



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

CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN - REMAND

CSP-05006

Application	General Data
Project Name: West Hyattsville Commons Location: The northwest quadrant of the intersection of Ager Road and Hamilton Road and the West Hyattsville Metro Station. Applicant/Address: West Hyattsville Metro Development, LLC c/o Centex Homes 3684 Centerview Drive Suite 100 Chantilly, VA 20151	Date Accepted: 03/01/2006
	Planning Board Action Limit: Waived
	Plan Acreage: 44.56
	Zone: M-X-T, TDO
	Dwelling Units: 1,400
	Square Footage: 2,300,000–2,558,888
	Planning Area: 68
	Tier: Developed
	Council District: 2
	Municipality: Hyattsville
	200-Scale Base Map: 207NE02

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
Mixed-use development consisting of 130–225 single-family attached, 1,000–1,270 multifamily units, 200,000–220,000 square feet office, 13,000 square feet community center, and 60,000–85,000 square feet of retail. REMANDED from District Council on March 12, 2007	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: 06/01/2006 (CB-12-2003)
	Sign(s) Posted on Site and Notice of Hearing Mailed: 01/29/2008

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

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: West Hyattsville Commons
Conceptual Site Plan CSP-05006 – Remand
Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/19/06

The Urban Design staff has completed its review of the revised conceptual site plan submitted by the applicant in response to the Order of Remand from the District Council. The plans have been revised to address the concerns of the District Council as expressed in the written order. The following evaluation and findings lead to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions as described in the recommendation section below.

FINDINGS

1. The Planning Board approved conceptual site plan CSP-05006 for West Hyattsville Commons on October 5, 2006 (PGCPB No. 06-218). The District Council reviewed the conceptual site plan (CSP) and remanded the case back to the Planning Board. The Order of Remand, dated March 12, 2007, is quoted below and responses by the applicant are provided.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, after review of the administrative record, that Application No. SP-05006, approved by the Planning Board in PGCPB No. 06-218, a conceptual site plan application showing a mixed-use development project, including 193 single-family attached dwelling units, 1,170 multifamily units, 226,620 square feet of office space, a 23,000 square-foot community center, and 69,380 square feet of retail space, on property referred to as West Hyattsville Commons, described as approximately 44.56 acres of land in the M-X-T/TDO zones, located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Ager Road and Hamilton Road, at the West Hyattsville Metro Station, in Hyattsville, is:

REMANDED to the Planning Board, for amendment of the site plan and de novo staff and Board review. The Planning Board should, if feasible, return this case to the District Council within 120 days.

The District Council remanded this case for the following reasons, as stated in their Order of Remand. In response, the applicant has revised the conceptual site plan in order to address the issues raised by the District Council. Below each of the points raised by the District Council, the applicant provided the following responses:

1. **The applicant must substantially revise the CSP application, and the development project must be redesigned, with new concepts. The applicant must strive to achieve the goals and objectives in the West Hyattsville Transit District Development Plan, as amended.**

Applicant's response: "The CSP has been substantially revised to address issues raised by the District Council and to incorporate new concepts. As a result of working with representatives of Planning Staff, the City of Hyattsville, the community, WMATA and the Applicant, the plan represents a consensus development proposal that is compatible with the TDDP and general goals for transit development."

The project as proposed meets many TDD Plan recommendations. The applicant incorporates low impact development techniques in building and street design and construction; the applicant includes a community center large enough to serve residents in the project and the surrounding community; and the residential densities and proposed project design conform generally to TDD Plan requirements and guidelines. Moreover, the development project has been reviewed and approved not only by staff and Planning Board, but also by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

As proposed, however, this project cannot be considered an integrated, high-quality, mixed-use community at the West Hyattsville Metro Station, as envisioned in the TDD Plan.

Applicant's response: "As revised, the CSP achieves a more integrated, high quality, mixed use community improving the relationships between the Metro Station, Hamilton Square and the proposed built environment to create an enjoyable and vibrant community experience."

- 2. Any development project at Metro's West Hyattsville Station will have direct access to, and use of, one of the largest publicly-funded capital resources in northern Prince George's County. A limited number of Metro stations, and a limited area around each station, will be available for near-term future development. The District Council has the responsibility and duty to ensure that this finite public resource provides the greatest benefit to Prince George's County and to its residents, workers, and businesses.**

Applicant's response: "The concern of the District Council for the importance of the Metro Station as a resource was a prime consideration in the discussions that led to the revisions made to the CSP."

- 3. This proposed project, West Hyattsville Commons, does not have sufficient coordination and integration between and among the townhouse component, the multifamily structures, the office building and office space, the recreational facilities, and the community and public open space. Each of the several buildings, structures, and spaces can be built and operated separately and independently, by different builders. It appears highly unlikely that a defined, integrated community will be created, to match what is shown in the applicant's renderings.**

Applicant's response: "In revising the CSP, particular attention was paid to the layout of the blocks to improve integration throughout the project. Hamilton Square was a primary focus of the design discussions. The design is intended to create an integrated mixed use environment. Although the community will be built in phases, architectural standards will be established at the time of Detailed Site Plan to ensure a coordinated design as the project moves to fruition."

4. **West Hyattsville Commons, as proposed, does not meet the standard of high quality that the West Hyattsville community deserves. For example, the multifamily structures are not designed with enough height and density, near the Metro Station, to encourage apartment dwellers to make frequent use of the Metrorail and Metrobus systems. Each multifamily structure is spread out, with a large building footprint, and most of the apartment structures surround and enfold interior public courtyards that are not part of the project's open space system. The walking distances between individual units and the Metro station are thereby substantially increased, and apartment dwellers are not invited to use the Metro or community open spaces and recreational facilities.**

A revised West Hyattsville mixed-use project should have building height at its core, both residential and office. Building height should be achieved by concrete and steel; core community buildings should not be “stick-built” construction that is not of high quality, and does not show good design. West Hyattsville Commons shows the latter, not the former.

The community spaces, corridors, and byways for West Hyattsville Commons do not encourage and will not produce a vibrant, pedestrian-friendly environment that brings people together and creates a sense of place and a sense of community. The project should have at its core a central plaza, ringed with retail and office uses that attract project residents and members of surrounding communities. The project's retail and office components should be substantial enough to generate jobs and foot traffic, and to create community spaces that attract workers and residents.

The recreational facilities and community open spaces for West Hyattsville Commons have been compromised by the design of the multifamily components. The multifamily buildings, of insufficient height and stick-built construction, occupy too much acreage, individually and collectively, to allow placement of pocket parks and plazas that are connected, part of an integrated and connected web of open space. The interior courtyards shown for most of the multifamily structures are not consistent with the concept of integrated community open space. Residential density achieved with vertical construction will provide the high-quality construction that a Metro station deserves, and more ground space will then be available for community and recreational uses.

Applicant's response: "This comment relates mainly to the east side of the rail tracks. In reviewing the plan, emphasis was placed on Hamilton Square as being the primary focal point for the project. The square was designed to be inviting and pedestrian friendly. The bus staging area was relocated to minimize impacts to the extent possible. The main office building was located at the west end of the square at the end of Hamilton Street extended to provide a primary visual focal point. Retail was added around Hamilton Square and garage entrances were located away from the square where possible. The Community Building continues to be a primary component of the plan and is located close to the station for maximum efficiency. The height of each building was evaluated with the intent to create a sense of urban place around Hamilton Square. With these changes, the plan represents a vibrant, transit oriented, mixed use development which will promote a pleasant pedestrian experience, increase ridership for Metro, attract employers and office workers, and result in a quality 24 hour environment for residents."

5. **On remand, the applicant must convert what it now proposes, a suburban residential development that has been made compact and placed at a Metro station, to a series of connected, urbanized, high-density spaces in an integrated, mixed-use community with a central plaza and urban core. A proposal like that will take full advantage of valuable public capital resources, including new Metro facilities.**

Applicant's response: "For all of the reasons stated above and as reflected in the plan, the revised CSP represents a cooperative effort to create an urbanized, high-density, integrated, mixed use community."

2. **Request:** The subject application proposes a mixed residential development with office/retail components. The plans propose 130–225 single-family attached units (townhouses/three-family dwellings), 1,000–1,270 multifamily units, 200,000–220,000 square feet of office space, 60,000–85,000 square feet of retail space, and a 13,000-square-foot community center. The residential units are proposed as three product types: townhouses, three-family dwellings and multifamily units. The office component is proposed as mid- to high-rise buildings with integrated multilevel parking structures located over the proposed WMATA Kiss and Ride facilities. The majority of the retail component is located on the street, surrounding Hamilton Square, combined with various multiuse buildings.

3. Development Data Summary

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	M-X-T/TDO	M-X-T/TDO
Use(s)	Metro Station	Mixed Use 130–225 single-family attached, 1,000–1,270 multifamily units, 200,000–220,000 square feet office 13,000 square foot community center, 60,000–85,000 sq. ft. retail
Acreage	44.57	44.57
Area within 100 year floodplain	24.7	2.61
Net tract area	19.87	41.96
Dwelling Units	0	single-family attached 130–225 multifamily units 1,000–1,270 Total 1,130–1,400
Lots	0	135–150
Parcels	9	10–12
Square Footage/GFA	WMATA structure unknown	2,300,000–2,558,888
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Based on 1,827,777 square feet of net tract area in the M-X-T Zone*	N/A	1.2585–1.4000

*Additional FAR may be provided at the time of DSP review pursuant to Section 27-545

4. The proposed phasing plan for the development is as follows:

Proposed Phasing	Building/Block	Residential	Retail	Office
Phase I (a) & I (b)	Buildings A, C and Hamilton Square	130± units	55,500± sq.ft.	60,000± sq. ft.
Phase I (c)	Building B	183± units		
Phase II	Blocks G, H and K-R	130± units		
Phase III	Buildings D, E and F	382± units	21,500± sq.ft.	144,000± sq. ft.
Phase IV	Blocks I and J	241± units		
Totals		1,066± units	77,000± sq.ft.	204,000± sq. ft.

Staff comment: The phasing above should be clarified through a condition of approval which should identify phase establishment and closure. The phasing schedule of the project should be as follows:

- a. Phase I (a) and (b)—Buildings/Blocks A and C and Hamilton Square—Prior to the issuance of building permits for any future phases other than I(a) and (b), the WMATA garage shall be completed and open to traffic; the WMATA Kiss-and-Ride shall be constructed and open to traffic; the remaining portion of Block C shall be completed and use and occupancy permits issued for no less than 19,000 square feet of the retail GFA in Block C; and Hamilton Square shall be constructed and landscaped.
- b. Phase I (c) and Phase II—Building/Block B G, H, K–R inclusive
- c. Phase III—Buildings D, E and F—Prior to the issuance of building permits for Buildings D and E within Phase III, Building F shall be constructed and use and occupancy permits issued for no less than 3,700 square feet of the retail GFA in Block F.
- d. Phase IV – Buildings I and J

No buildings within a later phase shall be issued building permits, except as noted above, before building permits for all buildings in the preceding phase have been issued.

5. The applicant provided the discussion in regard to the preferred land use map as included on the TDDP and the use table:

“Table 2 of the TDDP sets forth various Preferred Land Use Categories (From Map 13). The revised CSP proposes certain modifications which impact Map 13 and Table 2. The Applicant has submitted with the CSP an Alternative Land Use Plan Map. This Alternative Map provides a color coded illustration of the various use categories and their locations within the Applicant’s CSP boundaries. The Applicant requests that with the approval of the CSP, that Map 13 of the TDDP be revised to correspond with the Alternative Land Use Plan Map submitted herewith. Additionally, the Applicant has included a triple attached residential product on the west side of the rail tracks. For purposes of Table 2, the Applicant would request that the Category of “Townhouses” be deemed to include the triple attached product.”

Staff comment: The staff recommends that the alternative land use plan be adopted in the review and approval of the revised conceptual site plan. This land use plan reflects the applicant's desire to develop the property in some ways that are similar, but also different than the plan that was designed by the staff at the time of the adoption of the TDDP. In addition, the applicant is introducing a product type that was not included in the use table at the time of the TDDP. The three-family dwelling is a familiar product that was developed extensively in the 1980s as three-family attached units, also known as "piggyback units." It appears that the product type being proposed at this time is slightly different than the attached three-family dwellings of an earlier time, because these units appear to have attached garages. No architecture for the product type has been submitted at this time, therefore, the staff recommends that the proposed amendment for the use of three-family dwelling not be granted at this time, but be further evaluated at the time of detailed site plan for the project.

Any change to the list of allowed uses, as modified by the TDDP, require the review and approval of the District Council in accordance with Section 27-548.09.01.

The applicant is asking for modifications to many of the development standards as set forth with the TDDP. The following excerpt is taken from the applicant's statement of justification, and lists the proposed amendments:

Building Envelope and Block Standards

- 3. Buildings shall front the street and square and provide ground level retail uses to provide an active, vital, and safe pedestrian public space.**
- 6. Buildings shall provide retail on all ground floor elevations to provide an active and interesting pedestrian street life. Community-serving financial (e.g., commercial bank or savings and loan branch) or professional (medical, tax preparation, insurance) service establishments may be allowed in ground-floor space provided that such uses have a primary entrance on the street.**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

"The CSP incorporates this principle in concept. The CSP includes a mixture of buildings. Retail is focused on the ground level primarily surrounding Hamilton Square, the main open space parcel in the core of the project. Specifically, ground level retail is proposed as follows:

"Building A—Ground level retail proposed for frontage on Hamilton Square and on northwest frontage facing Building B. Community Building also proposed for ground level. Extent of retail facing the bus lanes and Building C will be refined at the time of DSP.

"Building B—No ground level retail.

"Building C—Ground level retail wrapping the corner of Ager Road and Hamilton Street comprising approximately one third of Ager Road frontage and all of Hamilton Street frontage other than garage entrance. Ground level retail also proposed for Southeastern frontage facing Building A. Extent of retail facing the bus lanes and Building A will be refined at the time of DSP. No ground level retail on street frontage facing Building B.

“Building D—Ground level retail proposed for approximately 90 percent of frontage facing Hamilton Square (except for space needed for residential lobby entrance). No retail proposed facing other street frontages of Building D.

“Building E—No ground level retail.

“Building F—Ground level retail on 100 percent of northwest frontage facing Hamilton Square, Hamilton Street and Building D except for area required for lobby entrance for office building. No retail proposed for other facades of Building F.

“Buildings G-R (West Side of Tracks)—No ground level retail.

“Applicant’s modified proposal for ground level retail is shown on the Conceptual Land Use Plan (street level) submitted with the remand case. The revised CSP embraces the concept of promoting an active and interesting pedestrian street life. Community-serving establishments will be encouraged and can be accommodated in any of the areas identified for ground level retail uses.”

Staff comment: In the above discussion, the applicant is asking for relief from the requirement that all the ground-level floor area to be comprised of retail uses. The staff supports this request, as market conditions may not support more retail than is proposed. In addition, this change contributes toward the design of the “preferred land use plan” within the TDDP. The applicant has submitted an alternative land use plan, which is also an amendment to the plan. The staff supports the alternative land use plan.

8. Building parking areas (off-street) shall be located away from the street and shared by multiple owners/uses.

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“The CSP incorporates this principle by including multiple parking structures for the multifamily, retail and office uses. The shared parking characteristics of the project are as follows:

“Building A—Includes internal structured parking that will allow for shared use.

“Building B—Is located away from the mixed use core and as such will have an internal parking garage to serve its residents and guests only.

“Building C—Will contain the WMATA parking which will be dedicated for its use, but will also include other parking that will allow for shared use.

“Building D—Will have a parking garage for use by its residents and guests only. The customers of the retail uses will park in the shared parking sections of other garages.

“Building E—Is located away from the mixed use core and as such will have an internal parking garage to serve its residents and guests only.

“Building F—Will house the WMATA Kiss and Ride function and the parking for the office users of Building F. There will be shared parking opportunities in the lower levels.

“Buildings G-R (West Side of Tracks)—Each of these buildings will have off-street parking dedicated to their specific residents and guests. The multifamily buildings (Buildings I and J) will have internal parking garages. The townhouse and triple attached will have off street parking for each unit.”

Staff comment: The applicant is requesting relief from the aspect of the development standard that requires the parking structures to be located away from the street. The revised plan indicates parking structures located directly at the street line at multiple locations. In order to mitigate this use along the streetscape, staff recommends that either additional uses line these street frontages or, at a minimum, the building facades of parking structures should be designed with facades that mimic those of attractive commercial buildings in order to screen the horizontal tier structure of the garage.

9. Commercial and mixed-use blocks shall contain a minimum of 80 percent commercial uses on the ground floor.

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“While the CSP does not meet the 80 percent requirement, the plan locates retail uses predominantly surrounding Hamilton Square. A breakdown of each building is as follows:

“Building A—100% (counting the Community Building). Blocks may be refined at time of DSP.

“Building B—N/A (not a mixed use block).

“Building C—Approximately 50 percent of ground level dedicated to retail/commercial use. Percentage may increase at time of DSP based on market conditions.

“Building D—The ground level retail comprises over 90 percent of the frontage on Hamilton Square, but only approximately 20 percent of the entire ground level of Building D. Frontages away from Hamilton Square are not proposed to have ground level retail/commercial.

“Building E—N/A (not a mixed use block)

“Building F—The ground level retail comprises over 90 percent of the frontage on Hamilton Square, but only approximately 30 percent of the entire ground level of Building F. Frontages away from Hamilton Square are not proposed to have ground level retail/commercial.

“Buildings G-R (West Side of Tracks)—N/A (not mixed use blocks).”

Staff comment: Staff agrees with the proposed amounts of commercial uses at the ground level and proposes a condition of approval that will require the minimum amounts of commercial uses at the time of detailed site plan. In addition, the streetscape of Ager Road has been identified as a concern in regard to the expansive amount of parking structures along that street edge. In order to mitigate this issue, staff recommends that prior to the approval of a DSP for Building C, the incorporation of live/work units or retail/office type uses should be considered to be incorporated along the street edge of Ager Road and the street bordering the north end of the parking structure, or that the façade of the garage be designed, as shown in the CDP exhibits, to mimic those of attractive commercial buildings which will screen the horizontal tier structure of the garage.

BUILDING STREET TYPES

Height Specifications

- 2. Parking Structure Height and Block Coverage: No parking structure within the block shall exceed the eave height within 40 feet of the parking structure. Any parking area fronting the build-to line shall provide a three-foot-high solid masonry wall to screen vehicles. No block shall have more than 25 percent of its street frontage occupied by screened parking. Unscreened parking shall be prohibited.**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“The parking structure along Ager Road is six (6) stories in height. The fenestration of the parking garage will be incorporated into the design of the surrounding buildings to satisfy the screen wall requirement. Approximately 75 percent of Building C will consist of screened parking. There will be no unscreened parking.”

Staff comment: The building height for Building C is two stories higher than the TDDP allows because the TDDP called for two- to four-story residential townhouses in this location. The staff supports the applicant’s proposal to allow the height of the WMATA parking structure to exceed four stories. However, it appears that the parking structures within Building C will visually dominate the block. The staff recommends that the plans be revised to incorporate additional uses within the block to reduce the visual impact of the parking structure dominating the entire block.

Additionally, Ager Road is designated a boulevard street that forms a first impression of the area. Thus, all screened parking needs to be of the highest quality to create an attractive boulevard. The quality of the parking structure will be of particular concern at detailed site plan review.

A building height amendment requires review and approval by the District Council in accordance with Section 27-548.09.01.

Siting Specifications

- 2. Maximum Block Length: Block lengths shall be a maximum of 400 feet in length; refer to the TDDP block registration plan (Map 13).**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“Building B Block is approximately 510 feet (curb to curb) and Building C Block is approximately 430 feet (curb to curb) along Ager Road.”

Staff comment: The irregular shape and angle of Building B makes it difficult to conform to the 400-block-length standard. Building B mitigates the greater length with residential units fronting Ager Road in conformance with the TDDP. However, the lack of units along the internal street has the effect of making this most direct route to the station from Ager Road unsafe. The relationship of Building B to the internal street line should be improved by adding residential units along the frontage of the street, instead of 260 linear feet of parking garage.

- 3. Lot coverage: Building shall only occupy the lot area delineated in the siting specifications and shall be in accordance with the west Hyattsville TDDP. All**

buildings are required to be located at the build-to line and shall be located zero feet from the sidewalk edge. The sidewalk location and width shall be in accordance with the applicable streetscape sections and roadway segments of the TDDP and shall be delineated on the detailed site plan. The minimum open contiguous area shall comprise a minimum 15 percent of the total buildable area and can be located anywhere within the buildable area of the site.

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“The proposed CSP does not comply with Building Blocks E and G (Map 13) on Ager Road. The CSP proposes a Build-To Line of between 11 to 18 feet along Ager Road. Building C meets the 0 feet from sidewalk edge requirement. Building B has a green space from edge of building to the sidewalk. Buildings B and C do not meet the minimum 15 percent open contiguous area requirement. Building B has 0% open contiguous area and Building C has 0% open contiguous area along Ager Road.”

Staff comment: Buildings B and C do not propose any land area not covered by buildings. In a development with this level of urban quality it is unlikely that a lot coverage requirement would even be suggested. Staff recommends approval of the amendment to lot coverage.

Main Street (Hamilton Street)

Height Specifications

- 1. Building Height: Principal building height is measured in stories. All buildings shall be a minimum of three stories and a maximum of six stories in height, except where otherwise noted in the TDDP.**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“Buildings C, D and E meet the 3-6 story height requirement. Building F is an office building proposed at 10-12 stories.”

Staff comment: Staff finds that Building/Blocks C, D, and E conform to the TDDP height standards. The TDDP also provides for a residential tower of 10–12 stories. While the proposed tower (Building Block F) is not in precisely the location per the preferred land use plan of the TDDP (Map 14, page 36), it is generally located in the area consistent with the TDDP; therefore, no amendment is necessary for the requirement. Nevertheless, the height of Building Block F may cause shadows to be cast during the winter that make the town square bleak and uninviting. It seems appropriate that at the time of detailed site plan for Building F a shadow study should be produced indicating the impact of shadows on the plaza for the four seasons of the year. Adjustments to the height of the building may be necessary at that time.

A building height amendment requires review and approval by the District Council in accordance with Section 27-548.09.01.

- 2. Parking Structure Height and Block Coverage: No parking structure within the block shall exceed the eave height within 40 feet of the parking structure. Any parking area fronting the build-to line shall provide a three-foot-high solid masonry wall to screen vehicles. No block shall have more than 25 percent of its street frontage occupied by screened parking. Unscreened parking shall be prohibited.**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“The parking structure along Hamilton Street in Building C is six (6) stories in height. The fenestration of the parking garage will be incorporated into the design of the surrounding buildings to meet the screening requirements. Approximately 75% of Building C will consist of screened parking. There is no unscreened parking.”

Staff comment: It appears that the applicant is in conformance to the TDDP for this requirement.

Siting Specifications

- 2. Maximum Block Length: Block lengths shall be a maximum of 400 feet in length; refer to the TDDP block registration plan (Map 13).**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“Building D Block exceeds 400 feet in length. The Building D Block is approximately 470 feet (curb to curb) along Hamilton Street.”

Staff comment: These blocks do not necessarily pose particularly odd shapes. It seems possible to create building blocks that could meet the 400-foot length. For example, one unit could be opened to provide an opening from Jamestown into the courtyard similar to the opening to the courtyard from Park Drive.

- 3. Lot Coverage: Building shall only occupy the lot area delineated in the siting specifications and shall be in accordance with the West Hyattsville TDDP. All buildings are required to be located at the build-to line and shall be located zero feet from the sidewalk edge. The sidewalk location and width shall be in accordance with the applicable streetscape sections and roadway segments of the TDDP and shall be delineated on the detailed site plan. The minimum open contiguous area shall comprise a minimum 15 percent of the total buildable area and can be located anywhere within the buildable area of the site.**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“The proposed CSP does not comply with Building Blocks for Hamilton Street (Map 13). The revised Block pattern evolved through planning review and meetings with the local municipality and community representatives. The CSP proposes a Build-To Line of 12-15 feet along Hamilton Street. Buildings C and D meet the 0 feet from sidewalk edge requirement. Buildings C and D do not meet the minimum 15 percent open contiguous area requirement. Building C has 0% open contiguous area and Building D has 0% open contiguous area along Hamilton Street.”

Staff comment: Again, lot coverage variations are reasonable considering the urban character of the development.

Park Drive

Height Specifications

1. **Building Height:** Principal building height is measured in stories. All buildings shall be a minimum of three stories and a maximum of four stories in height, except where otherwise noted in the TDDP. Residential point towers are permitted on development blocks S, X, and CC (see Map 13). These buildings shall be a minimum of 10 stories and a maximum of 12 stories in height. Mid-rise condominium buildings are permitted in development block EE (see Map 13). These buildings shall be a minimum of four stories and a maximum of six stories in height.

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“All the buildings on Park Drive conform to the height requirement except for Buildings J and D. Building J is 4-6 stories and Building D is 4-5 stories.”

Staff comment: Staff supports the additional height proposed for Buildings D and J. A building height amendment requires review and approval by the District Council in accordance with Section 27-548.09.01.

Siting Specifications

2. **Maximum Block Length:** Block lengths shall be a maximum of 400 feet in length; refer to the TDDP block registration plan (Map 13).

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“Building J Block is 530 feet (curb to curb) and Building E Block is 430 feet (curb to curb).”

Staff comment: While the shape of these building blocks is not particularly irregular, their relation to the Metro tracks makes the block difficult to dissect and the length is reasonable.

Residential Streets

Siting Specifications

2. **Maximum Block Length:** Block lengths shall be a maximum of 400 feet in length; refer to the TDDP block registration plan (Map 13).

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“Along Residential Streets (as shown on the Conceptual Land Use Plan), the block lengths are as follows:

“Block G—380 feet

“Block H—440 feet

“Block I—250 feet

“Block J—530 feet

“Block K, L, M—475 feet

“Block N, O, P— 475 feet

Block Q, R—475 feet”

Staff comment: Staff concurs with the proposed block lengths. As noted previously, while the shape of these building blocks is not particularly irregular, their relation to the Metro tracks makes the block length reasonable.

3. **Buildable Area: Building shall only occupy the lot area delineated in the siting specifications and shall be in accordance with the West Hyattsville TDDP. All single-family residential buildings are required to be located two feet back from the build-to line to provide additional room for a front porch as stated below in the element specifications. The sidewalk location and width shall be in accordance with the applicable streetscape sections and roadway segments of the TDDP and shall be delineated on the detailed site plan.**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“The area occupied by the buildings on the residential streets is as shown on the CSP. All residential streets incorporate sidewalks. Modified streetscape sections have been submitted with the CSP and shall be further delineated on the DSP.”

Staff comment: The requirement seems to address the architectural layout of the single-family detached dwelling, but the level of detail is such that it cannot be addressed at this time. Therefore, staff does not recommend an amendment at this time.

Local Access Street and Alley

Height Specifications

1. **Building Height: Principal building height is measured in stories. All buildings shall be a minimum of four stories and a maximum of six stories in height, except where otherwise noted in the TDDP. No accessory building shall be more than 18 feet to its eaves.**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“Buildings along alleys range from 3-6 stories in height. There are no local access streets within this CSP.”

Staff comment: The applicant is asking for relief in order to build structures three stories when the TDDP requires four stories. A building height amendment requires review and approval by the District Council in accordance with Section 27-548.09.01. The staff supports a revision to the building heights as stated above and as shown on the applicant’s exhibit “Building Heights.”

Siting Specifications

1. **Building Street Façade: The façades of all buildings shall be constructed at the build-to line (or sidewalk edge) for at least 75 percent of the street frontage of each block with the following exception: Block corners are exempt from the build-to line requirement if a special pedestrian-oriented building corner treatment is provided.**

The street façade shall be a single plane, limited to façade jogs of less than 24 inches, interrupted only by porches, stoops, bay windows, shop fronts, and balconies.

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“Building Street facades will be addressed at DSP.”

Staff comment: Staff concurs that building street facades will be addressed at DSP. No amendment is required at this time.

- 2. Maximum Block Length: Block lengths shall be a maximum of 400 feet in length; refer to the TDDP block registration plan (Map 13).**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“Modifications to Block lengths have been itemized above.”

Staff comment: As stated above, staff supports the variations to this requirement as is shown on the alternative land use plan.

- 3. Buildable Area: Building shall only occupy the lot area delineated in the siting specifications and shall be in accordance with the West Hyattsville TDDP. All single-family residential buildings are required to be located two feet back from the build-to line to provide additional room for a front porch as stated below in the elements specifications. The sidewalk location and width shall be in accordance with the applicable streetscape sections and roadway segments of the TDDP and shall be delineated on the detailed site plan.**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“Blocks and building areas are as shown on the proposed CSP. As it relates to alleys, specific design elements will be addressed at DSP.”

Staff comment: The staff agrees that this issue should be addressed at the time of the DSP review.

- 4. Side Yard Line: The minimum side setback is five feet.**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“Side setbacks will be addressed at DSP.”

Staff comment: The staff agrees that this issue should be addressed at the time of the DSP review.

- 5. Rear Yard Line: On sites with no alley access, there shall be a 12-foot setback from the rear yard line.**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“Rear yard lines will be addressed at DSP.”

Staff comment: The staff agrees that this issue should be addressed at the time of the DSP review.

STREETSCAPE STANDARDS

GENERAL DESIGN PRINCIPLES AND INTENT

Blocks and Alleys

- 3. Block Size: Block perimeters and lengths shall be in accordance with the West Hyattsville TDDP block registration plan. No block face shall exceed 400 feet in length without a street, common access easement, alley, or pedestrian pathway that provides through access to another street, alley, or pedestrian pathway.**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“See previous answers regarding 400 feet requirements.”

Staff comment: Again, staff supports the variations to the building block lengths as stated earlier in this report.

- 4. Alleys: Alleys shall provide access to the rear of all building lots and off-street parking facilities. Alley construction shall be required as part of any redevelopment project within the rear setback unless an alley already exists.**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“Alleys are incorporated into the Blocks containing Buildings G, H and K-R. Buildings A-F and I-J are served by streets.”

Staff comment: Alleys on the plan serve the single-family attached portions of the development. The requirement above seems to state that all buildings should be served by an alley, which is not reasonable considering the proposed uses such as multifamily development with interior parking structure, office and retail mixed-use buildings of 4–12 stories in height. Therefore the staff supports the request for relief from this development standard.

- 6. Shade Trees: At least one canopy shade tree per 200 square feet of the required open (unpaved) area shall be planted in the rear lot area and no closer than five feet to any common lot line. Trees shall be a minimum of four-inch caliper and ten feet in height. Tree species shall be as specified in the TDDP street tree list.**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“The proposed CSP is an urban transit oriented design. Shade trees are not proposed in the alley sections.”

Staff comment: This requirement does not make sense in the context of the proposed development of the TDDP as a whole. All of the single-family development is required to be served by alleys; alley design may include a minimal amount of unpaved surface at the rear of the units. Further, there is no requirement for unpaved/open space at the rear of the units. Size dimensions described above do not follow the industry standards, which are set by the American Standards for Nursery Stock, and the TDDP does not have a street tree list for alleys. Therefore, the staff does not recommend an amendment at this time, but it should be reanalyzed at the time of DSP.

8. Curb Cuts: Curb cuts shall be prohibited on Boulevard and Main Street development sites.

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“The proposed CSP incorporates curb cuts only as necessary to access structured parking.”

Staff Comment: The above TDDP requirement is problematic because curb cuts are a necessary element in the design of this type of high-intensity development in order to provide access to the parking structure and loading and service areas. The applicant’s request for relief is reasonable.

OFF-STREET PARKING

Configurations and Techniques:

2. Uses Within Parking Structures Along Street Frontages: Retail uses shall be provided on the ground floor of any parking structure with street frontage within commercial mixed-use blocks as identified in the West Hyattsville TDDP. Retail spaces on the ground floor shall have display windows, canopies/awnings, and recessed entrance doors to enhance the parking structure. Parking structures on corner lots shall provide ground-floor retail uses within the parking structure along both the front and side streets.

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“The commercial/mixed use blocks proposed on the revised CSP are contained in Blocks A, C, D, and F. On the frontages containing retail or commercial uses (as shown on the CSP and described herein) the retail extends along the front and sides at the corners. Not all facades contain ground level retail/commercial as specified above.”

Staff comment: In most cases the plans have provided for uses other than parking structures at the street level. However, Building C has an extensive amount of the parking structure at the street line of Ager Road and the street located along the north face of the building. Staff recommends that prior to the approval of a detailed site plan that the incorporation of live work units, or retail/office type uses be incorporated along the street frontage of Ager Road and the street bordering the north end of the parking structure.

5. Parking Structure Height: Structured parking shall be from a minimum of two stories to a maximum of five stories. Parking garages shall not exceed the height of the surrounding buildings and shall not visually dominate the block where visible from the street or other public space.

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“There are no stand alone parking structures. All structured parking is incorporated into the building design. Incorporated into Building C is the WMATA parking structure which is planned at 5-6 stories. Other garages will not exceed 5 stories.”

Staff comment: The staff supports the applicant’s proposal to allow the height of the WMATA parking structure to exceed 5 stories. However, it appears that the parking structures within building C will visually dominate the block. The staff recommends that the plans be revised to incorporate additional uses within the block to reduce the visual appearance of parking structure dominating the entire block.

A building height amendment requires review and approval by the District Council in accordance with Section 27-548.09.01.

- 6. Siting of Parking Structures With Street Frontage: All parking structures with street frontage shall be located at the build-to lines that shall be sited zero feet from the sidewalk edge to create a continuous street wall. Each applicant or the applicant’s heirs, successors, and/or assignees, shall be responsible for parking structure improvements as delineated in the West Hyattsville TDDP. Parking garages shall be located within the interior of a block, surrounded by buildings that front the street except where otherwise delineated in the West Hyattsville TDDP. Parking structures on corner lots shall meet the build-to lines along both the front and side streets.**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“There are no stand alone parking structures. All structured parking is incorporated into the building design, but are not necessarily surrounded on all four sides by buildings (Building A – surrounded on 4 sides; Building B – surrounded on 3 sides; Building C – surrounded on 2 1/3 sides; Building D – surrounded on 3 sides; Building E – surrounded on 3 sides; Building F – surrounded on 1 side but backs on to the tracks; Building – surrounded on 2 sides but backs onto the tracks; Building J – surrounded on 2 sides but backs onto the tracks. Mixed-use/commercial buildings (Buildings A; C; and F) meet the zero feet to sidewalk requirement. Residential buildings (Buildings B; D; E; I and J) include a green space strip. Parking structures have the same build to lines as the buildings they are incorporated in.”

Staff comment: The intent of the requirement above has not been fulfilled. The concept of limiting the amount of structured parking along the street edge is vital to the vibrancy of the streetscape of the project. Prior to the approval of a detailed site plan for the project, the plans should place other uses besides parking structures along the street edge, except those areas where WMATA parking structure(s) are proposed. Where parking structures are located along the street edge, the design of the parking structure should be of the highest visual quality and contribute toward the pedestrian experience.

- 7. Parking Structure Entrances and Exits (Single-Family Residential): Parking structure entrances and exits within single-family residential areas shall not be more than 80 square feet in area, and there shall not be more than one garage door for each 16 feet of building frontage. All townhouse and live/work unit garages shall be tuck-under. Access to parking garages from the street frontage shall be prohibited.**

Parking access shall consist of a single location point for entry/exit purposes to minimize curb cuts.

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“There are no parking structures within single family areas. The garage design for single family residential will be addressed at DSP; however, there will potentially be some parking garages proposed from the street frontage. Parking access will be reviewed at the time of DSP.”

Staff comment: Parking structures are not used to serve single-family development, so it is unclear if the requirement above was intended to refer to multifamily development. Even then, the requirement is difficult to understand. Staff agrees that parking access will be examined in detail at DSP, at which time requests to vary from the standards may be necessary.

- 8. Parking Structure Entrances and Exits (Multifamily/Nonresidential): Parking structure entrances and exits within multifamily residential or nonresidential areas shall not exceed 16 feet clear height and 24 feet clear width and shall not be sited within 100 feet of the block corner or another garage entry on the same block. Garage entry portals may be set back up to 24 inches behind the surrounding façade. Parking access shall consist of a single location point for entry/exit purposes to minimize curb cuts. Vehicle access from the street frontage shall be prohibited.**

The applicant provided the following response to the development standards above:

“Except that vehicles will have access from the street frontage, the CSP incorporates this principle. The garage in Building A has 1 entrance; Building B has 1 entrance; Building C has 3 entrances (includes main WMATA parking); Building D has 1 entrance; Building E has 1 entrance; Building F has 2 entrances; Building I has 1 entrance; and Building J has 1 entrance.”

Staff comment: This requirement should be reviewed at the time of the detailed site plan review, as the conceptual site plan does not provide the level of detail this requirement sets forth. Therefore, the staff does not recommend that the Planning Board take an action on this particular development standard.

6. The **Environmental Planning Section** provided the following analysis in conjunction with the revised plans as stated in their memo dated February 5, 2008.

The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the conceptual site plan for West Hyattsville Commons, CSP-05006, and Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/019/06, received on January 23, 2008. The additional information submitted, including a revised layout of the site, warrants minor revisions to some of the existing conditions recommended for approval and some new conditions. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of the revised conceptual site plan, CSP-05006 and Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/19/06, subject to the new and revised conditions listed at the end of this memo.

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed Parcel 1 of this site as part of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-92031, with Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/15/92, which was withdrawn, and Detailed Site Plans, DSP-96047 and DSP-96048 that were approved with an exemption from the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because that parcel contained less than 10,000 square feet of woodland. Parcel 115 was previously reviewed in conjunction with Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/246/91.

On September 28, 2006, the Planning Board approved CSP-05006 and TCPI/19/06. The case was appealed to the District Council on October 30, 2006; however, it was remanded back to the Planning Board March 12, 2007 for amendment of the site plan and staff and Board review. The revised plans were reviewed for conformance with the West Hyattsville sector plan, the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan, and the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

Because the building and street layout of the proposed application has changed, the relocation of some proposed Low Impact Development (LID) techniques was warranted. The revised Low Impact Development Design Plan submitted in the revised package shows all of the proposed concepts that were previously proposed, and applied to the new layout. The location of each of the concepts is clearly shown and identified on the plan, and is consistent with the recommendations of the West Hyattsville Sector Plan. The concept proposes 13 types of LID techniques that include green roofs, vegetative filters, naturalized water quality facilities, micro pools, and “green streets.” The revised LID design plan meets the recommendations of the adopted West Hyattsville Sector Plan with regard to the incorporation of Low Impact Development techniques.

Because the use of Low Impact Development techniques are a focus of the development of the site, joint reviews by the appropriate agencies prior to submittal of the first detailed site plan and prior to the issuance of the first grading permit are necessary to ensure that the concept is adequately addressed prior to implementation. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of CSP-05006 and TCPI/19/06 subject to the new and revised conditions as stated below.

Recommended Condition: Prior to the approval of any detailed site plans by the Planning Board for construction of any gross floor area on the subject site, a DSP for rough grading, infrastructure and stormwater management shall have received certificate approval.

Recommended Condition: Prior to acceptance of the detailed site plan for infrastructure, the applicant shall coordinate at least one meeting that includes DPW&T stormwater management reviewers and staff from M-NCPPC’s Planning Department to confer on the design of the stormwater management on the site. The stormwater management plan shall use the low-impact development techniques shown on the Low Impact Development Design Plan dated December 18, 2007. An approved stormwater management concept letter subsequent to that meeting shall be included in the first detailed site plan application for rough grading and infrastructure.

Recommended Revisions to Previous Conditions

The following are the previous conditions revised with new language recommendations. [Brackets] indicate deleted language and underlining indicates new language.

4. **[Prior to certificate approval of the CSP, the LID plan shall be revised to illustrate] At the time of submission of the detailed site plan for infrastructure, a plan showing how the run-off from each of the building roofs will be addressed using the [symbols] methods shown on the low-impact design plan dated [June 5, 2006] December 18, 2007. The plan shall clearly show the green building techniques to be employed throughout the project and which buildings will be constructed with green roofs and what portion, conceptually, will be green. Water quality green roofs**

shall not be located on top decks of garages that should be employed for outdoor recreational space.

6. Prior to [certificate approval of the CSP] approval of the detailed site plan for infrastructure, all proposed streets perpendicular to Northeast Branch that are not identified on the LID design plan dated [June 5, 2006] December 18, 2007, as an LID street shall be designed as green streets incorporating low impact development techniques with underground, connected soil volumes and surface tree grates. [Prior to certification of the CSP, the LID plan shall be revised to] The plan shall show the location of the green streets and include a [conceptual] detail of the street tree installation including a plan view and cross section of the above and below ground features. Jamestown Road and Hamilton Street shall be designed as green streets with medians that are designed with the same treatment as the trees along the green streets, unless another design is deemed more suitable. All LID green street designs shall be subject to the review and approval of DPW&T or other appropriate entity such as the City of Hyattsville.

Staff comment: The new recommended conditions and the revised conditions have been included in the recommendation section of this report.

7. The **Transportation Planning Section** reviewed the revised CSP and provided the following comments dealing with pedestrian and bicycle facilities in a memo dated February 8, 2008:

CSP-05006 was initially reviewed by staff in May 2006. Recommendations regarding pedestrian, trail, and bicycle facilities were made at that time and incorporated into the resolution (PBCPB No. 06-218). These conditions continue to be appropriate for the revised plan and should be included as part of the approval for the remanded plan. More specifically, Condition 11 (a – f) and Condition 15 continue to be applicable to the remand and should be carried forward on subject application.

In addition to Condition 11 and Condition 15 of PBCPB No. 06-218, staff also recommends the following conditions:

- a. Provide standard or wide sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, excluding alleys, unless modified by DPW&T or the City of Hyattsville.
 - b. The pedestrian walkway/tunnel near the West Hyattsville Metro Station will be evaluated at the time of DSP for Infrastructure. Appropriate improvements for public safety or accessibility will be recommended at that time, if necessary.
8. The **Transportation Planning Section** reviewed the revised CSP and provided the following additional comments in a memo dated February 11, 2008:

The revised conceptual site plan submitted proposes to develop the property under the M-X-T zoning with mix of residential, office and retail uses that may include up to 1,400 residential units (130 to 225 townhouse units, and 1,175 to 1,270 multi-family units), 200,000 to 230,000 Gross Square Feet (GSF) of office space, 62,500 to 92,500 GSF commercial retail, with a community center of at least 13,000 GSF. The revised plan proposes provision of no more than 3,858 parking and loading spaces, of which 641 will be constructed as replacement for existing metro's Park and Ride and Kiss and Ride parking spaces, in accordance with the recommended parking ratios contained in the WH-TDDP. The suggested 3,858 parking spaces include provision of 334 on-

street parking spaces, or more than eight percent, along streets and roadways within the West Hyattsville TDDP. This is done without providing any approval from the appropriate agencies having jurisdiction over these roadways. For these reasons, staff recommends that provision of on-street parking and conformance to the approved WH-TDDP parking ratios be revisited with each detailed site plan.

This memorandum is intended to provide analysis of a proposed development mix in response to the remand order from the District Council. The order did not specifically request that the Planning Board review its transportation adequacy findings made as part of the approval of the original CSP application (CSP-05006), and the companion Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-05145). As result, this review would be limited to the comparison of estimated site trip generation between the original plan and a proposed development mix suggested by the revised plan prepared per the remand order. This is done to determine whether or not a new adequacy determination would be required for the revised concept plan, and/or a new preliminary plan, if needed.

As a part of the original findings of adequacy, the total development and Maximum AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trips were limited to 1,400 residential units, 230,000 GSF of office space, and 62,000 GSF of retail space, or different mix of uses generating no more than 866(444 inbound, and 422 outbound), and 1,037 (491 inbound, 546 outbound) new AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trips. This finding, as stated, provides the needed flexibility in recommending changes to development quantities by type provided the resulting new AM and PM total vehicle trips generated are equal to or less than the above stated trip caps.

Based on the possible development ranges included in the revised site analysis, the applicant's traffic consultant has concluded that the suggested development levels of approximately 1,333 residential units (143 townhouses and 1,190 multi-family units), 213,000 Gross Square Feet (GSF) of office space, 79,200 GSF commercial retail, 13,000 GSF community center, would generate 813, and 1026 new vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours. The calculated AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trip estimates are 53 and 11 vehicle trips less than the approved 866 AM and 1,037 PM vehicle trip caps.

In addition to meeting the approved AM and PM vehicle trip caps, the development on subject property is subject to several additional transportation related conditions and is required to make several roadway improvements in the area pursuant to a finding of adequate public facilities made for the Concept Plan (CSP-05006), and the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-05145). These findings were supported by a traffic study submitted and reviewed by staff. Staff recommends inclusion of all transportation-related conditions as part of this and any subsequent approval.

The revised conceptual site plan proposes reasonable design alternatives for internal street network and major roadways serving the proposed site, some of which are not consistent with the previously approved cross sections, and established standards utilized by State, County and/or the City. The TDDP requires applicant to construct the needed streetscape and roadway improvements as well as providing acceptable coordination with applicable state, county or municipal agencies for maintenance of these facilities. Since this has yet to be done, staff recommends submission of a detailed site plan for infrastructure which clearly identifies all proposed public and private roadways and includes approval from the appropriate operating agency (City, DPW&T and /or SHA) on the appropriateness of the proposed street cross sections, design elements, rights-of-way limits, provision of on-street parking and street furniture, and the required maintenance authority.

Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that adequate transportation facilities would exist to serve the proposed development as required, if the revised conceptual site plan application, prepared per the District Council remand order, is approved with the following additional conditions to approval conditions contained in the Prince George's County Planning Board approval resolution (PGCPB No. 06-218):

- a. Prior to the approval each detailed site plan, the applicant shall provide a detailed trip generation tabulation which will demonstrate the projected total AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trips for the proposed development and all previously approved will be at or below the approved AM, and PM peak-hour vehicle trip caps of 866 (444 inbound, and 422 outbound), and 1,037 (491 inbound, and 546 outbound), respectively.
 - b. Prior to the approval of any detailed site plans (DSP) by the Planning Board for construction of any gross floor area on the subject site, a DSP for infrastructure which clearly identifies all proposed public and private roadways and includes approval from the appropriate operating agency (City, DPW&T and /or SHA) on the appropriateness of the proposed street cross sections, design elements, rights-of-way limits, provision of on-street parking and street furniture, and the required maintenance authority shall have received certificate approval.
9. The property is the subject of Preliminary Plan 4-05145 (PGCPB No. 06-262) and the resolution of approval was adopted on December 21, 2006. The preliminary plan remains valid until December 21, 2012 pursuant to Section 24-119(d)(6) or six (6) years from the date of adoption of the resolution of approval. The resolution contains 40 conditions. Of note is Condition 36 which contains the following transportation cap on the development:
- “Total development within the subject property shall be limited to 1,400 residential units, 230,000 GSF of office space, 62,000 GSF of retail space or any other development levels generating no more than 866 (444 inbound, and 422 outbound), and 1,037 (491 inbound, 546 outbound) new AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trips, excluding the community center. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein above shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.”
- Once the conceptual site plan is approved, the preliminary plan will be reviewed for conformance to the revised and approved conceptual site plan. If the previously approved preliminary plan substantially conforms to the new CSP, then a new preliminary plan will not be required. However, any substantial deviation from the new CSP or an increase in the traffic capacity beyond the approval within the preliminary plan proposed by future DSP's will require an new preliminary plan submission to determine adequacy of public facilities.
10. The staff of the **Department of Parks and Recreation** (DPR) has reviewed the conceptual site plan. Our review considered the recommendations of the Approved Transit District Development Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone, Master Plan for Planning Area 68, current zoning and subdivision regulations and existing conditions in the vicinity of the proposed development as they pertain to public parks and recreation facilities.

The subject remanded conceptual site plan application had been revised to address site design issues. Condition 12 of CSP-05006 address the parks and recreational facilities, and DPR staff believes that this condition should remain without change.

Condition 3c. of approved by the Planning Board CSP-05006 states:

Prior to approval of the conceptual site plan, the following issues shall be conceptually indicated with the appropriate graphics or notes; prior to approval of the applicable detailed site plan, the issues shall be resolved and appropriately delineated on the plans:

- c. Provide the Park Drive east/west private street connection to accommodate vehicular traffic in addition to the pedestrian promenade, if acceptable to the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR).**

Staff Comments: The applicant proposes Park Drive, an east/west street connection (60-foot right-of-way), which is in two locations impacts the adjacent parkland. DPR staff believes that this proposal will require disposal of the parkland. The existing parkland had been purchased by M-NCPPC with the funds established by Capper-Cramton Act for the protection of stream valleys of the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers. The disposal of this parkland is subject to the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) and M-NCPPC Planning Board and Full Commission approvals. DPR staff discussed with the applicant the possibility of land exchange to justify disposal of the parkland. The applicant agrees with DPR proposal in concept but believes that it is too premature to discuss the details of land exchange because of conceptual nature of the CSP-05006 application and future approval of the road alignment by DPW&T and Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA). DPR staff agrees to discuss the details of the land exchange and construction details of east/west trail connector at the time of the detailed site plan. The applicant submitted conceptual layout of the 10-foot-wide master planned trail along Park Drive. DPR staff finds this location of the trail acceptable.

DPR staff recommends to the Planning Board that all previously approved conditions related to the parks and recreation shall remain. In addition approval of the above-referenced remanded Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-05006 shall be subject to the following additional conditions:

- a. The applicant shall establish the exact location of the Park Drive (east/west road connection) and submit to DPR a land exchange proposal at least 60 days prior to submission of the first detailed site plan. The land exchange proposal shall clearly demonstrate that monetary and recreational value of land to be conveyed to M-NCPPC is greater than the value of disposed parkland. If DPR staff finds that the land proposed for exchange is not clearly more valuable, the applicant shall fund two appraisals to be ordered by DPR. The land exchange will be based on the values indicated in appraisals.
- b. The applicant shall work with the DPR staff to obtain National Capital Planning Commission approval for the disposal of parkland for road construction.

- 11. **Urban Design Section**—The following is a chart comparing the previously approved plans and the revised plan in regard to unit count:

	Previously approved plan	Revised plan
Single-family attached units (townhouses)	193	130–225 (143 shown on plan)
Multifamily units	1,170	1,000–1,270 (130 of the units so designated by the applicant are actually three-family dwellings dispersed among the townhouses)
Community Center	23,000 square feet	13,000 square feet
Retail	69,380 square feet	60,000–85,000 square feet
Office	226,620 square feet	200,000–220,000 square feet
Maximum retail/office proposed	296,000 square feet	292,000 square feet

A major change to the revised plan in regard to the unit count is the addition of 130 three-family dwellings that were not previously approved or noted in the plans. In the revised plan, the three-family dwellings are located on the west side of the development and result in a decrease in the number of townhouses and an increase of new product footprints that were not included in the original plans. Approximately 44 footprints will be the three-family dwellings. Another major change is that the community center, which is required by the TDDP, has changed from 23,000 square feet to 13,000 square feet. The retail and office uses have not changed substantially.

The revised design of the west side of the development includes the addition of the three-family dwelling type, which has been described by the applicant as two two-story units above one “flat” unit with three garage spaces (one for each unit). Other changes on the west side include the reduction of multifamily structures and the redesign of the roadway system, including a connection the east and west sides with a vehicular connection. In regard to open space and recreational facilities, the revised plan has reduced two major open space components on the west side of the development. The pedestrian connection from the east side of the site to the west side of the project was originally designed to include a large open urban square identified as a “civic green” located on the west side of the development. The revised plan has replaced this square with a small traffic circle and a median strip containing LID stormwater management techniques down the middle of a roadway.

The amount of open space depicted on the revised conceptual site plan located on the west side of the development is inadequate to serve the future residents. In addition to the change above, a substantial triangle-shaped green space in the middle of the attached housing area that included the community building and pool is also reduced. The staff recognizes that the project is located just north of the stream valley park. However, the project would benefit from the development of a substantial HOA recreational open green area that would provide sufficient open space for on-site recreational facilities. Therefore, the staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt a condition that deletes nine of the three-family dwellings and six townhouses within Block O, as shown on the illustrative conceptual site plan, in order to create a substantial green area comparable to the amount of green space previously shown in the originally approved plans.

Another concern is the loss of a community building and a swimming pool that were shown on the original plan but are no longer proposed on the revised plans. The applicant has explained that the number of units available to support the pool may be too low. Staff supports this contention because it is generally understood that a development of less than 500 dwelling units could not easily support a pool due to financial restraints. The HOA that would be responsible for the pool as shown on the original plans consisted of no more than 275 units. The applicant also explained that the multifamily units located within Buildings I and J may have a pool associated with those developments, which could offer memberships to the townhouse dwellers. The staff is not opposed to the idea of allowing some flexibility in the plans at this concept stage of the development. However, at the time of the DSP review, coordination of the development of recreational facilities to serve the future populations is appropriate. There is a condition of approval that requires adequate recreational facilities to be provided, at which time the staff would use the current practice of determining an appropriate mix of on-site facilities for each phase. The staff would like to ensure the future residents access to a pool on the west side of the development in at least one of the multifamily buildings, I or J, whichever is built first, within the project. Therefore the staff recommends that the DSP for either Building I or J, whichever comes in for review first, shall include a pool. Consideration should be given to allowing the residents of the townhouse development to have access to the pool with a membership.

The incorporation of three-family dwellings has resulted in more townhouses facing each other, creating mews of green space instead of what would normally be a street in traditional urban design. The lack of the streetscape element in the design increases the amount of lawn area on the site, but does not provide for the sense of shared public space. The pedestrian in those spaces begins to feel as if he or she is encroaching upon private yards and is less likely to walk freely in those areas.

Phase two of the development could be improved at the time of DSP if the following are taken into account:

- a. The use of three-family dwellings should only be allowed at the corners of each of the blocks, with strings of townhouse units arranged between the three-family dwellings.
- b. The mews between the units should be converted to streets in order to create a more walkable neighborhood between Blocks L and K and Q and R.
- c. The face-of-unit to face-of-unit distance should be a minimum of a 1:1 relationship where a mews is proposed.

In regard the east side of the development the reduction of the community building is the most dramatic change in the design of the plans. The original plans proposed a 23,000-square-foot facility and the revised plans propose a 13,000-square-foot facility. The community center was an element of the approved preferred land use plan. One of the problems with the concept of a community center is the ultimate operator of the facility. Without a commitment from either a public or private entity to operate the facility it is questionable if this can actually come to fruition. The size of the facility may have an indirect effect on the willingness of an entity to operate the facility.

Another concern relating to the revised plans is that Hamilton Square was previously designed as a hard-surfaced plaza, with a variety of paving materials and even a focal point at its center. The revised plan treats that space with much more lawn area, which may not withstand the pressure of human activity expected in the urban development. Therefore, the staff recommends that the

plans be revised to incorporate the same hardscape and level of detail in the treatment of the square as was shown on the original plans. This should be done prior to signature approval of the CSP plans.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design Section recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings contained herein and further:

- A. RECOMMENDS that the Planning Board recommend to the District Council that the proposed change to the building heights as shown on the applicant's Building Heights exhibits be APPROVED;
- B. RECOMMENDS that the Planning Board recommend to the District Council that the applicant's proposed alternative land use plan exhibit be APPROVED; and furthermore
- C. RECOMMENDS that the Planning Board APPROVE the proposed alternative development district standards as follows:

Building Envelope and Block Standards

- 3. Allows other uses besides retail at the ground level of buildings.
- 6. Allows other uses besides retail at the ground level of buildings.
- 8. Allows parking structures to be located at the street line.
- 9. Allows the reduction from 80 percent commercial uses on the ground floor of mixed-use buildings to the following minimum percentages:

Building A—80%
Building B—0% not a mixed use building
Building C—50 %
Building D—20 %
Building E—0 % not a mixed use building
Building F—30%
Buildings G-R—0% not mixed use buildings

Building Street Types

Height Specifications

- 2. Allows the building height of Building C to be a maximum of six stories.

Siting Specifications

- 2. Allows the building block length for Building B to be not more than 510 linear feet and the building block length for Building C to be not more than 430 linear feet.
- 3. Allows the maximum lot coverage required to be reduced from 15 percent to 0 percent.

Main Street—Hamilton Street

Height Specifications

2. Allows the building height of Building C to be a maximum of six stories. (Same as above)

Siting Specifications

2. Allows the building block length for Building B to be not more than 510 linear feet and the building block length for Building C to be not more than 430 linear feet. (Same as above)
3. Allows the maximum lot coverage required to be reduced from 15 percent to 0 percent. (Same as above)

Park Drive

Height Specifications

1. Allows the building height of Building D and Building J to be a maximum of six stories.

Site Specifications

2. Allows the building block length for Building E to be not more than 430 linear feet and the building block length for Building J to be not more than 530 linear feet.

Residential Streets

Siting Specifications

2. Allows the building block length for Building H to be not more than 440 linear feet and the building block length for Buildings K, L M, N, O, P Q and R to be not more than 475 linear feet.

Local Access Street and Alley

Height Specifications

1. Allows the building height along alleys to range from three to six stories in height.

Siting Specifications

2. Allows the building block length for Building H to be not more than 440 linear feet and the building block length for Buildings K, L M, N, O, P Q and R to be not more than 475 linear feet. (Same as above)

Streetscape Standards

3. Allows the block sizes to vary from the 400 linear feet as stated above.

4. Allows that all buildings do not have to be served by an alley.
8. Allows curb cuts at mid-block to the building.

Off-Street Parking

Configuration and Techniques

2. Allows the use of parking structures at the street-line.
5. Allows the WMATA parking structure to be 506 stories in height.
6. Allows the use of parking structures at the street-line. (Same as above)

D. RECOMMENDS that the Planning Board APPROVE conceptual site plan CSP-05006 and APPROVE Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/19/06 for the above-described land, subject to the following revised and additional conditions:

- *1. West Hyattsville Commons shall be developed in ~~[substantial]~~ conformance with the conceptual site plan illustrative plan dated ~~[September 1, 2006]~~ February 8, 2008. Substantial deviation from the illustrative plan is permitted only upon a finding by the Planning Board or District Council that the modified design is superior to the approved concept in its fulfillment of the purpose of the Transit District Overlay Zone.
- *2. Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan, the plans shall be revised as follows or the specified information shall be provided:
 - *a. Provide a community center ~~[on Street "A"]~~ in Building "C" that is in close proximity to Hamilton Square. Notes on the conceptual site plan shall state that:
 - ~~[(1)]~~ The community center location shall be clearly identified on Building C with a vertical blade marquee sign facing Hamilton Square or similar signage that establishes increased visibility of the community center; and
 - ~~[(2)]~~ If possible, locate all or a portion of the second floor of the community center over the retail facing Hamilton Square in Building "C."]
 - *b. Either eliminate any parking structure screened street frontage that exceeds the 25 percent limitation on ~~B[b]uilding[s] B [and G-1]~~ or provide architecturally articulated facades that eliminate the perception that the structures are parking garages.
 - *[e]. ~~[Provide conceptual building elevations for the WMATA Parking Structure, Building "A."]~~
- *3. Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan, the following issues shall be conceptually indicated with appropriate graphics or notes; prior to approval of the applicable detail site plan, the issues shall be resolved and appropriately delineated on the plans:

- a. Building heights for all buildings ~~[H-1 and H-2]~~ shall be ~~[six]~~ 3 to 12 stories or more to reduce block lengths, unless the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board at detailed site plan that this is not economically feasible, or that the additional ~~[approximate 100]~~ units gained by building more than four stories cause the project to exceed approved limits on vehicle trips, provided the additional residential units will not reduce the amount of approved office or retail space.
- *~~[b]. Provide a direct pedestrian connection from building H-1 and H-2 to the abutting Metro Station via an elevated pedestrian plaza and/or street level concourse that shall connect to the platform level at a new Metro station entrance, unless it can be demonstrated that this is not technically feasible or will not be permitted by WMATA.]~~
- *~~[c]. Provide the Park Drive east/west private street connection to accommodate vehicular traffic in addition to the pedestrian promenade, if acceptable to the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), the Department of Environmental Resources (DER), and the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR).~~
- *~~[d. Provide the Hamilton Street east/west street connection under the Metro tracks, unless shown to be technically infeasible or not permitted by WMATA.]~~
- *~~[e]. Provide a low impact development (LID) boulevard along the street that runs the length of the west boundary of the property on the portion of the ROW within the boundaries of the project, unless at detailed site plan for adjacent units it is demonstrated that provision of LID on one side of the road is technically infeasible or the LID features do not justify the water quality benefits that would result from them in the context of the overall LID program for the site.~~
- *4. At the time of submission of the detailed site plan for infrastructure ~~[Prior to certificate approval of the CSP, the LID plan shall be revised to illustrate]~~ a plan showing how the run-off from each of the building roofs will be addressed using the ~~[symbols]~~ methods shown on the plan dated ~~[June 5, 2006]~~ December 18, 2007. The plan shall clearly show the green building techniques to be employed throughout the project and which buildings will be constructed with green roofs and what portion, conceptually, will be green. Water quality green roofs shall not be located on top decks of garages that should be employed for outdoor recreational space.
5. Prior to certificate approval of the TCP I, all plans shall be revised to show the same building and street layout as that shown on the CSP.
- *6. Prior to ~~[certificate]~~ approval of the detailed site plan for infrastructure ~~[CSP]~~, all proposed streets perpendicular to Northeast Branch that are not identified on the LID design plan dated ~~[June 5, 2006]~~ December 18, 2008, as an LID street shall be designed as green streets incorporating low impact development techniques with underground, connected soil volumes and surface tree grates. ~~[Prior to approval of the Detailed Site Plan certification of the CSP, t].~~ The LID plan shall be revised to show the location of the green streets and include a ~~[conceptual]~~ detail of the street tree installation including a plan view and cross section of the above and below ground features. Jamestown Road and Hamilton Street shall be designed as green streets with medians that are designed

with the same treatment as the trees along the green streets, unless another design is deemed more suitable.

7.
 - a. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan, the TCPI shall be revised to show disturbance of only those areas that are necessary for development and all proposed buildings and grading within the limits of disturbance shall be shown. This shall include off-site areas.
 - b. Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan, the TCPI shall be revised to add the following note: "All street trees used in conjunction with low impact development techniques may be used toward meeting the woodland conservation requirements. The credit shall be calculated using the anticipated tree canopy at ten years' growth."
8. A Phase I noise study shall be included as part of the preliminary plan application. The noise study shall address the location of the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn contour and the contour shall be shown on the revised TCPI. A Phase II noise study shall be provided with the detailed site plan.
9. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan, a revised and approved stormwater management concept letter and associated plans shall be submitted. The plan shall show the incorporation of all required LID techniques. The preliminary plan and revised TCPI shall reflect the elements of the concept plan.
10. At the time of detailed site plan, the DSP shall show the details of each of the proposed LID techniques.
- *1[0]1. Prior to acceptance of the first detailed site plan, the application package shall be inspected to ensure that it includes a revised Type II tree conservation plan for the Chillum Park property that shows the regulated features, all proposed clearing, a clear limit of disturbance, and all information required on a TCPII.
- *1[+]2. In conformance with the adopted West Hyattsville Transit District Development Plan, the applicable detailed site plans shall include the following and apply to the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees:
 - a. Provide combined parking and bike lanes along the subject site's entire frontage of Ager Road per the Boulevard Street Section included on page 66 of the adopted and approved Transit District Development Plan, unless modified by DPW&T. Signage and pavement markings for the bike lanes should be in conformance with the 1999 AASHTO *Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities*.
 - b. Provide the wide pedestrian zone and minimum seven-foot-wide sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of Ager Road per the TDDP, as shown on submitted street section 16-16.
 - c. Curb extensions, curb cuts, crosswalks, and pedestrian refuges are to be evaluated in conformance with the TDDP streetscape standards.

- d. All construction and/or relocation of the Northwest Branch Trail shall be approved by the Department of Parks and Recreation and be in conformance with the current Parks and Recreation guidelines and standards.
- *e. Provide [~~additional~~] trail connections or walkways in the townhouse portion of the development to [~~more~~] directly accommodate residents walking to Metro and/or other uses on the subject site. These connections can be made between groups of townhouses and other available open space, and appropriate locations should be identified.
- f. The number and location of bicycle parking spaces shall be determined in conformance with the Bikeways and Bicycle Parking section of the approved TDDP.

*1[2]3. West Hyattsville Commons shall be subject to the following conditions regarding recreational facilities:

- a. The applicant, his heirs, successors, and/or assignees, shall provide adequate, private recreational facilities in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreational Facilities Guidelines*.
- *b. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Section of DRD for adequacy and location during the detailed site plan review for all residential development.
- c. Submission of three original, executed private recreational facilities agreements (RFA) to DRD for their approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a final plat. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.
- d. Submission to DRD of a performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee for the construction of private recreational facilities in an amount to be determined by DRD, within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits.
- e. At detailed site plan, the developer, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall satisfy the Planning Board that there are adequate provisions to assure retention and a future maintenance of the proposed private recreational facilities.
- f. Prior to approval of the first detailed site plan, the applicant shall reach an agreement with DPR regarding the maintenance and security of the promenade to ensure that DPR will not be burdened with unreasonable maintenance or security costs.
- g. Submission of three original, executed public recreational facilities agreements (RFA) for the construction and maintenance of the promenade to DPR for their approval, three weeks prior to submission of a final plat. Upon approval by DPR, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

- *1[3]4. Total development within the subject property shall not exceed ~~[be limited to]~~ 1,400 residential units, ~~[230,000]~~ 220,000 gross square feet of office space, and ~~[62,000]~~ 85,000 gross square feet of retail space, or any other mixture of unit type or development levels generating no more than 866 (444 inbound, and 422 outbound), and 1,037 (491 inbound, 546 outbound) **new** AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trips, excluding the community center.
- *1[4]5. Total parking that will be provided within the subject property shall be limited to ratios indicated in CR-59-2006, unless revised by the District Council, and 220 spaces as on-street parking, only if determined to be acceptable by the City of Hyattsville, DPW&T, and/or SHA.
- *1[5]6. Detailed site plans shall, at a minimum, provide the level of pedestrian connections that are shown conceptually on the conceptual site plan and shall observe the following principles to the extent possible:
- Providing direct pedestrian connections to the Metro station.
 - Siting buildings closer to the Metrorail station and siting parking farther away.
 - Placing building entrances closer to rather than farther from the pedestrian network.
- *1[6]7. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (1) have full financial assurances through either private money or full funding in the county's capital program, (2) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (3) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:
- a. Modification of northbound Queen Chapel Road at Chillum Road to include an exclusive left-turn lane, two through lanes and a shared through/right lane, and any other intersection improvements deemed needed by SHA. All these improvements shall be implemented according to SHA standards.
 - b. Modify westbound Hamilton Street at Queen Chapel Road to include an exclusive left-turn lane, two through lanes, and an exclusive right-turn lane, and any other intersection improvements deemed needed by SHA and /or DPW&T. All these improvements to be implemented according to DPW&T and/or SHA standards.
 - c. If deemed appropriate by DPW&T and /or SHA, modify northbound Queen Chapel Road between Chillum Road and Ager Road to accommodate the proposed third through lane recommended along north bound Queen Chapel at Chillum Road, and any other improvements deemed needed by SHA. All these improvements to be implemented according to SHA standards.
 - d. Submission of acceptable traffic signal warrants studies to DPW&T for the intersections of Ager Road with Lancer Drive and Ager Road with Nicholson Road. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of DPW&T. If signals are deemed warranted by DPW&T, the applicant shall

bond the signals prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property and install them at a time when directed by DPW&T. The requirements for the signal warrant studies may be waived by DPW&T if that agency determines in writing that there are sufficient recent studies available to make a determination regarding these two signals.

- e. Submission of acceptable detailed queue analysis using the total projected traffic for the intersection of Hamilton Street with Ager Road to DPW&T, and if deemed needed by DPW&T, the provision of double right-turn lanes along west bound Hamilton Street, and double left-turn lanes along south bound Ager Road, per DPW&T standards.

*1[7]8. The phasing schedule for the project shall be as follows: ~~[applicant shall not receive more than 500 building permits for residential units prior to receiving building permits for at least 65,000 square feet of gross floor area for the proposed office and/or retail space. If, however, the applicant applies for a building permit for Building C or Building D, both of which are mixed use retail/residential buildings, the above referenced restriction shall not apply. Additionally, the applicant shall not receive more than 1,000 total building permits for residential units prior to receiving building permits for 220,000 total square feet of gross floor area of the office/retail space (which includes the first 65,000 square feet of office/retail space). In addition, prior to issuance of the 750th building permit for residential units, the applicant shall submit the following for review by the Planning Board as they relate to the phasing thresholds above:]~~

- ~~[a. a report on present and planned future efforts to market available office space at West Hyattsville Commons to possible tenants]~~

- ~~[b. a market study examining absorption rates and the state of the office market in Hyattsville, College Park, Riverdale Park, and Greenbelt.]~~

- a. Phase I (a) and (b)—Buildings/Blocks A and C and Hamilton Square—Prior to the issuance of building permits for any future phases other than I(a) and (b), the WMATA garage shall be completed and open to traffic; the WMATA Kiss-and-Ride shall be constructed and open to traffic; the remaining portion of Block C shall be completed and use and occupancy permits issued for no less than 19,000 square feet of the retail GFA in Block C; and Hamilton Square shall be constructed and landscaped.

- b. Phase I (c) and Phase II—Building/Block B G, H, K–R inclusive

- c. Phase III—Buildings D, E and F—Prior to the issuance of building permits for Buildings D and E within Phase III, Building F shall be constructed and use and occupancy permits issued for no less than 3,700 square feet of the retail GFA in Block F.

- d. Phase IV – Buildings I and J

No buildings within a later phase shall be issued building permits, except as noted above, before building permits for all buildings in the preceding phase have been issued.

*1[8]9. Prior to the approval of the applicable detailed site plan, the following issues shall be addressed:

- a. Brick fronts shall be a standard feature for no less than 60 percent of all townhouses.
- *[b. ~~The pool house on Block “I” shall be placed in a visually prominent location, in a building that is clad primarily with brick or other attractive masonry.]~~
- *b[e]. Entrance features including signage, landscaping, and/or landmark or identity structures shall be shown on the detailed site plan and shall be appropriately coordinated in design.
- *c[d]. Demonstrate building massing with walls that do not exceed the 40-foot limit for blank, uninterrupted lengths without architectural features.
- *[d. ~~Show good faith efforts to provide retail uses along the southern side of the WMATA parking structure, Building “A,” at time of detailed site plan for the WMATA parking structure.]~~

*[19. ~~Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan:~~

- ~~a. Locate all proposed entrance features and gateways on the conceptual site plan.~~
- ~~b. Provide a design guidelines and standards booklet for the proposed West Hyattsville Commons development. The booklet shall describe the design principals and standards, accompanied by illustrations and photographs, for the following commercial and residential components of the project:~~

~~Building Envelope and Block Standards~~

- ~~i. General Design Principals and Intent~~
- ~~ii. Building Street Types~~

~~Streetscape Standards~~

- ~~iii. General Design Principals and Intent~~
- ~~iv. General Streetscape Standards~~

~~Architectural Standards~~

- ~~v. General Design Principals and Intent~~
- ~~vi. Building Facades~~
- ~~vii. Window and Door/Entrances~~
- ~~viii. Signage~~

~~Parking Standards~~

~~ix. General Design Principals and Intent On Street Parking~~

~~x. Off Street Parking~~

~~xi. Bikeways and Bicycle Parking]~~

NEW CONDITIONS

- *20. The applicant shall establish the exact location of the Park Drive (east/west road connection) and submit to DPR a land exchange proposal at least 60 days prior to submission of the first detailed site plan. The land exchange proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the monetary and recreational value of land to be conveyed to M-NCPPC is greater than the value of disposed parkland. If DPR staff finds that the land proposed for exchange is not clearly more valuable, the applicant shall fund two appraisals to be ordered by DPR. The land exchange will be based on the values indicated in appraisals.
- *21. The applicant shall work with DPR staff to obtain National Capital Planning Commission approval for the disposal of parkland for road construction.
- *22. Prior to the approval each detailed site plan, the applicant shall provide a detailed trip generation tabulation which will demonstrate the projected total AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trips for the proposed development and all previously approved vehicle trips will be at or below the approved AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trip caps of 866 (444 inbound, and 422 outbound), and 1,037 (491 inbound, and 546 outbound), respectively.
- *23. Prior to the approval of any detailed site plans (DSP) by the Planning Board for construction of any gross floor area on the subject site, a DSP for infrastructure which clearly identifies all proposed public and private roadways and includes approval from the appropriate operating agency (city, DPW&T and /or SHA) on the appropriateness of the proposed street cross sections, design elements, rights-of-way limits, provision of on-street parking and street furniture, and the required maintenance authority shall have received certificate approval.
- *24. Provide standard or wide sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, excluding alleys, unless modified by DPW&T or the City of Hyattsville.
- *25. The pedestrian walkway/tunnel near the West Hyattsville Metro Station will be evaluated at the time of DSP for infrastructure. Appropriate improvements for public safety or accessibility will be recommended at that time, if necessary.
- *26. Prior to the review and approval of any detailed site plans by the Planning Board for construction of any gross floor area on the subject site, a DSP for rough grading, infrastructure, and stormwater management shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board and shall have received certificate approval.

- *27. Prior to acceptance of the detailed site plan for infrastructure, the applicant shall coordinate at least one meeting that includes DPW&T stormwater management reviewers and staff from M-NCPPC's Planning Department to confer on the design of the stormwater management on the site. The stormwater management plan shall use the low impact development techniques shown on the low impact development design plan dated December 18, 2007. An approved stormwater management concept letter subsequent to that meeting shall be included in the first detailed site plan application for rough grading and infrastructure.
- *28. Prior to the approval of a DSP for Building C, the applicant should consider the use of either live/work units or retail/office uses along the street edge of Ager Road, but not in the area of the WMATA garage, and along the street edge of the street located on the north side of the parking structure, or that the façade of the garage be designed, as shown in the CDP exhibits, to mimic those of attractive commercial buildings which will screen the horizontal tier structure of the garage.
- *29. Prior to the approval of a DSP for Building B, the relationship of Building B to the internal street line should be improved by adding residential units along the frontage of the internal street, instead of 260 linear feet of parking garage.
- *30. Prior to the approval of a DSP for Building F, a shadow study should be submitted to indicate the impact of shadow on the plaza for the four seasons of the year. Adjustments to the height of the building, from what is currently shown as an 8–12 story building on the CSP, shall be considered.
- *31. Prior to the approval of a DSP for a multifamily structured located on the west side of the development, the recreational facility package for the residents shall include a pool of sufficient size to serve the residents and the single-family attached neighborhood. Consideration should be given to allowing the residents of the HOA to have access to the pool with a membership.
- *32. The following issues shall be addressed prior to the approval of a DSP for the single-family neighborhood:
- a. The use of three-family dwellings should only be allowed at the corners of each of the blocks, with strings of townhouse units arranged between the three-family dwellings.
 - b. The mews between the units should be converted to streets in order to create a more walkable neighborhood between Blocks L and K and Q and R.
 - c. The face-of-unit to face-of-unit distance should be a minimum of a 1:1 relationship where a mews is proposed.
- *33. Prior to the approval of Phase I of the development, the size of the community center and the determination of an entity to operate the facility shall be resolved.

- *34. Prior to signature approval of the CSP, the plan shall be revised to reflect the same amount of hardscape and level of detail in the treatment of Hamilton Square as was shown on the original CSP.