

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 October 19, 2000, regarding Conceptual Site Plan No. 00024 for The Boulevard at Prince George's Metro Center, the Planning Board finds:

1. The Conceptual Site Plan is for Subareas 2 and 3 of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ). The plan proposes a mixed-use development with a "Main Street" theme that will include office, retail and residential. Both subareas are being reviewed as one site, and combined consist of 38.63 acres in the M-X-T Zone and 9.07 acres in the O-S Zone, for a total of 47.70 gross acres. The site is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of East West Highway, MD 410, and Belcrest Road, within close proximity of the metro station. The site is bisected by Toledo Road which runs east to west and connects Belcrest Road to Adelphi Road. To the east of the site are several existing churches, a library and a community center that have access either from Adelphi Road or Toledo Road; to the west, across from Belcrest Road is the existing Prince George's Plaza Mall; to the south, across from East West Highway, is Subarea 4, recently developed as retail; and to the north, across from Belcrest Road is Subarea 1, partially developed as multifamily residential.

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 several Primary and Secondary Amendments to the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP).

Primary Development Requirements

An application to amend P1, P44, P46, P48, P50, P52, P53, P54, P58, and P59 has been processed in accordance with the Primary Amendment Procedure stipulated in Section 27-213.06(b) of the Zoning Ordinance concurrently with the Conceptual Site Plan, and will be heard the same day by the Planning Board.

The following "P" Requirements that are not the subject of a Primary Amendment, warrant discussion:

P34 At the time of Preliminary Plat of Subdivision or Conceptual or Detailed Site Plan, the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) will review the site plan related to the development's impact on existing public parkland and recreation facilities and the need for additional parkland and recreation facilities. Any residential development shall meet the mandatory dedication requirements of the County Subdivision Ordinance (Subtitle 24).

In a memorandum dated September 25, 2000 (Palfrey to Whitmore), the Park Planning and Development Division of the Department of Parks and Recreation offered the following comments:

“INTRODUCTION

“Staff of the Park Planning and Development Division has reviewed the above referenced Conceptual Site Plan, (CSP-00024). Our review considered the recommendations of the Transit District Improvement Plan, the Master Plan for Planning Area 68, the Land Preservation and Recreational Program for Prince George's County, current zoning and subdivision regulations and existing conditions in the vicinity of the proposed development.

“EXISTING CONDITION

“The proposed mixed use development is immediately adjacent to the Prince George's Plaza Community Center. This center was the first of its kind to be built in Prince George's County. It was constructed on a one acre lot. The existing building is a single story, non-sprinklered structure consisting of 13,044 square feet. The existing building is in fair to poor condition and has only six parking spaces available on site. 0.33 are acres leased from the applicant to provide an additional 30 parking spaces. The approved Transit District Development Plan recommends that the existing community center ‘be renovated with additional indoor space and outdoor activities or replaced with a new large structure.’ In 1997, a community center needs assessment was completed for the Department by Murray & Associates and Petrossian & Associates. The study recommended remodeling, renovation, expansion, playground replacement and the addition of 180 parking spaces to meet current code requirements. The cost of renovation of the building was estimated at \$1.5 million dollars. This figure did not include any land acquisition costs.

“National and State standards for the provision of parkland call for the provision of 15-acres of local parkland for every thousand residents. The standards also recommend an additional 20 acres of regional parkland for every thousand residents. Only 10.35 acres of parkland per one thousand residents are currently available in the Hyattsville area.

“ANALYSIS

“The submitted plan does not indicate if any recreational facilities will be provided as part of the planned development. The Zoning Ordinance requires that all land uses and improvements be specified and that a general description of recreational facilities be provided [Section 27-272 (c)(1)(D)]. Since this was not accomplished, staff has performed

some very general analysis using available information.

“The applicant’s proposal indicates that 800 to 1,200 residential dwelling units will be provided as part of the planned development. Using current occupancy statistics for multi-family dwelling units leads to the conclusion that the proposed development will result in a population of 1,600 to 2,400 people. By applying the previously mentioned standards staff has concluded that 24 to 36 acres of local parkland should be provided to serve the anticipated population of the new development.

“The proposed development may occur as a series of individually developed parcels so that the opportunity may not be provided to comprehensively review the need for parkland and recreational facilities to serve the proposed development. A mechanism is needed to insure that comprehensive planning is accomplished to meet the future needs of the residents of the proposed development for parkland and recreational facilities. We believe that this should occur as early in the process as possible.

“The Transit District Development Plan indicates (page 86) that “the County should look to new mechanisms to acquire and develop additional parkland and open space in the transit district.” To at least partially achieve this end, staff believes that it would be desirable to provide opportunities for flexibility in developing a package of land, facilities and/or fees to meet future recreational needs. Further, when applying the provisions of the subdivision ordinance, staff believes that it would be desirable to insure that all options (the dedication of land, the provision of recreational facilities or the payment of a fee) can be combined and used to create a comprehensive package that best meets the needs of the planned community, while recognizing the constraints of both the site and existing recreational facilities in the area.

“In addition, it is important to note that the O-S zoned portions of the property should not be considered in addressing the need for land for active recreational facilities. A “mandatory development requirement” of the Transit District Development Plan (P48) is that the area zoned O-S shall remain undisturbed as a tree preservation area. So while this area, which contains a stream and associated floodplain could be incorporated into an open space system and serve as passive recreation area, it shall not be considered as potentially developable for active recreation facilities as per the subdivision ordinance.”

To address the issues discussed above, staff recommends that the conceptual site plan be approved subject to conditions 2 and 3 in the Recommendation Section below.

P55 It is preferable that a single Conceptual Site Plan be submitted for Subareas 2 and 3. If separate Conceptual Site Plans are submitted, each must be designed with the other subarea in mind. Each plan must contain adequate

information concerning both existing and proposed conditions on the other subarea to determine that both subareas can function together in harmony and that the design of one will reinforce the proposed or existing uses, architecture and site design, physical layout, amenities and circulation patterns of the other. Elements of particular importance are continuous, clear, direct and attractive pedestrian routes through both sites, especially to and from the metro station, matching gateway or landmark treatments at the intersection of Toledo and Belcrest Roads, matching treatment of the street edges along Toledo Road, and visual and physical axes that connect both subareas.

The applicant has provided a single Conceptual Site Plan for Subareas 2 and 3. The subject application demonstrates a cohesive development with design elements dependent upon each other. The Main Street theme continues through both subareas and provides a visual axis that connects the two subareas; plazas being provided in both subareas that will be designed and reviewed at the time of Detailed Site Plan will also ensure compatibility of the subareas with one another. However, while the subject application has taken into consideration the Main Street that penetrates both subareas, the intersection of Toledo and Belcrest Roads has not been addressed. No information has been provided for the matching gateways or landmark treatments at the intersection of Toledo and Belcrest Road. The Conceptual Site Plan should be amended to include the location of such treatment. Upon revision of said plan the submission will provide a continuous, clear, direct, and attractive pedestrian route through Subareas 2 and 3 that will enhance the pedestrian experience to and from the Metro Station.

Secondary Development Requirements

An application to amend S8, S17, S18, S30, and S33 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 all Secondary Amendments requested by the applicant.

The following “S” Requirements, that are not the subject of an amendment, warrant discussion:

Urban Design (p.28)

- S1 All proposed development/redevelopment shall have a primary pedestrian walkway system that coincides with the street system and provides a connection directly to the Metro. In addition, the secondary and tertiary pedestrian systems shall provide inner block connections through parks, plazas**

and green areas and have efficient pedestrian circulation.

The Boulevard project introduces a new “Main Street” theme to the development of Subareas 2 and 3 that was not previously envisioned with the implementation of the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP). The applicant proposes to provide a primary pedestrian walkway system that coincides with the new Main Street. The Main Street will bisect Subarea 3, running north to south and penetrate Subarea 2, terminating with a residential apartment building on axis with the street as a focal point. The new street will connect to both Toledo Road and East West Highway and provide a pedestrian walkway system with shops, restaurants, a cinema, offices and residential buildings on either side. The street is intended to remain private and will not be dedicated to the County for public use.

The applicant has not provided any design guidelines as to the width of the street, sidewalk or building setbacks. Therefore, the Urban Design Staff recommends that prior to the approval of the first Detailed Site Plan for Subareas 2 and 3, plans, sections and details of the streetscape for the boulevard should be provided for Planning Board approval, including building setbacks, the dimensions and details of all travel lanes, parking bays, sidewalks, street tree spacing and planting areas.

S28 All commercial or industrial establishments shall provide a common sign plan when there is more than one principal building proposed (not including accessory buildings), such as shopping centers, malls and office parks on a single lot or combination of lots under common ownership. Common sign plans shall specify standards for consistency among all signs within the development including lighting, colors, lettering style and size and relative location of each sign on the building. New signs proposed in connection with exterior renovation or rehabilitation of 60 percent or more of an existing structure shall also submit a common sign plan. No sign permit shall be issued for a sign requiring a permit unless a common sign plan for the development on which the sign will be erected has been submitted and approved by the Planning Board or designee.

A common sign plan was not submitted for review with the Conceptual Site Plan. Staff is of the opinion that a common sign plan for the overall development should be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board concurrently with the review and approval of the first Detailed Site Plan.

S33 Afforestation of at least 10 percent of the gross tract shall be required on all properties within the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District currently exempt from the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance.

Afforestation shall occur on-site or within the Anacostia Watershed in Prince George's County, with priority given to riparian zones and nontidal wetlands, particularly within the Northwest Branch sub-watershed.

In a memorandum dated October 7, 2000 (Finch to Whitmore), the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comments:

“Subarea 3 is currently exempt from the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance, so it is subject to the 10% afforestation requirement for the gross tract area. A TCP I (TCP I/35/00) has been submitted for Subarea 3.

“Subarea 2 is subject to the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The woodland conservation requirement for the M-X-T portion of the site is 15%, and for the O-S portion of the site is 50%. The applicant has submitted a TCP I (TCP I/35/00) based on inaccurate acreages for the O-S and M-X-T zones. The TCP needs to be revised to correct zoning acreage prior to plan approval.

“The applicant has requested a primary amendment for relief from providing the required afforestation within the Anacostia watershed. The applicant has performed an extensive search, and has experienced considerable difficulty in finding suitable off-site woodland mitigation sites within the watershed. The Environmental Planning Section supports the applicant's amendment request to provide off-site mitigation outside of the Anacostia, with the condition that the plan be revised to show maximum preservation of on-site woodlands.

“Off-site woodland preservation must be carried out at a rate of 2-to-1, while off-site woodland afforestation is at a rate of 1-to-1. A specific location for the off-site woodland mitigation is not required until time of TCP II review, in conjunction with the Detailed Site Plan.”

S34 If it is determined by the Natural Resources Division that a noise study is required, it shall be reviewed and approved by the Natural Resources Division prior to approval of any Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, Conceptual Site Plan, and/or Detailed Site Plan. The study shall use traffic volumes at LOS E and include examination of appropriate mitigation techniques and the use of acoustical design techniques. Furthermore, a typical cross-section profile of noise emission from the road to the nearest habitable structure is required.

In a memorandum dated October 7, 2000 (Finch to Whitmore), the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comments:

“The 65 dBA noise contour has been reflected on the Existing Conditions Plan (Sheet 4 of 9) in accordance with this condition. The noise contour delineated along the east side of Belcrest Road in Subarea 2 is mislabeled at 156 feet from centerline, but is drawn in the correct location. The label should read 92 feet from centerline. The noise contour line should also be added to the Conceptual Site Plan (Sheet 3 of 9).

“The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the location of the noise contours (Phase 1 Noise Study) relative to proposed site uses. Because residential uses are proposed within the noise impact zone a Phase 2 Noise Study shall be required at time of Detailed Site Plan in order to address mitigation in accordance with standards established in the TDDP.”

S35 All Conceptual and Detailed Site Plans shall be submitted to the Fire Department for review and to evaluate whether a medivac landing area location is warranted.

A referral was sent to the Fire Department. Their response comments are related to Detailed Site Plan issues and are not relevant to the subject Conceptual Site Plan. Also, a medivac landing area was approved with the Detailed Site Plan for the Home Depot site.

In a memorandum dated August 29, 2000 (Izzo to Whitmore), the Public Facilities Planning Section provided the following information with regard to fire and rescue services:

Fire Service

“The existing **fire engine service** at **Hyattsville, Company 1** located at **6200 Belcrest Road** has a service response time of **1.14** minutes, which is **within** the **3.25** minutes response time guideline.

“The existing **ambulance service** at **Hyattsville, Company 1** located at **6200 Belcrest Road** has a service response time of **1.14** minutes, which is **within** the **4.25** minutes response time guideline.

“The existing **paramedic service** at **Brentwood, Company 4** located at **3712 Utah Avenue** has a service response time of **4.75** minutes, which is **within** the **7.25** minutes response time guideline.

“The existing **ladder truck service** at **Riverdale, Company 7** located at **4714 Queensbury Road** has a service response time of **3.27** minutes, which is **within** the **4.25** minutes response time guideline.

“These findings are in conformance with the *Adopted and Approved Public Safety Master Plan 1990* and the *Guidelines For The Analysis Of Development Impact On Fire and Rescue Facilities*.”

S36 All Conceptual and Detailed Site Plans shall be referred to the County Police Department for review and comments pertaining to the impact on police services.

In a memorandum dated August 29, 2000 (Izzo to Whitmore), the Public Facilities Planning Section indicated that the proposed development is within the service area for District I-Hyattsville station. The staff concluded that the existing County police facilities will be adequate to serve the proposed development.

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.

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. Several amendments to the Mandatory Development Requirements have been processed along with the Conceptual Site Plan. A Primary Amendment application (TP-00002) for P1, P44, P46, P48, P50, P52, P53, P54, P58, and P59 has been processed in accordance with the Primary Amendment Procedure stipulated in Section 27-213.06(b) of the Zoning Ordinance. A Secondary Amendment application (TS-00024) for S8, S17, S18, S30, and S33 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 all Secondary Amendments requested by the applicant.

The development data is as follows:

Zone M-X-T and O-S

Site Area

Subarea 2	M-X-T Zone	12.39 acres	
	O-S Zone		9.07 acres
Subarea 3	M-X-T Zone	26.24 acres	

Total Site Area 47.7 acres

100-year Floodplain (Subarea 2) 5.2 acres
Tidal and non-tidal Wetlands (Subarea 2) .76 acres in O-S Zone
Gross Floor Area
Existing Office Towers
 Metro I 316,000 square feet
 Metro II 427,000 square feet
 Metro III 494,000 square feet
Total Existing 1,237,000 square feet

Proposed Development* 1,931,500 square feet
 Conceptual Development Level* (Total sq. ft.) 3,168,500 square feet
 Floor Area Ratio for 38.63 Acres of M-X-T 1.88 FAR
 Zone per Conceptual Site Plan*
 Base FAR permitted by Zone 0.40 FAR
 Existing FAR (1,237,000/38.62 acres) = 0.73 FAR

Bonus Incentives Proposed

Theater
 4 GSF per GSF of theater @ 62,000 sq. ft. = 248,000 - SF = 0.15 FAR
Residential
 Additional gross floor area ratio of 1.0 shall be permitted
 where twenty or more dwelling units are proposed = 1.0 FAR
Outdoor Plaza
 Eight GSF permitted for every 1 sq. ft.
 outdoor plaza provided, at a minimum of 34,000 sq. ft. of plaza = .16 FAR
Either Open arcade (@ 3/1 GSF)
 Enclosed Pedestrian space (@ 4/1 GSF)
 or Rooftop activities (@ 1/1 GSF) = .12 FAR
Total bonus Incentives Earned at Conceptual Site Plan Level* 1.43 FAR

Conceptual Site Plan FAR Potential* = 2.16 FAR
FAR Proposed per Conceptual Site Plan 1.88 FAR

Parking

Existing Surface parking (not to be exceeded during redevelopment) 3,506 spaces
Proposed Structured Parking 4,000 spaces
Proposed new surface parking 0 spaces
Total Parking 7,506

*Based on Illustrative Plan, actual Development Level and FAR will vary per final Detailed Site Plans.

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 proposed application has been designed so that Subarea 2 and 3 will function in harmony with one another and the surrounding existing and proposed development.

The design is respectful of both proposed and existing uses and has taken into consideration architecture, site design, layout of buildings and circulation. Clear and efficient access to the Metro Station has been provided for both pedestrians and vehicles.

The subject application has incorporated sufficient plaza, landscaping, and open spaces to create a pedestrian-friendly environment. Therefore, staff has determined that the subject application meets the purposes of the Transit District Overlay Zone.

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.**

Staff has reviewed the subject application in relation to existing and proposed development within the Transit District Overlay Zone. Four (4) office buildings exist in Subarea 3, and the subject application proposes structures that are compatible in terms of use, mass and height. Several smaller structures are proposed in the interior of the site, specifically along the main street. These buildings will be oriented around a new main street environment with strong pedestrian connections that unify existing development with proposed development.

One of the existing office buildings mentioned above is located in the southeast corner of Subarea 3 and is not included in this application. The subject application includes an existing office building and a 7 -12 story office or hotel that will be compatible in mass and height with this existing office building.

Along the eastern property line there are existing churches and a library that front on Adelphi Road. The parking lots for those uses are generally located behind the buildings. The applicant proposes to locate a parking garage along that property line and has requested an amendment to the setback requirements. Staff is in support of that request subject to special treatments of the proposed parking garage that would enhance the

viewshed along Adelphi Road.

Staff is of the opinion that this application is compatible with structures and uses that are either existing or proposed within the Transit District Overlay Zone. See Finding 8 for more detail on the above discussion.

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 Conceptual Site Plan for *The Boulevard at Prince George's Metro Center* proposes a mixed-use development centered around a Main Street theme that provides a development scheme similar to that of Reston Town Center, Virginia. The boulevard will bisect the existing office buildings in Subarea 3 and provide for the opportunity for high quality and distinctive architecture, retail shopping, restaurants, a movie theater, a museum, outdoor skating rink, and an animated streetscape with plazas, street trees, planters and special paving that will be in conformance with the purposes and provisions of the M-X-T Zone. In addition to 1.2 million square feet of existing office development on Subarea 3, the plan has the potential for up to 1.4 million square feet of new office, 250,000 square feet of retail, and 1,900 dwelling units on both Subareas 2 and 3. As such, the proposed plan will enhance the economic status of the County and provide an expanding source of desirable employment and living opportunities.

The Transit District Development Plan (TDDP) will ensure that the Conceptual Site Plan maximizes public and private development potential and promotes the effective and optimum use of transit and other major transportation systems.

The proposed mix of diverse land uses, interacting with other existing and proposed land uses in the Transit District, ensures a twenty-four (24) hour environment through a maximum of activity for those who will work, live or visit the area. The plan as proposed will create dynamic, functional relationships among uses within a distinctive visual character and identity.

The proposed mixed-use development provides for the opportunity to maximize economies of scale and savings in energy. The project creates the opportunity to live, work, shop, dine, have entertainment and utilize transit.

The Conceptual Site Plan maintains a flexible response to the market within the confines of the uses and densities proposed. Freedom of architectural design will be permitted at

the time of Detailed Site Plan review with conformance to the Transit District Development Plan requirements.

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 proposed mixed-use development will have both an outward orientation with new buildings fronting on existing streets, and an inward orientation with buildings fronting on the new main street.

Subarea 3 has one existing building on the corner of East West Highway that is not the subject of this application. That building is adjacent to one of the three existing office towers of the proposed development and is approximately 60 feet from the face of curb of East West Highway. A new 7-12 story office building or hotel with a parking garage is proposed on the east side of the existing office building. The new buildings will front on the new main street with access to the parking garage from Belcrest Road. The applicant has requested a Primary Amendment to P52 to allow the required build-to line along East West Highway to be reduced from 40 feet to 20 feet. Staff does not support that request in part because it would increase the difference of the setbacks of the two buildings from 20 to 40 feet, creating a physical and visual imbalance between the two properties.

Along the east property line there are existing churches and a library that front on Adelphi Road. The applicant has requested a Primary Amendment to P54 to reduce the required setback along that property line from 120 feet to 50 feet. The reason for the larger setback was to maintain the viewshed along Adelphi Road by not allowing large office buildings close to the property line. Most of the new office buildings will be sited fronting on the Main Street. Parking garages will be behind the office buildings. Staff supports the request for the reduction of the setback conditioned upon the requirement that the parking garages be attractively designed with planters on every level, and that each level be staggered away from the building setback by eight (8) feet. Staff believes that the added treatments will help to maintain an attractive viewshed along Adelphi Road.

Other requirements of the TDDP will further ensure that the new development will be physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development. Because of the magnitude of the proposed development, it also has the potential to catalyze adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation.

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

The proposed mixed-use development provides office, retail, and residential that will offer employment, shopping and entertainment for those who will live, work or visit the area. The proposed development is an appropriate mix of land uses that will complement and enhance the character of the area and promote ridership of transit facilities.

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;**

Conceptually, the mix and arrangement of the proposed and existing uses, centered around an open-air Main Street concept, reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability. Subareas 2 and 3 are already developed with 1.237 million square feet of existing office and associated surface parking that provide for a significant employment base that will help to contribute to a stable environment. The proposed additional density, consisting of a mixture of office, retail and residential, along with other supporting uses, such as restaurants, a cinema, museum, outdoor plazas and ice-skating rink, will enhance the quality of the Transit District.

A major aspect in maintaining the quality of the environment of the Main Street is ensuring that the street trees are provided with an environment that they can thrive in, which is something that is typically overlooked in dense urban developments. Most of the area of both subareas is covered with either existing buildings or parking. Existing conditions, along with the grading of the site necessary to provide the Main Street, will create an extreme amount of soil compaction where street trees are to grow. This compaction, along with the construction materials used for streets, parking lots and sidewalks, will severely inhibit the root growth of shade trees, causing them to have stunted growth and die prematurely, never reaching their natural genetic potential, especially if they are planted in tree pits as is typically the case.

Tree pits, which are usually filled with a soil mixture, often become “bath tubs” because the soil around them is compacted to a point that water entering the pit cannot infiltrate into the soil below and around the pit. Trees planted in pits thus suffer from inadequate drainage and aeration, and their growth is stunted as a result. Furthermore, typical tree pits rarely provide adequate soil volumes. A tree pit that measures 5 feet by 12 feet with a soil depth of three feet will provide 180 cubic feet of soil volume. The average shade tree, with a crown spread/diameter of 20 feet needs a minimum soil volume of 628 cubic feet to thrive. The rule of thumb is two cubic feet of soil volume for every one square foot of crown projection. Insufficient soil volume prevents most trees in pits from ever attaining more than a fraction of their normal size. One area where needed soil volumes

can be attained is under the sidewalk. Taking advantage of a continuous soil volume under the sidewalk which connects tree pits, tree roots can expand freely, there are more water and nutrients available, and trees are much more capable of growing to their full potential.

As recommended in the American Institute of Architects' recently revised Architectural Graphic Standards, staff recommends that in addition to the requirements of the TDDP, the Conceptual Site Plan specify that all Detailed Site Plans provide details that ensure that street tree pits be connected with a continuous soil volume under the sidewalk, with an average 500 cu.ft. of soil volume per tree and a maximum soil depth of 24 inches. This will help insure the health and long life of the trees in this area and allow them to attain sufficient size to provide real shade for pedestrians. Large healthy trees will also significantly bolster the "Main Street" character sought in the Boulevard area. Failure to provide adequate soil volume for shade trees at the beginning of this project will result in an endless struggle with stunted or dying trees that never reach their full potential.

Staff has recently learned of a new product developed and patented by Cornell University called "CU-Soil" (Cornell University Soil) which is a "Structural Soil" that is a mixture of stone, soil, and a wetting agent that is specifically designed for trees planted in paved conditions, such as streets, sidewalks and parking lots. The soil is made of 80 percent stone, which provides the structural support for pavement, and 20 percent soil. "CU-Soil" can be compacted to meet ASTM and AASHTO standards, providing the structural support necessary for paved surfaces, while allowing unimpeded root growth of trees under pavement, ensuring that the trees reach their full potential. Locally, the product has been approved by the Montgomery County DPW&T for the Downtown Silver Spring revitalization project, and the Prince George's County Planning Board for the Bowie New Town Center Mall. It has also been used for several projects in downtown Washington, DC. There are two licensed distributors in the area (one is located in Springfield, Virginia, and the other is in Landover, Maryland) that can design, test and mix the appropriate materials to exact specifications. Staff strongly encourages that "CU-Soil" or an equal product be used for all shade trees planted in tree pits on streets within the development.

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 Conceptual Site Plan has been designed comprehensively with buildings that will function together around a new Main Street theme. The applicant proposes nine (9) stages of development. Each stage consists of at least one major use that can be designed as a self-sufficient entity. Depending on the market, any one of the phases can be effectively integrated into the development. Phase I of the development is for a pro-

posed office building for the Center for Disease Control. A Detailed Site Plan is currently being prepared by the applicant for submission in the near future.

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

A major component of the development is the main street with wide sidewalks, special paving, street trees, landscaping, furniture and lighting that is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity. Restaurants and shopping are also proposed along the main street which bisects Subarea 3 and connects with Subarea 2. The pedestrian system will connect into existing streets that will create convenient access to the Metro Station and surrounding subareas.

Secondary Amendments

13. In accordance with the Secondary Amendment Procedure stipulated in Section 27-213.06(c) of the Zoning Ordinance, the applicant has filed Secondary Amendments for the following District Wide and Subarea Requirements:

S8 All property frontages shall be improved in accordance with Figures 7, 8 and 9 in order to create a visually continuous and unified streetscape.

The applicant has provided the following justification:

“The applicant requests a Secondary Amendment to S8 to allow the width of the frontage improvements to be in accordance with the widths requested by P44, P52, and P53. Frontage improvements will be provided in accordance with figures 7 and 8, only the area of the width is requested to be amended. This will provide a more uniform streetscape appearance for the site.”

The Town of University Park in a memorandum dated September 11, 2000 (Brunner to Whitmore), offered the following comment:

“This amendment appears reasonable as long as all of the features including 8 foot landscaping and 12 foot sidewalks on Toledo Road and on Belcrest Road are maintained. On East West Highway, what the applicant has proposed appears impossible, with a 20 foot setback and still maintain a 12 foot sidewalk with two (2) parallel 8 foot landscape strips on each side of the sidewalk.”

The City of Hyattsville in a memorandum dated October 5, 2000 (Armentrout to Whitmore), offered the following comment:

“Assuming the grading plan includes raising the existing grade to allow for the TDDP/TDOZ landscaping requirement, the requested waiver proposed by the applicant seems to be a responsible solution for some but not all building uses. Please refer to comments we have provided for P58. We want Park and Planning staff to review the landscaping requirement and apply a standard that would be consistent with other projects along East West Highway. We understand that it may not be possible to retain consistency because of grade changes at the north/east section of East West Highway but the distance from the road to the building structure is important here. The developer is planning to have below-grade retail development at ground level and may also have retail/commercial development located on lower floors with housing on the upper floors.”

The Community Planning Division in a memorandum dated September 1, 2000 (Fisher/Iraola to Development Review Division), offered the following comment:

“The TDDP requires that all property frontages shall be improved in accordance with Figures 7, 8 and 9 in order to create a visually continuous and unified streetscape. As stated previously in the recommendations and various reasons listed above (see P44, P52 and P53), we recommend that no amendment be granted.”

Urban Design Staff Comment:

Staff does not agree to an amendment to P44 for Subarea 2. There is no existing development in that subarea and all new development should conform to standards established by the TDDP.

Staff does not agree to an amendment to P52 for Subarea 3. Staff is of the opinion that a reduction in the build-to line along East West Highway from 40 feet to 20 feet from face of curb would be undesirable from a visual standpoint and from a safety standpoint. Twenty (20) feet is not wide enough for a safe pedestrian zone along this major six lane arterial.

Staff does not believe that an amendment to S8 is necessary to accommodate an increase in the build-to line from 20-40 feet to 20-60 feet as recommended in the amendment to P53.

Therefore, Staff recommends that **no amendment be granted for S8.**

S17 All parking lots shall, in general, be located behind buildings, and shall not occupy more than 33 percent of the frontage of any subarea along a pedestrian street.

The applicant has provided the following justification:

“A secondary amendment is requested to the requirement that all parking spaces be located behind buildings. It is part of the Main Street character of the plan to have a few parking spaces along the boulevard. Only a few spaces will be provided for convenient drop off, pick up, and short term parking. The regular and long term parking will be located in the four garages.”

The Town of University Park in a memorandum dated September 11, 2000 (Brunner to Whitmore), offered the following comment:

“It is our recommendation that parking should not be allowed along the Boulevard. It would only create congestion brought on by high use features, such as restaurants, convenience retail and ice rink, all which tend to attract vehicles and the need for drop-off areas.”

The City of Hyattsville in a memorandum dated October 5, 2000 (Brunner to Whitmore), offered the following comment:

“We want to ensure adequate drop-off areas are provided (standing zone, bus bays and shuttle holding areas) including space for shuttle/trolley services near buildings that house high demand facilities such as the ice rink, museum and retail facilities. We support timed parking along the Boulevard.- Approve with conditions.”

The Community Planning Division in a memorandum dated September 1, 2000 (Fisher/Iraola to Development Review Division), offered the following comment:

“The TDDP requires that all parking lots shall, in general, be located behind buildings, and shall not occupy more than 33 percent of the frontage of any sub-area along a pedestrian street. This amendment is acceptable because the intent of the TDDP is adhered to by only proposing ‘relatively few on-street parking spaces...along the main Boulevard.’ Therefore, we have no objection to this amendment.”

Urban Design Staff Comment:

The Urban Design Staff concurs with the above comments that support the proposed amendment and recommends **approval of an amendment to S17.**

S18 All parking lots shall not extend beyond the build-to-line or project beyond the front plane of adjoining buildings.

The applicant has provided the following justification:

“The requirement states that parking structures should not extend beyond the build-to line or front plane of a building. The intent of this guideline is that parking structures not obstruct buildings. The proposed parking structure along Belcrest Road in Subarea 3 of the development extends beyond the front plane of the proposed office building. However, the proposed garage may exceed the front plane of the building due to grade changes and architectural design elements with no visible obstruction of the building. The applicant requests an amendment to requirement S18 to allow for a parking structure to extend beyond the front plane of a building on a case by case basis as reviewed at Detailed Site Plan.”

The City of Hyattsville in a memorandum dated October 5, 2000 (Brunner to Whitmore), recommends approval of S18.

The Community Planning Division in a memorandum dated September 1, 2000 (Fisher/Iraola to Development Review Division), offered the following comment:

“The TDDP requires that parking lots shall not extend beyond the ‘build-to line’ or project beyond the front plane of adjoining buildings. The intent of the TDDP is to create an edge along the streetscape to provide for the pedestrian experience. The applicant also proposes to: ‘adhere to P53 and not extend beyond the build-to line along Belcrest Road.’ The applicant’s proposed amendment to P53 is not acceptable for the reasons listed above (see P53). Because the applicant has joined the amendment request of S18 with P53, we recommend that no amendment be granted.”

Urban Design Staff Comment:

The Urban Design Staff believes that the applicant’s request is premature. The building shown on the Illustrative Plan is conceptual in nature. It will not be known until there is a user for the site what the shape of the building will be. Staff is of the opinion that if there is a need for a Secondary Amendment for S18, it should be applied for when a De-

tailed Site Plan is submitted for that building. Staff recommends that **no amendment be granted for S18.**

S30 All new retail development shall provide four bicycle racks per 10,000 gross square feet of floor space with each rack holding a minimum of two bicycles.

The applicant has provided the following justification:

“A secondary amendment is requested for mandatory requirement S30. S30 requires that bike racks be provided at a ratio of 4 racks (each rack holding 2 bikes) per 10,000GSF of retail development. At this rate, the applicant would be required to provide 63 bike racks, holding 2 bikes each, for 144,000 square feet. This ratio is extremely high. The applicant proposes to amend S30 to provide the required number of bike spaces (63) rather than the number of racks, and that they be dispersed throughout the site rather than concentrated at the retail location.”

The City of Hyattsville in a memorandum dated October 5, 2000 (Brunner to Whitmore), recommends approval of S30.

The Transportation Planning Section in a memorandum dated October 5, 2000 (Shaffer to Whitmore, Wagner) offered the following comments:

“In accordance with the Adopted and Approved Prince George’s Plaza Transit District Development Plan, the applicant and the applicant’s heirs, successors, and/or assigns shall provide the following:

“...Bicycle racks shall be provided throughout the development. The TDDP recommends four bicycle racks per 10,000 gross square feet of retail development with each rack holding a minimum of two bicycles. The proposed development contains 156,000 square feet of retail space. In most cases, staff believes that the number of bicycle spaces required by the TDDP is excessive. However, due to the large number of multi-use development and existing office space in the vicinity, it is recommended that the number of bicycle spaces be maintained at 126 spaces (63 racks holding 2 bicycles each), as required by the TDDP. The exact location of the bicycle racks will be determined at the time of Detailed Site Plan.”

The Community Planning Division in a memorandum dated September 1, 2000 (Fisher/Iraola to Development Review Division), offered the following comment:

“The applicant proposes an amendment to S30 in order to permit a 50% reduction in the number of required bike spaces. In previous applications, reductions have been permitted at Home Depot and Superfresh. However, these are not typical bicycling destinations and a reduction was warranted. In the subject application, retail uses along a non-automobile-oriented ‘Main Street’ within the overall development are proposed. In addition, a large number of apartments are proposed within the development. It is anticipated that many retail customers will come from the nearby apartments. In short, this is exactly the type of development in which bicycling is both practical and desirable. Accordingly, we recommend that no amendment be granted.”

Urban Design Staff Comment:

The Urban Design Staff concurs with the above and recommends that **no amendment be granted to S30.**

S33 Afforestation of at least 10 percent of the gross tract area shall be required on all properties within the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District currently exempt from the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance. Afforestation shall occur on-site or within the Anacostia Watershed in Prince George’s County, with priority given to riparian zones and nontidal wetlands, particularly within the Northwest Branch sub-watershed.

The applicant has provided the following justification:

“The applicant requests an amendment to mandatory requirement S33. The applicant proposes to amend the requirement by preserving 2.5 acres in the Forest Hills subdivision in Upper Marlboro, also owned by the applicant, rather than completing afforestation off-site in the Anacostia watershed. Due to much development in the Prince George’s Plaza TDOZ, there is an insignificant amount of land left for afforestation in the Anacostia watershed. The preservation of land in Forest Hills will be an asset to the County, the citizens and the applicant.”

The Town of University Park in a memorandum dated September 11, 2000 (Brunner to Whitmore), offered the following comment:

“The applicant is requesting the transfer of an off-site afforestation requirement in the Anacostia Watershed to 2.5 acres that the applicant owns in Upper Marlboro, in a different part of the County and in a different watershed. The Anacostia River is one of the most polluted rivers in the United States, and the need

is great in its watershed for water quality control and improvement measures. We insist that if off-site mitigation is necessary that those measures take place within a watershed in need of considerable help.”

The City of Hyattsville in a memorandum dated October 5, 2000 (Brunner to Whitmore), offered the following comment:

“We recommend and request that the off-site mitigation requirement take place within the Anacostia Watershed and if at all possible within the City limits of Hyattsville. We urge you to look at the area behind Home Depot on East West Highway if there are no plans to reforest the newly graded area. Hyattsville will gladly assist in locating other sites. - Approve with conditions.”

The Community Planning Division in a memorandum dated September 1, 2000 (Fisher/Iraola to Development Review Division), offered the following comments:

“While it is true that afforestation potential may be limited within the 300 acre transit district, the Anacostia Watershed is a very large area that is by no means fully developed. It should be possible not only to afforest in the Anacostia Watershed but to do so in the Northwest Branch sub-watershed as recommended in the TDDP. Accordingly, we recommend that no amendment be granted.”

The Environmental Planning Section in a memorandum dated October 7, 2000 (Finch to Whitmore, Wagner) offered the following comment:

“Subarea 3 is currently exempt from the *Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance*, so it is subject to the 10% afforestation requirement for the gross tract area. A TCP I (TCP I/35/00) has been submitted for Subarea 3.

“Subarea 2 is subject to the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The woodland conservation requirement for the M-X-T portion of the site is 15%, and for the O-S portion of the site is 50%. The applicant has submitted a TCP I (TCP I/35/00) based on inaccurate acreages for the O-S and M-X-T zones. The TCP needs to be revised to correct zoning acreage prior to plan approval.

“The applicant has requested a primary amendment for relief from providing the required afforestation within the Anacostia watershed. The applicant has performed an extensive search, and has experienced considerable difficulty in finding suitable off-site woodland mitigation sites within the watershed. The Environmental Planning Section supports the applicant’s amendment request to provide off-site mitigation outside of the Anacostia, with the condition that the plan be revised to show maximum preservation of on-site woodlands.

“Off-site woodland preservation must be carried out at a rate of 2-to-1, while off-site woodland afforestation is at a rate of 1-to-1. A specific location for the off-site woodland mitigation is not required until time of TCP II review, in conjunction with the Detailed Site Plan.”

Urban Design Staff Comment:

The Urban Design Staff concurs with the Environmental Planning Section and recommends **approval of an amendment to S33.**

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 Amendments are in compliance with the requirement of the TDDP in that the Conceptual Site Plan meets all other applicable regulations of the underlying zone in terms of allowed land uses and density. The Conceptual Site Plan for the mixed-use development is designed to maximize safety and efficiency; and each structure and use, in the manner proposed, is compatible with other structures and uses in the Transit District, and with the existing and proposed adjacent development.

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

The proposed Secondary Amendments that are recommended for approval are in conformance with the applicable purposes of the TDOZ. Specifically, the amendments are necessary to accomplish an efficient design for the proposed development and will therefore provide the necessary flexibility in the design and layout of the buildings and structures to promote a coordinated and integrated development scheme.

- (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 amendments are jus-

tified and fulfill the original intent of the Transit District Development Plan.

14. In general, the Conceptual Site Plan is in conformance with all applicable Sections of the *Landscape Manual*. In addition each Detailed Site Plan will be reviewed for conformance with the *Landscape Manual*.

Referrals

15. In a memorandum dated October 7, 2000 (Finch to Whitmore), the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comments:
 - “a. A 100-year Floodplain Study has been provided by the applicant.
 - “b. A Conceptual Stormwater Management approval and plan have been provided by the applicant. The applicant has decided to fulfill the 15% green space requirement on the site, so no further determination as to whether on-site SWM is being provided will be necessary.
 - “c. The SWM Concept Plan indicates that on-site bioretention will be utilized to the greatest extent that is reasonable given site development constraints. Staff believes that the approved Concept Approval addresses the “Water Quality Recommendations for the Prince George’s Plaza TDDP” (Department of Environmental Resources, March, 1993).
 - “d. The Existing Conditions Plan (Sheet 4 of 9) includes a delineation of the environmental envelope/ natural reserve area related to the stream and wetland area. This line should also be included on the Conceptual Site Plan (Sheet 3 of 9).
 - “e. The Existing Conditions Plan (Sheet 4 of 9) should show the correct zoning line between the M-X-T and O-S zone on Subarea 2. The Conceptual Site Plan (Sheet 3 of 9) should also include the correct zoning line in Subarea 2.
 - “f. The Conceptual Site Plan (Sheet 3 of 9) should be revised to show the boundary of the TDOZ, and of the subareas. Parcel 67 is part of Subarea 2 and is indicated to have two zoning categories, while the official zoning maps show it to be O-S. The parcel should be correctly labeled as O-S.”
16. In a memorandum dated October 10, 2000 (Mokhtari to Whitmore), the Transportation Planning Section offered the following comments:

“The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the above referenced and submitted Conceptual Site Plan, and the submitted Justification Statement Report in support of the proposed Primary Amendment and Secondary Amendment to the PG-TDDP requirements for the proposed development in Subareas 2 and 3 of the Transit District

“Background

“This referral memo will present a discussion on the PG-TDDP’s Transportation and Parking, and Parking and Loading Mandatory Development Requirements (or MDRs) and the submitted Concept Plan’s compliance with these requirements. The MDRs for Trails and Bicycle Facilities will be discussed on a separate referral memo from the Transportation Planning Section’s Trails Planner.

“The approved PG-TDDP guides the use and development of all properties within its boundaries. The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon staff evaluation of the submitted site plan and each of the requested amendments and the ways in which the proposed development conforms to the MDRs and Guidelines outlined in the PG-TDDP.

“One of the purposes of the TDDP is to ensure a balanced transportation and transit facilities network. Therefore, as part of the TDDP, staff performed an analysis of all road facilities in the vicinity of the Transit District. This analysis indicated that one constraint to development in the transit district is vehicular congestion, particularly the congestion caused by the Single-Occupant Vehicles (SOV) trips that can be combined or converted to trips taken on the available transit service in the district. One method for relieving congestion is to reduce the number of vehicles particularly SOV, trips to and from the transit district. As result, the TDDP addresses transportation adequacy by recommending a number of policies for managing the surface parking supply in the transit district, and by adopting Level-of-Service E (LOS E) as a goal for the minimum acceptable operating standard for transportation facilities. Among the most consequential of these are:

5. “Establishment of a Transit District-wide cap on the number of new parking spaces (3,000 Preferred, plus 1,000 Premium) that can be constructed or provided in the Transit District to accommodate any new development.
5. “Implementation of a system of developer contributions based on the number of Preferred and Premium surface parking spaces attributed to each development project. The contributions are intended to recover sufficient funding to defray some of the cost of the transportation improvements as summarized in Table 4 of the TDDP, which are needed to ensure that the critical roadways

and intersections in the transit district remain at or above traffic LOS E.

5. “Establishment of a mandatory Transportation Demand Management District (TDMD). (The 1992 TDDP called for reauthorization of the Transportation Management Association (TMA) to ensure optimum utilization of Trip Reduction Measures (TRMs) to combine, or divert to transit, as many peak hour SOV trips as possible, and to capitalize on the existing transit system in the Transit District. The TMA is no longer functional.) The TDMD will have boundaries that are coterminous with the Transit District. As of this writing, the Prince George’s Plaza TDMD has not been legally established under the TDMD Ordinance (now Subtitle 20A, Division 2 of the County Code) enacted in 1993. The TDMD will establish (or reauthorize) the TMA pursuant to MDR P13 of the current TDDP.
5. “Developing an annual TDMD operations fee based on the total number of parking spaces (surface and structured), for each property.
5. “Requiring that the TDMD prepare an annual transit district transportation and parking operations analysis that would determine whether or not the LOS E has been maintained, and to determine additional trip reduction, transportation and parking management measures that are required to restore LOS E.

“The MDR P6, on page 58 of the PG-TDDP, includes only surface parking in the definition of parking. The distinction between surface parking (which is included under the Preferred and Premium Caps), and structure parking (which is not included under these Caps) is significant because the PG-TDDP MDRs related to transportation adequacy (MDRs P7, P8 and P12) apply only to proposed developments with surface parking. It is the Transportation staff’s understanding that the reason for this distinction (between surface and structure parking) is the District Council’s intent to create an urban atmosphere for developments within close proximity to Metro Stations, to encourage the use of structured parking and to discourage construction of large amounts of surface parking within the Transit District. This is consistent with the Urban Design Goals as noted on page 14 of the PG-TDDP.

“Finally, in addition to the Washington Area Metropolitan Transit Authority (WMATA) Metrorail system, this area is currently served by Metro buses, and the University of Maryland’s ShuttleUM transit service.

“Status of Surface Parking in the Transit District

“Pursuant to the Planning Board’s previous approvals of Detailed Site Plans in the Trans-

it District, the remaining available Preferred and Premium surface parking for the Transit District and each class of land use are reduced to the following values:

	RESIDENTIAL		OFFICE/RESCH		RETAIL		TOTAL	
	PREF.	PREM	PREF.	PREM	PREF.	PREM	PREF.	PREM
TDDP Caps	920	310	1,170	390	910	300	3,000	1,000
Subarea 4					(121)			
Subarea 6					(72)			
Subarea 9					(321)			
Unallocated	920	310	1,170	390	396	300	2,486	1,000

“As structure parking is not included in the Parking Caps pursuant to MDR P6, approval of the subject development would not change the above allocation of available Preferred and Premium Parking spaces.

“Conceptual Site Plan Findings

- “1. The PG-TDDP identifies the subject property as Subareas 2 and 3 of the Transit District. There are 15 subareas in the Transit District, two of which are designated as open space and will remain undeveloped. The proposed site consists of approximately 47.7 acres of land, 38.63 acres in the M-X-T zone and 9.07 acres in the O-S zone. The property is located at the northeast quadrant of the East-West Highway (MD 410) and Belcrest Road intersection and contains three existing office buildings totaling more than 1,237,000 square feet of office space. The total number of existing parking spaces is 3,506 spaces. Pursuant to the PG-TDDP’s MDR P6 (see finding number 3 below), these surface parking spaces or their replacement are exempt and will not be subject to the PG-TDDP Transportation and Parking Mandatory Requirements.
- “2. The proposed application is for construction of an additional 1,931,500 gross square feet of mixed use of retail, hotel, office and residential development, and approximately 4,000 new parking spaces, which the applicant has proposed to construct entirely as structured

parking, for a total of 7,506 spaces. However, as part of the parking demand calculations included in the applicant's justification statement, the applicant requests a total of 6,992 total parking spaces. Among the reasons cited in the applicant's justification statement report in support of the 6,922 figure, are:

- a. To account for sharing of parking
- b. To provide the opportunity to discourage single occupant vehicle use
- c. To encourage use of transit system

In order to resolve this conflict, a more detailed parking demand analysis should be prepared as part of the Detailed Site Plan application.

- “3. The PG-TDDP contains a goal of *encouraging the use of structured parking and discouraging huge expanses of surface parking*. MDR P6 provides that *“the term parking, as used in these requirements, shall refer only to surface parking. Parking provided in or below a structure that is used, built or redeveloped for a use or uses approved under the provisions of this plan shall be considered surface parking as used in these requirements”*.
- “4. As a result, the proposed concept plan as submitted with structured parking would not result in any reduction to the total numbers of available and unallocated preferred and premium surface parking caps.
- “5. The exclusion of the structure parking spaces from the Parking Caps under MDR P6 leaves only new surface parking spaces to be considered in the MDRs related to transportation adequacy. The achievement of the PG-TDDP's Transportation Goal of *providing for adequate transportation operations and transit service efficiency*, and its Objective of *promoting alternatives to SOV use, such as trip reduction policies, ridesharing, priority and market-rate pricing of parking, and other types of transportation demand management, to reduce peak-hour traffic congestion*, for the proposed project with structured parking may require (1) formal establishment of the PG-TDMD and (2) initiation of the Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDMP) for the subject property as provided in Section 206 of the TDM District Ordinance, pursuant to MDR P13, P14 and P16. As a result, staff is preparing a draft resolution for the establishment of the PG-TDMD to be submitted to the Prince George's County Council.
- “6. The internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns as generally proposed in the concept plan appear to be acceptable. However, the exact design, size and location of all on-site pedestrian and vehicular facilities will be determined based on the total number of vehicle trips that would be generated at time of Detailed Site Plan.
- “7. Staff is concerned with the lack of any traffic control at the intersection of Toledo Road

and the site's main Boulevard. Inclusion of a traffic circle or any other appropriate traffic control measures as deemed necessary by the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) would appear to be highly desirable.

- “8. The Plan proposes an additional right-in/right out access along East-West Highway (MD 410). Staff is concerned with the potential traffic conflicts that could result between the existing traffic at this location with the traffic that would turn right from East-West Highway onto Belcrest Road.”

Transportation Staff Analysis and Conclusions

Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that the proposed development in the Conceptual Site Plan as submitted will meet the requirements of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan (page 22) and Section 27-548(c)(1)(D) of the County Code, provided that conditions 15, 16 and 17 below are met.

17. In a memorandum dated October 5, 2000 (Shaffer to Whitmore and Wagner), the Transportation Planning Section offered the following comments:

“The Adopted and Approved Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan (TDDP) recommends that Belcrest Road be designated as a Class III bikeway with appropriate signage. Because Belcrest Road is a county right-of-way, the applicant, and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assigns shall provide a financial contribution of \$840 to the Department of Public Works and Transportation for the placement of this signage. A note shall be placed on the final record plat for payment to be received prior to issuance of the first building permit.”

Urban Design Staff Comment:

Condition 13 of the Recommendation Section of this report addresses the above referenced concern.

“Provide four- to six-foot wide striped bicycle lanes along both sides of Toledo Road from Belcrest Road to Adelphi Road. Appropriate signage and/or pavement markings shall be provided.”

Urban Design Staff Comment:

Condition 14 of the Recommendation Section of this report addresses the above referenced concern.

18. In a memorandum dated September 8, 2000 (Hijazi to Whitmore), the Department of Public Works and Transportation offered the following comments:

“The subject property is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of East West Highway (MD. Route 410) and Belcrest Road, which is within the Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ). Right-of-way dedication and frontage improvement along the frontage of the property on Belcrest Road, Toledo Road, and Adelphi Road in accordance to Department of Public Works and Transportation Standard No. 12 are required.”

19. In a memorandum dated September 6, 2000 (Bailey to Whitmore), the Maryland State Highway Administration offered the following comments:

“Our Regional Intermodel Planning Division notified us that their review of the site plan and support documentation is complete. We have no objection to approval of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-00024 as submitted. However, State Highway (SHA) would like the opportunity to comment further on the proposed site access at MD 410 (East West Highway) prior to issuance of building permits.”

20. In a memoranda dated August 14, and September 19, 2000, respectively (Del Balzo to Whitmore), the Subdivision Section offered the following comments:

“The property is the subject of two record plats. The southern portion of the property, below Toledo Road, is known as Parcels C, D, and E recorded in 1992 as Record Plat VJ 163 @ 19. The northern part of the property, above Toledo Road, is known as Parcel A, recorded as Record Plat WWW 59 @ 11, in 1966. Both record plats are known as Prince George’s Center. The site plan identifies Parcel A as Subarea 2; Parcel C, D and E are identified as Subarea 3.

“Subdivision will be required for development in Subarea 2, but not for development in Subarea 3. The site plan proposes a mix of multi-family and office uses on Parcel A, Subarea 2. Since this property is the subject of a plat recorded prior to October 27, 1970, a new subdivision plat will be required to proceed with development, pursuant to Section 24-111(c) of the Subdivision Regulations.

“Parcels C, D and E, Subarea 3, are partially developed with offices. The site plan proposed additional office space, commercial and multi-family residential uses. This property was platted in 1992 as part of a Lot Line Adjustment plat. While a new subdivision plat will not be required, a new school adequacy test will need to be performed because the plats are more than six years old.”

“As noted in my memorandum of August 14, 2000, Subarea 3 is exempt from the requirement to subdivide. However, P34 of the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District

Development Plan (p.87) states the following:

“At the time of Preliminary Plat of Subdivision or Conceptual or Detailed Site Plan, the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) will review the site plan related to the development’s impact on existing public parkland and recreation facilities and the need for additional parkland and recreation facilities. Any residential development shall meet the mandatory dedication requirements of the County Subdivision Ordinance (Subtitle 24).

“I hope this clarifies that even though Subarea 3 is exempt from the requirements to file a preliminary plat, it is subject to P34 of the TDDP; therefore, mandatory dedication requirements of the Subdivision Regulations can be applied at the Conceptual Plan review stage.”

21. The City of Hyattsville and University Park were sent referrals. The referral comments from both municipalities have been incorporated into the body of both the Primary Amendment (TP 00002) and Conceptual Site Plan staff reports. In general they approve of the subject applications with conditions.

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 Conceptual Site Plan for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. The following are Land Use quantities for the development:

Existing Office Towers

Metro I	316,000 square feet
Metro II	427,000 square feet
Metro III	494,00 square feet
Total Existing	1,237,000 square feet

Proposed Development*	1,931,500 square feet
Conceptual Development Level* (Total sq. ft.)	3,168,500 square feet
Floor Area Ratio for 38.63 Acres of M-X-T	1.88 FAR
Zone per Conceptual Site Plan*	
Base FAR permitted by Zone	0.40 FAR
Existing FAR (1,237,000/38.63 acres) =	0.73 FAR

Bonus Incentives Proposed

Theater	
4 GSF per GSF of theater @ 62,000 sq. ft. = 248,000 - SF =	0.15 FAR

Residential

Additional gross floor area ratio of 1.0 shall be permitted
where twenty or more dwelling units are proposed = 1.0 FAR

Outdoor Plaza

Eight GSF permitted for every 1 sq. ft.
outdoor plaza provided, at a minimum of 34,000 sq. ft. of plaza = .16 FAR

Either Open arcade (@ 3/1 GSF)

Enclosed Pedestrian space (@ 4/1 GSF)
or Rooftop activities (@ 1/1 GSF) = .12 FAR

Total bonus Incentives Earned at Conceptual Site Plan Level* 1.43 FAR

Conceptual Site Plan FAR Potential* = 2.16 FAR

FAR Proposed per Conceptual Site Plan 1.88 FAR

Parking

Existing Surface parking (not to be exceeded during redevelopment) 3,506 spaces

Proposed Structured Parking 4,000 spaces

Proposed new surface parking 0 spaces

Total Parking 7,506 spaces

*Based on Illustrative Plan, actual Development Level and FAR will vary per final Detailed Site Plans.

2. Prior to the submission of Detailed Site Plans or Preliminary Plats for any portions of the property exceeding twenty-five percent (25%) of the gross acreage, the applicant and staff of the Department of Parks and Recreation shall develop a mutually acceptable package of parkland, outdoor recreation facilities, fees or donations to meet the future needs of the residents of the planned community.
3. The park dedication/recreational facilities package shall include the dedication of $0.33 \pm$ acres (as shown on DPR exhibit A) currently used as parking for the Prince George's Plaza Community Center, to the M-NCPPC.
4. Prior to certificate approval of the Conceptual Site Plan:
 - a. The Existing Conditions Plan (Sheet 4 of 9) and Conceptual Site Plan (Sheet 3 of 9) shall include the delineation of the environmental envelope/ natural reserve area related to the stream and wetland area.
 - b. The Existing Conditions Plan (Sheet 4 of 9) and Conceptual Site Plan (Sheet 3 of 9) shall show the correct zoning line between the M-X-T and O-S zone on

- Subarea 2.
 - c. The Conceptual Site Plan (Sheet 3 of 9) shall be revised to show the boundary of the TDOZ, and the boundaries of the subareas. Parcel 67 shall be shown as part of Subarea 2.
 - d. The Conceptual Site Plan should be revised to show no development in the O-S zone.
 - e. The Conceptual Site Plan (Sheet 3 of 9) shall be revised to show the 65dBA noise contour, and the noise contours on the Existing Conditions Plan shall be correctly labeled.
 - d. Conceptual Site Plan shall be revised to indicate the location of matching gateway or landmark treatments at the intersection of Toledo and Belcrest Roads.
- 5. Prior to certificate approval, TCP I/35/00 shall be revised as follows:
 - a. The TCP I shall include all area included in Subarea 2.
 - b. All O-S zoned property within Subarea 2 shall be shown as tree preservation and credited towards the fulfillment of woodland conservation requirements on-site.
 - c. The zoning line on Subarea 2 shall be correctly delineated;
 - d. The Woodland Conservation Worksheet shall be corrected to reflect accurate acreages and site requirements.
- 6. Off-site woodland conservation sites shall be determined at time of TCP II. If off-site mitigation locations outside of the Anacostia watershed are proposed, the applicant shall demonstrate that due diligence has been made to secure a location within the watershed, and that efforts have been unsuccessful.
- 7. A determination of jurisdictional wetlands shall be provided at the time of Preliminary Plan, for Subarea 2, along with any variation requests for disturbance of nontidal wetlands or wetland buffers.
- 8. A Phase II Noise Study shall be submitted at time of Detailed Site Plan for any residential components to address noise mitigation in accordance with standards established in the TDDP.
- 9. Concurrently with the review and approval of the first Detailed Site Plan, sections and details of the typical streetscape for the boulevard shall be provided for Planning Board approval, including building setbacks, the dimensions and details of all travel lanes, parking bays, sidewalks, street tree spacing and planting areas.
- 10. Concurrently with the review and approval of the first Detailed Site Plan for Subareas 2

and 3, a common sign package for the entire development, consistent with S28, shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board.

11. Each Detailed Site Plan shall specify that all tree pits along the boulevard shall be connected with a continuous non-compacted soil volume under the sidewalk. Details of how this will be accomplished shall be included on the plans and shall be agreed upon by the Planning Board or its designee. The use of "CU-Soil" as a "structural soil" or other equal product for shade trees planted in tree pits is strongly encouraged.
12. Prior to issuance of the first building permit, payment of \$840 shall be paid to the Department of Public Works, for bicycle signage.
13. At the time of Detailed Site Plan review the plans shall indicate that they are providing four- to six-foot wide striped bicycle lanes along both sides of Toledo Road from Belcrest Road to Adelphi Road.
14. All Detailed Site Plans shall be in conformance with TP-00002 or as amended in the future.
15. For each Detailed Site Plan, the applicant, his heirs, successors, and/or assigns shall submit a parking demand analysis which reflects appropriate reduction for shared parking between the existing and proposed uses.
16. At the time of review of the first Detailed Site Plan, the applicant, his heirs, successors, and/or assigns shall submit a detailed on-site transportation study for the entire site of this Conceptual Site Plan, which shall include traffic projections for all access points and along major internal roadways.
17. Prior to certification of the Conceptual Site Plan, the plan shall be revised to show a traffic roundabout for the proposed intersection of Toledo Road and the site's main Boulevard. As part of the review of the first Detailed Site Plan, the applicant shall obtain from DPW&T the approval for construction of a traffic roundabout or any other appropriate traffic control measures as deemed necessary.

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 Eley, seconded by Commissioner Lowe, with Commissioners Eley, Lowe

PGCPB No. 00-195

File No. CSP-00024

Page No. 34

and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Brown absent, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, October 19, 2000, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 9th day of November.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:lw:ve