

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 24, 2001, regarding Detailed Site Plan SP-01001 for The Boulevard at Prince George's Metro Center, The Boulevard, Phase I, 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-01001, is for approximately 360 linear feet of Phase I of the Boulevard, which includes special paving, street furniture, trash receptacles, landscaping, public art, and lighting within 1.24 acres in Subarea 3. The site is located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Belcrest Road and Toledo Road, within close proximity of the Metro station. Toledo Road is located to the north of the site and runs east to west and connects Belcrest Road to Adelphi Road. To the east of the site is the proposed Center for Disease Control (CDC) office building and parking garage. Access to CDC will be provided by the proposed Boulevard and a service road located to the rear of the building which leads to the parking garage; to the west, across from Belcrest Road, is the existing Prince George's Plaza Mall; across from Belcrest Road is Subarea 1, partially developed as multifamily residential; and to the south is an existing parking lot within Subarea 3.

Required findings for a Detailed 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 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 Subarea 2 and 3 to proceed as stipulated by those amendments. The Urban Design staff has determined that the Detailed Site Plan is in strict conformance with all Mandatory Development Requirements as amended by the District Council.

Primary Development Requirements

The applicant has not filed any amendments to the mandatory development requirements with this application, but the following ■P• requirements warrant discussion:

P25 Any Development shall provide for water quality and quantity control in accordance with all Federal, State and county regulations. Bioretention or other innovative water quantity or quality methods shall be used where deemed appropriate.

In a memorandum dated May 9, 2001 (Finch to Whitmore), the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comment:

■Under stormwater management, Mandatory Requirement P26 states that: **▲When SWM cannot be provided for existing development parcels, a mandatory 15% green space requirement shall be provided. The green space can be incorporated into the mandatory 10 percent afforestation requirements if it occurs on the actual property.▲** The Department of Environmental Resources (DER) is responsible for the enforcement of stormwater management requirements through the conceptual and technical plan approval process.●

The applicant should demonstrate that stormwater management is being provided for Parcels C, D and E, or that the Detailed Site Plan fulfills the 15 percent green space. Should the applicant choose not to demonstrate this mandatory requirement they should apply for a Primary Amendment to P25.

Urban Design Staff Comment: The applicant faxed to staff on May 11, 2001, a copy of the approved Conceptual Stormwater letter (#8328349-2000-00), approved on May 8, 2001, with an expiration date of May 8, 2004.

P28 Any new development or reconstruction of existing development shall be in conformance with the Prince Georges County Floodplain Ordinance.

In a memorandum dated May 9, 2001 (Finch to Whitmore), the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comment:

■There is 0.06 acre of 100-year floodplain located in the northeast corner of Parcel E.●

The plans should be revised to delineate the existing 100-year floodplain in Subarea 3. Additional information should be provided that addresses impacts and mitigation for the disturbance of the 100-year floodplain.

Urban Design Staff Comment: Condition 1b in the Recommendation section of this report addresses this concern.

P32 Prior to the final inspection and sign-off of permits by the Sediment/Stormwater or Building Inspector, any storm drain inlets associated with the development and all inlets on the subject subarea shall be stenciled with ■Do Not Dump, Chesapeake Bay Drainage.● The Detailed Site Plan and the Sediment Control Plan (in the sequence of construction) shall contain this information.

In a memorandum dated May 9, 2001 (Finch to Whitmore), the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comment:

■The applicant should revise the Detailed Site Plan to include notes and details necessary to implement the stenciling of any storm drain inlets associated with the development and all inlets on parcels C, D and E with ●Do Not Dump, Chesapeake Bay Drainage,▲ if applicable, and at time of permits, the Environmental Planning Section should review the Sediment and Erosion Control Plan to confirm that the information necessary to implement storm drain stenciling has been included in the Sequence of Construction.●

Urban Design Staff Comment: Condition 1a in the Recommendation section of this report addresses this concern.

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 February 5, 2001 (Asan to Whitmore), the Park Planning and Development Division of the Department of Parks and Recreation stated that they had no comments at this time. It should be noted that at the time of approval of the Conceptual Site Plan the following condition was requested and incorporated into the recommendation:

■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.

■The park dedication/recreational facilities package shall include the dedication of 0.33 ∇ acres (as shown on DPR exhibit A) currently used as parking for the Prince George's Plaza Community Center, to the M-NCPPC.●

This submission does not surpass the 25 percent threshold; therefore, this condition is not applicable.

P57 All amenities which are bonus incentives as defined in Section 27-545(b) shall include a construction phasing schedule. Construction phases shall be determined at the time of Conceptual Site Plan or Detailed Site Plan approval.

The applicant has not included a construction phasing schedule for Phase I of the Boulevard. Public art is proposed in the southwest quadrant of the Boulevard and Toledo Road. The applicant has verbally indicated to the Planning Board that they wish to be allowed to have this piece of art installed prior to Use and Occupancy for the Center for Disease Control building (DSP-01001), which will be presented to the Planning Board the same day. Staff has no objection to this request. However, should the area in which the artwork is to be installed be completed prior to release of the Use and Occupancy permit for the CDC building, the area in which the artwork is to be installed should be temporarily paved to avoid a hazardous situation. The plans should be revised to show an interim plan for this situation.

Urban Design Staff Comment: Condition 1e in the Recommendation section of this report addresses this concern.

Secondary Development Requirements

The applicant has not applied for any Secondary Amendments. DSP-01001 is generally in conformance with all Secondary Development Requirements but the following ■S■ requirements warrant discussion:

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.

Urban Design Staff Comment: This application includes approximately 1/3 of the Boulevard in Subarea 3. The applicant proposes to provide a primary pedestrian walkway system that creates a main street theme. The main street will bisect Subarea 3, running north to south, and will penetrate Subarea 2. While Subarea 2 is not part of this submission it is important to point out that this main street will terminate at 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 provided a section of the proposed Boulevard which indicates that pedestrians will be able to access East West Highway by continuing south through the existing parking lot. This section also

indicates that the Boulevard will be a continuous road which will provide a direct route for both pedestrians and motorists to the Metro station.

At the time of approval of the Conceptual Site Plan the applicant had not provided any design guidelines as to the width of the street, sidewalk or building setbacks. Therefore, the Urban Design staff recommended 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. These have been provided to staff and have been found to be acceptable.

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.

Urban Design Staff Comment: The applicant has submitted a common sign plan for review with the Detailed Site Plan. The sign plan is a separate booklet which demonstrates the relationship of proposed signage with existing and proposed buildings.

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 May 9, 2001 (Finch to Whitmore), the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comment:

■ Subarea 3 is exempt from the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance, so it is subject to the 10 percent afforestation requirement for the gross tract area. A Type II Tree conservation Plan (TCP II/15/01) was approved concurrent with DSP-00052, which addressed the off-site woodland conservation requirements of parcels C and D. At this time, a revised TCP II has been submitted, which includes the gross tract area for Parcels C, D and E. An off-site woodland

conservation mitigation site has been secured for Parcels C, D and E. for 2.62 acres, and a recorded easement has been provided to the Environmental Planning Section.●

- S32 Prior to the final inspection and sign-off of permits by the Sedi-ment/Stormwater or Building Inspector, any storm drain inlets associated with the development and all inlets on the subject subarea shall be stenciled with ■Do Not Dump, Chesapeake Bay Drainage.● The Detailed Site Plan and the Sediment Control Plan (in the sequence of construction) shall contain this information.**

In a memorandum dated May 9, 2001 (Finch to Whitmore), the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comment:

■The Detailed Site Plan shall be revised to include notes and details necessary to implement the stenciling of any storm drain inlets associated with the development and all inlets in Parcel C, D and E with ■Do Not Dump, Chesapeake Bay Drainage,▲ if applicable, and at the time of permits. The Environmental Planning Section shall review the Sediment and Erosion Control Plan to confirm that the information necessary to implement storm drain stenciling has been included in the Sequence of Construction.●

Urban Design Staff Comment: Condition 1a in the Recommendation section of this report addresses the above concern.

- 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 May 9, 2001 (Finch to Whitmore), the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comment:

■The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed and approved a Phase I Noise Study for Subarea 3. The submittal of a Phase II Noise Study is required at this time, so any site plan requirements can be addressed. The Detailed Site Plan shows the 65 dBA(Ldn) noise contour, but no Phase 2 noise study has been submitted. The 65 dBA(Ldn) contour for Toledo Road indicates that there are noise impacts to the Metro Three, the proposed Metro IV building, and the parking garage.

■A determination has been made that a Phase 2 Noise Study is not required for the existing Metro Three building. . . .●

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.

At the time of the writing of the staff report a referral response had not been received from the Fire Department. It should be noted that a medivac landing area was approved with the Detailed Site Plan for the Home Depot site.

In a memorandum dated January 4, 2001 (Williams to Whitmore), the Public Facilities Planning Section stated that no Adequate Public Facilities (APF) findings are necessary.

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.

At the time of the writing of the staff report the Police Department had not responded to the referral request.

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 Detailed 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 Detailed Site Plan generally meets all the requirements of the Transit District Overlay Zone. However, it should be noted that the applicant should have applied for a Secondary Amendment to S24 (page 39 of the TDDP) which states the following:

- 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.●

Urban Design Staff Comment: The applicant should apply for a Secondary Amendment. Should the request be denied the plans should be revised to conform with the approved lighting fixture on pages 164 and 165 of the TDDP. Condition 2 in the Recommendation section addresses this concern.

The development data is as follows:

Zone	M-X-T
Site Area	1.24 acres
Gross Floor Area	None proposed
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	
No additional sq. ft. proposed to existing development, this is for approximately 360 linear feet of Phase I of the Boulevard and streetscape improvements along Toledo Road on the north side of Metro III.	
Bonus Incentives Proposed	
Outdoor Plaza	
Eight GSF permitted for every 1 sq. ft. outdoor plaza provided, at a minimum of 34,000 sq. ft. of plaza =	.02 FAR
Total bonus Incentives Earned	.02 FAR
Parking	
Proposed new surface parking	15 spaces
Total Parking	2,933 spaces

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 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 design is respectful of both proposed and existing uses and has taken into consideration architecture, site design, layout of buildings, and circulation, both pedestrian and vehicular.

The subject application has incorporated a public art plaza, landscaping, wide sidewalks, lighting, and street furniture to create a pedestrian-friendly environment. Therefore, the Planning Board 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.**

The Planning Board 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 Phase I of the Boulevard that will create a main street theme for the entire development of Subarea 2 and 3. The proposed main street elements are compatible in terms of use, materials, signage and colors. At this time no new structures are being proposed on the west side of the boulevard. On the east side the Center for Disease Control (CDC) building (DSP-01002) is being proposed. This building will frame the intersection of the Boulevard and Toledo Road, creating a strong statement of arrival. The CDC building proposes a pedestrian plaza on the west side with seating niches on the north side for pedestrians. The addition of this portion of the Boulevard in combination with the CDC building will create strong pedestrian connections that unify existing development with proposed development.

The Planning Board 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.

7. **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 subject application is a proposal for Phase I of the Boulevard with accompanying landscaping, street furniture, lighting, special paving materials, and public art. The proposed application will be in conformance with the Conceptual Site Plan upon approval of the recommended conditions.

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

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

At the time of final buildout 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. 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.

This is the first step in creating a dynamic environment for the residents of Prince George's County and surrounding areas.

9. **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 boulevard will have both an outward orientation with new paving, street furniture, landscaping and public spaces fronting on Toledo 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.

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

Phase I of the Boulevard will provide a pleasing streetscape that will complement and enhance the character of the area and promote ridership of transit facilities. The proposed improvements will also upgrade the existing Metro III building by providing a pleasing outdoor environment for those who work in and visit the area.

11. **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 existing office and associated surface parking that provide for a significant employment base that will help to contribute to a stable environment. The proposed addition of the Boulevard will enhance the existing and proposed development on the site. Future development, such as the Center for Disease Control, office buildings, restaurants, a cinema, museum, outdoor plazas and ice-skating rink, will enhance the quality of the transit district.

12. **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-01001, for Phase I of the Boulevard has been reviewed and processed, Detailed Site Plan DSP-01002 for the Center for Disease Control has been reviewed concurrently and will be presented to the Planning Board on the same day as Phase I of the Boulevard. These two submissions are co-dependent on one another, meaning that

they must go forward together and will, therefore, become a self-sufficient entity that will allow for effective integration of future phases of development.

13. **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. The pedestrian system will connect into existing streets that will create convenient access to the Metro station and surrounding subareas.

14. **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 indicate that the proposed plazas and public art have been specifically designed for the human experience. The pedestrian will experience a pleasing streetscape along the main street that includes special paving, lighting, trash receptacles, and street trees, which will create an overhead canopy that will give the existing and future development a pleasing human scale.

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

The applicant made no requests for Secondary Amendments. However, during the review of the subject application staff recognized that the applicant should have applied for a Secondary Amendment to S24, which states:

■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.●

According to the above-referenced section of the Zoning Ordinance the applicant must submit in writing justification as to why they should be granted an amendment to S24. Therefore, the applicant should submit a Secondary Amendment to S24 for approval to be granted permission to use the light pole they have proposed. Should the applicant not choose to submit the required amendment request they should revise the plans to indicate the lighting fixture that will be utilized will be the one in Figures 13 and 14 (pp 164 and 165 of the TDDP). It should be noted that staff has reviewed the proposed lighting fixture, has found it to be superior to what is on Belcrest Road and would support the request for a Secondary Amendment.

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

Referrals

16. In a memorandum dated May 9, 2001 (Finch to Whitmore), the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comments:

■Background

■Parcels C, D and E are located in Subarea 3 of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone, and are subject to the specific requirements of Transit District Development Plan. Conceptual Site Plan CSP-00024, Primary Amendment TP-0002, and Secondary Amendment TS-00024 were approved on November 9, 2000, subject to conditions stated in PGCPB No. 00-196. An Order Affirming Planning Board Decision (CSP-00024) was subsequently issued by the County Council on February 26, 2001.

■Subsequently, DSP-00052 was approved for minor improvements to Parcels C and D. At the same time TCPII/15 /01 was approved to address the afforestation requirement for Subarea 3 under the TDDP documents.

■The current applications request approval of two Detailed Site Plans. The first, DSP-01001, is for the construction of the Phase 1 of *The Boulevard* roadway on the Toledo Road right-of-way, and adjacent areas of Parcels C and D; an expansion of the parking lot area on Parcel C; and a new access roadway between Parcels C and D. The second, DSP-01002, directly to the east of DSP-01001, is for the construction of a 195,350-square-foot office building and a parking garage on Parcels D and E.

■Site Description

■Subarea 3 consists of Parcels A, C, D and E with a total area of 26.79 acres in the M-X-T Zone. The current Detailed Site Plans include Parcels C, D and E with a total gross tract area of 26.24 acres. The subarea is largely developed and the proposals being reviewed are the first sections of a major redevelopment of the site.

■Environmental Review

■A 100-year floodplain study has been submitted to the Department of Environmental Resources, which indicates that the 100-year floodplain for Subarea 3 is

limited to 0.06 acre located in the northeast corner of Parcel E. A Conceptual Stormwater Management Approval (#008004540) was submitted in conjunction with the Conceptual Site Plan which indicates that on-site bioretention will be utilized to the greatest extent reasonable and refers to "Water Quality Recommendations for the Prince George's Plaza TDDP" (Department of Environmental Resources, March 1993). The Stormwater Management Conceptual Approval also requires, as Condition 4: "Separate concept approvals required for each phase of development."

Urban Design Staff Comment: The applicant faxed to staff on May 11, 2001, a copy of the approved Conceptual Stormwater letter (#8328349-2000-00), approved on May 8, 2001, with an expiration date of May 8, 2004.

Mandatory District-Wide Requirements

- 1. Under stormwater management, Mandatory Development Requirement P27 states:

"Within 12 months after the District Council approves the Prince George's Plaza TDDP, the Department of Environmental Resources shall make recommendations to the District Council regarding treatment of pollutants based on the *Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone Environmental Management Plan*, July 1993. Any property owner who completes construction or receives a use and occupancy permit prior to the completion of the Department of Environmental Resources study shall comply with the findings and recommendations of the study."

■The Department of Environmental Resources is responsible for determining conformance with the "Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone Environmental Management Plan" at time of stormwater management technical review.

- 2. Under stormwater management, Mandatory Development Requirement S31 states:

"At 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."

■Trash cans have been indicated on the plans as part of the proposed street furnishings. The Environmental Planning Section will defer to the Urban Design Review Section in determining the appropriate number and location for these elements in coordination with the streetscape design.

- 3. Under nontidal wetlands, Mandatory Development Requirement P31 indicates that:

▲If impacts to nontidal wetlands are proposed, a Maryland Corps of Engineers Joint Permit Application shall be required.▲

■There are no nontidal wetlands located in Subarea 3.

■4. Under noise, Mandatory Development Requirement P33 indicates that:

▲Each Preliminary Plat, Conceptual and/or Detailed Site Plan shall show a 65 dBA (Ldn) noise contour based upon average daily traffic volumes at LOS E. Upon plan submittal, the Natural Resources Division shall determine if a noise study is required based on the delineation of the noise contour.▲

■Under noise, Mandatory Development Requirement S34 indicates that:

▲If it 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 Plan of Subdivision, Conceptual and/or Detailed Site Plan.▲

■The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed and approved a Phase I Noise Study for Subarea 3. The submittal of a Phase II Noise Study is required at this time, so any site plan requirements can be addressed. The Detailed Site Plan shows the 65 dBA(Ldn) noise contour, but no Phase 2 noise study has been submitted. The 65 dBA(Ldn) contour for Toledo Road indicates that there are noise impacts to the Metro Three, the proposed Metro IV building, and the parking garage.

■A determination has been made that a Phase 2 Noise Study is not required for the existing Metro Three building. . . .

■5. Under nontidal wetlands, Mandatory Development Requirement P31 states:

▲If impacts to nontidal wetlands are proposed, a Maryland Corps of Engineers Joint Permit Application will be required.▲

■Under nontidal wetlands, Mandatory Development Requirement P32 states:

▲If impacts to nontidal wetlands are proposed, a State Water Quality Certification pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act will be required from the Maryland Department of the Environment.▲

■There are no jurisdictional wetlands on Parcels C and D.

■Mandatory Requirements for Subarea 3

■The Mandatory Development Requirements for Subarea 3 are not environmental in nature.

■Conditions of Primary Amendment Approval

■Primary Amendments to Mandatory Guidelines P50, P53, P54 and P59 were approved for Subareas 2 and 3. These amendments do not affect the environmental requirements of the site.

■Conceptual Site Plan Conditions

■Conceptual Site Plan CSP-00024 was approved by the Planning Board on November 9, 2000. The plan submittal was reviewed for conformance with applicable environmental conditions of approval as expressed in PGCPB No. 00-195.

■6. Condition No. 6 states:

◆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. Condition No. 8 states:

◆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.◆

■These conditions were previously discussed and addressed.●

17. In a memorandum dated April 30, 2001 (Mokhtari to Whitmore), the Transportation Planning Section offered the following comments:

■The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the above referenced and submitted Detailed Site Plans for the proposed addition to the existing development in these two subareas of the Transit District.

■This Transportation Section's referral memo will present a discussion on the PG-TDDP's Transportation and Parking Mandatory Development Requirements and the submitted

Detailed Site Plans Compliance with these requirements as well as the recently approved Conceptual Site Plan (CSP-00024).

■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.

■**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 this TDDP is to ensure a balanced transportation and transit facilities network. Therefore, and for the purpose of assessing transportation needs, staff performed an analysis of all road facilities in the vicinity of the transit district. This analysis indicated that the primary 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, this 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 the minimum acceptable operating standard for transportation facilities. Among the most consequential of these are:

- 1. Establishment of a Transit District-wide cap on the number of additional parking spaces (3,000 preferred, plus 1,000 premium) that can be constructed or provided in the transit district to accommodate any new development.
- 2. 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, and needed to ensure that the critical roadways and intersections in the transit district remain at or above traffic LOS

- 3. Retaining a mandatory Transportation Demand Management District (TDMD). The TDMD was established by the 1992 TDDP plan 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 district. The TDMD will continue to have boundaries that are coterminous with the transit district. As of this writing, the Prince George's Plaza Transportation Demand Management District (TDMD) has not been legally established under the TDMD Ordinance (now Subtitle 20A, Division 2, of the County Code) enacted in 1993.
- 4. Developing an annual TDMD operations fee based on the total number of parking spaces (surface and structured), each property owner maintains.
- 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 Transit 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.

■Detailed Site Plan Findings

- 1. The TDDP identifies the subject property as Subareas 2 and 3 of the TDOZ. There are 15 subareas in the TDOZ, two of which are designated as open-space and will remain undeveloped. The property is located at the northeast quadrant of the intersection of East West Highway, MD 410 and Belcrest Road. The proposed application is for construction of an additional multistory office building with approximately 195,350 gross square feet, a six-level parking garage structure with a total of 1,565 parking spaces, and construction of a roadway between the existing Metro 3 and the proposed Metro 4 office buildings. The submitted site plan for the proposed buildings indicates a total of 2, 933 surface parking spaces, a total of 374 less than the number of surface parking spaces that existed on these two subareas prior to the approval of the TDDP.
- 2. The total number of proposed surface parking spaces shown in the submitted Detailed Site Plans is less than the total number of surface parking spaces that were existing on Subareas 2 and 3 prior to the approval of the TDDP. Pursuant to the TDDP applicability, new structure parking spaces as well as replacement or alterations to legally pre-existing parking spaces are exempt from meeting the TDDP Transportation and Parking Mandatory Requirements.
- 3. The PG-TDDP contains a goal of *encouraging the use of structured parking and discouraging huge expanses of surface parking.*

- 4. As a result, the proposed Detailed Site 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. Based on a traffic analysis submitted by the applicant to the Transportation Section, the internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns as proposed in the Detailed Site Plans appear to be acceptable. This finding was based on field observations, and the submitted traffic analysis that the proposed office building peak-hour trip generation rates would be nearly 50 percent of M-NCPPC's approved and published trip generation rates for office. The submitted plans show a new access road only 160 feet east of the proposed north-south roadway and between the proposed Metro 4 office building and the proposed parking structure. A similar access road is proposed to the east of this roadway. Considering the number and close proximity of these three access roads, staff is concerned with potential traffic operational difficulties along Toledo Road. Elimination of the access road located to the east of the proposed "Boulevard" and between the proposed office building and the parking structure appear to be very desirable.

Urban Design Staff Comment: The access road 160 feet east of the proposed Boulevard relates to DSP-01002 and will be commented on in that section of this report. However, staff concludes that the proposed Detailed Site Plan as submitted will meet the requirements of the Prince George's County Plaza Transit District Development Plan (page 22) and Section 27-548(c)(1)(D) of the County Code, provided that Condition 1b is met which relates to DSP-01001.

18. In a memorandum dated March 5, 2001 (Shaffer to Whitmore), the Transportation Planning Section offered the following comments:

- . . . Regarding the boulevard roadway, staff concurs with the recommendation for wide sidewalks along both sides of this roadway. However, staff recommends that bike lanes also be incorporated into this design in accordance with the 1999 American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guidelines for Bicycle Facilities. This bike lane can be provided in areas with parking by providing a minimum width of 11 feet for both the parked vehicles and the bike lane, as shown in Figure 6 of the AASHTO guidelines. If necessary, the sidewalk width can be reduced to 11 or 12 feet to accommodate this extra space for on-road bicycle traffic. A sidewalk width of 11 or 12 feet is consistent with the sidewalks being provided in other areas of the TDDP. The bike lanes are a necessary component of the roadway as riding a bicycle on a sidewalk is currently prohibited in the State of Maryland. Bike lanes can also reduce bicycle conflicts with much slower moving pedestrian traffic.●

Urban Design Staff Comment: Figure 23 (p. 79 of the TDDP) Trail and Bikeway connection to the Metro Station of the TDDP does not require a bicycle path through

Subarea 3. It does show a bike lane on Toledo Road and the submitted plans are proposing this bike lane. Therefore, staff does not believe a bike lane should be required along the Boulevard in Subarea 3.

19. In a memorandum dated February 9, 2001 (Fisher/Iraola to Whitmore), the Community Planning Section offered several comments which have been addressed except for the following:

- . . G3 (page 30): Applicant needs to identify the plant materials that will constitute the "green screen" on the garage facades.

and

- . . S24 (Page 39): Applicant must use the lighting fixture shown in Appendix A which is consistent with the lighting used along Belcrest Road.

Urban Design Staff Comment: The landscape plans should be revised to include the following plant material to be installed on the "green screen" on the garage facades: Akebia quinata "alba" (Fiveleaf akebia), Wisteria sinensis (Chinese Wisteria), Hedera Helix (English Ivy). Finding 4 discusses S24.

20. In a memorandum dated February 1, 2001 (De Guzman to Whitmore), the Department of Environmental Resources offered the following comments:

- The stormwater concept for the Boulevard at Prince George's Metro Center, Phase I, DSP-01001 has not been approved by this office yet.

Urban Design Staff Comment: The applicant faxed to staff on May 11, 2001, a copy of the approved Conceptual Stormwater letter (#8328349-2000-00), approved on May 8, 2001, with an expiration date of May 8, 2004.

21. In a memorandum dated January 26, 2001 (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. The site is bisected by Toledo Road, and has frontage on Adelphi Road. Right-of-way dedication and frontage improvements along the frontage of Belcrest Road, Toledo Road, and Adelphi Road in accordance to DPW&T Standards No. 14, No. 12, and No. 14A respectively are required.

Urban Design Staff Comment: It should be noted that Toledo Road is not a county road. The City of Hyattsville has jurisdiction over said road.

22. In a memorandum dated January 30, 2001 (Bailey to Whitmore), the Maryland State Highway Administration offered the following comments:

■This office completed its review of the site plan and support documentation. We have no objection to approval of DSP-01001 as submitted. However, State Highway Administration (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.●

23. In a memorandum dated January 22, 2001, (Del Balzo to Whitmore), the Subdivision Section offered the following comments:

■Parcels C, D and E were recorded in 1992 as VJ 163 & 19. This proposal is in conformance with the plats on file.●

24. In a memorandum dated February 2, 2001 (Murphy to Whitmore), The City of Hyattsville offered the following comments:

■The Planning Board action on Conceptual Site Plan - 00024. The Boulevard at Prince George's Metro Center was referred to the Prince George's County District Council for an evidentiary hearing. The Board approved the Conceptual Site Plans subject to certain conditions, listed as items numbered 1-17. In honoring item 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 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.

■The applicant has submitted a plan to the City of Hyattsville that the city cannot support. I provide below the City testimony delivered during the Evidentiary Hearing:

■. . . The proposed Toledo Road round-about has been placed on the development plans without any consultation with the City of Hyattsville. We own and maintain that road. We do not believe that the round-about provides for traffic calming, traffic enhancement or that it establishes a community amenity that is practical or useful. The radius is much too small to accommodate busses and large delivery trucks at a location where there is a substantial grade change. The City of Hyattsville is not prepared to support the required maintenance of this improvement. During severe winter weather the round-about will increase the possibility for accidents, as the road at that location remains very icy. We would encourage the

developer to increase the landscaping and physical amenities at this location to support its importance to the overall project using, large scale landscaping materials, improved hardscape, creative lighting, street furnishings, sculpture and water features.▲

■The City will work with the developer to determine appropriate improvements and traffic calming measures should it be found they are warranted at this location. In conclusion, the City of Hyattsville supports approval of the landscape amenities provided in the DSP and finds them consistent with the CSP as previously approved by the Planning Board.●

Urban Design Staff Comment: The plans have been revised and the round-about in question has been removed. The applicant should consult with the City of Hyattsville to determine what type of traffic calming devices will be necessary at this intersection.

25. Detailed Site Plans DSP-01001 and DSP-01002 were referred to the Town of University Park. The town responded to referral request DSP-01002. At the time of the writing of the staff report, they had not responded to DSP-01001.
26. 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.

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

1. Prior to certification of the Detailed Site Plan the following revisions or information shall be supplied:
 - a. The Detailed Site Plan shall be revised to include notes and details necessary to implement the stenciling of any storm drain inlets associated with the development and all inlets on Parcels C, D, and E with ■Do Not Dump, Chesapeake Bay Drainage,● if applicable.
 - b. The applicant, his heirs, successors, and/or assigns shall submit adequate information to support the 50 percent reduction in AM and PM peak hours trip generation rates used in the applicant's submitted traffic analysis, especially with the provision of 1,222 (1596-374) new parking spaces for the proposed 195,300 gross square feet of additional office space.
2. A copy of the signage program shall be submitted with each Detailed Site Plan.

3. Prior to release of the Use and Occupancy permits for Metro IV
 - a. The piece of public art approved by the Planning Board or designee for DSP-01001 shall be installed
 - b. The applicant shall submit a justification for Secondary Amendment S24. The amendment shall be referred to all applicable referral agencies and a Planning Board hearing shall be required or the plans shall be revised to reflect the light poles required by the TDDP.

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 Lowe, seconded by Commissioner Eley, with Commissioners Lowe, Eley, Scott and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and Commissioner Brown absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, May 24, 2001, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 21st day of June 2001.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:LW:rmk