PGCPB No. 04-109 File No. DSP-03072

R E S O L U T I O N

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

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on May 13, 2004, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-03072 for University Town Center (formerly The Boulevard At Prince George's Metro Center), the Planning Board finds:

1. The Conceptual Site Plan for Subareas 2 and 3 of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ) was approved by the District Council on January 8, 2001. The plan proposes a mixed-use development with a "main street" theme that will include office, retail and residential. Both subareas were reviewed as one site and combined consist of 40.1 acres in the M-X-T Zone and 7.6 acres in the O-S Zone, for a total of 47.7 gross acres. This application, DSP-03072, is for 6.62 acres in the M-X-T Zone for the purpose of reviewing the plans for the creation of streets and the streetscape improvements along MD 410. The subject application consists of infrastructure grading plans by Greenhorne and O'Mara and hardscape plans designed by RTKL Associates, Inc.

2. Primary amendments to the transit district development plan for the subject property, TP-00002, were approved by the District Council on February 26, 2001. In the Order Approving Primary Amendments To Transit District Development Plan, the District Council approved modifications to P1 and P52 of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan, both of which are relevant to this application (see Finding No. 4).

3. The Detailed Site Plan generally meets all the requirements of the Transit District Overlay Zone. The development data is as follows:

Zone	M-X-T
Site Area	6.62 acres
Use	grading and infrastructure

Parking

Existing surface parking	2,132 spaces
Freestanding structured parking garage	1,455 spaces
Underground structured parking garage	1,167 spaces
Proposed surface parking	2,144 spaces
Total number of spaces	4,766 spaces

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

stated in the Transit District Development Plan

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

The District Council approved several primary amendments (P1, P44, P46, P48, P50, P52, P53, P54, P58 and P59) and adopted the Planning Board's findings concerning mandatory requirements P34, P55, S28, S33, S34, S35 and S36 to the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP), which allows the development of Subareas 2 and 3 to proceed as stipulated by those amendments. The Urban Design staff has determined that the detailed site plan is not in strict conformance with all mandatory development requirements as amended by the District Council, specifically P1 and P52 which where amended and combined to state the following:

The Applicant shall provide streetscape improvements along the property's entire East-West Highway frontage, with a 28-foot pedestrian zone, measured from face of curb. No permits shall be issued until there is approved a Detailed Site Plan showing conformance with TDDP streetscape requirements. Construction of streetscape improvements shall be in phase with development. It may be scheduled when the Detailed Site Plan is approved.

Approval of the 28-foot build-to line is subject to the following conditions:

1. **The first floor of the building on East-West Highway, including the first 15 feet of building height, shall include, for at least 80% of the linear footage along the building's build-to line, uses to enliven the area adjacent to the sidewalk and pedestrian zone. Such uses may include retail shops, restaurants, movie theaters, display windows, residences, hotels, hotel or office lobbies, indoor or outdoor eating areas, or similar uses.**

2. **A parking garage may front on East-West Highway, subject to the conditions just stated and the following: Parking garage use on or above the first floor shall employ such techniques as building off-sets, variations in building materials or color, and attractive banding, to avoid monotonous facades.**

3. **Each Detailed Site Plan shall show that all tree pits along East-West Highway are connected by a continuous noncompacted soil volume system under the sidewalk. Details of the soil and tree pit system shall be shown on applicable Detailed site Plans and approved by the Planning Board or its designee. Plans shall show use of a 'structural soil' like 'CU-Soil' or an equivalent product for shade trees in tree pits.**

The applicant has provided the following comment to the staff in letter dated April 30, 2004, Ryan to Lareuse, regarding the placement of overhead utility lines underground along the frontage of the subject site along MD 410:

"The applicant is considering whether the existing utilities can be placed underground, both physically and financially. Under any scenario, the plans have been revised to remove the poles

from the sidewalk. The applicant would be amenable to a condition requiring the 'continued investigation of the potential for placing these utilities underground,' but cannot agree to a condition requiring it at this time. There are a significant quantity of utilities on the poles along the East-West Highway frontage and there may not be physical space to place them all underground in the existing rights-of-way. Additionally, the utility companies would have to agree and contribute to the expense of this operation. The application has been pursuing this option and will continue discussions with the utility companies toward this end but cannot commit to an obligation at this time. The walkway proposed is unencumbered by utility poles. The lights and street trees will be placed in a landscape strip."

The Community Planning Division has reviewed the plans for conformance to the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan and has provided input on this issue as follows:

The plan shows existing utility poles to remain as located within the center of the proposed paved 15-foot-width walkway. According to the standards established by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the proposed walkway contains barriers and is not safe for a visually impaired person who may be harmed by running into these existing utility poles. Another concern is that the walkway is reduced to a minimum four-foot width at the location of the existing utility poles within the proposed walkway. This may be an ADA barrier because two-way wheelchair access along pathways requires a five-foot minimum width. The District Council's approval of TP-00002 reduced the 40-foot pedestrian zone to 28 feet along East West Highway. However, the District Council may not have known what the existing conditions were regarding the overhead utility poles along East West Highway when this decision was made. Due to the fact that the existing utility poles occur within the 28-foot wide pedestrian zone, it is unacceptable to propose a 15-foot-wide walkway that coincides with these utility poles. The health, safety, and welfare of the pedestrians are adversely affected by the unsafe design of the proposed walkway.

The visual appeal of this street frontage does not uphold the quality vision as illustrated in the applicant's conceptual site plan rendering. In addition, the proposed walkway within the existing utility pole location is not consistent with the TDDP vision for streetscape environment, accessibility, pedestrian safety, and primary pedestrian walkways. The utility poles are approximately 60 feet high and also serve as light poles with overhead wires. (See image #1 and 2 attached to this report for existing utility pole conditions along East West Highway.) Also, the applicant's plan depicts an incorrect image of existing utility poles and shows a modest "Washington-style street lamp." It should be noted that the remaining East West Highway streetscape along Prince George's Plaza is a different image regarding existing utilities, in that the existing utility poles occur adjacent to the face of curb (in a green area) and do not occur within the middle of the pedestrian way. There are four existing utility poles along the proposed development. The applicant should remove these poles and place the utilities underground due to the unsafe design issues stated above.

Comment: The Development Review Division agrees with the Community Planning Division on this issue. The most recently submitted plans indicate the current location of the existing utility

poles, but none of the plans show a proposed relocation of the poles. Allowing the existing utility poles to continue to be in the location as shown on the site plan, in the middle of the reduced streetscape, is not reasonable. Further, the applicant has stated that they may relocate the poles to the six-foot green area between the curb and the sidewalk, if they do not place the utilities underground. The record of the conceptual site plan and the primary amendment exhibits clearly depicted an upscale, urbane street frontage with lots of activity, special pavement, granite curbs, etc. The exhibits for that case clearly did not incorporate the existing utility poles. Any indication of the poles remaining within the 28-foot-wide streetscape would have resulted in the staff's objection at the time of the original primary amendment. Therefore, the staff recommends that the plans be revised to indicate that the existing overhead utility lines shall be placed underground. Alternatively, the staff recommends that the plans be approved for the remaining areas of the site with the approval withheld for the area along MD 410. This is recommended because if the applicant is now in the position of claiming that the feasibility of the placement of the wires underground cannot be determined at this time due to technical issues relating to the public utility company, width of area available for placement of the utilities underground, and the ultimate cost, then the plans are certainly being submitted prematurely. These kinds of issues should have been investigated by the applicant at the time of the granting of the request of the primary amendment; certainly the staff's understanding was that the existing utilities were to be placed underground. If this critical issue is still unresolved, then the plans should not be approved for the area directly adjacent to MD 410 and should be held until such time as the issue is resolved or plans for the development adjacent to the streetscape are submitted and the build-to line can be re-evaluated to determine if the previously granted 28-foot-wide streetscape is an appropriate width if the utilities are to be relocated rather than placed underground.

Another aspect of the conformance issue relating to the conceptual site plan and the primary amendment as stated above is in the design of the edge of the streetscape along the building edge. Condition one of Primary Amendments 1 and 52 as stated above in bold indicates that the first 15 feet of the height of the building shall include "uses to enliven the area adjacent to the sidewalk and the pedestrian zone. Such uses may include retail shops, restaurants, movie theaters, display windows, residences, hotels or office lobbies, indoor or outdoor eating areas, or similar uses." The edge of the streetscape adjacent to the building edge is shown to be planted at the base of the building in a continuous planting bed. This is not the treatment of the edge of the buildings as was represented in the original conceptual site plan or the companion primary amendment. Therefore, the staff recommends that the planting bed be removed and the special paving continue to the edge of the building. Further analysis of this foreground treatment of the streetscape shall be reviewed at the time of the detailed site plan for the building(s) directly adjacent to the streetscape.

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

The transit district detailed site plan is not consistent with and does not reflect the guidelines and criteria contained in the transit district development plan, particularly the following criteria and guidelines:

- ***S8 (TDDP, page 31)*** *– "All property frontages shall be improved in accordance with Figures 7, 8, and 9 in order to create a visually continuous and unified streetscape."*

- ***S12 (TDDP, page 31)*** *– "All tree pits for street tree planting shall be designed in accordance with Figure 10, or the most current technology.; and"*

The applicant has provided the following comment to the staff in letter dated April 30, 2004, Ryan to Lareuse, regarding the placement of a double row of street trees along MD 410:

"Space does not permit a double row of trees along East West Highway. We discussed this item and suggest staggering the rows to give the appearance of a double row, and await your thoughts on this issue."

The Community Planning Division has reviewed the plans for conformance to the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan and has provided input on this issue:

The applicant provides a single row of street trees along East West Highway. However, the applicant is required by TDDP (Figures 8 and 9) to provide a double row of street trees. These street trees can be provided within the ample 28-foot width of pedestrian zone provided on the applicant's plan. This image illustrates that the double row of street trees can be accommodated within the proposed 28-foot pedestrian zone by providing a 5-foot landscape strip adjacent East West Highway, a 15-foot walkway, and an 8-foot landscape strip adjacent to the proposed building area. If the applicant chooses to use tree grates within the proposed 15-foot-wide sidewalk, the tree root ball should be planted within a continuous soil bed under the proposed pavement area. The soil bed should be constructed to extend underneath the entire paved area of the proposed 15-foot-wide sidewalk. Based on the discussion above, the applicant should remove the existing utility poles and place utilities underground and provide the double row of street trees within the proposed walkway along East West Highway to comply with the TDDP requirements of P1, S4, S8, S12, and G2.

Comment: Development Review does not agree that the reduced width of 28 feet as was previously approved for the streetscape allows for the growth of a double row of street trees along MD 410 as is shown in the details of the TDDP for a 40-foot build-to line. The concept of a double row of street trees can only be accommodated by placing the second row within grates closer to the proposed building edge. The staff believes that a second row of trees can be accommodated in grates if the tree type is pyramidal in shape and the locations of the grates are carefully designed to integrate with the design of the building(s) which will ultimately front the streetscape. Here again, the staff is of the opinion that the streetscape along MD 410 is being submitted prematurely for an accurate evaluation of what can and should be done in this area. However, if approved, the plans should be changed prior to signature approval to incorporate a second row of trees located in grates within the area between the six-foot-wide green space and the face of building; the tree root ball should be planted within a continuous soil bed under the proposed pavement area. Details and specifications should be added to the plans as well to delineate the required planting techniques.

- ***S3 (TDDP, page 29)*** *– "All primary and secondary pedestrian walkways shall be well-lighted to a minimum standard of 1.25 footcandles."*

- ***S24 (TDDP, page 39)*** *– "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."*

- ***S25 (TDDP, page 39)*** *– "All lighting shall have a minimum level of 1.25 footcandles, and shall be provided for all outdoor spaces, plazas, parking lots… for the safety and welfare of all users."*

- ***S26 (TDDP, page 39)*** *– "Lighting shall be designed to prevent glare, where possible, on adjoining properties, roadways and uses within the subject development."*

- ***S27 (TDDP, page 39)*** *– "At the time of the first Detailed Site Plan Submission, the M-NCPPC Urban Design staff shall select and specify the lighting fixture(s) to be used for all subsequent development phases within the transit district. A coordinated lighting plan shall be submitted with each Detailed Site Plan."*

The Community Planning Division has reviewed the plans for conformance to the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan and has provided input on this issue:

The applicant did not provide a legible photometric chart (RTKL, sheet 95.10), which delineates footcandles. The applicant's lighting plan is too small to read specific footcandle numbers delineated on the plan. The applicant should provide an enlarged photometric chart that is readable to analyze the minimum 1.25-footcandle requirement. Regarding TDDP S24 and S27, the plans should show the Belcrest Road street light detail along East West Highway. This detail should be provided on the detail sheet of the plans; currently the plan shows a different light standard ("Saturn 3 – Selux" fixture) which is proposed for the internal lighting of the Boulevard. This is not an acceptable light fixture for East West Highway and does not continue the TDDP S24 streetscape lighting established by other developments within the transit district. The plan should show the Belcrest light standard for East West Highway as required by the TDDP. The applicant should comply with TDDP S3, S24, S25, S26, and S27.

NOTE: Proposed lighting requirements should comply with the ADA federal guidelines and should provide lighting standards for accessible spaces and pedestrian paths to be a minimum of 2.0 footcandles.

Comment: The Development Review Division agrees with the Community Planning Division and has included conditions to address the issues above.

- ***S5 (TDDP, page 29)*** *– "All primary and secondary pedestrian routes shall be constructed using special paving materials…"*

• ***S6 (TDDP, page 29)*** *– "At the time of the first Detailed Site Plan submission, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) Urban Design staff shall select and specify the paving material to be used for the primary and secondary pedestrian system throughout the transit district.";*

• ***S9 (TDDP, page 31)*** *– "…Urban Design staff shall select and specify the streetscape elements which shall constitute the streetscape vocabulary for all future development in the transit district, such as lighting fixtures, benches, trash receptacles, bicycle racks, sign posts, planters, building awnings, paving pattern(s) and materials."*

• ***S15 (TDDP, page 36)*** *– "All plazas shall have paving materials that are high quality visually attractive and compatible with adjacent building elements. A combination of the following may be required: brick, concrete pavers, flagstone, tile, exposed aggregate concrete, granite setts, and cobbles. Large expanses of poured concrete are not acceptable. A detailed paving/banding plan will be required at the time of Detailed Site Plan."*

The Community Planning Division has reviewed the plans for conformance to the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan and has provided input on this issue:

The applicant's plan contains large expanses of poured/scoured concrete along East West Highway and also contains this same material within the proposed internal Boulevard streetscape paving. There are also some areas where pavers are shown within the proposed streetscape system. Specifically, the applicant should comply with the herringbone brick pavers and Belgium Block edging as approved by the Certificate of Approval, signed by Steve Adams on October 31, 2002, for DSP-01002/01 for the Boulevard paving streetscape. This was the first approved detailed site plan to set the streetscape paving/elements for Subarea 3. The paving plan should not contain large expanses of poured/scoured concrete. The applicant should provide two-foot by three-foot London pavers bordered by a double band of brick pavers and segmented into 10-foot widths as approved by the Urban Design staff for all previous plans within the TDDP.

Comment: The Development Review Division agrees with the Community Planning Division on this issue and has included conditions in the Recommendation section of this report.

• ***S23 (TDDP, page 38) –*** *"All surface parking lots shall be screened from view of roadways by the use of both a low, opaque wall and an evergreen hedge (See Figure 7), unless they are provided in short-term parking for ten cars or fewer."*

Comment: The plans identify a parking garage along the east end of the project along MD 410. No surface parking compounds are proposed along the right-of-way.

• ***S29 (TDDP, page 41) –*** *"The location and number of bicycle lockers, racks and other features shall be determined at Detailed Site Plan review."*

• ***S30 (TDDP, page 41)*** *– "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."

- ***G38 (TDDP, page 38)*** *– "The use of public art and water features as a focal point is encouraged."*

  The Community Planning Division has reviewed the plans for conformance to the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan and has provided input on this issue:

The applicant's plan does not address requirements for bike racks, artwork and water features within the proposed Boulevard streetscape. The Boulevard streetscape should have bicycle racks, artwork, and water features as defined by the TDDP. It is difficult to determine the number of bike racks required because the TDDP calculation is based on the square footage of proposed buildings. No buildings are proposed at this time; however, it is critical that this requirement be included within the streetscape construction. The future buildings shown on the approved conceptual site plan should be used to determine the number and locations of proposed bike racks. In addition, the applicant has not proposed any public art or water features within the proposed plaza area/streetscape. It is important that these TDDP requirements be met; therefore, it should be included as a condition that any future DSP for a building or parking structure with frontage along the streetscape/boulevard infrastructure will require bicycle racks, artwork, and water features to be provided to comply with the required TDDP S29, S30, and G38.

- ***S31 (TDDP, page 69)*** *– At the time of Detailed Site Plan, the number of trash cans and locations shall be shown on the plan. Trash receptacles should be placed in strategic locations to prevent litter from accumulating in and around the proposed development."*

  The Community Planning Division has reviewed the plans for conformance to the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan and has provided input on this issue:

The applicant's plan does not show trash receptacle locations on the streetscape plan for the Boulevard project, but does provide details on the plans. The applicant should provide trash receptacle locations within the streetscape on the plan. The plan should specify trash receptacles that are Victor Stanley Model S-424 burgundy color to match Belcrest Road receptacles.

The Community Planning Division has reviewed the plans for conformance to the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan and has provided input on this issue:

- ***G32 (TDDP, page 37) –*** *"Plaza trees should be a minimum size of 4 inches in caliper at the time of installation. They shall be planted in at least 700 cubic feet of soil per tree with a depth of soil of 3 to 4 feet and be planted either with grating flush to grade, or in a planting bed with a continuous area of at least 75 square feet exclusive of bounding wall."*

The Community Planning Division has reviewed the plans for conformance to the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan and has provided input on this issue:

The applicant proposes 1½- to 2-inch caliper Yoshino Cherry trees within the proposed plaza area along the Boulevard near East West Highway and proposes 2½- to 3-inch caliper London Plane trees along the Boulevard streetscape. These trees do not meet the caliper size requirements of the TDDP. The applicant should provide four-inch caliper trees within plaza areas as required by the TDDP and should provide 3 ½- to 4-inch caliper street trees along the Boulevard streetscape consistent with the TDDP East West Highway street tree requirement of S8 (Figure 9). The applicant should also provide Structural CU Soil under plaza paving and in planting beds for the health and future growth of the trees.

- ***G34 (TDDP, page 37) –*** *"All landscaping materials should have an automated irrigation system."*

The Community Planning Division has reviewed the plans for conformance to the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan and has provided input on this issue:

The applicant's plan does not provide an irrigation plan. The plan should provide an irrigation plan to maintain the health, vigor, and quality of the landscape material and the lawn areas. The applicant should comply with TDDP G34 requirement. NOTE: All lawn areas shall be sodded and should not contain seed installation. Sod is easily established, reduces weed growth, decreases stormwater run-off, improves the water quality, and maintains a high quality look for the transit district. All plans should delineate lawn areas to be comprised of sod and a note should be placed on all landscape plans.

- ***G2 (TDDP, page 30)*** *– "Pedestrian links should be barrier free."*

The plan does not clearly show the ultimate location of the existing utility poles currently located within the center of the proposed 15-foot-wide walkway. As stated earlier in this report the utility lines should be placed underground.

6. **The Transit District Site Plan meets all of the requirements of the Transit District Overlay Zone and applicable regulations of the M-X-T Zone;**

7. **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 3 will function both independently and in harmony with the existing and proposed uses in Subareas 2 and 3, as well as the entire transit district overlay zone.

The location of the main street and its design are respectful of both proposed and existing uses and have taken into consideration architecture, site design, layout of buildings, and circulation, both pedestrian and vehicular. However, the streetscape proposed along the frontage of MD 410 is not designed to effectively accommodate the pedestrian movement as was proposed in the

earlier approved plans of development, specifically the conceptual site plan.

The subject application follows an application to construct a student-housing tower, DSP-03037/01, and will be followed by retail components and a public plaza. These future applications will all be located within the limits of Subarea 2. The future submittal of plans for the development adjacent to the proposed streetscape along MD 410 and the main street will each be developed in accordance with the requirement above.

8. **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. 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.

9. **In addition to the findings above, the following is required for Detailed Site Plans:**

a. The Planning Board shall find that the Detailed Site Plan is in general conformance with the approved Conceptual Site Plan.

The proposed application is generally in conformance with the conceptual site plan; however it is not in conformance with the conceptual site plan or the primary amendment in regard to the improvements along MD 410.

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

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

The proposed infrastructure plan is one component of the overall project known as the Boulevard at Prince George's Metro. At the time of final buildout, the boulevard will provide for high quality and distinctive architecture, as determined through the public hearing process, for additional retail and office development. As such, the proposed project, during development and at the time of completion, 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 detailed site plan maximizes public and private development potential and promotes the effective and optimum use of transit and other major transportation systems.

11. **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 overall project will have both an outward orientation with new paving, street

furniture, landscaping, and public spaces fronting on MD 410 and Belcrest Road, as well as an inward orientation with new pedestrian sidewalks, street furnishings, public art, landscaping, and lighting fronting on the new main street.

As this project continues to develop, other requirements of the TDDP will further ensure that 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.

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

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.

13. **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;**

Subareas 2 and 3 are already developed with 1.237 million square feet of office buildings, and the opening of the Center for Disease Control provides for a significant employment base that will help to contribute to a stable environment. The addition of the underground parking garage and the development of the student housing will enhance the existing and proposed development on the site. Future development, such as the retail uses including restaurants, a cinema, and outdoor plazas, will also enhance the quality of the transit district.

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

While this submission, DSP-03072, for the infrastructure plan has been reviewed and processed independently, detailed site plans for the development of the retail components will be presented to the Planning Board in the near future. These submissions build upon each other such that the combined elements of the overall development will ultimately become a self-sufficient entity that will allow for effective integration of future phases of the development.

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

A major component of the detailed site plan is the main street with wide sidewalks, special paving, street trees, landscaping, furniture, and lighting that is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity. The pedestrian system will connect into existing streets that will create convenient access to the Metro station and surrounding subareas.

16. **On the Detailed Site Plan, in areas of the development which are to be used for pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people, adequate attention has been paid to human**

scale, high quality urban design and other amenities, such as the types and textures of materials, landscaping and screening, street furniture and lighting (natural and artificial).

The subject plans provide for the movement of the pedestrian but has not adequately addressed the issue of existing utility poles and has not addressed the issue of high quality urban design.

Referrals

17. The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the above referenced revised detailed site plan for the Boulevard at Prince George's Metro Center, DSP-03071, stamped as received by the Countywide Planning Division on March 28, 2004. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of the detailed site plan (DSP-03037-01) with no environmental conditions.
The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed this site in 2001 as a preliminary plan of subdivision (4-01092) and subsequently as detailed site plans, the most recent being DSP-03037/01, which was approved. This application seeks the approval of a detailed site plan for infrastructure only that includes the construction of roadways within the subject property. The subject property is located in the M-X-T Zone within the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone. The subject property has an approved conceptual storm drain plan, CSD #27352-2003-00, dated September 26, 2003. This site has an approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/15/01), which proposes to meet all woodland conservation requirements off-site on TCPII/129/99.

The subject property is located in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of Belcrest Road and Toledo Road with frontages on both roads. A review of the information available indicates that Marlboro clay, steep and severe slopes, 100-year floodplain, wetlands, or streams are not found to occur on this property. The site is located in the Northeast Branch watershed, which is a tributary to the Anacostia River Basin. The soils found to occur on this property according to the Prince George's County Soil Survey are in the Christiana series. This series does not pose major problems for development. There are no rare, threatened, or endangered species located in the

vicinity of this property based on information provided by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program. No historic or scenic roads are affected by this proposal. East West Highway and Belcrest Road are noise generators; however, the noise levels are low enough to not adversely impact the commercial use proposed. The proposed use is not anticipated to be a noise generator. This property is in the Developed Tier as delineated on the approved General Plan.

TRANSIT DISTRICT OVERLAY ZONE ENVIRONMENTAL MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS.

The property was the subject of Detailed Site Plan DSP-01002, Prince George's County Planning Board Resolution No. 01-04, and was approved on January 9, 2001. All previous environmental conditions in the resolution have been addressed. All applicable mandatory requirements from the approved transit district development plan for this site have been addressed in previous

submittals.

Environmental Review

This subject property is located in Subarea 3 and is exempt from the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance. This site is subject to a 10 percent afforestation requirement for the gross tract area due to a mandatory requirement of the TDOZ. The applicant has addressed this requirement through a note on the plan submitted which states: "Tree Conservation Requirements: 10% of the 13.85 acre net tract area (1.39 acres) will be provided for in a woodland conservation easement off-site." DSP-03037 as submitted is in conformance with the approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/15/01). Required off-site easements for this site have been previously secured.

Comment: No additional information is required with respect to the Tree Conservation Plan.

A copy of the Stormwater Management Concept Approval Letter was submitted and is dated September 26, 2003. The requirements for stormwater management will be met through subsequent reviews by the Department of Environmental Resources.

Comment: No further information is required with regard to stormwater management.

18. The Transportation Planning Division has reviewed the above referenced detailed site plan. The TDDP identifies the subject property as Subareas 2 and 3 of the TDOZ. The property is located at the northeast quadrant of the intersection of East West Highway, MD 410 and Belcrest Road.

    The approved Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan (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 mandatory development requirements and guidelines outlined in the TDDP.

    During the preparation of the TDDP, staff performed an analysis of all road facilities in the vicinity of the TDOZ. This analysis was based on establishment of a transit district-wide cap on the number of additional parking spaces (preferred and premium) that can be constructed or provided in the transit district to accommodate any new development. Pursuant to this concept, the plan recommends implementing a system of developer contributions to ensure adequacy of the transportation facilities, based on the number of additional parking spaces, as long as the authorized total parking limits and their attendant, respective, parking ratios (Tables 5 and 6 of the TDDP) are not exceeded. The collected fee will be applied toward the required number of transportation improvements totaling $1,562,000, as summarized in Table 4 of the TDDP. These improvements are needed to ensure that the critical roadways and intersections in the transit district will remain adequate and will be operating at or above Level-of-Service E, as required by the plan.

    The proposed detailed site plan is for construction of the needed infrastructures and does not propose to construct any additional surface parking spaces. It is important to note that all

proposed structural parking is exempt from meeting the TDDP transportation and parking mandatory requirements. Therefore, the review of the submitted detailed site plan will be limited to the review of the proposed, vehicular, and pedestrian circulation and the recommended access points.

The submitted detailed site plan is acceptable from the standpoint of internal circulation. However, the plan proposes to change existing limited right-in/out access driveways along East West Highway and Belcrest Road to full access driveways that will accommodate left-turn traffic to and from the site. East West Highway (MD 410) is an arterial roadway and maintained by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA). Belcrest Road is collector roadway maintained by the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation. The proposed access modifications as indicated in the submitted detailed site plan are not acceptable, since neither of these operating agencies have approved the provision of full access instead of existing right in/right-out access.

It should be noted that the 1998 PG-TDDP also authorized the Prince George's Plaza Transportation Demand Management District (TDMD), which requires that each property owner in the district be a member and participate in the TDMD once it is established. The annual TDMD membership fee is $5.00 for each surface parking space. The annual TDMD membership fee for parking spaces in structures and surface spaces that are permanently reserved for handicapped occupant vehicles, carpools, and vanpools is set at a rate of $2.00 per space.

Transportation Staff Conclusions

Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that the proposed detailed site plan for infrastructure as submitted will be in conformance and consistent with all applicable transit district mandatory transportation and parking requirements and site design guidelines, the approved conceptual site plan, if the proposed full access driveways (one along East West Highway and one along Belcrest Road) are changed to right-in/right-out access. As indicated in the findings below, the plans have been changed, as of the writing of this report.

19. The Maryland Department of Transportation, State Highway Administration, reviewed the plans and commented on the proposed ingress/egress point on MD 410, including the proposed left-turn lane on eastbound MD 410. Coordination with the Engineering Access Permits Division within SHA is required prior to the approval of the proposal. The applicant has since revised the plans to eliminate the proposal for the left-turn lane and has placed a note on the plan stating the need for evaluation by SHA.

20. The plans will conform to the *Landscape Manual* with minor revisions to the plans, including adding the required schedules.

21. The detailed site plan was referred to the City of Hyattsville, but the staff did not receive a response.

22. The Mayor for the Town of University Park attended the Planning Board hearing and testified in

support of the application, but raised a technical question regarding the proposed lighting and the possible future median break along Belcrest Road. The staff added language to the lighting condition to address the mayor's concerns. The staff also explained that the applicant revised the plan prior to the Planning Board hearing in order to remove the proposed median break on Belcrest Road and advised the Planning Board that the need for concurrence by the Department of Public Works and Transportation would be required prior to an approval of such proposal.

23. If the conditions of approval are adopted, the detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

24. The plans conform to the Conceptual Site 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 the Detailed Site Plan DSP-03072, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval the plans shall be revised to include the following changes:

   a. Place a note on the plans indicating that the existing overhead utilities along MD 410 shall be placed underground. The streetscape improvements shall be resubmitted at the time of the detailed site plan submission for the buildings along the frontage of MD 410 for the purpose of re-examining and refining the streetscape.

   b. The planting bed shown in front of the buildings along MD 410 shall be eliminated and paving shall be shown to extend across that area to the building wall. Each Detailed Site Plan for buildings in the area adjacent to the streetscape in this plan shall re-examine and refine the streetscape/building perimeter for this area, in compliance with the requirements of the conditions of TP-0002 (as stated in the Order Approving Primary Amendments to Transit District Development Plan).

   c. A second row of street trees shall be incorporated into the streetscape along MD 410 between the green area along the right-of-way and the face of the building(s). These trees shall be appropriate in form for a confined space (upright branching and columnar/oval in form), located in grates (similar to those approved within Belcrest Road streetscape) and shall be located approximately 30 feet on center. A continuous non-compacted soil volume under the proposed pavement, incorporating a structural soil (in selected locations to be agreed upon by applicant and staff) and irrigation system shall be provided. Details and specifications of the soil, tree pit system and grates shall be provided on the plans. Each Detailed Site Plan for buildings in the area adjacent to the streetscape in this plan shall reexamine and refine the streetscape/building perimeter for this area, in compliance with the requirements of the conditions of TP-0002 (as stated in the Order Approving Primary Amendments to Transit District Development Plan).

d. A legible photometric plan shall be submitted demonstrating a minimum 1.25 foot-candles in all pedestrian areas. At the time of the Detailed Site Plan for each of the buildings, the lighting may be adjusted to demonstrate an average minimum (or minimum, whichever s the industry standard) of 1.25 foot-candles. Where applicable, the ADA federal guidelines for lighting shall be provided.

e. Lighting fixtures within the streetscape of MD 410 shall be revised to indicate the same street light detail as is required by the TDDP and has been required throughout the transit district, in accordance with TS-00024/01 (as stated in PGCPB No. 01-248), except that Selux lights that have been approved for the Boulevard shall be permitted at the intersection of the Boulevard and MD 410.

f. Paving materials for the pedestrian sidewalk along MD 410, from the bike lane to the edge of the buildings, shall be shown as brick pavers in a herringbone pattern. The detail of the Belgian block shall be revised to indicate bands of brick pavers.

g. The location of trash receptacles shall be shown on the plans.

h. The plans shall demonstrate conformance to the *Landscape Manual*.

i. All trees located within plaza areas, along the boulevard as street trees and along the MD 410 shall be shown as 3 ½ to 4-inch caliper.

j. An irrigation plan for the plaza area at the intersection of MD 410 and the main street shall be submitted for review and approval by the Urban Design Section.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with the District Council of Prince George's County within thirty (30) days following the final notice of the Planning Board's decision.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Squire, seconded by Commissioner Harley, with Commissioners Squire, Harley, Vaughns, Eley, and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, May 15, 2004, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 3rd day of June 2004.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:SHL:meg