



Comment [COMMENT1]: WHEN INSERTING INFORMATION AT THE @ SIGN REMEMBER TO USE INDENT FOR SECOND LINE - NOT TAB. ALSO, IT WILL LOOK LIKE THE TEXT IS GOING WACKO, BUT DON'T WORRY - IT IS FINE.

CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN

CSP-00024/01

SECONDARY AMENDMENT

TS-00024/01

Application	General Data
Project Name THE BOULEVARD AT PRINCE GEORGE'S METRO CENTER	Date Accepted9/13/01
	Planning Board Action Limit11/22/01
	Tax Map & Grid42-A2
Location Located northeast of the intersection of East-West Highway and Belcrest Road.	Plan Acreage47.70 acres
	ZoneM-X-T/O-S
	Dwelling UnitsN/A
Applicant PRINCE GEORGE'S METRO CENTER, INC. 6525 BELCREST ROAD HYATTSVILLE, MD 20782	Square FootageN/A
	Planning Area68
	Council District2
	MunicipalityHyattsville
	200-Scale Base Map208NE03

Purpose of Application			Notice Dates	
A REVISION TO CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN CSP-00024 AND TS-00024 FOR SUBAREAS 2 AND 3 OF THE PRINCE GEORGE'S TRANSIT DISTRICT OVERLAY ZONE FOR THE PURPOSE OF BEING ALLOWED TO USE A DIFFERENT LIGHTING FIXTURE THAN WHAT IS REQUIRED BY THE TDDP (S24).			Adjoining Property Owners (CB-15-1998)	08-24-01
			Previous Parties of Record (CB-13-1997)	10-19-01
			Sign(s) Posted on Site	10-26-01
			Variance(s): Adjoining Property Owners	N/A
Staff Recommendation			Staff Reviewer Elizabeth Whitmore	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION	
	X			

July 30, 2009

MEMORANDUM

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor

FROM: Elizabeth Whitmore, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: The Boulevard at Prince George's Metro Center
CSP-00024/01 and TS-00024/01

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the revision to Conceptual Site Plan CSP-00024 and Secondary Amendment TS-00024/01 for the subject property and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of Approval with conditions to amend Development Requirement S-24.

EVALUATION

The Conceptual Site Plan was reviewed and evaluated for compliance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of the Prince George's Transit District Development Plan (TDDP).
- b. The requirements of Part 10A, Overlay Zones, of the Zoning Ordinance.
- c. The requirements for Secondary Amendments in the Transit District Overlay Zone.
- d. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the M-X-T Zone.
- e. Conceptual Site Plan CSP-00024 and Secondary Amendment TS-00024 (Council Order, January 8, 2001).
- f. Referrals

FINDINGS

Based upon evaluation and analysis of the subject application, the Urban Design staff recommends the following findings:

1. This Conceptual Site Plan revision is for the sole purpose of amending the Secondary Amendment request, TS-00024, which was approved concurrently with CSP-00024. The applicant applied for Secondary Amendments to several Mandatory Development

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. **The Transit District Site Plan meets all of the requirements of the Transit District Overlay Zone and applicable regulations of the underlying zones;**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

11. **If the development is staged, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity,**

while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases;

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

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

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

Secondary Amendments

13. Secondary Amendment

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

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

The applicant has provided the following justification:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Urban Design Staff Comment:

The Urban Design Staff concurs with the above comments that support a partial approval to the applicant's request to amend S24. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the alternative lighting fixture for Subareas 2 and 3 within the interior of the site which includes the Boulevard, Toledo Road and any secondary roads within the boundaries of Belcrest Road, East-West Highway and Adelphi Road.

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

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

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

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

The proposed Secondary Amendment that is recommended for approval is in conformance with the applicable purposes of the TDOZ. Specifically, the amendment will contribute to a cohesive design for the Main Boulevard, Toledo Road, and secondary roads and, therefore,

will help provide a coordinated and integrated pedestrian experience within Subareas 2 and 3.

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

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

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation, analysis and findings of this report, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE CSP-00024/01 and TS-00024/01, subject to the following conditions:

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