

**Staff Analysis of Testimony**

**Second Draft (2024) West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel Sector Plan and**

**Proposed West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel Sectional Map Amendment (SMA)**

**October 1, 2024, Joint Public Hearing Record**

**Table of Contents**

I	Introduction			2
II	Analysis of Testimony	A	General Testimony	5
		B	Summary of Key Issues	9
		B1	Queens Chapel Manor Rezoning	10
		B2	Future Land Use and Zoning at 2130 Chillum Road (Washington Gas)	16
		B3	Queenstown Apartments Recommendations	20
		B4	Displacement	22
		C	Land Use (Section III)	25
		D	Transportation and Mobility (Section V)	33
		E	Natural Environment (Section VI)	41
		F	Housing and Neighborhoods (Section VII)	44
		G	Public Facilities (Section X)	46
		H	Proposed Sectional Map Amendment	47
		I	Testimony Outside the Scope of the Draft Sector Plan and/or Proposed SMA	48
III	List of Speakers			50
IV	List of Exhibits			51

I. Introduction

**Purpose of the Analysis of Testimony and Process**

This analysis of testimony is intended to identify areas where staff recommend the Planning Board amend the Second Draft Sector Plan or Proposed SMA in its resolutions of adoption and endorsement in response to issues raised in public testimony. Analysis of testimony on a master/sector plan or SMA does not, and is not intended to, do the following:

- Provide a point-by-point analysis of all issues raised in public testimony.
- Calculate, quantify, or determine public or community sentiment based on the amount of testimony received and/or the amount/percentage of testimony received in favor of, or opposed to, a particular course of action.

Following the Planning Board’s work session on this analysis of testimony, the Planning Board may adopt, adopt with amendments, deny, or remand (to staff) the Draft Sector Plan and/or Proposed SMA. Once adopted, the Planning Board then transmits the adopted sector plan and endorsed SMA to the District Council. The District Council may review the adopted plan and endorsed SMA in a work session and then determine whether to approve them, approve them with amendments based on the record, deny the plan, remand one or both of them to the Planning Board for further analysis, or propose amendments to the plan or SMA not based on information contained in the record of public testimony. If the District Council proposes amendments to the plan and/or SMA that are not based on information in the record of public testimony, a second Joint Public Hearing of the District Council and Planning Board must be held on those amendments only.

**Staff Recommended Actions**

At the direction of the Planning Board, recommendations in this analysis will be incorporated into the Planning Board’s Resolution of Adoption, and will include, as an attachment, an Errata Sheet containing corrections and clarifications.

This report analyzes 55 exhibits and 28 pages of transcribed oral testimony (representing 7 speakers) from the Joint Public Hearing on the Second Draft West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel Sector Plan and its Proposed SMA held on October 1, 2024. Copies of the transcript and all exhibits submitted before the close of public record on October 16, 2024, are included as attachments. Following a review of the exhibits and oral testimony, Planning Department staff analyzed the issues raised in the testimony and offered the Department’s response and several recommendations for changes to the text and maps of the Second Draft Sector Plan and Proposed SMA, as amendments, in response to testimony. Testimony includes written testimony received during the open record period and verbal testimony, which is provided at the Joint Public Hearing.

This analysis is organized as follows:

General testimony regarding the plan and key issues are provided first, followed by additional testimony that us then organized by key topic. For **example**, testimony recommending new bioretention facilities would fall under:

Section	Natural Environment
Topic	Stormwater Management (SWM)

Within each Section, the following is provided:

Issue No.	Summary of Issues	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross References	Exhibit/Speaker #	Staff Recommendation	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
Topic							
Serial number	Summary of issues raised in testimony	Staff analysis of testimony (including a summary of how the staff draft sector plan or proposed SMA addresses the issue raised)	References to Specific Plan Policies/Strategies or Page Numbers	List of exhibits/speakers providing testimony on this topic	Staff recommendation to Planning Board (if any)	Planning Board Action (completed after adoption)	District Council Action (completed after approval)

# I. Introduction

Within the testimony analysis, the following symbols are used:

Underline indicates language added to the draft plan and/or proposed SMA.

[Bracket] indicates language deleted from the draft plan and/or proposed SMA.

# I. Introduction

**Acronym Guide**

AG	Agriculture and Preservation Zone		LTO-C	Local Transit-Oriented-Core Zone		RMF-48	Residential, Multifamily-48 Zone
CB	Council Bill		LTO-E	Local Transit-Oriented-Edge Zone		ROS	Reserved Open Space Zone
CN	Commercial, Neighborhood Zone		MD	Maryland		RSF-65	Residential, Single-Family-65 Zone
CR	Council Resolution		M-NCPPC	The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission		RSF-A	Residential, Single-Family-Attached Zone
DPIE	Prince George’s County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement		MPOT	Master Plan of Transportation		SHA	Maryland State Highway Administration
DPW&T	Prince George’s County Department of Public Works and Transportation		OS	Open Space		SMA	Sectional Map Amendment
DSP	Detailed Site Plan		PD	Planned Development Zone		TDDP	Transit District Development Plan
HAWK	High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk		PGCEDC	Prince George's County Economic Development Corporation		WHQC	West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel
IE	Industrial, Employment		PGCPS	Prince George's County Public Schools		WMATA	Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority
IH	Industrial, Heavy Zone		RMF-20	Residential, Multifamily-20 Zone		ZC	Zoning change
LTO	Local Transit-Oriented Zone						

II. Analysis of Testimony: A. General Testimony

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
General Support							
A1	“I think this plan is quite significant and bold and we’re very enthusiastic about seeing this move forward.” “Very important, bold step forward.”	Acknowledged.	Plan-wide	V1, 23/Cheryl Cort	No change.		
A2	Supports plan.	Acknowledged.	Plan-wide	16/Mrs. Harris, 37/Dan Behrend	No change.		

II. A: General Testimony

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
General Opposition							
A3	Opposes Sector Plan and SMA.	Acknowledged.	Plan-wide, SMA-wide	50/Jenny Wesberry	No change.		
A4	Sector plan does not make a long-term plan for Hyattsville, nor does it represent the identity of the City of Hyattsville.	The plan vision (p. 12) and themes (p. 13) set forth goals, strategies, and policies for the portions of Hyattsville, Mount Rainier, Brentwood, and unincorporated parts of Prince George’s County within the sector plan area over the next 25 years, and the implementation matrix (p. 221-240) provides the timeline for each relevant strategy’s attainment. By definition, a sector plan is a “comprehensive plan for the physical development of the entirety of one or more planning areas, showing in detail elements such as the type, density, and intensity of land uses; pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular traffic features; public facilities; and the relationship between the various uses to transportation, other public facilities and services, and amenities within the master plan area, and where appropriate, to other areas.” These plans are intended to guide development for specific areas of the County and are generally more detailed than the County’s General Plan, also known as Plan 2035. The sector plan and SMA intend to balance the needs, and the feedback received from residents, business owners, government agencies, non-profit organizations, and other stakeholders to create a path forward for the sector plan area that in the future implements County policies and further supports best practices for promoting enhanced quality of life.	Plan-wide	V10,48/Shea Winsett	No change.		
A5	Plan goal of development seems to be profit. Hyattsville is only pushing for land taxes and consumer spending, not expanding industry, agriculture, and tourism. Development doesn’t include jobs or economic prosperity.	<p>The Economic Prosperity element (Section IV, beginning on page 81) promotes jobs and business expansion for local, small, and minority-owned businesses; the creation of attractive commercial corridors that attract businesses; and diversifying business growth and job opportunities in the sector plan area while investing in training and maintaining a skilled workforce. This promotes both residents and business owners within the sector plan area and encourages a wider variety of businesses to come into the area, further contributing to the economic vitality of the region.</p> <p>While the draft plan may not actively pursue expanding agriculture and tourism with specific policies, the plan does create an environment conducive to urban agriculture and tourism. The plan is a culmination of years of work, prioritizing other economic drivers, such as retail and business development. Agriculture and tourism are not discouraged, and the plan includes policies that could boost both agriculture, tourism, and local visitation, such as adding small-scale edible gardens on parkland, expanding restaurant choice, adding interpretative signage along the Anacostia Riverfront, and promoting local historic sites. While agriculture and tourism are not the primary focus, the plan supports these sectors in a way that complements the broader goals of fostering a vibrant community.</p>	Plan-wide	V10,48/Shea Winsett	No change.		

II. A: General Testimony

A6	Developers and other non-resident opinions do not accurately reflect those of Hyattsville residents	Staff engaged with hundreds of stakeholders within the sector plan area since the plan was initiated in October 2020. Additionally, the engagement process is guided by a detailed Public Participation Plan. Staff conducted outreach through in-person and online meetings; via email, ground mail, and social media; and through interviews, all to ascertain stakeholders' priorities and develop a path forward for the sector plan's vision, goals, policies, and strategies. Hyattsville residents were invited to, and did participate in, all of staff's outreach efforts. The sector plan and SMA's goals are to balance the needs of all participants to create a path forward for the sector plan area that is equitable, economically viable, and environmentally sound. Business owners, developers and non-residents provided ideas that overlapped with those of sector plan area residents, and many of these ideas that were included in the plan have been positively received by sector plan area residents.	Plan-wide	V10,48/Shea Winsett	No change.		
----	---	--	-----------	---------------------	------------	--	--

II. A: General Testimony

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
Testimony Regarding Process							
A7	Insufficient outreach was done for the SMA.	A postcard notifying all Queens Chapel Manor residents, including Mr. Lazarus, of the Queens Chapel Manor-specific community meeting was mailed prior to the February 27, 2024, meeting. Additional postcards were mailed in late May 2024 to notify all property owners and residents in the sector plan area about the two open houses held in June 2024. Further, Mr. Lazarus was mailed three notices in compliance with County Code regarding the Joint Public Hearing as well as staff’s contact information should he have any questions; the first was sent on May 3, 2024, for the July 8, 2024, joint public hearing that was ultimately postponed, and notices for the rescheduled October 1, 2024, joint public hearing were sent on August 2, 2024, and August 19, 2024.	SMA-wide	53/Leonard Lazarus	No change.		
A8	Information about the plan should be bilingual. The official notices were not accessible due to too many technical terms and their unavailability in Spanish. He hopes the hearing will be accessible and understandable for the entire community.	Noted. Throughout the planning process, communications and other correspondence were translated in Spanish, as available. Project meetings and public events, including the February 2024 and June 2024 open houses and the October 1, 2024, joint public hearing, were promoted through flyers and postcards in both English and Spanish, and the project website has a Spanish language translation for all materials. All public meetings had an interpreter available. The Planning Department will continue to prioritize.	Plan-wide	36/Enrique Zurita	No change.		
A9	Stakeholder engagement was insufficient. Did not find out about meetings until October 1 Joint Public Hearing was advertised. Number of interviewees was insufficient. Dislikes use of “stakeholders” in the plan.	<p>Postcards were mailed in late May 2024 to notify all property owners and residents in the sector plan area about the two bilingual open houses held in June 2024. Additionally, Dr. Winsett was mailed three notices regarding the Joint Public Hearing; the first notice was sent on May 3, 2024, for the July 8 joint public hearing that was ultimately postponed, and notices for the rescheduled October 1, 2024, joint public hearing were sent on August 2, 2024, and August 19, 2024. Information regarding meetings was also relayed to stakeholders through Prince George’s County Planning Department’s social media and news releases, as well as through the City of Hyattsville.</p> <p>For clarification, “stakeholders” include multiple property owners, including residents, business owners and employees, government agencies, and non-profit organizations that live, work, and shop within the community.</p>	Plan-wide	V10,48/Shea Winsett	No change.		



II. B: Key Issues

This section of the analysis discusses **key** issues raised in public testimony. These issues may be complex, feature a significant number of witnesses or articles of written testimony, or require a lengthy staff analysis and/or recommendation. This table serves as a synopsis; refer to staff analysis and recommendations for more robust context.

No.	Key Issue	Summary	Recommended Changes	Pages
B1	Queens Chapel Manor Rezoning	Testimony and exhibits were submitted both in favor of and in opposition to the zoning proposal for the Queens Chapel Manor (RSF-65 to RSF-A). Some are in favor, given its location proximate to two Metro stations, potential to mitigate climate change, and ability to increase the local tax base. Others oppose the recommendations for a multitude of reasons, including inequitable treatment of the neighborhood and concerns with services, traffic, parking, infrastructure, density, climate change, and displacement.	Transportation and Mobility New strategy TM 10.2 and revisions to existing strategies TM 10.2-10.8 notation.  Housing and Neighborhoods Reorganized with shifted notations. New strategies HN 1.4 (HN 2.6) and HN 1.8 (HN 1.3) and revisions to existing strategies HN 1.4 (HN 2.6), HN 1.5 (HN 1.5), HN 1.6 (HN 1.4), HN 1.7 (HN 2.12), HN 1.8 (HN 1.3), HN 1.9 (HN 1.2), HN 1.10 (HN 2.9) notations.  Public Facilities New policy PF 6 and strategies PF 6.1 and PF 6.2.	10-15
B2	Future Land Use and Zoning at 2130 Chillum Road (Washington Gas)	Washington Gas requests the reclassification of its property at 2130 Chillum Road to the Industrial, Employment (IE) Zone.	Revise plan and SMA to rezone subject property to Local Transit-Oriented – Edge (LTO-E).	16-19
B3	Queenstown Apartments Recommendations	Draft Sector Plan should prioritize redevelopment of Queenstown Apartments over the current recommendation of acquisition for preservation or flood mitigation. Only recommending that Queenstown Apartments relocate residents to comparable housing is a burden not imposed onto other property owners.	Land Use Revisions to Queenstown Apartments callout (p. 62) and LU 2.10. New strategy LU 2.10 (LU 5.5).  Transportation and Mobility Revisions to TM 1.4.  Housing and Neighborhoods Revisions to HN 1.8. (HN 1.3)	19-22
B4	Displacement	Given the possibility for the displacement of lower-income residents in the sector plan area, particularly in flood prone areas as these properties are potentially acquired to mitigate floodplain concerns or because of redevelopment, strong recommendations need to be included to prevent as much displacement as possible.	Housing and Neighborhoods Reorganized with shifted notations. Added new Policy HN 2 to single out anti-displacement strategies specifically. Drafted new strategies HN 2.1, HN 2.2, HN 2.3, HN 2.10, and HN 2.11  Added new section highlighting anti-displacement measures.	23-24

## II. B1: Queens Chapel Manor Rezoning

**Plan/SMA Cross References:**

LU 9.3 (p. 79)

HN 1.3 (p. 174)

HN 1.6 (p. 174)

SMA ZC 31

**Exhibits/Speakers:**

V1, 23/Cheryl Cort

V2, 27, 44/Alan Socha

V9/Alan Jones

11/Melissa Schweisguth

12/Jennifer Kubit

14/Alexi Boado

15/Christopher Higham

17/Jeff Ulysse

18/Pat Doyen

19/Henry Renze

20/Johannes Bennehoff

21/Moira McCauley

22/John Smith

24/Laura Ehle

25/Danny Schaible

26/Daniel Walter Rowlands

28/Lisa Frank

29/Dan Behrend

30/Thomas Zeller

31/Bernard Holloway

32/Jessica McBirney

33/Steven Hartig

34, 39/Joseph Kane

35/Gannon Sprinkle

40/Peter Stockus

41/Jacob Goldberg

42/Amanda Huron

43/Elissa Woodbury

45/Brendan Wray

47/Daniel Broder

49/Lindsey Mendelson

50/Mark Shappirio

52/Will Koper

53/Leonard Lazarus

**Summary of Issues:**

Queens Chapel Manor stakeholders have expressed mixed sentiments to rezoning the entirety of the neighborhood to RSF-A. Some are in favor, given its location proximate to two Metro stations, potential to mitigate climate change, and ability to increase the local tax base. Others oppose the recommendations for a multitude of reasons, including inequitable treatment of the neighborhood and concerns with services, traffic, parking, infrastructure, density, climate change, and displacement.

## II. B1: Queens Chapel Manor Rezoning

**Staff Analysis:**

In Support:

Twenty-three pieces of testimony received were **in support** of the proposed rezoning for Queens Chapel Manor and/or its accompanying Strategy HN 1.6 (HN 1.4) (“Construct a variety of infill single-family housing types, including single-family detached, single-family attached, duplex, triplex, rowhomes, and townhomes, in the area between the West Hyattsville and Hyattsville Crossing Metrorail Stations.”) **with no changes**. The below stakeholders provided testimony in favor of the policies, strategies, and rezoning, as written by staff, concerning Queens Chapel Manor either at the October 1, 2024, Joint Public Hearing or in writing by the close of the record on October 16, 2024:

- Dan Behrend
- Johannes Bennehoff
- Cheryl Cort
- Pat Doyen
- Laura Ehle
- Lisa Frank
- Jacob Goldberg
- Steven Hartig
- Bernard Holloway
- Amanda Huron
- Joseph Kane
- Will Koper
- Jessica McBirney
- Moira McCauley
- Lindsey Mendelson
- Henry Renze
- Daniel Walter Rowlands
- John Smith
- Gannon Sprinkle
- Peter Stockus
- Elissa Woodbury
- Brendan Wray
- Thomas Zeller

Five stakeholders testified **in support** of the proposed rezoning for Queens Chapel Manor and/or its accompanying Strategy HN 1.6 **with changes** in writing by the close of the record on October 16, 2024:

- Daniel Broder
- Christopher Higham
- Danny Schaible
- Melissa Schweisguth
- Jeff Ulysse (on behalf of the City of Hyattsville)

Each of these five pieces of testimony supported upzoning for even more density than what was proposed in the draft plan for Queens Chapel Manor and/or adjacent neighborhoods than what was proposed in the sector plan and SMA. Ms. Schweisguth and Mr. Broder stated it was not clear why the plan references upzoning within a 15-minute walkshed of the Metro while the SMA proposes a much smaller area, mentioning that upzoning other areas proximate to the West Hyattsville Metro station to RSF-A could be appropriate. Similarly, Mr. Schaible recommends rezoning areas east of Queens Chapel Road that are also in the study area, so long as they are within 3/4 mile of a Metro station, and Mr. Ulysse states that the City of Hyattsville recommends rezoning from RSF-65 to RSF-A occur in all areas of the sector plan within the City of Hyattsville or considered in future sector plan updates so as not to reinforce statements of inequitable treatment that are commonly expressed by West Hyattsville residents. Queens Chapel Manor was originally selected because nearly the entire neighborhood is within a 15-minute walkshed from either the West Hyattsville or the Hyattsville Crossing Metro stations,<sup>1</sup> and the neighborhood is a distinct area with definitive boundaries. While other parts of the sector plan area are also within the 15-minute walkshed, these neighborhoods are only partially within that walkshed. Further, within the 15-minute walkshed, many properties are either already zoned or proposed to be zoned within either an LTO zone or a multifamily zone, both of which are more intense categories than the RSF-A zoning. Still, staff agree that a more equitable application of RSF-A zoning would include rezoning all properties

---

<sup>1</sup> Map 22, “Metrorail Station Walksheds and Bikesheds,” Staff Draft II West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel Sector Plan, 2024.

## II. B1: Queens Chapel Manor Rezoning

currently zoned RSF-65 into the RSF-A Zone. Upon further evaluation and consideration of the 15-minute walkshed and the 15-minute bikeshed, rezoning all properties current zoned RSF-65 into RSF-A is the preferred recommendation. Additional detail can be found in the “Staff Recommendation” section following this section.

Mr. Higham stated that more aggressive rezoning would be preferable, such as rezoning a couple of streets in closer proximity to the Metro to allow for transit-oriented development. While the suggestion for more aggressive rezoning is recognized, the sector plan already recommends rezoning properties in proximity of the Metro station to the LTO-C and LTO-E Zones. The application of these zones is restricted to the boundaries of a designated Center. As such, expanding the use of these zones would require a further expansion of the designated Center boundaries. Expanding the Center boundary too much could potentially dilute the overall density of development in the area. Furthermore, the purpose of concentrating development within a defined Center boundary is to focus growth and infrastructure investment in areas with the greatest potential for sustainable, transit-oriented development. When the boundary becomes too large, it spreads the potential for density over a wider area, making it more challenging to achieve the high-density development that is necessary for successful transit-oriented communities. This could result in underutilized land, less efficient transit, and the difficulty of reaching the desired density targets that are vital for creating a vibrant, walkable neighborhood.

In Opposition:  
Six pieces of testimony were received in **opposition** to the proposed rezoning for Queens Chapel Manor and/or its accompanying Strategy HN 1.6 (HN 1.4) (“Construct a variety of infill single-family housing types, including single-family detached, single-family attached, duplex, triplex, rowhomes, and townhomes, in the area between the West Hyattsville and Hyattsville Crossing Metrorail Stations.”). The stakeholders below provided testimony opposed to the policies, strategies, and rezoning concerning Queens Chapel Manor either at the October 1, 2024, Joint Public Hearing or in writing by the close of the record on October 16, 2024:

- Alexi Boado
- Alan Jones
- Leonard Lazarus
- Jennifer Kubit
- Mark Shappirio
- Alan Socha

Below is a summary of stakeholders’ concerns, along with staff’s response.

Inequitable Treatment of Queens Chapel Manor  
Multiple stakeholders (Mr. Boado, Ms. Kubit, and Mr. Socha) expressed concern that the proposed rezoning is inequitable, as the Queens Chapel Manor neighborhood is largely lower-income and Hispanic. By not expanding the proposed rezoning across Queens Chapel Road, the Queens Chapel Manor residents are the only ones to carry the burden of the rezoning. Staff suggest this rezoning as a way of mitigating the inequalities between Queens Chapel Manor and the remainder of Hyattsville. By providing the opportunity to create more affordable homes in a neighborhood that is, on average, lower income and more diverse than the rest of the city, this is a strategy that helps to keep the neighborhood more affordable and thus more accessible. These more extensive housing options enable a greater diversity of low- and middle-income households to build wealth through home ownership, can counteract exclusionary displacement by providing affordable options and empowering current residents to remain in their neighborhoods despite rising land values, and can also enable homeowners to redevelop their single-family homes to add a rental unit, which would both increase the County’s housing supply and provide a vital income stream for the homeowner. Staff recognize the benefits of rezoning additional properties from RSF-65 into RSF-A will further the perceived benefits throughout the entire West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel Sector Plan area.

Two stakeholders (Mr. Lazarus and Mr. Socha) also expressed concern that other parts of the sector plan area could have also been proposed to be rezoned to RSF-A, with Mr. Socha stating the rezoning should apply to all of Hyattsville rather than just Queens Chapel Manor. As stated under “In Support,” Queens Chapel Manor was specifically selected originally because nearly the entire neighborhood is within a 15-minute walkshed from either the West Hyattsville or the Hyattsville Crossing Metro stations,<sup>2</sup> and the neighborhood is a distinct area with definitive boundaries. However, staff now acknowledge that there are additional areas, beyond Queens Chapel Manor, that could also benefit from RSF-A Zoning. This is especially true considering that the entire sector plan area is within the 15-minute bikeshed of the Metro Stations, a factor that was not fully considered in the original zoning proposal. The 15-minute bikeshed is an important consideration because it reflects an expanded area of accessibility to transit, beyond just walking distance. As biking becomes a more viable transportation option, especially considering the many bicycle infrastructure improvements recommended in the plan, areas within this Sector Plan area will gain greater potential for transit-oriented development, as they become better connected to the Metro Station. Overall, rezoning the entire bikeshed rather than just focusing on a specific neighborhood like Queens Chapel Manor aligns with broader goals of promoting accessibility, sustainable development, and creating a cohesive community where more people can take advantage of the Metro, regardless of whether they walk or bike to the station. Further details can be found in the “Staff Recommendation” section following this section.

### Overcrowded PGCPs Schools

---

<sup>2</sup> Map 22, “Metrorail Station Walksheds and Bikesheds,” Staff Draft II West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel Sector Plan, 2024.

## II. B1: Queens Chapel Manor Rezoning

Mr. Boado, Mr. Jones, and Ms. Kubit also expressed concern that the neighborhood schools are overcrowded and adding more students will further strain them. At present, three schools within Prince George’s County Public Schools serve the Queens Chapel Manor neighborhood: Edward M. Felegy Elementary School, Nicholas Orem Middle School, and Northwestern High School. These schools have a utilization rate of 75%, 127%, and 102%, respectively.<sup>3</sup> Staff agree the present utilization rates at Nicholas Orem Middle and Northwestern High are not desirable. However, there currently is extra capacity for students within PGCPs. The middle schools’ average utilization rate is 98%, while the high schools’ average utilization rate is 94%.<sup>4</sup> Redistricting to alleviate pressure at schools over capacity and add students to undercapacity schools is part of PGCPs’ solution to reduce strain on impacted schools. Additionally, PGCPs is addressing overcrowding in the northern part of the County through creating a new middle school in the Glenridge area<sup>5</sup> and high schools in the northern Adelphi area<sup>6</sup> as well as the International School at Langley Park; construction of the International School at Langley Park is supported by Strategy PF 3.2.<sup>7</sup> Further, Strategy PF 3.1 recommends coordinating with PGCPs to provide adequate facilities to ensure all students have an opportunity to attend a high-quality public school that operates within Board of Education-established facility utilization rates. The Planning Department will no longer use pupil yield analyses in long-range planning, as a) school enrollment varies based on housing type, demographic variations, average neighborhood age, and other factors well beyond the scope or control of a sector plan and makes the use of broad statistical measures inadequate in responding to targeted needs; b) PGCPs prefers that coordination on school planning occur on a broader, county-wide level, or on a unique case by case basis where a plan area corresponds with a facility need PGCPs identifies; and c) systemwide capacity exists and will continue to exist and overutilization of schools over a multi-year period is largely the result of school boundaries, not facility needs.

### Exacerbating Existing Parking Problems

Mr. Boado, Mr. Jones, Ms. Kubit, Mr. Lazarus, and Mr. Socha expressed concern regarding on-street parking availability. Parking is sometimes difficult to find now, and adding new households will only exacerbate problems. Not all households have off-street parking, and many residents expect to be able to park in front of their homes, especially those with physical disabilities or safety concerns. However, it is important to note that many households who move to Queens Chapel Manor do so because of the proximity to two Metro stations. While staff expect new households to have cars, many of these households may be car-light or even car-free because they selected to live in a neighborhood that has access to public transportation and trails. There is no guarantee that parking is always available in front of one’s house on a public right-of-way, but if a resident needs a parking space in front of their house due to disability, they can apply to have an on-street parking space near their home reserved through the City of Hyattsville.

The Queens Chapel Manor neighborhood currently has four parking districts: 8, 9A, 9B, and 10. These districts cover nearly the entire neighborhood; the 3500-3700 blocks of Nicholson Street, 5800 block of 31<sup>st</sup> Place, and 5800 block of 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue are not included within a parking district. All households in a parking district may receive a minimum of one permit and a maximum of four permits, which depends on both the number of off-street parking spaces that an individual property can support and by the total number of available on-street parking within a designated zone. All four parking districts restrict parking from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., which is when neighborhood residents are more likely to be at work. The plan can help mitigate both existing and future parking shortages by encouraging the City of Hyattsville to revise the parking district hours to cover evening hours rather than daytime hours. Further details about this recommendation can be found in the “Staff Recommendation” section following this section.

### Exacerbating Existing Traffic Problems

Mr. Lazarus, and Mr. Socha both expressed concern about traffic worsening as density increases. Traffic is more likely to worsen due to development outside of the sector plan area that creates sprawl, which encourages people to move farther away from the city center and commute through major thoroughfares such as Queens Chapel Road in single-occupancy vehicles. While this plan cannot control development outside of the sector plan area, its recommendation to put new housing near transit is the best way to give residents a choice to take non-single-occupancy vehicle forms of transportation.

### Worsening Local Services

Mr. Jones, Mr. Lazarus, Mr. Shappirio, and Mr. Socha all testified with concerns that local services, such as code enforcement or emergency services, could suffer as density increases. The smart, compact growth proposed by this plan facilitates better access to and for emergency services as opposed to sprawl. The increased potential residential density proposed for Queens Chapel Manor, combined with the proposed Hamilton Street “main street” and mixed-use developments, would create much needed tax revenue in the form of property taxes, sales taxes, and food taxes. In turn, this money can go towards improved city and county services. Staff have added language that strengthens recommendations to ensure local services are adequate. Further details about this recommendation can be found in the “Staff Recommendation” section following this section.

### Exacerbating Climate Change

Mr. Jones expressed concerns that increasing density within the sector plan area can make climate change worse. By adding more people, Queens Chapel Manor would see a loss of trees, increase in vehicles, and additional heat. However, through the kind of infill development envisioned for Queens Chapel Manor, the County can preserve its natural environment by reducing sprawl. This development pattern supports walkable neighborhoods, which can reduce parking needs per household, lower greenhouse gas emissions, lessen development of impervious surfaces, and preserve green space. Positive impacts include better stormwater retention, in turn leading to less flooding as new development is subject to more stringent stormwater management planning than was required when most Queens Chapel Manor homes were built; more tree cover; and cleaner air. Strategy NE 5.2 (NE 5.1). (“Maximize residential development at locations where residents can walk, bicycle, or take transit to their destinations.”) supports development in transit-rich areas, and adding two- and three-family homes to the Queens Chapel Manor neighborhood abides by policies LU 1 (“Create a vibrant, sustainable community surrounding the West Hyattsville Metro Station that includes a variety of land uses.”), TM 2 (“Minimize the potential motor vehicle traffic generated by all future developments in the sector plan area.”), HC 1 (“Create a built environment that allows for safe walking and biking to

<sup>3</sup> Prince George’s County Public Schools, September 30th enrollment data – Excel reports: Official Sept 30, 2023, Report, accessed online February 28, 2024, at <https://www.pgcps.org/offices/pupil-accounting/school-boundaries/enrollment-report>.

<sup>4</sup> Prince George’s County Public Schools, September 30th enrollment data – Excel reports: Official Sept 30, 2023, Report, accessed online February 28, 2024, at <https://www.pgcps.org/offices/pupil-accounting/school-boundaries/enrollment-report>.

<sup>5</sup> Prince George’s County, FY 2024-2029 Approved Capital Improvement Program & Budget, p. 163. Accessed online October 30, 2024, at [https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education\\_2.pdf](https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education_2.pdf).

<sup>6</sup> Prince George’s County, FY 2024-2029 Approved Capital Improvement Program & Budget, p. 164. Accessed online October 30, 2024, at [https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education\\_2.pdf](https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education_2.pdf).

<sup>7</sup> Prince George’s County, FY 2024-2029 Approved Capital Improvement Program & Budget, p. 157. Accessed online October 30, 2024, at [https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education\\_2.pdf](https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education_2.pdf).

## II. B1: Queens Chapel Manor Rezoning

multiple destinations, amenities, and other non-automobile transportation options.”), and PF 1 (“Create a vibrant transit-oriented development that facilitates outdoor enjoyment, public gathering, and healthy lifestyles and preserves environmental assets.”). Furthermore, Plan 2035’s goals include creating choice communities through “...supporting neighborhood investment in existing public infrastructure, services, and facilities and designing diverse and distinct communities that promote walkability and convenient access to employment, retail, and entertainment options” and protecting and valuing our natural resources through “proactively greening our built environment, restoring degraded resources, and promoting a more sustainable development pattern that reduces our reliance on driving and shifts development pressures away from our greenfields,” both of which encourage increased density in walkable, transit-rich communities in order to encourage non-motorized transport and protect the environment.

### Insufficient Lot Sizes for Duplexes and Triplexes

Mr. Jones, Ms. Kubit, Mr. and Lazarus stated that lots in Queens Chapel Manor are too small to be able to handle duplexes and triplexes. Per the Zoning Ordinance, there is no minimum lot size for two- and three-family homes in the RSF-A zone. On average, Queens Chapel Manor properties zoned RSF-65 are 0.15 acres (~6,500 sq. ft.), while those zoned RSF-A are 0.08 acres (~3,500 sq. ft.). The average Queens Chapel Manor parcel containing a single-family detached home can accommodate a duplex that matches the density of the neighborhood’s existing duplexes. Further, duplexes and triplexes do not necessarily have to be side-by-side; the sector plan includes examples of stacked duplexes. With maximum heights of 50’ for two-family dwellings and 40’ for three-family dwellings in RSF-A, these lots are suitable for duplexes and triplexes, depending on design and topography.

An additional benefit of rezoning the entire neighborhood to RSF-A and expanding the rezoning to other neighborhoods in the sector plan area, is that property owners would be able to replace their existing single-family detached houses with new single-family detached houses, if so desired. Of the newly proposed, 1,455 lots zoned RSF-65 in Queens Chapel Manor, 872 lots are less than 6,500 square feet, the minimum lot size for a single-family detached house, and are thus non-conforming structures. Without a special exception, a single-family detached house could not be rebuilt on a lot smaller than 6,500 square feet in the RSF-65 zone, even if that lot previously had a single-family detached home, because it would not conform to that zone. However, the minimum lot size for a single-family detached home in RSF-A is 5,000 square feet. Rezoning the Queens Chapel Manor neighborhood along with other nearby neighborhoods to RSF-A would allow nearly every single-family detached home to be rebuilt.

### Existing Stormwater and Sewage Infrastructure Concerns

Mr. Boado, Mr. Lazarus, Mr. Shappirio, and Ms. Kubit expressed concerns because the plan neither solves existing flooding issues caused by insufficient stormwater management, nor factors in increased loads on stormwater and sewage infrastructure. In addition to the aforementioned stringent stormwater management plans required with today’s development (see “Exacerbating Climate Change” above), Policy PF 5 (“Serve the sector plan area with modern utility infrastructure that can support recommended growth.”) and Strategy PF 5.1 (“Work with utility providers to systemically update infrastructure, including replacing obsolete transmission lines, adding capacity, and ensuring seamless utility services as growth and redevelopment occurs.”) ensure utilities, including storm sewers, are responsive to the neighborhood’s needs.

### Impacts on Property Values and Taxes

Mr. Socha testified that property values and taxes may be impacted. As discussed in the property rezoning notification letter, this process may result in an increase in property values, and thus property taxes. However, studies have repeatedly shown that adding more affordable housing, including subsidized housing, into a neighborhood does not decrease property values; it causes property values to increase.<sup>8</sup> As mentioned under “Worsening Local Services,” however, staff expect other types of tax revenue to be generated, including commercial property tax, sales tax, and food tax, through the proposed Hamilton Street “main street” and other mixed-use development, thus not putting all tax burden on Queens Chapel Manor residents.

### Lack of Parks

Mr. Jones testified with concerns about losing green space, parks in particular, if this plan is executed. Policy PF 1 (“Create a vibrant transit-oriented development that facilitates outdoor enjoyment, public gathering, and healthy lifestyles and preserves environmental assets.”) and Strategy PF 1.1 (“Provide a variety of park, recreational, and open spaces in the sector plan area by constructing or expanding the facilities identified in Table 23 and Map 40, New Recommended Parks, Recreation, and Public Open Space Facilities, and ensuring these new facilities follow the Urban Park Guidelines and Typologies found in Formula 2040, Appendices F and G.”) make recommendations for 9 new or enhanced parks. Details on these parks can be found in Table 23 (pages 205-210) and their locations identified in Map 40 (page 211). Further, over 2.5 miles of new hard surface trails are planned for the sector plan area, including those that are part of the West Hyattsville Greenway and the Mall, as well as nearly one mile of new side paths. Additional plazas and open spaces are planned for the sector area; these locations are to be determined.

### Lack of Interest or Ability to Make Improvements

Mr. Shappirio testified that it is unlikely for homeowners to make improvements to their homes to allow for an additional unit due to both lack of financial means and interest in doing so. The only way it would be possible would be to sell to a developer to then make those improvements. Staff acknowledge the possibility of homeowners selling to developers, but this possibility exists today. There is nothing stopping a homeowner from selling their property to a developer. Further, several attendees at public meetings expressed an interest in adding a unit to their single-family houses to create a separate living space for family members.

### Existing Sidewalks on Nicholson Street Provide Important Value to the Community

---

<sup>8</sup> Arizona State University Stardust Center for Affordable Homes and the Family. “Does Mixed-Income Housing Affect Surrounding Property Values” accessed online October 30, 2024, at <https://static.sustainability.asu.edu/docs/stardust/housing-research-synthesis/research-brief-3.pdf>.

## II. B1: Queens Chapel Manor Rezoning

Mr. Lazarus expressed concern that changes to Nicholson Street will cause unwanted changes to the sidewalks; namely, the grassy strip between the sidewalk and the street will be eliminated. Nicholson Street has been classified as a Neighborhood Residential Street per the sector plan’s Urban Street Types, which can include landscaping buffers between the sidewalk and the street. If right-of-way exists, staff encourage the City of Hyattsville to maintain a buffer whenever the street is reconstructed.

### Triplexes Can Block Light to Neighboring Properties

Mr. Lazarus testified with concerns that if allowed, triplexes might block sunlight from reaching neighboring properties. In the RSF-65 zone, single-family detached dwellings are currently limited to 40’. In the RSF-A zone, both single-family detached dwellings and three-family dwellings are still limited to 40’, while two-family dwellings are permitted up to 50’.

### **Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends expanding the RSF-A zoning to all properties currently zoned RSF-65, in order to apply the zone equitably throughout the sector plan area, to allow for the reconstruction of existing houses on lots less than 5,000 square feet, and to encourage the construction of Missing Middle housing types throughout the entire sector plan area, since the entire area is within 15-minute bikeshed, and much of the area is within the 15-minute walkshed of the Metro station.

~~LU 9.3 LU 10.3~~ As redevelopment opportunities arise, develop context-sensitive one-, two, or three-family dwelling units (detached or attached) within the Avondale Terrace, Avondale Grove, Avondale, North Woodridge, Evans Addition to Hyattsville, Czarra, Castle Manor, Clearwood, and Queens Chapel Manor neighborhood and subdivisions within the sector plan area. ~~between the West Hyattsville and Hyattsville Crossing Metrorail Stations.~~ Implement this strategy by reclassifying the subject neighborhoods/subdivisions from the Residential, Single-Family, Detached (RSF-65) Zone to the Residential, Single-Family, Attached (RSF-A) Zone. See also Strategy ~~HN 1.3~~ 1.4 and Appendix ~~H~~ G.

### **RIGHT SIZE ZONING**

Within the West Hyattsville area, many of the neighborhoods’ current zoning of RSF-65 (Residential Single-Family, Attached), with minimum lot size of 6,500 square feet, does not align with the existing lotting pattern, which is below 6,500 square feet on average. This means that any potential redevelopment, even with a new single-family house, would require purchasing at least two lots to meet the necessary setbacks and other requirements. However, rezoning to RSF-A (Residential Single-Family, Attached), which permits townhouses along with other housing types, would allow construction to take place on a single lot of 5,000 square feet. Rezoning much of the area from RSF-65 to RSF-A would provide more flexibility for infill Missing Middle housing overall. Rezoning the 1,455 lots is based on feedback from the Community and the City of Hyattsville from the October 2024 public hearing to include more housing choice and stock near transit.

TM 10.2. Collaborate with the City of Hyattsville to assess the feasibility of revising the parking district hours for districts 8, 9A, 9B, and 10 to cover additional evening hours rather than just daytime hours.

TM 10.[2]3. Collaborate with the City of Hyattsville, DPW&T Office of Transportation, the Revenue Authority of Prince George’s County, businesses, and property owners to advance parking management practices, such as variable demand-based parking pricing, carpool parking priority, parking cash-out programs, and unbundled parking costs.

TM 10.[3]4. Permit and encourage on-street parking to count toward off-street parking minimums, per Section 27-6307(e) of the Zoning Ordinance (Off-Street Parking Alternatives), to support the on-street provision of short-term/high-turnover parking for customers or residential visitors.

TM 10.[4]5. Permit and encourage a 50 percent parking reduction within one-quarter mile of the West Hyattsville Metro Station, pursuant to Section 27-6308(a) of the Zoning Ordinance (Reduced Parking Standards for Parking Demand Reduction Strategies: Transit Accessibility).

TM 10.[5]6. Permit and encourage a 15 percent parking reduction between one-quarter and one-half mile of the West Hyattsville Metro Station, pursuant to Section 27-6308(a) of the Zoning Ordinance (Reduced Parking Standards for Parking Demand Reduction Strategies: Transit Accessibility).

TM 10.[6]7. Permit and encourage a 5 percent reduction in the minimum number of required off-street parking spaces, pursuant to Section 27-6308(c) of the Zoning Ordinance (Special Facilities for Bicycle Commuters), for the provision of additional bicycle parking facilities, showers, and dressing areas for bicycle commuters.

TM 10.[7]8. Coordinate with WMATA to shift parking demand to Hyattsville Crossing Metro Station through reduced and/or shared parking at the West Hyattsville Metro Station.

TM 10.[8]9. Coordinate with the City of Hyattsville and WMATA to determine the proper siting of car sharing locations, and ride-hailing loading/unloading spaces, as new development occurs.

### Policy PF 6. Provide enhanced public service within the sector plan area.

PF 6.1. Coordinate with the City of Hyattsville, City of Mount Rainier, Town of Brentwood, Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), and Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE) to ensure that services such as code enforcement, inspections, maintenance, and others properly serve the needs of community members.

Policy 6.2. Create a working group to include DPIE, DPW&T, and the Prince George’s County Planning Department to coordinate on addressing code enforcement.

Combine and revise HN 1.3 and HN 1.6 to ~~HN 1.3 HN 1.4~~ Construct a range of one-, two-, and three-family attached housing products-variety of infill single-family housing types, including single-family detached, single-family attached, duplex, and triplex, on properties zoned RSF-A, including the Avondale Terrace, Avondale Grove, Avondale, North Woodridge, Evans Addition to Hyattsville, Czarra, Castle Manor, Clearwood, and Queens Chapel Manor neighborhoods and subdivisions within the sector plan area.

## II. B2: Future Land Use and Zoning at 2130 Chillum Road (Washington Gas)

**Plan/SMA Cross References:**

Map 9, Future Land Use (p. 54)

SMA

**Exhibits/Speakers:**

V6 – Brandon Todd, Senior Director for Corporate Public Policy, Washington Gas Light Company

V8/13/55 – Midgett S. Parker; Attorney, Law Office of Midgett S. Parker, P.A.; representing Washington Gas Light Property

**Summary of Issues:**

Washington Gas Light Company requests the reclassification of its property at 2130 Chillum Road to the Industrial, Employment (IE) Zone.

**Staff Analysis:**

The subject property was classified into the Open Space (O-S) Zone April 6, 1982, through the 1982 *Approved Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Area 68* (CR-34-1982). The District Council carried forward this zoning in the 1994 *Approved Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Area 68*, the 1998 *Approved Transit District Development Plan and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone*, and the 2006 *Approved Transit District Development Plan and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone*.

The property’s zone was transitioned from the Transit District Overlay/Open Space Zone to the Agriculture and Preservation (AG) Zone, a one-to-one conversion, through the 2021 *Approved Countywide Map Amendment*. The subject property’s use by Washington Gas, a privately-owned public utility, and its precursor companies for support of natural gas distribution operations dates to 1933. The property owner has continued these uses for 40 years in the OS Zone, and since 2021, in its replacement zone, the AG Zone. The uses on the property are defined by Section 27-2500 of the Zoning Ordinance as “public utility uses or structures, major”, which is defined as follows:

*A structure or facility that is a relatively major component of an infrastructure system providing community- or region-wide utility services. Examples of major public utility uses or structures include potable water treatment plants, water towers, wastewater treatment plants, solid waste facilities, gas compressor stations, and electrical substations. This use does not include telecommunications facilities, monopoles, or towers; or antennas.*

Public utility uses or structures, major, are permitted by Special Exception in the AG, IE and LTO-E Zones. The Special Exception Standards for this use, Section 27-5402(aaa), require:

*(A) The use, at the location selected, is necessary for public convenience and service, and cannot be supplied with equal public convenience if located elsewhere;*

*(B) Public utility buildings and structures in any Rural and Agricultural or Residential base zone, or on land proposed to be used for residential purposes in the RMH Zone shall (whenever feasible) have the exterior appearance of residential buildings;*

*(C) Overhead lines, poles, radio or television transmitter towers, and other towers shall not be located in airport approach areas; and*

*(D) In Rural and Agricultural or Residential base zones, or on land proposed to be used for residential purposes on an approved Basic Plan for the LCD Zone or any approved detailed site plan, telephone, radio, or television transmission towers shall be set back (from the boundary line of the special exception) a distance equal to its height (measured from its base) plus fifty (50) feet.*

The property owner is requesting the Industrial, Employment Zone, a light industrial zone that allows a range of employment uses in addition to industrial uses. The IE Zone permits public utility uses or structures, major; liquid gas storage (a use that the community has expressed strong opposition to); bulk storage of gasoline; concrete batching; concrete and electronic recycling facilities; vehicle salvage yard; junkyard; heavy armament fabrication; and other high impact uses by special exception. Both Brandon Todd, Senior Director for Corporate Public Policy for the Washington Gas Light Company, and Midgett Parker, lawyer for the Washington Gas Light Company, testified that a rezoning to IE would properly reflect both its historical and future uses and is necessary to support both current and future uses of the site. Mr. Todd cited many uses occurring on the site, including natural gas transmission and distribution, operations and maintenance support, employee trainings, and equipment storage. Reclassifying this property to the IE Zone would permit the following high impact uses by right:

- Commercial fuel depot
- Commercial vehicle repair and maintenance
- Vehicle towing and wrecker service
- Dry-cleaning, laundry, or carpet-cleaning plant
- Contractor’s yard, photographic processing plant
- Fuel oil or bottled gas distribution
- Alcohol production facility, large-scale
- Cannabis processor
- Manufacturing, assembly or fabrication, light
- Cold storage plant or distribution warehouse
- Motor freight facility
- Storage warehouse



## II. B2: Future Land Use and Zoning at 2130 Chillum Road (Washington Gas)

- Recycling collection

While staff understands Washington Gas intends to use the site to support natural gas transmission in the future, the potential that they could decommission, surplus, or otherwise divest themselves of part or all of the property at 2130 Chillum Road remains, and staff does not agree that industrial uses are appropriate in this area of Prince George’s County, given its proximity to a Metro station, stream valley and residential neighborhoods. Therefore, reclassification of the subject property to the Industrial, Employment (IE) Zone is determined to be inappropriate.

Washington Gas, as a public utility can continue public utility uses on this site without a zoning change. As stated on page 60 of the draft plan, “most, if not all, development and uses associated with operation of that privately-owned public utility are exempt from the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance and are subject only to Mandatory Referral review per State law.” Rezoning to an industrial classification would open the door to a panoply of uses should ownership of any part of the property be transferred to another business, which are completely and wholly inappropriate for:

1. The convergence of two major streams with the Northwest Branch of the Anacostia River and their associated floodplains and other environmental features.
2. Presence within, and surrounded by, existing residential neighborhoods and parkland.
  - a. That these neighborhoods are home to a predominantly Hispanic, Latino, and African American community and that such communities have often disproportionately faced the negative impacts (i.e., pollution, noise, smells, etc.) of industrial development further reinforces staff’s recommendation.
3. Property in close proximity to an existing Metro Station.

Furthermore, in Mr. Parker’s testimony, he disagrees with the property’s institutional future land use category, claiming that it should be classified as industrial use. However, per Section 27-5101(c) “Principal Use Table for Rural and Agricultural, and Residential Base Zones” of the Zoning Ordinance, “public utility uses or structures, major” are classified as “Public, Civic, and Institutional Uses.” Therefore, the current use, and previous Future Land Use recommendation is institutional. However, staff have reconsidered the long-term use of the property given its proximity to the Metro station.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the Washington Gas property, along with previously deleted properties north and south of the Chillum Road area, be added back to the West Hyattsville Local Transit Center Edge and to rezone the subject property to the Local Transit-Oriented–Edge (LTO-E) Zone. Reinstating the previously deleted properties ensures a strong physical connection to the Metro Station and Center using existing connections over the stream valley. Rezoning to LTO-E will allow for a mix of future uses that align with the overall vision for the center and increase the density very close to the Metro Station. Though the property has environmental constraints and limitations, mitigation is required by law and would be strongly considered during any future redevelopment. Staff also acknowledge that current use will likely continue for the time being and, therefore, also recommend several design guidelines if the current property owner expands existing utility land uses or redevelops with a similar use. These recommendations are not mandatory, but they will be considered during the mandatory referral process.

Update Map 9. Future Land Use to show Mixed-Use for the subject property.

~~LU 4.2. Exclude the undevelopable or environmentally constrained properties listed in Table 5 from the West Hyattsville Local Transit Center. Delete Table 5. Properties Excluded from the West Hyattsville Local Transit Center and Recommended for Reclassification out of the LTO Zones (if applicable) pursuant to Strategy 4.2.~~

~~LU 2.7. LU 7.4 Uses and structures associated with the operation of a public utility should continue at the WGL facility at 2130 Chillum Road (Tax Account 1976596). WGL should continue to partner with the Maryland Department of the Environment and other partners to mitigate the environmental impacts of its prior and ongoing use of the property. Should all or part of this site be decommissioned from public utility uses, all remaining environmental impacts of its use should be mitigated and the site transferred to another public utility or public agency for public use~~ The long-term redevelopment of the WGL facility at 2130 Chillum Road (Tax Account 1976596) should focus on creating a mixed-use development, leveraging its proximity to the West Hyattsville Metro Station to promote sustainable, transit-oriented uses, primarily commercial, while enhancing the center’s vibrancy.

~~LU 2.8. LU 7.5 The property at 2130 Chillum Road is not appropriate for any other uses than those associated with the operation of a public utility or public agency, or as passive open space. For this reason, it should retain its current Agriculture and Preservation (AG) Zoning and should not be reclassified to any other zone. Classification to any other zone would permit, by right, uses that are not appropriate for this site~~ should be rezoned to the Local Transit-Oriented – Edge (LTO-E) Zone to better position the property for long-term mixed-use development as shown in the Map 9, Future Land Use Map.

LU 7.6 If the WGL facility at 2130 Chillum Road is decommissioned and redeveloped with a new use, the property owner should partner with the Maryland Department of the Environment and other stakeholders to mitigate environmental impacts, including mitigating any environmental contamination. However, if the property is redeveloped or expanded as a continued utility land use, the property owner should adhere to the design guidelines outlined in Policy HD 8.

Revise the Washington Gas Property at 2130 Chillum Road callout box:

**WASHINGTON GAS PROPERTY AT 2130 CHILLUM ROAD**

II. B2: Future Land Use and Zoning at 2130 Chillum Road (Washington Gas)

The Washington Gas Light Company (WGL) has operated a privately owned public utility at 2130 Chillum Road since 1933. The property was reclassified into the Open Space (O-S) Zone April 6, 1982, through the 1982 Approved Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Area 68 (CR-34-1982). The District Council carried forward this zoning in the 1994 Approved Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Area 68, the 1998 Approved Transit District Development Plan and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone, and the 2006 Approved Transit District Development Plan and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone. The property’s zone was transitioned from the Transit District Overlay/Open Space Zone to the Agriculture and Preservation (AG) Zone, a one-to-one conversion, through the 2021 Approved Countywide Map Amendment. WGL has continued to conduct public utility operations at this location throughout its more than 90-year history, including more than 40 years in the same zoning classification.

At the October 11, 2022, joint public hearing for the July 2022 draft sector plan, WGL requested reclassification to the Industrial, Heavy (IH) Zone, which staff recommended against. In the subsequent joint public hearing held in October 2024 on the 2024 Draft II Sector Plan, WGL requested the Industrial/Employment (IE) Zone. WGL testified that the subject property is used for “support of natural gas distribution operations” and “is improved with several structures which include a complex network of subsurface transmission and distribution lines, compressor buildings, offices, classrooms, vehicle storage and repair areas, driver and excavation training areas, radio communications site, warehousing, materials storage, and other industrial type land uses.” Despite the long-standing utility use, this Sector Plan recommends that eventually the public utility land use is phased out and replaced with a mixed-use development.

Before mixed-use redevelopment can proceed, it is important to address potential contamination on the site, stemming from its historical industrial use. Although the property has participated in the Maryland Department of the Environment's (MDE) Voluntary Cleanup Program (VCP), which completed some remediation of environmental contamination, the property is still subject to a deed restriction that prohibits residential land use due to potential contamination. Any issues must be properly cleaned up to meet environmental standards, ensuring the site is safe for new development. Additionally, floodplain mitigation measures will be necessary to minimize the risk of flooding and support sustainable development. This approach will help create a more resilient and environmentally responsible development, while supporting regional goals for sustainable growth in line with the sector plan’s vision for a vibrant, transit-oriented community.

Until the property is adapted for the desired development, the plan assumes the use as a privately-owned public utility, which is exempt from the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance but is subject to mandatory review per state law. The current zoning allows for the Mandatory Referral process to ensure that neighborhood compatibility is maintained while considering the health, wellness and safety of surrounding neighborhoods. During the review process of this site, this plan recommends following the design guidelines provided under Policy HD 8, in addition to all applicable environmental regulations, zoning regulations, and the Prince George’s County Landscape Manual to ensure the utility use is harmonious with the surrounding community and environmentally responsible.

Revise all road Segments UC-210 (UM-227) Chillum Road, between 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue and MD 500 to a Mixed-Use Boulevard B. Revise Table 11 (Table 13), Recommended Countywide Master Plan of Transportation, and Map 27 (Map 29), Recommended Countywide Master Plan of Transportation Streets.

ID	Route ID/Facility Name	From	To	USDS Type	Zone	Min ROW	Facility	Vehicle Lanes	Notes
UM-227	MD 501 (Chillum Road)	16th Avenue	MD 500 (Queens Chapel Road)	Mixed-Use Boulevard B	All	103’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Inside lanes 10’</li><li>• Outside lanes 11’</li><li>• 10’ landscaping and furniture buffer on both sides</li><li>• Minimum 10’ sidewalk on south side</li><li>• 10’ shared-use path on north side</li><li>• Maximum 25 mph speed limit</li></ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-No on-street parking on north side</li><li>-Retrofit in LTO/RTO Zones will occur with redevelopment.</li><li>-Remainder to be reconstructed by SHA over long-term.</li><li>-Construct a shared-use sidepath (T-217) on the north side of the street as properties are acquired for preservation. Left-turn lane from eastbound MD 501 to northbound MD 500.</li><li>-Preserve the existing service lane with on-street parking on the south side of MD 501.</li></ul>

Add the following design guidelines:

Policy HD 8. Policy HD 8. Promote urban design that ensures appropriate transitions between incompatible land uses, enhancing compatibility while adhering to zoning regulations and the landscape manual as periodically amended by the County Council.<sup>34</sup> See Strategy LU 7.6.

HD 8.1. If the Washington Gas Light Company property at 2130 Chillum Road (Tax Account 1976596) redevelops or expands existing utility uses, shield the site from Chillum Road by providing a minimum ten-foot-wide landscape strip along the street line for all nonresidential uses and parking lots adjacent to Chillum Road. The buffer should include a minimum of 1 shade tree and 10 shrubs per 35 linear feet (excluding driveway openings) or a minimum of 80 plant per 100 linear feet of frontage (excluding driveway openings).

HD 8.2. HD 8.2. If the Washington Gas Light Company Property at 2130 Chillum Road (Tax Account 1976596) redevelops or expands utility uses, shield the site from the view of nearby residential areas by providing a minimum three-foot-wide landscape strip between any adjacent property line and nonresidential uses or parking lots. The landscape strip should include 15 shrubs per 35 linear feet to create a solid 3-foot-high landscaped buffer.

## II. B2: Future Land Use and Zoning at 2130 Chillum Road (Washington Gas)

HD 8.3. Recommended buffers for the Washington Gas Light Company Property at 2130 Chillum Road (Tax Account 1976596) should consist of at least 40 percent of native evergreen trees, 60 percent of native shrubs, 70 percent of native ornamental trees, and 80 percent of native shade trees.

HD 8.4. If the Washington Gas Light Company Property at 2130 Chillum Road (Tax Account 1976596) redevelops or expands utility uses a minimum of eight percent planted area should be included for any new buildings with frontage on Chillum Road.

HD 8.5. If feasible, during future redevelopment of the Washington Gas Light Company property at 2130 Chillum Road (Tax Account 1976596), expand the existing vegetated buffer located between the utility site and the stream valley to help absorb excess floodwater and reduce erosion. The buffer should consist primarily of native species and help shield the view of the utility site from the Northwest Branch Trail.

HD 8.6. Ensure any future development of the Washington Gas Light Company property at 2130 Chillum Road (Tax Account 1976596) complies with all applicable state and local floodplain regulations.

HD 8.7. Given the surrounding residential and open space land uses around the Washington Gas Light Company property at 2130 Chillum Road (Tax ID 1976596), the storage of liquid gas is strongly discouraged at 2130 Chillum Road.

<sup>34</sup>The Prince George’s County Landscape Manual offers multiple options to meet design requirements, and the property owner is within their right to consult the Landscape Manual to see if there are additional options to meet design requirements. However, these are the requirements deemed most suitable for the site.

## II. B3: Queenstown Apartments Recommendations

**Plan/SMA Cross References:**

LU 2.10 (p. 62)

**Exhibits/Speakers:**

V7/10 – Casey Cirner, Attorney, Miles & Stockbridge; representing Queenstown Apartments Limited Partnership

**Summary of Issues:**

Draft Sector Plan should prioritize redevelopment of Queenstown Apartments over the current primary recommendation of acquisition for preservation or flood mitigation. Only recommending that Queenstown Apartments relocate residents to comparable housing is a burden not imposed onto other property owners. A definition for “gross tract area” should be added to the Zoning Ordinance and the Zoning Ordinance’s definition for “net lot area” should be modified.

**Staff Analysis:**

Queenstown Apartments is a 75-year-old apartment complex located at 3301 Chillum Road. These 1,062 units serve the needs of community members through providing naturally occurring, non-subsidized affordable housing. The property is located immediately to the north of the Allison Street levee system. After an evaluation revealed deficiencies, the levee and its wall system were raised and extended, and its pumps were upgraded.

Casey Cirner, attorney at Miles & Stockbridge representing Queenstown Apartments Limited Partnership, testified regarding the Draft Sector Plan’s recommendation that the Queenstown Apartments should be acquired for floodplain mitigation unless DPIE grants a floodplain waiver. Ms. Cirner’s testimony was centered around concerns that the current recommendation would deter reinvestment and impair the property’s market value, and that if all necessary permits and approvals are obtained, redevelopment of the Queenstown Apartments can help achieve the Sector Plan’s goals of transit-oriented, walkable, mixed-use development near the West Hyattsville Metro station. Ms. Cirner also noted that of the apartment complexes recommended or potentially recommended for redevelopment, only Queenstown Apartments has a recommendation to relocate residents to comparable housing, at comparable unit sizes and price points, within a half-mile of a Metro station. Based on testimony and the need for further analysis, the Planning Department will update recommendations to ensure no displacement is promoted as part of resilience, while supporting future opportunities to partner with government agencies, where feasible.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Callout for Queenstown Apartments on page 62:

Queenstown Apartments is a 1,062-unit garden apartment complex constructed in 1949 at 3301 Chillum Road and located within a half mile of the West Hyattsville Metro station. The residential development entire property is located behind the Allison Street levee system, constructed along segments of the Northwest Branch to reduce the risk of riverine flooding, [and Arundel Road levees. While the levee system may reduce risk for riverine flooding, the complex’s location and elevation may contribute to behind the levee flooding]. In 2016, FEMA identified [these properties as being in] portions of the property within the 0.2-percent annual chance (500-year) floodplain and outside of the special flood hazard areas. Prince George’s County continues to identify [most of this] part of the property [as being] within the County’s regulatory floodplain, where [re]development is subject to [the provisions]Chapter 32 of the County Code, the County Floodplain Ordinance. However, the ongoing Allison Street Flood Protection System Certification Project is ameliorating the system’s deficiencies by raising and extending the levee and its wall system and upgrading its pumps; the former may result in the removal of Queenstown Apartments from the FEMA 500-year floodplain and the County’s regulatory floodplain.

This sector plan recognizes the appropriateness of maximizing the property’s potential to provide transit-adjacent, pedestrian-friendly, and mixed-use development that includes additional units of housing near the West Hyattsville Metro Station. This is reflected in, among other things, the plan’s proposed rezoning of the property to the Local Transit-Oriented, Core (LTO-C) Zone and mixed-use designation on the Future Land Use Map. After completion of the Allison Street Flood Protection System Certification Project, if the property is removed from the County’s regulatory floodplain. [This sector plan recommends acquisition of Queenstown Apartments unless it is able to receive the necessary stormwater and floodplain approvals for redevelopment; clarifying the applicability of the County Floodplain Ordinance to this property and what mitigation strategies are viable are key to its success.] The plan encourages the redevelopment of the Queenstown Apartments with the quality and density commensurate with the Local Transit-Oriented, Core (LTO-C) Zone.

LU 5.5. Queenstown Apartments, located at 3301 Chillum Road (see Map 15, properties subject to LU 5.5 and LU 5.6), should be redeveloped into a sustainable, retrofitted, transit-oriented, pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use development with the quality and density commensurate with the Local Transit-Oriented, Core (LTO-C) Zone.

LU 2.10 LU 5.6. If Queenstown Apartments [at 3301 Chillum Road continues to be identified within the County’s regulatory floodplain, it should be acquired for preservation or flood mitigation.] are redeveloped, ensure development complies with local codes and regulations, including receiving applicable waivers and approvals in alignment with adequate floodplain mitigation measures, where appropriate.

- [i)Until acquisition or demolition occurs, this property should be rehabilitated and maintained as naturally occurring affordable housing.
- ii) Any demolition or redevelopment of this property should not occur until residents have been relocated to comparable housing, at comparable unit sizes and price points, within a half mile of a Metro station.
- iii) If a redeveloper obtains appropriate stormwater and floodplain approvals from DPIE for reconstruction in a floodplain, the property should be redeveloped with a mix of uses, including mixed income multifamily housing at densities commensurate with the Local Transit-Oriented, Core (LTO-C) Zone.]

## II. B3: Queenstown Apartments Recommendations

~~Map 13. Property Subject to Strategy LU 2.10~~ ~~Map 14. Property Subject to Strategy LU 5.5 and LU 5.6.~~

TM 1.4...~~[If Queenstown Apartments at 3301 Chillum Road are acquired for preservation purposes as recommended by Strategy LU 2.10, UC 211 and UC 213 should not be constructed.]~~

~~HN 1.8~~ HN 1.3. Work with property owners and encourage partnerships with housing authorities and other government agencies for additional resources, to reposition the properties listed in Table 21 for long-term redevelopment for new multifamily housing, including affordable housing. ~~[Rehabilitate these apartment buildings in the short term to ensure high quality of life for tenants. In the mid- to long term, work with tenants and other stakeholders to assist residents in relocating prior to redevelopment. Work with developers to ensure new development offers a mix of unit types, sizes, and price points.~~

Table 19. Properties Recommended for Long-Term Redevelopment

Property	Address	Tax ID
Kirkwood Apartments	2607 Kirkwood Place	1836873
	2722 Kirkwood Place	1836824
	2616 Kirkwood Place	1836865
	2623 Nicholson Street	1836840
	2600 Kirkwood Place	1836857
	2700 Kirkwood Place	1836832
Landon Court Apartments	3601 Gallatin Street	1808922
North Pointe Apartment Homes	5735 29 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	1791409, 1791425
<u>Queenstown Apartments (in accordance with LU 5.5 and LU 5.6)</u>	<u>3301 Chillum Road</u>	<u>1839505, 1943836, 1943802, 1943786, 1943844, 1943794, 1943788, 1943810, 1943828</u>

## II. B4: Displacement

**Plan/SMA Cross References:**

- LU 2.10 (p. 62)
- LU 5.3 (p. 69)
- HN 1.8 (p. 175)
- HN 2.3 (p. 177)
- HN 2.4 (p. 179)
- HN 2.5 (p. 179)
- HN 2.6 (p. 179)
- HC 5.1 (p. 195)

**Exhibits/Speakers:**

- V1, 23/Cheryl Cort
- V2, 27, 44/Alan Socha
- 11/ Melissa Schweisguth
- 12/Jennifer Kubit
- 14/Alexi Boado
- 18/Pat Doyen
- 19/Henry Renze
- 20/Johannes Bennehoff,
- 21/Moira McCauley
- 22/John Smith
- 24/Laura Ehle
- 26/Daniel Walter Rowlands
- 28/Lisa Frank
- 29/Dan Behrend
- 30/Thomas Zeller
- 31/Bernard Holloway
- 32/Jessica McBirney
- 34/Joseph Kane
- 35/Gannon Sprinkle
- 41/Jacob Goldberg
- 42/Amanda Huron
- 43/Elissa Woodbury
- 45/Brendan Wray
- 47/Dan Broder
- 49/Lindsey Mendelson
- 50/Mark Shappirio

**Summary of Issues:**

Given the possibility for the displacement of lower-income residents in the sector plan area, particularly in flood prone areas, as these properties are potentially acquired to mitigate floodplain concerns or because of redevelopment, strong recommendations need to be included to prevent as much displacement as possible.

**Staff Analysis:**

A majority of those expressing concern regarding displacement (all but Mr. Boado, Ms. Kubit, Mr. Shappirio, and Mr. Socha) are doing so regarding the proposed acquisition of apartments in flood prone areas; namely Queenstown Apartments. LU 2.9 recommends acquiring the complex for preservation or flood mitigation unless the property owners obtain appropriate stormwater and floodplain approvals for DPIE for construction in a floodplain, at which point they should only be developed with vertical mixed-use, transit-oriented development at densities commensurate with the Local, Transit-Oriented, Core (LTO-C) Zone. Several plan strategies seek to mitigate displacement as much as possible, which staff recommend highlighting as an important element of the plan’s implementation. Further details about this recommendation can be found in the “Staff Recommendation” section following this section.

## II. B4: Displacement

Mr. Boado, Ms. Kubit, Mr. Shappirio, and Mr. Socha opposed rezoning the Queens Chapel Manor neighborhood because it may make the neighborhood less affordable and thus would result in displacement. Displacement, unfortunately, can often be an unintended consequence as plans are developed and executed. In accordance with planning principles, staff recommendations are updated to further support anti-displacement strategies.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Add the following anti-displacement discussion to the Existing Conditions of the Housing and Neighborhoods section:

**ANTI-DISPLACEMENT**

Anti-displacement strategies are actions aimed at preventing the displacement of individuals or communities from their houses or neighborhoods, due to redevelopment, rising rents, increasing property taxes, or other external pressures. Displacement typically occurs when redevelopment activities result in the rapid decline of existing residents or established communities due to economic, social, or environmental changes, often linked to redevelopment. To prevent resident displacement during redevelopment, a variety of methods could be used, as evaluated and assessed through many case studies across the country. One approach is to provide affordable housing options through subsidies or rent control to help keep costs manageable for existing low-income residents even after redevelopment. Additionally, anti-displacement zoning regulations and missing middle housing could help increase the housing stock to ensure the housing demand is met. Other methods include implementing a "right to return" policy, which allows eligible displaced residents to return to new or renovated housing units in their original neighborhood at affordable rates; or Community Land Trusts, where land is most typically owned by a non-profit, but the houses are sold at affordable prices to low-income families. Regardless of the method, community engagement is essential to guarantee residents have a voice and that redevelopment process addresses their needs and concerns.

This sector plan proactively provides policies and strategies to prevent displacement of existing residents. However, additional anti-displacement tools are recommended to be developed at the County and state levels for future implementation in the sector plan area.

Reorganized Housing and Neighborhoods by creating three distinct polices; each one addressing each key concern including increasing quantity and diversity of housing, mitigating displacement/creating affordable housing, and improving the physical quality of existing housing stock.

Policy HN 1. Implement Housing Opportunities for All by increasing the quantity and diversity, ~~and affordability~~ of the housing supply throughout the sector plan area through new construction.  
Policy HN 2. Implement Housing Opportunities for All by employing an anti-displacement strategy that focuses on maintaining and improving housing affordability and empowering residents throughout the sector plan area.  
~~Policy HN 2~~ HN 3. Implement Housing Opportunities for All by improving the quality of the existing housing supply, including older homes and income-restricted properties ~~and helping keep housing costs low to stabilize residents at risk of displacement.~~

Add the following anti-displacement strategies:  
HN 2.1. Work with municipalities, Prince George’s County Department of Housing and Community Development, and other stakeholders, as appropriate, to continue developing anti-displacement strategies long-term as development and redevelopment occurs in the sector plan area.  
HN 2.2. Proactively connect residents at risk of displacement with free legal assistance to protect their housing rights.  
HN 2.3. Support local advocacy groups that help renters negotiate rental increases with developers and landowners.  
HN 2.10. Enact “right to return” legislation at the County level and apply to redevelopment projects in the sector plan area.  
HN 2.11. Actively seek a non-profit organization to develop a Community Land Trust to build and sell affordable housing units to ensure long-term affordability and collective ownership.

Add the following callout boxes.

**RIGHT TO RETURN**

"Right to Return" housing legislation ensures that eligible residents who are displaced due to redevelopment or public infrastructure projects have the right to return to their neighborhood once new housing is built. This policy guarantees that eligible displaced individuals and families can move back into affordable housing units in their original community, often at a similar rent or price as before the redevelopment. The goal is to preserve the cultural fabric of the community and protect long-standing residents from being priced out during gentrification. By prioritizing the return of displaced residents, this legislation fosters equity and helps maintain the diversity of the neighborhood, preventing the loss of low-income housing options in revitalized areas.

**COMMUNITY LAND TRUSTS**

The Maryland Affordable Housing Land Trust Act created the legal mechanisms necessary for the creation of Community Land Trusts. A Community Land Trust (CLT) is when an organization, such as a nonprofit purchases land for collective ownership, usually with the intention to build and sell affordable housing units. CLTs allow for long-term community control and prevent displacement due to market pressures. In a CLT, the land is owned collectively, while individuals purchase the houses on the land at affordable prices. This model not only helps preserve affordable housing but also fosters community stability. CLTs are a powerful tool for promoting equity and resilience in communities, while the protecting existing residents from displacement as neighborhoods evolve.

## II. B4: Displacement

More recently the County Council passed Council Resolution (CR-093-2024) on November 12, 2024, which has established a Community Housing Trust Task Force in Prince George’s County to explore ways to increase affordable housing opportunities through land trust. The task force will consist of members from affordable housing organizations, County Council, housing and planning departments, and will focus on researching and recommending policies for a Community Housing Trust model (i.e., Community Land Trusts). The Task Force is required to submit a report with recommendations to the County Council within 12 months.

Add new plan highlight:

Anti-Displacement Strategies for the West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel Sector Plan Area

Displacement is a real concern as neighborhoods redevelop and change. This sector plan acknowledges that possibility while also seeking to retaining and expanding as much existing affordable housing as is feasible.



II. C: Land Use (Section III)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
Properties Within the Floodplain							
C1	Concerns in regard to how to address displacement of residents of naturally occurring affordable housing in the floodplain. Asks Council and administration to address challenge of preventing displacement as the County wrestles with floodplain concerns.	Staff acknowledge the potential elimination of any naturally occurring affordable housing will reduce the availability of a much-needed housing type for current and future sector plan area residents.  HN 2.5 (HN 3.4) encourages using a variety of tools to support affordable housing preservation and rehabilitation within the sector plan area, and HN 2.6 (HN 2.8) makes recommendations regarding working with partners to ensure tenants whose leases are not renewed due to property redevelopment are provided with assistance in securing housing with similar or superior access to amenities.	LU 2.10, HN 1.8	V1, 23/Cheryl Cort	See B4. Displacement for staff recommended changes.		
C2	Agrees with LU 2.1, LU 2.2, LU 2.3, and the addition of LU 2.4- LU 2.10	Acknowledged.	LU 2.1, LU 2.2, LU 2.3, LU 2.4- LU 2.10	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
C3	Requests removal of LU 2.9. This will scare away investors and lenders for much-needed TOD projects. Restricting development of these properties will provide no benefits to the floodplain as it will not increase storage capacity and will cost the County and State millions of dollars in taxes. Plan should consider providing financial incentives to landowners within or adjacent to the floodplain to increase floodplain storage capacity and to provide on-site stormwater capture that will reduce runoff into the floodplain.	5402 Jamestown Road is an undeveloped, vacant, wooded lot that is entirely within the regulatory and 100-year floodplain. 2775 Hamilton Street is developed and entirely within the regulatory and 100-year floodplain. Nearly the entirety of the Ager Road property is undeveloped and wooded and within the regulatory and 100-year floodplain. LU 2.9 does not restrict development potential, rather it states that the property may be developed with vertical mixed-use, transit-oriented development at densities commensurate with the Local, Transit-Oriented, Core (LTO-C) zone, should DPIE issue the appropriate stormwater and floodplain approvals. Nothing in this plan prohibits DPIE from issuing those approvals if they see fit to do so. The plan does not recommend any changes to zoning on these properties, and maintains them in the classifications in which they are already in. However, the strategy can be reworded to make it clear DPIE can issues waivers for development that meets certain standards.	LU 2.9	38/Zak Elyasi	Revise LU 2.9.  <del>LU 2.9. LU 7.7</del> The following properties along Jamestown Road near its intersection with MD 500 (Queens Chapel Road) are predominantly within the 1-percent annual chance (100-year) floodplain. <u>If DPIE permits floodplain waivers for development as supported by best management practices and sustainable development, these properties should [and should be acquired for preservation or flood mitigation unless they obtain appropriate stormwater and floodplain approvals from DPIE for construction in a floodplain, at which point they should only]</u> be developed with vertical mixed-use, transit-oriented development at densities commensurate with the Local, Transit-Oriented, Core (LTO-C) Zone.		

II. C: Land Use (Section III)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
Properties Within the Floodplain							
C4	Agrees with removal of properties within floodplains from the list in LU 9.1.	Acknowledged.	LU 9.1	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
Transit-Oriented Development							
C5	Expressing support for rezoning allowing transit-oriented development near Metro.	Acknowledged.	LU 4, LU 5	18/Pat Doyen, 19/Henry Renze, 20/Johannes Bennehoff, 21/Moira McCauley, 22/John Smith, 23/Cheryl Cort, 24/Laura Ehle, 26/Daniel Walter Rowlands, 28/Lisa Frank, 29/Dan Behrend, 30/Thomas Zeller, 31/Bernard Holloway, 32/Jessica McBirney, 33/Steven Hartig, 34/Joseph Kane, 35/Gannon Sprinkle, 41/Jacob Goldberg, 43/Elissa Woodbury, 45/Brendan Wray, 49/Lindsey Mendelson	No change.		

II. C: Land Use (Section III)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action																																												
Transit-Oriented Development																																																			
C6	Believes acquisition of properties along the north side of Chillum Road is wise but concerned that acquisition of properties on the south side of Chillum Road could eliminate much-needed retail options for local residents.	<p>Staff have reassessed the approach and now find that pursuing M-NCPPC acquisitions north and south of Chillum Road is no longer desirable. One of the main reasons for this change is the plan’s overall focus on maintaining the existing functionality of local businesses in the area, along with improving stormwater management features. In particular, LU 2.4 states, "Existing buildings and sites may be renovated, as needed, to maintain business operations, improve the appearance of buildings and sites, and improve stormwater management or otherwise mitigate environmental impacts." This approach prefers revitalizing the current properties rather than acquiring new land for parkland development.</p> <p>Furthermore, the sector plan supports the retention and growth of neighborhood-serving businesses, as outlined in Policy EP 1, "Promote local entrepreneurship and small, local, and minority-owned business development," (p. 83). The policy includes strategies that focus on supporting and financially backing existing businesses. Additionally, strategies like EP 2.1, which advocates for concentrating neighborhood-serving retail in the West Hyattsville Local Transit Center, reinforce the idea of enhancing and preserving the existing commercial zones rather than initiating acquisitions. Plus with the including the Washington Gas Property back into the West Hyattsville Local Transit Center, along with the connecting properties on Chillum Road, these Chillum Road properties will best contribute to the vitality of the Center, but at a lower density. This also helps maintain the Greenway Concept along Chillum Road.</p> <p>After considering the goals of neighborhood-serving business preservation, community-based retail development, and sustainable growth, staff have determined that acquisition is no longer a priority. Instead, the focus should shift toward enhancing the existing infrastructure and fostering a thriving local economy.</p>	LU 2.3, LU 5.3, EP 2.1, EP 2.2, EP 2.7, EP 2.8	11/Melissa Schweisguth, 15/Christopher Higham, 47/Daniel Broder	<p><del>LU 2.3.</del> <b>LU 7.3</b> The properties listed Table 7, Properties Subject to Strategy LU 7.3, into the Commercial Service Zone and recommend commercial future land uses to allow existing businesses to continue operations, for newly permitted businesses to adaptively reuse existing structures, and for future commercial redevelopment to occur. In the mid- to long-term, work with municipal, state, M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), and County agencies to acquire, mitigate environmental impacts of prior development on, and preserve as open space the properties in Table 4. See also Policy LU 2, Policy NE 1, Policy NE 2, Policy NE 3, and Policy PF 1.</p> <p>Table 7. Properties Subject to Strategies LU 7.3</p> <table><tr><th>Address</th><th>Tax ID</th></tr><tr><td>0 Chillum Road ,</td><td>2923548</td></tr><tr><td>2440 Chillum Road,</td><td>1848159</td></tr><tr><td>2308 Chillum Road,</td><td>1882810</td></tr><tr><td>2460 Chillum Road,</td><td>1965086</td></tr><tr><td>2309 Chillum Road,</td><td>1912245</td></tr><tr><td>2480 Chillum Road,</td><td>1905678</td></tr><tr><td>2421 Chillum Road,</td><td>1898618</td></tr><tr><td>2486 Chillum Road,</td><td>1922574</td></tr><tr><td>2425 Chillum Road,</td><td>1912237</td></tr><tr><td>0 Queens Chapel Road,</td><td>1972405</td></tr><tr><td>2426 Chillum Road,</td><td>1840636</td></tr><tr><td>0 Queens Chapel Road,</td><td>5644428</td></tr><tr><td>2428 Chillum Road,</td><td>1840669</td></tr><tr><td>3200 Queens Chapel Road,</td><td>1871482</td></tr><tr><td>2430 Chillum Road,</td><td>1839166</td></tr><tr><td>3201 Queens Chapel Road,</td><td>1943638</td></tr><tr><td>2434 Chillum Road,</td><td>1853605</td></tr><tr><td>3201 Queens Chapel Road,</td><td>1837665</td></tr><tr><td>3290 Queens Chapel Road,</td><td>1874221</td></tr><tr><td>3213 Queens Chapel Road,</td><td>1978451</td></tr><tr><td>3299 Queens Chapel Road,</td><td>1971712</td></tr></table>	Address	Tax ID	0 Chillum Road ,	2923548	2440 Chillum Road,	1848159	2308 Chillum Road,	1882810	2460 Chillum Road,	1965086	2309 Chillum Road,	1912245	2480 Chillum Road,	1905678	2421 Chillum Road,	1898618	2486 Chillum Road,	1922574	2425 Chillum Road,	1912237	0 Queens Chapel Road,	1972405	2426 Chillum Road,	1840636	0 Queens Chapel Road,	5644428	2428 Chillum Road,	1840669	3200 Queens Chapel Road,	1871482	2430 Chillum Road,	1839166	3201 Queens Chapel Road,	1943638	2434 Chillum Road,	1853605	3201 Queens Chapel Road,	1837665	3290 Queens Chapel Road,	1874221	3213 Queens Chapel Road,	1978451	3299 Queens Chapel Road,	1971712		
Address	Tax ID																																																		
0 Chillum Road ,	2923548																																																		
2440 Chillum Road,	1848159																																																		
2308 Chillum Road,	1882810																																																		
2460 Chillum Road,	1965086																																																		
2309 Chillum Road,	1912245																																																		
2480 Chillum Road,	1905678																																																		
2421 Chillum Road,	1898618																																																		
2486 Chillum Road,	1922574																																																		
2425 Chillum Road,	1912237																																																		
0 Queens Chapel Road,	1972405																																																		
2426 Chillum Road,	1840636																																																		
0 Queens Chapel Road,	5644428																																																		
2428 Chillum Road,	1840669																																																		
3200 Queens Chapel Road,	1871482																																																		
2430 Chillum Road,	1839166																																																		
3201 Queens Chapel Road,	1943638																																																		
2434 Chillum Road,	1853605																																																		
3201 Queens Chapel Road,	1837665																																																		
3290 Queens Chapel Road,	1874221																																																		
3213 Queens Chapel Road,	1978451																																																		
3299 Queens Chapel Road,	1971712																																																		
Density																																																			
C7	Increasing density will improve quality of life by widening the tax base, allowing for more affordable housing,	Acknowledged.	LU 1, LU 4, LU 5, LU 6, LU 7, LU 8, LU 9	52/Will Koper	No change.																																														

II. C: Land Use (Section III)

	increasing demand for climate-friendly modes of transportation, reducing sprawl, and improving economic vitality for local businesses.						
C8	<p>Opposed to redeveloping Kirkwood Apartments as a mixed-use development. Redevelopment will increase flood risk for surrounding properties, decrease pedestrian safety, increase traffic, stress local schools, reduce quality of life for nearby residents, and decrease open space.</p>	<p>Kirkwood Apartments is currently zoned LTO-C and LTO-E and, as such, can be redeveloped as a mixed-use development by right. Prior to the Countywide Map Amendment, it had been zoned Mixed Use Transportation Oriented (M-X-T) since May 2006.</p> <p>Redevelopment of this property would improve stormwater retention, in turn leading to less flooding as new development is subject to more stringent stormwater management planning than was required in 1950 when the Kirkwood Apartments were built. Furthermore, Policy PF 5 (“Serve the sector plan area with modern utility infrastructure that can support recommended growth.”) and Strategy PF 5.1 (“Work with utility providers to systemically update infrastructure, including replacing obsolete transmission lines, adding capacity, and ensuring seamless utility services as growth and redevelopment occurs.”) ensures storm sewer capacity handles the sector plan area’s needs.</p> <p>Pedestrian safety is a major component of this plan, as evidenced by Policy TM 1 (“Prioritize the movement of people rather than vehicles by incorporating active transportation safety features, attractive landscaping, and, where feasible, stormwater management best practices into all streets throughout the sector plan area to improve multimodal travel.”) and its accompanying strategies, Policy TM 4 (“Increase connectivity and reliance on non-vehicular modes of travel by comprehensively connecting trail and shared-use path networks with on-street pedestrian and bicycle facilities.”) and its accompanying strategies, Policy TM 5 (“Enhance active transportation infrastructure to make healthy and sustainable travel modes safe, comfortable, and attractive.”) and its accompanying strategies, and Policy TM 8 (“Support the County’s efforts to achieve Vision Zero Prince George’s, a Countywide interdisciplinary approach to eliminate all traffic-related fatalities and serious injuries.”) and its accompanying strategies. This plan recommends nearly eight miles of new sidewalks, over three miles of new hard surface trails, as well as nearly one mile of new side paths.</p> <p>Traffic is more likely to worsen due to development outside of the sector plan area that creates sprawl, which encourages people to move farther away from the city center and</p>	LU 5.5, HN 1.8	54/Sally Gifford	No change.		

II. C: Land Use (Section III)

		<p>commute through major thoroughfares such as Queens Chapel Road in single-occupancy vehicles. While this plan cannot control development outside of the sector plan area, its recommendation to put new housing near transit is the best way to give residents a choice to take non-single-occupancy vehicle forms of transportation.</p> <p>Staff agree the present utilization rates at Nicholas Orem Middle (127%)<sup>9</sup> and Northwestern High (102%)<sup>10</sup> are not desirable. However, there currently is extra capacity for students within PGCPs. The middle schools’ average utilization rate is 98%, while the high schools’ average utilization rate is 94%.<sup>11</sup> Redistricting to alleviate pressure at schools over capacity and add students to undercapacity schools is part of PGCPs’ solution to reduce strain on impacted schools. Additionally, PGCPs is addressing overcrowding in the northern part of the county through creating a new middle school in the Glenridge area<sup>12</sup> and high schools in the northern Adelphi area<sup>13</sup> as well as the International School at Langley Park.<sup>14</sup></p> <p>Policy PF 1 (“Create a vibrant transit-oriented development that facilitates outdoor enjoyment, public gathering, and healthy lifestyles and preserves environmental assets.”) and Strategy PF 1.1 (“Provide a variety of park, recreational, and open spaces in the sector plan area by constructing or expanding the facilities identified in Table 23 and Map 40, New Recommended Parks, Recreation, and Public Open Space Facilities, and ensuring these new facilities follow the Urban Park Guidelines and Typologies found in Formula 2040, Appendices F and G.”) make recommendations for 11 new or expanded parks, adding over 71 acres of new parkland to the sector area with 21 acres of new parkland located south of Chillum Road. Details on these parks can be found in Table 23 (pages 205-210) and their locations identified in Map 40 (page 211). Specific to the Kirkwood Apartments, the plan recommends a greenway/linear park parallel to and encompassing The Mall between Kirkwood Place and the Northwest Branch Stream Valley Trail. Additional plazas and open spaces are planned for the sector area; these locations are to be determined.</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>9</sup> Prince George’s County Public Schools, September 30th enrollment data – Excel reports: Official Sept 30, 2023, Report, accessed online February 28, 2024, at <https://www.pgcps.org/offices/pupil-accounting/school-boundaries/enrollment-report>.

<sup>10</sup> Prince George’s County Public Schools, September 30th enrollment data – Excel reports: Official Sept 30, 2023, Report, accessed online February 28, 2024, at <https://www.pgcps.org/offices/pupil-accounting/school-boundaries/enrollment-report>.

<sup>11</sup> Prince George’s County Public Schools, September 30th enrollment data – Excel reports: Official Sept 30, 2023, Report, accessed online February 28, 2024, at <https://www.pgcps.org/offices/pupil-accounting/school-boundaries/enrollment-report>.

<sup>12</sup> Prince George’s County, FY 2024-2029 Approved Capital Improvement Program & Budget, p. 163. Accessed online October 30, 2024, at [https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education\\_2.pdf](https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education_2.pdf).

<sup>13</sup> Prince George’s County, FY 2024-2029 Approved Capital Improvement Program & Budget, p. 164. Accessed online October 30, 2024, at [https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education\\_2.pdf](https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education_2.pdf).

<sup>14</sup> Prince George’s County, FY 2024-2029 Approved Capital Improvement Program & Budget, p. 157. Accessed online October 30, 2024, at [https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education\\_2.pdf](https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education_2.pdf).

II. C: Land Use (Section III)

C9	Support rehabilitating existing Kirkwood Apartments.	Staff recognize your support for rehabilitating the existing buildings, but redevelopment is essential for creating higher quality, higher density housing in proximity to the Metro station. The site’s transportation access is an opportunity to enhance accessibility to public transportation and reduce reliance on cars. Staff also recognize concerns about traffic and stormwater management and want to highlight that any new development will include bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure (See TM 1.18 and TM 2.3) improvements and will have to follow strict stormwater management and floodplain regulations.	HN 1.8	54/Sally Gifford	No change.		
C10	If Kirkwood is redeveloped, preserve the existing setback, do not allow for exceptions to building height and make any buildings near the Riverfront townhomes lower in height, preserve existing mature shade trees, and ensure dumpsters face the radio tower right of way area.	Though the sector plan can make recommendations regarding design guidelines it is the Zoning Ordinance that dictates development standards, including building heights, setbacks, landscaping requirements, and neighborhood compatibility standards, to include refuse collection. Staff concur that any redevelopment of the Kirkwood Apartments must comply with the Zoning Ordinance.	LU 5.5	54/Sally Gifford	No change.		
C11	LU 3.1 should be revised to include consistency with the Climate Action Plan to the list of considerations, as well as indicate that CB-20-2024, CB-21-2024, and CB-22-2024 were passed.	Acknowledged and will further revise to indicate that CB-15-2024 was passed.	LU 3.1	46/Joseph Jakuta	<p>LU 3.1. When evaluating the effectiveness of and potential updates to the Zoning Ordinance, the County Council should consider:</p> <p>i) Whether the goals of this plan will be best achieved if the District Council prohibits the use of the prior Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations for properties subject to Sectional Map Amendments adopted after <del>September</del> <u>April 1, 2022</u>.</p> <p>ii) Allowing accessory dwelling units and/or other forms of “Missing Middle” housing. See also Policy LU <del>9 10</del> and <u>HN 1.4 HN 1.3</u>.</p> <p><del>iii) Continuing to allow the construction of dwelling units on non-conforming lots of record smaller than 6,500 square feet without requiring a variance. See also Strategies LU 9.3 and HN 1.3.</del></p> <p><del>iv) The following amendments to the Zoning Ordinance proposed by CB-15-2024: (1) Limiting the locations of the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center Planned Development Zones; (2) Prohibiting townhomes and three-family dwellings in the LTO-C Zone, where only multifamily housing and other vertical forms of development are appropriate. (3) Increasing the maximum permitted densities in the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center Zones; (4) Increasing the maximum permitted structure heights in the LTO Zones; (5) Identifying specific types of potential public benefits that may be included in a Planned Development zone.</del></p> <p><del>✦ iii) Clarifying the applicability of woodland conservation and tree canopy coverage requirements to Plan 2035 Centers as [proposed]required by CB-20-2024 and CB-21-2024 or subsequent updated bills updating the code.</del></p> <p><del>✦ iv) Increasing the maximum required regulated stream buffers as [proposed]required by CB-22-2024.</del></p>		

II. C: Land Use (Section III)

					<del>Should pending legislation be approved prior to adoption and/or approval of this sector plan, the plan should be revised to reflect its enactment.</del>		
C12	No indication why RSF-A should not be further upzoned to LTO as well.	<p>Per Section 27-4204(b)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance, the LTO Zone may only be located on lands within:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ A Local Transit Center as designated on the Growth Policy Map in the General Plan or the applicable Area Master Plan or Sector Plan, as may be amended from time to time;</li><li>▪ The Innovation Corridor as designated on the Strategic Investment Map in the General Plan or the applicable Area Master Plan or Sector Plan; or</li><li>▪ Along that portion of US 1 located south of the Innovation Corridor to the border with Washington, D.C.</li></ul> <p>Any proposed rezoning to a Transit-Oriented/Activity Center base zone shall be in accordance with the locational standards of Section <a href="#">27-4204</a>(b)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance.</p> <p>Properties zoned RSF-A currently serve as a buffer between the highest densities recommended in the sector plan area and lower density uses. However, increased density can be added within RSF-A and is specifically recommended with the proposed upzoning of the entirety of the Queens Chapel Manor neighborhood to allow for two- and three-family homes.</p>	LU 4.1	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
C13	All properties listed in LU 4.2 should be rezoned to ROS, not just those as recommended in LU 2.1.	The properties proposed to be rezoned to ROS are publicly owned property. The Zoning Ordinance prohibits rezoning privately owned property to ROS without the property owner’s consent under Section 27-3503(a)(4)(F), and given this would significantly restrict development rights on those properties, staff do not anticipate this would be successful.	LU 2.1, LU 4.2	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
C14	All parcels in the 10-minute walkshed of the West Hyattsville Metro station should be included in the West Hyattsville Local Transit Center. All parcels currently zoned RSF-A in that walkshed should be further upzoned, and all parcels in the 15-minute walkshed should be upzoned to RSF-A.	The LTO designation is intended to concentrate development around Metro stations and the single-family attached homes that are permitted by-right in the RSF-A zone are inappropriate within an LTO. Staff concurs that all RSF-65 properties in the 15-minute walkshed should be rezoned to RSF-A. Staff recommends expanding this further to include the entire 15-minute bikeshed as well.	LU 5.1, LU 6.1	46/Joseph Jakuta	See B1. Queens Chapel Manor Rezoning for staff recommended changes.		
C15	Appreciates inclusion of LU 5.5, though it should offer assurances for current	These recommendations are included in HN 1.8. However, staff agree that stronger anti-displacement recommendations can be included in the plan.	LU 5.5, LU 2.10, HN 1.8	46/Joseph Jakuta	See B4. Displacement, for staff recommended changes.		

II. C: Land Use (Section III)

	residents like those in LU 2.10.ii.						
C16	Agree with recommendations in LU 8.1.	Acknowledged.	LU 8.1	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
C17	Uncertain why properties between 3511 and 3601 Hamilton Street were not included in the proposed upzoning to CN, as well as the properties on the northern side of the street.	<p>The properties mentioned are proposed for rezoning from CGO to CN per LU 8.2 and ZC 7. The plan does not envision a major commercial district here; rather, it allows for neighborhood-serving businesses that are appropriate given their location and proximity to the main commercial corridor on Hamilton Street west of Queens Chapel Road. The properties recommended for any rezoning within a commercial zoning classification were those already in an existing commercial zone, as this plan seeks to support and advance Plan 2035, the County’s General Plan (see Land Use Policy 9, “Limit the expansion of new commercial zoning outside of the Regional Transit Districts and <b>Local Centers</b> to encourage reinvestment and growth in designated centers and in existing commercial areas,” p.116). The plan’s recommendation is to redevelop existing commercial properties to the more urban, walkable design of the CN Zone, but not to expand retail/commercial uses beyond what already exists on the corridor.</p> <p>Staff did not consider redevelopment of existing single-family detached houses along MD 208 (Hamilton Street) an important priority of this sector plan and are concerned about the addition of properties to support retail when the sector plan area is over-retailed, and the plan recommends concentration of retail within the Local Transit Center</p>	LU 8.2	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		



II. D: Transportation and Mobility (Section V)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
General Transportation Recommendations							
D1	Supporting the proposal to remove vehicle level of service as a street performance metric in transit-oriented development areas.	Acknowledged.	TM 1.15	V1, 23/Cheryl Cort, 18/Pat Doyen, 19/Henry Renze, 20/Johannes Bennehoff, 21/Moira McCauley, 22/John Smith, 23/Cheryl Cort, 24/Laura Ehle, 26/Daniel Walter Rowlands, 28/Lisa Frank, 29/Dan Behrend, 30/Thomas Zeller, 31/Bernard Holloway, 32/Jessica McBirney, 33/Steven Hartig, 34/Joseph Kane, 35/Gannon Sprinkle, 41/Jacob Goldberg, 43/Elissa Woodbury, 45/Brendan Wray, 49/Lindsey Mendelson	No change.		
D2	Supports setting speed limits at 20 and 25 per guidance from the County’s Urban Street Design Standards.	Acknowledged.	TM 1.8, TM 1.16	V1, 23/Cheryl Cort, 18/Pat Doyen, 19/Henry Renze, 20/Johannes Bennehoff, 21/Moira McCauley, 22/John Smith, 23/Cheryl Cort, 24/Laura Ehle, 25/Danny Schaible, 26/Daniel Walter Rowlands, 28/Lisa Frank, 29/Dan Behrend, 30/Thomas Zeller, 31/Bernard Holloway, 32/Jessica McBirney, 33/Steven Hartig, 34/Joseph Kane, 35/Gannon Sprinkle, 41/Jacob Goldberg, 42/Amanda Huron, 43/Elissa Woodbury, 45/Brendan Wray, 49/Lindsey Mendelson, 52/Will Koper			

II. D: Transportation and Mobility (Section V)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
D3	Update sector plan when the in-progress Master Plan of Transportation is released to update relevant maps, recommendations, etc.	Staff concur and have been working closely with the MPOT team to incorporate recommendations. Per Section 27-3502(j)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, “[w]hen General Plan amendments and Functional Master Plans (and amendments thereof) are approved after the adoption and approval of Area Master Plans or Sector Plans, they shall amend the Area Master Plans or Sector Plans only to the extent specified in the approved amendment and/or in the resolution of approval.”	Throughout the Transportation and Mobility section	11/ Melissa Schweisguth, 47/Daniel Broder	No change.		
D4	Revise the sector plan to reflect that the Walkable Urban Streets Act passed.	Acknowledged.	Throughout the Transportation and Mobility section	11/ Melissa Schweisguth, 47/Daniel Broder	<p>Revise “Complete and Green Streets” callout (p. 93):</p> <p>Prince George’s County established the Complete and Green Streets policy in 2012 with Council Bill CB-83-2012. On November 14, 2023, the Prince George’s County Council approved CR-67-2023, CR-68-2023, and CB-69-2023, collectively referred to as the Walkable Streets Act of 2023, updating the County’s adopted Urban Street Design Standards. The provisions of the Walkable Urban Streets Act of 2023 became effective June 1, 2024. Subsequent to this legislation, the Department of Public Works and Transportation <del>initiated</del> released a comprehensive update to the County’s Urban Street Design Standards in May 2024. <del>This update will last through at least July 2024 and will not be complete in time to inform the specific Urban Street Design Standards to be used for the design of streets in this Staff Draft II Sector Plan.</del></p> <p><u>This plan recommends the specific urban street type (Mixed-Use Boulevard, Neighborhood Connector, Neighborhood Residential, etc.), based on the approved Urban Street Design Standards. In lieu of specific Urban Street Design Standard recommendations, this plan recommends the specific urban street type (Mixed-Use Boulevard, Neighborhood Connector, Neighborhood Residential, etc.), based on the urban street types in the 2023 adopted Urban Street Design Standards. Should the County Council adopt updated Urban Street Design Standards prior to adoption and/or approval of this sector plan, they should be incorporated as amendments through the adoption and/or approval process, or through the ongoing update to the Countywide Master Plan of Transportation.</u></p> <p>Revise Footnote 12 (p. 141):</p>		

II. D: Transportation and Mobility (Section V)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
					The Walkable Urban Streets Act of 2023 incorporates this recommendation and is effective June 1, 2024. The 2024 update of the Urban Street Design Standards ( <del>in progress as of May 2, 2024</del> ) should provide additional clarity on sidewalk and buffer requirements.		
D5	Recommend engaging municipalities and SHA to apply the updated Urban Street Design Standards to State roads.	This action is covered under TM 1.5, “Reconstruct the following existing streets outside the Local Transit Center or Regional Transit District to the appropriate urban street design standards from the 2023 Prince George’s County Urban Street Design Standards (or the most up-to-date County-approved urban street standards) during redevelopment of properties or through DPW&T/SHA capital improvement projects. (See Table 11: Recommended Countywide Master Plan of Transportation Streets for specific recommended urban street design standards; Map 27: Recommended Countywide Master Plan of Transportation Streets, and the descriptions of key street design standards on page 100.)” (p. 95). Included amongst that recommendation are MD 500 (Queens Chapel Road) and MD 501 (Chillum Road).	TM 1.5	11/ Melissa Schweisguth, 47/Daniel Broder	No change.		
D6	Supports removing right-turn slip lanes.	Acknowledged.	TM 1.14	V1, 23/Cheryl Cort, 18/Pat Doyen, 19/Henry Renze, 20/Johannes Bennehoff, 21/Moira McCauley, 22/John Smith, 23/Cheryl Cort, 24/Laura Ehle, 25/Danny Schaible, 26/Daniel Walter Rowlands, 28/Lisa Frank, 29/Dan Behrend, 30/Thomas Zeller, 31/Bernard Holloway, 32/Jessica McBirney, 33/Steven Hartig, 34/Joseph Kane, 35/Gannon Sprinkle, 41/Jacob Goldberg, 42/Amanda Huron, 43/Elissa Woodbury, 45/Brendan Wray, 49/Lindsey Mendelson, 52/Will Koper	No change.		

II. D: Transportation and Mobility (Section V)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
D7	Plan language re: removing right-turn slip lanes could be stronger as it discusses evaluating removing lanes rather than comprehensively removing them.	TM 1.14 includes information on how these slip lanes might be removed, including a pilot program to evaluate their effectiveness and impact on improving bicyclist and pedestrian experience and safety, as well as a plan for how the slip lanes would ultimately be removed.	TM 1.14	V1, 23/Cheryl Cort, 46/Joseph Jakuta	<p>Update TM 1.14 to include stronger language and separate the strategies into TM 1.14, TM 1.15, and TM 1.16 for clarity.</p> <p>TM 1.14 Eliminate the free-right turn (slip lane) at MD 501 (Chillum Road) and 19th Avenue pursuant to the 30 percent design plans for T-210, the Anacostia Gateway/Prince George’s Connector Trail.</p> <p><u>TM 1.15</u> Conduct a temporary pilot project with free-right turn (slip lane) removal (blocking off the lane to vehicles with traffic cones) in coordination with DPW&amp;T, MDOT SHA, DDOT, WMATA, and municipalities, <u>at the following locations:</u> • Hamilton Street and Ager Road • Hamilton Street and MD 500 (Queens Chapel Road) • MD 500 (Queens Chapel Road) and Eastern Avenue NE (in coordination with DDOT) • MD 500 (Queens Chapel Road) and Ager Road. <u>The project should</u> evaluate the feasibility of eliminating free-right turns (slip lanes) and <u>their effectiveness and impact on improving bicyclist and pedestrian experience and safety, while considering the crossing distance and pedestrian timing.</u></p> <p><u>TM 1.16</u> Should the pilot project <u>recommended under TM 1.15</u> proceed, DPW&amp;T/DDOT and SHA is recommended to partner to permanently implement the project’s recommendations, <u>which may include</u> adjusting curb radii, in coordination with WMATA, at the above intersections as needed to improve visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists from oncoming vehicles. <u>This may also include expanding sidewalks and increasing pedestrian refuge spaces to improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety (See Table 13. Recommended Countywide Master Plan of Transportation Streets; and Map 29. Recommended Countywide Master Plan of Transportation Streets).</u></p>		
D8	Excited about bike lanes, street retrofits, and trail connections.	Acknowledged.	TM 1.1-1.9, TM 1.16, TM 4.1-4.7, TM 4.12, TM 5.15, TM 5.16, TM 9.3, TM 9.4	V1, 23/Cheryl Cort, 11/Melissa Schweisguth, 18/Pat Doyen, 19/Henry Renze, 20/Johannes Bennehoff, 21/Moira McCauley, 22/John Smith, 23/Cheryl Cort, 24/Laura Ehle,	No change.		

II. D: Transportation and Mobility (Section V)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
				25/Danny Schaible, 26/Daniel Walter Rowlands, 28/Lisa Frank, 29/Dan Behrend, 30/Thomas Zeller, 31/Bernard Holloway, 32/Jessica McBirney, 33/Steven Hartig, 34/Joseph Kane, 35/Gannon Sprinkle, 41/Jacob Goldberg, 42/Amanda Huron, 43/Elissa Woodbury, 45/Brendan Wray, 47/Daniel Broder, 49/Lindsey Mendelson, 52/Will Koper			
D9	Recommend retaining parking on one side of Jamestown Road and Nicholson Street, ensuring no street trees are removed for road redesign.	Recommendation for Jamestown Road keeps on-street parking on both sides of the street, while recommendation for Nicholson Street keeps on-street parking on one side of the street between Queens Chapel Road and Ager Road and on both sides between Ager Road and Little Branch Run. Maintaining as many street trees as possible is a priority.	TM 1.16	11/ Melissa Schweisguth, 47/Daniel Broder	No change.		
D10	Plan should require off-street parking, ideally permeable and/or multi-use, in any newly upzoned properties	Policy TM 10, “Manage parking to reduce automobile use and encourage walking, bicycling, transit, and other alternative modes of transportation,” discourages the expansion of vehicular infrastructure in order to encourage alternative modes of transportation. Additionally, off-street parking requirements are regulated by the Zoning Ordinance and changes to the Zoning Ordinance are outside the scope of this plan.	TM 10	11/ Melissa Schweisguth, 47/Daniel Broder	No change.		
D11	Promote/incentivize permeable off-street parking, in general.	This is promoted under Strategy NE 7.2, “Maximize the use of pervious surfaces (for example, pervious pavement, green roofs) in the design and construction of new development and redevelopment” (p. 162). Further, permeable pavement is encouraged in both Section 27-61603, Green Building Standards, of the Zoning Ordinance (although residential development that contains fewer than 10 dwelling units is exempt) and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements, of the Prince George’s County Landscape Manual. While the County promotes the use of permeable pavement, further incentivizing its use is outside the scope of this sector plan.	NE 7.2	11/ Melissa Schweisguth, 47/Daniel Broder	No change.		

II. D: Transportation and Mobility (Section V)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
D12	Recommend retaining parking on Jamestown Road, and further recommend keeping on-street parking as a traffic calming tool.	Recommendation for Jamestown Road keeps on-street parking on both sides of the street. Staff concur that on-street parking can be an important traffic calming tool.	TM 1.16	17/Jeff Ulysse	No change.		
D13	Urges Council to support recommendations for green street improvements.	Acknowledged.	TM 3.1, TM 3.2	23/Cheryl Cort	No change.		
D14	Endorses setting aggressive targets for the creation of new active transportation infrastructure, including 19 miles of new sidewalks, 9 miles of new bike lanes, and 2 miles of trails.	Acknowledged.	TM 4, PF 1.2	33/Steven Hartig	No change.		
D15	Opposes connecting Kirkwood Place to Little Branch Run as these streets do not support cross traffic and already have too much traffic.	Connecting Kirkwood Place to Little Branch Run is an important strategy for improving connectivity to the West Hyattsville Metro station for pedestrians, bicyclists, and others using non-motorized transportation. These streets are already platted, and constructing these streets within Riverfront to the property line was a condition of approval for the Riverfront Townhouse development project. <sup>15</sup> The timing of the opening of the two roads will be determined by DPIE and the City of Hyattsville.	TM 4.10	54/Sally Gifford	No change.		
D16	Opposed to bike lanes on Hamilton Street. They will impede parking in front of my house and worsen traffic.	The recommendations for the Hamilton Street bike lanes date back to the 2009 Master Plan of Transportation. Prioritizing the movement of people rather than vehicles by incorporating attractive transportation safety features is a key policy of the Transportation and Mobility element per Policy TM 1 (p. 93).	TM 1	V10,48/Shea Winsett	No change.		
D17	Applaud strengthening of TM 1.10.	Acknowledged.	TM 1.10	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
D18	A HAWK should be recommended where the Northwest Branch Trail	This recommendation is included under TM 8.3.	TM 1.10, TM 8.3	46/Joseph Jakuta	Add definition callout box.  <u>HAWK SIGNAL</u>		

<sup>15</sup> See [PGCPB No. 17-42](#) and [PGCPB No. 17-43](#)

II. D: Transportation and Mobility (Section V)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
	intersects with Chillum Road.				<u>A HAWK (High-intensity Activated Crosswalk) signal or pedestrian crossing is a traffic control system designed to improve pedestrian safety typically at high-speed or wide-crossing roadways. It uses a unique beacon with two red lenses above a yellow lens, high-visibility crosswalk markings, and illuminated signs to alert drivers to the presence of pedestrians. When activated by the pedestrian, the beacon signals drivers to stop with a solid red light, allowing pedestrians to cross. The system features an alternating flashing red phase, where drivers can proceed after stopping, depending on whether pedestrians have finished crossing.</u>  Source: Safety Effectiveness of the HAWK Pedestrian Crossing, Technical Briefing. FHWA Publication No.: FHWA-HRT-10-045. McLean, VA: Federal Highway Administration. June 2010. Retrieved January 8, 2025 at <a href="https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/research/safety/10045/10045.pdf">https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/research/safety/10045/10045.pdf</a>		
D19	Likes creation of a grid of green and complete streets south of MD 410, west of MD 500 and north and east of Belcrest Road with a possible new street connecting with American Boulevard in TM 1.20.	Acknowledged.	TM 1.20	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
D20	Priority should be given to bump out islands as traffic calming measures in TM 2.2.	Recommendations will depend on a variety of factors, such as type of street, daily traffic, width, topography, etc., and should be determined based on what best suits that street.	TM 2.2	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
D21	Final recommendations need to call on DPW&T to connect levee paving efforts to existing networks and ensure safe crossing for pedestrians and bicyclists.	This recommendation is included under TM 4.12.	TM 2	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
D22	Varnum Street/Arundel Road should be included in the list of streets to become “Green Streets.”	The plan recommends in TM 3.1 and TM 3.2 that new streets and retrofitted streets be green streets, wherever feasible; this does not exclude Varnum Street/Arundel Road. TM 3.1 specifically lists streets that should be prioritized because of soil types that better support infiltration measures. Redeveloping Varnum Street/Arundel	TM 3.1	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		

II. D: Transportation and Mobility (Section V)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
		Road as a Green Street would be welcomed by both staff and the plan.					
D23	TM 3.5 is reasonable.	Acknowledged.	TM 3.5	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
D24	Policy TM 3 should include recommendations concerning lighting through parkland.	This is addressed in TM 5, TM 5.14, and HD 4.2	TM 3, TM 5, TM 5.14, and HD 4.2	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
D25	Concerning recommendation TM 4.1, the connection described in Map 27 as T-208 is a particularly crucial connection to a daycare facility and an underutilized park that should not be neglected.	Acknowledged.	TM 4.1	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
D26	Strongly commend the inclusion of TM 4.3 through TM 4.7.	Acknowledged.	TM 4.3-TM 4.7	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
D27	Stripe the crossing on 34th Street from the west side of the levee to the east side of the levee north of the 34th Street bridge.	This is recommended under TM 4.13.	TM 4.7	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
D28	Plan should address paving the gap between the sidewalk and bike lane on Buchanan Street that leads to the Mount Rainier Nature Center.	This is recommended under TM 1.16.	TM 4.10	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
D29	Encouraged that language in TM 10.1 was strengthened to provide better direction to DPW&T.	Acknowledged.	TM 10.1	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		



II. E: Natural Environment (Section VI)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
Floodplain Management							
E1	Agrees with dropping floodplain plan from first staff draft of plan.	Acknowledged.		15/Christopher Higham	No change.		
E2	Recommendations for compensatory storage are inappropriate. Any properties that are in an inappropriate area need to be rezoned to ROS and structures need to be gradually removed with a planned and appropriate timeline.	Staff acknowledge compensatory storage is not ideal; however, it is permitted by Subtitle 32, Division 4 of the County Code and the plan discourages it in the most environmentally sensitive areas. Further, the Zoning Ordinance prohibits rezoning privately owned property to ROS without the property owner’s consent under Section 27-3503(a)(4)(F) and given this would significantly restrict development rights on those properties, staff do not anticipate this would be successful.	NE 1.6	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
Stormwater Management							
E3	Require more stringent stormwater management plans for upzoned properties and do not allow variances for tree canopy, champion/specimen tree retention or impervious surface.	Per Subtitle 32, Division 3, “Stormwater Management” of the Prince George’s County Code of Ordinances, stormwater management plans are required for any development that disturbs at least 5,000 square feet of land area and are ultimately reviewed and approved by the Prince George’s County Department of Permitting, Engineering, Inspections, and Enforcement. While further requirements not outlined in Subtitle 32, Division 3 are outside the scope of this plan, Policy NE 7, “Reduce stormwater runoff” (p. 162) and its accompanying strategies encourage property owners to reduce runoff through several activities. Special conditions cannot be applied to any newly upzoned properties that would not apply to other by-right uses in that same zone. Variances are regulated by the zoning ordinance in Section 27-3613, Landscape Manual regulates landscaping, buffering, and screening, and Subtitle 25 regulates tree canopy; amending those is outside of the scope of this sector plan.	NE 7	11/ Melissa Schweisguth, 47/Daniel Broder	No change.		
E4	Excited about environmental aspects of plan; specifically increasing the forest buffer around the Northwest Branch and working with WMATA to shift parking demand from the West Hyattsville Metro station to the Hyattsville Crossing station.	Acknowledged.		42/Amanda Huron	No change.		

II. E: Natural Environment (Section VI)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
Climate Change							
E5	Applaud expansion of NE 5 to include recommendations necessary for mitigating and adapting to climate change, as well as calls to implement recommendations of the Climate Action Plan.	Acknowledged.	NE 5	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
E6	Density creates urban heat islands.	A major contributor to climate change is sprawl. The best way to combat sprawl is by maximizing residential development at locations where residents can walk, bicycle, or take transit to their destinations. Further, the plan encourages all new development and redevelopment to incorporate multiple green building techniques found in the Zoning Ordinance (Section 27-61600) in Strategy NE 5.4, and Policy NE 6 says to “[p]reserve and expand tree canopy to the maximum extent possible to create a comfortable and attractive environment for people, provide additional wildlife habitat, and reduce urban heat island effects.”	NE 5.4, NE 6	V10,48/Shea Winsett	No change.		

II. E: Natural Environment (Section VI)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
Trees and Vegetation							
E7	Would like to see recommendations about reducing the size of the West Hyattsville Metro station parking lot and combining with adjacent land for a food forest, community garden, or urban agriculture project.	This testimony is contrary to recommended strategies LU 4.4 (“Activate retail corridors by concentrating eating and dining establishments and convenience retail and services along Hamilton Street west of and including 3420 Hamilton Street to the West Hyattsville Metro Station and along MD 500 (Queens Chapel Road) between 29th Avenue and Hamilton Street. Such uses should be located primarily on the ground-floor of mixed-use buildings.”) and EP 2.4 (“Create a dynamic commercial main street corridor stretching east along Hamilton Street from the West Hyattsville Metro Station.) Should WMATA express interest in reducing the size of the parking lot in the future, this is supported through Strategy TM 10.7 (“Coordinate with WMATA to shift parking demand to Hyattsville Crossing Metro Station through reduced and/or shared parking at the West Hyattsville Metro Station.”).		42/Amanda Huron	No change.		
E8	An additional stipulation must be that when it is necessary to remove a tree, it must be replaced so that there is no net tree loss in the geography of the sector plan.	Strategy NE 6.4 states that “[d]uring the design and construction of new development and redevelopment, plant native, non-invasive trees and other vegetation in compliance with the Prince George’s County Landscape Manual along streets and in open spaces, gathering areas, other landscaped areas, and re-vegetated construction areas. New development and redevelopment should also seek to install landscaping improvements beyond the minimum required to the maximum extent practicable.” While staff would welcome a one-for-one tree replacement, this is not always practicable, nor is it enforceable. Trees are regulated by the Landscape Manual and Subtitle 25 of the County Code.	NE 6.1	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
E9	NE 6.6 should be revised to indicate that crepe myrtles on Hamilton Street can be replaced in-kind.	As crepe myrtles are non-native, invasive trees, staff recommend replacing them with native trees as appropriate per NE 6.6.	NE 6.6	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		
E10	Policy NE 6 should add an additional sub-recommendation of providing resources and funding to maintain trees in the area.	The plan cannot promise resources and funding for vegetation maintenance, but it can make recommendations to encourage high-quality services, including maintenance, are provided.	NE 6	46/Joseph Jakuta	<u>PF 6 Provide enhanced public service within the sector plan area.</u> <u>PF 6.1. Coordinate with the City of Hyattsville, City of Mount Rainier, Town of Brentwood, Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&amp;T), and Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement (DPIE) to ensure that services such as code enforcement, inspections, maintenance, and others, properly serve the needs of community members.</u> <u>PF 6.2. Create a working group to include DPIE, DPW&amp;T, and the Prince George’s County Planning Department to coordinate on addressing code enforcement.</u>		

II. F: Housing and Neighborhoods (Section VII)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
F1	Rezoning of Queens Chapel neighborhood to RSF-A to allow for duplexes and triplexes neighborhood-wide is a plan highlight.	Acknowledged.	LU 9.3, HN 1.6, ZC 31	V1, 23/Cheryl Cort	No change.		
F2	Encourages County to expand quality, affordable housing construction to give families of all incomes the opportunity to live near transit, in a walkable community.	Staff concur. This is captured in HN 1.1 (“Construct a variety of multifamily housing types at a range of price points within the sector plan areas of the Prince George’s Plaza Regional Transit District, the West Hyattsville Local Transit Center, and properties zoned RMF-48.”), HN 1.2 (HN 2.7) (“Encourage use of the Planned Development Zones to add below-market-rate housing units.”), and HN 1.4 (HN 2.6) (“Work with Prince George’s County, the State of Maryland, and other stakeholders to construct new below-market-rate housing individually or as part of a mixed-income development.”).	HN 1	23/Cheryl Cort	No change.		
F3	Density is anti-Hyattsville. People did not move to Hyattsville to live in a dense area.	The sector plan area only contains a portion of the City of Hyattsville and also contains portions of unincorporated Prince George’s County, along with parts of Mount Rainier, and Brentwood. With a population of 21,187 in its 2.71 square miles of land area, Hyattsville has a population density of 7,832.5 people per square mile. <sup>16</sup> This density is significantly closer to that of Washington, D.C. at 11,280.7 people per square mile (population 689,545, land area 61.13 square miles) <sup>17</sup> than it is to the population density of Prince George’s County, which is 2,003.9 people per square mile (population 967,201, land area 482.7 square miles). <sup>18</sup> Hyattsville is predominated by smaller homes on compact lots, apartments, and single-family attached dwellings. While less dense than Washington, D.C., Hyattsville is a dense, transit-rich, compact city, and the redevelopment proposed in this plan does not substantially alter the character of Hyattsville’s residential development pattern.	LU 4, LU 5, LU 6, LU 7	V10,48/Shea Winsett	No change.		

<sup>16</sup> U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: Hyattsville city, Maryland. United States Census Bureau. Accessed online November 20, 2024, at: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/hyattsvillecitymaryland/INC110222>.  
<sup>17</sup> U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: District of Columbia. United States Census Bureau. Accessed online November 20, 2024, at: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/DC/PST045223>.  
<sup>18</sup> U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: Prince George’s County, Maryland. United States Census Bureau. Accessed online November 20, 2024, at: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/princegeorgescountymaryland/PST045223>.

II. F: Housing and Neighborhoods (Section VII)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
F4	Housing is unaffordable and will become more so after redevelopment.	Part of the reason that housing is increasingly unaffordable is because of lack of supply. This plan recommends adding significantly more housing to the sector plan area, including single-family detached, single-family attached, duplexes, triplexes, and apartments, while also recommending rehabilitation of and preserving naturally occurring affordable housing. Further, there is significant language in the plan that addresses the issue of displacement, aging in place, and ensuring housing at a variety of price points is built. Staff have added language that incentivizes building and maintaining affordable two- and three-family homes in Queens Chapel Manor to mitigate displacement as much as possible, as well as a callout in the Housing and Neighborhoods section further highlighting anti-displacement strategies that can be implemented.	HN 1.1, HN 1.2, HN 1.3, HN 1.4, HN 1.6, HN 1.7, HN 2.1, HN 2.3	V10,48/Shea Winsett	See B4. Displacement section for staff recommended changes.		
F5	Opticos Design is leading the planning direction for the sector plan.	The plan used a graphic designed by Opticos Design to illustrate the forms Missing Middle Housing can take, but staff did not work with Opticos on this plan.	Housing and Neighborhoods section	V10,48/Shea Winsett	No change.		
F6	Thankful for the inclusion of HN 1.7.	Acknowledged.	HN 1.7	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		

II. G: Public Facilities (Section X)

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
Additional Public Facilities Needs							
G1	Plan does not come with maintenance/ service plan for Hyattsville.	Increased residential density combined with the proposed Hamilton Street “main street” and mixed-use developments would create much needed tax revenue in the form of property taxes, sales taxes, and food taxes. In turn, this money can go towards improved city and county services. Staff encouraged the County and impacted municipalities to continue to provide excellent services to their residents.	Public Facilities section	V10,48/Shea Winsett	See E10 above for staff recommended changes.		
G2	Plan does not seem to have a plan for schools.	Staff agree the present utilization rates at Nicholas Orem Middle (127%) <sup>19</sup> and Northwestern High (102%) <sup>20</sup> are not desirable. However, there currently is extra capacity for students within PGCPS. The middle schools’ average utilization rate is 98%, while the high schools’ average utilization rate is 94%. <sup>21</sup> Redistricting to alleviate pressure at schools over capacity and add students to undercapacity schools is part of PGCPs’ solution to reduce strain on impacted schools. Additionally, PGCPs is addressing overcrowding in the northern part of the county through creating a new middle school in the Glenridge area <sup>22</sup> and high schools in the northern Adelphi area <sup>23</sup> as well as the International School at Langley Park. <sup>24</sup> The plan also prescribes coordinating with PGCPs to provide adequate facilities to ensure all students have an opportunity to attend a high-quality public school that operates within Board of Education-established facility utilization rates under Strategy 3.1.	PF 3, PF 3.1, PF 3.2	V10,48/Shea Winsett	No change.		
G3	Plan should include recommendations for resilience hubs, particularly at the Mount Rainier Nature Center	The plan recommends constructing a small multipurpose community resource center on the south side of Chillum Road, west of Queens Chapel Road. This may serve some functionality of a resilience hub, but further research should be conducted on this topic, particularly in relation to M-NCPPC’s capacity to develop, staff, and maintain a resilience hub.	PF 2	46/Joseph Jakuta	No change.		

<sup>19</sup> Prince George’s County Public Schools, September 30th enrollment data – Excel reports: Official Sept 30, 2023, Report, accessed online February 28, 2024, at <https://www.pgcps.org/offices/pupil-accounting/school-boundaries/enrollment-report>.  
<sup>20</sup> Prince George’s County Public Schools, September 30th enrollment data – Excel reports: Official Sept 30, 2023, Report, accessed online February 28, 2024, at <https://www.pgcps.org/offices/pupil-accounting/school-boundaries/enrollment-report>.  
<sup>21</sup> Prince George’s County Public Schools, September 30th enrollment data – Excel reports: Official Sept 30, 2023, Report, accessed online February 28, 2024, at <https://www.pgcps.org/offices/pupil-accounting/school-boundaries/enrollment-report>.  
<sup>22</sup> Prince George’s County, FY 2024-2029 Approved Capital Improvement Program & Budget, p. 163. Accessed online October 30, 2024, at [https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education\\_2.pdf](https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education_2.pdf).  
<sup>23</sup> Prince George’s County, FY 2024-2029 Approved Capital Improvement Program & Budget, p. 164. Accessed online October 30, 2024, at [https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education\\_2.pdf](https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education_2.pdf).  
<sup>24</sup> Prince George’s County, FY 2024-2029 Approved Capital Improvement Program & Budget, p. 157. Accessed online October 30, 2024, at [https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education\\_2.pdf](https://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/default/files/media-document/Board%20of%20Education_2.pdf).



## II. H: Proposed Sectional Map Amendment

### Public Rezoning Request

One request was submitted by the public for the reclassification of property into a new zoning classification.

Staff make the following recommendations:

	Public Rezoning Requests for Proposed SMA Zoning Change	Type of Request (Reclassify to New Zone / Retain Current / Agreement with Proposed Zone)	Exhibit #/Name	Address	Tax Account	Current Zone	Proposed Zone	Requested Zone	Staff Recommendation	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
G4	N/A	Reclassify to New Zone	V6/Brandon Todd, V8/13/Midgett S. Parker	2130 Chillum Road	1976596	AG	LTO-E	IE	See B2. Future Land Use and Zoning at 2130 Chillum Road (Washington Gas)		

Map H. Public Rezoning Request



II. I: Testimony Outside the Scope of the Staff Draft Sector Plan and/or Proposed SMA

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
H1	Expressed support for Accessory Dwelling Units once legally allowable.	Permitting ADUs is only possible through changes to the Zoning Ordinance. Notwithstanding, staff concur and support this through Strategy HN 1.7 (HN 2.12), “Should the Zoning Ordinance be amended to permit accessory dwelling units, their use is recommended throughout the West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel sector.”	HN 1.7, LU 9.4	V1, 23/Cheryl Cort, 15/Christopher Higham, 18/Pat Doyen, 19/Henry Renze, 20/Johannes Bennehoff, 21/Moira McCauley, 22/John Smith, 23/Cheryl Cort, 24/Laura Ehle, 26/Daniel Walter Rowlands, 28/Lisa Frank, 29/Dan Behrend, 30/Thomas Zeller, 31/Bernard Holloway, 32/Jessica McBirney, 33/Steven Hartig, 34/Joseph Kane, 35/Gannon Sprinkle, 41/Jacob Goldberg, 43/Elissa Woodbury, 45/Brendan Wray, 49/Lindsey Mendelson	No change.		
H2	Because rezoning only Queens Chapel Manor would be inequitable, all of Hyattsville should be upzoned to RSF-A.	As most of the City of Hyattsville is outside the sector plan area, this is outside of the plan’s scope. However, staff support rezoning to allow for two- and three-family housing as appropriate outside of the sector plan area.	HN 1.6, SMA ZC 31	V5/Alan Socha	See B1. Queens Chapel Manor Rezoning.		
H3	Requests M-NCPPC conducts a Missing Middle Housing Study to better assess Missing Middle Housing’s impact on local infrastructure.	The Prince George’s County Planning Department launched a Missing Middle Housing Initiative in 2021 and is in the process of launching a two-part project that includes a Missing Middle Housing study and a pattern book for Missing Middle Housing.	LU 9.3	17/Jeff Ulysse	<u>HN 2.4. Conduct a Missing Middle Housing study for the sector plan area, as part of larger Countywide study, to assess and address current and future housing needs and affordability.</u>		
H4	Affidavit for a property owner supporting an upzoning that would impact their property is an uneven burden.	This requirement is mandated by state law. Staff encourage those in opposition to this requirement to reach out to state senators and delegates to express their opposition.	SMA	23/Cheryl Cort	No change.		
H5	A detailed site plan should be approved before a property can be upzoned.	Comprehensive zoning (to include “upzoning” and “downzoning”) are regulated by Section 27-3500 of the Zoning Ordinance. The Decision Standards (27-3503(b)(5)) for a sectional map amendment do not require a detailed site plan to be developed for rezoning nor would it be feasible. The purpose of rezoning by the County is simply to change the	N/A	53/Leonard Lazarus	No change.		



II. I: Testimony Outside the Scope of the Staff Draft Sector Plan and/or Proposed SMA

Issue No.	Summary of Issue	Staff Response	Plan/SMA Cross-References	Exhibit #/Name	Staff Recommendations	Planning Board Action	District Council Action
		zoning designation, not to review specific development plans. A Sectional Map Amendment is a high-level zoning decision, meant to accommodate broader land use objectives and give developers flexibility to apply for development applications suited to that zone. Requiring a DSP, which includes detailed architectural drawings and site-specific information would effectively turn a zoning change into a quasi-development review, unnecessarily complicating the process. This would add time and cost without serving any meaningful planning purpose, as the site plan review comes later in the development process when specific projects are proposed.					
H6	A definition for “gross tract area” should be added to the Zoning Ordinance and the existing definition of “net lot area” should be modified to increase density outside the County’s regulated floodplains, as portions of a property outside the floodplain could potentially support additional density.	This recommendation falls outside the scope of this Draft Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment.	N/A	V7,10 /Casey Cirner	No change.		

III. List of Speakers

Verbal Testimony #	Speaker Signup #	Name	Title	On Behalf Of
V1	1.	Cheryl Cort		Coalition for Smarter Growth
V2	2.	Peter Stockus (Absent)		
V3	3.	Joseph Jakuta (Absent)		
V4	4.	Amanda Huron (Absent)		
V5	5.	Alan Socha		Self
V6	6.	Brandon Todd	Senior Director for Corporate Public Policy	Washington Gas Light Company
V7	7.	Casey Cirner	Attorney, Miles and Stockridge	Queenstown Apartments Limited Partnership
V8	8.	Midgett S. Parker	Attorney, Law Office of Midgett S. Parker, P.A.	Washington Gas Light Company
V9	9.	Alan Jones		Self
V10	10.	Shea Winsett		Self

IV. List of Exhibits

Exhibit No.	Item Description	Received From	Date
1.	Second Draft West Hyattsville Queens Chapel Sector Plan	M-NCPPC	10/1/2024
2.	Planning Board Resolution – Proposed Sectional Map Amendment (SMA)	M-NCPPC	10/1/2024
3.	2015 <i>Greater Chillum Community Study</i>	M-NCPPC	10/1/2024
4.	2006 <i>Approved Transit District Development Plan and Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone</i> (By reference: available online)	M-NCPPC	10/1/2024
5.	2004 <i>Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Prince George’s County Gateway Arts District</i> (By reference: available online)	M-NCPPC	10/1/2024
6.	1994 <i>Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Area 68</i> (By reference: available online)	M-NCPPC	10/1/2024
7.	1989 <i>Approved Master Plan for Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt and Vicinity and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 65, 66, and 67</i> (By reference: available online)	M-NCPPC	10/1/2024
8.	First Draft West Hyattsville Queens Chapel Sector Plan	M-NCPPC	10/1/2024
9.	Errata Sheet for the West Hyattsville-Queens Chapel Sector Plan SMA (as of October 1, 2024)	M-NCPPC	10/1/2024
10.	Letter regarding Sector Plan recommendations for Queenstown Apartments	Casey L. Cirner and Phillip A. Hummel, Miles & Stockbridge	6/27/2024
11.	Email supporting Sector Plan and SMA with refinements	Melissa Schweisguth	9/30/2024
12.	Email in opposition to SMA recommendations for Queens Chapel Manor	Jennifer Kubit	10/15/2024
13.	Request for rezoning and agent affidavit for 2130 Chillum Road	Midgett S. Parker	8/30/2024
14.	Email in opposition to SMA recommendations for Queens Chapel Manor	Alexi Boado	10/16/2024
15.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Christopher Higham	7/03/2024
16.	E-comment in support of the plan	Mrs. Harris	9/22/2024
17.	Email and letter in support of the plan with recommendations	Jeff Ulysse, City Planner, City of Hyattsville	9/23/2024
18.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Pat Doyen	9/25/2024
19.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Henry Renze	9/25/2024
20.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Yohannes Bennehoff	9/25/2024
21.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Moira McCauley	9/25/2024
22.	Email and letter in support of the plan with recommendations	John Smith	9/25/2024
23.	E-comment & support letter in support of the plan	Cheryl Cort, Policy Director, Coalition for Smarter Growth (CSG)	9/25/2024
24.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Laura Ehle	9/26/2024
25.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Danny Schaible	9/26/2024
26.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Daniel Walter Rowlands	9/26/2024
27.	E-comment with concerns about the plan	Alan Socha	9/27/2024
28.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Lisa Frank	9/28/2024
29.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Dan Behrend	9/29/2024
30.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Thomas Zeller	9/29/2024
31.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Bernard Holloway	9/30/2024
32.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Jessica McBirney	9/30/2024
33.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Steven Hartig	9/30/2024
34.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Joseph Kane	9/30/2024
35.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Gannon Sprinkle	9/30/2024
36.	E-comment	Enrique Zurita	9/30/2024
37.	E-comment in support of the plan	Dan Behrend	9/30/2024
38.	Email in opposition of the plan with recommendations	Zak Elyasi, RAZ Development	9/30/2024
39.	E-comment in support of the plan	Joseph Kane	9/30/2024
40.	E-comment and support in support of the plan	Peter Stockus	9/30/2024
41.	Email in support of the plan	Jacob Goldberg	10/1/2024
42.	Email and letter in support of the plan with recommendations along with affidavit	Amanda Huron	10/1/2024
43.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Elissa Woodbury	10/1/2024
44.	Email and letter in opposition of the plan	Alan Socha	10/4/2024
45.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Brendan Wray	10/12/2024

IV. List of Exhibits

Exhibit No.	Item Description	Received From	Date
46.	Email and letter in support of the plan with recommendations	Joseph Jakuta, Prince George's Sierra Club	10/12/2024
47.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Daniel Broder	10/13/2024
48.	Email and letter in opposition of the plan	Shea Winsett	10/13/2024
49.	Email in support of the plan with recommendations	Lindsey Mendelson	10/15/2024
50.	Email in opposition of the plan	Jenny Wesberry	10/15/2024
51.	Email in opposition of the plan	Marcus Shappirio	10/15/2024
52.	Email in support of the plan	Will Koper	10/16/2024
53.	Email and letter in opposition of the plan	Leonard Lazarus	10/16/2024
54.	Email and letter in opposition of the plan with recommendations	Sally Gifford	10/16/2024
55.	Rezoning Request Form: Washington Gas Light Company Property Address: 2130 Chillum Road, Hyattsville, MD 20782 Current: AG Zone Request: IE Zone	Midgett S. Parker, Law Office of Midgett Parker, P.A.	10/16/2024