

February 9, 2004

MEMORANDUM:

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor

FROM: Susan Lareuse, Planner Coordinator

SUBJECT: Prince George's Center
Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ)
Detailed Site Plan DSP-03036

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the detailed site plan and requested amendments for the proposed shopping center and office building complex and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of DISAPPROVAL.

EVALUATION

The detailed site plan was reviewed and evaluated for compliance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of the Prince George's Transit District Development Plans (TDDP).
- b. The requirements of Part 10A, Overlay Zones, of the Zoning Ordinance.
- c. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the C-S-C Zone.
- d. The requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.

- e. Referrals.

FINDINGS

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

1. The detailed site plan is for construction of six separate buildings consisting of 77,077 square feet of gross floor area in Subarea 10A of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone. The site consists of approximately 6.8 acres of land in the C-S-C Zone and is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of East West Highway and Toledo Terrace. The existing site is vacant and wooded, consisting of a deep ravine created from stormwater runoff from the adjacent developments.
2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	C-S-C	C-S-C
Use(s)	Vacant	Shopping center and office building complex
Acreage	6.806	6.806
Lots	1	1
Parcels	0	0
Square Footage/GFA	0	Bank: 3,000 SF Restaurant: 9,597 SF Office: 30,000 SF one floor retail: 10,000 SF Retail 1: 6,000 SF Retail 2: 9,240 SF <u>Retail 3: 9,240 SF</u> Total = 77,077 SF
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	0	0.24

3. The State Highway Administration (SHA) reviewed the previously submitted plans for the development and raised a number of concerns regarding the proposed plans for development. [redundant—could say “previously submitted plans and raised a number of concerns regarding the proposed development”] First, the plans proposed to locate a 42-inch storm pipe within the right-of-way of MD 214 (Central Avenue). SHA will not support the proposal to place the pipe in the right-of-way because of maintenance issues. The pipe is carrying approximately 23 acres of stormwater runoff from the adjacent Prince George’s Shopping Center site. The staff met with both the SHA representative and the Department of Environmental Resources (DER) staff to discuss this issue on January 17, 2004. It was made clear that SHA does not consider it to be in the public interest to agree to maintain the pipe within SHA’s right-of-way.

The applicant submitted a revised detailed site plan package on February 9, 2004. These plans eliminate the 42-inch pipe from the SHA right-of-way, but the site plan does not show its new location. The applicant did submit the stormwater management concept plan, which shows the 42-inch pipe placed within the limits of the site adjacent to the Toledo Terrace right-of-way. The same plan also shows an 18-inch pipe in the SHA right-of-way. No evidence has been submitted that the SHA will allow the proposed 18-inch stormdrain pipe within the right-of-way.

Further, at the January 17, 2004, meeting between DER staff and MNCPPC staff, DER staff indicated that the county would;

- A. Require a minimum 25-foot-wide easement for the placement of the pipe on site, located outside of the ten-foot-wide public utility easement (which is located adjacent to the right-of-way).

- B. Require the easement to be at least one foot off the face of any building.

The stormwater management plans do not meet these requirements. The plans proposed the 25-foot-wide easement placed over the public utility easement. Evidence that the applicant has the permission of the public utilities to place the stormdrain easement over the PUE has not been provided and staff questions whether the applicant has the authority to place another easement over the PUE, even if the Department of Environmental Resources approves the stormwater management concept plan.

These issues have major design impacts to the current site layout and could result in reduced building footprints. Staff believes that the approval of the detailed site plan at this time would be premature without the pipes shown on the detailed site plans and without the final approval by the appropriate agencies, such as the SHA, DER and the public utility companies.

4. The previously approved plan was not in conformance with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03033 in that the detailed site plan for development of the subject property showed 0.58 acre of woodland clearing and grading on adjacent parkland to the north in order to maximize development of the site. However, the applicant submitted a revised plan on February 9, 2004, which removed grading from the park property along the north property line through the use of a retaining wall. No details or specifications of the retaining wall have been provided, nor have top and bottom elevations of the wall been provided.

The applicant proposes two stormwater management outfalls along the western property line in an environmentally sensitive area of the park. The stormwater management plan, including the associated outfalls and drainage ways on parkland, should be reviewed and approved by DPR prior to approval of the grading permit.

5. The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the plans and has a number of concerns. One of the purposes of the Transit District is to promote Metro ridership. If excessive parking is proposed on the site, then the project promotes vehicular traffic, not pedestrian traffic.

*****According to mandatory development requirement P7, the following is required:

The Preferred Parking Cap for each land use type in the transit district (Table Five) shall apply to all new development in the district.

According to the calculations within table five for the preferred parking cap, the applicant is only allowed to have 232 surface parking spaces versus the 288 spaces proposed on the plan. Considering that the proposed development only equates to a 0.23 floor area ratio, the justification to utilize the premium parking is questionable. In order to exceed the preferred parking cap, the applicant must submit a proposal with a justification statement for evaluation by the Planning Department, which has not been done as of the writing of this report.

6. The plan is not in conformance with a number of the requirements of the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP). Section 27-548.08(c), contains the required findings for a detailed site plan in the Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ).

(A) The Transit District Site Plan is in strict conformance with any Mandatory Development Requirements of the Transit District Development Plan;

The detailed site plan is not in strict conformance with all of the mandatory development requirements. Mandatory development requirements are made up of primary and secondary requirements. The Zoning Ordinance in Section 27-548.09.01(b)(1), Amendment of the Approved Transit District Overlay Zone, allows the owner of a property to request a deviation from the mandatory requirements and states the following:

(b) Property Owner.

- (1) A property owner may ask the District Council, but not the Planning Board, to change the boundaries of the T-D-O Zone, a property's underlying zone, the list of the allowed uses, building height restrictions or parking standards in the Transit District Development Plan. The Planning Board may amend the parking provisions concerning the dimensions, layout, or the design of parking spaces or parking lots. (Emphasis added.)**

The owner's representative has filed a request to change the minimum building height on this site from four stories to one story. Section 27-548.09(b)(5) states the following:

- (5) The District Council may approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove any amendment requested by a property owner under this Section. In approving an application and site plan, the District Council shall find that the proposed development conforms with the purposes and recommendations for the Transit Development District, as stated in the Transit Development District Plan, and meets applicable site plan requirements. (Emphasis added.)**

The District Council has mandatory review of this project because the applicant is asking for a modification to one of the requirements that is only allowed if granted by the District Council. **In the case the Planning Board provides a recommendation to the District Council. [incomplete sentence]** The applicant is requesting relief from the following mandatory development requirement:

P86 The minimum building height shall be 4 stories.

In order to understand the issue of height as it relates to Subarea 10A, the purpose statement within Subarea 10A states the following:

“To provide additional office space adjacent to the existing low-rise office at the intersection of Toledo Terrace and East West Highway and provide the building mass to create a gateway into the transit district.”

The following other mandatory development requirements also relate to height and architecture:

P87 The maximum building height shall not exceed 8 stories.

S61 Architecture shall be high quality, enduring and distinctive.

S62 Any building located at the corner of East West Highway and Toledo Terrace shall be designed with equal orientation to both rights-of-way.

There shall be no surface parking lot located between the building and East West Highway.

The TDDP purpose statement for Subarea 10A envisioned a four-story or taller office building, up to eight stories in height at this location, which would have created the mass for a substantial landmark upon entering the transit district. The second requirement above requires high-quality architecture. As an alternative to the vision of the plan, the applicant has proposed a mixed-use development, similar to a typical integrated shopping center with six separate buildings, including three retail multiple tenant buildings, a restaurant, and two office buildings, one of which is a bank. All buildings are one-story, except for a four-story office building proposed at the rear of the property. The mixed use on this site is generally horizontal; however, one building proposes retail on the first floor and three stories of office above. These proposed uses are consistent with the C-S-C zoning on the property.

The applicant, in a memorandum dated September 27, 2003, Norman D. Rivera to Susan Lareuse, provides the following justification for the reduction in the minimum required height of buildings in Subarea 10A:

“The heights for all structures are proposed to be between one, two and three stories, or a minimum of 16 feet in height. These are attractive high-quality buildings with architecturally pleasing facades and treatments. In combination with the provided landscaping and other design elements, it is our opinion the minimum height requirement can be modified. In our opinion, the modification will not be a detriment to the public, health, safety and welfare. Rather the facilitation of development of this site will further serve the goals of the transit

district by providing needed retail services and banking facilities to the surrounding residential areas and users of the Metro.

“Furthermore, it is our opinion that the four-story requirement dealt with the site as if it were to be office, which is not proposed at this time. The above retail uses are permitted by the underlying C-S-C Zone, and as such, we believe the intent of the guideline is not to be strictly construed.”

Comment: The applicant argues that the modification will not be detrimental to the public and asserts that the retail services and banking are needed in the area. Neither of these arguments supports the criteria for approval of the request. Section 27-548.09(b)(5) states that the District Council shall find that the proposed development conforms with the purposes and recommendations for the Transit Development District, as stated in the Transit Development District Plan, and meets applicable site plan requirements.

The Community Planning Division provides the following recommendation regarding this proposal by the applicant:

“The plan does not conform to the TDDP for building height because the proposed one-story buildings are less than the minimum four-story building height requirement. In addition, the proposed development does not achieve the design goals of the transit district (urban design, p. 28) for “placement of buildings...to define space, create a pedestrian-friendly environment and minimize views of parking areas.” Most of the proposed buildings are up close to the street edge; however, the buildings have no relationship to one another and do not portray a cohesive design element. The development appears to be a typical suburban development with six pad sites consisting

of retail shops, bank, restaurant, and an office building. This building arrangement places the prominent three-story office building to the rear of the site. The TDDP purpose for this property (TDDP page 115, Subarea 10A—Purpose) states “provide office space...at the intersection of Toledo Terrace and East West Highway.” The architectural footprint of the pad sites does not relate in shape nor design features; some buildings are square and some are angled. The applicant should redesign the square building adjacent the median entrance off East West Highway to provide a coordinated entrance design/relationship with the other angled buildings. The plan should show compliance with the TDDP-P86 requirement.”

The staff recognizes from a site design standpoint that the plan’s most desirable feature in the layout is the placement of “twin” buildings at the intersection of East West Highway and Toledo Terrace that will visually dominate that corner. However, the design of the architectural elevations for the buildings, as viewed from the intersection, does not provide the focal point necessary to avoid the appearance of the buildings turning their backs on the street. The site plan places a third, large, box-shaped building near the build-to line and finally places a fourth building, the proposed bank building, near the build-to line of East West Highway. This design places the architectural elevations of the buildings in the visually prominent streetscape.

One of the primary concerns of the staff is that the project be architecturally coordinated so that all the buildings appear harmonious. However, the architectural elevations show a variety of materials and do not provide for repetition of materials in a consistent manner. Currently the architectural elevations show the bank and the office building to be primarily brick. All of the retail buildings, with the exception of the restaurant, are similarly designed and include the use of split-face block at the base of buildings with

EIFS (a synthetic dryvit-like material) above. None of the retail buildings incorporates brick into the exterior finish; however, the bank building is all brick. Detailing between the buildings should be coordinated with architectural renderings and material boards in order to properly evaluate the project prior to the approval by the Planning Board.

Without this information, the staff is unable to conclude that there is sufficient justification to recommend approval of the applicant's request to modify the mandatory development requirement P86, which calls for a minimum building height of four stories.

7. The detailed site plan as submitted for development at the Prince George's Center-Contee Parcel A (commercial shopping center) does not conform to the TDDP public transit goals and mandatory development requirements for 40-foot pedestrian zone/streetscape improvements, sign plan, building height, 30-foot landscape strip, pedestrian walkways, crosswalks, street trees, paving materials, streetscape elements, building materials, building design consideration, plaza paving materials, accessible plaza slopes and bus shelter/waiting area provision, plaza trees, parking lot screening, light poles, 1.25-foot-candle light levels, light glare prevention, light fixtures, location of bike racks, trash receptacles, high-quality architecture, accessible parking slopes, and public transit goals. The applicant is also asking for relief from the following mandatory development requirements (these requirements do not require mandatory review by the District Council).

- **P1 Unless otherwise stated within the Subarea Specific Requirements, each developer, applicant, and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assigns, shall be responsible for streetscape improvements along the entire length of the property frontage from the building envelope to face of curb. (See Figures 7, 8 and 9. Toledo Terrace: 20-foot pedestrian zone; East West Highway: 40-foot pedestrian zone; Belcrest Road: 20-40 foot pedestrian zone.) These improvements shall be included as**

part of any application for building or grading permits, except for permits for interior alterations which do not constitute redevelopment as defined in the previous chapter. No building or grading permits shall be issued without a Detailed Site Plan which indicates conformance with the streetscape requirements of the TDDP. Construction of the streetscaping improvements shall be in phase with development, or the construction schedule shall be determined at the time of Detailed Site Plan.

The applicant provides the following justification statement in memorandum dated January 30, 2004, Norman Rivera to Susan Lareuse:

“The site plan indicates substantial compliance with this requirement. A pedestrian zone which ranges approximately from 26’ to 34’ in width has been provided along Route 410. This area includes a 10’ minimum wide green strip, with an 8’ wide trail/sidewalk, and an additional 6’ wide grass strip. Likewise, an approximately 16’ wide pedestrian area is provided along Toledo Terrace. This area includes an 8’ wide landscaped strip and an 8’ wide sidewalk/trail. The building along Toledo Terrace must be shifted to accommodate the SD easement adjacent to the r/w.

“The fixtures or their equals will be provided as proposed to be conditioned by this DSP with respect to trash receptacles, light poles, and benches. We seek a modification of the sidewalk from 11’ to 8’ as that is the existing standard for other similar projects in the TDDP. The bus shelter will not be utilized for advertising thus reducing visual pollution in the Transit District.”

The Community Planning Division offers the following opinion:

“The applicant’s plan does not meet the requirements for the East West Highway pedestrian zone or the streetscape improvements. The TDDP envisions this site as part of a significant gateway to the transit district and the Prince George’s Plaza Metro Station, and it is bordered by a prominent major roadway (East West Highway) and a prominent residential street (Toledo Terrace). The TDDP provides specific guidelines that will achieve a prominent gateway for the transit district. Successful urban environments warrant people activity along the street to promote activity and add marketable retail, curb and pedestrian appeal. The pedestrian zone is provided for safe pedestrian movement away from vehicular traffic. The applicant’s reduction in the required 40-foot pedestrian zone along East West Highway is not justified by the submitted plan because there is ample room on this site to provide for this TDDP requirement. Figures 7, 8 and 9 refer to the required TDDP crosswalk detail, streetscape, and street trees. In addition to the discussion listed below for the TDDP-S8 requirement, the remaining streetscape elements listed in Appendix A of the TDDP require that the streetscape be consistent with that of Belcrest Road:

- “a. Trash receptacles (Victor Stanley Model S-424 burgundy color)

- “b. Light poles (Hadco pedestrian light fixture, #85277, 250 Watt, High Pressure Sodium, burgundy color, ballast module)

- “c. Benches (Victor Stanley Model RB-28, match color, style and size of existing benches on Belcrest Road)

- “d. Sidewalk (11-foot minimum scored concrete walk bordered and cross sectioned using eight-inch x eight-inch pavers (ruby squares by Hoyle Stone) adjacent a scored concrete; applicant should match the existing sidewalk details provided along East West Highway adjacent to the Outback Steakhouse parcel development at Prince George’s Plaza
- “e. Bus shelter (dome roof with solar panel, model #13ALD-GL, etched tempered safety glass panels, five-foot metal bench with anti-vagrant bars, color to match existing Belcrest Road street furniture, dimension 4-feet 8-inch wide x 12-feet 7 7/8-inch length.”

The Urban Design Section.....

- **P90 The existing trees within the 100-year floodplain shall be preserved.**

The applicant provides the following justification statement in memorandum dated January 30, 2004, Norman Rivera to Susan Lareuse:

“The existing trees within the 100-year floodplain will be preserved except a small portion at the far western side of the site where approximately 3,528.00 SF (.089 ac.) of clearing in the floodplain is proposed.”

The Environmental Planning Section provided the following opinion:

“This mandatory requirement does not allow for any clearing of woodland within the limits of the 100-year floodplain. The plans as submitted propose clearing of woodland

within the limits of the 100-year floodplain on-site. Permission has been requested from the Department of Environmental Resources to fill the 100-year floodplain on-site and it is likely that this permission will be granted because the area is small and the clearing, grading and filling are necessary for the development of the property as proposed. The required approval from the Department of Environmental Resources has not been received to date.”

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of the Detailed Site Plan, the applicant shall submit written approval from the Department of Environmental Resources for the proposed clearing within the 100-year floodplain.

- **P8 The Preferred Parking Cap may not be exceeded except that, at the time of Detailed Site Plan:**
 - (a) **the applicant may request that the Planning Department apply the Premium Parking Cap (Table 5), its attendant ratios (Table 6) and the fee schedule (P18), or**
 - (b) **The Planning Department may find that the number of surface parking spaces attributed to the development proposal in the transit district requires either:**
 - 1) **Application of the Premium Parking Cap and its attendant ratios and fee schedule, or**

2) Adjustment of the overall authorized surface parking caps (Table 5) for the district by a corresponding, one-to-one reduction of the Preferred Parking Cap for a class of land use for each surface parking space added to another class of land use.

(c) An applicant proposing development that exceeds either of the parking caps identified in Table 5 for a class of land use may apply to have those limits adjusted by a corresponding, one-to-one reduction in other categories where the parking cap has yet to be exceeded.

The applicant provides the following justification statement in memorandum dated January 30, 2004, Norman Rivera to Susan Lareuse:

“The proposed parking based on the above development proposal is 288 spaces while the Preferred amount would be 274 spaces. The Applicant seeks a minor increase in parking from the Preferred Parking Cap which will require an allocation of 14 spaces from the Premium Cap detailed Table 6 (page 59 of the TDOZ Plan). The reason for the increase is to allow sufficient parking for the national, regional and local tenants for the site in order to ensure the viability of their business. The applicant has made great strides in addressing the needs and goals of the Transit District as to design, architecture, etc., and the allocation of a minor portion of Premium spaces will ensure the success of this site. The additional spaces will be screened as required by the guidelines and as such will have a de minimus impact on the Transit District with no detriment to the public health, safety, and welfare.”

The Transportation Section provides the following opinion:

8. The Community Planning Division has provided comment on the plans as stated in their January 15, 2004, memorandum from Brenda Iraola to Susan Lareuse. The following is a discussion of conformance to the requirements of the TDOZ:

- **P2 (TDDP, page 40)** – “All development/redevelopment shall have a sign plan...provide location, size, color, lettering style, construction details and material specification including the method of illumination.”

Staff Comment: It is necessary to provide all elements of a proposed signage plan as stated in the TDDP requirement for size, color, lettering style, construction details, material and illumination methods so that a coordinated sign plan can be adhered to and reviewed for design compatibility. The signage plan for the site should be clarified for each of the buildings including type of signage (i.e., track-mounted lettering, panel, canopy-mounted, awnings, ground-mounted vs. building-mounted directional signage, etc.), color designations, and dimensions of signs. No building mounted signage should be **allowed permitted [?]** along MD 410. Further, the freestanding sign currently exceeds the maximum sign size for the C-S-C zone.

- **P89 (TDDP, page 115)** – “A minimum 30-foot-wide landscaped strip shall be provided along East West Highway in accordance with Figure 30.”

Staff Comment: The TDDP requires that a 30-foot-wide landscape strip be required behind the streetscape. The plan provides for the 30-foot setback from the streetscape and the applicant has placed two plazas in this area. Essentially, this requirement has been met.

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

Staff Comment: The plan fails to provide the minimum 1.25-foot-candle lighting coverage throughout the proposed development and has deficiencies as follows:

- a. 0.05-foot-candles occurs along the primary pedestrian sidewalk near Toledo Terrace and East West Highway.
- b. 0.13-foot-candles occurs along the walkway to the proposed bank.
- c. 0.15-foot-candles occurs along the secondary walkway near the proposed restaurant pathway to East West Highway.
- d. 0.51-foot-candles occurs along the sidewalk ramp leading from the proposed retail shops to East West Highway.
- e. 1.06-foot-candles along the sidewalk ramp near the proposed three-story office building.
- f. 0.99 foot-candles along the sidewalk near the retail building to the rear of the site. The proposed development should address all lighting concerns listed above. All light fixtures should specify full cut-off to reduce glare and sky glow.

The plans should be revised prior to signature approval to show compliance with the TDDP-S3 requirement. Prior to signature approval the applicant should submit a new photometric plan to address this issue. It is also noted (for the applicant's information) that these foot-candles are inadequate and do not correspond with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Federal guidelines provide lighting standards for accessible spaces and pedestrian paths to be a minimum of 2.0 foot-candles. In addition, the ADA federal guidelines require 5.0-foot-candles at building

entrances. The building entrances on the proposed site plan have deficiencies per ADA as follows:

- a. 1.58-foot-candles at the office building entrance.
 - b. 2.08-foot-candles at the retail store located to the rear of the property.
 - c. 1.01- and 0.83-foot-candles at the retail shop building(s).
 - d. 1.59-foot-candles at the proposed restaurant.
 - e. 1.47-foot-candles at the proposed bank entrance.
- **S5 (TDDP, page 29)**–“All primary and secondary pedestrian routes shall be constructed using special paving materials. (See Figure 7 for detail of crosswalks)”

Staff Comment: This TDDP requirement relates to sidewalks and refers to the crosswalk detail that is to be provided at all street crossings. Specifically, crosswalks should be placed at the curb opening along Toledo Terrace (near the proposed twin retail shops), across Toledo Terrace at the intersection of East West Highway for connectivity to the Prince George’s Plaza development, and along the primary site entrance adjacent to East West Highway. In addition, the applicant will need to show the TDDP Figure 7 detail for crosswalks on the plan. The plans should be revised prior to signature approval.

- **S6 (TDDP, page 29)**–“...Urban Design staff shall select and specify the paving material to be used for the primary and secondary pedestrian system throughout the transit

district”

Staff Comment: The plans provide a concrete sidewalk with brick banding. It has been coordinated with that which has previously been approved at the adjacent Outback Steakhouse development. This requirement has been met.

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

Staff Comment: TDDP—These figures refer to the streetscape/pedestrian zone area. The requirements for the pedestrian zone provide an area for pedestrian activity and safety adjacent to vehicular traffic areas. The specified pedestrian zones within the TDDP allow for the placement of the pedestrian sidewalk to be located away from vehicular traffic areas, as well as provide an expanse of space for art work, plazas, café seating, lighting, trash receptacles, etc. The pedestrian zone is provided to enhance the development. TDDP—Figure 9 refers to the street trees to be used along the roadway system within the transit district; Toledo Terrace should be improved using *Quercus phellos* (willow oak trees) and East West Highway should be improved using *Platanus acerifolia* ‘Bloodgood’ (London plane tree). The applicant’s plan portrays the wrong streetscape material and delineates sycamore trees along East West Highway and Toledo Terrace as well as one solitary red maple tree. The proper street trees should be provided and planted at the required TDDP 3½ to 4-inch caliper size. The plans should be revised to show compliance with the TDDP-S8 requirement.

- **S9 (TDDP, page 31)**—“...Urban Design staff shall select and specify the streetscape elements which shall constitute the streetscape vocabulary for all future development in

the transit district, such as lighting fixtures, benches, trash receptacles, bicycle racks, sign posts, planters, building awnings, paving pattern(s) and materials.”

Staff Comment: The proposed plan does not contain details for the parking lot lighting—GLGalleria 400-1000 W, metal halide lamp, mounting height should not exceed height of proposed buildings, color of pole to match existing lights at Prince George’s Plaza. The plans should be revised to show compliance with the TDDP-S9 requirement.

- **S11 (TDDP, page 31)**–“All street trees shall be limbed up to a minimum of six feet above grade.”

Staff Comment: The plan shows compliance with this requirement.

- **S14 (TDDP, page 35)**–“Building materials shall be high quality, enduring and distinctive. Exterior building materials, such as precast concrete, brick, tile and stone are encouraged.”

.....

Staff Comment: The proposed bank building provides the only high-quality material in this development, which uses brick, stone and slate. All proposed buildings on this property should be high quality as required by the TDDP and use precast concrete, brick, tile, or stone. The plans should show compliance with the TDDP-S14 requirement.

- **G9 (TDDP, page 35)**–“All sides of a building should receive equal design consideration if viewed from a public area..”

Staff Comment: The lack of windows near public areas provides an unsafe and unattractive atmosphere. The proposed buildings should provide windows and architectural design adjacent to the pedestrian public areas to provide for interest and safety and to enhance the pedestrian experience. The plans should be revised to show compliance with the TDDP-G9 requirement.

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

Staff Comment: The applicant’s plan shows large expanses of concrete paving within the plaza areas. The plaza area should use high-quality paving material as specified in the TDDP requirement above. Concrete is not a quality material, nor does it provide interest to the plaza area for pedestrian use. The applicant is also required to provide a paving/banding [bonding?] plan at the time of detailed site plan. The plan should be revised to show compliance with the TDDP-S15 requirement and a paving plan should be required to be submitted.

- **G18 (TDDP, page 36)**–“Plazas should be designed to accommodate a variety of activities and users and shall provide a variety of functions, such as a bus waiting area, pedestrian link between the blocks or plazas, or outdoor lunch plaza.”

Staff Comment: The applicant proposes plaza cross slopes of 4.5 percent at the twin retail buildings and five percent adjacent to the restaurant. The site has an existing bus stop along East West Highway. The TDDP requires that the plaza accommodate a variety of users. The

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) states accessible public areas cannot exceed a maximum of two percent slope in any direction. Therefore, the proposed plaza slopes of 4.5 percent and five percent exceed the two percent maximum and are too steep for accessible public safety. In addition, the proposed development does not address the existing bus stop. The applicant should provide a bus shelter with a waiting area and accommodate a safe pedestrian linkage to the proposed plaza and shops. The bus shelter will provide refuge from inclement weather and promote upscale quality for the transit district. It is necessary to continue previously approved streetscape elements in the transit district. The plans should be revised to show compliance with the TDDP-G18 requirement.