Id. See also* 01/26/2015 District Council Zoning Agenda. No petition for appeal of Planning Board's disposition within PGCPB No. 14-121 was filed by any person of record pursuant to § 27-290 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Accordingly, after the close of the appeal period for the subject application, the Clerk of the District Council mailed notice of the oral argument scheduled for March 9, 2015, to all persons of record pursuant to §§ 27-125.04 and 27-290 of the Zoning Ordinance. *See* 02/06/2015 Floyd Notice Ltr. We conducted oral argument as scheduled on March 9, 2015, in accordance with the prescriptions of § 27-131 of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as the District Council Rules of Procedure. *See generally* 03/09/2015 Tr. *See also* Rule 6, R. of Proc., County Council of Prince George's County, sitting as the District Council. Upon conclusion of the proceeding, we took this matter under advisement. *See* 03/09/2015 Tr. Thereafter, on April 13, 2015, and in the manner prescribed within § 27-132 of the Zoning Ordinance, the District Council voted to refer DSP-13027 and SP-130004 for preparation of an Order of Disapproval as its final decision.

## FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

### Applicable Law

The Prince George's County Council, by way of the express authority conferred by the Maryland General Assembly through the Regional District Act ("RDA"), sits as the District Council for that portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District within Prince George's

County.<sup>2</sup> See §§ 14-101(f), 22-101(b), RDA. What’s more, the RDA designates the Prince George’s County Council, sitting as the District Council, broad authority to regulate zoning and land use matters. See §§ 22-201(b), 22-202(a, b), 22-206, 22-208, 22-301(a)–(c), 22-310(a), 22-407 and 25-210, RDA. In so doing, the legislature designated specific authority for the Council to make factual determinations and to adjudicate various factual disputes in rendering the final decision in zoning cases.

Further, and pursuant to § 22-104 of the RDA, the District Council may, by ordinance, adopt and amend the text of its local zoning ordinance and may, by resolution or ordinance, adopt and amend the map or maps accompanying the zoning ordinance text to regulate, in the portion of the regional district lying within its county, the size of lots, yards, courts and other open spaces.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, in exercising its authority to regulate land use and zoning in the County, the District Council enacted certain procedural prescriptions within its Zoning Ordinance. See *Prince George’s County v. Ray’s Used Cars*, 398 Md. 632, 635–36, 922 A.2d 495, 497 (2007).

---

<sup>2</sup> The District Council sits as an administrative agency when reviewing a zoning matter. See *County Council v. Brandywine Enter’s*, 350 Md. 339, 711 A.2d 1346 (1998) (“Regional District Act authorizes the County Council to sit as a district council in zoning matters, and, when it does so, it is acting as an administrative agency”); *County Council v. Carl M. Freeman Assoc’s*, 281 M. 70, 376 A.2d 869 (1973) (“When it sits as the district council in a zoning matter, the Prince George’s County Council is an ‘administrative agency’ as the term is broadly defined”). See also § 14-101(f) and § 22-101(b), RDA; § 27-107.01(a)(1, 67, 68), PGCZO (each subsection therein defining ‘district’ as that portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District located in Prince George’s County, Maryland, and ‘district council’ as The Prince George’s County Council, sitting as the District Council for that portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District located in Prince George’s County).

<sup>3</sup> See Md. Code Ann., Land Use § 14-101 (h), (q) (2012 & Supp. 2014): “(h)(1) Local law. — ‘Local law’ means an enactment of the legislative body of a local jurisdiction, whether by Ordinance, resolution, or otherwise.

(2) ‘Local law’ does not include a public local law.”

“(q)(1) Zoning law. — ‘Zoning law’ means the legislative implementation of regulations for zoning by a local jurisdiction.

(2) ‘Zoning law’ includes a zoning ordinance, zoning regulation, zoning code, and any similar legislative action to implement zoning controls in a local jurisdiction.”

In conveying this expansive zoning authority, the Maryland General Assembly also ceded substantial legislative prerogative to the district councils to carry out its zoning powers and responsibilities to adopt and amend zoning laws. *See* § 22-104(a)–(b), RDA. In so doing, the district councils may also divide the portion of the regional district located within its county into districts and zones of any number, shape, or area it may determine. *See, e.g.*, § 22-201, RDA. As such, the enactment of zoning laws affecting the districts and zones of its respective geographic designation, as well as the right to the construction, alteration, and uses of buildings and structures, and the uses of land, including surface, subsurface, and air rights falls within the exclusive province of the district councils. *Id.* Thus, the RDA inures the district councils with regulatory controls to promulgate prescriptions governing the form and manner of uses and structures on land, and to dictate the form and order of procedures deemed appropriate as to zoning and land use controls for land within its purview. *See* §§ 22-202, 22-206, RDA.

In turn, the District Council adopted local zoning provisions in its Zoning Ordinance in furtherance of the exercise of its ample authority supplied via the RDA, in keeping with the overarching purpose to guide exercise of its police power in furtherance of the public safety, health, and welfare of the citizens and residents of the County. *See* § 27-102, PGCZO.<sup>4</sup> In so

---

<sup>4</sup> Section 27-102, PGCZO, states the following purposes of the Zoning Ordinance:

- (1) To protect and promote the health, safety, morals comfort, convenience, and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the County;
- (2) To implement the General Plan, Area Master Plans, and Functional Master Plans;
- (3) To promote the conservation, creation, and expansion of communities that will be developed with adequate public facilities and services;
- (4) To guide the orderly growth and development of the County, while recognizing the needs of agriculture, housing, industry, and business;
- (5) To provide adequate light, air, and privacy;
- (6) To promote the most beneficial relationship between the uses of land and buildings and protect landowners from adverse impacts of adjoining development;
- (7) To protect the County from fire, flood, panic, and other dangers;
- (8) To provide sound, sanitary housing in a suitable and healthy living environment within the economic reach of all County residents;
- (9) To encourage economic development activities that provide desirable employment and a broad, protected tax base;
- (10) To prevent the overcrowding of land;

doing, we enjoy specific authority to regulate local requirements for site plans, including detailed site plans, within Subtitle 27, Division 9, Subdivision 3 of the Zoning Ordinance. Because the subject property lies within an approved D-D-O (Development District Overlay) Zone, the proposed development must also comply with the prescriptions of Part 10A, Division 3 of the Zoning Ordinance. Lastly, detailed site plan applications for property within a D-D-O Zone must comport with § 27-548.25 of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires conformance with submittal requirements in the Development District Standards, and a finding that the proposed site plan application meets applicable Development Standards.’

#### Applicant’s Development Request

As stated in the administrative record, this request involves a residential structure, constructed in 1949, on property in a residential neighborhood with zoning classification R-35 (One-Family Semidetached, and Two-Family Detached, Residential) Zone. *See* PGCPB No. 14-121, at 2; 10/03/2014 TSR, at 4. The property is bounded to the southeast by a single-family detached unit in the R-35 Zone, with 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue beyond; to the northwest by single-family detached units in the R-55 (One-Family Detached Residential) Zone; to the southwest by Longfellow Street with single-family detached units in the R-55 Zone; and to the northeast by a single-family detached unit in the R-35 Zone. Additionally, and as is the case with the subject property, all of the surrounding properties share an additional zoning classification in the D-D-O Zone, pursuant to approval by the District Council of the *Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Prince George’s County Gateway Arts District* (“2004 Gateway

- 
- (11) To lessen the danger and congestion of traffic on the streets, and to insure the continued usefulness of all elements of the transportation system for their planned functions;
  - (12) To insure the social and economic stability of all parts of the County;
  - (13) To protect against undue noise, and air and water pollution, and to encourage the preservation of stream valleys, steep slopes, lands of natural beauty, dense forests, scenic vistas, and other similar features;
  - (14) To provide open space to protect scenic beauty and natural features of the County, as well as to provide recreational space; and
  - (15) To protect and conserve the agricultural industry and natural resources.

SMA/DDOZ”), more specifically, the Traditional Residential Neighborhood (“TRN”) character area within the Gateway Arts Development District. *See* 2004 Gateway SMA/DDOZ, at 14.

The record for DSP-13027 / SP-130004 reveals that Applicant seeks approval for conversion of the one-family dwelling at 3516 Longfellow Street to a building containing up to three (3) dwelling units (not considered as a two-family, three-family, or multifamily dwelling) within the R-35 Zone and the Gateway Arts District D-D-O Zone. *See* 09/25/2014 App. Just’n Stmt., at 1.

#### Zoning Requirements Applicable to the Property

Based on our review of the administrative record, we find that the proposed request is subject to regulations set forth in Zoning Ordinance for the R-35 Zone, as modified regulatory provisions of the D-D-O Zone superimposed over the entire sector plan area approved within the 2004 *Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Prince George's County Gateway Arts District*, pursuant to §§ 27-548.21, 27-548.22, and 27-548.23 of the Zoning Ordinance. *See* PGCPB No. 14-121, at 2; 10/03/2014 TSR, at 5; 2004 *Gateway Arts District SMA*, at 107, 111, 135, 138, 139–43. Accordingly, the regulations and uses permitted in the D-D-O Zone are the same as those of the underlying zoning classification for a property, except as modified by the Development District regulations, including the list of permitted uses. *See* §§ 27-548.21, 27-548.22, PGCZO.

Our assessment begins with the stated purposes of the R-35 Zone, as set forth in § 27-431 of the Zoning Ordinance, in pertinent part as follows:

Sec. 27-431. R-35 Zone (One Family Semidetached, and Two-Family Detached, Residential.

(a) Purposes.

(1) The purposes of the R-35 Zone are:

(A) To provide for and encourage variation in the size, shape, and width of one-family semidetached and two-family detached residential subdivision lots, in order to better utilize the natural terrain;

- (B) To facilitate the planning of higher density one- and two-family residential developments with small lots and dwellings of various sizes, types, and styles;
- (C) To provide for a variety of housing types;
- (D) To encourage the preservation of trees and open spaces; and
- (E) To prevent soil erosion and stream valley flooding.

(b) Uses.

(1) The uses allowed in the R-35 Zone are as provided for in the Table of Uses (Division 3 of this Part).

(c) Regulations.

(1) Additional regulations concerning the location, size, and other provisions for all buildings and structures in the R-35 Zone are as provided for in Divisions 1 and 5 of this Part, the Regulations Tables (Division 4 of this Part), General (Part 2), Off-Street Parking and Loading (Part 11), Signs (Part 12), and the Landscape Manual.

§ 27-431(a)–(c), PGCZO.

We note the reference in § 27-431, above, to the Table of Uses for the residential zones of the County set forth in § 27-441(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, and its specific designation of “conversion of a one-family dwelling to a building with up to three dwelling units (not considered as a two-family, three-family, or multifamily dwelling)” as a prohibited use in the R-35 Zone and the R-55 Zone, the zoning classification for land adjacent to the subject property. *See* PGCPB No. 14-121, at 2; 10/03/2014 TSR, at 5.

As explained on page 135 of the 2004 *Gateway Arts SMA/DDOZ*, the Development District is superimposed over the entire sector plan area order to ensure that the development of land meets sector plan goals and objectives that achieve a central vision of an Arts District that is a focal point for arts activities of all types, as well as a place for socializing, dining, shopping, and living. *See* 2004 *Gateway SMA/DDOZ*, at 135. To this end, the Arts District DDOZ states, there are seven (7) character areas for the Gateway development district; with the exception of “stream valley park,” each character area has its own set of development district standards that are tailored to implement concepts and recommendations in the 2004 Gateway Arts vision. *Id.*



Here, the subject property lies within the Traditional Residential Neighborhood (“TRN”) character area of the Arts District DDOZ. The land use characteristics of the TRN area, as stated in the SMA, which overlay land zoned for attached and detached single-family development are

an asset to be protected from encroachment or significant loss of integrity. This development character **reinforces the existing single-family detached residential neighborhoods as calm, low-traffic**, and child-safe. Although the **area is zoned residential, fine art and handcraft home occupations are permitted**. Development district standards retain the block face and scale of residential streets, as well as **prohibit the paving over of front yards** and the construction of overly wide driveway aprons.

2004 *Gateway Arts SMA/DDOZ*, at 138 (*emphasis added*).

The stated goals of the TRN character area in the Arts District DDOZ are

[t]o promote development of both family- and artist-related residential development in the R-55, R-35, R-20, and R-T Zones. To preserve the single-family residential neighborhood character as the anchor of the Arts District, while supporting artists who produce and teach from their homes. To enhance the “built-in” natural surveillance of public areas by active neighbors on porches, in yards, and on the sidewalk.

2004 *Gateway Arts SMA/DDOZ*, at 138.

As contemplated within the text of Part 10A in the Zoning Ordinance, the Arts District DDOZ is placed over the existing zoning for the land where it is placed, and may modify specific requirements of those underlying zones. *See* § 27-548.21, PGCZO. In the subject case, the Arts District DDOZ also states that “[d]evelopment in the DDOZ is subject to the development district standards of the character area within which it is located, and all new development, redevelopment, and **renovation of existing structures within the DDOZ shall comply with the general intent and goals of the development district** and standards in the plan.” 2004 *Gateway Arts SMA/DDOZ*, at 139 (*emphasis added*). Thus, the introductory text to the Arts District DDOZ Table of Uses specifies that “this table controls the underlying uses lists listed in the Zoning Ordinance,” and that “some of the uses permitted in a character area might be prohibited

in the underlying zone's use table as listed in the Zoning Ordinance. For example, many residential uses are prohibited in industrial zones but are now permitted in the I-2 Zone within the arts production and entertainment character area because it is consistent with the goals of the Arts District." 2004 *Gateway Arts SMA/DDOZ*, at 167. *See also* PGCPB No. 14-121, at 3; 10/03/2014 TSR, at 5.

Here, while § 27-441(b) of the Zoning Ordinance prohibits "conversion of a one-family dwelling to a building with up to three dwelling units (not considered as a two-family, three-family, or multifamily dwelling) in the R-35 Zone, the Arts District Table of Uses, inexplicably, provides that the use is permitted by special permit in the TRN. 2004 *Gateway Arts SMA/DDOZ*, at 194. *See also* PGCPB No. 14-121, at 3; 10/03/2014 TSR, at 5.

As established within the administrative record, this request seeks approval to convert a one-family dwelling to a building with up to three (3) dwelling units. PGCPB No. 14-121, at 3; 10/03/2014 TSR, at 5. In its findings regarding subject applications, Planning Board found that the proposed use for the subject property helps meet the goal to "promote the development of family and artist-oriented residential development in the R-35 Zone." *Id.* However, Planning Board offers no further explanation of the rationale for this finding in its disposition as to DSP-13027 in PGCPB No. 14-121, which might otherwise have allowed us to render a meaningful assessment as to validity of this finding.

In fact, to the contrary, we find that the plain language of the Arts District DDOZ puts the proposed use directly at odds with the goals and land use characteristics within TRN in the Arts District DDOZ. 2004 *Gateway Arts SMA/DDOZ*, at 139. Therefore, with nothing to compare, and our substantiated finding, we find Planning Board erred in finding that the conversion of a one-family dwelling into a building with three units, the maximum number of units, helps promote the goal of the TRN in the Arts District DDOZ because it pushes the density of the

existing residential structures beyond the Arts District vision for the TRN to “preserve the single-family residential neighborhood character as the anchor of the Arts District,” promotes overcrowding that erodes the goal of the TRN “to be protected from encroachment or significant loss of integrity. This development character **reinforces the existing single-family detached residential neighborhoods as calm, low-traffic**, and child-safe.” *See* PGCPB No. 14-121, at 3; 10/03/2014 TSR, at 5; 2004 *Gateway Arts SMA/DDOZ*, at 138.

Next, we find that the request for three units creates untenable parking issues in order to supply minimum parking to accommodate this use that frustrates the goal of the TRN character area to reinforce the existing single-family detached residential neighborhoods as calm, low-traffic, and child-safe, with development district standards retain the block face and scale of residential streets and prohibit the paving over of front yards and the construction of overly wide driveway aprons. *See* 2004 *Gateway Arts District SMA/DDOZ*, at 138.

To compound our finding that the requested use, conversion of a one-family dwelling to three units, is incompatible with the goals and land use characteristics articulated for the TRN character area of the Arts District, we note the finding of Planning Board in the administrative record that the subject request is exempt from the Arts District development district standards, the land use controls designed to ensure consistency with the land use vision. *See* PGCPB No. 14-121, at 3; 10/03/2014 TSR, at 5. Thus, the result is a use that is incompatible with the goals of the zone and wholly exempt from the design standards effectuated as aesthetic and regulatory controls for the TRN character area. *Id.*

Maryland law provides that when statutes link planning and zoning, comprehensive plans are elevated to the level of true regulatory devices. *HNS Dev., LLC v. People’s Counsel for Baltimore County*, 425 Md. 436, 42 A.3d 12 (2012). Moreover, the cases provide that zoning requests that do not conform to the master plan must be rejected, and nonconformance may serve

as an independent basis of denial. *Id.*, citing *Maryland-Nat'l Capital Park & Planning Comm'n v. Greater Baden-Aquasco Citizens Ass'n*, 412 Md. 73, 985 A.2d 1160 (2009), *Coffey v. Maryland-Nat'l Capital Park & Planning Comm'n*, 293 Md. 24, 441 A.2d 1041 (1982). Finally, when making a final decision in zoning cases, we are not constrained by the findings of Planning Board as to consistency with the purpose and intent of comprehensive plans. *See Richmond Corp. v. Board of County Commissioners*, 254 Md. 244, 255 A.2d 398, 408 (1969) (finding District Council not bound by opinions of Planning Commission or Department of Inspection and Permits as to certain uses and whether said uses harmonize with purpose and intent of the General Plan).

One of the purposes of the County's Zoning Ordinance is to implement the Master Plan, and a general purpose of a detailed site plan is to provide for development in accordance with the principles for the orderly, planned, efficient and economical development contained in the General Plan, Master Plan, or other approved plan. *See* §§ 27-201(a)(2) and 27-281(b)(1)(A), PGCZO. These provisions of the Zoning Ordinance link planning and zoning and, as such, serve to elevate the 2004 *Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Prince George's County Gateway Arts District* and Arts District DDOZ as true regulatory devices. For the reasons stated above, we conclude that DSP-13027 to convert a one-family dwelling to a **building with three dwelling units** (not considered as a two-family or multifamily dwelling unit) does not conform to the 2004 *Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Prince George's County Gateway Arts District* and Arts District DDOZ.

Instead of rejecting DSP-13027 in its entirety, as it does not conform to the 2004 *Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Prince George's County Gateway Arts District* and Arts District DDOZ, the application to convert a one-family dwelling to a **building with three dwelling units** is APPROVED IN PART, and DISAPPROVED IN PART, as to the applications

to approve a detailed site plan and special permit for conversion of a one-family detached dwelling to a building containing up to three dwelling units (not considered as a two-family, three-family, or multifamily dwelling), for property described as 0.132 acre of land in the R-35 (One-Family Semidetached, and Two-Family Detached, Residential) and D-D-O (Development District Overlay) Zones, located on the northeastern side of Longfellow Street approximately 440 feet southeast of its intersection with Queens Chapel Road, with street address of 3516 Longfellow Street, Hyattsville, Planning Area 68, in Council District 2, be and the same is hereby DISAPPROVED IN PART, and APPROVED IN PART. The application to permit conversion of a one-family dwelling to a building containing up to three (3) dwelling units is APPROVED, subject to the conditions, for two (2) dwelling units as a use contemplated within Traditional Residential Neighborhood (“TRN”) character area table of permitted uses applicable to the subject property, but DISAPPROVED as to the request for three (3) dwelling units, as recommended in PGCPB No. 14-121.

Approval of DSP-13027 and SP-130004, as modified herein, is subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the subject plan, the following corrections shall be made or additional materials submitted:
  - a. The measurement unit of square feet or “sf” shall be added to the gross floor area calculation provided in the general notes.
  - b. A general note shall be added to the plans stating that “the request in the case is the Conversion of a one-family detached dwelling to a building containing up to three dwelling units (not considered as a two-family, three-family or multifamily dwelling), disapproved in part for three (3) units and approved in part for two (2) units” as permitted in the use table on page 194 of the 2004 *Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Prince George’s County Gateway Arts District*.
  - c. The applicant shall add lot coverage calculations in a general note on the site plan.

- d. The precise location of each of the provided parking spaces shall be indicated on the site plan.
- e. The height of the subject building shall be provided within the building's footprint and in a general note on the site plan.

Ordered this 4<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2015, by the following vote:

In Favor: Council Members Franklin, Davis, Glaros, Harrison, Lehman, Taveras, Toles and Turner.

Opposed:

Abstained:

Absent: Council Member Patterson

Vote: 8-0

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S  
COUNTY, MARYLAND, SITTING AS THE  
DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PART OF  
THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTON  
REGIONAL DISTRICT IN PRINCE GEORGE'S  
COUNTY, MARYLAND

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Mel Franklin, Chairman

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Redis C. Floyd  
Clerk of the Council