



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

Detailed Site Plan

DSP-10011-01

Application	General Data	
Project Name: Queens Chapel Town Center Location: Northwest quadrant of Queens Chapel Road (MD 500) and Hamilton Street. Applicant/Address: Queens Chapel Town Center, LLC 931 King James Landing Annapolis, MD 21403	Planning Board Hearing Date:	01/31/13
	Staff Report Date:	01/16/13
	Date Accepted:	08/02/12
	Planning Board Action Limit:	Waived
	Plan Acreage:	6.05
	Zone:	M-X-T/T-D-O/R-55
	Dwelling Units:	N/A
	Gross Floor Area:	64,740 sq. ft.
	Planning Area:	68
	Tier:	Developed
	Council District:	02
	Election District	16
	Municipality:	Hyattsville
	200-Scale Base Map:	207NE03

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates	
Amending the July 2006 <i>Approved Transit District Development Plan and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone</i> , specifically for Queens Chapel Town Center to allow internally-lit, building-mounted signage.	Informational Mailing:	04/10/12
	Acceptance Mailing:	07/26/12
	Sign Posting Deadline:	01/31/13

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Jill Kosack Phone Number: 301-952-4689 E-mail: Jill.Kosack@ppd.mncppc.org	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
		X	

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan DSP-10011-01
Queens Chapel Town Center

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the revision to a detailed site plan for the subject property and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of DISAPPROVAL as described in the Recommendation section of this report.

EVALUATION

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

- a. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for the Transit District Overlay (T-D-O) and Mixed Use Transportation-Oriented (M-X-T) Zones.
- b. The July 2006 *Approved Transit District Development Plan and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone*.
- c. The requirements of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.
- d. The requirements of the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance.
- e. The requirements of the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance.
- f. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

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

1. **Request:** The subject application requests an amendment to the mandatory development requirements of the 2006 *Approved Transit District Development Plan and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone* (2006 West Hyattsville TDDP), specifically for the shopping center known as Queens Chapel Town Center. The requested amendments would allow all future proposed building-mounted signs to be internally-illuminated box signs located on the cornice or parapet of the building.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	M-X-T/R-55/T-D-O	M-X-T/R-55/T-D-O
Use(s)	Shopping Center	Shopping Center
Acreage	6.05	6.05
Parcels	15	15
Building Square Footage/GFA	64,740	64,740

On-Site Parking Data

	EXISTING
Standard Spaces	229
Parallel Spaces	3
Handicapped Spaces	11 (6 Van Accessible)
Total	243 (11 Handicapped)

3. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 68 and Council District 2. More specifically, it is located in the northwest corner of the intersection of Hamilton Street and Queens Chapel Road (MD 500) in the City of Hyattsville.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject property is bounded to the south by Hamilton Street and, across the street, by commercially-developed property in the Mixed Use Transportation–Oriented (M-X-T) Zone; to the east by Queens Chapel Road (MD 500) and, across the road, by commercially-developed property in the M-X-T Zone; to the west by Ager Road and, across the road, by a metro parking lot in the M-X-T Zone; to the northeast by Hamilton Manor Apartments in the Multifamily Medium Density Residential (R-18) Zone; and to the north by single-family homes in the One-Family Detached Residential (R-55) Zone.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The existing buildings on-site were mostly built prior to 1965 and have been the subject of various permits over the years. Detailed Site Plan DSP-00040 for Residue Parcel A-13 was approved by the Planning Board on December 21, 2000 (PGCPB Resolution No. 00-230) under the previous 1998 West Hyattsville Approved Transit District Development Plan for the Transit District Overlay Zone, with six conditions. These conditions are no longer outstanding as they were complied with and completed through the certification, permit, and construction processes.
- Conceptual Site Plan CSP-10002 and Detailed Site Plan DSP-10011, to allow an amendment to the Table of Uses of the 2006 *Approved Transit District Development Plan and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone* for the subject property, were approved by the Planning Board on January 27, 2011 subject to three conditions. Subsequently, the Prince George’s County District Council reviewed both of these cases on June 13, 2011 and adopted the Planning Board’s resolutions, with one modification and three conditions.
6. **Design Features:** The subject parcels are already developed with various commercial buildings that present themselves as a shopping center. This DSP proposes no new physical development on-site, so the following is a description of the existing layout of the property.

The shopping center is comprised of multiple connected and discrete buildings measuring a total of 64,740 square feet divided over 15 parcels, all of which are under the same ownership. The buildings are generally located no more than 14 feet behind the right-of-way line along Hamilton Street and Queens Chapel Road (MD 500), although one building is set back further at approximately 48 feet. The on-site parking is generally located behind the buildings, accessed from a public alley that runs along the rear of the property, although there are a few locations in which small parking lots are adjacent to the rights-of-way. Additionally, for most of the site's frontage along Hamilton Street and 31st Avenue, either angled or parallel parking spaces are located within the rights-of-way. The site is accessed from multiple driveways off of Ager Road, Queens Chapel Road, Hamilton Street, and 31st Avenue.

Starting at the southwest corner of the site is Residue Parcel A-13, which is the subject of a prior approval of Detailed Site Plan DSP-00040, and is developed with a 2,839-square-foot, brick and stucco, fast-food, Kentucky Fried Chicken restaurant. This building sits within 2.5 feet of the right-of-way at the corner of Hamilton Street and Ager Road and the existing drive-through lane runs along the north side of the building, with parking beyond it. Within the eastern portion of this parcel is a one-story, cinder block, 4,523-square-foot building with three tenants, specifically a bakery, furniture store, and liquor store. There is parking located between this building and Hamilton Street and within a parking lot that takes up the remainder of the eastern portion of the parcel.

The portion of the site from the eastern property line of Residue Parcel A-13 to 31st Avenue is divided into ten parcels of varying size. One large, 22,790-square-foot, brick, stone, and cinder-block building sits across all of these parcels, set back approximately ten feet from the Hamilton Street right-of-way, with multiple tenants including a barber, restaurant, dry cleaners, and nail salon, among others. Additional parking and loading spaces are then provided behind the buildings along the northern property line, with access via the adjacent alley.

On the eastern side of 31st Avenue is Parcel B-3 which includes a single, 5,971-square-foot, brick and concrete building located within nine feet of the Hamilton Street right-of-way, with four tenants, specifically a restaurant, dollar store, hair salon, and barber. Parking and loading are located at the rear of the building with access from the alley that runs along the northern property line. To the east is Parcel B-2, which has a parking lot along the western edge and a portion of a brick and glass building, with a convenience store tenant, in the southeastern corner, which sits within 12 feet of the Hamilton Street right-of-way. This building extends to the east into the adjacent Residue Parcel B-1 for a total area of 8,584 square feet and includes two more tenants, a pet groomer and a post office. After a small gap, another 13,360-square-foot, brick and glass building runs parallel to and stays within nine feet of the right-of-way line at the corner of Hamilton Street and Queens Chapel Road. This building houses seven tenants including a bank, bridal store, and restaurants, among others.

Across a 20-foot-wide public alley is Residue Parcel F, which sits along the northern and eastern boundaries of the entire subject property. It has one small, 6,673-square-foot, brick and concrete, three-tenant building in the eastern corner fronting on Queens Chapel Road, sitting within nine feet of the right-of-way. The rest of this parcel is asphalt parking and gravel areas that wrap around the north side of the public alley between the shopping center and the adjacent residential areas.

The subject DSP requests amendments to the 2006 West Hyattsville TDDP signage standards for the entire property to allow all future proposed building-mounted signs to be internally

illuminated signs until such time as the entire center redevelops. An example of the proposed signage was provided with the request; however, the request is for any future proposed signage within the existing shopping center.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application is for amendments to the signage standards of the 2006 *Approved Transit District Development Plan and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone* (2006 West Hyattsville TDDP). As part of a TDDP, the application is subject to Section 27-548.08, Site Plan, of the Zoning Ordinance, which specifies the following required findings:

(c) **Required findings.**

- (1) **The findings required by Section 27-285(b) shall not apply to the T-D-O Zone. Instead, the following findings shall be made by the Planning Board when approving a Detailed Site Plan in the T-D-O Zone:**

- (A) **The Transit District Site Plan is in strict conformance with any mandatory requirements of the Transit District Development Plan;**

Comment: The subject application requests amendments to the TDDP requirements for signage only and this is discussed in Finding 8 below.

- (B) **The Transit District Site Plan is consistent with, and reflects the guidelines and criteria for development contained in, the Transit District Development Plan;**

Comment: Further discussion of conformance of the requested signage amendments with the guidelines and criteria of the TDDP are in Finding 8 below.

- (C) **The Transit District Site Plan meets all of the requirements of the Transit District Overlay Zone, and applicable regulations of the underlying zones;**

Comment: The subject application proposes amendments to the TDDP standards for signage only. Further discussion of conformance of the signage with the purposes of the Transit District Overlay (T-D-O) Zone is in Finding 8 below. The regulations for building-mounted signage in the underlying M-X-T Zone, Section 27-613(f)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, allow that the design standards shall be determined by the Planning Board for each development at the time of DSP review as follows:

In approving these signs, the Planning Board shall find that the proposed signs are appropriate in size, type, and design, given the proposed location and the use to be served, and are in keeping with the remainder of the Mixed Use Zone development and, in the M-X-C Zone, are in conformance with the sign program as set forth in Section 27-546.04(j).

The proposed signage amendments are not appropriate in type and design given the existing shopping center's overall small-scale, pedestrian-oriented nature, where the buildings are set back approximately 14 to 48 feet from the right-of-way line with little or no parking in front. Additionally, the current site development almost fully exemplifies the type of compact, transit-oriented development that is envisioned by the TDDP; therefore, the proposed signage amendments, which would continue the usage of the suburban, vehicular-oriented signage design that currently exists within the shopping center, can be said to be in opposition to the remainder of the development.

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

Comment: The subject application proposes revisions to the signage standards only. Further discussion of the signage amendment meeting the purposes of the T-D-O Zone are in Finding 8 below.

- (E) Each structure and use, in the manner proposed, is compatible with other structures and uses in the Transit District, and with existing and proposed adjacent development.**

Comment: The subject application does not propose any changes to structures or uses; therefore, this requirement does not apply.

- (2) The applicant may ask the Planning Board to apply development standards which differ from mandatory requirements in the Transit District Development Plan, unless the plan provides otherwise. The Board may amend any mandatory requirements except building height restrictions and parking standards, requirements which may be amended by the District Council under procedures in Part 10A, Division 1. The Board may amend parking provisions concerning the dimensions, layout, or design of parking spaces or parking lots.**

In approving the Transit District Site Plan, the Planning Board shall find that the mandatory requirements, as amended, will benefit the proposed development and the Transit District and will not substantially impair implementation of the Transit District Development Plan, and the Board shall then find that the site plan meets all mandatory requirements which apply.

Comment: The requested amended requirements are discussed further in Finding 8 below. However, the requested building-mounted signage amendment will not benefit the existing shopping center development and the transit district as it will allow an existing pedestrian-oriented shopping center to add new suburban-style, vehicular-oriented signage. The proposed amended sign requirements would substantially impair the implementation of the TDDP. They would allow the shopping center to not adhere to TDDP sign standards that it could easily and effectively enforce, and would instead

permit them to use signage that is typical of that installed in other vehicular-oriented centers throughout the county. Approval of these amended signage requirements is not appropriate for this specific site with its specific style of development.

8. **Conformance with the 2006 Approved Transit District Development Plan and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone:** The 2006 *Approved Transit District Development Plan and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone* (2006 West Hyattsville TDDP) places Queens Chapel Town Center shopping center in the Retail/Commercial Preferred Land Use Plan category. The applicant has requested modifications from the TDDP development standards for all future proposed building-mounted signage on the subject property. The following provides a discussion of the standards to which amendments are requested and a response from both the applicant and staff:

- a. **Sign Lighting: Building signs shall be illuminated with external lighting only. Lighting shall provide full cut-off fixtures to reduce sky glow and glare. Flashing, traveling, animated, or intermittent lighting shall be prohibited on the exterior of any building or building sign whether such lighting is of temporary or long term duration.**

Comment: The applicant requests an amendment to this standard for all future sign replacements in the shopping center until such time as the entire center is renovated. Details of proposed internally-illuminated signage for Aaron's Rental Store and T-Mobile, two new tenants in the shopping center, were provided as examples of the internally-illuminated signage the requested amendment would allow, which is similar to signs installed at other centers in the county. The applicant stated that all of the existing building-mounted signage in the shopping center is internally illuminated and, if this standard were complied with for new signs, it would create an unsuitable mismatch of signage on the property. The applicant also noted that re-facing of the existing internally-illuminated signs is allowed without compliance to the TDDP standards; however, if internally-illuminated signs were allowed, the entire sign structure could be replaced and upgraded. The applicant stated they are encouraging new tenants to install new signs, rather than reface existing signs, in order to improve the character of the center.

Staff concurs with the applicant's assertion that other centers throughout the county have a similar type of internally-illuminated signage. However, staff also notes that the standard for externally-illuminated signage was written for a transit-oriented development that is close to the street and pedestrian-friendly, such as this existing development. If the applicant would like to improve the character of the shopping center by installing completely new signs, they could do so by proposing signs that conform to the TDDP standards without losing the functionality of the signs. Instead, they request modification of the standards to allow installation of building-mounted signage that is the opposite of the TDDP standards in order to have signs that are indistinguishable from those in many other shopping centers throughout the county. The applicant's argument that an unsuitable mismatch would occur if only new signs conformed to the TDDP standards is only a temporary issue that would probably be resolved in a few years as tenants change, or the next time the entire shopping center is refaced by the property owner. This issue could also be partially mitigated through the use of creative signage design techniques. Staff is not in support of the requested amendment.

- b. **Sign Specifications: Building signage shall be permitted as board signs, cornice signs, blade signs, door signs, awning signs, and window signs only. All other signage, including freestanding signs, shall be prohibited. Sign specifications, typology, and location standards are as follows:**

Comment: The applicant requests an amendment to this standard to allow building-mounted box signs, which are not allowed under this requirement because they are not board, cornice, blade, door, awning, or window signs. Given that the allowed types of building-mounted signage are all feasible on this site with the existing building layout and some, such as window signs, are actually in use, staff is not in support of the requested amendment.

- c. **Cornice/parapet signs shall be permitted using a masonry or bronze plaque bearing an owner or building's name. These signs shall be placed in the building's cornice/parapet wall or under the eaves and above the upper story windows.**

Comment: The applicant requests an amendment to this standard as the majority of building-mounted signage in the shopping center is cornice/parapet signs and the applicant does not wish to conform to the requirement that they be masonry or bronze plaques bearing the owner or building's name. Given the one-story, small-scale design of the existing buildings and site, which are to remain unchanged, masonry or bronze plaque cornice/parapet signs would be visible and effective. Additionally, individual tenants would be allowed to also have board, blade, door, awning, or window signs, all of which could be effective in creating visibility and informing customers of the offered goods and services. Staff is not in support of the requested amendment.

As to conformance with the goals of the 2006 West Hyattsville TDDP, staff offers the following (TDDP, p. 1):

The goal of the West Hyattsville TDDP is to provide a clear and predictable path for transit-oriented development (TOD) within the West Hyattsville TDOZ...The 2002 Prince George's County Approved General Plan (page 44) defines TOD as development that actively seeks to increase the transit use and decrease automobile dependency by:

- **Locating homes, jobs, and shopping closer to transit services;**

Comment: The shopping center is located within a quarter mile of the West Hyattsville Metro Station. Requiring existing and proposed retail tenants to provide signage in conformance with the TDDP standards, which are appropriate for the scale and layout of the existing buildings, will not compromise the viability of the businesses that are in close proximity to the metro.

- **Locating the mix of critical land uses (living/working/shopping) in closer proximity to one another; and**

Comment: This DSP is not proposing any changes to the shopping center. The sole purpose is to amend the signage requirements contained in the TDDP.

- **Establishing land use/transit linkages that make it easier to use transit (rail and bus).**

Comment: As mentioned above, the existing shopping center is in close proximity to the West Hyattsville Metro Station, which makes it easily accessible from the trains and buses en route to and from the metro station.

As stated on page 4 of the TDDP:

The main purpose of this plan is to maximize the public benefits from the West Hyattsville Metro Station. The plan sets out primary goals emphasizing the neighborhood, environment, transportation, and low-impact development (LID).

- **Promote TOD near the Metro Station and create a sense of place consistent with the neighborhood character areas.**

Comment: The existing shopping center layout promotes transit-oriented design (TOD). Requiring it to install signage in conformance with the TDDP standards will help to create a sense of place consistent with the neighborhood character area.

- **Ensure that all new development or redevelopment in the transit district is pedestrian-oriented.**

Comment: The applicant is not proposing any redevelopment to the existing shopping center.

- **Restore, protect, and enhance the environment by protecting environmentally-sensitive areas, minimizing impacts of development, and expanding recreational opportunities and trail and bikeway connections.**

Comment: The subject property has no environmentally-sensitive areas and proposes no new development.

- **Maximize residential development opportunities within walking distance of the Metro Station.**

Comment: Enforcing TDDP signage standards on this site, within walking distance of the metro station, will help create a sense of place and a pedestrian-friendly environment which will be attractive for the surrounding communities, thereby potentially attracting developers to pursue more residential opportunities nearby.

9. **Conformance to Conceptual Site Plan CSP-10002:** Conceptual Site Plan CSP-10002 was approved by the Planning Board on January 27, 2011 (PGCPB Resolution No. 11-07) subject to three conditions. Subsequently, the District Council reviewed the case on June 13, 2011 and adopted the Planning Board's resolution, with one modification and three conditions.
10. **Conformance to Detailed Site Plan DSP-10011:** Detailed Site Plan DSP-10011 was approved by the Planning Board on January 27, 2011 (PGCPB Resolution No. 11-08) subject to three conditions. Subsequently, the District Council reviewed the case on June 13, 2011 and adopted the Planning Board's resolution, with one modification and three conditions. None of the conditions are applicable to the subject DSP review.

11. **Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The current DSP application is not subject to the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) as there is no proposed increase in gross floor area or impervious surface and there is no change of use from a lower to higher intensity use category. Any future revisions to these plans should be reviewed for conformance to the Landscape Manual if they propose any new physical improvements.
12. **Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** The requirements of the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance were addressed through the original DSP approval and this application does not change any of those findings.
13. **Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** The requirements of the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance were addressed through the original DSP approval and this application does not change any of those findings.
14. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

- a. **Historic Preservation Section**—In a memorandum dated August 9, 2012, the Historic Preservation Section noted that the subject application will have no effect on identified historic sites, resources, or districts.
- b. **Archeological Review**—The archeology planner coordinator noted that the subject application will have no effect on archeological resources.
- c. **Community Planning Division**—In a memorandum dated August 30, 2012, the Community Planning North Division noted that this application is consistent with the 2002 Prince George's County Approved General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developed Tier, and that this application conforms with the retail/commercial land use recommendations of the 2006 *Approved Transit District Development Plan and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone* (2006 West Hyattsville TDDP). More particularly, they offered the following summarized comments:

The 2006 West Hyattsville TDDP contains three distinct neighborhoods including Hamilton Square, North Park, and Queenstown. The Queens Chapel Town Center is within the Hamilton Square neighborhood, which is envisioned to be the most active neighborhood with the most diverse development mix. The Illustrative plan (page 8) and Parks and Open Space plan (page 12) in the TDDP clearly shows Hamilton Street designated as a Main Street Commercial District.

On page 14, the TDDP states:

“Hamilton Main Street: The plan envisions the existing Hamilton Street commercial corridor as an expanded activity center and destination with its terminus at Hamilton Town Square. Lined with primarily retail uses, the Hamilton Main Street corridor will allow TDOZ residents to satisfy many of their daily needs without the use of their personal vehicles. The adjacent private property site plan and public streetscape elements – ornamental lighting, street trees, trash receptacles, benches, bike racks, and smaller pedestrian focused signage – will help to create a pedestrian-oriented environment.”

Table 1: West Hyattsville TDDP Street Hierarchy, on page 25 states:

Table 1: West Hyattsville TDDP Street Hierarchy			
Type	Nearest County Equivalent	Transit District Example	Character and Function
Main Street	Minor Collector Primary Residential Street	Hamilton Square Hamilton Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defines Hamilton Square Neighborhood • On-street parking to buffer pedestrian movements • Moderately low automobile speeds (maximum 25 mph recommended) • Street trees and furniture • Public art • Major civic activity spaces: parks, and plazas

The TDDP signage standards, pages 107-108, states on page 108:

“Sign Lighting: Building signs shall be illuminated with external light only. Lighting shall provide full cut-off fixtures to reduce sky glow and glare. Flashing, traveling, animated, or intermittent lighting shall be prohibited on the exterior of any building or building sign whether such lighting is of temporary or long-term duration.”

The applicant has provided an application and justification statement to amend this TDDP standard to allow for internally-lit building signs within the commercial shopping center. The Queens Chapel Town Center structures are in close proximity to Hamilton Street, which is a heavily traveled pedestrian corridor, provides direct access to the West Hyattsville Metro station, and is designated as a Main Street Commercial District. Because the Queens Chapel Town Center buildings are in close proximity to Hamilton Street, and it is a heavily traveled pedestrian corridor, pedestrian-scaled and externally-lit signage is appropriate at this location.

Community Planning staff respectfully recommends that the Planning Board consider not approving an amendment for internally-illuminated signs for the Queens Chapel Town Center.

- d. **Transportation Planning Section**—The Transportation Planning Section provided an analysis of the subject application and provided the following conclusion.

A site plan is required for properties within the T-D-O and also within the M-X-T Zones. Amendments to the 2006 *Approved Transit District Development Plan and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone* (2006 West Hyattsville TDDP) can only be considered within the context of site plan review. The site is subject to the general requirements of site plan review; the zoning condition requires particular attention to buffering and screening of adjacent residential areas, noise impacts, and building acoustics. No traffic-related findings are required.

The site is located on several recorded parcels of Queens Chapel Manor. Given that no new construction is proposed, there will be no preliminary plan for this site; also, there are no outstanding preliminary plan conditions.

Ingress and egress are acceptable, and not proposed to be changed by this plan. The site receives access from Hamilton Street and internal alleys and driveways, and this is acceptable. No issues with on-site circulation are identified.

The site has frontage on Queens Chapel Road (MD 500) and Ager Road, which are master plan arterial facilities; and on Hamilton Street which is a master plan collector facility. All existing rights-of-way are consistent with the master plan recommendations.

Given the limited nature of the request to amend the TDDP regarding signage, the Transportation Planning Section has no comment on the amendment and no further comment on the overall site plan.

- e. **Subdivision Review Section**—In a memorandum dated September 13, 2012, the Subdivision Review Section indicated, since no new construction or gross floor area are proposed with this DSP, that a preliminary plan of subdivision is not required and there are no other subdivision issues with this application.
- f. **Trails**—The trails coordinator indicated that they had no comment on the subject application.
- g. **Permit Review Section**—The Permit Review Section indicated that the application's request was correct in format and there were no other permit-related issues.
- h. **Environmental Planning Section**—The Environmental Planning Section indicated that that site has an approved Natural Resources Inventory and A Woodland Conservation Ordinance exemption letter and that there are no other environmental planning issues with this application.
- i. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department**—The Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department, in a memorandum dated August 28, 2012, provided standard comments regarding fire apparatus, hydrants, and lane requirements. Those issues will be enforced by the Fire/EMS Department at the time of the issuance of permits.
- j. **Department of Public Works & Transportation (DPW&T)**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, comments have not been received from DPW&T.
- k. **Prince George's County Police Department**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, comments have not been received from the Police Department.
- l. **Prince George's County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated September 4, 2012, the Health Department indicated that they had no comments or recommendations on the subject application.
- m. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—In a memorandum dated August 10, 2012, SHA indicated that they had no comment on the subject application.
- n. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—WSSC indicated that they had no comments on the subject application.

- o. **Verizon**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, comments have not been received from Verizon.
 - p. **Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO)**—At the time of the writing of the staff report, comments have not been received from PEPCO.
 - q. **City of Hyattsville**—In a letter dated October 9, 2012, the City of Hyattsville stated that the City voted unanimously on October 8, 2012 to oppose the applicant’s request to amend the standards of the 2006 *Approved Transit District Development Plan and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone* (2006 West Hyattsville TDDP) and requested that the applicant withdraw the application and proceed with signage consistent with the adopted architectural standards. They furthermore stated that the applicant’s request for internally-illuminated exterior signage is intended for vehicular traffic, which is in direct conflict with the pedestrian-oriented development standards and overall intent of the West Hyattsville TDDP.
 - r. **Town of Brentwood**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, comments have not been received from the Town of Brentwood.
 - s. **Town of North Brentwood**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, comments have not been received from the Town of North Brentwood.
 - t. **City of Mount Rainier**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, comments have not been received from the City of Mount Rainier.
15. The subject application does not adequately take into consideration the requirements of the 2006 *Approved Transit District Development Plan and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone* (2006 West Hyattsville TDDP). The requested amendments to the mandatory standards would perpetuate a suburban-style, vehicular-oriented signage design that is incompatible with the purposes of the TDDP and would not, for these reasons, benefit the proposed development and the transit district, as required by Section 27-548.08(c)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance, and would in fact substantially impair the implementation of the TDDP.

As a result, in accordance with Section 27-285(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan does not represent a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, of the Prince George’s County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

16. Per Section 27-285(b)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance, which became effective on September 1, 2010, a required finding for approval of a detailed site plan is as follows:

(4) The Planning Board may approve a Detailed Site Plan if it finds that the regulated environmental features have been preserved and/or restored in a natural state to the fullest extent possible.

Comment: There are no regulated environmental features found on the subject property; therefore, no preservation or restoration is necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and DISAPPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-10011-01 for Queens Chapel Town Center.