



*Note: Staff reports can be accessed at [www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm](http://www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm).*

## Detailed Site Plan DSP-09006

### Request to Rezone Property from R-18 to the M-U-I Zone

Application	General Data	
<p><b>Project Name:</b> Belcrest Plaza Mixed Use</p> <p><b>Location:</b> Southwest quadrant of the intersection of Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace</p> <p><b>Applicant/Address:</b> Contee Company, LLP 11900 Tech Road Silver Springs, MD 20904</p>	Planning Board Hearing Date:	12/10/09
	Staff Report Date:	11/25/09
	Date Accepted:	08/11/09
	Planning Board Action Limit:	12/17/09
	Plan Acreage:	24.92
	Zone:	R-18 & TDOZ
	Dwelling Units:	2,675
	Retail:	62,100 sq. ft.
	Office:	216,000 sq. ft.
	Gross Floor Area:	3,377,900 sq. ft.
	Planning Area:	68
	Tier:	Developed
	Council District:	02
	Election District:	17
	Municipality:	N/A
200-Scale Base Map:	208NE03	

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Mixed-use development consisting of 57 attached dwelling units, 2,618 multifamily units, 62,100 square feet of retail, and 216,000 square feet of office space (of which 40,000 square feet have been identified as a public amenity).</li> <li>•Rezone 24.92 acres from the R-18 Zone (with TDOZ overlay) to the M-U-I Zone (with TDOZ overlay).</li> </ul>	Informational Mailing:	06/13/09
	Acceptance Mailing:	08/11/09
	Sign Posting Deadline:	11/10/09

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Lareuse/Silor	
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-09006  
Request to rezone property from the R-18 Zone to the M-U-I Zone  
Belcrest Plaza Mixed Use

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the requested rezoning of the subject property from the R-18 (Multifamily Medium Density Residential) Zone to the M-U-I (Mixed Use—Infill) Zone and the associated detailed site plan. Staff presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of DISAPPROVAL for the multiple requests included with the plan of development. Companion to this case is a Departure from the number of Parking and Loading Spaces, DPLS-351, and Departure from Design Standards, DDS-600.

**ZONING EVALUATION**

(Evaluation of the detailed site plan issues begin on page 42 below)

The zoning request was reviewed and evaluated for compliance with the following criteria:

- a. The purposes and the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ) in accordance with Section 27-548.09.01.
- b. The goals and objectives of the *Approved Transit District Development Plan for the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone*.
- c. Compatibility with existing or approved future development.
- d. The purposes and the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the M-U-I Zone.
- e. Referrals.

**FINDINGS—ZONING REQUEST**

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

1. **Request:** The detailed site plan includes a request to rezone the property from the Multifamily Medium Density Residential (R-18) Zone to the Mixed Use—Infill (M-U-I) Zone and a request to amend the use table and building heights. These specific amendments require the approval of the District Council. In addition, the application includes requests for amendments to mandatory

development standards, and requests approval of a detailed site plan for three noncontiguous properties within the transit district development plan (TDDP).

The staff report for the detailed site plan beginning on page 42 presents a separate analysis for each pod of development in order to convey the information in an orderly fashion. The three pods of development are located on four separate and distinct legal parcels, all of which are currently developed with existing three-story multifamily buildings built circa 1960. One pod of development consists of two contiguous parcels of land. The other two pods of development are separated from each other by public streets. The application has been reviewed for conformance to the TDDP and the Zoning Ordinance for each pod of development. The following is the legal description and a summary of each of the existing pods of development:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Sub Area</b>	<b>Plat</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Existing D.U.'s</b>
Parcel A Americana Plaza	13 A	PBWWW34 P41	3.5713	105
Parcel B Americana Plaza	13 A	PBWWW35 P59	0.8811	N/A
Parcel C Americana Plaza	13 A	PBWWW35 P59	7.9957	167
Parcel B Georgian Plaza	12	PBWWW32 P30	12.4669	294

The detailed site plan proposes to combine Parcels A and B of Americana Plaza to create one pod for multifamily development with a small amount of retail/office use. Parcel C is proposed as a mixed-use development consisting of townhouses and a multifamily development with a small amount of retail/office use. Parcel B of Georgian Plaza is proposed as a development of high intensity that includes multifamily, office, and retail combined. Each of the pods is described and analyzed below in regard to the request for rezoning from the R-18 Zone to the M-U-I Zone and the proposed plans for development.

2. **Rezoning—Development Data Summary**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>
Zone(s)	R-18	M-U-I
Use(s)	Multifamily	Multifamily, Townhouses, Office and Retail
Acreage		
Americana Plaza, Parcel A	3.57	3.57
Americana Plaza, Parcel B	.88	.88
*Total acreage (A & B)	4.45	4.45
Americana Plaza, Parcel C	7.99	7.99
Georgian Plaza, Parcel B	12.47	12.47
Area within 100 year floodplain	0	0
Dwelling Units - Multifamily		
Americana Plaza, Parcels A & B	105	283
Americana Plaza, Parcel C	167	356
Georgian Plaza, Parcel B	294	1,979
Dwelling Units - Townhouse		
Americana Plaza, Parcel C	0	57
Office Square Footage/GFA		
Americana Plaza, Parcels A & B	0	0
Americana Plaza, Parcel C	0	0
Georgian Plaza, Parcel B	0	216,000
Retail Square Footage/GFA		
Americana Plaza, Parcels A & B	0	1,600
Americana Plaza, Parcel C	0	1,290
Georgian Plaza, Parcel B	0	58,620

\* Americana Plaza, Parcels A and B are proposed as one pod of development.

3. In order for the application for rezoning to be approved, the applicant must demonstrate that the proposed rezoning meets the purposes of the Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ) and the M-U-I Zone. This report begins with an analysis of Section 27-548.09.01 of the Zoning Ordinance in order to address the impact of the proposed rezoning as an amendment to an approved TDOZ. As quoted below, Section 27-548.09.01 of the Zoning Ordinance requires an applicant requesting rezoning in a TDOZ to demonstrate that the proposed development conforms to the purposes and recommendations for the transit district as stated in the TDDP:

**(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 allowed uses, building height restrictions, or parking standards in the Transit District Development Plan. The Planning Board may amend parking provisions concerning the dimensions, layout, or design of parking spaces or parking lots.**

- (2) **The owner's application shall include:**
- (A) **A statement showing that the proposed development conforms with the purposes and recommendations for the Transit District, as stated in the Transit District Development Plan; and**

**Comment:** The applicant has submitted a statement in accordance with the requirement above.

- (B) **A Detailed Site Plan or Conceptual Site Plan, in accordance with Part 3, Division 9.**

**Comment:** The applicant has submitted a detailed site plan in accordance with Part 3, Division 9.

- (3) **Filing and review of the application shall follow the site plan review procedures in Part 3, Division 9, except as modified in this Section. The Technical Staff shall review and submit a report on the application, and the Planning Board shall hold a public hearing and submit a recommendation to the District Council. Before final action the Council may remand the application to the Planning Board for review of specific issues.**

**Comment:** The Planning Board hearing on the subject application is scheduled and posted for December 10, 2009. After the hearing, the Planning Board's decision will be duly filed with the Clerk of the Council and copies of the decision will be sent to all persons of record.

- (4) **An application may be amended at any time. A request to amend an application shall be filed and reviewed in accordance with Section 27-145.**

**Comment:** The applicant has not amended the proposed rezoning application.

- (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 District Development Plan, and meets applicable site plan requirements.**

**Comment:** The purposes of the TDOZ and the Prince George's Plaza Transit District are contained in Section 27-548.03 of the Zoning Ordinance and on page 9 of the TDDP. The applicant has filed a detailed site plan for the entire acreage proposed for the M-U-I Zone within the transit district. The applicant has also filed a justification statement in support of the rezoning of the property and amendments relating to the use table and height restrictions. Section 27-548.03 lists the following specific purposes of TDOZs. The purposes are stated below in **bold** face type and following each is the applicant's justification, followed by staff's comment:

**(1) To enhance the development opportunities in the vicinity of transit stations;**

The applicant provided the following discussion in the statement of justification:

“The development proposed in this application in the M-U-I zone is consistent with the purposes of the TDOZ, as set forth in Section 27-548.03, and as listed on Page 9 of the TDDP. As stated in the Project Description, the goal of the Belcrest Plaza redevelopment is to create an exciting, transitional and vibrant proposal to create a lifestyle community just step away from the Prince George’s Plaza Metro Center. The M-U-I zone allows the Applicant to implement this vision, thereby enhancing the development opportunities in the vicinity of the transit station by concentrating residential density with a mix of uses on land closest to the transit station (27-548.03(a)(1)).”

**Comment:** The purpose of this TDOZ is to enhance the development opportunities in the vicinity of the Prince George’s Plaza Metro Station and was promoted through the review and approval of the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District Development Plan (TDDP). The TDDP sets forth the vision of future development of the transit district and was vetted through the public review process of the sectional map amendment. The plan retained the zoning of the subject properties in the R-18 Zone and approved rezoning of those properties closest to the transit station. At the same time, the plan inserted a statement for the purposes of each subarea. Subarea 12 envisions a mixed-use development in the future and Subarea 13A was envisioned to retain housing that offers easy access and excellent recreational opportunities.

**(2) To promote the use of transit facilities;**

The applicant provided the following discussion in the statement of justification:

“The use of the transit station will be promoted by the urban, pedestrian and bicycle friendly design (27-548.03(a)(2)).”

**Comment:** The subject application will promote the use of transit facilities through the use of trip reduction measures intended to reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips.

**(3) To increase the return on investment in a transit system and improve local tax revenues;**

The applicant provided the following discussion in the statement of justification:

“Urban development oriented to transit ridership will increase the return on investment in the transit station (27-548.03(a)(3)).”

**Comment:** The rezoning of the subject property from the current underlying R-18 Zone to a zone which allows an increase in density is warranted and will increase ridership, which in turn will increase the return on investment in the transit system and will improve the local tax revenues for the property.

**(4) To create a process which coordinates public policy decisions, supports regional and local growth and development strategies, and creates conditions which make joint development possible;**

The applicant did not provide a discussion regarding this purpose in the statement of justification.

**Comment:** The plan proposed may support local growth by contributing to the redevelopment of the property directly south, known as Prince George's Plaza Shopping Center. The design of the subject site may provide a layout that may foster future development and could link the two properties in a coherent and harmonious fashion.

**(5) To create a process which overcomes deficiencies in ordinary planning processes and removes obstacles not addressed in those processes;**

The applicant provided the following discussion in the statement of justification:

“The M-U-I zone overcomes deficiencies in the underlying Euclidean zone by allowing the recommendations of the TDDP to be implemented (27-548.03(a)(5)).”

**Comment:** The ability of the Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ) to adjust the underlying zone of a property provides more flexibility than Euclidean zoning, in that the time factor is substantially reduced. The M-U-I Zone itself is more flexible than the underlying R-18 Zone in that there are not any quantitative measures that are requirements, such as minimum green area or open space, maximum lot coverage, maximum density, etc. The TDDP sets forth its own set of requirements through mandatory development standards.

**(6) To minimize the costs of extending or expanding public services and facilities, by encouraging appropriate development in the vicinity of transit stations;**

The applicant did not provide a discussion of this purpose in the statement of justification.

**Comment:** Increasing the intensity of the development of the subject parcels located within walking distance of the metro should result in more metro ridership. However, the impact of the intensity of development, as proposed, may have unforeseen impacts on other public facilities such as the transportation system, stormwater management systems, water and sewer systems.

**(7) To provide mechanisms to assist in financing public and private costs associated with development;**

The applicant did not provide a discussion of this purpose in the statement of justification.

**Comment:** Through the creation of the TDDP, the plan projected the costs of transportation systems based on the TDDP recommended zoning for the properties and the future projected population. In order to address the financing of improvements, the plan collects an appropriate developer contribution fee which is applied toward the construction of needed improvements.

**(8) To provide for convenient and efficient pedestrian and vehicular access to Metro stations;**

The applicant provided the following discussion in the statement of justification:

“The proposed development concentrates on enhancing the pedestrian experience, while at the same time promoting efficient vehicular access to the Metro station (27-548.03(a)(8)).”

**Comment:** With implementation of the recommendations of DPW&T and if the outstanding issues are resolved regarding the location of public utilities, the plan will provide for convenient and efficient pedestrian and vehicular access to the Metro.

**(9) To attract an appropriate mix of land uses;**

The applicant did not provide a discussion of this purpose in the statement of justification.

**Comment:** The TDDP contemplated a mix of residential, retail, and office uses in Subarea 12 and a primarily residential development in Subarea 13.

**(10) To encourage uses which complement and enhance the character of the area;**

The applicant did not provide a discussion of this purpose in the statement of justification.

**Comment:** The detailed site plan could be improved by providing uses that line the street in Subarea 12, including both the public and the private street. Currently, the plan proposes five-story parking garages along the street line of Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace, as well as the private streets.

**(11) To insure that developments within the Transit District possess a desirable urban design relationship with one another, the Metro station, and adjoining areas; and**

**Comment:** The subject plan should be improved by activating the private streetscapes that the plan is creating in Subarea 12 instead of lining the streets with parking garages.

**(12) To provide flexibility in the design and layout of buildings and structures, and to promote a coordinated and integrated development scheme.**

The applicant provides the following discussion in the statement of justification for both 11 and 12 above:

“Finally, the M-U-I zone allows the designers to emphasize quality development and flexible, sophisticated urban design, with the project seamlessly blending into the surrounding community (27-548.03(a)(11) and (12)). These features, available only in the M-U-I zone will enhance the development’s attractiveness as a transit oriented community, and satisfy the purposes of the TDOZ and the TDDP.”

**Comment:** The TDDP provides for flexibility and the proposed M-U-I zoning also provides for flexibility in the design and layout of buildings. This same type of flexibility is found in the M-X-T (Mixed Use—Transportation Oriented) Zone as well.

4. The application for rezoning is also subject to Section 27.546.15, Purposes of the M-U-I Zone, Section 27-546.17, Uses in the M-U-I Zone, Section 27-546.18, Regulations in the M-U-I Zone, and Section 27-546.19, Site Plans for Mixed Uses, of the Zoning Ordinance.

a. Section 27.546.15(b), Purposes of the M-U-I Zone, is provided below followed by a comment relating to the appropriateness of the zone for the subject property.

**(1) To implement recommendations in approved Master Plans, Sector Plans, or other applicable plans by encouraging residential or commercial infill development in areas where most properties are already developed;**

**Comment:** In comments dated November 20, 2009, the Community Planning Division stated that the subject project is not inconsistent with the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan* Development Pattern policies for the Developed Tier and the 1998 *Approved Transit District Development Plan for the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone*, and is inconsistent with certain subarea design and areawide standards of the transit district development plan/transit district overlay zone. The project is certainly residential or commercial-infill development in an area where most properties are already developed as contemplated in the stated purposes of the M-U-I Zone. The immediate surroundings are in turn surrounded by a mix of residential and commercial land use. This mix includes:

- Prince George's Plaza Shopping Center to the south;
- Part of the University Town Center property to the east;
- The existing twin tower development known as part of the Landy Property; and
- A multifamily development to the west.

The proposed project certainly includes the type of retail/office and residential-infill development contemplated by the above-stated purpose of the M-U-I Zone.

**(2) To simplify review procedures for residential, commercial, and mixed residential and commercial development in established communities;**

**Comment:** The review procedure for the subject mixed-use development in an established community was greatly simplified by allowing the application itself to set its own standards eliminating the need for variances. In that way, it was not penalized by the requirements of open space and green area required in the more traditional residential zones in regard to each of the parcels, setback requirements, and so forth for the development of the site.

**(3) To encourage innovation in the planning and design of infill development;**

**Comment:** The proposed project is innovative in design in regard to the layout if the applicant can secure an access easement to the Prince George's Plaza Shopping Center property.

**(4) To allow flexibility in the process of reviewing infill development;**

**Comment:** The flexibility is inherent in the applicant’s ability to set their own standards. Staff has approached the review of the project with respect for the integrity of the project’s design, while suggesting revisions in order to improve and clarify its design.

**(5) To promote smart growth principles by encouraging efficient use of land and public facilities and services;**

**Comment:** The land is efficiently used by designing compact development and by combining commercial, residential, and recreational space in a multifamily, mid- to high-rise project; the residential and commercial density is necessarily greater than would have been achieved through standard zoning regulation. The detailed site plan proposes the following density calculations:

Americana Plaza, Parcels A and B	283 units	64 units per acre
Americana Plaza, Parcel C	356 units	45 units per acre
Georgian Plaza, Parcel B	1,979 units	159 units per acre

**(6) To create community environments enhanced by a mix of residential, commercial, recreational, open space, employment, and institutional uses; and**

**Comment:** The mix of commercial and residential land use in the subject project and the location of structures along the streetscape edge will help to create a community environment. This project should be revised to enhance public safety by keeping more “eyes on the street” by lining the public and private streets with uses that preferably would provide 24-hour uses. The commercial retail and office components of the project will provide employment opportunities, and the recreational package included for the project will provide recreational use, available to the project’s residents. However, the open space element in the project is largely lacking and staff is recommending a large open space element located central to the development.

- b. Section 27-546.16, Approval of the Zone, provides that a property owner may request a reclassification to the M-U-I Zone in conjunction with an application for a detailed site plan for such a property, provided certain procedures are followed. Staff will first address the requirements of this section by listing each element of the procedure in **bold** face type below, following by applicant and staff comment, including other relevant sections.

**(b) The M-U-I Zone may be approved on property which has proposed development subject to site plan review and is in the *Transit District Overlay Zone* or the *Development District Overlay Zone*, or on property owned by a municipality or the Prince George’s County Redevelopment Authority, which requests the zone.**

**(1) Property in the T-D-O Zone may be reclassified from its underlying zone to the M-U-I Zone by an amendment to the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP). *In the amendment process, the owner shall show that the proposed rezoning and development will meet TDDP goals and objectives and will be***

*compatible with existing or approved future development on adjacent properties.* (Emphasis added)

**Comment:** Below is a list of each of the goals as stated in the TDDP followed by the applicant's response and an evaluation by staff.

**Urban Design Goals (TDDP)**

- a. **Encourage the placement of buildings along East West Highway, Toledo and Belcrest Roads and Toledo Terrace so that they define the space, create a pedestrian-friendly environment and minimize views of parking areas.**
- b. **Encourage the use of structured parking and discourage huge expanses of surface parking.**
- c. **Link existing residential neighborhoods to the Metro and other uses with a strong pedestrian network.**
- d. **Continue the strong sense of identity for the Metro station and transit district established by the public investment of streetscape improvements along Belcrest Road.**

The applicant provided the following comment:

“The extensive overview of the Urban Design of the proposed development set forth in Exhibit A addresses each of these goals. The proposed buildings reflect multiple heights, from an iconic tower at the corner of Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace to 4-story multifamily buildings and townhouses abutting the fringes of the TDOZ boundaries. In all cases, the buildings are located along the street to define the space and to create a pedestrian and mass transit friendly environment. With the exception of a small (42 space) parking area adjacent to the recreation center, all parking will be structured and will not be visible from outside the project. Thus, there are no huge expanses of surface parking. The design of the community encourages pedestrian movement, and the proposed layout of Subarea 12 encourages future connections to the Mall at Prince George's [sic] consistent with the TDDP. Finally, the streetscape along Belcrest Road will be continued to cement the strong sense of identity within the Transit District.”

**Comment:** The urban design goals above address the public space, one aspect of which is the public and private streetscapes as shown on the plans. In this case, there has been much discussion about the design of the future streetscape in regard to those elements that influence the design of the streetscape. In this case, the TDDP states the very first primary requirement of the transit district in P1 as follows:

- 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 streetscape improvements shall be in phase with development, or the construction schedule shall be determined at the time of Detailed Site Plan.**  
(Emphasis added)

The property has frontage on both Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace. Along Belcrest Road, the detailed site plan is required to provide a 20 to 40-foot-wide streetscape as measured from face of curb to the building façade. The site plan has not provided a dimension of the streetscape on the plans, but it appears that the application is providing an 18-foot-wide streetscape along this frontage. It should be noted that the applicant has not requested an amendment to this requirement.

Along Toledo Terrace, the plans are required to provide a 20-foot-wide streetscape as measured from face of curb to the building façade. The site plan has not provided a streetscape dimension on the plans, but it appears that the application is providing a minimum of 20 feet in width for the streetscape along this frontage.

The plan as shown seems to adhere to the requirement of the TDDP. However, the problem is that the TDDP measures the streetscape from the face of curb to the building façade. In this case, it has been determined that the Transportation Planning Section and the DPW&T are recommending a widening of Toledo Road along the frontage of the subject property of seven feet, creating 43 feet of pavement rather than the current 36 feet of pavement. In the widening effort (needed to accommodate three lanes for vehicles and a five-foot-wide bike path on both sides of the road, as required in the TDDP) to accommodate vehicles and bikes within the right-of-way, the face of curb is moving into the site by seven feet for Parcels A and B, Americana Plaza, and along a majority of Parcel B, Georgian Plaza. Where the property has frontage on both sides of the street, it is yet to be determined if the widening will occur on both sides of the street or on just one side of the street.

Inside of the property line, the applicant has shown a ten-foot-wide public utility easement (PUE). In addition to the issues raised above in regard to the streetspace design, the applicant is proposing to underground the overhead utilities, which will create a clean and attractive edge to the development. The current utilities along Toledo Terrace also serve the Prince George's Plaza Shopping Center. There has been concern expressed over the impact of disturbing the current facilities and the process of undergrounding, as well as maintaining power to the shopping mall in an effort to place these utilities underground. As part of the normal referral process for detailed site plans, the plans are sent to the following utilities for their review:

PEPCO  
Verizon  
Comcast  
Washington Gas  
WSSC

Along Belcrest Road, the proposed building would encroach into the proposed PUE approximately two feet. Along Toledo Terrace, it appears that the buildings have been

kept out of the proposed ten-foot-wide PUE. At the Subdivision and Development Review Committee meeting on September 4, 2009, the following was determined:

PEPCO—needed ten feet

Verizon—needed an additional and separate ten feet

Washington Gas—needed an additional and separate ten feet

Since that time, the applicant has been negotiating with the utility companies to try to find a solution that would not require them to provide a 30-foot-wide PUE for utilities proposed to be located within the property, in order to avoid increasing the setback of the buildings in some locations another 20 feet back from the current building edge as shown on the plans. There is some discussion that Washington Gas could be located across the street from the electrical lines, so that issue may have been addressed. After a minimum of three meetings with the utilities companies that were coordinated by M-NCPPC staff and the applicant (in which WSSC and Washington Gas were not represented), final referrals as of the writing of this report from the utilities are as follows:

a. E-mail from PEPCO, Roberta D. Dickey to Lareuse, dated November 17, 2009:

“We have reviewed the project and determined that there are 2 34Kv lines on each pole on both sides of the road which would need to be undergrounded in separate ductbanks. Additionally, 3 new 13 Kv feeders would have to be brought into the site and undergrounded as well as the existing 13 Kv line. Thus, Pepco would have to request a 12’ Pepco easement on both sides of Toledo Terrace. The streetlight ductbank would also need to be located underground. The street trees, streetlights, and splice boxes would need to be located 3’ off the face of curb. Since Washington Gas was to be located on the opposite side of the road from Pepco, Verizon, and CATV, requesting a 12’ Pepco Easement on the same side as Washington Gas would be cumbersome at best. The cost to the Developer would be in the millions of dollars. Pepco’s proposal is to remain overhead. Construction access to the site is very limited due to the existing pole lines. Other concerns are still the switch/fuse and transformer locations where proper space, access and clearances are needed. Although remaining overhead is an option, the Maryland High Voltage Line Act must be enforced for safety. A person cannot work closer than 10’ from our lines, thus the building must be at least 15’ to 20’ back from our lines. This scenario excludes any road relocation requirement. Keep in mind that while all the construction of this site is in progress, Pepco still needs to provide service to the other locations served from these facilities. Finally, we do not agree that this site plan provides adequate space, clearances, and accesses in order to provide Adequate Public Electric Utilities to the project.”

b. E-mail from Verizon, Gabor Varsa to Lareuse, dated November 17, 2009:

“Verizon would like to state that the 10’ PUE provided for the conduits, and the proposed and planned “bump-outs” for the manholes for the main run would be satisfactory for Verizon providing:

“1. Street lighting conduits, transmission lines and Washington gas along with other carriers would be in public space.

“2. The facilities for Pepco and Verizon would be designed and constructed simultaneously by a mutually approved vendor, contractor with Verizon issuing the designed job, and inspections provided by Verizon.”

For further clarification of Verizon’s position, they do not want to be located in the public right-of-way. The following was taken from an earlier e-mail dated November 13, 2009, Gabor to Lareuse:

“With this communication I understand that the 10’ PUE will be dedicated only to Pepco with the support and confirmation of the County? I do find this a little bit unfair and erroneous. This is an exclusionary decision. All utilities having a franchise in the state should have access to all PUEs. Moreover, putting Verizon in the sidewalk area, under the sidewalk poses several pressing issues and questions. What kind of trees will be planted in the tree space? Roots damage conduits with the passing of time. Verizon will have to permit all future activities with that structure, and will lose the protection of the PUEs for future prior rights. Verizon will ask to have the system designed and constructed by Verizon approved vendors under Verizon’s supervision.”

c. WSSC—No Comment, dated November 19, 2009.

The plan now shows ten feet for the utilities. The applicant has stated that they have been working with the utility companies to address this issue, but staff has not had time to study this issue further, nor to draw any conclusions from what is relayed in the information above. Until the issue of providing adequate area for the installation of utilities to service the proposed development is resolved, the acceptable location for the building edge along the streetscape cannot be determined with certainty.

The other issue that is impacting the streetscape design along Toledo Terrace is the incorporation of bus pull-off areas located within the public right-of-way along Toledo Terrace. These bus pull-off areas are impacting the streetscape by reducing the sidewalk width from the required 12-foot-wide sidewalk as stated in the TDDP, to as little as five feet in width.

Further, the applicant has not officially requested an amendment to P1 to adjust the minimum requirements, partly because staff cannot advise with the issues continuing to be unresolved.

### **Private Streets**

In addition to the issues stated above, staff is concerned about the streetscapes shown on the plan as private streets and their relationship to the property to the south. First, the original submittal proposed to connect the private streets to the driveway that loops around Prince George’s Plaza Shopping Center. The applicant has not provided evidence that permission to connect to that facility has been granted from the owners of the shopping center. The applicant has provided the following letter dated November 12, 2009 from Joseph F. Coradino, Executive Vice President, PREIT Associates, LP to Lareuse:

“After a series of meetings and discussions we have had over the past few months with Contee Company, LLP (“Contee”), it is our understanding that Contee plans to redevelop its property, known as Belcrest Plaza Apartments, as a

high-density, mixed-use community (the “Belcrest Redevelopment”) immediately to the north of PREIT’s Mall at Prince George’s. We support Contee’s proposed Belcrest Redevelopment substantially in the form as presented to us.

“We further understand that during the review of the Detailed Site Plan application for the Belcrest Redevelopment, the Planning Commission has requested assurances that fire, rescue, and emergency equipment and vehicles would have ingress and egress access along an approximately 30’ wide paved area on PREIT’s private property immediately to the south of the Belcrest Redevelopment’s property line that adjoins PREIT’s Mall at Prince George’s (“PREIT’s Private Ring Road”). This letter is to confirm PREIT’s intention to grant legal and unobstructed access on, through, and across PREIT’s Private Ring Road for the benefit of the Belcrest Redevelopment; but only for fire, rescue, and/or emergency equipment and vehicular purposes. Nothing in this letter should be construed to grant any other vehicular ingress or egress to or from the Belcrest Redevelopment on, through, or across PREIT’s Private Ring Road, except for fire, rescue, and/or emergency equipment or vehicular access. PREIT further intends to agree and covenant that no obstruction to fire, rescue, and/or emergency equipment or vehicular access shall be constructed on, through, or across PREIT’s Private Ring Road within 30’ of the Belcrest Redevelopment’s property line that adjoins the Mall at Prince George’s.

“This Letter of Support and Confirmation of Intention is merely an expression of PREIT’s present intent, and shall not constitute any legally binding obligation for PREIT to grant access to or use of PREIT’s Private Ring Road for fire, rescue, and/or emergency equipment or vehicular access, unless and until such time as a mutually acceptable easement agreement has been negotiated in good faith and executed by all appropriate parties.”

Therefore, the plans were changed to dead-end the private streets that are proposed. The fact that the applicant has not secured the right from the adjacent property owner to access Prince George’s Plaza Shopping Center causes a hindrance in the development of the plan in regard to Parcel B, Georgian Plaza, because the block pattern and connective urban street grid that is proposed are not fully functional.

Further, these private streets threaten to become dead zones within the property as the uses directly adjacent to those streets on both sides are five-story parking garages. The residential units are proposed on the fourth and fifth floors of some of the buildings flanking these areas. Each of the building elevations and the associated floor plans should be revised to incorporate uses that will result in a 24-hour environment, i.e. office/retail, residential uses. This will assure that the concept of “eyes on the streets” is provided for within the development.

The plan proposes to create a pedestrian streetscape along the property edge of Parcel B, Georgian Plaza. This property line separates Prince George’s Plaza Shopping Center from the subject property. The applicant’s intent is to enliven this edge of the development by placing 40,000 square feet of a public use amenity (yet to be identified) on the southern side of the office building and other retail spaces within the remaining buildings along this edge of the development. In front of the façades of the buildings located along this edge of the development is a proposed ten-foot-wide sidewalk that is

located six feet from the shared property line. Within this six-foot area are proposed street tree plantings that will shade the south side of the buildings and the walkway.

The proposal to activate the southern edge of the development may have a positive effect on the future development of Prince George's Plaza Shopping Center. However, the on-site parking facilities for the retail uses are not convenient to shoppers that might want to shop at retail facilities facing the shopping center and may result in shoppers parking on the shopping center site and then walking across the driveway to access the shops. This in turn may cause a dangerous situation, as there are no crosswalks to accommodate pedestrians and none shown on the plan as off-site improvements. Until the applicant can provide clear evidence that the subject site is providing for convenient and easily accessible parking to serve the retail uses, staff does not support the proposed layout.

In addition to the streetscape, staff believes that the goals apply to the clear definition of public spaces other than the streetscape, such as plazas and open space elements that should be provided in the form of recreational areas. The plans would be improved through the incorporation of a public park that will service the recreational needs of the future community. Incorporation of a park into the design of the community will contribute to a sense of identity for the transit district and will provide an improved sense of place.

#### **Environment (TDDP)**

- a. Restore, protect and enhance environmental quality whenever possible by protecting environmentally sensitive areas, minimizing the negative impacts of development and expanding recreation and aesthetic opportunities.**

The applicant provided the following comment:

“The existing properties are fully developed. The proposed redevelopment will include the construction of water quality devices to improve water quality. A conceptual stormwater management plan (Case #11078-2009-00) has been approved. In addition, the intention of the project is to realize an entire neighborhood redevelopment that employs and encourages sustainable practices. With walkable and pedestrian scaled street frontages, pedestrian and bicycle linkages to mass transit and local services and a campus of LEED certified buildings, the project responds to the growing need for sustainable developments which reduce negative impacts on our environment.”

**Comment:** The applicant clearly proffers Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified buildings in the statement above.

The Environmental Planning Section identified the following environmental issues further defined in the TDDP:

The site is within the Prince George's Plaza Approved Transit District Development Plan for the Transit District Overlay Zone. The following mandatory development requirements from the approved transit district development plan are environmental in nature and are applicable to this review. The mandatory development requirements are numbered in accordance with the approved plan and shown in **bold** print.

**P25 Any development shall provide for water quality and quantity control in accordance with all Federal, State and County regulations. Bioretention or other innovative water quantity or quality methods shall be used where deemed appropriate.**

A Stormwater Management Concept Approval Letter and Plan (11078-2009) were included with the application. The letter states that bioretention, filtration, and one-year extended detention are required. Stormwater management is being provided for the entire site.

The site is providing on-site underground stormwater treatment and bioretention. The approved concept plan shows four underground storage treatment facilities that are correctly reflected on the detailed site plan. Three landscaped bioretention facilities on the southwest portion of the site are also proposed. In addition to these required water quality and quantity controls, some of the rooftop stormwater runoff will be captured, filtered, and reused in seven proposed vegetated courtyards in the development. These stormwater management methods are considered innovative and are appropriate for this type of high-density development. According to the Environmental Planning Section, the proposed application is in general conformance with the approved concept.

**P26 Where stormwater management cannot be provided for existing developed properties, a mandatory 15 percent green space requirement shall be provided. The green space can be incorporated into the mandatory 10 percent afforestation requirements (referred to in S33, Woodland Conservation) if it occurs on the actual property.**

All stormwater management for the subject site is proposed to be provided on-site. No additional information regarding stormwater management is required at this time.

**S31 At the time of Detailed Site Plan, the number of trash cans and locations shall be shown on the plan. Trash receptacles should be placed in strategic locations to prevent litter from accumulating in and around the proposed development.**

This requirement has been addressed. The landscape plan shows several trash receptacles strategically placed throughout the proposed development at a volume adequate to prevent litter accumulation. No additional information regarding placement of trash cans is required.

**S32 Prior to the final inspection and sign-off of permits by the Sediment/Stormwater or Building Inspector, any storm drain inlets associated with the development and all inlets on the subject subarea shall be stenciled with "Do Not Dump, Chesapeake Bay Drainage." The Detailed Site Plan and the Sediment Control Plan (in the sequence of construction) shall contain this information.**

A copy of the sediment and erosion control plan was not submitted with this application, and the detailed site plan did not include information regarding this requirement. The revised detailed site plan and a copy of the sediment and erosion control plan addressing this requirement are needed to ensure that the information regarding stormdrain stenciling of the inlets is included.

**S33 Afforestation of at least 10 percent of the gross tract shall be required on all properties within the Prince George's Plaza Transit District currently exempt from the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance. Afforestation shall occur on-site or within the Anacostia Watershed in Prince George's County, with priority given to riparian zones and nontidal wetlands, particularly within the Northwest Branch sub-watershed.**

This site is not subject to the requirements of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because it contains less than 10,000 square feet of woodland and has no previously approved tree conservation plans. A standard letter of exemption for the subject site was issued on July 11, 2009. Because the site is exempt, S33 must be applied to the subject application.

The gross tract area of the site, as stated on the approved natural resources inventory (NRI) is 24.99 acres. The requirement for afforestation for the subject site is 2.50 acres, or 108,900 square feet. The applicant has proposed to meet this requirement using 111,400 square feet of on-site tree canopy coverage based on tree credits at 10-year canopy growth. According to the plan and the Tree Cover Credit worksheet, the requirement will be met with the landscaping of approximately 712 deciduous trees that includes ornamental and columnar trees as well as large and medium shade trees. An additional 72 evergreen will also be used to meet the requirement.

The use of tree canopy coverage on-site does not meet the requirements of S33. In the majority of past cases in the TDDP, S33 has been addressed through the provision of woodland conservation at off-site locations. In the majority of those cases, the applicants were not able to meet the requirement within the Anacostia watershed because of the absence of viable planting sites. Before being allowed to meet the requirement elsewhere in the county, these applicants were required to show due diligence in seeking sites within the Anacostia watershed. Contacts were made with the Anacostia Watershed Society to locate sites, and properties owned by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) were also evaluated. Finding no viable sites, applicants were allowed to meet the requirements outside the Anacostia watershed.

Since the approval of the majority of the development within the TDDP, the Planning Board's policies with regard to the use of tree canopy in urban areas has changed. In May 2009, the Planning Board transmitted legislation to the County Council that allows the use of landscaping and street trees to meet the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The legislation also codifies the use of urban tree canopy to enhance urban settings like those of the TDDP.

Because S33 requires the provision of afforestation within the Anacostia watershed, the plans must be revised to reflect how S33 will be addressed unless an amendment to S33 is filed. Amendments could be filed to either use tree canopy coverage to meet the 10 percent or to allow afforestation to be provided outside the Anacostia watershed. If the applicant can present evidence to the Planning Board that supports the amendments, the Planning Board has the authority to approve these alternative approaches.

If the Planning Board approves the use of tree canopy coverage as a method to meet the intent of S33, then an exhibit that demonstrates how the tree credits in the worksheet are accounted for in the plant schedules shall be submitted, and information regarding the required amount of soil volumes shall be provided, per direction from the Urban Design Section.

**P28 Any new development or reconstruction of existing development shall be in conformance with the Prince George's County Floodplain Ordinance.**

Floodplain does not occur on this site.

**P29 No development within the 100-year floodplain shall be permitted without the express written consent of the Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources.**

Floodplain does not occur on this site.

**P32 If impacts to nontidal wetlands are proposed, a State Water Quality Certification pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act shall be required from the Maryland Department of the Environment.**

Non-tidal wetlands do not occur on this site.

**P33 Each Preliminary Plat, Conceptual and/or Detailed Site Plan shall show a 65 dBA (Ldn) noise contour based upon average daily traffic volumes at LOS E. Upon plan submittal, the Natural Resources Division shall determine if a noise study is required based on the delineation of the noise contour.**

**S34 If it is determined by the Natural Resources Division that a noise study is required, it shall be reviewed and approved by the Natural Resources Division prior to approval of any Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, Conceptual and/or Detailed Site Plan. The study shall use traffic volumes at LOS E and include examination of appropriate mitigation techniques and the use of acoustical design techniques. Further more, a typical cross-section profile of noise emission from the road to the nearest habitable structure is required.**

The subject site fronts Toledo Terrace which is not classified and does not carry sufficient traffic to require noise mitigation. The southernmost portion of the site is approximately 325 feet from East-West Highway (MD 410), an arterial roadway that is a source of noise levels above the state noise standards. In order to preliminarily assess potential noise impacts from MD 410 on the subject site, the noise analysis of the adjacent site, known as Post Park, located between the subject site and MD 410, was used. The results of that analysis show that the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour is located approximately 196 feet from the centerline of MD 410. The subject site is located another 129 feet outside of the unmitigated noise contour, therefore, noise impacts to the subject site from MD 410 are not anticipated.

## **Transportation (TDDP)**

- 1. Ensure that all new development or redevelopment in the transit district is coordinated in a fashion that:**
  - a. Provides for adequate levels of transportation and transit operating and service efficiency.**
  - b. Ideally produces a net revenue increase for the County.**
  - c. Is based on transportation and transit policies that seek to increase protection of County environmental assets and resources.**

The applicant provided the following comment:

“As indicated above, the proposed community has been designed to take advantage of its location near a Metro station. The mix of uses and the pedestrian and bicycle friendly design of the project will discourage vehicle trips and create a true transit oriented development. The proposal will satisfy all of the transportation requirements of the TDDP, and there will be a substantial overall reduction in surface parking. The mix of both retail and office uses will generate positive tax revenue and the completed development will result in a substantial increase in property tax and other revenues.”

**Comment:** The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the proposed change of the underlying zone from R-18 to M-U-I, the proposed DSP application referenced above, the prepared statement of justification, and the traffic study that has been prepared by the Traffic Group in accordance with the requirements of Sections 27-546.16 and 27-548.09.01 of the Zoning Ordinance. The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon review of these materials and additional analyses conducted by staff of the Transportation Planning Section consistent with the TDDP requirements, the Planning Department’s “Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals,” and reviews conducted by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) and the County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T).

### **Background**

The subject property is located along the north and south sides of Toledo Terrace, extending from Belcrest Road to just north of East-West Highway (MD 410). Toledo Terrace is a county-maintained two lane roadway with 36 feet of pavement, and 70 feet of dedicated rights-of-way (ROW). The existing 36-foot-wide pavement is sufficient to provide the two existing travel lanes, and either a continuous center left-turn lane, or two five-foot-wide on-road bike lanes as recommended by the TDDP, in accordance with DPW&T specifications and standards for bridges and roads. However, a review of the materials submitted indicates the need for both a center lane and two five-foot-wide bike lanes.

The subject property is located within the Prince George’s Plaza TDDP developed for the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone (PG-TDOZ). The approved TDDP guides the use and development of all properties within the PG-TDOZ boundaries. During the initial preparation of the TDDP in 1991, staff performed an analysis of all key

intersections in the vicinity of the TDDP using the maximum allowable development levels resulting from the recommended zoning for all 15 Subareas in the transit district. This analysis included the current R-18 zoning on the subject property, identified as Subareas 12 and part of 13A in the TDDP. The results of this analysis are documented in a 1991 publication entitled “Transportation Study, The Prince George’s Plaza and West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zones.”

The transportation study of the TDDP land uses led to the development of specific transportation-related recommendations and the establishment of a transit district-wide cap on the number of additional parking spaces (preferred and premium). Pursuant to the establishment of the district-wide parking cap developed for the 1991 TDDP Plan, the TDDP recommends a transportation adequacy determination approach which is based on the number of proposed parking spaces for any development within the transit district. Application of the recommended parking-based adequacy determination at detailed site plan review has resulted in collection of an appropriate developer contribution fee to be applied toward the construction of the transportation improvements needed to meet the TDDP’s goal of an adequate transportation system. The term “parking” used in the 1998 TDDP adequacy requirements is defined to include only surface parking for new development and redevelopment plans. To account for the use of surface parking in the adequacy determination, the TDDP recognized that construction of the recommended transportation improvements alone would not be sufficient to reach the goal of an adequate transportation system. To this end, the formation of the Prince George’s Plaza Transportation Demand Management District (PG-TDMD) is also a recommendation of the 1998 TDDP.

The PG-TDMD may be authorized by the County Council, upon the recommendation of the Planning Board, as required in the TDMD Ordinance (Subtitle 20A of the Prince George’s County Code). Once the TDMD is authorized, the TDDP requires collection of annual TDMD fees from every property owner in the transit district to fund the required additional trip reduction measure, related roadway and transit and pedestrian improvements, and parking management measures required to restore LOS E for the intersections studied as part of the 1991 transportation study prepared for the TDDP.

Pursuant to the Mandatory Transportation Development Requirements of the TDDP (pages 56–62) each CSP and/or DSP application proposing a development that is generally consistent with the land use assumptions of the original transportation study used in support of the TDDP, is not required to submit a traffic impact analysis to demonstrate adequate levels of service for transportation. For such applications, the required adequacy findings for the transportation network are made using the proposed number of new and non-exempt surface parking spaces that will be constructed as part of the proposed development application, in accordance with Mandatory Development requirements P6 through P19.

### **Existing Development**

The four parcels of land included in the submitted DSP application (totaling 24.92 acres) consist of Parcel B of the Georgian Plaza plat of Subdivision (12.47 acres) located behind the Prince George’s Plaza shopping center, and Parcels A, B, and C of the Americana Plaza (12.45 acres) located at the northwest corner of Toledo Terrace and Northwest Drive. These parcels are currently developed with 566 multifamily rental dwelling units in 27 low-rise buildings constructed in the 1950s and 1960s. The existing parcels which comprise the subject property are zoned R-18. The existing development level of 566

units is consistent with the maximum allowable yield for an R-18 zoned property, or 20 units per gross acre. The existing residential development on the site includes a total of 743 surface parking spaces. This level of development is projected to generate 294 AM peak hour, and 340 PM peak-hour vehicle trips, using the *Guidelines*' recommended trip generation rates for multifamily garden apartments. The submitted traffic study, using a very low peak-hour reduction for Metrorail, bus, and pedestrian trips, has reported that the existing development would generate 189 AM peak hour, and 295 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. The reported vehicle trip volumes for the existing development and for the AM and PM peak hours have not been field-verified by conducting separate driveway vehicle counts.

### **Proposed Development**

The DSP proposes to replace the existing multifamily garden apartments with a mixed-use development consisting of office, retail, public spaces, and residential units. To achieve this, the DSP requests to: (1) change the underlying zone from R-18 to M-U-I Zone, (2) modify the use list approved for Subareas 12, and 13A, and (3) amend several of the TDDP's Mandatory Development Requirements, and Design Guidelines. If the requested M-U-I Zone is granted, the DSP proposes to demolish the entire 566 multifamily residential apartment buildings and construction of 176,000 square feet of office space, 62,100 square feet of commercial retail space, 40,000 square feet public amenity space, 2,618 multifamily high-rise residential units, and 57 townhouses. The DSP also proposes to replace the existing 743 surface parking spaces with 3,779 new parking spaces, of which only 78 will be constructed as surface parking spaces. While this represents nearly 90 percent reduction in number of surface parking for these two Subareas (12, and 13A), it is an increase of over 77 percent in total number of parking spaces assumed for these two Subareas.

Based on the recommended trip generation rates by the *Guidelines*, the proposed development is projected to generate 1,205 AM peak hour, and 1,727 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. The mix of uses planned on the subject site is expected to reduce the projected AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trips by the trips that would not be made by people who would work, live, and shop within the confines of the development and transit district. This reduction is referred to as internal trips. Using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) recommended internal trip generation interchange for a mixed use development. The reported AM and PM peak hour total new vehicle trips for the proposed development would be further reduced to 1,294, and 1,597 vehicle trips respectively. The applicant's prepared traffic study includes the recommended TDM-based peak-hour vehicle trip reduction factors of 55 percent for any residential uses, and 35 percent for commercial retail and office uses. These factors were used in the 1991 transportation study for the TDDP. The applicant did not provide any mandatory or voluntary, but enforceable, on-site TDM strategies to justify their use. Using these additional vehicle trip reductions and assuming one-to-one credit for the traffic that is generated by existing 566 apartment units, the submitted traffic study prepared in support of the DSP, indicates that the proposed development is projected to generate 583 new AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 747 new PM peak-hour vehicle trips, or less than half the number of AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trips projected by staff for the subject site. Nonetheless, these figures represent a 300 percent increase from the calculated vehicle trip generation of the existing 566 apartment units.

### **Conformance to the Zoning Ordinance for Rezoning to M-U-I Zone**

The DSP for the proposed mix-use development also proposes to change to the underlying zone from R-18 to the M-U-I Zone for each of the four parcels of land forming the subject site. Section 27-546.16 (b) (1) of the Zoning Ordinance indicates that properties within a TDOZ may be rezoned to the M-U-I Zone by amending the TDDP, provided it can be shown that: “ the proposed rezoning and development will meet TDDP goals and objectives and will be compatible with existing or approved future development on adjacent properties.” The Transportation goal of the TDDP (page 14) states, “Ensure that all new development or redevelopment in the transit district is coordinated in a fashion that: provides for adequate levels of transportation and transit operating and service efficiency.” As part of the Transportation chapter, on page 44 of the TDDP, within the Introduction section, it is stated that traffic level-of-service E (LOS E) is the operational adequacy standard for transportation facilities within the transit district. Finally, within the Transportation chapter of the TDDP (page 44), the first objective is to “Identify and provide for the transportation facilities and transit service that are needed for a safe and efficient transportation network capable of supporting existing and planned development in the transit district.” LOS E is the same as the recommended adequacy standard for Metropolitan and Regional Centers within the Prince George’s County General Plan.

As indicated above for the rezoning of subject property to M-U-I Zone, the applicant must demonstrate that the TDDP goals, including the Transportation Goal with regard to “adequate levels of transportation and transit operating and service efficiency,” is fully met. To do this, staff requested that the review of the rezoning should include a detailed transportation analysis in accordance with the requirements of Section 27-546.16(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, and the approved TDDP. This study would serve as an update to the prepared 1991 transportation study which evaluated the recommended zoning and land uses of the TDDP. In a scoping meeting with the applicant’s traffic consultant, held early in October 2009, staff recommended the updated traffic study should clearly identify any additional trip reduction goals needed to maintain LOS E for the transportation system in the TDDP study area. This included recommending timely implementation of appropriate and effective elements for a Transportation Management Plan for the subject site, including enhancing the bus, pedestrian, and biking experience between the subject property and other uses in the transit district and the metro station. It was made clear to the applicant that if such an updated study is not provided in timely fashion for the proposed rezoning to M-U-I, staff would not be able to make the required finding of conformance to the goals of the TDDP including the transportation goal for the proposed rezoning to the M-U-I Zone.

### **The Review of the Submitted Traffic Study**

An updated traffic study, dated October 20, 2009, was submitted for review on October 23, 2009. This study evaluated the existing and future conditions (build out represented by year 2030) in the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District, as well as the impact of the requested rezoning of the existing Belcrest Plaza Apartment site (TDDP Subareas 12, and part of 13A) from R-18 to the M-U-I Zone. The study analyzed all the key intersections that were included in the 1991 TDDP Transportation Study. Most of the existing traffic data used in this study was obtained from State Highway Administration (SHA), and from another on-going study for the City of Hyattsville. On October 27, 2009, the submitted traffic study prepared in support of the proposed DSP, was referred to the City of Hyattsville, the Town of University Park, the State Highway Administration (SHA), and the County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), with a

detailed transmittal letter outlining the specific requirements of Section 27-546.16(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, and the approved TDDP transportation adequacy requirements that this study should fully address.

The existing conditions analysis indicates that two of the signalized intersections in the transit district are currently operating below the level-of-service standard (LOS E) that has been established by the TDDP. These intersections are: (1) the intersection of MD 410 (East-West Highway) with US 1, and (2) the intersection of MD 410 with MD 500 (Queens Chapel Road) and Adelphi Road. Only one of the unsignalized intersections indicates a peak-hour delay for minor street approach exceeding the maximum acceptable level of 50 seconds. This is the intersection of MD 410 and Editor's Park Drive. Analysis of the existing conditions combined with the projected traffic associated with the proposed development as result of the rezoning, and by using every possible vehicle trip reductions and assumptions recommended by the ITE and TDDP, indicates that the same two intersections would require improvements. However, this analysis indicates that the traffic attributed to the proposed development represents only 3.6 percent and 11.3 percent of the total traffic at the intersections of US 1 with MD 410, and at MD 500 with Belcrest Road/Queensbury Road.

In order to determine the future projections (build out), staff provided the applicant's traffic consultant with the year 2030 projected peak period data (morning and evening) that was developed by the TransForm Model, the county's regional transportation model. These peak periods traffic volume projections are for a 3-hour period during the morning and a 2½-hour period in the evening. Staff also provided the traffic consultant with the base year (2000), and the forecast year (2030) projected daily volumes for major roadway links in the study area. The consultant converted the forecasted 2030 peak period link volumes into peak hour intersection turning movements by using the Direct Volume Method (found in NCHRP 255) and the 2009 existing volumes as a base. The resulting year 2030 intersection turning movement projections are based on the regional model and therefore include a substantial amount of regional growth that is not associated with the TDDP area. The future year analyses evaluated the key intersections assuming the road network with future master plans' road configurations, capital improvement program (CIP) and consolidated transportation program (CTP) improvements that are planned, as well any intersection improvements recommended by the TDDP. The results of this analysis indicates that, in order to achieve LOS E conditions, a total of eight signalized intersections would require improvements beyond the lane use recommendation of approved master plans, the CIP/CTP, and the TDDP improvements. These intersections are: (1) MD 410 with MD 212, (2) MD 410 with 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, (3) MD 410 with MD 500/Adelphi Road, (4) US 1 with MD 410, (5) Adelphi Road with Belcrest Road/Underwood Street, (6) MD 500 with Nicholson Street, (7) MD 500 with Hamilton Street, and (8) MD 500 with MD 501 (Chillum Street). Three of the unsignalized intersections also indicate peak hour delay for minor street approaches exceeding the maximum acceptable level of 50 seconds. These intersections are: MD 410 and Editor's Park Drive, Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace, and MD 500 and Nicholson Lane.

Finally, by using all possible vehicle trip reduction measures and assumptions recommended by the ITE and the TDDP, the total new trips projected to be generated by the proposed development for subject site, as explained above, were distributed and assigned to the TDDP road network. This resulted in projected total AM and PM peak hour turning movements for key intersections. Intersection analyses using the total projected 2,030 turning movements, including the traffic associated with proposed

rezoning, indicated that the same signalized and unsignalized intersections would require improvements in addition to the lane use recommendations of approved master plans and the TDDP. The intersections of MD 410 with Toledo Terrace, MD 410 with MD 500/Adelphi Road, and MD 500 with Nicholson Lane require additional improvements that are over and above the levels identified for 2,030 future conditions without the site-generated traffic.

### **The Submitted Study Findings**

The following is the submitted traffic study's findings and conclusions:

#### **“Findings**

“This study has indicated that based on the year 2030 projections significant improvements will be needed to the road network to maintain level of service “E” conditions in the Prince George's Plaza TDDP study area. It should be noted that the basis for the 2030 projections came from the regional model developed by M-NCPPC and accounts for a great deal of growth from other areas of the County and not just the TDDP area.

“The number of intersections requiring improvements by the year 2030 is more than what was outlined in the 1998 Approved Prince George's County TDDP. However what is clear from this study is that the rezoning of the Belcrest Plaza Apartments site does not have a significant impact on the need for these future improvements.

“The intersections which indicate that the rezoning of the subject property will require additional improvements in 2030 are a result of the overall growth in this area not just the rezoning of the property. The subject rezoning of this site would represent a small percentage of the traffic at these intersections. Furthermore, these improvements would not be able to be constructed until such time as all of the other improvements have been implemented.

“Therefore the following is each list of these improvements and the impact on each location resulting from rezoning:

- MD 410 & Toledo Terrace - 10.8%
- MD 410 & MD 500/Adelphia Road - 1.6%
- MD 500 & Nicholson Street - 2.7%

“The results of the analysis examining the existing volumes in this area and the additional traffic resulting from the rezoning indicate that only two intersections would require improvements.

“At the US 1 and MD 410 intersection, the improvements identified are needed based on existing conditions. This project only represents 3.6% of the traffic at this location.

“At the MD 500 and Queensbury Road/Belcrest Road intersection the improvements previously discussed would achieve a Level of Service “E” condition. The traffic generated by the rezoning would account for 11.3% of the traffic.

#### **“Conclusions**

“Based on the results of this study the TDDP study area is experiencing levels of service that exceed the established level of service “E” standard established by the approved

TDDP. It would appear from this analysis that the TDMD requirements established in the TDDP should be implemented for this area.

“Furthermore, it is clear that the requested rezoning of the Belcrest Plaza Apartment site will not have a significant impact on the future traffic conditions within the TDDP, and that reasonable improvements that are a direct result of the rezoning, could be implemented. Upon approval, the Belcrest Plaza Apartments would be subjected to the same criteria as every other development within the TDDP to pay for the other improvements needed in this area.”

### **Transportation Staff Findings and Conclusions**

Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that the proposed rezoning request from the R-18 to the M-U-I Zone and the associated mixed-use development levels for the subject property, and the findings of the submitted traffic study prepared in support of the proposed DSP application, do not meet and satisfactorily address the TDDP goal:

**“Ensure that all new development or redevelopment in the transit district is coordinated in a fashion that: Provides for adequate levels of transportation and transit operating and service efficiency.”**

The report failed to identify the specific trip reduction goals needed to maintain an adequate transportation system in the TDDP study area. It also failed to recommend elements for a Transportation Management Plan for the subject site, including enhancing the bus, pedestrian and biking experience to and from the site to other uses in the transit district and the metro station, and did not recommend timely implementation of appropriate measures.

### **Public Facilities (TDDP)**

- a. Provide the most efficient delivery of essential, general and educational services to the residents, businesses and uses of the transit district.**
- b. Minimize crime through a variety of crime prevention strategies and increase citizen and business awareness.**

The applicant provided the following comment:

“The proposed development will contribute to creating the critical mass needed to create a vibrant, sustainable transit oriented area. As a lifestyle community, the residents will largely be committed to locating in an urban transit oriented development. This will allow for the more efficient delivery of essential, general and educational services. In addition, the applicant has proposed the inclusion of 23,780 square feet of public space in the office building closest to the Metro station. Initially, this space is proposed to support the local library, but could be used for other public purposes if a greater need is identified.”

**Comment:** Staff believes that the public facility issues are addressed through various laws already in place, specifically the schools facility surcharge and the public safety surcharge. In regard to the school facility surcharge, the applicant will be obliged to make payment at the time of building permit. In regard to the public safety surcharge, the

applicant is exempt from that payment as it is tied to the requirement of a preliminary plat of subdivision. Since a determination has been made that the subject site is not required to subdivide, the applicant will not be required to make a public safety surcharge payment unless a condition is placed on the property through either the zoning or the detailed site plan. A similar situation occurred on the adjacent property, Post Park, where the requirement of \$2,000 per unit became a condition of approval and was required to be paid at the time of building permits.

### **Economic Development (TDDP)**

- a. Maximize the function of the station facility as a transit transfer point, employment destination and off-peak shopping center.**
- b. Encourage evening usage of the area.**
- c. Promote the development of service-oriented businesses which will support the large existing daytime population and encourage Metro ridership.**

The applicant provided the following comment:

“Consistent with the recommendation for mixed use development within Subarea 12, the proposed community will satisfy all three of the economic development goals. The development will include employment opportunities within walking distance of the Metro, and will provide a concentration of population which can increase Metro ridership. The additional residential population, and the service commercial uses and restaurants within the property will encourage evening use of the area and complement the existing commercial core of the area.”

**Comment:** The mix of uses in the project, the promotion of “eyes on the street,” and the encouragement of use of the area during the evening, are all impacted by the review and approval of the detailed site plan both through the physical development and the retail/office uses proposed. The subject site could be improved by providing additional residential units at the street level and directly above the street level on both public and private streets.

### **Trails (TDDP)**

- a. Have pedestrian/multiuse trails and bikeways viewed seriously as a viable transportation mode that can provide a low-cost, energy-efficient and environmentally safe alternative to single-occupant vehicles (SOV).**
- b. Have in place a uniform, totally connected, continuous trail and bikeway network with access to and from all neighborhoods and communities for all aspects of the living environment, office, shopping schools, transit, parks and bus stops.**
- c. To achieve, with the recommended trails and bikeway infrastructure in place, a goal that at least 5 percent of the transit district workers and/or persons accessing Metro will use bicycles and walking as alternative transportation modes.**

The applicant provided the following comment:

“The proposed plan is completely consistent with this goal. The Applicant has designed bicycle and tricycle parking areas into the parking garage, approximately 40 bicycle racks will be strategically located around the retail stores facing the urban green and a changing room is provided in the building at Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace to encourage bicycle use by both the residents, patrons and office workers.”

**Comment:** The Trail’s Coordinator provided the following analysis of the pedestrian system:

The Approved Prince George’s Plaza Transit District Development Plan places a high priority on creating walkable, multi-modal connections to metro. The plan opens with several goals related to accessing Metro and creating a truly multi-modal network.

The subject application proposes an extensive and high-density mixed-use development in Subareas 12 and 13a of the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District Development Plan. As a mixed-use center close to Metro, pedestrian accommodations and facilities for multi-modal transportation are a priority. The Approved Prince George’s Plaza TDDP includes numerous standards, guidelines, and recommendations pertaining to pedestrian and bicycle accommodations. These include areawide TDDP requirements, as well as requirements specific to the subareas in question.

#### **Mandatory Development Requirements**

- 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 the face of curb (See Figures 7, 8 and 9).
- S1** All proposed development/redevelopment shall have a primary pedestrian walkway system that coincides with the street system and provides connection directly to the Metro station. In addition, the secondary and tertiary pedestrian systems shall provide efficient pedestrian circulation and inner-block connections through parks, plazas, and green areas.
- S2** Walkways through parking lots, other than those linking buildings with parking lots, shall, wherever possible, be avoided.
- S4** All proposed development shall have direct, safe pedestrian links provided between the transit district uses, the primary walkway system and ultimately to the Metro station.
- S5** All primary and secondary pedestrian routes shall be constructed using special paving materials. (See Figure 7 for detail of crosswalks.)
- S8** All property frontages shall be improve in accordance with Figures 7, 8 and 9 in order to create a visually continuous and unified streetscape.

- S13** All major pedestrian crossings, such as crossings that traverse more than three lanes of traffic, shall have a contrasting pavement material. Crossings are to conform to all Road Code standards and conform to Figure 7.
- S29** The location and number of bicycle lockers, racks and other features shall be determined at Detailed Site Plan review.
- S30** All new retail development shall provide four bicycle racks per 10,000 gross square feet of floor space with each rack holding a minimum of two bicycles.
- P20** Developers shall provide continuous sidewalks along all frontages of their property on public rights-of-way in the transit district.
- S72** TDDP streetscape improvements shall only be required along Toledo Terrace (Subarea 13a only).

In regard to the subject site, Figure 8 within the TDDP requires a 20-foot-wide pedestrian zone with a 12-foot-wide sidewalk along Toledo Terrace. Toledo Road includes a 20-foot-wide pedestrian zone with a required 12-foot-wide sidewalk. Belcrest Road requires a 20- to 40-foot-wide pedestrian zone, including a wide sidewalk of undetermined width. Cross sections for all three roads include an in-road “bike zone” or bike lane. Table 10 further clarifies this to include striped bicycle lanes along Toledo Terrace and Toledo Road (TDDP, p 83).

**Site Design Guidelines**

- G1** All pedestrian walkways should be designed to minimize vehicular/pedestrian conflicts.
- G2** Pedestrian link(s) should be barrier-free.
- G48** Whenever possible, bicycle parking facilities should be located near building entrances but should not be located so as to conflict with major pedestrian circulation routes.
- G49** In subareas with structure parking garages, a separate bicycle parking area should be provided.
- G50** All bicycle racks and/or lockers located outside of parking structures should be located in secure, well-lit and highly visible areas with adequate space for maneuverability.
- G51** Bicycle racks and/or lockers should be sensitively sited and include landscape plantings, berming and/or low walls.

**Other Relevant TDDP Recommendations**

The TDDP also states the following objectives for bicycle parking and related facilities as part of all new construction or major renovation, including office, retail and housing developments (TDDP, p 81):

- **Construct bicycle parking facilities in well-traveled and lighted areas. Facilities should be covered and secure.**
- **Require placement of bicycle parking facilities in convenient locations; short-term parking should be as close as possible to building entrances; long-term parking facilities should be located in secure areas.**
- **Ensure the provision of showers and changing facilities in all new or renovated commercial developments.**

### **Findings and Observations**

A comprehensive sidewalk network is provided, with wide sidewalks being proposed along Belcrest Road, Toledo Terrace, Toledo Road, and some internal roads. Sidewalks appear to be provided along all road frontages, and marked crosswalks are indicated at most locations (consistent with Mandatory Development Requirement, p 20). Also, it appears that relatively small block sizes are provided between Toledo Terrace and Toledo Road, with standard or wide sidewalks being provided along both sides of the cross streets. The crosswalk detail appears to indicate a contrasting material (per Mandatory Development Requirement S13), although it is difficult to determine what it will look like based on a written description only.

Facilities provided on the submitted detailed site plan include:

- An 11-foot-wide sidewalk along Belcrest Road (Mandatory Development Requirement S8 requires a 20- to 40-foot pedestrian zone with a sidewalk of undetermined width, per Figure 8).
- A 10-foot-wide sidewalk along the southern property boundary.
- Seven-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of Toledo Terrace (Mandatory Development Requirement S8 requires a 20-foot pedestrian zone with a 12-foot-wide sidewalk, per Figure 8).
- Six-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of Toledo Place.
- Six-foot-wide sidewalks along the frontages of Northwest Drive (south of the townhouse units).
- Six-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of the road between Buildings 3 and 4.
- Eighteen-foot-wide sidewalks along the east side of Building 2.
- Eighteen-foot-wide sidewalks along the west side of Building 1.
- Standard sidewalks along all other road frontages, excluding alleys. This is consistent with Mandatory Development, p 20.
- 294 bicycle parking spaces. This total is 7.5 percent of the total number of car parking spaces provided and is an acceptable ratio. The racks are distributed throughout the subject site. This is in conformance with Mandatory Development Requirement S29 and Site Design Guideline 49.

- 40 bicycle racks will be located around the retail stores facing the urban green. Mandatory Development Requirement requires four bike racks accommodating two bicycles each for every 10,000 square feet of retail space, or 80 bicycle racks for the 200,000 square feet of retail space proposed.
- A changing room is provided in Building 1 to serve cycling residents, patrons, and office workers. This is consistent with a recommendation in the Pedestrian/Bicycle/Multiuse Trail Network Section for showers and changing facilities in all new or renovated commercial developments (TDDP, p 81). It is unclear from the background information if a shower is included in the changing room. Staff recommends that wording be added stating that shower facilities will be included in the changing room for full consistency with the TDDP recommendation.

### **Issues and Modifications Made to the DSP**

- Provide designated bike lanes along Toledo Terrace Road. No lane widths or pavement markings are included in the submittal for Toledo Terrace Road. DPW&T has agreed to the provision of designated bike lanes per the November 23, 2009 e-mail from Rey De Guzman to Susan Lareuse (attached).
- The sidewalks included in the streetscape along Toledo Terrace Road have been widened. The plans initially submitted included seven-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of Toledo Terrace Road. The most recently submitted plans include seven-foot-wide sidewalks.
- A sidewalk detail for the southern edge of the subject site has been provided. A ten-foot-wide sidewalk is reflected on the submitted site plan and labeled as detail 10/L3.2.
- The 294 bicycle parking spaces distributed throughout the site appear to be in conformance with Mandatory Development Requirements and Site Design Guidelines regarding bicycle parking. Forty bike racks will be provided near the retail component of the development. Mandatory Development Requirements requires four bike racks accommodating two bicycles each for every 10,000 square feet of retail space, or 80 bicycle racks for the 200,000 square feet of retail space proposed. While staff believes that this total is probably excessive, staff does recommend that an additional 20 bicycle racks be provided around the retail component to more fully met the intent of the TDDP. This will bring the total number of racks in this area to 60. The number and location of the racks provided around the retail stores should be indicated on the detailed site plan.
- Pedestrian access through the southern portion of the plaza between Building 1 and Building 2 (see Sheet L2.4) has been clarified. The revised plans include a marked crosswalk and curb cuts in this vicinity.
- Bicycle racks have been added to the retail component of the development. However, the location and number should be indicated on the approved DSP.

### **Prince George's Plaza Metro Area Study**

The M-NCPPC received funding through the Council of Government's Transportation/Land Use Connections Program for a pedestrian safety study for the Prince George's Plaza Metro Area. This study evaluated short, mid, and long-term recommendations for improving the pedestrian environment in the area. It also summarized complete street principles that can be applied to the built environment to make existing roads serve as complete streets accommodating all modes of transportation. Many of the study's specific recommendations relate to the immediate vicinity of the MD 410 and Belcrest Road intersection and are beyond the scope of the subject application. However, there are a few recommendations that more directly relate to the subject site. Many of the complete street principles are also applicable to the subject application. These items are discussed below.

- A trail bridge along the Northwest Branch Trail between Toledo Terrace and West Park Drive has recently been washed out and is proposed to be replaced to restore an important trail connection in the study area. The exact location of the bridge is between West Park Drive and the south end of High View Terrace. This bridge is located on M-NCPPC land just west of American Plaza and will directly connect the site with the Northwest Branch Trail.
- The study recommends that the narrow striped shoulder along Belcrest Road be replaced with a wide outside curb lane with shared lane markings. Shared lane markings have the following benefits:
  1. Provide a visible cue to bicyclists and motorists that bicycles are expected on the roadway.
  2. Indicate the most appropriate location to ride on the roadway with respect to moving and parked cars.
  3. Can be used on roads where there is not enough space for standard width bicycle lanes.
  4. Connect gaps between other bicycle facilities along narrow stretches of road.

The study concludes that “the existing shoulder is not wide enough for comfortable bicycle travel and so a wide outside lane with a shared lane marking is considered to be an improvement over the existing condition.”

- The pedestrian improvements noted in the study relate mainly to retrofitting the existing roads to better accommodate pedestrians via measures such as medians, pedestrian refuges, re-striping, reducing pedestrian crossing distances, reduce turning radii, and more effective use of underutilized or wasted space within the right-of-way. The subject application includes standard and wide sidewalks along all roads. Contrasting crosswalks are also provided at many locations. Wide streetscapes are provided along Belcrest Road, Toledo Terrace, and along the property's southern edge. These streetscapes, plus some of the more stringent requirements of the TDDP fulfill many of these complete street principles.
- The pedestrian safety study also recommends the reduction of turning radii at

intersections to slow traffic and improve the pedestrian environment. The study includes a graphic from the State Highway Administration's (SHA) Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines depicting an improved right-turn slip lane to reduce the curb radius. "Free" right turns can be especially hazardous for pedestrians and reducing the turning radii can slow traffic to a speed that is more compatible with pedestrian traffic. It appears that the current turning radius of the Toledo Terrace and Belcrest Road intersection is wider than recommended in the SHA guidelines. As the streetscapes along both Belcrest and Toledo Terrace are going to be reconstructed, this may be the time to reduce the turning radius at the intersection along the property's frontage. Additional discussions may be necessary to determine if it is appropriate to reduce the turning radius of the subject site's portion of the intersection in keeping with the pedestrian safety study. An aerial photo of the intersection and the illustration from the SHA Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines are attached to this memorandum to illustrate the existing intersection configuration and the preferred SHA design.

It should also be noted that the Toole Design report focused the majority of study on the improvements needed at the Belcrest Road and MD 410 intersection. Most of the pedestrian traffic from the subject site will funnel down Belcrest Road towards Metro, using either the existing pedestrian bridge or the at-grade crossing at the Belcrest Road/MD 410 intersection. Although this intersection is off the subject site, inadequate pedestrian facilities impact how pedestrians from the subject site will reach Metro.

Issues that were identified and recommendations that were made for the Belcrest Road/MD 410 intersection include those listed below. If off-site pedestrian improvements are determined to be an appropriate method of addressing the subject application's accessibility to Metro, the Toole Design report should be consulted for a list of potential projects. Included with this memorandum is the aerial photo from the Toole Design report showing all the recommended improvements at and around this intersection. These recommended improvements include the following:

- New pedestrian crossing over MD 410 at American Boulevard
- Curb extensions to reduce the turning radii and reduce the crossing distance for pedestrians
- Expanded median
- New pedestrian route through the Prince George's Plaza parking lot to the pedestrian bridge
- New sidewalk links
- Consolidation of ingress/egress points
- "Sharrow" pavement markings along Belcrest Road
- Raised crosswalks
- Realigned crosswalks

It should also be noted that on September 22, 2009 at a meeting with the City of Hyattsville and SHA, the City noted that the stairwells at the pedestrian bridge are not adequate to accommodate the number of pedestrians experienced during rush hour, particularly after large numbers of riders have exited a train at the Prince George's Plaza Metro. The stairwells are narrow and incapable of accommodating two-way traffic to the bridge. When large numbers of pedestrians are coming down the stairwell, it frequently becomes difficult or impossible for pedestrians to move in the opposite direction. Improvements may be needed in the future to improve the capacity of the stairwells to accommodate more pedestrians in a safe and effective manner. This may involve widening the stairwells to increase the capacity of the approaches leading to the bridge.

Based on field visits and the Toole Design report, staff feels strongly that improving pedestrian accessibility in this area will ultimately involve improving the at-grade crossing at MD 410 and Belcrest Road, as well as enhancing the existing pedestrian bridge. Although staff does not typically recommend off-site pedestrian improvements for development proposals, they are listed above in case it is determined that off-site improvements are needed to adequately facilitate pedestrian movement between the subject site and Metro.

#### **Parks and Recreation (TDDP)**

- a. Provide parks, recreation facilities and programs to respond to the needs of residents and employees of the transit district.**
- b. Develop facilities that are functional, safe and sensitive to the surrounding environment.**
- c. Protect and conserve public open space and natural resources.**
- d. Utilize alternative methods of park acquisition and facility development such as donation and mandatory dedication.**

The applicant provided the following comment:

“The existing development provides no recreation facilities for the existing residents. The proposed plan will be rich with recreational amenities and green spaces appropriate for an urban environment. First, each section of the development will have recreational facilities to serve the residents. In addition, a multi use recreation center for the exclusive use of the residents will be constructed within Subarea 12, at the epicenter of the new community. The recreation center includes a 25 meter pool, a full size basketball court/gymnasium, exercise facilities, billiards, juice bar, and café areas. In the center of this parcel are three (3) blocks consisting of varying building heights. Amenities are provided in each of the buildings, including swimming pools and other amenities that will meet the demographics for this community. In addition to these facilities, extensive parks, courtyards, and plazas with several pedestrian walkways and a continuous sidewalk along street frontages assist in unifying the site thematically, compliment the buildings, provide iconic art settings and meet the leisure needs of the residents and workers.”

**Comment:** On November 6, 2009, staff from the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) met with other staff and the applicant’s development team to review the final submission package for the detailed site plan application. The following is a summary of findings and recommendations for the Planning Board to consider.

On October 6, 2009, M-NCPPC staff met with the applicant to discuss parks and recreation issues for this project. The applicant proffered to dedicate approximately 3.5 acres of off-site property on Americana Plaza, Parcel D to M-NCPPC and to develop the property for outdoor recreational activities (see attached Exhibit A for Parcel D as provided by the applicant). Since our meeting with the applicant, the applicant has not verbalized or placed in writing a withdrawal of this proffer, hence DPR understands that the applicant’s proffer is still valid.

As previously stated, DPR is pleased that the applicant is willing to work with them to address the need for additional parkland and outdoor recreational facilities for this project.

The applicant’s proffer of a portion of Americana Plaza, Parcel D, while generous, is not within the limits of the TDOZ and the current detailed site plan application. DPR recommends that the parkland and outdoor recreational facilities be located within the limits of the detailed site plan application and TDOZ, and more specifically on Georgian Plaza, Parcel B, with the reasoning and justification as noted in DPR’s memo to Susan Lareuse dated October 22, 2009, which states:

“DPR and Development Review staff has met to discuss possible alternate locations for the dedication of parkland and facilities and the consensus is that it would be preferable for the land dedication to be located within the current Belcrest Plaza Site Plan application limits for several reasons:

- “• The existing topography on Americana Plaza Parcel D is quite severe and encumbered by existing buildings.
- “• The Site Development process on Americana Plaza Parcel D has not commenced.
- “• Americana Plaza Parcel D is not central to the proposed development or the TDOZ area.
- “• Significant engineering/design would be required on Americana Plaza Parcel D to meet all applicable zoning and regulatory restrictions such as Landscape Manual, Stormwater Management and Accessibility Standards.
- “• The process for land conveyance will be cumbersome and DPR will require assurances that the proposed Belcrest Plaza development will have adequate recreation facilities in a timely manner.

“One suggested location would be the area currently occupied by buildings 2 (land area between building 1 and building 3) on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza. See attached Exhibit A. We estimate that this area is approximately 3.5 acres and would be centrally located in the development and the TDOZ area. The land area

is relatively level and could be developed into a central open space recreation area as a focal point for the development and community. Providing an urban park would be a welcome oasis to the larger scale mixed use development surrounding the area. This location is ideal as it within close proximity, (within one-half mile) and within a 10 minute walk to the existing Prince George's Plaza Community Center which could be used as a shared resource.

"If this land area can be developed into an active recreation area then the goals and requirements of the Approved Transit District Development Plan for Prince George's Plaza, Transit District Overlay Zone for parks and recreation will be satisfied.

**"Recommendations:**

As stated, the applicant's proffer of off-site dedication along with the construction of facilities will greatly enhance the needs of the proposed residents and local community. However, DPR is concerned about the viability and timing of the proposed conveyance of off-site property that is encumbered with existing residential buildings. Additionally, the applicant would need to provide detailed engineering studies to show that the dedicated property could be developed as envisioned. The exact acreage of dedication will be provided upon completion of preliminary engineering studies and will be subject to DPR's final determination of whether the needed facilities can be accommodated on the parcel for dedication. DPR and the Development Review preference would for the applicant to consider DPR's recommendation for parkland dedication as per Exhibit A."

DPR along with Urban Design staff has suggested an alternative location of using the area currently occupied by proposed Building 2 (land area between Building 1 and 3) on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza (See attached Exhibit A) for parkland dedication. We estimate that this area is approximately 2.8 acres in size and provides a central location within the development and the TDOZ area. This area is relatively level and should be easier to develop into a central park open space/recreation area than Americana Plaza, Parcel D, and could also serve as a focal point for the development and the community. M-NCPPC staff envisions that the development of an urban park within this area would create a beneficial link between the inner courtyards of the proposed buildings and promote active interaction amongst the residents as well as the local community. M-NCPPC staff believes that the public open recreation space created will be superior to the land area associated with Americana Plaza, Parcel D as proffered by the applicant. Suggested facilities which could be constructed in this area include the following:

- Urban playground area for pre-teens and teens with resilient surfacing.
- Open lawn area for informal games and active play, such as frisbee, running, or informal games and general passive recreation opportunities.
- Public gathering/meeting space for outdoor performances and art displays.
- Amphitheater style seating for viewing of the various activities.
- Futsal/Multi-Use Courts with resilient surfacing.

The provision of an urban park within Georgian Plaza, Parcel B would be a welcome oasis in the surrounding larger scale mixed-use development. Dedication of this land would have numerous environmental and urban design benefits. If this land area is developed into an active recreation area, DPR believes the goals and objectives of the *Approved Transit District Development Plan for the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone* with regards to parks and recreation will be satisfied.

In addition, Urban Design staff believes that another justification for promoting the 2.8 acres for a public park in accordance with the goal of “protecting and conserving public open space and natural resources” is the comparison of the amount of green area that would be required for the site under the current zoning verses the amount of open space proposed for the site under the proposed zoning. If the property is retained in the R-18 Zone, the amount of green area required for the entire property (approximately 25 acres) is approximately 15 acres, based on the 60 percent green area requirement of the zone. The M-U-I Zone does not have a requirement for green area; however, the applicant has provided an exhibit which clarifies the amount of proposed open space for the development as follows:

Open space at grade	273,604 sq. ft. or 6.28 acres
Open space on-structure	<u>195,187 sq. ft. or 4.48 acres</u>
Total	468,791 sq. ft. or 10.76 acres

A direct comparison of the green space required by the R-18 Zone to the open space exhibit outlining the applicant’s proposal indicates that the subject application falls short of the R-18 Zone requirement by a quantifiable calculation of about 4.24 acres. The applicant’s direct correlation of open space to green area actually gives more credit to the applicant’s proposal because both definitions in the Zoning Ordinance do not allow for counting of open space on structures. Therefore, the concentration of the open space element as a public park within the development at 2.8 acres is justified.

- c. Section 27-546.16(b)(1) also requires that the rezoning and development will be compatible with existing or approved future development on adjacent properties.

**Uses**

The applicant proposes to construct a mix of residential, retail, and office uses on the subject property. Parcel C, Americana Plaza, contains mainly residential uses and is adjacent to existing multifamily developments to the north, east, and west. Building 6 on Parcels A and B, Americana Plaza, features mainly residential uses and is adjacent to multifamily uses to the west and south. The retail portions of Buildings 6 and 7 are concentrated at the intersection of Toledo Place and Toledo Terrace, across from an entrance into Prince George’s Plaza. The development of Parcels A through C of Americana Plaza are found to be compatible with the surrounding uses.

The highest concentration of nonresidential uses is located in the eastern portion of the development on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza, adjacent to the Prince George’s Plaza Shopping Center and additional retail uses across Belcrest Road. The uses are found to be compatible with the surrounding development to the south and east, and the development would be found to provide a transition to the existing residential development to the north if the park/open space component was incorporated into the plan.

### **Building Height**

The proposed buildings are to be compatible in size, height, and massing to buildings on adjacent properties and compatible with the vision for each subarea, except for Buildings 1 and 2 on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza. Building 1 is designed with a 31-story residential tower at the intersection of Toledo Terrace and Belcrest Road. A portion of Building 2 is proposed to be 17 stories. The maximum height set by the TDDP for Subarea 12, within which Buildings 1 and 2 are proposed to be located, is 16 stories. The TDDP envisions buildings with a maximum height of 16 stories on the adjacent properties to the north (Subarea 1) and south (Subarea 11) as well. Therefore, a height limit of 16 stories is appropriate within the portion of the property located in Subarea 12, as it is expected that the adjacent properties will be redeveloped some time in the future with buildings that are a maximum height of 16 stories. Staff finds that the building heights proposed for Buildings 1 and 2 are not compatible with the surrounding building heights.

### **Architecture**

The proposed architectural elevations of Buildings 6 and 7 feature a combination of face brick in traditional red and other accent colors and accent hardiplank panels and trim. The multifamily structures to the north and west feature traditional red brick while the buildings within the Post Park development, to the south, feature a more modern combination of brick and hardiplank panels in bold accent colors. The proposed elevations offer an appropriate transition between the old and new by incorporating materials from both, and are considered compatible.

The architectural elevations of buildings one through five are predominately finished with varying colors of face brick, with metal panel accents. Accent moldings and cornices are constructed of cast stone, and accent metal trellises are incorporated at many rooflines. The proposed architecture blends modern and traditional elements, which is appropriate and compatible with the surrounding architecture given its location within the transit district, where recently approved projects, such as University Town Center and Post Park, featuring modern design, are juxtaposed with older, more traditional structures.

5. Section 27-546.16(c) states the following:

**Unless requested by a municipality or the Prince George's County Redevelopment Authority, the M-U-I Zone may be approved only on property which adjoins existing developed properties for twenty percent (20%) or more of its boundaries, adjoins property in the M-U-I Zone, or is recommended for mixed-use infill development in an approved Master Plan, Sector Plan, or other applicable plan. Adjoining development may be residential, commercial, industrial, or institutional but must have a density of at least 3.5 units per acre for residential or a floor area ratio of at least 0.15 for nonresidential development.**

Each of the parcels independently must meet this requirement. Americana Parcels A, B, and C each adjoin R-18 zoned property to the west that is developed at approximately 20 units per acre. Georgian Plaza, Parcel B adjoins Prince George's Shopping center. According to tax account information, the property is approximately 51 acres of land and there is approximately 924,747 square feet of floor area on the site. Based on those figures, the floor area ratio (FAR) of the parcel is approximately 0.42.

6. In regard to the applicant's request to change the table of uses for the subject property, the applicant submitted the following justification statement:

“Each of the four parcels comprising the subject property is currently zoned R-18, and the list of permitted uses contained in the TDDP reflects uses consistent with the R-18 zone. The TDDP recommends, however, the redevelopment of the subject property, including mixed use. The M-U-I zone is proposed to implement this recommendation and thus a use list consistent with the provisions of the M-U-I zone is proposed. The list of allowed uses proposed by the applicant is set forth in Exhibit “B” attached hereto and made a part hereof. In essence, the M-U-I zone permits all uses permitted by right or by special exception permitted in the C-S-C zone, except for uses in the Miscellaneous category and Residential category listed in Section 27-461(b)(3) and (b)(6). For these categories, the uses allowed in the R-18 zone are permitted. The use list attached as Exhibit “B” includes all of those uses permitted by right in the C-S-C Zone, but does not include all of those uses permitted by special exception, eliminating such uses as pawn shops and drug treatment centers.”

**Comment:** The applicant is essentially creating a use list for the development in the M-U-I Zone, as the current governing transit district development plan has a list of uses which only relates to the R-18 Zone for the specific subareas involved with this application. The applicant has provided Exhibit B which is attached. This amendment would be necessary in order to establish which uses are permitted at the time of use and occupancy permits and which uses are not permitted. Therefore, staff would support this amendment to amend the use list for the subject properties if the property were rezoned to the M-U-I Zone.

7. In conclusion, staff is recommending disapproval of the rezoning of the property from the R-18 Zone to the M-U-I Zone because the plan of development fails to adequately address Section 27-546.16(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance which states:

**(1) Property in the T-D-O Zone may be reclassified from its underlying zone to the M-U-I Zone by an amendment to the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP). In the amendment process, the owner shall show that the proposed rezoning and development will meet TDDP goals and objectives and will be compatible with existing or approved future development on adjacent properties.**

Specifically, the plan of development has failed to demonstrate that the following Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development goals have been fulfilled:

- a. Urban Design
- b. Environmental
- c. Transportation
- d. Trails
- e. Parks and Recreation

The reasons and findings that lead to this conclusion are found above beginning on page 8 in Finding 4.

8. In regard to the applicant's request to modify the height restrictions for the subject property, the applicant submitted the following justification statement:

"The Applicant has proposed four circumstances in Subarea 12 and one in Subarea 13 where the height of the buildings may not conform to the height requirements of the TDDP. To the extent it is determined that the proposed buildings do not conform to the height requirements of the TDDP, a modification is requested.

"Subarea 12. In Subarea 12, P99 provides that the minimum building height shall be 6 stories. P100 provides that the maximum height shall be 16 stories. Building 5, located at the western end of Subarea 12, contains three components with varying height. This building has a 14-story component, a 7-story component and a 2 story component. The 2 story section of the building contains the proposed 25,000 square foot recreation center. Since the various building components vary in height from 2 stories to 14 stories, the overall building may be deemed to conform to the minimum height of 6-stories. However, in the event it is determined that the part of the building which is 2 stories does require a change in the TDDP, such change is requested.

"Second, also in Subarea 12, the Applicant is proposing to construct a mixed-use urban plaza along the eastern end of the property. The northern end of this plaza is framed by a portion of Building 2. Building 2 consists of varying heights. The portion of Building 2 framing the urban plaza is 4-stories. Building 2 also contains two U-shaped residential towers, with each resting on a 5-story parking and retail podium. The two residential towers are identical, with one facing Toledo Terrace and one facing Toledo Road. While most of the two residential towers is 14-stories, the "wings" of the buildings drop off and the center portion of the buildings is 17-stories. The 17-story towers require a modification to the 16 story maximum height for Subarea 12. If it is determined that the 4-story section of Building 2 framing the urban plaza does not meet the 6-story minimum height requirement, a modification is also requested.

"Third, Building 1a is a 33-story tower proposed for the intersection of Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace, where the subject property is closest to the Metro Station. A change in the maximum height requirement of 16 stories in Subarea 12, set forth in P100 is requested.

"Subarea 13A. Subarea 13A also has height requirements. P103 provides for a minimum building height of 4 stories. P104 provides for a maximum building height of 8 stories. The buildings fronting on Toledo Terrace conform to these requirements with building heights of 4-to 5-stories. However, along Northwest Drive, at the northwestern edge of the TDDP, the Applicant proposes 3 and 4 story townhouse style condominiums. While this is intended to provide a variety in housing unit types, a change in the minimum height requirement set forth in P104 is required for the 3 story models.

"The Applicant submits that the changes in proposed building heights conforms to the purposes of the Transit District and is justified. The Applicant is proposing a sustainable lifestyle community development with a transit oriented focus. The proposed development offers a variety of housing choices, from townhouse style condominiums, to multifamily for sale condominiums and rental apartments. Providing a variety of housing styles allows a more diverse resident population and helps provide housing to a broader economic spectrum.

“With specific regard to the proposed increases in building height (33-stories for Building 1a and 17-stories for Buildings 2a and 2b), the Applicant believes that such increases conform with the purposes and recommendations for the Transit District, as stated in the TDDP. The Urban Design Goals of the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District include the placement of buildings along Toledo Terrace and Belcrest Road which define the space, creating a pedestrian-friendly environment, minimizing the views of parking areas, encourage structured parking and continuing the strong sense of identity for the Metro Station. The purposes of TDOZ’s include promoting the use of transit facilities, attracting an appropriate mix of land uses, encouraging uses which complement and enhance the character of the area, insuring developments that possess a desirable urban design relationship with one another and providing flexibility in the design and layout of buildings and structures. The purposes of the M-U-I zone include encouraging innovative planning and design in infill development and promoting smart growth principles by encouraging the efficient use of land and public facilities.

“The Applicant has the opportunity to create a sustainable transit oriented community across 25 acres of land within walking distance of a Metro Station. It is also important that the design of the project be compatible with surrounding development. Rather than construct monolithic buildings of similar height, the design seeks to create a development which transitions in height as it nears the transit station. This transition of building heights serves several purposes. First, it concentrates the density at the point closest to the Metro Station, promoting smart growth, the use of mass transit and a pedestrian friendly environment. Second, the varied building heights encourages innovative design, allowing the buildings to capture the maximum light exposure to create a more livable environment and creating a more attractive block abutting the north end of the Mall at Prince George’s. Third, the additional height concentrates the population at a spot which attracts a greater mix of land uses, with a pedestrian friendly plaza surrounded by retail uses. Fourth, the construction of a landmark building contributes to the sense of place at the Prince George’s Plaza Metro and defines the space. Finally, the diversity in height promotes compatibility with the surrounding development. The 4-story buildings in Subarea 13A, for example, are more compatible with the adjacent remaining garden apartments in Subarea 13A which are not owned by the Applicant than would 8-story buildings permitted by the TDDP. The proposed townhouses in the northwest corner of Subarea 13A are a better transition to adjoining development outside the TDOZ that 8-story buildings would be. The perspective of the proposed buildings shown on page 9 of the Project Description shows that the 33-story building is compatible with the context of the taller buildings that already exist along Belcrest Road, except that it represents a signature landmark structure that helps identify the Prince George’s Plaza Metro Station. A universal, unbending cap of 16-stories throughout the TDDP will not allow any building to stand out as a landmark structure. Thus, the construction of a the proposed 33-story tower at the nearest corner to the transit station conforms with the purposes and recommendations of the TDDP. The height of this single building, and the distinctive architecture, will identify this as a Metro community and allow a greater variety of building heights across the Applicant’s properties. The varied heights of the buildings also provide greater architectural interest, a sense of place with a human scale and a distinctive urban character. These are exactly the goals of the Transit District. The building heights proposed by the Applicant, while technically varying from the specific language of the TDDP, are wholly consistent with the goals and objectives of the TDDP to concentrate a mixed use development accessible to the Metro Station. The approval of the height waiver will not impair the implementation of the plan, but will serve as a catalyst for additional transformation.

“With regard the to request to lower the building heights in certain locations, the Applicant also believes that the specific, strategic lowering of building heights also conforms with the purposes and recommendations for the Transit District, as stated in the TDDP. In Subarea 12, the two instances where portions of larger buildings are proposed to be less than 6 stories, these are done to create a more human scale and introduce a transition in heights. This is particularly true for the 4-story portion of Building 2 which is intended to frame the pedestrian plaza. In Subarea 13a, the reduction of building height is intended to increase the variety of housing type offered in this area. The area chosen for this purpose is the furthest from the Metro Station, abuts the fringes of the TDOZ boundary and does not front of the main roads which define the TDOZ.”

**Comment:** Staff agrees in principle with the applicant’s comments above in regard to the advantages of using multiple building heights, but the degree to which the proposal exceeds the allowable 16-story maximum building height per the TDDP is excessive. Building height is a critical factor in evaluation of conformance to the sector plan’s vision of the area and is essential to the required finding for compatibility of the project to surrounding land uses. The following chart summarizes the amendments to the proposed building heights:

Building	Maximum allowed height	Maximum height proposed	Minimum height allowed	Minimum height proposed
1	16	31*	6	11
2	16	17	6	4
5	16	14	6	2
Townhouses	8	4	4	3

\*as shown on the architectural elevations

Staff finds that the applicant’s request to allow construction of a 33-story building (shown on the architectural drawings as 31 stories) within Subarea 12 is wholly inconsistent with the standards set forth in the TDDP and the vision for the transit district. A building of this height would be incompatible with existing buildings on surrounding properties and the recommendations for future development/redevelopment within the transit district. Even if the rezoning proposed by the applicant were approved, staff would not support the applicant’s requested amendment to exceed the maximum building heights for Buildings 1 and 2.

Staff finds that the majority of Building 5 meets the minimum height requirement established by the TDDP of six stories. If the rezoning proposed by the applicant were approved, staff would support the applicant’s requested amendment to reduce the minimum building height for Building 5 to two stories.

Staff finds that the requested amendment to allow three-story townhouse models within Subarea 13A is appropriate given the nature of the unit type and the applicant’s effort to provide a variety of residential products. Townhouse models will feature a fourth-story optional loft. Therefore, many of the townhouse units may be in conformance with the minimum height requirement set forth in the TDDP. If the rezoning proposed by the applicant were approved, staff would support the applicant’s requested amendment to allow the townhouses to be three stories in height if a fourth-story optional loft is offered to potential home buyers.

## DETAILED SITE PLAN EVALUATION

The detailed site plan (DSP), considered independently of the issues pertaining to the rezoning request, was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

- a. The Approved Transit District Development Plan for the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ);
- b. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for the M-U-I (Mixed Use Infill) Zone;
- c. The requirements of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*;
- d. Referral comments.

## FINDINGS—DETAILED SITE PLAN REQUEST

The following portion of the staff report dealing particularly with the detailed site plan is presented for each pod of development as a separate analysis in order to convey the information in an orderly fashion. The application consists of three pods of development located on four separate and distinct legal parcels, all of which are currently developed with existing three-story multifamily buildings built circa 1960. Parcel B of Georgian Plaza is proposed as a development of high intensity that includes multifamily, office and retail combined. The detailed site plan proposes to combine Parcels A and B of Americana Plaza to create one pod of development of primarily multifamily development. Parcel C is proposed as a mixed-use development consisting of townhouses and a multifamily building. Each of the pods is described and analyzed separately below for conformance to the requirements of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan and the Zoning Ordinance.

### PARCELS A & B, AMERICANA PLAZA

9. **Request:** If this parcel is rezoned pursuant to the request explained and analyzed above, the detailed site plan proposes development of 283 multifamily units and 1,600 square feet of retail/office space on Parcels A & B, Americana Plaza.

10. **Development Data Summary for Parcels A & B, Americana Plaza:**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>
Zone(s)	R-18	M-U-I
Use(s)	Multifamily	Multifamily and Retail
Acreage		
Parcel A	3.57	3.57
Parcel B	.88	.88
Total:	4.45	4.45
Area within 100 year floodplain	0	0
Dwelling Units	105	283
Parcels	2	2
Square Footage/GFA	0	Residential–297,000 Commercial–1,600 Total–298,600
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	N/A	1.54

	Required	Provided
Parking	N/A	304
Loading	1	2

11. **Location:** Parcels A & B, Americana Plaza are located within Subarea 13A of the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone, at the northwest corner of the intersection of Toledo Terrace and Toledo Place.
12. **Surrounding Uses:** Parcels A and B, Americana Plaza, are bounded to the north by Parcel C, Americana Plaza, to the west by Toledo Plaza, an existing multifamily development in the R-18 (Multifamily Medium Residential) Zone, to the south by Post Park, an existing multifamily and retail development in the M-X-T (Mixed Use Transit Oriented) Zone, and to the east by Toledo Terrace.
13. **Design Features:** As Phase I of the project, Parcels A & B of the Americana Plaza are proposed to be developed with a four- to five-story building shown as Building 6. The building is linear and reflects the shape of the two parcels on which it is located. There is very little open space associated with this portion of the development. A small surface parking lot is proposed in the southern portion of Parcel A, which contains 42 surface parking spaces. The remainder of the 318 total proposed parking spaces is located in a one-level, podium parking structure, which makes up the first floor of Building 6. The proposed multifamily units and retail/office space are located above the single story structured parking facility in three- and four-story buildings. The parking garage will have two access points: one along Toledo Place and a second along the internal access drive located behind the building that parallels the shared property line with the existing multifamily development to the west.

The two proposed loading spaces are located within the parking structure and will be served by separate accesses. One is located along the Toledo Place frontage. The other is located on the south side of the building, adjacent to the surface parking lot. Loading is conveniently located for both retail and residential uses.

Three relatively small landscaped bioretention areas are proposed within this section of the development: one at the intersection of Toledo Place and Toledo Terrace, one further south along Toledo Terrace, and a third at the southernmost tip of the site, south of the surface parking lot. A long underground stormwater management storage facility is proposed along the rear of the building, parallel to the shared property line with the existing multifamily development to the west.

A retaining wall is proposed along a portion of the western property line, adjacent to the existing multifamily development. The retaining wall is a maximum of 9.5 feet high and retains the property to the east. In addition, a six-foot-high green-screen fence is proposed to be located along this entire property line.

The proposed use is primarily residential units located above the first floor parking garage, which is fully above grade at the front of the building. The parking garage façade blends with the exterior façade of the residential units. The proposed building elevations feature a combination of various color brick, hardipanel trim elements, and wood shake siding. The illusion of multiple, separate, and distinct buildings is created through the use of various sized decorative cornices and parapets and notches in the building façade above the podium parking level. Varied window styles and sizes are shown.

Although a consistent building edge is maintained at the street level, a total of five courtyards are proposed on top of the one level of podium parking, which create recesses in the east and west façades above the first story of the building. Four of the courtyards include planting areas and separate private terraces, which are designated to specific residential units. The fifth courtyard area is the largest and includes a swimming pool and kiddie pool, sitting areas, shade structures and landscaping areas and is available for use by all building residents. The retail/office portion of the building is located at the eastern corner of the intersection of Toledo Place and Toledo Terrace and fronts on a small pedestrian plaza with terraced seating, decorative paving and site furnishings.

Interior amenities are provided on the first floor of the building and include a business center, a 900-square-foot party room, which connects to the outdoor pool courtyard amenity space, a 1,313-square-foot fitness area, and locker rooms.

One monument sign (identified as Sign Type B) is proposed to be located near the main building entrance. The main monument sign features a brick base and two tapered columns between which is located a metal sign panel identifying Belcrest Plaza. The two columns are connected by accent metal bands. An additional monument sign (identified as Sign Type A) is proposed on the north side of the access to the surface parking lot. This sign is designed with materials and detailing consistent with Sign Type B and features one tapered column with a vertical sign panel identifying Belcrest Plaza, brick base and accent metal bands. Two additional directional signs (identified as Sign Type C) are proposed: one at the intersection of Toledo Place and Toledo Terrace and one near the main building entrance. Although considerably smaller in scale, the design of the directional signs is compatible with Sign Type A and B and features a brick base with a metal sign panel and accent metal banding.

14. **Conformance with any Mandatory Development Requirements of the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP):** The applicant has requested modifications from the development standards for Parcels A and B, Americana Plaza. The following provides a discussion of the requirements, including amendment requests and a response from staff:

## Subarea 13A

### **P105 Three-bedroom units shall be permitted only when developed as condominiums.**

**Comment:** The proposal does not meet this requirement because 24 three-bedroom units are proposed within Building 7 and are not designated for condominium ownership. The applicant has requested an amendment from this requirement and provides the following justification in support of this request:

“This requirement applies to Subarea 12. The vast majority of multifamily dwelling units proposed by the Applicant are one or two bedroom units. The applicant is proposing, however, to [sic] construct a total of 118 two bedroom units with a den and study. Under the provisions of Section 27-101.1 (a)(22), the term bedroom includes a habitable room included within a dwelling unit, regardless of whether it is called a “study” or a “den”. The studies proposed by the Applicant would not be considered habitable and therefore would not qualified as a bedroom. However, the proposed dens would. Thus, the two bedroom units with a study and a den are technically considered three bedroom units. Twenty four such units are provided in Building 1 and are specifically identified as condominium units. However, 94 other such units are spread throughout the remaining four buildings (no building contains more than 46 such units), and are not set aside exclusively as condominiums. The Applicant requests a modification of P102 so that random units within a rental apartment building are not required to be sold as condominium units. Only 6% of the total dwelling units proposed are designated as two bedroom plus study and den and are offered to provide a greater diversity of unit type.”

The applicant subsequently submitted the following additional justification:

“In its previous waiver request, the Applicant requested that two bedroom units with studies and dens, which would be considered as three bedroom units, not be required to be sold as condominiums. After reviewing the floor plans with Staff, however, it appears that additional clarification, and a more specific waiver will be necessary.

“The definition of “bedroom” set forth in Section 27-101.1(a)(22) includes any “habitable room” included within a dwelling unit. In the Applicant’s floor plans, dens are rooms that have windows but no closet, while studies are internal rooms that have no windows. It was believed that the studies do not qualify as “habitable” and therefore no waiver was requested for such rooms. Thus the waiver request was limited to units with two bedrooms with a study and a den. In the event that a study is considered a habitable room however, additional units within the project could be considered three bedroom (or even four bedroom) units. As a matter of caution, therefore, the applicant is now requesting that all units with three or more rooms labeled as “bedroom”, “den” or “study” not be required to be sold as condominium units. As the Applicant indicated previously, it does not desire to have random units in buildings proposed for rental to be required to be sold due to the interpretation that a study is a bedroom. Also, the Applicant plans to have units for sale and wishes to include a broad range of units such as efficiencies and one bedrooms. Requiring all units that qualify as three bedroom units to be sold will restrict the ability to provide a broader mix of for sale dwelling units within the project.”

Staff concurs with the applicant’s assertion that it would not be appropriate to require the sale of individual three-bedroom units, which are located randomly within the proposed buildings and that it is desirable to have a greater diversity of rental units available to potential tenants. The

Community Planning North Division staff has indicated that they are in support of the requested amendment.

### Architecture

**S14 Building materials shall be high quality, enduring and distinctive. Exterior building materials, such as pre-cast concrete, brick, tile and stone, are encouraged.**

**Comment:** While the majority of the proposed finish materials are of an appropriate durability, the maintenance needs of wood siding render it undesirable in this application. Therefore, the wood shake siding should be replaced with a composite or high-quality vinyl shake product and the plans should be revised accordingly.

### Parking and Loading

**S18 All parking lots shall not extend beyond the build-to line or project beyond the front plane of adjoining buildings.**

**Comment:** The proposal does not meet this requirement because the small surface parking lot extends beyond the front plane of the most projected portion of Building 6. The applicant has requested an amendment from this requirement and provides the following justification in support of this request:

“Building 6 located on Parcels A and B, Americana Plaza contains a small 48-space surface parking lot at the southern end of the property. While the parking lot, and the screen wall provided in compliance with S23, do not extend beyond the build-to line, it could be found to extend beyond the front plane of the adjoining building. Parcels A and B are located along the curvature of Toledo Terrace, making the property wider at the southern and northern ends than it is in the middle. Where the parking lot abuts the building, it does not extend beyond the front plane of the building. However, the width of the building at this location is restricted by the width of the property. At the northern end of the Parcels A and B, the building widens. The parking lot does not extend beyond the building where it widens. Should it be determined that the front plane of the building is measured from the narrowest width of the building rather than from the wider width, a waiver from S18 is requested.”

Staff finds that the applicant’s request is appropriate. The surface parking lot does not extend beyond the most projected portion of the front plane of the building and will be appropriately screened by a low masonry wall and landscaping. The Community Planning North Division staff has indicated that they are in support of this amendment.

15. **Conformance to the guidelines and criteria contained in the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP):** The plans for Parcels A and B, Americana Plaza are in conformance with the guidelines and criteria contained in the TDDP except for the following, from which the applicant has not requested an amendment:

**G41 High-quality exterior finish materials should be used on all sides of the garage structures and shall complement the exterior materials displayed by the main buildings.**

**Comment:** The plans show that the front elevation will feature red brick on the ground level parking garage elevation, which is a high-quality material complementary to the main building finishes; however, the drawings for the remainder of the garage elevations do not specify the finish material. The elevation drawings should be revised to indicate that a high-quality exterior finish material will be used on all sides of the garage portion of the building.

16. **Conformance to the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual***—This portion of the development is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements, Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements, and Section 4.4, Screening Requirements of the Landscape Manual. The site plan has been found to be in conformance with the applicable Sections of the Landscape Manual except for Section 4.4. Several transformers and generators are shown on the site plan and are not proposed to be screened as is required by Section 4.4. The plans should be revised to demonstrate that the proposed transformers/generators will be screened in accordance with the requirements of Section 4.4 of the Landscape Manual.
17. **Urban Design Analysis:** There are several inconsistencies between the site and landscape plans in the vicinity of the surface parking lot. The detailed site plan should be revised to demonstrate the configuration of the freestanding walls proposed to screen the parking lot and retaining wall proposed to tie into the southeastern corner of Building 6 as shown on the landscape plans. Since the freestanding and retaining walls are integrally designed, they should be treated with the same materials as on the main building and details should be provided on the plans to demonstrate as much.

The detailed site plan indicates that the stairs leading to the main building entrance are proposed to be located within the public utility easement (PUE); however, the landscape plan correctly shows the stairs outside of the PUE. The detailed site plan should be revised so that the stairs that access the main building entrance are located outside of the public utility easement as shown on the landscape plans.

The plans indicate that the pool plaza, main entrance plaza and the plaza associated with the retail area will receive various enhanced paving treatments; however, the detail sheets only provide one paving detail. The hardscape plans should reference a specific paving detail for each of these areas and such details should be provided on the plans. Areas receiving the same paving treatment should not be depicted differently on the plans. The raised concrete planter proposed within the plaza associated with the retail component is shown with an unfinished exterior, which is not appropriate within a pedestrian-oriented space that is part of a quality development. The exterior of this planter should be finished with masonry to match the freestanding walls proposed to screen the surface parking lot.

The parking garage façades show unscreened openings at the pedestrian level. The proposed design does not restrict entry into the garage by potential criminals. The elevation drawings should be revised to demonstrate that access will be restricted through the provision of decorative grates or other appropriate construction elements within the openings in the garage façade.

## **PARCEL C, AMERICANA PLAZA**

18. **Request:** If this parcel is rezoned pursuant to the request explained and analyzed above, the detailed site plan proposes the development of 356 multifamily units, 1,290 square feet of retail/office space, and 57 single-family attached townhouse units on Parcels C, Americana Plaza.

19. **Development Data Summary for Parcel C, Americana Plaza:**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>
Zone(s)	R-18	M-U-I
Use(s)	Multifamily	Multifamily, Single-family Attached Townhouse, & Retail
Acreage	7.99	7.99
Area within 100 year floodplain	0	0
<b>Dwelling Units</b>		
Multifamily	167	356
Townhouse	0	57
Parcels	1	1
Square Footage/GFA	0	Residential–405,000 Commercial–1,300 Total–406,300
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	N/A	1.17

	<b>Required</b>	<b>Provided</b>
Parking	N/A	523
Loading	2	2

20. **Location:** Parcel C, Americana Plaza is located within Subarea 13A of the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ), at the northwest corner of the intersection of Toledo Terrace and Northwest Drive, between Toledo Terrace and Dean Drive.

21. **Surrounding Uses:** Parcel C, Americana Plaza, is bounded to the north by Dean Drive, to the east by Northwest Drive, to the south by Toledo Terrace, and to the west by Toledo Plaza, an existing multifamily development in the R-18 (Multifamily Medium Residential) Zone.

22. **Design Features:** As Phase II of the overall project, Parcel C of the Americana Plaza is proposed to be developed with 356 multifamily units and 1,300 square feet of retail/office space within a four- to five-story building shown as Building 7 and 57 single-family detached townhouse units. The multifamily building is designed to completely fill the entire usable land area in the south portion of Parcel C, except for a 10-foot-wide public utility easement (PUE) along the perimeter of the site. The multifamily and townhouse portions of Parcel C are proposed to be separated by a private access drive. The multifamily building will be located on the southern portion of Parcel C and will taper from five stories in height along its Toledo Terrace frontage to four stories along its private drive frontage, across from the townhouse units. Building 7 consists of two, roughly square-shaped portions connected by a five-story parking structure. The parking structure is fully concealed by the building on three sides and is exposed for approximately 125 linear feet along the private drive. Although the parking structure faces the streetscape in this area, the façade is treated with materials, detailing and fenestration patterns compatible with the treatment of the rest of the building.

The proposed use is primarily residential, with a 1,290-square-foot retail/office component proposed to be located at the intersection of Toledo Terrace and Toledo Place, across from the retail/office component of Building 6. A patterned concrete plaza area is proposed between the face of the retail portion of the building and the curb. Each of the two square-shaped sections features a large interior courtyard. The courtyard within the eastern portion of the building

includes two raised biofiltration planters, private terraces, and a network of paths and sitting areas for use by all residents of the building. The courtyard within the western portion of the building features private terraces, raised planters and a central amenity area with a pool, shade structures, a raised lawn area and seating areas.

The two proposed loading spaces are located within the parking structure and will be served by separate accesses along the private drive. The loading spaces are conveniently located for use by the residential and retail tenants.

The elevations of Building 7 are similar to Building 6 in terms of materials and designs and feature a combination of various color brick, hardipanel trim elements, and a combination of brick, panel and wood shake siding on the internal courtyard elevations. Various sized decorative cornices and parapets are proposed to provide variation in height. Varied window styles and sizes are shown. Relief is provided mid block along Toledo Terrace by a roughly 40-foot-deep by 80-foot-wide recess in the building, which provides an opportunity for the incorporation of additional landscaping and an entry plaza.

Interior amenities are provided on the first and second floors of the building and include a 1,600-square-foot business center, a party room, a 1,930-square-foot fitness area, locker rooms and a media/game room.

One monument sign (identified as Sign Type B) is proposed to be located near the main building entrance. The main monument sign features a brick base and two tapered columns between which is located a metal sign panel. The two columns are connected by accent metal bands. An additional directional sign (identified as Sign Type C) is also proposed near the main building entrance. Although considerably smaller in scale, the design of the directional signs is compatible with Sign Type A and B and features a brick base with a metal sign panel and accent metal banding.

The 57 townhouse units are proposed to be constructed north of Building 7 and the proposed private access drive and are proposed as a condominium regime; subdivision is not contemplated. All of the units feature rear-loaded garages and are served via a network of alleys, which is accessed from Northwest Drive. This section is designed so that units front on all perimeter streets (Northwest Drive, Dean Drive, and the private access drive). A majority of the remaining units front on the common open space. This area of open space is provided in the west-central portion of the townhouse pod and includes an open lawn area and play area designed in an arc pattern, with paths, seating areas and bands of landscaping. A small, landscaped bioretention area is also proposed along the western edge of the open space. A retaining wall with a maximum height of 7.5 feet is proposed along a portion of the west property line adjacent to the existing Toledo Plaza multifamily development. A six-foot-high green-screen fence is also proposed along this property line.

The townhouses, which are arranged in sticks of four to nine, are proposed in two widths-16 and 20 feet wide, and feature front and side façades of face brick and rear façades treated with hardipanel. A fourth-story loft is available as an option. The base square footage of the proposed house types ranges from 1,200 to 1,670 square feet.

One monument sign (identified as Sign Type B) is proposed to be located on the northwestern side of the intersection of the private access drive and Northwest Drive. The main monument sign features a brick base and two tapered columns between which is located a metal sign panel identifying Belcrest Plaza. The two columns are connected by accent metal bands. An additional

monument sign (identified as Sign Type A) is proposed on the west side of the Northwest Drive in the front yard of one of the townhouse units. This sign is designed with materials and detailing consistent with Sign Type B and features one tapered column with a vertical sign panel identifying Belcrest Plaza, a brick base and accent metal bands.

23. **Conformance with the Mandatory Development Requirements of the Transit District Development Plan:** The applicant has requested modifications from one of the development standards for this portion of the project. The following provides a discussion of the requirement, including amendment requests and a response from staff:

**Subarea 13A**

**P105 Three-bedroom units shall be permitted only when developed as condominiums.**

**Comment:** The proposal does not meet this requirement because 24 three-bedroom units are proposed within Building 7 and are not designated for condominium ownership. The applicant has requested an amendment from this requirement and provided justification. Staff concurs with the applicant's assertion that it would not be appropriate to require the sale of individual three-bedroom units, which are located randomly within the proposed buildings and that it is desirable to have a greater diversity of rental units available to potential tenants. The Community Planning North Division staff has indicated that they are in support of the requested amendment.

**Architecture**

**S14 Building materials shall be high quality, enduring and distinctive. Exterior building materials, such as pre-cast concrete, brick, tile and stone, are encouraged.**

**Comment:** Although the applicant has not requested an amendment from S14, the detailed site plan is not in conformance with its requirements. While the majority of the proposed finish materials are of an appropriate durability, the maintenance needs of wood siding render it undesirable in this application. Therefore, the wood shake siding proposed on the courtyard elevations of Building 7 should be replaced with a composite or high-quality vinyl shake product and the plans should be revised accordingly. In addition, the townhouse elevations should be revised to specify the finish material of the optional loft elevations. The loft façades should be treated with the same materials as proposed on the primary façade of that unit.

24. **Conformance to the guidelines and criteria contained in the Transit District Development Plan:** The plans are not in conformance with the following guideline, from which the applicant has not requested an amendment:

**G41 High-quality exterior finish materials should be used on all sides of the garage structures and shall complement the exterior materials displayed by the main buildings.**

**Comment:** The plans show that the front elevation will feature red brick on the ground level parking garage elevation, which is a high-quality material complementary to the main building finishes; however, the drawings for the remainder of the garage elevations do not specify the finish material. The elevation drawings should be revised to indicate that a high-quality exterior finish material will be used on all sides of the garage portion of the building.

25. **Conformance to the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual***—Parcel C, Americana Plaza is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements, Section 4.4, Screening Requirements, and Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the Landscape Manual. The site plan has been found to be in conformance with the applicable Sections of the Landscape Manual except for Section 4.4. Several transformers and generators are shown on the site plan and are not proposed to be screened as is required by Section 4.4. The plans should be revised to demonstrate that the proposed transformers/generators will be screened in accordance with the requirements of Section 4.4 of the Landscape Manual.

26. **Urban Design Analysis:**

**Building 7:** The plans indicate that the pool plaza, main entrance plaza and the plaza associated with the retail area will receive various enhanced paving treatments; however, the plans only provide one paving detail. The hardscape plans should reference a specific paving detail for each of these areas and such details should be provided on the plans. Areas receiving the same paving treatment should not be depicted differently on the plans.

The architectural elevations include a label for material 13. The key indicates that material 13 is “not applicable”; however, the plans label several elements, including windows and main finish materials, as 13. This notation should be clarified prior to the Planning Board hearing.

**Townhouse Section:** There are several inconsistencies between the site and landscape plans in the vicinity of the open space associated with the townhouse section. The amenities shown on the landscape plans, including the play areas, paths and bioretention area, are not, but should be shown on the detailed site plan. While the landscape plans show a bioretention area in this location, the detailed site plan shows an underground stormwater management facility. The applicant should clarify if one or both of these facilities will be provided and should revise both sets of plans accordingly. The open space is located behind the units and is a usable size for outdoor activities and play. However, the slope is rather steep and will render the area less usable than if the area were flatter. This could be achieved through the use of a few short retaining walls.

The location of all signs should also be shown on the detailed site plan. Sign Type A is shown between the townhouse units and Northwest Drive in what would be the front yard of the townhouse units if fee simple lots were proposed. Considering the size of the proposed sign (nine and a half feet high with a four-foot-wide base) this location is inappropriate. The sign should be moved closer to the intersection of the northern access drive and Northwest Drive where it will not impede a future owner's use of the green space associated with their unit.

The six-foot-high green-screen fence that is located along the western property line terminates near the westernmost parallel parking space on the north side of the private access drive separating Building 7 and the townhouse section; however, the retaining wall that parallels the fence in the townhouse section continues along the western edge of the access drive, terminating near the intersection of the access drive and Toledo Place. While the green-screen fence doubles as retaining wall safety fencing within the townhouse section, no safety fencing is shown for the remaining portion of the retaining wall. The plans should be revised to indicate the type and style of safety fencing proposed in this area. The fencing should be the same in this visible location.

**PARCEL B, GEORGIAN PLAZA**

- 27. **Request:** If this parcel is rezoned pursuant to the request explained and analyzed above, the detailed site plan proposes development of 1,979 multifamily units, 59,250 square feet of commercial space, and 216,000 square feet of office space within five buildings on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza.
- 28. **Development Data Summary for Parcel B, Georgian Plaza:**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>
Zone(s)	R-18	M-U-I
Use(s)	Multifamily	Multifamily, Office & Retail
Acreage	12.46	12.46
Area within 100 year floodplain	0	0
Parcels	1	1
<b>Dwelling Units</b>		
Multifamily	294	1,979
Square Footage/GFA	0	Residential–2,255,000 Commercial–59,250 Office–216,000 Total–2,530,250
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	N/A	4.66

	<b>Required</b>	<b>Provided</b>
Parking	N/A	2,952
Loading	2*	13

\*This number reflects the requirement based on the number of dwelling units and amount of office square footage proposed. The requirements for the retail and amenity uses are based on the number of spaces that would normally be required under Part 11, except that the retail components were calculated on the total retail space rather than on a tenant by tenant basis, which cannot be determined at this time. The applicant has filed a companion departure from the number of parking and loading spaces required, Departure from Parking & Loading Standards DPLS-351, to allow a shared loading analysis to determine the loading requirements for the development.

- 29. **Location:** Parcel B, Georgian Plaza is located within Subarea 12 of the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone, at the northwest corner of the intersection of Toledo Terrace and Northwest Drive, between Toledo Terrace and Dean Drive.
- 30. **Surrounding Uses:** Parcel B, Georgian Plaza, is bounded to the north and west by Toledo Terrace, to the east by Belcrest Road, and to the south by Prince George’s Plaza, a commercial shopping center in the C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) Zone.
- 31. **Design Features:** Parcel B of the Georgian Plaza is proposed to be developed with 1,979 multifamily units, 59,210 square feet of retail, and 216,000 square feet of office within five buildings. Parcel B is roughly rectangular in shape and tapers to a point west of Northwest Drive. The proposed buildings range in height from three stories at the westernmost tip of the parcel, to 31 stories at the northeast corner of the parcel, at the intersection of Belcrest Road and Toledo

Terrace. The five buildings are separated by private access drives which create separate and distinct blocks. The southern edge of Parcel B is adjacent to the private access drive of Prince George's Plaza. Each of the five proposed buildings has frontage on Toledo Terrace, at least one of the north-south private access drives. Building 1 also has frontage along Belcrest Road.

### **Building 1**

Building 1 is proposed to be constructed at the southwest corner of the intersection of Toledo Terrace and Belcrest Road. The building consists of two main structures atop a five-story podium parking garage. The structures are located on the north and south ends of the podium and a shared courtyard on top of the garage features recreational space.

The north elevation of Building 1, at the intersection of Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace, features a 31-story structure for use as a residential tower. West of the main tower, along the Toledo Terrace frontage, the building drops to nine stories.

The west elevation of the building, along the internal access drive, features retail uses at the street level. Two stories of residential units are proposed above the retail, beginning on the third story. Additional retail uses are proposed at the southwest corner of the building at the street level adjacent to the internal access drive and the Prince George's Plaza property.

The south elevation of the building, adjacent to the Prince George's Plaza property, features an 11-story office building. Two access lobbies are located at the ground level on the south side of the office tower portion of Building 1; one will access the 40,000 square feet of public amenity space that the applicant is proposing to provide on the first four floors of the office tower, the other will access the 176,000 square feet of office space that is proposed to be provided on floors five through ten of this tower.

The applicant has provided the following description of the amenity space proposed within Building 1:

“The Public Amenity area that is designed in Building 1 is expected to consist of approximately 40,000 square feet of space. The potential use (or multiple uses) of the Public Amenity area will be determined by mutual agreement among the applicant and local and/or state governmental agencies, using good faith, reasonable judgment on a single use (or a combination of multiple uses) that would be of beneficial service to the surrounding communities.

“The applicant intends to construct the Public Amenity area, at its expense, as an open “shell” space, which could then be improved by the end user(s), and the expense of the end user(s), in accordance with the needs and specifications of the end user(s). The applicant intends to lease the Public Amenity area as a “triple-net” lease with a base rent of \$1 per year.

“The Public Amenity area will be easily accessible from the surrounding neighborhoods via walking, biking or driving. Parking will be located inside Building 1's shared structured parking garage, with approximately one hundred parking spaces designated for patrons of the Public Amenity area.”

The office lobby wraps around the southeast corner of the building and fronts on Belcrest Road. The east elevation along Belcrest Road features five levels of parking garage between the office lobby at the southwest corner of the building and the residential lobby associated with the

31-story residential tower at the northwest corner of the building. Although the parking structure fronts the streetscape in this area, the façade is treated with materials, detailing and fenestration patterns compatible with the treatment of the rest of the building.

Between the north residential portion of the building (30 and 9 stories) and the south office tower (11 stories), a plaza area is proposed on top of the five-story podium parking structure. A portion of this courtyard area is open to office and residential users of the building and features a putting green, sitting areas, shade structures, a games lawn and raised lawn panel. An additional area is provided for use by building residents only and is protected by keyed gates. This plaza area features a swimming pool, cabanas, an outdoor fireplace, covered pavilion and seating areas. The plaza areas are separated and defined by raised planters with extensive landscaping. A portion of the podium rooftop is also proposed as a green roof, for the purpose of retaining and filtering rain water.

Two loading spaces are proposed within the nine-story portion of the building, along Toledo Terrace. The applicant has filed a companion Departure from Design Standards, DDS-600, to allow access to these loading spaces to be provided directly from Toledo Terrace. Two additional loading spaces are proposed within the southwest portion of the building and will be accessed via the internal access drive.

Indoor amenities within Building 1 include a business center, conference room and juice bar on the lower lobby level, a game room and fitness room on the first floor, a theater room on the third floor, and locker rooms associated with the pool, a party room with a kitchen, which connects to the pool plaza, and a sitting room on the fifth floor.

## **Building 2**

Building 2 is located west of Building 1. Buildings 1 and 2 are partially separated by a main plaza area. The rectangular 200-foot-long by 80 feet wide plaza is surrounded by an access drive that provides to parking and loading facilities within the parking structures on the first five stories of Buildings 1 and 2. The plaza features a paved area with benches, a pavilion, a water feature and area for public art and seating areas. South of the paved portion of the plaza is an open lawn. The entire plaza is flanked on both sides by benches and shade trees arranged in linear patterns. The plaza's vehicular and pedestrian surfaces are paved identically in bands of contrasting materials. Retail uses are proposed at the ground level of Buildings 1 and 2 along the plaza. Residential units are proposed within Buildings 1 and 2, adjacent to the plaza, on the outer edge of the third through fifth floors of the five-story parking podium associated with each building.

Building 2 features two main building sections on top of a five-story parking podium. The north elevation, along Toledo Terrace, is designed with a central, 17-story residential tower, which is flanked on each side by a 14-story residential tower. This configuration is mimicked on the building's south side, adjacent to Prince George's Plaza, within Building 2B. The easternmost portion of Building 2A along Toledo Terrace steps to three stories in height and features retail at the ground level and two stories of residential above. This portion of the building partially screens the main plaza from Toledo Terrace. The primary use of Building 2 is residential except for ground level retail uses along the east elevation, adjacent to the plaza, within the four-story portion of the building and at the southeast corner of Building 2B. The west elevation features four stories of parking garage adjacent to the streetscape.

A drop off area is proposed along Toledo Terrace, adjacent to the main entrance to Building 2A. Access to the parking garage is provided on the east side of the building, adjacent to the north edge of the main plaza and in the center of the building on the west side. Separate loading

facilities are proposed within Buildings 2A and 2B and are conveniently located for retail and residential users.

Building 2 features a courtyard area on top of the five-story podium parking structure between the two main building masses. The courtyard features a swimming pool, raised lawn panels, seating areas, shade structures, a grilling area and raised planters with extensive landscaping. Several private terraces are proposed, which are separated from the common area by the raised planters. Indoor amenities within Building 2A include a business center, sitting room and juice/coffee bar on the first floor and a 1,023-square-foot party room with a kitchen on the fifth floor, adjacent to the rooftop courtyard. The indoor amenities within Building 2B include a business center and sitting area on the first floor and a 387-square-foot fitness area on the fifth floor, adjacent to the rooftop courtyard.

### **Building 3**

Building 3 is located west of Building 2. Buildings 2 and 3 are separated by an internal access drive, which serves the west garage entrances of Building 2 and the east garage entrances of Building 3. The building consists of two main structures- Building 3A to the north and Building 3B to the south-atop a four-story podium parking garage. The structures are located on the north and south ends of the podium and a shared courtyard on top of the garage features amenity space. The primary use of Building 3 is residential except for ground level retail/office uses along the south and southeast elevations, adjacent to the Prince George's Plaza property.

The north elevation, along Toledo Terrace, is designed with a central, 16-story residential tower, which is flanked on each side by a 12-story residential tower. Retail/office uses are located at the ground level along Toledo Terrace, above which residential units are proposed. The east elevation, adjacent to the internal access drive, features four stories of exposed parking garage with residential units beginning at the fifth story. First floor retail/office uses are proposed along the south and southwest elevations adjacent to the Prince George's Plaza property. Residential units are proposed beginning at the second story in this area. The southwest portion of the building is curved around a half-circle proposed between Buildings 3 and 4, which is a main entrance to each building. The west elevation of Building 3 features three stories of exposed parking garage with residential units above.

Although the parking structure fronts the streetscape in some areas, the façade is treated with materials, detailing and fenestration patterns compatible with the treatment of the rest of the building.

A drop off area is proposed along Toledo Terrace, adjacent to the main entrance to Building 3A. An additional entrance is located along the southwest elevation, adjacent to the half circle. Access to the parking garage is provided on the east side of the building, adjacent to the north edge of the main plaza and in the center of the building on the west side. Separate loading facilities are proposed within Buildings 3A and 3B, and are accessed from the internal access drive to the east. The loading facilities are conveniently located for both residential and office/retail users.

Building 3 features a courtyard area on top of the four-story podium parking structure between the two main building masses. The courtyard features a swimming pool, raised lawn panels, seating areas, shade structures, tables and chairs, a grilling area and raised planters with extensive landscaping. Several private terraces are proposed, which are separated from the common area by the raised planters. Indoor amenities within Building 3A include a business center on the first floor and a party room with a kitchen on the fifth floor, adjacent to the rooftop courtyard. The

indoor amenities within Building 3B include a business center on the first floor and a fitness area on the fifth floor, adjacent to the rooftop courtyard.

#### **Building 4**

Building 4 is located west of Building 3. Buildings 3 and 4 are separated by an internal access drive, which serves the east garage entrances of Building 4 and terminates in a half circle adjacent to the Prince Georges Plaza property. The building consists of two main structures- Building 4A to the north and Building 4B to the south-atop a four-story podium parking garage. The structures are located on the north and south ends of the podium and a shared courtyard on top of the garage features amenity space. The primary use of Building 4 is residential except for ground level retail/office uses along the south and southeast elevations, adjacent to the Prince George's Plaza property.

The north elevation, along Toledo Terrace, is designed with a central, 16-story residential tower, which is flanked on each side by a 12-story residential tower. The leasing office, business center and residential uses are located at the ground level along Toledo Terrace, above which residential units are proposed. The east elevation, adjacent to the internal access drive, features three stories of exposed parking garage with residential units beginning at the fourth story. The south portion of the building features a 12-story residential tower. First floor retail/office uses are proposed along the south and southeast elevations adjacent to the Prince George's Plaza property. Residential units are proposed beginning at the second story in this area. The southeast portion of the building is curved around a half-circle proposed between Buildings 3 and 4. The west elevation of Building 4 features three stories of exposed parking garage with residential units above.

Although the parking structure is exposed in some areas, the façade is treated with materials, detailing and fenestration patterns compatible with the treatment of the rest of the building.

A drop off area is proposed along Toledo Terrace, adjacent to the main entrance to Building 4A. Access to the parking garage is provided on the west side of the building. Separate loading facilities are proposed within Buildings 4A and 4B. The loading space associated with Building 4A is accessed from the internal access drive to the west. The loading space associated with Building 4B is accessed from the internal access drive to the east. The loading facilities are conveniently located for both residential and office/retail users.

Building 4 features a courtyard area on top of the four-story podium parking structure between the two main building masses. The courtyard features a play area for children, raised lawn panels, seating areas, shade structures, tables and chairs, and raised planters with extensive landscaping. Several private terraces are proposed, which are separated from the common area by the raised planters. Indoor amenities within Building 4A include a club room/coffee shop on the first floor and a party room with a kitchen on the fifth floor, adjacent to the rooftop courtyard. The indoor amenities within Building 4B include a business center on the first floor and a game/media room on the fifth floor, adjacent to the rooftop courtyard.

#### **Building 5**

Building 5 is a roughly triangular-shaped building, which is located at the westernmost tip of Parcel B, Georgian Plaza. This building is proposed to contain the main recreational amenity space associated with the project, which will be available for use by all residents of the community. The building is designed in various heights ranging from 3 to 14 stories. The east portion of the building features a three-story above ground and one level underground parking podium, above which residential units and courtyard space are located. Ground floor retail uses

are located along the building's Toledo Terrace frontage. Residential units are located on the second through fourteenth floors. The recreational uses are proposed in the western portion of the building and include a fitness center, locker rooms, billiard/dart room, arcade, a 80-foot by 30-foot indoor pool, a yoga room and an indoor basketball court. A business center is also proposed for use by the residents of the building.

### **Architecture**

The architectural elevations of buildings one through five are predominately finished with varying colors of face brick, with metal panel accents. Accent moldings and cornices are constructed of cast stone and accent metal trellises are incorporated at many rooflines. Each building is designed with a flat roof and features decorative parapets with metal panels, louvers and cast stone cornices. Vertical bands of balconies and horizontal cast stone bands modulate the façades. Ground floor retail areas are proposed to be clad with face brick, composite stone, and typical glazing systems. The office tower within Building 1 will feature frameless window panels and a glass curtain wall system above the five-story parking podium. All of the exposed parking structures are proposed to be clad with materials and detailing comparable to the main buildings.

### **Signage**

Two monument signs (identified as Sign Type A) are proposed along Belcrest Road: one at the corner of Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace and one at the corner of Belcrest Road and the private drive that accesses Prince George's Plaza. This sign is designed with one tapered column with a vertical sign panel identifying Belcrest Plaza, a brick base and accent metal bands. Five additional monument signs (identified as Sign Type B) are also proposed in the following locations: one near the main entrance to buildings 2, 3, 4, and 5 along Toledo Terrace, and one at the westernmost tip of Parcel B, across from the intersection of Toledo Place and Toledo Terrace. Sign Type B features a brick base and two tapered columns between which is located a metal sign panel identifying Belcrest Plaza. The two columns are connected by accent metal bands matching those proposed at the top of Sign Type A.

Six additional directional signs are also proposed at various locations within Parcel B (identified as Sign Type C). Although considerably smaller in scale, the design of the directional signs is compatible with Sign Type A and B and features a brick base with a metal sign panel and accent metal banding.

A detailed analysis of issues relating to urban design is provided in Finding 5(b) in the rezoning discussion, relating to the site plan's conformance to the urban design goals of the TDDP.

## **32. Conformance with any Mandatory Development Requirements of the Transit District**

**Development Plan:** The applicant has requested modification of one of the development standards for Parcel B, Georgian Plaza. The following provides a discussion of the requirement, including amendment requests and a response from staff:

### **Subarea 12**

#### **P102 Three-bedroom units shall be permitted only when developed as condominiums.**

**Comment:** The proposal does not meet this requirement because 24 three-bedroom units are proposed within Building 1, 46 three-bedroom units are proposed within Building 2, 26 three-bedroom units are proposed within Building 3, 4 three-bedroom units are proposed within Building 4, and 18 three-bedroom units are proposed within Building 5 and are not designated for condominium ownership. The applicant has requested an amendment from this requirement and

justification in support of this request which is provided above in Finding 14 relating to Parcels A and B, Americana Plaza:

Staff concurs with the applicant's assertion that it would not be appropriate to require the sale of individual three-bedroom units, which are located randomly within the proposed buildings and that it is desirable to have a greater diversity of rental units available to potential tenants. Community Planning North Division staff has indicated that they are in support of the requested amendment.

33. **Conformance with the guidelines and criteria contained in the Transit District Development Plan:** The plans are not in conformance with the following guideline, from which the applicant has not requested an amendment:

**G53 Residential uses should be upscale and luxurious in building construction and amenities. For example, amenities include but are not limited to the following:**

1. **Party and/or community rooms with kitchen, minimum size of 3 square feet per dwelling unit.**
3. **Fitness facilities, a minimum size of 4 square feet per dwelling unit, which include: exercise/weight equipment, sauna/steam room, dance floor for aerobic and exercise classes and/or swimming pool.**

**Comment:** Although these facilities are proposed within each building, some do not meet the minimum size requirements established in G53. The amenity floor plans would have to be revised to demonstrate conformance with G53.

34. **Conformance to the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual***—This portion of the development is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements, Section 4.4, Screening Requirements, and Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the Landscape Manual. The site plan has been found to be in conformance with the requirements of Section 4.1 of the Landscape Manual. The plans are not in conformance with Sections 4.4 and 4.7 of the Landscape Manual. Several transformers and generators are shown on the site plan in the right-of-way and the streetscape and are not screened as is required by Section 4.4. The plans would have to be revised to demonstrate that the proposed transformers/generators will be relocated and screened in accordance with the requirements of Section 4.4 of the Landscape Manual. Departure from Design Standards DDS-600 is a companion to this detailed site plan. The applicant has requested a departure from the requirements of Section 4.7 of the Landscape Manual along the southern property line of Parcel B, Georgian Plaza, adjacent to Prince George's Plaza, a commercial shopping center.

## **REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR OVERALL DEVELOPMENT**

35. **Required Findings for a Detailed Site Plan in the Transit District Overlay Zone as stated in the Transit District Development Plan:**
1. **The Transit District Site Plan is in strict conformance with any Mandatory Development Requirements of the Transit District Development Plan.**

**Comment:** The applicant has requested modifications from several mandatory development requirements, which apply to the entire development. Amendments that are specific to a particular land area are discussed in the analysis of each specific pod of development. The following provides a discussion of the amendments requested for the overall development, including amendment requests and a response from staff:

### **Streetscape**

**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.

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

**Comment:** The applicant has requested an amendment to these standards and offered the following justification in support of these requests:

“The Applicant has submitted detailed drawings setting forth the proposed streetscape. Various factors outside the control of the Applicant affect the ultimate streetscape which will be achievable. For example, The TDDP (Figure 12) establishes a right of way for Toledo Terrace of 60 feet. Toledo Terrace is currently a 70 foot right of way. The Department of Public Works and Transportation has indicated that it may require a widening of Toledo Terrace. If Toledo Terrace is widened, it would increase the speed of vehicles and frustrate the goal to establish a pedestrian friendly street section. Further, the Applicant has been working with the utility companies to establish the location of the various utilities, including placing the telecommunication utilities within the public right of way. A waiver has been submitted to DPW&T requesting waivers. The decision of DPW&T in this regard will determine the exact streetscape. To the extent that the streetscape which results from the resolution of these issues varies from the strict compliance with the provisions of P1 and S8, the Applicant requests a waiver.”

**Community Planning Comment:** The applicant proposes a continuation of Toledo Road from Belcrest Road to Toledo Terrace, an 11-foot sidewalk along Belcrest Road, a 10-foot-wide sidewalk along the southern property boundary at Toledo Road, and a 7-foot-wide sidewalk along both sides of Toledo Terrace Road.

The proposed plans are not in compliance with figure 8, which requires a 20-foot-wide pedestrian zone with a 12-foot-wide sidewalk along Toledo Terrace Road. Toledo Road includes a 20-foot-wide pedestrian zone with a 12-foot-wide sidewalk. Belcrest Road reflects a 20- to 40-foot-wide pedestrian zone, including a wide sidewalk of undetermined width. Cross sections for all three roads include an in-road “bike zone” or bike lane. Table 10 further clarifies this to include striped bicycle lanes along Toledo Terrace and Toledo Road (TDDP, page 83). The subject plans provide:

- An 11-foot-wide sidewalk along Belcrest Road (Mandatory Development Requirement S8 requires a 20- to 40-foot pedestrian zone with a sidewalk of undetermined width, per Figure 8)
- A ten-foot-wide sidewalk along the southern property boundary at Toledo Road
- A seven-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of Toledo Terrace Road (Mandatory Development Requirement S8 requires a 20-foot pedestrian zone with a 12-foot-wide sidewalk, per Figure 8)

The applicant submits that various factors outside their control affect the ultimate streetscape. For example figure 12 establishes a right-of-way for Toledo Terrace of 60 feet. Toledo Terrace is currently a 70-foot right-of-way. The Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) has indicated that it may require a widening of Toledo Terrace. If it is widened it will negatively affect the goal to achieve a pedestrian friendly streetscape. Thus, a waiver has been requested of DPW&T. The disposition of the requested waiver will affect the ultimate streetscape and departure from these TDDP standards. Staff supports the waiver request. The design goals of the TDDP are to encourage the placement of buildings along East-West Highway, Toledo and Belcrest Roads and Toledo Terrace so that they define the space, and create a pedestrian-friendly environment. A waiver of the 70-foot right-of-way to accommodate a pedestrian-friendly streetscape is appropriate in light of the fact that the TDDP establishes a 60-foot right-of-way for Toledo Terrace. A diminished and minimal streetscape is inconsistent with the TDDP. There cannot be a minimalist streetscape with the kind of density envisioned and proposed. An accommodating streetscape of appropriate uses and functions that activate the street will be essential to implement the vision.

**Comment:** The Community Planning North Division’s support of the requested amendment relies heavily on the presumption that additional widening of Toledo Terrace would not be required.

As discussed within the analysis of the site plan’s conformance with the goals of the TDDP (Finding 4 regarding the rezoning discussion), the ultimate design of the streetscape cannot be determined at this time due to uncertainty relating to road widening and the adequacy of the proposed public utilities along Toledo Terrace. Currently, the Department of Public Works and Transportation and the Transportation Planning Section are recommending that Toledo Terrace be widened from 36 to 43 feet of pavement within the existing right-of-way. This widening of seven feet would result in a reduction in the width of the streetscape, measured per the TDDP from face of curb to edge of building. Currently, the sidewalk proposed along the property’s Toledo Terrace frontage is as narrow as five feet wide where drop-off locations are proposed within the right-of-way, which is inconsistent with the TDDP’s requirement for a 12-foot-wide sidewalk along Toledo Terrace. The widening of Toledo Terrace would exacerbate this issue and could

require the relocation of buildings and/or modifications to their footprints, the redesign or elimination of the drop off areas, and other substantial site modifications in order to provide an acceptable streetscape. In addition, staff is in receipt of comments from various public utility companies indicating that the public utility easements as shown are the plans are insufficient to ensure that service can be provided to the project. The provision of a wider public utility easement would also affect building siting and the ultimate streetscape. Given the uncertainty of the streetscape design, staff is not able to recommend approval of an amendment to P1 and S8 regarding streetscape design.

### **Transportation and Parking**

**P6** Unless otherwise noted, the term “parking” as used in these requirements, shall refer only to surface parking. Parking provided in or below a structure that is used, built or redeveloped for a use or uses approved under the provisions of this plan shall be considered surface parking as used in these requirements. *Unless stated otherwise in this plan, all existing County requirements relating to parking and loading as required by Subtitle 27, Part 11, of the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance shall be applicable.* (Emphasis added)

**Comment:** The proposed development as shown on the detailed site plan complies with the parking and loading regulations with one exception. The applicant is requesting an amendment to these standards relative to the size of the standard parking spaces located in the structured parking garages to allow nine-foot by nineteen-foot standard parking spaces instead of 9.5 feet by 19 feet standard spaces as is required by Part 11 of the Zoning Ordinance.

The applicant provides the following justification for this request:

“The majority of the proposed parking spaces will be provided within parking garages spread throughout the site. In order to provide a consistent parking space size for design purposes, the applicant proposes to utilize a universal 9’ by 19’ parking space, rather than the 9.5’ by 19’ parking space size normally required by the Zoning Ordinance. Section 27-548.08(c)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance provides that in a TDOZ, the Planning Board “may amend parking provisions concerning the dimensions, layout or design of parking spaces or parking lots.” As such, the Applicant requests that the Planning Board approve an amendment of the parking space sizes to allow a universal size parking space .5 feet narrower than the standard space. No compact parking spaces are proposed within the parking structures. Since the Planning Board has the authority to approve such a modification as part of the Detailed Site Plan, no Departure from Design Standards will be filed by the Applicant.”

Staff finds that the applicant’s requested reduction in the size of standard parking spaces from 9.5 feet by 19 feet to 9 feet by 19 feet is appropriate. The proposed parking spaces are sufficiently wide to allow such workers, residents and retail patrons to enter and leave vehicles safely without compromising adjacent vehicles or pedestrian safety. Similar reductions have been approved within various DDOZs throughout the county.

## Lighting

- S3 All primary and secondary pedestrian walkways shall be well-lighted to a minimum standard of 1.25 footcandles.**
- S25 All lighting shall have a minimum level of 1.25 footcandles, and shall be provided for all outdoor spaces, plazas, parking lots, etc., for the safety and welfare of all users.**

**Comment:** The applicant has requested an amendment to these standards and offered the following justification in support of this request:

“The Applicant has prepared and submitted a detailed photometric plan of the entire development. While an average lighting level of 1.25 footcandles is provided for all outdoor spaces, including all primary and secondary pedestrian walkways, some areas do not provide a minimum of 1.25 footcandles. To achieve this, maximum footcandle levels of 7.3 are required directly under the fixture. In order to achieve a minimum of 1.25 footcandles in all locations, however, the maximum footcandles would have to be around 15 footcandles and would be too bright. This high level of lighting is counter to energy efficiency initiatives and night sky goals. In addition, over lighting the site is inconsistent with the goal to achieve LEED certification. One of the credits required for LEED certification (i.e. light pollution reduction) requires the light level in the exterior of a building to be at or below the levels recommended by the Illuminating Engineering Society (IES) recommended practice manual for outdoor environments. The highest minimum average light level recommended, for commercial area walkways, is only .9 footcandles. Thus, the applicant requests a waiver of S 8 and S25 to allow it to provide an minimum average lighting level of 1.25 footcandles, rather than a minimum lighting level of 1.25 footcandles.”

Staff concurs with the waiver request noting that in order to achieve a minimum of 1.25 footcandles in all locations, the maximum footcandles would be approximately 15 footcandles, which would be too bright and would not support energy efficiency consistent with the goal to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification. The highest minimum average light level recommended by the Illuminating Engineering Society, for commercial area walkways is .9 footcandles. Thus, the request for a minimum average light level of 1.25 footcandles is reasonable for the proposed mixed use area.

Staff concurs with the applicant’s assertion that the provision of lighting at the level of 15 footcandles directly beneath the luminaires, which is necessary in order to achieve a minimum level of 1.25 footcandles, would be undesirable. One of the compatibility standards set forth in the Zoning Ordinance for the M-U-I Zone is that site design should minimize glare, light, and other visual intrusions into and impacts on yards, open areas, and building facades on adjacent properties. The applicant’s requested amendment will ensure that an adequate level of lighting is maintained on the subject site while minimizing the impact of excessive light levels on adjacent properties. Therefore, staff recommends that the minimum footcandle requirement be 0.9 footcandles.

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

**Comment:** The applicant has requested an amendment to these standards and offered the following justification in support of this request:

“The applicant has proposed to utilize the same light fixtures along Belcrest Road as have been approved for and installed by prior developments. The existing light poles in Toledo Terrace, Toledo Place and Northwest Drive have old wood poles with Cobra heads and do not comply with the drawings in Appendix A. The applicant has been advised that a light pole different from that used on Belcrest Road should be selected and the one selected by the applicant is from Pepco’s approved list. Thus, the applicant requests a waiver of S24 to extend necessary to allow it to utilize a street light style different from that used on Belcrest Road, as [sic] directed by Staff.”

The selected light fixture is appropriate in terms of scale and design for use along Toledo Terrace, Toledo Place and Northwest Drive. Staff is in support of the applicant’s requested amendment. The Community Planning North Division staff has indicated that they are in support of the requested amendment.

### **Signs**

**P5 Small regulatory signs, such as signs which direct traffic or identify the location of service entrances or parking areas, shall not exceed 2 square feet in area.**

**Comment:** The applicant has requested an amendment to these standards and offered the following justification in support of this request:

“Included in the applicant’s [sic] plans are several way-finding signs intended to direct visitors and residents to key elements of the project, such as main plaza areas, specific buildings or bus stops. Each of these signs is important to the movement of both vehicular and pedestrian traffic. The signage is designed in a comprehensive style and is of high quality. The signs are approximately 4.5 square feet in area. Two square feet of sign area is not sufficient to [sic]for the signs to serve their intended purpose. While the applicant does not believe these signs violate the letter or intent of P5, a waiver from this restriction is requested should it be determined that the proposed signage would be prohibited.”

Staff concurs that the sign design plan is comprehensive, coordinated and of high quality and the larger way-finding size results partly from the fact that the signs are framed by brick veneer to match building materials.

The proposed way-finding signs, shown as Sign Type C on the plans, are appropriately sized given their intended purpose. Staff is in support of the applicant’s requested amendment.

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

**Comment:** The applicant has requested modifications from the guidelines set forth in the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP) for this portion of the project. The following provides a discussion of the requirements, including amendment requests and a response from staff:

**Recommended Multifamily Amenities**

**G53 Residential uses should be upscale and luxurious in building construction [sic] and amenities. For example, amenities include but are not limited to the following:**

**For each residential unit:**

**Kitchen with self-cleaning oven, microwave oven, garbage disposal, trash compactor, frost-free refrigerator with automatic icemaker, dishwasher, pantry cabinet and/or option for a gourmet kitchen with a grill, double oven or island counter.**

**Comment:** The applicant has requested an amendment to these standards and offered the following justification in support of this request:

“The applicant has G53 requires that each residential unit have a trash compactor and a double oven or island counter. Trash compactors will not be provided. Recycling will be encouraged and trash compactors will hinder this effort. A single oven and microwave will be provided in each unit, but a double oven will not be provided. Waivers from these requirements are requested.”

**Full-size washer and dryer.**

**Comment:** The applicant has stated that the majority of units will have stacked washer and dryers and larger units will feature full-size side-by-side washer/dryers.

**Separate bathroom and bath for the master bedroom with a spa tub and separate shower.**

**Comment:** The applicant has stated that the majority of units will have a combined bathtub and shower and that only in selected units will there be a spa tub and separate shower.

**8-foot sliding glass patio door.**

**Comment:** The applicant has requested an amendment to these standards and offered the following justification in support of this request:

“G53 requires “8-foot sliding glass patio doors” in each residential unit. The requirement does not specify if this refers to height or width. The Applicant is proposing 8-foot high sliding glass patio doors, but not 8-foot wide patio doors. The doors proposed are 6-feet wide. If it is determined that this requirement applies to the width of the doors, a waiver is requested.”

**Walk-in closets.**

**Comment:** The applicant has requested an amendment to these standards and offered the following justification in support of this request:

“G53 requires that each residential unit have “walk-in closets”. This term is used in the plural. While each unit will have at least one walk-in closet, certain units (efficiencies and one bedroom units) will only have one. Therefore, a waiver from this requirement is requested.”

**Gas fireplace.**

**Comment:** The applicant has indicated that only selected units will feature gas fireplaces.

**Burglar/intrusion alarm.**

**Comment:** The applicant has requested an amendment to these standards and offered the following justification in support of this request:

“G53 requires that each residential unit have a burglar/intrusion alarm. While the building will have 24-hour security and security cameras, each individual unit will not have its own burglar/intrusion alarm. First, with technology advancing, individual alarms on each unit is not necessary. Second, there is increasing concern regarding false alarms that may be triggered by an individual system. Placing alarms on each unit will increase the likelihood of false alarms. Third, the project has been designed so that all first floor units are six feet above the street level to increase the security of these units. While each individual resident can have an alarm installed, the Applicant does not intend to provide such an alarm for every unit. A waiver of this requirement is requested.”

**For units on the top floors, cathedral ceilings and skylights.**

**Comment:** The applicant has indicated that there will be no cathedral ceilings or skylights provided within top floor units due to the flat roof design of the proposed building. The Community Planning North Division staff has indicated that they are in support of the requested amendment.

**3. 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 site plan’s conformance to the requirements of the TDDP is discussed above. The applicable regulations of the proposed underlying zone are set forth in Section 27-546.18(b) of the Zoning Ordinance as follows:

**Section 27-546.18(b) Regulations in the M-U-I Zone:**

- (b) Where an owner proposes a mix of residential and commercial uses on a single lot or parcel in the M-U-I Zone, the site plan as approved shall set out the regulations to be followed. The approved regulations may reduce**

**parking requirements by thirty percent (30%), where evidence shows that proposed parking will be adequate, notwithstanding provisions in Part 11. (CB-10-2001; CB-42-2003)**

**Comment:** The subject detailed site plan will establish the regulations to be followed. The parking requirements set forth in the TDDP are discussed in detail in the Transportation Planning Section's analysis of the subject application in Findings 4 and 36.

- 4. 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:** A detailed discussion of the site plan's conformance with the goals and purposes of the TDDP is provided above in Finding 4 of the rezoning discussion.

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

**Comment:** The proposed buildings are be compatible in size, height, and massing to buildings on adjacent properties and compatible with the vision for each subarea, except for Buildings 1 and 2 on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza. Building 1 is designed with a 31-story residential tower at the intersection of Toledo Terrace and Belcrest Road. A portion of Building 2 is proposed to be 17 stories. The maximum height set by the TDDP for Subarea 12, within which Building 1 and 2 are proposed to be located, is 16 stories. The TDDP envisions buildings with a maximum height of 16 stories on the adjacent properties to the north (Subarea 1) and south (Subarea 11) as well. Therefore, a height limit of 16 stories is appropriate within the portion of the property located in Subarea 12, as it is expected that the adjacent properties will be redeveloped sometime in the future with buildings that are a maximum height of 16 stories.

The applicant proposes to construct a mix of residential, retail and office uses on the subject property. The highest concentration of non-residential uses is located in the eastern portion of the development, on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza, adjacent to the Prince George's Plaza shopping center and additional retail uses across Belcrest Road. Parcel C, Americana Plaza, contains mainly residential uses and is adjacent to existing multifamily developments to the north, east and west. Building 6 on Parcels A and B, Americana Plaza, features mainly residential uses, and is adjacent to multifamily uses to the west and south. The retail portions of Buildings 6 and 7 are concentrated at the intersection of Toledo Place and Toledo Terrace, across from an entrance into Prince George's Plaza.

- 6. M-U-I Zone Required Findings as set forth in Section 27-546.19(c) of the Zoning Ordinance:**

**(c) A Detailed Site Plan may not be approved unless the owner shows:**

- (1) The site plan meets all approval requirements in Part 3, Division 9;**

**Comment:** The detailed site plan as submitted meets the requirements of Part 3, Division 9.

- (2) All proposed uses meet applicable development standards approved with the Master Plan, Sector Plan, Transit District Development Plan, or other applicable plan;**

**Comment:** Conformance to the applicable standards of the TDDP is discussed in detail above in Finding 35.

- (3) Proposed uses on the property will be compatible with one another;**

**Comment:** The applicant proposes to construct a mix of residential, retail and office uses on the subject property. Although individual buildings are proposed to feature a mix of uses, the design is such that separate entrances and amenities are provided for different users of each building. The area of concern is the relationship of the uses in the building as they relate to the streetscape. Both public and private streets within the property should be fully activated with uses.

- (4) Proposed uses will be compatible with existing or approved future development on adjacent properties and an applicable Transit or Development District; and**

**Comment:** The applicant proposes to construct a mix of residential, retail and office uses on the subject property. The highest concentration of nonresidential uses is located in the eastern portion of the development, on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza, adjacent to the Prince George's Plaza shopping center and additional retail uses across Belcrest Road. Parcel C, Americana Plaza, contains mainly residential uses and is adjacent to existing multifamily developments to the north, east and west. Building 6 on Parcels A and B, Americana Plaza, features mainly residential uses, and is adjacent to multifamily uses to the west and south. The retail portions of Buildings 6 and 7 are concentrated at the intersection of Toledo Place and Toledo Terrace, across from an entrance into Prince George's Plaza.

- (5) Compatibility standards and practices set forth below will be followed, or the owner shows why they should not be applied:**

- (A) Proposed buildings should be compatible in size, height, and massing to buildings on adjacent properties;**

**Comment:** The proposed buildings will be compatible in size, height, and massing to buildings on adjacent properties and compatible with the vision for each subarea, except for Buildings 1 and 2 on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza. Building 1 is designed with a 31-story residential tower at the intersection of Toledo Terrace and Belcrest Road. A portion of Building 2 is proposed to be 17 stories. The maximum height set by the TDDP for Subarea 12, within which Building 1 and 2 are proposed to be located, is 16 stories. The TDDP envisions buildings with a maximum height of 16 stories on the adjacent properties to the north (Subarea 1) and south (Subarea 11) as well. Therefore, a height limit of 16 stories is appropriate within the portion of the property located in Subarea 12, as it is expected that the adjacent properties will be redeveloped sometime in the future with buildings that are a maximum height of 16 stories.

- (B) Primary facades and entries should face adjacent streets or public walkways and be connected by on-site walkways, so pedestrians may avoid crossing parking lots and driveways;**

**Comment:** The primary façades and entries face adjacent streets and public walkways so that pedestrians may access buildings without crossing parking lots and driveways.

- (C) Site design should minimize glare, light, and other visual intrusions into and impacts on yards, open areas, and building facades on adjacent properties;**

**Comment:** The applicant has submitted a photometric plan, which demonstrates that the lighting levels on the subject property will not negatively impact surrounding properties. The applicant has filed for an amendment from S3 and S25 of the TDDP to allow for an average level of 1.25 footcandles instead of a minimum level of 1.25 footcandles, which will help to ensure that excessive light levels are not provided in some areas in order to achieve the minimum requirement.

- (D) Building materials and color should be similar to materials and color on adjacent properties and in the surrounding neighborhoods, or building design should incorporate scaling, architectural detailing, or similar techniques to enhance compatibility;**

**Comment:** The proposed architectural elevations of Buildings 6 and 7 feature a combination of face brick in traditional red and other accent colors and accent hardiplank panels and trim. The multifamily structures to the north and west feature traditional red brick while the buildings within the Post Park development, to the south, feature a more modern combination of brick and hardiplank panels in bold accent colors. The proposed elevations offer an appropriate transition between the old and new by incorporating materials from both.

The architectural elevations of buildings one through five are predominately finished with varying colors of face brick, with metal panel accents. Accent moldings and cornices are constructed of cast stone and accent metal trellises are incorporated at many rooflines. The proposed architecture blends modern and traditional elements, which is appropriate given its location within the Transit District, where recently approved projects, such as University Town Center and Post Park, featuring modern design, are juxtaposed with older, more traditional structures.

- (E) Outdoor storage areas and mechanical equipment should be located and screened to minimize visibility from adjacent properties and public streets;**

**Comment:** Several unscreened transformers are shown on the plans in highly visible locations. Several conditions have been included in the

recommendation section which would require the screening and/or relocation of these items.

- (F) **Signs should conform to applicable Development District Standards or to those in Part 12, unless the owner shows that its proposed signage program meets goals and objectives in applicable plans; and**

**Comment:** The proposed signs conform to the applicable Development District Standards.

- (G) **The owner or operator should minimize adverse impacts on adjacent properties and the surrounding neighborhood by appropriate setting of:**

- (i) **Hours of operation or deliveries;**

**Comment:** The loading facilities are internal to the buildings. Therefore, deliveries will not impact residents of the building or surrounding communities.

- (ii) **Location of activities with potential adverse impacts;**

**Comment:** Loading and trash storage/removal will be contained within the buildings, thereby mitigating their adverse impacts. Loading spaces are accessed via separate garage entrances to eliminate potential conflicts with general use of the parking garages.

- (iii) **Location and use of trash receptacles;**

**Comment:** Trash chutes are located in each building within separate, enclosed rooms. Trash storage facilities are located within the first-floor parking garage also within separate, enclosed rooms.

- (iv) **Location of loading and delivery spaces;**

**Comment:** The location of the proposed loading spaces is generally acceptable. The applicant has filed a companion departure from design standards, DDS-600, to allow two loading spaces to be accessed directly from Toledo Terrace. Staff is recommending disapproval of DDS-600.

- (v) **Light intensity and hours of illumination; and**

**Comment:** The applicant has submitted a photometric plan, which demonstrates that the lighting levels on the subject property will be maintained at an average level of 1.25 footcandles. The applicant has filed for an amendment from S3 and S25 of the TDDP to allow for an average level of 1.25

footcandles instead of a minimum level of 1.25 footcandles, which will help to ensure that excessive light levels are not provided in some areas in order to achieve the minimum requirement.

**(vi) Location and use of outdoor vending machines.**

**Comment:** No outdoor vending machines are proposed.

36. **Referrals:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

a. **Transportation Planning:** Adequacy is required to be determined at the time of DSP review pursuant to the TDDP.

As discussed above in Finding 4 in regard to conformance to the transportation goals of the TDDP, the application does not meet the goal of providing for adequate levels of transportation and transit operating and service efficiency. As required by Section 27-546.16(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the owner must show that the proposed rezoning and development will meet the goals and objectives of the TDDP. As a result of the application's failure to meet the above mentioned goal, staff is recommending disapproval of the rezoning to the M-U-I Zone.

However, the detailed site plan's conformance to the adequacy determination required at the time of detailed site plan review pursuant to the requirement of the TDDP is discussed below.

The 1998 TDDP transportation adequacy requirements are based on: (1) an established district-wide parking cap, (2) the number of additional surface parking spaces (preferred and premium) that will be constructed and/or provided in support of any new development or redevelopment plan, and (3) the implementation of a system for developer contributions toward construction of the needed transportation facilities, based on the number of additional new surface parking spaces. The proposed DSP is proposing to replace the existing 743 surface parking spaces with only 78 new surface parking spaces. Since the 743 surface parking spaces existed prior to TDDP approval, they are considered exempt from TDDP parking requirements. If the rezoning were approved, pursuant to the TDDP Mandatory Development requirements P6 through P19, the existing, programmed, and planned transportation facilities would be deemed adequate to serve the mixed use development proposed by the submitted DSP.

b. **Community Planning**—In a memorandum dated November 19, 2009, the Community Planning North Division provided an analysis of the applicant's requested amendments to the standards of the TDDP and a general analysis of the detailed site plan's conformance to the TDDP.

This application is consistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for centers in the Developed Tier but the question arises as to what level of service pertinent to transportation is provided with the proposed density. The General Plan and the Prince George's Plaza TDDP recommend a minimum level of service E. The transportation division will need to determine if this requirement has been met. This application does not conform to the land use recommendations of the *1998 Approved*

*Transit District Development Plan for the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone* and is inconsistent with certain subarea design and area wide standards of the Transit District Development Plan/Transit District Overlay Zone. (See Planning Issues Section below.)

As a part of this DSP application, the applicant is requesting a change in the underlying zoning from R-18 to Mixed-Use-Infill (MUI) for TDOZ sub areas 12 and 13A (Georgian Plaza, Parcel B and Americana Plaza, Parcels A,B and C, respectively).

### **SUB AREA 13A**

**Applicant's proposal:** In TDOZ sub area 13A the applicant proposes a mix of residential uses with a small percentage of "flex space" indicated in Parcels A, B, and C of Americana Plaza.

**Comment:** The TDDP plan promotes increased density within a quarter mile walking distance of the Metro station and since this area is more than a quarter mile walking distance from the Metro station, the approved plan retained the multi-family zoning, specifically the R-18 Zone for sub area 13A. The applicant's proposal is predominantly residential. Parcels A and B (Americana Plaza Building 6) is proposed for multifamily (283 units in 3- to 4-story buildings over parking podium). Parcel C, (Americana Plaza Building 7) is proposed for multi-family (356 units in 4- to 5-story buildings), and townhouses (57 units in 3- to 4-story buildings).

It is important to note that the R-18 Zone allows a maximum of 20 dwelling units per acre which permits less than the existing 783 dwelling units (including subarea 12, Georgian Plaza Parcel B). Redevelopment in accordance with the R-18 Zone would result in approximately 240 dwelling units.

Today, the existing multifamily development provides affordable rental housing for area residents. The TDDP recognizes the need to retain and provide affordable work force housing. Relocation of existing tenants is anticipated (Gazette, August 29, 2009). The applicant has not indicated whether provisions for affordable work force housing will be incorporated as part of the proposed redevelopment which is proposed to exceed both the existing and TDDP recommended residential densities.

In conclusion, the proposed residential density exceeds the existing and recommended TDDP densities. While the proposed redevelopment would introduce residential development within proximity of Metro rail and bus transportation consistent with the goals of the TDDP, the increase in density must be further evaluated by the transportation department to verify if the development meets a minimum level of service E as indicated in the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan* and the TDDP.

### **SUB AREA 12**

**Applicant's proposal:** In TDOZ sub area 12 the applicant requests a rezoning from the R-18 Zone to the M-U-I Zone and proposes a mix of uses in buildings ranging in height from four stories to 30 stories in Georgian Plaza, Parcel B. Approximately 2011 dwelling units are proposed and 176,000 square feet of commercial office, retail and flex space is proposed.

**Comment:** The design goals of the TDDP are to encourage the placement of buildings along East-West Highway, Toledo and Belcrest Roads and Toledo Terrace so that they define the space, create a pedestrian-friendly environment and minimize views of parking areas (page 28, TDDP). While the proposed buildings are placed so that they define space and minimize views of parking areas, a number of the proposed buildings contain podium structured parking, which creates streets that are not activated with street level uses. Such development is inconsistent with the purposes of the TDDP (page 9) particularly purposes 2, and 8 through 12.

The applicant's development utilizes the existing circulation pattern that includes a parking drive aisle of the Prince George's Plaza Mall between Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace. The amount of proposed development necessitates a dedicated roadway. As it is, Toledo Terrace, Toledo Road, and Belcrest Road are primary residential streets that function as collector roadways during peak traffic hours. For this reason it is understandable that the applicant suggests additional grid street development that may happen in future redevelopment of the Prince George's Plaza Mall, but there is no certainty of providing an expanded grid road network on property not owned by the applicant. The intensity of development and increased density suggests the need for a transportation study to determine how proposed development allows for adequate traffic circulation, capacity and safety in conformance with the TDDP.

In conclusion, based on the goals of the 2002 *Prince George's Approved General Plan* and the TDDP, level-of-service E (LOS E) must be maintained and the transportation department will review if the applicant has achieved this minimum level-of-service. Additionally, the proposed development of Sub area 12 (Parcel B, Georgian Plaza) relies on the integration of the abutting parking drive aisle without authorization from the adjoining property owner. These conditions underscore a number of uncertainties that do not support a rezoning to M-U-I at this time.

The applicant's revised proposal contains a maximum building height of 30 stories for TDOZ sub area 12 which does not conform to the following TDDP mandatory standards:

**P100 (page 121, TDDP) – The maximum building height shall be 16 stories**

The applicant's proposal does not conform to the following TDDP District area wide standards:

**Plaza site design guidelines—S15 (mandatory plaza standard, page 36, TDDP) provides that 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, cobbles. Large expanses of poured concrete are not acceptable. A detailed paving/banding plan will be required at the time of Detailed Site Plan.**

Plaza Design Guidelines G16 through G38 (pages 36-38 do not conform). For example, G20 provides that plazas should be free of automobile traffic but the proposed plaza contains a driveway that encircles the plaza.

- c. **Subdivision**—In a memorandum dated September 25, 2009, the Subdivision Section provided the following analysis of the need for a preliminary plan of subdivision and the detailed site plan's conformance to the record plats:

The site plan correctly indicates that the site is composed of Parcels B, C, A, and B, Tax Map 41 in Grid F1, and is 24.915 acres. Parcels B and C of Americana Plaza are recorded in Plat Book WWW 35 @ 59. Parcel A of Americana Plaza is recorded in Plat Book WWW 34 @ 41. Parcel B of the Georgian Plaza is recorded in Plat Book WWW 32 @ 30. The site plan does not provide enough information on the existing conditions of the site. Each parcel and its acreage on the site plan should be labeled and the gross floor area of each existing structure provided. In evaluating the site plan for conformance with the three record plats mention above, there are some inconsistencies. The property lines bearings do not match the record plats, this should to be corrected. The applicant, Contee Company, LLP, is proposing to raze all the existing structures for a redevelop mixed use 2,750 multifamily dwelling and 289,480 square feet of commercial space.

Section 24-111 of the Subdivision Regulations provides for exemptions from the requirement of filing a preliminary plan of subdivision for parcels with a record plat in certain circumstances. Specifically, in this instance Section 24-111(c)(4) provides:

- (c) **A final plat of subdivision approved prior to October 27, 1970, shall be resubdivided prior to the issuance of a building permit unless:**
  - (4) **The development of more than five thousand (5,000) square feet of gross floor area, which constitutes at least ten percent (10%) of the total area of the site, has been constructed pursuant to a building permit issued on or before December 31, 1991.**

Parcels A, C, and B of Americana Plaza are pursuant to record plat approved in 1959. Parcel B of Georgian Plaza is pursuant to a record plat approved in 1958. Based on the PG Atlas and the aerial photographs submitted with the application, it appears that the gross floor area of the existing buildings on each of the parcels is more than ten percent of the total area of each parcel. The buildings on-site appear to be built in the 1950s and 1960s according to the assessment records and statement of justification in the application.

The site is exempt from the requirement of filing a preliminary plan of subdivision under Section 24-111(c)(4) based on the existing conditions and structures of the site provided by information in the application, PG Atlas, and the assessment records, if they are correct.

To ensure that the exemption will apply to the future redevelopment of the site once the existing structures are razed, we strongly recommend that the applicant file a final plat for the site in accordance with Section 24-108 of the Subdivision Regulations for which no preliminary plan is required. The final plat will include a note to ensure the exemption under 24-111(c)(4) as described above. The applicant has the option to apply for a separate plat for each of the parcels or one plat for the entire site. The relationship between the four parcels cannot be altered by the plat to vest the development.

In a subsequent memo dated November 23, 2009, the Subdivision Section provided the following analysis of the revised detailed site plan's conformance to the record plats:

In evaluating the amended DSP-09006, there are no significant changes in regarding to subdivision issues. Like the previous DSP, this site plan still need to show the acreage of each parcel and the bearings on the property lines do not match the record plats. The applicant needs to correct the bearings or submit a letter of explanation for the inconsistencies of the bearings. This site plan did improve in the labeling of each parcel and the distance on the property lines did match with the record plats. Overall, the amendments to the DSP-09006 for Belcrest Plaza Mixed-Use have no major affect on the findings in the Subdivision memorandum submitted to Urban Design on September 25, 2009.

**Comment:** There are no other subdivision issues at this time.

- d. **Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)**—In a memorandum dated November 19, 2009, DPW&T provided the following analysis of the detailed site plan:
- (1) The property is located on the southwestern quadrant of the intersection of Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace.
  - (2) All improvements within the public rights-of-way, as dedicated for public use to the County, are to be in accordance with the County Road Ordinance, DPW&T Specifications and Standards and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
  - (3) Toledo Terrace is to be widened to 43 feet to accommodate two 11-foot travel lanes, one 11-foot two-way center left-turn lane and two five-foot-wide bicycle lanes. Two-inch mill and overlay for the full width of Toledo Terrace, Belcrest Road (MD 410 to Adelphi Road), Northwest Drive, and Toledo Place for the entire property frontage is also required. No parking will be allowed along Toledo Terrace.
  - (4) Hiker/Biker lanes on both sides of Toledo Terrace are to be accommodated within the 17-foot space at the back of the existing curbs. (Note: In an e-mail dated November 23, 2009, Abraham to Lareuse, DPW&T revised this item and indicated that bike lanes would be accommodated on Toledo Terrace as outlined in “c” above).
  - (5) Compliance with DPW&T’s Utility policy is required. Based upon the plans submitted, proper temporary and final patching and the related mill and overlay in accordance with the established DPW&T Policy and Specification for Utility Installation and Maintenance Permits are required.
  - (6) In this limited instance and subject to DPW&T’s detailed review, given the site property constraints, it is acceptable for placement of underground utilities related to Verizon and Comcast telecommunication cable and conduit within the public right-of-way below the proposed sidewalks in the public right-of-way at a minimum depth of 24 inches. The developer, and upon transfer of ownership, the property owner fronting the referenced sidewalk, will be responsible for maintenance and accept all related liability for the referenced sidewalk in perpetuity. Execution of a maintenance covenant relative to these requirements is necessary prior to issuance of any DPW&T permits for the referenced site.

Relative to this, and, as a minimum, approval by DPW&T of a typical section showing placement of the referenced underground utilities is required.

- (7) The private road within the site will require a DPW&T permit prior to issuance of the building permit. The roads are to be constructed in accordance with DPW&T's Specifications and Standards.
- (8) Any proposed and/or existing Master Plan roadways that lie within the property limits must be addressed through coordination between the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) and DPW&T and may involve rights-of-way reservation, dedication and/or construction in accordance with DPW&T's specifications and standards.
- (9) Conformance with DPW&T street tree and street lighting standards is required.
- (10) Sidewalks are required along all roadways within the property limits in accordance with Sections 23-105 and 23-135 of the County Road Ordinance.
- (11) All storm drainage systems and facilities are to be in accordance with DPW&T's specifications and standards requirements. (Be aware that the new Maryland Stormwater Management regulations take effect on May 4, 2010. All stormwater management practices/facilities must meet the new regulations).
- (12) An access study shall be conducted by the applicant and reviewed to determine the adequacy of the access point(s) and the need for acceleration/deceleration lanes and a by-pass lane with dedication of the necessary additional right-of-way.
- (13) A soils investigation report which includes subsurface exploration and a geotechnical engineering evaluation for public streets and proposed dwellings are required.
- (14) The bus pull-offs located on Toledo Terrace were reviewed by DPW&T and determined that the six shown on the plan are excessive and that the number needs to be reduced to four due to the close proximity of the buildings to one another.
- (15) The developer has indicated a willingness to execute a Memorandum of Understanding to provide bus shuttle services for the residents of the development. Metrobus should have access to one or more of the proposed bus pull-offs.
- (16) The location of the proposed monument signs need to be evaluated to ensure that appropriate sight distance is maintained.
- (17) A traffic impact study was reviewed by DPW&T and the specific comments were forwarded to M-NCPPC under separate cover.
- (18) The proposed site development is consistent with the approved DPW&T Stormwater Management Concept Plan 11078-2009-00 dated May 26, 2009. The stormwater management facilities proposed are in accordance with current county stormwater management regulations.

- (19) The proposed loading entrance backing directly onto Toledo Terrace, located on the south side of Toledo Terrace at the intersection of Belcrest Road, is too close to the intersection. This proposed loading entrance is not acceptable.
  - (20) In conclusion, noting that this development increases the area density levels by fivefold recommended within the current, approved Transit District Development Plan and the Transit Demand Overlay Zone document, and realizing that a long-term funding mechanism will be needed to implement and maintain the transit district improvements stated above, and realizing that there is to be a plan to improve the traffic level service “E” that the traffic study indicates resulting from this development it is DPW&T’s recommendation to the Prince George’s County Planning Board that the County’s first Transportation Demand Management District (TDMD) be authorized by the County Council as authorized under the TDMD Ordinance (Subtitle 20A of the Prince George’s County Code). The implementation and oversight of the TDMD is to be the responsibility of M-NCPPC.
- e. **Town of University Park**—The application was sent to the Town of University Park; however, as of the writing of this technical staff report, no comments have been received by this office
  - f. **City of Hyattsville**—The City of Hyattsville was sent the application, but as of the writing of this technical staff report, no comments have been received by this office.
  - g. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In an e-mail memorandum dated November 18, 2009, WSSC indicated that they had no comment at this time.
37. As required by Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the Detailed Site Plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9 of the Prince George’s County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

- 1. RECOMMEND that the District Council DISAPPROVE the request to rezone the property from the R-18 Zone to the M-U-I Zone; and
- 2. RECOMMEND that the District Council DISAPPROVE the proposed change to the use list to add permitted uses in the M-U-I Zone for Subarea 12 and 13A for the subject parcels; and
- 3. RECOMMEND that the District Council DISAPPROVE the proposed change to the maximum building heights for Buildings 1 and 2 within Subarea 12; and furthermore

4. RECOMMEND that the District Council DISAPPROVE DSP-09006, DISAPPROVE amendments to parking space sizes, and DISAPPROVE the following amendments to standards of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan:

- Overall Development: P1, P5, P89, P90, P91, S8, S3, S24, S25, S62 and G53
- Parcel B, Georgian Plaza: P102
- Parcel C, Americana Plaza: P105
- Parcels A & B, Americana Plaza: P105 and S18