



Note: Staff reports can be accessed at www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm.

CSP-02001; TCPI/26/03; Amendments to P-65, P-66, and Use Table

Application	General Data
Project Name: BELCREST CENTER Location: Southwest corner of the intersection of Maryland Route 410 and Belcrest Road. Applicant/Address: Taylor Development & Land Company 12000 Biscayne Boulevard, Suite #803 Miami, FLA. 33181	Date Accepted: 03/04/02
	Planning Board Action Limit: WAIVED
	Plan Acreage: 22.70
	Zone: M-X-T
	Dwelling Units: 275-478 MF
	Election District 17
	Planning Area: 68
	Council District: 02
	Municipality: N/A
	200-Scale Base Map: 207NE03

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN: Commercial Office, Retail Commercial, Hotel & Multi-Family Residential Uses.	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record 02/28/02 Registered Associations: (CB-12-2003)
	Sign(s) Posted on Site: 09/24/03

Staff Recommendation			Staff Reviewer: WAGNER
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

October 1, 2003

MEMORANDUM

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor

FROM: Gary Wagner, Planner Coordinator

SUBJECT: Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-02001, Belcrest
Subarea 5, Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone
Amendment to P-65, Residential Building Height Restriction
Amendment to P-66, Nonresidential Building Height Restriction
Amendment to Use Table
(Note: The above amendments require District Council approval. Other requested amendments, not requiring District Council approval, are contained within.)

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the conceptual site plan and requested amendments of the Transit District Development Plan for the subject property and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions.

EVALUATION

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

- a. Conformance to the 1998 *Approved Transit District Development Plan for Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone* requirements.
- b. Conformance with the applicable Zoning Ordinance requirements in the M-X-T Zone.
- c. Conformance to Section 27-548.09.01, Amendment of Approved Transit District Overlay Zone.
- d. Referrals.

FINDINGS

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

1. The subject site consists of 22.22 acres in the M-X-T Zone and is located within the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ). The property is referenced as Parcel 5 in the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP). The site is located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Belcrest Road and East West Highway (MD 410), adjacent to the City of

Hyattsville. The applicant for the conceptual site plan is Taylor Development and Land Company. The project is a redevelopment of the existing Prince George's Plaza Metro Station. The applicant proposes to construct a mixed-use development consisting of office, retail and multifamily residential. Taylor Development and Land Company has teamed up with Mid-City Financial Corporation, who will be constructing the residential portion of the development. The bulk of the development will be located in an area between the existing station and East West Highway.

The applicant's original submittal included fairly detailed footprints for the layout of the retail/residential/office uses and the plaza. It also included a shopping street at the rear of the property, aligned with the Metro garage that gave an internal orientation to the site. After extensive discussions concerning the shopping street, it was mutually agreed that there were numerous problems with the design, and that furthermore, the design was more detailed than necessary for a conceptual site plan. The applicant agreed to submit a more general plan and to postpone a discussion concerning the details of the location of store entrances, exact location, design and size of the plaza and the pedestrian circulation until detailed site plan. Therefore, the plans, if approved, will show the general uses, square footage and parking for the area between the Metro station and East West Highway, but not the design of the plaza, circulation or building footprints. The following discussion explains the issues with the original submittal.

A pedestrian corridor with three small plazas is to extend from the existing pedestrian overpass on East West Highway to the Metro station. The plazas total approximately 8,000 square feet in size. Lining the plazas and corridors will be one level of retail and restaurants on the ground floor, a fitness club and retail on the second level, and five levels of residential above for a total of seven stories. The applicant also proposes to locate two "big box" retail stores as the primary retail anchors facing an internal street (Belcrest Way) that runs parallel to the station and East West Highway. The applicant envisions Belcrest Way to be a "Main Street" with vibrant pedestrian activity. Access to the stores would be from Belcrest Way. There would be no access to East West Highway. A three-story parking structure is to be located above the big box retail. Access to the parking structure and to loading and service areas will also be from Belcrest Way. What will be visible from East West Highway will be the back of the stores and three stories of parking structure that are to be treated architecturally to look like a front elevation. The parking structure is to provide parking for the retail stores and the five stories of residential.

A freestanding, multifamily residential development by Mid-City Financial is proposed in the southeast corner of the site, between the Metro station and Belcrest Road. To the south of the subject property from west to east is the Nicholas Orem Junior High School, an existing single-family residential neighborhood (Queens Chapel Manor), and the American Red Cross office building. To the east, across Belcrest Road is The Shoppes at Metro Plaza, a \pm 60,000 square-foot retail center, and a church. To the west is a Giant food store, currently under construction. To the north, across East West Highway is the Prince George's Plaza Mall. Cater-cornered to the northeast is The Boulevard, a mixed-use development in the M-X-T Zone.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use(s)	Metro station	Commercial Office, Retail and Residential
Acreage	22.22	22.22
Lots	1	1
Parcel #	Parcel 5 of TDOZ	Parcel 5 of TDOZ
Square Footage/GFA	Existing Metro Station	Retail: 150,000 SF – 190,000 SF; Office: 250,000 – 350,000 SF; Restaurants: 10,000 – 15,000 SF
Dwelling Units:	0	125-200 MFDU above retail; 250-278 MFDU (stand alone)

Required Findings of the TDDP:

3. *The transit district site plan is in strict conformance with any mandatory development requirements of the TDDP.*

The Conceptual Site Plan is not in strict conformance with mandatory development requirements of the TDDP. The applicant has applied for seven different amendments to mandatory development requirements and one amendment to the Use Table. Four of the amendments may be approved by the Planning Board under Section 27-548.08 of the Zoning Ordinance. Three of the requested amendments require District Council approval.

The amendments that require District Council approval are P-65, height requirements for residential structures; P66, height requirements for nonresidential structures; and a change of allowed uses in the Use Table of the TDDP. According to Section 27-548.09.01, the above three requested amendments may only be amended by the District Council under procedures in Part 10A, Division 1. In this case, the Planning Board shall submit a recommendation to the District Council. The District Council must find that the proposed development conforms to the purposes and recommendations for the Transit Development District, as stated in the Transit District Development Plan, and meets applicable site plan requirements. The three amendments that require District Council approval are as follows:

P-65 The minimum building height shall be 6 stories for residential development.

The applicant is requesting an amendment to construct a four- to five-story multifamily apartment building on approximately five to six acres in the southeast corner of the site with approximately 278 dwelling units. Some of the units on the 4th and 5th levels would have lofts, giving the building the appearance of being six stories in some areas. This is to occur particularly along Belcrest Road in order to provide a variety of building heights along the street. The applicant contends that the lower profile buildings will be more compatible with the adjacent single-family detached development, Queens Chapel Manor, to the south and has provided staff with sections that show that the lower-profile buildings, with the preservation of existing trees along the property line and supplemental plantings, will be less of an impact to the adjacent residential neighborhood than buildings that are six stories or higher.

The applicant has also provided documentation from Delta Associates, a marketing consultant, that market-rate, high-rise Class A apartments are not feasible at this location. The applicant has

stated, “We have determined there is not a market for rents that would align with the costs of a steel frame or concrete frame building as those rents are above \$2.00 per square foot.” In a memorandum dated June 18, 2003 (Delta Associates to Farasy), the consultants verify that the “average rents of roughly \$2.00 to \$2.25 per SF would be required to make a highrise apartment project economically feasible...” and that, “the highest apartment rent in the county is \$1.42 per SF at Wynfield Park in College Park.” The memorandum goes on to state, “the market will support midrise apartments in the Prince George’s Plaza Metro station area.” The applicant is proposing Class A midrise luxury apartments. The densities achieved by the proposal are comparable to densities of a six-story building by providing structured parking. Also, the City of Hyattsville, in a memorandum dated August 23, 2003 (Mayor Gardiner to Hewlett), states, “The City supports the developer’s request for a variance regarding the minimum number of stories for the residential buildings. The City accepts the four and five-story units with lofts.” Based on the above findings, staff recommends approval of an amendment to P-65 for residential structures only to a minimum building height of four to five stories with lofts in some of the units that would give the appearance of six stories in some locations. With the proposed amendment as specifically stated above, the proposed development conforms to the purposes and recommendations for the Transit Development District, as stated in the Transit District Development Plan, and meets applicable site plan requirements.

The applicant is also requesting an amendment to go down to three-story residential buildings on a small residual piece of the property that is sandwiched between the entrance drive to the station off of Belcrest road and the Metrorail tracks that are underground. Because of the location of the underground tracks and the small area of the residual piece (approximately 10,000 square feet), construction of taller buildings would not be feasible because of the impact on the Metro tunnel. The applicant envisions that these units would have the appearance of townhouses with the possibility of live/work spaces on the lower level. The Community Planning Division, in their memorandum dated September 24, 2003, commented that “the poorly sited 3-story apartment units have no relationship to pedestrian access or parking; they are also immediately adjacent to a primary access point with an expected high volume of cars and buses near Belcrest Road.” The City of Hyattsville, in their memorandum, did not offer support of the three-story units, only the four to five stories. The Urban Design staff has several concerns with the proposal. The applicant indicates that they may possibly provide live/work space on the first floor. If so, there is no indication how patrons would access those units and where they would park. The applicant has not provided enough information as to how the work spaces would be serviced.

There doesn’t appear to be provisions for trash service or deliveries. There is not enough information, at this time, to determine if live/work units are feasible. It would appear that apartments may be the only alternative in this case. The applicant has not made a convincing case that three-story apartments are warranted in this location. This area should be used as a buffer area for the main part of the apartment complex. Berming and heavy landscaping should be provided in this area to help ameliorate noise and fumes from the expected heavy bus use of the access drive. An amendment to three-story residential is not recommended for approval in this case. The design and layout of the proposed three-story buildings are not coordinated or integrated well with the overall development scheme. The amendment does not conform to the purposes and recommendations for the Transit Development District, as stated in the Transit District Development Plan, and does not meet applicable site plan requirements.

P66 The minimum building height for uses other than residential shall be 4 stories.

The applicant has requested an amendment to the above requirement to allow a small, one-story retail structure along the Belcrest Road frontage, just north of the access driveway to the site.

The applicant proposes that the structure may also be used as freestanding restaurant(s). Surface parking would be provided for the use behind the building. The site area is less than one-half acre. The Community Planning Division, in a memorandum dated September 24, 2003, strongly objects to the amendment citing that the building would have no relation to the rest of the proposed retail buildings on the site, the access to the site is located near the rear loading area for other proposed buildings, and that the building is located at the rear of an existing gas station.

The Urban Design staff further notes that a landmark building is required to eventually replace the gas station in accordance with P-71 of the TDDP and, more than likely, will have multiple stories. A one-story building would appear to be out of character and scale with a landmark building as well as the other proposed buildings on the site. Staff is cognizant of the fact that there are one-story retail stores across Belcrest Road at The Shoppes at Prince George's Plaza. However, that center was designed comprehensively as an integrated center. The applicant submitted this request on September 16, 2003, and has provided little detail as to how this proposed retail or restaurant use will complement and enhance the character of the proposed development. They have not shown how this use will provide a desirable urban design relationship with other uses in the transit district, nor have they shown how the design and layout of the building promotes a coordinated and integrated development scheme with the rest of the development. An amendment to the minimum building height to one story for uses other than residential is not recommended for approval in this case. The amendment does not conform to the purposes and recommendations for the Transit Development District, as stated in the Transit District Development Plan, and does not meet applicable site plan requirements.

Amendment to Table of Uses:

The applicant also requests an amendment to the Table of Uses to allow for the possibility of a restaurant use to occupy all or a portion of the above-mentioned retail space. The Table of Uses requires that restaurants be "located within an office building, department store, variety or drug store, hotel, wholly enclosed shopping mall or within and accessory to an allowed use." The applicant states, "the possibility of locating a restaurant(s) in this retail building will allow a structure of a size and scale to facilitate a pedestrian friendly environment along Belcrest Road." The applicant has not indicated what type of restaurant is proposed for this location. The amount of square footage has not been added to the development program. Surface parking spaces are shown, but not accounted for in the development program. No design guidelines have been proposed. Based on the late application for the proposed amendment and the lack of information, and for the reasons stated above under the amendment to P-66, the Urban Design staff recommends that an amendment to the Table of Uses not be granted. The amendment does not conform to the purposes and recommendations for the Transit Development District, as stated in the Transit District Development Plan, and does not meet applicable site plan requirements.

The following are requested amendments by the applicant that do not require District Council approval:

- P1** Unless otherwise stated within the Subarea Specific Requirements, each developer, applicant, and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assigns, shall be responsible for streetscape improvements along the entire length of the property frontage from the building envelope to face of curb. (See Figures 7, 8 and 9. Toledo Terrace: 20-foot pedestrian zone; East West Highway: 40-foot pedestrian zone; Belcrest Road: 20-40 foot pedestrian zone.) These improvements shall be included as part of any application for building or grading permits, except for permits for interior alterations which do not constitute redevelopment as defined in the previous

chapter. No building or grading permits shall be issued without a Detailed Site Plan which indicates conformance with the streetscape requirements of the TDDP. Construction of the streetscaping improvements shall be in phase with development, or the construction schedule shall be determined at the time of Detailed Site Plan.

The applicant has requested an amendment to two parts of the above mandatory requirement. First, the applicant has requested to reduce the 40-foot-wide pedestrian zone along East West Highway to 30 feet. The applicant's justification for this is that the Metro station and parking structure "dominates the site and creates a substantial impediment for the development of the balance of the property." The applicant further states that they have been "forced to attempt to place a substantial portion of the proposed development between the existing Metro station and the East West Highway frontage. This existing physical situation, which was not created by the applicant, has added to the difficulties which the applicant has experienced in attaining development densities contemplated by the TDOZ." The applicant further goes on to say that they "can still provide ample streetscape and pedestrian circulation along East West Highway within the 30-foot setback. Moreover, the additional 10 feet which will be available for development will assist in providing meaningful densities while also facilitating both pedestrian and vehicular circulation on the interior of the site."

The Community Planning Division, in their memorandum dated September 24, 2003, offered the following comments: "The applicant is requesting that the required TDDP 40-foot pedestrian zone be reduced to 30 feet to allow an additional 10 feet for the proposed internal roadway. In addition, the conceptual site plan does not show the required 'outward orientation' (Required Findings for Conceptual Site Plans in the M-X-T zone, Finding @@ below). The proposed buildings fronting East West Highway have no access to the streetscape pedestrian zone and therefore an 'inward' orientation is proposed for the development. This important primary pedestrian zone has been established by the approved TDDP Mandatory Development Requirements to create a street-front appearance and pedestrian activity zone along East West Highway. In addition, this TDDP requirement has been adhered to by all adjoining development previously approved along the south side of East West Highway. The applicant proposes an internal street that cannot be viewed from the primary East West Highway pedestrian movement and vehicular traffic. This internal street appears on the submitted plans as a 'back alley' approach and is narrow, tight in design, problematic for vehicular and bus traffic, and appears to be unsafe for the pedestrian user. Lighting is a concern for this internal street, which should be designed carefully to avoid a 'dark alley effect'; safety for the pedestrian should be given by providing ample cross walks with specialty paving design as well as added signage to resolve conflicts with pedestrian flow and traffic. The proposed height of the big box stores and the existing WMATA parking garage present a problem of safety in that the proposed internal street is narrow and will be shadowed by the tall buildings proposed. The applicant does not give a good justification for reducing the pedestrian zone along East West Highway.

"Staff Comment: Successful urban design projects warrant people activity along the street to promote an active environment and add marketable retail appeal, curb appeal, and pedestrian appeal. This Metro site is the first site to be developed in Prince George's County at a major Metro station, is bordered by a prominent roadway, and is adjacent to the county's streetscape project for Belcrest Road. In order to realize a prominent development for this county, it is imperative that the Prince George's Plaza Metro Station be developed to show buildings fronting the street and provide the 40-foot pedestrian zone enhanced by future plaza area, café seating, lighting, benches, flag poles, planting, and specialty architecture and paving."

The Urban Design staff also has concerns with an orientation of big box retail that would front on an internal street. The main reason for the requested amendment is to accommodate the width of the internal street. Even with an additional 10 feet, the proposed 12–16-story office building, which is on the south side of the street, and the big box retail with three stories of parking garage above would be approximately 60 feet apart, building face to building face. The applicant contends that an internal street would be a vibrant pedestrian-oriented street. Staff disagrees with this assessment. Big box retail stores are warehouse type facilities with their own dedicated parking and are not particularly conducive to pedestrian-oriented streets. The distance between the two entrances is approximately 300 feet with nothing in between but two service entrances and the access to the parking structure. If anything, customers would drive to the site, park in the parking structure, take the elevator or stairs to the street level, and return to their cars and leave the site after they have completed their shopping. The typical number of vehicle trips that such stores average, based on the Trip Generation Manual of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), is approximately 4.5 trips per 1,000 square feet during a weekday in the PM peak hour, which equates to approximately 248 trips, based on 55,000 square feet of retail space. The manual does not offer trip generation figures for a weekend, but it can be assumed that since most people do most of their shopping on the weekends, vehicle trips would be constant throughout the day. Additionally, the parking structure is proposed to accommodate parking for approximately 125-200 apartments located above the retail. The number of vehicles entering and exiting the parking structure will be in conflict with and a deterrent to pedestrian activity. To amend P-1 to allow more space to be provided for an internal street does not make sense if pedestrians are not going to use the space. Furthermore, turning the back of the building to East West Highway, even if the building is architecturally embellished, does not define or enhance the pedestrian experience along East West Highway. The TDDP requires that “Modification of these standards is only permitted where justification is provided and if determined to be equal or better than the existing improvements along Belcrest Road” (p.30 of the TDDP). The modification proposed by the applicant cannot be found to be equal or better than the existing improvements along Belcrest Road at this time. This does not preclude the applicant from requesting an amendment to P-1 at the time of Detailed Site Plan. An amendment may be warranted at that time if the applicant provides a plan that meets the above requirement to be equal or better. For these reasons, staff does not support an amendment to P-1 at this time. The stores should be oriented to East West Highway and/or an outdoor plaza that is oriented to East West Highway, and the full 40-foot-wide pedestrian zone should be provided in accordance with the TDDP. P-1, as amended, will not benefit the proposed development and the transit district and will impair implementation of the Transit District Development Plan.

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

The applicant requests an amendment to this requirement because it coincides with an amendment to P-1 above. For the reasons stated in the amendment request for P-1, staff does not support an amendment to S-8. S-8, as amended, will not benefit the proposed development and the transit district and will impair implementation of the Transit District Development Plan.

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

The applicant has requested an amendment to the above requirement; however staff has come to the conclusion that an amendment is not necessary. The requirement is for parking lots and not for structured parking. However, the applicant is proposing to provide three levels of parking structure over a single story of retail for approximately 400 linear feet of frontage along East

West Highway, which equates to approximately 53 percent of the frontage of the site. Staff believes that the parking structure, even though it is elevated above the street level, will have a direct impact on the pedestrian zone along East West Highway from both a visual and physical standpoint if it is not properly treated. Parked vehicles, noise and fumes could have a direct impact on the pedestrian area. Any proposed parking structure visible from East West Highway should be attractively designed and meet TDDP guidelines.

P68 A build-to line of 40 feet from face of curb shall be established along East West Highway.

The applicant has not requested an amendment to this mandatory requirement. For reasons stated in P-1 and S-8 above, staff is of the opinion that the conceptual site plan should be revised to show a build-to line of 40 feet along East West Highway.

P70 A 100-foot-wide buffer consisting of preservation of existing trees shall be provided along the southern boundary adjacent to the residential uses.

The applicant requests an amendment to the above requirement for the area where the proposed four- to five-story multifamily dwelling units are to be sited in the southeast corner of the site. Approximately 13 existing single-family dwelling units in the adjacent Queens Chapel Manor subdivision will be impacted by the reduced bufferyard. The proposed multifamily building has three legs that encroach into the required buffer. A 65-foot-wide buffer is provided for two of the legs and a 45-foot-wide buffer is provided for the third leg. A proposed stormwater management pond also encroaches into the required bufferyard. The applicant proposes to provide a 20- to 25-foot-wide tree preservation area and intends to supplement the buffer with a substantial amount of landscape plantings. More plantings should be concentrated where the buildings penetrate into the bufferyard to maximize screening of the buildings. The City of Hyattsville, in their memorandum dated August 23, 2003, and a correction letter dated September 2, 2003 (Gardiner to Hewlett), offered support of the requested amendment. In their memorandum the city states that “The existing vegetative buffer must also be enhanced by adding appropriate evergreens to increase the visual barrier. The required 45-foot vegetative buffer does not apply to the stormwater pond itself, but the pond must have a minimum 25-foot vegetative buffer. The Conceptual Site Plan as presented indicated only three points of the structures that intrude into the 100-foot buffer. The 100-foot buffer, with significant vegetative screening must be required for the proposed parking structure adjacent to the proposed office building.” Staff concurs with the city and recommends that substantial plantings be provided at the time of detailed site plan to mitigate the views of the proposed office parking garage from the residences to the south. Staff further recommends approval of the requested amendment to P70 as indicated in the City of Hyattsville memorandum and correction letter. P-70, as amended, will benefit the proposed development and the transit district and will not substantially impair implementation of the Transit District Development Plan. The amendment to P70 will allow the applicant to achieve higher densities, which is desirable in the TDOZ.

P73 An urban plaza, with a park-like setting, shall be provided in order to create a pedestrian-friendly area at the base of the proposed Metro overpass.

The applicant has not requested an amendment to this mandatory requirement. Plazas, as defined by the TDDP, “are open air rooms whose walls are formed by adjacent buildings.” The plan currently shows three, evenly spaced small plazas, generally starting at the base of the Metro overpass and ending at the internal street (Belcrest Way). The plazas are not “park-like” in design or scale. The three plazas combined equal approximately 8,000 square feet in size. The

plazas and connecting hallways are to be lined with retail shops and restaurants. The buildings on either side of the plazas are seven stories in height (two floors of retail and five floors of residential), which will create a tight, enclosed space, rather than an urban plaza with a park-like setting. TDDP Guideline G19 recommends “*A minimum plaza distance to building height ratio of 2:1 should be provided.*” Assuming that the seven-story buildings are a minimum of 70 feet high, and possibly higher if the retail spaces require more than 10 feet, a plaza width of 140 feet should be provided. The applicant has provided a plaza to building height ratio of less than 1:1. Staff understands that a strict 2:1 ratio may not be achievable given the program uses proposed by the applicant. However, even a plaza with a 1.5:1 ratio would provide more of a vibrant setting with retail stores and restaurants with outdoor seating areas fronting on the plaza. Residential could continue to be provided above the retail, overlooking the plaza. The building could be stepped back to get more stories. The applicant should take into consideration that residential could be lower and perhaps extend along East West Highway over the big box retail to screen the view of the parking structure. Other guidelines for plaza design include shade trees at a ratio of one shade tree per 1,000 square feet of plaza, planting beds, changes in elevation for interest, seating areas, attractive street furniture, special paving, fountains and public art. G-23 recommends “*a majority of the total building frontage of the plaza should be allocated for retail service establishments, including at least one food establishment (preferably a café with outdoor seating).*” The applicant proposes two restaurants with outdoor seating at the small plaza adjacent to East West Highway. A larger plaza would offer more relief from the noise and fumes of East West Highway and make for a more pleasant dining experience. The conceptual site plan should be revised to incorporate a plaza at the base of the proposed Metro overpass that meets the above requirements and is closer to meeting the minimum plaza distance to building height ratio required by the TDDP.

P74 Three-bedroom units shall be permitted only when developed as condominiums.

The applicant has requested an amendment to the above requirement for up to eight percent of the total unit count. Currently, the applicant proposes a range of multifamily dwelling units from 375 to 478. Based on those figures, an amendment of a maximum of 24 three-bedroom apartments is requested. The applicant states in their justification statement that “Based on Mid-City’s experience, the market demand in the Hyattsville vicinity supports the offering of rental units of varying sizes, including units as large as three bedrooms. Mid-City has extensive experience in managing high-quality apartment complexes. Further, Mid-City intends to set its rental sales at or near the high-end of the rental market which will enable it to adequately maintain a high-quality appearance and function of the apartments and associated amenities.”

The Community Planning Division, in their memorandum date September 24, 2003, states “the applicant’s market analysis is suspect because high-rise residential condominium development is currently proposed for Subarea 1 (Landy Property), and Subarea 2 and 3 (the Boulevard at Prince George’s Plaza)” and that “The purpose of the condominium unit requirement is to encourage ownership and upkeep of the property.”

The Urban Design staff is of the opinion that the proposed apartment complex will be a quality development for several reasons. The applicant has stated in the CSP text that the proposed apartments will be Class A, luxury development. The applicant is also providing structured parking for all dwelling units. Each parking level will provide direct access to the dwelling units. With approximately 650 parking spaces dedicated to approximately 480 dwelling units and a cost of approximately \$7,000 per parking space, the cost of parking structure alone would be approximately three million dollars. The buildings will have elevators and controlled access. The applicant has also proffered to provide on-site amenities in the form of landscaped

courtyards, an outdoor swimming pool, and a clubroom. The applicant has also provided preliminary architectural elevations that show that the buildings will be of high quality in design. Staff notes that at the time of detailed site plan review, the applicant will be required to comply with other TDDP requirements to ensure that the apartments are luxury in nature. The Urban Design staff is of the opinion that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence that the proposed apartments will be high quality, luxury rental apartments and supports the requested amendment for eight percent of the total units as three-bedroom apartments. The amendment to P-74 will benefit the proposed development and the transit district and will not substantially impair implementation of the Transit District Development Plan.

4. *The transit district site plan is consistent with, and reflects the development guidelines and criteria contained in, the TDDP.*

The site plan is not consistent with the following development guidelines:

G-17 The level of the plaza should not be more than 3 feet above or 3 feet below the curb level of the nearest adjoining street in order to promote visibility and security.

The conceptual site plan shows a plaza that is five feet above the street level of East West Highway. The plaza should be designed to conform to the above requirement or otherwise meet the goals of the plan for visibility and access.

G-19 A minimum plaza distance to building height ratio of 2:1 should be provided .

As mentioned in P-73 above, the proposed plaza distance to building height ratio is less than 1:1. The conceptual site plan should be revised to provide a plaza area that is more consistent with the above guideline.

5. *The transit district site plan meets all of the requirements of the TDOZ and applicable regulations of the underlying zone.*

The Conceptual Site Plan will meet all the requirements of the TDOZ when conditions below have been met. See Findings 8-13 below for required findings in the M-X-T Zone.

6. *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 TDOZ.*

The Conceptual Site Plan does not meet all of this requirement. There are significant pedestrian and vehicular circulation conflicts as outlined in Finding 3 under the amendment for P-1. The big box retail entrances should be oriented to East West Highway and/or the plaza in order to eliminate pedestrian and vehicular conflicts.

7. *Each structure and use, in the manner proposed, is compatible with other structures and uses in the transit district and with existing and proposed adjacent development.*

For the most part, the conceptual site plan meets this requirement. The City of Hyattsville has expressed a concern with the size of the proposed office building and associate parking structure as it relates to the adjacent residential neighborhood. The closest structure proposed to the neighborhood is a seven-story parking structure that is 100 feet from the closest residential lot. Most of the existing trees along the property line with the residential lots are shown to be

preserved by the conceptual site plan. Additional heavy plantings of evergreens should be provided to supplement the existing trees in order to mitigate the views of the office building and parking garage from the adjacent residential development at the time of detailed site plan for the office and associated parking structure.

Required Findings in the M-X-T Zone:

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

The conceptual site plan meets this requirement. The redevelopment of the site will provide for desirable sources of employment within close proximity to the Metro station, maximize the development potential of the zone, promote the effective use of transit and facilitate a 24-hour environment, and add to the dynamic, functional relationship of other uses in the TDOZ.

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 conceptual site plan does not meet this requirement. One of the goals of the TDDP (p.28, Urban Design) is to “Encourage the placement of buildings along East West Highway, Toledo and Belcrest Roads and Toledo Terrace so that they define the space, create a pedestrian-friendly environment and minimize views of parking areas.” The applicant has indicated an intent to orient one-story, big box retail stores inward to an internal street (Belcrest Way) with three stories of parking structure above the stores. What would be visible to East West Highway with such an orientation would be the back of the retail stores and three stories of parking garage, architecturally “dressed-up” so as to have a good appearance from the street. No access to these stores would be provided from East West Highway. Despite the efforts to provide an architecturally attractive façade and an inviting pedestrian streetscape, the area would become a “dead zone.” Pedestrians would not utilize the street the way it was intended to be used, because for a distance of approximately 450 linear feet, nothing would happen: no storefronts, restaurants or other uses that might attract pedestrians to use the space. The space would not be a “people-oriented space”; rather, the pedestrian space and the building would become unrelated. It is not until you get to the pedestrian bridge that any pedestrian type of activity occurs. But this is a small area in relation to the entire street frontage. Staff recommends that store entrances be oriented to East West Highway and/or the required open-air plaza at the base of the pedestrian bridge. Consequently, the pedestrian circulation would be separated from the vehicular and service access driveways and the potential for pedestrian/vehicular conflicts will be eliminated. Staff also recommends that the amount of structured parking exposed to East West Highway be minimized. The applicant should explore the possibility of providing some residential uses over the retail, facing East West Highway. The residential uses would provide a visual barrier to the parking structure as well as provide architectural interest along the street that would help define and enhance the pedestrian experience. The parking structure levels could be increased in height to accommodate the need for additional parking. It is also recommended that sleeves of retail be provided in front of the big box retail along East West Highway to the extent possible to further encourage pedestrian activity.

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

The conceptual site plan generally meets this requirement. See Finding 7 above for further discussion.

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.*

The conceptual site plan generally meets this requirement. See Finding 9 for further discussion.

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

The proposed development has three stages. The first stage is the multifamily development in the southwest quadrant of the site. The second stage is the retail and residential uses along East West Highway. The third stage is the office. Each building phase has been designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for the effective integration of subsequent phases.

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

The conceptual site plan generally meets this requirement. A covered walkway should be provided in the form of a gallery, awnings or an arcade (open-sided) from the Metro overpass to Metro station.

Referrals:

14. In a memorandum dated September 30, 2003 (Mokhtari to Wagner), the Transportation Planning Section offered the following comments:

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 vehicle (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 vehicle, particularly SOV, trips to and from the transit district. As a 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 policies are:

- a. Establish 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.
- b. Implement 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
- c. Retain 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.

- d. Develop an annual TDMD operations fee based on the total number of parking spaces (surface and structured) each property owner maintains.
- e. Require that the TDMD prepare an annual transit district transportation and parking operations analysis that would determine whether or not LOS E has been maintained, and to determine additional trip reduction, transportation and parking management measures that are required to restore LOS E. It is important to note that the 1992 PG-TDDP also recommended the creation of the Prince George's Plaza Transportation Management Association.

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 structured 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. The reason for this distinction (between surface and structure parking) is the 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.

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 1	(178)							
Subarea 4					(121)			
Subarea 6					(72)			
Subarea 9					(321)			
Unallocated	742	310	1,170	390	396	300	2,486	1,000

As structured parking is not included in the Parking Caps pursuant to MDR P6, the parking figures reported above do not include the number of parking spaces that will be constructed as structured parking in each subarea.

Conceptual Site Plan Findings

- a. The PG-TDDP identifies the subject property as part of Subarea 5 of the transit district. There are 15 subareas in the transit district, two of which are designated as open space and will remain undeveloped. The proposed site consists of approximately 21.74 acres of land in the M-X-T Zone. The property is located on the south side of East West Highway (MD 410) and west of Belcrest Road. The proposed site does not include the existing Chevron gas station that is located on the southwest quadrant of the intersection of East West Highway and Belcrest Road. Currently, the subject property is the site of the existing Prince George's Plaza Metro Station. The existing station includes Metro tracks which are underground, the Metro station building, Metro storage facilities, and Metro parking facilities (Kiss-and-Ride lot with 168 short-term parking spaces, a bus staging area with 16 bus bays, and 1,068 long-term commuter parking spaces). The long-term parking is provided in a multideck parking structure that is constructed above the station, short-term parking lot and the bus staging area. A system of driveways and ramps from both East West Highway and Belcrest Road provide access to these facilities. In addition, the site is connected to Prince George's Plaza by a pedestrian bridge which extends across East West Highway. Of the 1,236 existing parking spaces, only 168 parking spaces are considered as surface parking. Pursuant to the PG-TDDP's MDR P6 (see Finding c. below), these existing surface parking spaces or their replacement as well as all structured parking spaces (existing or new) are exempt and will not be subject to the PG-TDDP Transportation and Parking Adequacy Requirements.
- b. The applicant proposes to construct a variety of retail stores, restaurants, a hotel, a high-rise office building, and a residential complex in three separate phases, which may be developed individually or in combination with one another. Fully developed, the site may include approximately 100,000 to 250,000 square feet of commercial retail spaces, between 10,000 and 30,000 square feet of restaurant spaces, a hotel, approximately 200,000 to 350,00 square feet of office space, a child care center, and about 375 to 470 residential units.
- c. The applicant is not proposing any additional surface parking at this time, and plans to construct the required parking needed for the proposed development in parking structures. These new parking spaces, which will be constructed for each development phase, are independent of, and will augment, the existing WMATA parking facilities. The compliance with the PG-TDDP's surface parking mandatory requirements and the need and availability of Preferred and/or Premium parking surface spaces will be determined at the time of detailed site plan for each development phase. Nevertheless, it is important to note that at this time from the TDDP's 1,000 Preferred surface parking spaces allocated for residential uses, only 742 spaces are unallocated. Since the allocation of TDOZ surface parking is at the time of detailed site plan approval, additional detailed site plan approvals with surface parking in the TDOZ may result in a reduction of the number of unallocated and available Preferred and/or Premium surface parking spaces.

- d. The proposed concept plan as submitted with structured parking would not result in any reduction to the total numbers of available and unallocated preferred and premium surface parking caps.
- e. The exclusion of the structure parking spaces from the parking caps under MDR P6 leaves only new surface parking spaces to be considered in the MDRs related to transportation adequacy. The achievement of the PG-TDDP's transportation goal of **providing for adequate transportation operations and transit service efficiency**, and its objective of **promoting alternatives to SOV use, such as trip reduction policies, ridesharing, priority and market-rate pricing of parking, and other types of transportation demand management, to reduce peak-hour traffic congestion** for the proposed project with structured parking may require (1) formal establishment of the PG-TDMD and (2) initiation of the Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDMP) for the subject property as provided in Section 206 of the TDM District Ordinance, pursuant to MDR P13, P14 and P16. As result and when deemed necessary, staff will prepare a draft resolution for the establishment of the PG-TDMD to be submitted to the Prince George's County Council.
- f. The internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns appear to be acceptable. During the second scheduled meeting with the applicant, transportation staff indicated that as of that date no traffic analysis has been submitted for review. Within several days we received several copies of a traffic impact analysis dated July 10, 2003, which was prepared by the applicant's traffic consultant for WMATA. Since as of this date, the proposed on-site circulation and access points are not fully finalized, and there is no sufficient time to transmit the submitted traffic analysis to the MD SHA and the county's DPW&T, staff is requesting the applicant provide sufficient and acceptable traffic analysis that can be used to demonstrate adequacy of the site access points, as required by the TDDP. At this time, the submitted conceptual site plan indicates the site will be accessed via one access road from East West Highway and two access point along Belcrest Road. However, the submitted revised plans show the second access point along Belcrest Road will be limited to right-in/right-out movements. The existing driveway along East West Highway that is located close to the western limits of the property is a full access driveway and is controlled by a traffic signal. With the submission of the first detailed site plan, the applicant is requested to provide staff with sufficient information that demonstrates provision of the additional access point along Belcrest Road is acceptable to the Prince George's County DPW&T.
- g. Staff is concerned with the lack of any direct pedestrian connection or walkways to the existing single-family detached residential community located south of the subject site. Currently the residents are using a set of stairs to gain access to the Metro. Provision of a hiker/biker ramp that is compatible with the requirements of the American with Disability Act would be desirable.

Transportation Staff Analysis and Conclusions

Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that the proposed development in the conceptual site plan as submitted will meet the circulation requirements of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan (page 22) and Section 27-548(c)(1)(D) of the County Code, provided that Conditions 1-4 below are met.

15. The Environmental Planning Section memorandum will be provided as a supplemental memorandum at the Planning Board hearing.
16. In a memorandum dated September 30, 2003 (William to Wagner), the Countywide Planning Division offered the following comments:

The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed the Conceptual Site Plan for public facilities impacts and concluded the following:

FIRE SERVICE

The existing fire engine service at Hyattsville Fire Station, Company 1 located at 6200 Belcrest Road has a service response time of 1.48 minutes, which is within the 3.25-minute response time guideline.

The existing ambulance service at Hyattsville Fire Station, Company 1 located at 6200 Belcrest Road has a service response time of 1.48 minutes, which is within the 4.25-minute response time guideline.

The existing paramedic service at Brentwood Fire Station, Company 4 located at 3712 Utah Avenue has a service response time of 5.09 minutes, which is within the 7.25-minute response time guideline.

The existing ladder truck service at Riverdale Fire Station, Company 7 located at 4714 Queensbury Road has a service response time of 3.08 minutes, which is within the 4.25-minute response time guideline.

These findings are in conformance with the *Adopted and Approved Public Safety Master Plan 1990* and the *Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities*.

The proposed development will be within the adequate coverage area of the nearest existing fire/rescue facilities for fire engine, ambulance, ladder truck and paramedic services.

Medivac Landing Area

In accordance with the 1998 Approved Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan (TDDP), it was recommended by the Fire Department that a medivac landing area with adequate vehicle access, lighting and glide path be designated within the Prince George's Plaza Transit District. Because the Home Depot, USA, Inc. site (SP-99006), which is southwest of East West Highway and Toledo Terrace, has been approved for the location of the medivac landing, the requirements of the transit district have been met. The applicant therefore will not be required to provide a medivac landing area.

Police Service

The proposed development is within the service area for Police District I-Hyattsville. The Planning Board's current test for police adequacy is based on a standard for square footage in police stations relative to the number of sworn duty staff assigned. The standard is 115 square feet per officer. As of June 30, 2002, the county had 874 sworn staff and a total of 101,303 square feet of station space. Based on available space, there is capacity for additional 69 sworn

personnel. The staff concludes that the existing county police facilities will be adequate to serve the proposed Belcrest Center development.

Public Schools

County Council bill CB-31-2003 establishes a school facilities surcharge in the amounts of: \$7,000 per dwelling if a building is located between interstate highway 495 and the District of Columbia; \$7,000 per dwelling if the building is included within a basic plan or conceptual site plan that abuts on existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority; or \$12,000 per dwelling for all other buildings.

The school surcharge maybe used for the construction of additional or expanded school facilities and renovations to existing school buildings or other systemic changes.

17. In a memorandum dated April 18, 2003 (Shaffer to Adams), the Transportation Planning Section Trails Planner provided the following comments:

BACKGROUND:

The subject site is located in Subarea 5 of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District and includes the existing Prince George's Plaza Metro Station. The adopted and approved Prince George's Plaza TDDP recommends several bicycle and pedestrian connections on the subject site. The TDDP recommends the provision of a pedestrian-friendly environment in the vicinity of the Metro to encourage walking and bicycling to the Metro for some trips.

The submitted CSP meets this goal and accommodates numerous pedestrian and trail connections. Pedestrian/trail facilities are accommodated along MD 410, Belcrest Road, along the southern edge of the subject site, and internal to the property. Connections are provided between land uses and to Metro. Furthermore, the submitted proposal will encourage walking and bicycling for some trips by providing a variety of land uses in close proximity to each other and to Metro.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

- a. The adopted and approved TDDP recommends a 40-foot-wide pedestrian zone along the subject property's entire frontage of East West Highway (MD 410) (Mandatory Development Requirement P1). Within this pedestrian zone, a wide sidewalk is recommended along the subject property's frontage. Location, paving materials, width, and other details can be finalized at the time of detailed site plan.
- b. Belcrest Road is designated as a master plan trail/bikeway route. However, wide sidewalks and bikeway signage have already been implemented as part of a DPW&T capital improvement program project. No additional improvements are recommended.
- c. The adopted and approved TDDP recommends an off-road trail parallel to the Metro line along the entire length of the subject property. It is recommended that this trail be

constructed as reflected it on the site plan. It should be a minimum of eight feet wide, asphalt, and ADA compatible.

- d. Additional pedestrian connections are indicated on the submitted CSP at various locations on the subject site. A detailed analysis of the pedestrian circulation on and to the site will be made at the time of detailed site plan.
 - e. The existing pedestrian connection from Oliver Street should be preserved and made ADA compatible in order to most effectively provide nonmotorized access to Metro.
 - f. All sidewalks and trails shall be free of above-ground utilities and street trees.
 - g. All sidewalks and trails shall be ADA compatible.
 - h. Bike racks and lockers shall be provided (Site Design Guideline S30). The appropriate number and locations will be determined at the time of detailed site plan.
18. In a memorandum dated September 30, 2003 (Asan to Wagner), the Park Planning and Development Division of the Department of Parks and Recreation offered the following comments:

Staff of the Park Planning and Development Division has reviewed the above-referenced conceptual site plan (CSP-02001). Our review considered the recommendations of *the Approved Transit District Development Plan for the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ)*, the master plan for Planning Area 68, the Land Preservation and Recreational Program for Prince George's County, current zoning and subdivision regulations, and existing conditions in the vicinity of the proposed development.

FINDINGS

The project area consists of 22.2 acres of land and includes the existing Prince George's Plaza Metro Station. The applicant proposes infill development around the Metro Station in Subarea V including commercial offices, varied retail uses, restaurants, a health club, and multifamily residential uses.

The Transit District Development Plan (TDDP) includes districtwide requirements and guidelines, which relate to the entire district, rather than to specific subareas. The following goals for parks and recreation are applicable to the transit district:

- To provide parks, recreation facilities and programs to respond to the needs of residents and employees of the transit district.
- To develop facilities that are functional, safe and sensitive to the surrounding environment.
- To protect and conserve public open space and natural resources.
- To utilize alternative methods of park acquisition and facility development such as donation and mandatory dedication.

The mandatory development requirement related to parks and recreation states:

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 conjunction with the mixed-use development planned for the transit district, the TDDP also recommends that the existing Prince George's Plaza Community Center be renovated with additional indoor and outdoor activities or replaced with a larger new facility.

The subject conceptual site plan shows residential development in the eastern corner of the planned development along Belcrest Road. The applicant's proposal indicates that 500 residential dwelling units will be provided as part of the planned development. Using current occupancy statistics for multifamily dwelling units leads to the conclusion that the proposed development will result in a population of 1,000 additional residents in the community. Although the applicant proposes a health club in the project area, a clubhouse with an indoor pool located within the interior of one of the apartment buildings, the use of health club and clubhouse will be limited to the members only. The plan also indicates that 8,000 square feet of outdoor plaza will be provided in the planned development, but there do not appear to be recreational uses associated with this area.

National and state standards for the provision of parkland call for the provision of 15 acres of local parkland for every thousand residents. The standards also recommend an additional 20 acres of regional parkland for every thousand residents. Only 10.35 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents are currently available in the Hyattsville area. Staff has performed some very general analysis using available information. By applying the above-mentioned standards, staff concludes that 8 to 10 acres of the local park should be provided to serve the anticipated population of the new development.

ANALYSIS

While the Transit District Development Plan requires that mandatory dedication requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance be applied to development in the TDDP, these requirements cannot be easily determined in those instances where mixed uses are proposed on the same parcel or lot. It is not possible to determine which portion of the parcel or lot will support the planned residential development and which portions will support other commercial uses.

To address this problem, the Boulevard at Prince George's Metro Center (the similar mixed-use development in the TDOZ) was approved with conditions requiring a monetary contribution to be used for the redevelopment and /or operation of the Prince George's Plaza Community Center. DPR staff is of the opinion that a similar condition should be applied to this development.

As was the case with the Boulevard at Prince George's Metro Center project, staff recommends establishing a formula for calculation of fees in lieu of parkland dedication in this mixed-use development. The amount of the fee required could be based on the cost of the recreational facilities that would be required if private recreational facilities were deemed a desirable option for meeting the requirements for mandatory dedication of parkland. The Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines provide a formula for determining the value of recreation facilities to be provided. Staff proposes using the formula to determine the value of recreation facilities required from the subject planned development:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Step 1:} & (N \times P) / 500 = M \\ \text{Step 2:} & M \times S = \text{Value of facilities} \end{array}$$

Where:

N = Number of units in project

P = Population per dwelling unit by Planning Area

M = Multiplier

S = Standard value of facilities for population of 500

Number of units in project: includes all dwelling units proposed for future development within the project area.

Population per dwelling unit by Planning Area: the Research Section of the Planning Department publishes projections of household type and size by Planning Area each year.

Multiplier: is the ratio of the projected total population of the proposed community to a standard population increment of 500 persons.

Standard value of facilities for population of 500: is the cost of providing and installing adequate recreation facilities for a population of 500. This monetary amount is determined by the Department of Parks and Recreation on a biennial basis and it is based on the cost of a representative selection of recreation facilities, which, according to generally accepted standards in the recreation industry, will satisfy the needs of the typical group of 500 citizens (this list of the quantity and respective value of the recreation facilities to be provided for a typical population of 500 is updated regularly).

Value of facilities to be provided: This dollar amount reflects the minimum cost of recreation facilities to be provided for the residents in the project area.

In conjunction with the mixed-use development planned for the transit district, the TDDP recommends that the existing Prince George's Plaza Community Center be renovated with additional indoor space and outdoor activities or replaced with a new, larger facility. This goal had been partially addressed by previous projects in the TDDP including the dedication of land from Landy Property and the dedication of land and the provisions of fees from the Boulevard at Prince George's Metro Center projects. Considering the close proximity of the proposed development, staff believes that it would be desirable to provide additional funds to improve the nearby dedicated parkland and/or to further renovate the existing Prince George's Plaza Community Center. These recreational facilities will serve the planned community.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Department of Parks and Recreation staff recommends to the Planning Board the following conditions of approval for Conceptual Site Plan CSP-02001:

- a. At the time of application for the Preliminary Plan, the applicant shall specify the total number of proposed dwelling units in the residential portion of the planned development.
- b. A fee shall be established at the time of Preliminary Plan based on the following formula:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Step 1:} & (N \times P) / 500 = M \\ \text{Step 2:} & M \times S = \text{Value of facilities} \end{array}$$

Where:

N = Number of units in project

M = Multiplier

S = Standard value of facilities for population of 500.

P = Population per dwelling unit will be based on estimates of average household size by Planning Area, generated by the Research Section of the Department of Planning. Variations may be allowed if approved by Urban Design Section and Park Planning and Development staff considering information provided by the applicant and reviewed and approved by the Research Section.

- c. The fee shall be determined by DPR upon request by the developer. The request shall be submitted two weeks prior to building permit for each residential structure in Subarea V.
 - d. The fee shall be paid prior to building permit for each residential structure and shall be used for renovation of the Prince George's Plaza Community Center or development of the University Hills Community Park located to the northwest of the transit district.
19. The Conceptual Site Plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.
20. In a letter dated August 23, 2003, and a correction letter dated September 2, 2003 (Gardiner to Hewlett), the City of Hyattsville recommended approval of the conceptual site plan subject to conditions that have been incorporated into the Findings of this report and in the Recommendation section. The following are the city's comments:

"The Hyattsville City Council and residents participated in several meetings and presentations to discuss the proposed development at Prince George's Plaza Metro Station. The development team provided information on the conceptual site plan, the requirements for this site, and the requested variances, and the team received feedback from the community and Council.

"During the Council Meeting of August 4, 2003, the Hyattsville City Council voted on three of the requested variances: a decrease in the required buffer along the southern property line that adjoins residences on Oliver Street; a waiver of the requirement that the apartments be at least six stories; and a decrease in the setback from East-West Highway. The City Council supported the following:

- "(1) The City supports a minimum 45-foot vegetative buffer, and a minimum 65-foot total distance from the southern property line to any structural portion of the residential buildings. [Note: The city, in a correction letter dated September 2, 2003, made the clarification that 'The new site plan showed one point of the apartment structure 45 feet from the southern property line; the other points of the apartment structure were at least 65 feet from the southern property line. The motion stated that the City would require a minimum 65-foot buffer (45 feet with vegetation), except for the one intrusion that left only a 45-foot buffer.'] The existing vegetative buffer must also be enhanced by adding appropriate evergreens to increase the visual barrier. The required 45-foot vegetative buffer does not apply to the storm water pond itself, but the pond must have a minimum 25-foot vegetative buffer. The conceptual site plan as presented indicated only three points of the structures that intrude into the 100-foot buffer. The 100-foot buffer, with

significant vegetative screening, must be required for the proposed parking structure adjacent to the proposed office building.

- “(2) The City supports the developer’s request for a variance regarding the minimum number of stories for the residential buildings. The City accepts the four and five-story units, with lofts.
- “(3) The City supports the developer’s request to reduce the East-West Highway setback from 40 feet to 30 feet, and to widen the street behind the retail stores by at least 10 feet. The main street behind the retail stores must be sufficiently wide and provide sufficient public plaza areas so that it is attractive, open, and bright, and not dominated by the parking structures above the retail, nor marred by poorly configured service bay entrances.

“The City would like to express other concerns that were raised during the presentations and which should be addressed prior to or in the detailed site plan. The façade of the retail and parking structure must be done in a manner that hides the parking levels and presents an attractive structure to East-West Highway and the main internal street. While it may not be necessary to require pedestrian access from East-West Highway to all retail stores, the pedestrian access points to all stores must be prominent, attractive, and interesting.

“The new retail center will increase the number of people crossing East-West Highway, and the City requests that an attractive hardscape and softscape barrier be constructed in the median to discourage street-level pedestrian crossings except at existing crosswalks. Additional pedestrians will also access the development from the Oliver Street entrance, and the City requests that a path, accessible for people with strollers, shopping carts, and on bicycles, be constructed near the existing series of steps that cannot be negotiated by the above users.

“The City requests that the developer remove the proposed office building garage vehicular access from Belcrest Road. This access road further intrudes in the 100-foot buffer, and access to the garage from East West Highway should be sufficient. The proposed size of the office building and the office garage is a concern. The City prefers a smaller building footprint, and requests significant soundproofing on the south side of the garage.

“The City is also concerned about traffic flow and related issues along Belcrest Road, and the potential for the traffic configuration to result in additional use of Oliver Street and/or lead to accidents on Belcrest Road. The traffic flow through the project must not be such that people choose to use Oliver Street as an easier drop-off point for the metro, the residents, or shopping. We ask that the developers work closely with the County and State to mitigate the traffic problems that could be caused by the development.”

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE CSP-02001 and TCPI/26/03, subject to the conditions below, and further recommend to the District Council APPROVAL of an amendment to P-65 for minimum building heights of four to five stories for residential development; DENIAL of an amendment to P-65 for minimum building heights of three stories for residential development; DENIAL of an amendment to P-66 for minimum building heights of one story for uses other than residential; and DENIAL of an amendment to the Table of Uses.

1. In addition to the information required for each detailed site plan, the applicant, his heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit a parking demand analysis which reflects appropriate reduction for shared parking between the existing and proposed uses.
2. In addition to the information required for the first detailed site plan, the applicant, his heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit a detailed on-site transportation study for the entire site of this conceptual site plan, which shall include traffic projections for all access points. This information will be used to determine the adequacy of the site access points.
3. Prior to the certification of the conceptual site plan, the applicant shall obtain from the MD SHA and/or the Prince George's County DPW&T the approval for construction of an additional access point along Belcrest Road. In the event that said agencies do not approve provision of an additional access point as proposed, the concept plan shall be revised.
4. Prior to the certification of the conceptual site plan, the applicant shall revise the plan to include an Americans with Disabilities Act-compatible hiker/biker ramp that would provide a direct connection between the existing single-family detached residential community located south of the subject site and the Metro.
5. The minimum building height for the standalone residential apartments shall be four to five stories. Lofts shall be provided in some of the units to give the appearance of six stories in some locations, particularly along Belcrest Road.
6. Retail stores, including "big box" retail, shall have their entrances fronting on East West Highway and/or the open-air urban plaza.
7. A 40-foot-wide pedestrian zone, including a 40-foot build-to line, shall be provided along East West Highway, in accordance with P-1 and S-8 of the TDDP.
8. Any parking structure visible from East West Highway shall be completely hidden with architectural treatments and shall be attractively designed so as to appear to be a residential or office building and be in compliance with the Mandatory Development Requirements/Site Design Guidelines on pages 38 and 39 of the TDDP.
9. An urban plaza, with a park-like setting, shall be provided at the base of the existing Metro overpass in accordance with page 73 of the TDDP. The plaza shall be designed to be in conformance with the Site Design Guidelines on pages 36–38 of the TDDP to the extent practicable. A covered walkway should be provided in the form of a gallery, awnings or an arcade (open-sided) from the Metro overpass to Metro station.
10. A 45-foot-wide vegetative buffer, consisting of a 20- to 25-foot-wide area of existing trees to be preserved and substantial evergreen and ornamental plantings to supplement the buffer and increase the visual barrier, shall be provided along the south property line. Building setbacks from the property line shall be a minimum of 65 feet, except for one leg of the proposed residential structure that may be 45 feet from the property line. Any proposed office or associated parking structure must meet the required 100-foot-wide buffer requirement of page 70 of the TDDP.
11. A minimum 25-foot-wide landscaped buffer shall be provided between the proposed stormwater management facility in the southeast corner of the site and the southern property line.

12. The stormwater management facility for the residential development shall be designed as an amenity for the residences. The pond shall be attractively landscaped and benches and walking paths shall be provided.
13. A maximum of eight percent of apartment units may be three-bedroom apartment units.
14. At the time of Detailed Site Plan review for the retail and residential in Phase II, the applicant shall consider providing residential above the retail along East West Highway and sleeves of retail in front of the proposed big box retail lining East West Highway.