

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Conceptual 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 November 15, 2001, regarding Conceptual Site Plan CSP-00024/01 for The Boulevard at prince George=s Metro Center, the Planning Board finds:

1. This Conceptual Site Plan revision is for the sole purpose of amending the Secondary Amendment request, TS-00024, which was approved concurrently with CSP-00024. The applicant applied for Secondary Amendments to several Mandatory Development Requirements at the time of approval of CSP-00024 and TS-00024, which were adopted by a Council Order on January 8, 2001. The applicant requests to be allowed to utilize a different style of lighting pole than that required by Mandatory Development Requirement, S24 (pg. 39 of the TDDP). At the time of the original approval, the applicant inadvertently omitted their request to amend S24. This amendment is for Subareas 2 and 3 of the Prince George=s Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ) only. The mixed-use development that was approved by the District Council will not be modified in any other way by the request to amend S24.

Required findings for a Conceptual Site Plan in the Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ) as stated in the Transit District Development Plan

2. **The Transit District Site Plan is in strict conformance with any Mandatory Development Requirements of the Transit District Development Plan;**

The Conceptual Site Plan is not in strict conformance with all Mandatory Development Requirements. The applicant has requested a Secondary Amendment to the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP) in accordance with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance that allow amendments to Development Requirements.

3. **The Transit District Site Plan is consistent with, and reflects the guidelines and criteria contained in the Transit District Development Plan;**

The Transit District Site Plan will be consistent with and reflect the guidelines and criteria contained in the Transit District Development Plan when the conditions of approval below are met. It should be noted that all previous findings and conditions of the Council Order dated January 8, 2001, which approved CSP-00024 and TS-00024, will not be affected by this request and will remain in full force and effect.

4. **The Transit District Site Plan meets all of the requirements of the Transit District**

Overlay Zone and applicable regulations of the underlying zones;

The Conceptual Site Plan generally meets all the requirements of the Transit District Overlay Zone. A Secondary Amendment application (TS-00024/01) for S24 has been processed in accordance with the Secondary Amendment Procedure stipulated in Section 27-213.06(c) of the Zoning Ordinance. See Finding 13 below for a discussion of the Secondary Amendment requested by the applicant.

5. **The location, size and design of buildings, signs, other structures, open spaces, landscaping, pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems, and parking and loading areas maximize safety and efficiency and are adequate to meet the purposes of the Transit District Overlay Zone;**

The subject application will not affect the previous findings and conditions of the Council Order dated January 8, 2001, which approved CSP-00024 and TS-00024 regarding the location, size and design of structures, open spaces and so forth. Those findings and conditions will remain in full force and effect.

6. **Each structure and use, in the manner proposed, is compatible with other structures in the Transit District and with existing and proposed adjacent development.**

The subject application will not affect the previous findings and conditions of the Council Order dated January 8, 2001, which approved CSP-00024 and TS-00024, regarding compatibility of structures and uses. These findings and conditions will remain in full force and effect.

Required Findings for Conceptual Site Plans in the M-X-T Zone

7. **The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this Division;**

The subject application for revision of Mandatory Development requirement S24 only will not affect the previous findings and conditions of the Council Order dated January 8, 2001, regarding conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this Division. Those findings and conditions will remain in full force and effect.

8. **The proposed development has an outward orientation which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation;**

The subject application will not affect the previous findings and conditions of the Council Order dated January 8, 2001, which approved CSP-00024 and TS-00024, regarding an outward orientation which is physically and visually integrated with the existing adjacent development. Those findings and conditions will remain in full force and effect.

9. **The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity;**

The subject application will not affect the previous findings and conditions of the Council Order dated January 8, 2001, which approved CSP-00024 and TS-00024, regarding compatibility with existing and proposed development. Those findings and conditions will remain in full force and effect.

10. **The mix of uses, and the arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements, reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability;**

The subject application will not affect the previous findings and conditions of the Council Order dated January 8, 2001, which approved CSP-00024 and TS-00024, regarding mixed uses and the arrangement and design of buildings and proposed improvements. Those findings and conditions will remain in full force and effect.

11. **If the development is staged, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases;**

The subject application will not affect the previous findings and conditions of the Council Order dated January 8, 2001, which approved CSP-00024 and TS-00024, regarding phasing and development of the Boulevard. Those findings and conditions will remain in full force and effect.

12. **The pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development;**

The subject application will not affect the previous findings and conditions of the Council Order dated January 8, 2001, which approved CSP-00024 and TS-00024, regarding the convenient and comprehensively designed pedestrian system. Those findings and conditions will remain in full force and effect.

Secondary Amendments

13. Secondary Amendment

1. In accordance with the Secondary Amendment Procedure stipulated in Section 27-213.06(c) of the Zoning Ordinance, the applicant has filed a Secondary Amendment for the following district-wide requirement:

S24 All lighting poles, fixture designs, light rendition and level of illumination shall be coordinated throughout the transit district to achieve a recognizable design, and be consistent with the streetscape construction drawings provided in Appendix A. (attachment 1).

The applicant has provided the following justification:

The applicant requests an amendment in order to utilize a different style lighting pole for the Boulevard project. The proposed poles will be distinct, but complementary to the existing lighting poles around Prince George's Metro Station. The intent in requesting a different fixture at this location is to create a sense of place for the Boulevard that is distinct and clearly identifiable as an entertainment destination. The light selected will sparkle and create an ambiance in keeping with the entertainment style of the Boulevard, as opposed to a more functional, utilitarian style as previously selected for the roadways throughout the district. As outlined in the technical staff report for Detailed Site Plan DSP-01001 and 01002, the light poles were shown on the DSP and discussed in the findings as follows:

>It should be noted that staff has reviewed the proposed lighting fixture, and has found it to be superior to the type of light poles that are found on Belcrest Road, and therefore, would support the request for a Secondary Amendment.=

This light fixture, if approved will be utilized along the entire length of the Boulevard through subsequent Detailed Site Plan applications along Toledo Road and East-West Highway.@

The Community Planning Division, in a memorandum dated September 18, 2001, (Fisher/Iraola to Whitmore), offered the following comment:

We recommend that an amendment be granted only for the Boulevard and Toledo Road. East-West Highway should continue to uphold the light standard required in the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP), as shown in Appendix A - Detail 13 and 14. A precedent has been set for lighting along East-West Highway. All previous development applications along this roadway (e.g. Subarea 4 - Hollywood Video Store, Subarea 6 - Super Fresh grocery store, Subarea 11 - Prince George's Plaza, and Subarea 9 - Home Depot) have complied with the Mandatory Development Requirements for lighting per the TDDP. This requirement must be carried forward for the streetscape vision of the TDDP to be realized.@

The City of Hyattsville and the Town of University Park had not commented on the request to amend S24 at the time of the writing of the staff report.

Urban Design Staff Comment:

The Urban Design Staff concurs with the above comments that support a partial approval to the applicant's request to amend S24. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the

alternative lighting fixture for Subareas 2 and 3 within the interior of the site which includes the Boulevard, Toledo Road and any secondary roads within the boundaries of Belcrest Road, East-West Highway and Adelphi Road.

Section 27-213.06(c)(3)(B), Required Findings for Secondary Amendment of Transit District Development Plan:

- (i) **The requested Secondary Amendment is in compliance with the requirements for the approved Transit District Development Plan as set forth in Section 27-548.08(c).**

The requested Secondary Amendment is in compliance with the requirements of the TDDP as set forth in Section 27-548.08(c) and in no way alters the previous Conceptual Site Plan findings and conditions adopted by the District Council, January 8, 2001, which remain in full force and effect.

- (ii) **The requested Secondary Amendment is in conformance with the purposes of the Transit District Overlay Zone.**

The proposed Secondary Amendment that is recommended for approval is in conformance with the applicable purposes of the TDOZ. Specifically, the amendment will contribute to a cohesive design for the Main Boulevard, Toledo Road, and secondary roads and, therefore, will help provide a coordinated and integrated pedestrian experience within Subareas 2 and 3.

- (iii) **The original intent of the Transit District Development Plan element or mandatory requirement being amended is still fulfilled with the approval of the Secondary Amendment.**

Given the scale of the proposed mixed-use development along with the existing site conditions that have an impact on the new development, the requested amendment, as amended in the Recommendation section of this report, is justified and fulfills the original intent of the Transit District Development Plan.

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 TS-00024/01, and further APPROVED the Conceptual Site Plan CSP-000024/01 , The Boulevard at Prince George's Metro Center for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. The alternative lighting fixture shall be allowed in Subareas 2 and 3 within the interior of the site which includes the Boulevard, Toledo Road, and any secondary roads within the boundaries of Belcrest Road, East-West Highway and Adelphi Road.
2. All previous conditions approved by the District Council decision dated January 8, 2001, shall remain in full force and effect.

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 Scott, seconded by Commissioner Lowe, with Commissioners Scott, Lowe, Brown, Eley and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, November 15, 2001, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 6th day of December 2001.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:LW:rmk