

A M E N D E D R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Conceptual Site Plans pursuant to Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

*WHEREAS, [in consideration of evidence presented at] a public hearing was held before the Planning Board on September 28, 2006, regarding Conceptual Site Plan CSP-05006 for West Hyattsville Commons, [the Planning Board finds:] and the Planning Board approved CSP-05006 and TCPI/19/06, and;

*WHEREAS, District Council reviewed the Detailed Site Plan CSP-05006 on March 12, 2007; and

*WHEREAS, the District Council remanded the case to the Planning Board to address issues as stated in the Remand Order, (see Finding No. 13) and

*WHEREAS, the Planning Board having considered the evidence presented at a second hearing on the case held on February 28, 2008 and evaluated the CSP-05006 in regard to the issues contained in the Order of Remand, the Planning Board finds:

[1. **Request:** ~~The subject application proposes a mixed residential development with office/retail components. The plans propose 193 single family attached units (townhouses), 1,170 multifamily units, 226,620 square feet of office space, 69,000 square feet of retail space, and a 23,000 square foot community center. The residential units are proposed as three products: 864 condominium units distributed over 7 four and six story buildings; 193 townhouse units distributed over 19 three to four story buildings; 306 multifamily rental units in 1 five story, mid-rise building. The office component is proposed as one 12 story, high-rise building with adjoining multilevel parking structures and one 7 story, mid-rise building with an adjoining multilevel parking structure. The retail component is located on the street level of two residential multi-family buildings, one office building, and one parking garage structure.]~~

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

*1. **Request:** The subject application proposes a mixed residential development with office/retail components. The plans propose 130–225 single-family attached units (townhouses dwellings), 1,000–1,270 multifamily/three-family dwelling units, 200,000–230,000 square feet of office space, 60,000–85,000 square feet of retail space, and a 13,000-square-foot community center. The residential units are proposed as three product types: townhouses, three-family dwellings and multifamily units. The office component is proposed as mid- to high-rise buildings with integrated multilevel parking structures located over the proposed WMATA Kiss and Ride facilities. The majority of the retail component is located on the street, surrounding Hamilton Square, combined with various multiuse buildings.

*[2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	M X T/TDO	M X T/TDO
Use	Metro Station	Mixed Use —193 single family attached, 1,170 multifamily units, 226,620 square feet office space, a 23,000 square foot community center, and 69,380 square feet of retail space
Acreage	44.56	44.56
Square footage	N/A	4,000,000}

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~striketrough~~ indicate deleted language

*2. **Development Data Summary¹**

	<u>EXISTING</u>	<u>PROPOSED</u>
<u>Zone(s)</u>	<u>M-X-T/TDO</u>	<u>M-X-T/TDO</u>
<u>Use(s)</u>	<u>Metro Station</u>	<u>Mixed Use</u> <u>130–225 single-family attached,</u> <u>1,000–1,270 multifamily/three-family</u> <u>dwelling units,</u> <u>200,000–230,000 sq. ft. office</u> <u>13,000 sq. ft. community center,</u> <u>60,000–85,000 sq. ft. retail</u>
<u>Acreage</u>	<u>44.57</u>	<u>44.57</u>
<u>Area within 100 year floodplain</u>	<u>24.7</u>	<u>2.61</u>
<u>Net tract area</u>	<u>19.87</u>	<u>41.96</u>
<u>Dwelling Units</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>single-family attached 130–225</u> <u>multifamily units/three-family dwelling</u> <u>1,000–1,270</u> <u>Total 1,130–1,400</u>
<u>Lots</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>135–150</u>
<u>Parcels</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10–12</u>
<u>Square Footage/GFA</u>	<u>WMATA structure</u> <u>unknown</u>	<u>2,300,000–2,558,888</u>
<u>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</u> <u>Based on 1,827,777 square feet</u> <u>of net tract area in the M-X-T</u> <u>Zone²</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>1.2585–1.4000</u>

¹For a comparison of the previously proposed development data to the revised Conceptual Site Plan, see Finding No. 17.

²Additional FAR may be provided at the time of DSP review pursuant to Section 27-545

3. **Location:** The subject site is located at the West Hyattsville Metro Station, northwest of the intersection of Ager Road and Hamilton Road. The site is located within Planning Area 68.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

4. **Surroundings and Use:** The adjacent properties are as follows:

Ager Road binds the property to the northeast along with existing single-family detached homes in the subdivision known as Queens Chapel Manor and small commercial establishments along Ager Road.

The property is bounded on the southeast by Hamilton Street and Jamestown Road along with existing commercial and institutional establishments.

The property directly to the southwest consists of woodland and open areas along the northern edge of the Northern Branch of the Anacostia River.

Existing multifamily housing in the Kirkwood Village subdivision bound the property to the northwest. Two streets, Kirkwood Place and Nicholson Street, terminate at the edge of the property.

5. **Previous Approvals:** The 2006 *Transit District Development Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone* was approved by the Prince George's County Council on May 23, 2006, per CR-24-2006. On July 18, 2006, the Prince George's County Council approved several amendments to the approved plan per CR-59-2006.

*6. **Design Features:** [~~The conceptual site plan is proposing the following:~~]

[Residential	193 single family attached units (townhouses)
	1,170 multifamily units
Community Center	23,000 square feet
Retail	69,380 square feet
Office	226,620 square feet
Total retail/office proposed	296,000 square feet]

The conceptual site plan was developed to generally conform to the requirements of the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP). Located next to the existing West Hyattsville Metro Station, this neighborhood is anticipated to be the most active of the three planned in the Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ). A diverse mix of residential, office and retail uses is planned, with buildings ranging in height from three to ten stories. A street pattern with public open spaces was developed to organize a manageable, pedestrian-friendly neighborhood.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

WMATA Facility

The existing land use on the east side is the West Hyattsville Metro Station with short- and long-term commuter parking lots and a bus transit facility. A requirement of the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority (WMATA) is for all existing facilities to be replaced on a one-to-one basis for them to be operational during the site construction.

*The WMATA-structured parking facility is located to the northeast of the existing station within a mixed use building (Building C). This area was the most logical location based upon the conceptual design developed in the TDDP and ~~[the contractual]~~ WMATA requirements on how the proposed facility is to operate. [This garage location] The Kiss and Ride facilities are located in the ground level of Building F to the south of the existing station. The location of the WMATA garage; the Kiss and Ride operation; and the bus operations (located between Buildings A and C) offers the transit commuter easy access to the station and allows bus and vehicle traffic flow. It also provides a logical process for phasing. The centrally located garage location provides a relatively empty facility to be used in evenings and weekends by local retailers and for public events.

*To maximize the development potential for the remainder of the site, the garage was designed to the minimum size possible that met WMATA's requirements. ~~[The bus drop-off area and bicycle parking are located on the ground level, short term parking is on the second level, and long term parking is located on levels three to five. Kiss and ride and taxi pick up access are located in front of the station as well as Hamilton Square, the public square.]~~

The days and times that buses and vehicles use the area was taken into consideration, along with the use by residents, office workers, and shoppers. Based upon WMATA's requirement for having buses enter their facility separate from vehicles, Jamestown Road is the primary access for the buses. This is the present bus route. Short- and long-term parking would access from the next proposed northern intersections off Ager Road. This location is from a new street, as is envisioned in the illustrative master plan.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~striketrough~~ indicate deleted language

Hamilton Square (East Side)

*Hamilton Square is the physical and visual core for the West Hyattsville community. The square is flanked by mixed-use retail, office, and residential buildings. Ground floor retail is located in the buildings facing Hamilton Square except for the existing station [~~building owned by WMATA~~]. The design/scale of the buildings in and around [~~Jamestown~~] Hamilton Square [~~is~~] should be as follows:

- ~~*[•] Block A: 4 to 5 story WMATA and parking structure.~~
- ~~• Block B: 4 story residential building.~~
- ~~• Block C: First floor retail with 4 story residential.~~
- ~~• Block D: 4 story residential building.~~
- ~~• Block E: 9 story office building with ground level retail. Includes 6 story office over 3 story parking structure.~~
- ~~• Block F: 6 to 10 story residential building.]~~
- Block A: 6-story building with a community building and ground level retail facing Hamilton Square and office uses in the upper levels.
- Block B: 4-story residential building.
- *• Block C: 6-story building with first floor retail and the WMATA parking garage. Residential uses on the upper levels..
- *• Block D: 5-6-story residential building with retail on the first level facing Hamilton Square.
- *• Block E: 4-story residential building.
- *• Block F: 8-12-story office building with first floor retail uses facing Hamilton Square, and the WMATA Kiss and Ride operations.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~striketrough~~ indicate deleted language

~~*[The heights of the buildings provide a transition between the existing neighborhood to the east and Hamilton Square. The lower scale mixed-use buildings are along Ager Road and Hamilton Street. The nine-story office building with ground floor retail is at the visual terminus of Hamilton Street. The ten-story residential building is located in close proximity to the station and will provide first rate views in the round.]~~

~~*Retail is proposed to be located in the buildings facing the square, except the WMATA station [parking facility. Additional retail extends one block along Ager Road, in Building C. Street-level residential units will be two stories within a taller building]. This will provide security and animation of the streetscape along the heavily traveled streets. [Living room, kitchen and dining rooms will be on the first floor; bedrooms on the second floor. These units will have the option for direct street access, although daily access for these units be from the internal hallway.]~~

~~*It is anticipated that Hamilton Square will have numerous roles and functions for passive and active activities. The square will be anchored with a water feature, a large grassy open space, and sitting areas. The types of paving materials will be precast pavers, Belgium block, granite pavers, and/or brick. The final design of Hamilton Square will be reviewed at the time of Detailed Site Plan.~~

~~*[**Hamilton** **West Hyattsville Commons Civic Green (West Side)**]~~

~~*The west side of [~~Hamilton Square~~] West Hyattsville Commons is a residential neighborhood[.][~~the focus being a residential civic green, directly opposite Hamilton Square.~~] Residents walking home from Metro, shopping and/or work will be able to use an existing pedestrian underpass to access the neighborhood on a daily basis. (See discussion below under Public Squares/Spaces.)~~

~~*[~~The Civic Green will be an inviting public space while also serving the purpose as a gateway to the Metro station from the west. This square has been designed on a neighborhood scale and includes a variety of landscape details. The plan includes street trees lining the outer edges of the area with a centrally located lawn panel. Also included in the design is a variety of groundcover and shrubs, benches, lighting, signage, and paving. Low impact design (LID) stormwater management techniques are anticipated to be incorporated into the civic green and to be utilized throughout the site.~~]~~

~~*[~~The residential units in this neighborhood will be owner-occupied for the most part. Only Building C, on the east side, is a rental building. The buildings have been conceptually designed to provide for the appropriate scale for a residential community. The buildings will follow the same guidelines as outlined for the east side. Additional detail follows below.~~]~~

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

***Architectural Design: [~~Hamilton Square~~] West Hyattsville Commons (East Side)**

The conceptual design of the buildings, contemporary art deco, was influenced by the historical interpretation of the area. The buildings are both contemporary classical in their design and proportions. A variety of colors and materials will be used to provide interest and a specific character for this area. The proportions of buildings five stories or less will be vertical, broken into numerous elements within the skin of the building. The exterior walls will have bay windows, entrances into ground level residential units, display windows, Juliet-style balconies, and other features that will provide visual interest at the pedestrian level.

Buildings over five stories will be monolithic with one design theme and will follow the same architectural vocabulary. The mix of heights, materials, and architectural composition will add diversity to this neighborhood.

***Architectural Design: [~~Hamilton Civic Green~~] West Hyattsville Commons (West Side)**

*The conceptual design for this area will follow both the character developed on the east side but will be more traditional in character. The heights will range from a residential scale of three- to four-stories for townhomes to a minimum of four stories for multifamily [~~condominiums~~] structures. To minimize the potential impact of noise, the [~~condominiums~~] multifamily structures have been designed with [~~hallways~~] parking structures facing the tracks. Since it is important for the walls of these buildings to be animated, the location, scale and number of windows will be developed and reviewed during the detailed site plan review process.

The townhomes have garages accessed from alleys, except for townhomes that have been designed to close the corners of alleys. To minimize the view of alleys in certain locations, numerous townhomes at the street corners have been rotated 90 degrees. The design of these units will provide diversity in the community. The corner unit townhomes will be premium residential units and *[~~will~~] may require two integral parking spaces; therefore, these units *[~~will~~] may be the only front-loaded units. They are located near the sidewalk so the opportunity for tandem parking does not exist.

*Due to the high water table all multifamily [~~condominiums~~] structures will be built on concrete slabs. The condominiums have been designed to be located [~~over~~] adjacent to a parking deck. The entire [~~four-stories~~] facades that face streets and/or public squares will be designed to provide an attractive streetscape.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

Public Squares/Spaces

*Besides the square and civic green described above, a neighborhood square is centrally located on the west side of [~~Hamilton Square~~] West Hyattsville Commons. Residential-scale townhomes will front this third major public space. [~~A community building for the exclusive use of the residents will be situated within this square, too.~~]

The residents of this community will have direct access to the stream valley park along the Northwest Branch. A comprehensive walkway/path system along the Northwest Branch will be integrated and connected to the residential sidewalks. Townhomes fronting the stream valley park will provide for an upscale residential environment for the neighborhood and will allow easy access to the regional park. A bicycle path will be provided between the street and the park.

*Numerous pedestrian scale spaces have been incorporated on the rooftops of the parking decks in five residential buildings. The private open spaces will provide a visual haven for residences facing these spaces. The conceptual design for these areas also provides for one of the LID techniques envisioned in the TDDP—green roofs. [~~However, staff recommends that green roofs not be located on the top of garages where they would reduce available recreational space.~~]

Streets/Parking

*The streetscape has been well designed to act as a unifying link between the existing community and [~~Hamilton Square~~] West Hyattsville Commons. The scale and details of the streets, [Sheet 46], shows a well-designed interconnective network. Appropriate street sections have been developed that are coordinated with the TDDP. The types of paving materials for the sidewalks will be a combination of precast pavers, Belgium block, granite pavers and/or brick.

*The proposed streets have been aligned with the existing Nicholson Street and Kirkwood Place. [~~Nicholson Street extended will terminate at a square with a residential scale club house.~~] Kirkwood Place will extend to the western end of neighborhood plaza near the Metro station and terminate at the Northwest Branch of the Anacostia River.

*Parking for almost every use is located in parking decks, underground parking and/or individual garages. On-street parking has been provided for visitors and short-term parking on almost every street. Street sections have been designed for every street. Numerous additional street sections are proposed to account for situations not anticipated in the TDDP. The [~~additional street sections~~] determination of conformance to the intent and standards set forth in the TDDP will be done at Detailed Site Plan.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

***~~[Development Standards Review~~**

~~No development standards were submitted for review by staff.~~

~~**Comment:** Staff recommends that the applicant submit design guidelines and standards in response to the Transit District Development Plan prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan.]~~

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The proposed mixed-use development is a permitted use in the M-X-T Zone. The conceptual site plan must comply with the following findings listed in Section 27-546(d), Site Plans, of the Zoning Ordinance.

(1) The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this Division;

~~*[In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that]~~~~[t]~~The proposed development in the West Hyattsville Commons will be in general conformance with the purposes and other provisions of the M-X-T Zone if the conditions of approval are adopted. West Hyattsville Commons furthers this purpose of the M-X-T Zone due to its proximity to the West Hyattsville Metro Station. The proposed development will create a destination and focal point for the West Hyattsville community by implementation of a new town center with a main street corridor enhanced by a 24-hour environment created by the integration of retail, commercial, and residential components along the main street.

(2) The proposed development has an outward orientation, which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation;

~~*[In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that]~~ The development proposed within the TDOZ has an outward orientation to the West Hyattsville community to create a focal point in the county at this Metro station. The design of the site will create a sense of place for this community through building height, orientation, and architecture.

It is also internally oriented to the main street corridor, forming the heart of the town square. The development then gradually transitions from commercial office to high-density residential to lower-density residential to be compatible with the lower-density residential development to the north, east and west of the site.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

~~*[Comment:]~~ The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed development has an outward orientation that is either physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation in the conceptual site plan.

(3) The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity;

Development within the vicinity of the subject site consists of residential and commercial uses along Ager Road and Queens Chapel Road located to the northwest and southeast of the property. The proposed project is compatible with this development by focusing its single-family detached and attached uses in this location as well.

The proposed development then begins the density transition adjacent to the Kirkwood community for continued compatibility.

Northwest of the subject site, it is anticipated that these sites will consist of mixed uses similar in design to that proposed for the subject site, which will continue the compatibility to the western property line.

~~*[Comment:]~~ The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity in the conceptual site plan.

(4) The mix of uses, and the arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements, reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability;

~~*[In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that]~~ [t]The proposed development [is intended to] will provide a self-contained, 24-hour environment of residential and commercial uses by integrating the town square as the focal point of the center of the site with office, retail and residential uses gathered around the development's focal point.

~~*[Comment: The applicant shall submit design guidelines and standards that will demonstrate the mix of uses and the arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements would be certain to reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality.]~~

(5) If the development is staged, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases;

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

~~*[In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that, as proposed, a development group of “Blocks” will constitute a phase. Each “Block Group,” or phase, is designed as a separate but integrated neighborhood unit and is, thereby, self-sufficient but allowing for staged integration of additional phases based on market demand and user identification.]~~

~~*[Comment: The applicant has not submitted a phasing schedule and has stated that the phasing is the construction of any development “Block Group” on the site plans with no specific time schedule.]~~

*The proposed phasing plan for the development based on the revised CSP in response to the remand order is as follows:

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

*However, at the Planning Board hearing on February 28, 2008, that applicant provided the following revised phasing plan for the development of the property as an alternative to the staff’s recommendation:

The phasing schedule for the project shall be as follows:

- a. Phase I (a),(b) and (c) shall consist of Buildings/Blocks A, B and C and Hamilton Square.
- b. Phase II shall consist of Building/Blocks G, H, K–R inclusive.
- c. Phase III shall consist of Building F
- d. Phase IV shall consist of Buildings D, E, I and J.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

*Buildings D and F may be issued a building permit concurrent with or earlier than a permit for any other buildings within earlier Phases so as to facilitate the completion of buildings around Hamilton Square.

*Buildings within Phase II may be issued building permits any time after the construction of the WMATA garage and the interim WMATA Kiss-and-Ride facilities and after the Applicant provides the Department of Environmental Resources with a certification from a third party inspector verifying that Building A's foundation and first four (4) floors and walls have been constructed in accordance with its permit.

*Except as otherwise provided above, Buildings within Phase IV may be issued building permits any time after the Applicant provides the Department of Environmental Resources with a certification from a third party inspector verifying that Building F's foundation and first four (4) floors and walls have been constructed in accordance with its permit.

*Building B may be deferred to Phase II if the Applicant is pursuing the acquisition of Parcel A-9 (5600 Ager Road).

*The Planning Board agreed with the Applicant's proposed timing for the construction and found that the phasing as proposed would provide that each building phase would be designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for the effective integration of subsequent phases.

~~[A condition in the recommendations section defines the required phasing necessary to encourage each building phase to be designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases.]~~

(6) The pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development;

~~*[In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that]~~ [a] An integrated pedestrian system will be designed to promote safe pedestrian travel from parking areas to residential structures and commercial uses and from residential units to on-site recreational and open space areas and the residential community centers.

*~~[Comment:]~~ The applicant has demonstrated that the pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development in the conceptual site plan.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

- (8) **On a Conceptual Site Plan for property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a Sectional Map Amendment, transportation facilities that are existing; that are under construction; or for which one hundred percent (100%) of construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, or the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or will be provided by the applicant, will be adequate to carry anticipated traffic for the proposed development. The finding by the Council of adequate transportation facilities at the time of Conceptual Site Plan approval shall not prevent the Planning Board from later amending this finding during its review of subdivision plats.**

Comment: The Transportation Planning Section concludes that adequate transportation facilities would exist to serve the proposed development as required if the proposed conceptual site plan application is approved with the conditions found in the recommendation section.

8. **Required Findings of Section 27-276(b) for a Conceptual Site Plan:** The proposed conceptual site plan will represent a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use if the proposed modifications and conditions in the Recommendation Section below are fulfilled.
9. **West Hyattsville Transit District Development Plan and Amendment CR-59-2006 (DR-1) Conformance:** The applicant submitted a conceptual site plan that does not conform to the TDDP development standards. The following are specific components and standards that are not in conformance with the TDDP and TDOZ:

Plan Elements

- a. Environment—the following plan elements were either excluded or not provided in the conceptual site plan:
- i. One of two neighborhood parks at the intersection of Ager Road and a future LID Street;
 - ii. Multifamily residential entry plazas along the western margin of the North Park Neighborhood;
 - iii. Five pocket parks within the North Park and Hamilton Square neighborhoods;
 - iv. Four green streets; three in the North Park neighborhood and one through the Hamilton Square Neighborhood.
- b. Transportation—the following plan elements were either excluded or not provided in the conceptual site plan:
- i. An integrated network of historical streets providing critical linkages between neighborhoods;
 - ii. Functional hierarchy of internal streets for local access that link neighborhoods.

- c. Low-Impact Development—The following plan elements were either excluded or not provided in the conceptual site plan:
 - i. Green roofs located on the residential, commercial and office buildings.

Development Standards

- a. The applicant did not provide design standards to determine if the conceptual site plan and building elevations correspond to the following TDDP Standards:
 - i. Building Envelop and Block Standards;
 - ii. Streetscape Standards;
 - iii. Architectural Standards;
 - iv. Parking Standards.

*Comment: In regard to the revised Conceptual Site Plan submitted in response to the remand order and its conformance of the plans to the TDDP, see Finding No.14.

- 10. **Landscape Manual:** The proposal is subject to the requirements of the *Landscape Manual* as modified by the TDDP. At DSP, exact conformance with the manual will be analyzed.
- 11. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** This property is *[exempt] subject to the provisions of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the property has *[less] more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland. A Type I tree conservation plan (TCPI/19/06) was submitted with the conceptual site plan application *(See Environmental discussion below).

~~*[Comment: No additional information is required concerning the TCPI.]~~

- 12. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are as follows:
 - a. **The City of Hyattsville** issued a memorandum dated July 13, 2006, discussing the concerns of the city and the Council of the City of Hyattsville regarding West Hyattsville Commons and concluding that the City opposed the Plan in its current form.

The following is a summary of the issues of concern:

- i. Integration and connectivity among the development areas
- ii. Mix of uses (overwhelmingly multifamily)

*Denotes Amendment
Underlining indicates new language
[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

- iii. Vitality of the town square area
- iv. Size of building footprints and low density of certain buildings
- v. Impact of new residents on recreation amenities
- vi. Location of community center

*In regard to the revised Conceptual Site Plan submitted in response to the remand order, the City of Hyattsville, City Council did review the project and participated in developer presentations, but no official comment on the proposal was authorized prior to the Planning Board hearing.

- *b. The **Community Planning Division** provided the following comments on [~~this~~] the original application (O'Connor to Estes, August 2, 2006). Excerpts from the memorandum are provided below regarding issues that have not been overtaken by events:

TDDP approval status—The 2006 *Transit District Development Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone* was approved by the Prince George's County Council on May 23, 2006, per CR-24-2006. On July 18, 2006, the Prince George's County Council approved several amendments to the approved plan per CR-59-2006.

Land Use

- CR-59-2006, which amends the West Hyattsville TDDP, was approved July 17, 2006, and provides per Amendment 6 that the developer of the blocks identified on Map 12 (the Block Registration Plan, Page 31) shall be required to construct a new 13,000-square-foot community multipurpose use facility and the location shall be determined at conceptual site plan.

Circulation

- The TDDP (Map 13, page 32, TDDP) envisioned several east/west vehicular connections at Hamilton Street or on Park Drive.

Applicant's Proposal: The applicant's proposal does not show any vehicular connectivity between each side of the Metro tracks. Park Drive is shown as an internal residential loop road up to Building H2 where it becomes a 20-foot right-of-way pedestrian street and a fire lane access. Pavers, rather than asphalt, reinforce the pedestrian boulevard connection to the stream valley area, serving as a passive recreation space with enhanced views of the stream valley and associated wetlands.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~striketrough~~ indicate deleted language

Staff Comment: The TDDP recommends an east/west connection via an internal street identified as Park Drive per the circulation plan and the TDDP Street hierarchy plan (Maps 8 and 9, pages 20 and 21, respectively in the TDDP). Characteristics of the internal street type per Table 1, page 22 of the TDDP are: (1) primarily for local circulation and accessibility in residential areas, (2) narrow widths, and (3) low automobile speeds (maximum 20 mph). The applicant's proposal does not conform to the TDDP circulation Plan, Map 8, page 20.

- The TDDP envisions an LID through street connecting from Ager Road to Park Drive on the east side of the Metro. This connection is not shown in the applicant's plan.

Applicant's Proposal: The applicant's proposal provides a connection from Ager Road to Building F where the street Ts around the building, then connecting to the pedestrian street/fire lane access, and ultimately to the passive river walk along the stream valley.

Staff Comment: Staff concurs with the circulation from Ager Road around Building F and the connection to Park Drive. However, Park Drive should not be a limited access fire lane but an internal street type according to the characteristics per Table 1, page 22, of the TDDP.

- The TDDP envisions an LID through street connecting from Ager Road (street section 1-1) to Park Drive (street section 5-5) on the west side of the Metro.

Applicant's Proposal: The applicant's proposal provides a connection from Ager Road to Park Drive, however, the street sections are not in conformance with the TDDP street sections. The illustrative plan (page 13) provided by the applicant indicates that trees will be planted on both sides of the street on the proposed LID street (section 1-1) and Park Drive (section 5-5). However, the street sections (page 14 of proposal drawings) indicate that trees will be planted on the side of the street where buildings are proposed.

Staff Comment: The LID street (section 1-1, page 14 of proposal drawings) does not conform to the TDDP. The TDDP on page 74 shows a two-way traffic LID street separated by a landscaped swale. The applicant's street section indicates two-way travel on the east side of the swale and notes a swale but indicates no landscaping. The concern is that the proposed LID street becomes like so many subdivision streets that are intended to connect through to a future subdivision to create better overall circulation but ends up as just another cul-de-sac separating communities.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~striketrough~~ indicate deleted language

Architecture

Urban Design Comment: The Community Planning staff comments have been incorporated into the recommendation section.

*Comment: In regard to the revised Conceptual Site Plan submitted in response to the Remand Order and its conformance to the TDDP, see Finding No. 14.

- c. The **Department of Environmental Resources** has stated that the proposal is consistent with approved stormwater concept plan 45949-2005.
- *d. The **Environmental Planning Section** [has] reviewed the conceptual site plan for West Hyattsville Commons, CSP-05006, and the Type I tree conservation plan, received on June 14, 2006. After recent discussions with the applicant and department staff, this memo has been revised from comments provided in a June 23, 2006, correspondence. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of the conceptual site plan, CSP-05006, and Type I tree conservation plan, TCPI/19/06, subject to the conditions found at the end of this memorandum. [~~This memorandum supersedes all other correspondence from this section regarding the subject application.~~]

CONFORMANCE WITH THE WEST HYATTSVILLE SECTOR PLAN

The subject property is somewhat developed at this time due to the existence of the West Hyattsville Metro Station. It is located in the West Hyattsville Transit District Development Plan. It also contains regulated areas, evaluation areas, and network gaps as shown in the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan. While the sector plan does focus on sensitive areas and restoration of some natural areas, the primary vision for the subject site is high-density development containing a mix of retail and residential units within walking distance of the Metro Station.

It should be noted that approximately half of the 44.56-acre property is within the 100-year floodplain. This application proposes to provide most of the necessary fill from an off-site location, identified as the Chillum Park property, in order to reduce the on-site floodplain and create more developable land. A review of the conceptual site plan indicates that the proposed development will result in impacts to the entire area of the on-site 100-year floodplain.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

On May 20, 2006, the applicant met with staff and during that meeting a presentation was given that detailed how LID techniques will be incorporated into the proposed development in conformance with the West Hyattsville Sector Plan and TDOZ. The sector plan envisions the use of several types of LID, including green roofs, bioretention areas, filter strips, wetlands with micro-pools, and sand filters. A LID Plan and LID concept narrative were submitted with the revised CSP package. Below are recommendations of the sector plan (pages 15, 23, and 24) in bold followed by comments in plain text.

The LID concept envisioned for the West Hyattsville TDOZ is supported by the Prince Georges County Department of Environmental Resources, which has published several extensive manuals on LID...

The West Hyattsville TDDP stormwater management plan envisions an array of environmentally sensitive stormwater management techniques distributed through the entire TDOZ.

Although some conventional stormwater management techniques may be necessary due to the high volume of stormwater anticipated, the use of LID techniques will reduce run-off volumes and enhance the quality of stormwater before ultimately draining to the Northeast Branch. The stormwater management concept plan submitted with this application does not show any of the proposed LID techniques. A revised and approved stormwater management concept letter and plan, showing the incorporation of all proposed LID techniques, should be submitted prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision. All related plans should reflect the approved concept plan.

Recommended Condition: Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan, a revised and approved stormwater management concept letter and associated plans shall be submitted. The plan shall show the incorporation of all required LID techniques. The preliminary plan and revised TCPI shall reflect the elements of the concept plan.

The West Hyattsville Master Plan envisions four LID or “green” streets within the West Hyattsville TDOZ. The fourth LID street will run through the center of the Hamilton Square Neighborhood.

LID and green streets are streets lined with trees and integrated with the stormwater management system such that the stormwater runoff is treated prior to draining to adjacent stream systems. The West Hyattsville Master Plan contains an illustration of an LID street that includes a median that is 30 feet wide and contains a bioswale. For the purposes of the development of this site, a distinction is being made between LID streets and green streets. An LID street is a street that contains a median and street trees on both sides that are designed using LID techniques. The width of the various features shown on the LID street section in the West Hyattsville Master Plan should be used as a guide; the dimensions of the features shown may vary to accommodate proper LID techniques and a desirable urban landscape. The street on the westernmost portion of the site is designated on the LID design plan, dated June 5, 2006, as an LID street. More details regarding this design will be provided at time of detailed site plan review.

A green street is defined for the purposes of this review as a street that contains street trees on both sides that are designed using an underground, connected soil volume with tree grates at the surface. A green street does not contain a median. Stormwater is then directed using sheet flow into tree grates and the connected soil volumes are fitted with an under-drain system to handle excess run-off.

The LID plan dated June 5, 2006, shows various LID techniques, and for most of the techniques, shows where the techniques will be implemented. The LID plan states that street trees proposed along all major streets within the site will incorporate an LID technique. It does not specify which street trees will be used for LID techniques or what the design will entail, so clarification is needed. At a minimum, all proposed streets perpendicular to Northeast Branch should be designed as green streets. If other streets can also be designed using these techniques, then they should be considered as well.

The streets associated with the Hamilton Square neighborhood include Hamilton Street and Jamestown Road. The design of Jamestown Road contains a median lined with street trees where there is the opportunity to incorporate a bioretention swale or the underground, connected soil volume technique described above. According to the LID concept narrative, "This median can then be designed to accommodate vegetated filter swale with street trees." The use of this LID technique is not indicated for this specific area; however, at a minimum, the median of Jamestown Road should be designed with LID.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of the CSP, all proposed streets perpendicular to Northeast Branch that are not identified on the LID design plan dated June 5, 2006, as an LID Street shall be designed as green streets incorporating LID techniques with underground, connected soil volumes and surface tree grates. Prior to certification of the CSP, the LID plan shall be revised to show the location of the green streets and include a conceptual detail of the street tree installation including a plan view and cross section of the above and below ground features. Jamestown Road and Hamilton Street shall be designed as LID streets with medians that are designed with the same treatment unless another design is deemed more suitable.

Recommended Condition: At the time of the detailed site plan, the DSP shall show the details of each of the proposed LID techniques.

LID development in the TDOZ will be done primarily with living green roofs...

The LID plan shows only three of the seven residential buildings as having green roofs. The LID plan is a little confusing with regard to the placement of the green roofs. The label "13" for green roofs was placed over the open space areas of the buildings. These areas are not suitable for green roofs because they are being used as open space areas for recreation. Green roofs cannot be walked on and as such are not appropriate for recreation; the green roof area will be located on the top level of the buildings. This may be merely a drafting clarification that is needed and a condition is proposed below to provide this clarification.

The LID narrative states that "where space and grading allow, roof drains on nongreen roof buildings will be piped to vegetated filters within planters or bio-retention." This LID concept is consistent with the sector plan; however, the LID plan shows the symbol for "disconnectivity" (roof drain disconnects) on one building proposed to have a green roof and one that is not shown to have a green roof. Three other buildings do not have green roofs and are not shown to have roof drain disconnects. Clarification is needed regarding how the run-off from all the proposed buildings will be handled.

Recommended Condition: The preliminary plan shall address the specific location of green roofs for buildings B through H, as identified on the illustrative site plan stamped as received on June 14, 2006. No green roofs shall be located in the same areas where recreational open spaces are planned.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of the CSP, the LID plan shall be revised to illustrate how the run-off from each of the building roofs will be addressed, using the symbols shown on the plan dated June 5, 2006. The plan shall clearly show which buildings will be constructed with green roofs and what portion, conceptually, will be green.

The plan envisions extensive bio-retention areas located throughout the TDOZ, mostly within the LID street rights-of-way... and...wetlands and micro-pools being located primarily in the future open space areas along Chillum Road.

In addition to street rights-of-way, the CSP proposes to incorporate several types of bioretention in the proposed stormwater management ponds both located on the south portion of the site and adjacent to Northeast Branch. The illustrative plan shows the use of forebays, micro-pools, and low-flow channelization for two water quality ponds. These techniques will serve to control run-off, enhance water quality, and provide easy access for maintenance. According to the illustrative plan, LID plan, and TCPI, the design of the pond will appear to have a natural design with some submerged aquatic vegetation. The ponds will also serve as a visual amenity to the highly dense area; however, public access will be very limited. These design features are consistent with the TDOZ. Previous designs showed large, traditional detention ponds that have been redesigned to use LID technologies.

Comment: The CSP is consistent with the stormwater management concepts of the TDOZ.

As revisions are made to the plans submitted the revision boxes on each plan sheet shall be used to describe what revisions were made, when, and by whom.

1. A signed natural resources inventory (NRI), NRI/030/05, was submitted with this application. The NRI correctly reflects all of the required information and the TCPI submitted with the application is consistent with the NRI. The FSD indicates one forest stand totaling 1.75 acres. No specimen trees were found. The site contains regulated areas, evaluation areas, and gap areas within the countywide green infrastructure plan.

Comment: No further information regarding the natural resources inventory is required.

2. The 100-year floodplain that occurs on this site is associated with off-site streams in the Northeast Branch. The regulated areas, evaluation areas, and network gaps of the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan are located along the southern boundary of the site adjacent to a main tributary of the Northeast Branch. This stream system is within the Anacostia Watershed and as such, these features are required to be protected under Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations.

A variation request in conformance with Section 24-113 of the Subdivision Regulations will be required during the review of the preliminary plan for the proposed impacts to the expanded buffer. The design should avoid any impacts to streams, wetlands and their associated buffers unless the impacts are essential for the development as a whole. Staff generally will not support impacts to

sensitive environmental features that are not associated with essential development activities. Essential development includes such features as public utility lines (including sewer and stormwater outfalls), street crossings, and so forth, which are mandated for public health and safety; nonessential activities are those such as grading for lots, stormwater management ponds, parking areas, and so forth, which do not relate directly to public health, safety or welfare.

The conceptual TCPI proposes impacts to the entire portion of the on-site expanded buffer. This proposed development as shown appears to be in conformance with the sector plan with respect to the mixed-use high density envisioned for this site, and the plan is in conformance with the Green Infrastructure Plan's policies regarding allowing flexibility where development is planned.

At this time not all of the plans show the same building layout. In particular, the TCPI and the LID plan show two different building and street layouts. All the plans must show the same layouts.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of the CSP, all plans shall be revised to show the same building and street layout as that shown on the CSP.

3. An extensive amount of fill will be required to create developable area outside the floodplain. The plan proposes on-site and off-site floodplain excavation with the intent that all proposed buildings will be elevated at least one foot above the 100-year floodplain.

According to a floodplain compensatory excavation study for the site, received on March 14, 2006, the proposed fill material within the floodplain is 72,292 cubic yards. The plan proposes to excavate approximately 18,893 cubic yards on-site and 64,905 cubic yards off-site. The proposed elevation of the 100-year floodplain has been shown on all plans.

The proposed location of the off-site excavation will occur on two parcels of the Chillum Park property, located approximately 1,500 feet east of the subject site. The excavation will result in two water quality ponds that will also serve as a park amenity.

The park is part of an approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/97/93. According to Sheet 9 of the off-site excavation plan, some woodland clearing may be necessary to excavate the pond; however, the aerials show that most of the site is cleared. In addition to the water quality ponds, an athletic field is proposed for the park. The proposed athletic field is located adjacent to the stream valley. It is not clear how the field will impact the regulated areas of the stream. There may also be impacts to the adjacent stream for the necessary stormwater outfalls associated with the proposed ponds. A natural resources

inventory is necessary to evaluate the existing environmental features of this site, and a revised Type II tree conservation plan will be required. The Natural resources inventory for the park will be requested with the preliminary plan application and the TCPII revisions will be provided with the DSP review package.

Recommended Condition: Prior to acceptance of the DSP, the application package shall be inspected to ensure that it includes a revised Type II tree conservation plan for the Chillum Park property that shows the regulated features, all proposed clearing, a clear limit of disturbance, and all information required on a TCPII.

4. The property is subject to the requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because the site is more than 40,000 square feet in size and contains more 10,000 square feet of existing woodland. A conceptual Type I tree conservation plan, TCPI/19/06, has been submitted and reviewed.

The conceptual TCPI has proposed to clear the entire site including all on-site woodland within the 100-year floodplain and approximately 6.01 acres off-site woodlands. The woodland conservation threshold has been correctly calculated at 6.30 acres, or 15 percent of the net tract. The plan proposes to meet the 15.95-acre woodland conservation requirement by providing off-site mitigation for the entire requirement. Although no woodland conservation is being provided on-site, the TCPI may have the opportunity to use the proposed street trees described in the LID concept plan to meet some of the on-site requirement.

Sheet 5 of the conceptual TCPI shows off-site clearing of woodland east of the proposed pond; however, no development is proposed for this area. It is not necessary to clear trees in areas that will not be disturbed. The trees in this location should be preserved because it serves as a buffer for the Northeast Branch.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan, the TCPI shall be revised to eliminate the site clearing of woodland east of the proposed water quality pond. The TCPI shall also be labeled a "conceptual Type I tree conservation plan" because it is subject to change at the time of preliminary plan review.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of the CSP, the TCPI shall be revised to add the following note: "All street trees used in conjunction with low impact development techniques may be used toward meeting the woodland conservation requirements. The credit shall be calculated using the anticipated tree canopy at ten year's growth."

5. According to the “Prince George’s County Soil Survey” the principal soils on the site are in the Codorus and Elsinboro series. These soils are highly erodible.

Comment: This information is provided for the applicant’s benefit. A soils report may be required by the Prince George’s County Department of Environmental Resources during the permit process review.

6. The site will be significantly impacted by noise generated from the West Hyattsville Metro Station, which bisects the property. Any future development will require the submittal of a vibration analysis and noise study. The centerline of the existing railroad track should be identified and the location of the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour should be shown on the TCPI.

It is not clear how noise will affect the proposed residential structures. It will not be possible to mitigate outdoor noise levels in outdoor activity areas; however, the interior shells of all residential structures should use the proper materials to ensure that noise has been mitigated to 45dBA Ldn or less.

Recommended Condition: A Phase I noise study shall be included as part of the preliminary plan application. The noise study shall address the location of the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn contour and the contour shall be shown on the revised TCPI. A Phase II noise study shall be provided with the detailed site plan.

7. A stormwater management concept approval letter and associated plan were included with the submission. The plan as submitted is consistent with the TCPI but does not show the proposed LID concepts. As previously discussed, a revised stormwater management concept approval letter and associated plan showing the incorporation of the LID concepts will be required prior to preliminary plan approval.

The plan proposes two water quality ponds. The associated outfalls for these ponds are not shown on the TCPI. Outfalls will be necessary to safely convey stormwater to the adjacent stream and should be shown on the plan.

Comment: Proposed conditions above address the stormwater concept plan issue.

*Urban Design Comment: The [~~Community~~] Environmental Planning staff comments have been incorporated into the recommendation section of this staff report. See Finding No. 18 for comments from Environmental Planning staff in regard to the revised Conceptual Site Plan submitted in response to the remand order.

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

- e. The stormwater management concept approval letter dated January 10, 2006, includes conditions of approval. The requirement for stormwater management concept approval will be met through subsequent reviews by the Department of Environmental Resources. No further information is required at this time with regard to stormwater management.
- f. The **Subdivision Section** referral reply comments dated September 18, 2006, stated that pursuant to Section 24-107 of the Subdivision Regulations a preliminary plan of subdivision is required for the construction of more than 5,000 square feet of gross floor area, prior to detailed site plan.

*The property consist[s]ed of multiple legal existing parcels, Parcel A-9, Parcel A-10, Parcel A-13, Parcel 1, Parcel C, Parcel 115, Parcel 143, Parcel 144, and Parcel 180. The applicant should revise the conceptual site plan to provide data that indicates what the gross floor area of all of the existing structures at the proposed site to determine if the gross floor area meets or exceeds the ten percent requirement of the total of 44.57 acres of the site, or approximately 194,147 gross square feet. [~~There are no other subdivision issues at this time.~~]

*[~~Urban Design Comment: The applicant, through a revised plan, has addressed those comments and questions.~~]

*The property is the subject of Preliminary Plan 4-05145 (PGCPB No. 06-262) and the resolution of approval was adopted on December 21, 2006. The preliminary plan remains valid until December 21, 2012 pursuant to Section 24-119(d)(6) or six (6) years from the date of adoption of the resolution of approval. The resolution contains 40 conditions. Of note is Condition 36 which contains the following transportation cap on the development:

“Total development within the subject property shall be limited to 1,400 residential units, 230,000 GSF of office space, 62,000 GSF of retail space or any other development levels generating no more than 866 (444 inbound, and 422 outbound), and 1,037 (491 inbound, 546 outbound) new AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trips, excluding the community center. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein above shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.”

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

Once the conceptual site plan is approved, the preliminary plan will be reviewed for conformance to the revised and approved conceptual site plan. If the previously approved preliminary plan substantially conforms to the new CSP, then a new preliminary plan will not be required. However, any substantial deviation from the new CSP or an increase in the traffic capacity beyond the approval within the preliminary plan proposed by future DSP's will require an new preliminary plan submission to determine adequacy of public facilities.

- g. **The Park Planning and Development Division of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)** (Asan to Estes, July 19, 2006) staff has reviewed the submitted plan and made the following findings. The subject property is located in Subareas 2 and 7 of the West Hyattsville Transit District Development Plan. The property is 44.56 acres in size and zoned M-X-T. The applicant proposes infill development around the West Hyattsville Metro Station including 184 townhouses, 1,170 multifamily units, 226,620 square feet of office space, and 69,380 square feet of retail space.

Using current occupancy statistics for single-family and multifamily dwelling units, this development would result in a population of 3,324 residents in the new community. Our records show that the existing Hyattsville community in high need for parkland and recreational facilities.

The Transit District Development Plan (TDDP) includes districtwide requirements and guidelines, which relate to the entire district, rather than to specific subareas. The following goals for parks and recreation are applicable to the transit district:

- To provide parks, recreation facilities, and programs to respond to the needs of residents and employees of the transit district.
- To develop facilities that are functional, safe and sensitive to the surrounding environment.
- To protect and conserve public open space and natural resources.
- Utilize alternative methods of park acquisition and facility development such as donation and mandatory dedication.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

The mandatory development requirement related to parks and recreation states:

P32 At the time of preliminary plat of subdivision or conceptual or detailed site plan, the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) will review the site plan related to the development's impact on existing public parkland and recreation facilities and the need for additional parkland and recreation facilities. Any residential development shall meet the mandatory dedication requirements of the County Subdivision Ordinance (Subtitle 24).

The TDDP recognizes the need for the acquisition of additional parkland and development of additional recreational facilities in the transit district. The cost of operating and maintaining parks must be considered before acquisition and/or development. When considering additional park acreage in the transit district, the TDDP recommends that, when possible, larger tracts of land be acquired for use as community parks, Countywide parks and special facilities, and that additional recreational facilities be developed as needed.

The applicant proposes on site recreational facilities including a clubhouse with exercise room, pool, theater and library within townhouse complex, clubhouse with pool, exercise room within multifamily buildings, playgrounds, plazas, pocket parks and green roof/amenity space on top of four buildings. In addition, the applicant proposes a promenade and trail construction to the south of the project area on adjacent parkland.

The project area is adjacent to Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park on the southwest and Kirkwood Park and Chillum Community Park on the north. The applicant proposes construction of the SWM facilities on adjacent parkland. Approximately ten acres of parkland shall be disturbed including existing cricket, softball, football, and soccer fields and hiker/biker/equestrian trails. These SWM facilities are essential to development of the property as is proposed. The applicant is in process of negotiating with DPR staff to provide recreational facilities that would be needed to mitigate those lost because of construction of the SWM ponds and the provision of floodwater compensatory storage. At a minimum, the mitigation package will include the design and construction of the following improvement:

Chillum Community Park—Construction of SWM ponds that will be an aesthetic enhancement to the park, construction of a soccer field, trails and design of a 32 space parking lot.

Kirkwood Park—Construction of a 26-space parking lot and design of a soccer field.

Colmar Manor Community Park—Construction of two soccer fields, baseball field, 100-space parking lot, graded area for overflow parking (54 spaces), access road and connector trails.

WMATA Property on Chillum Road—If M-NCPPC acquires this 8.14-acre property, the applicant shall construct a soccer field and connector trails and design and construct a parking lot. If M-NCPPC cannot acquire the property, the applicant shall provide one artificial turf soccer field within Colmar Manor Community Park.

Northwest Branch Stream Valley—Integrate the pedestrian and bicycle trail into the development by construction of a promenade on the south side of the development. The existing equestrian trail would be relocated.

DPR staff finds that proposed private facilities and off-site recreational facilities to be built as part of the mitigation package on adjacent and nearby parkland would be adequate to serve the residents of the planned community.

*Urban Design Comment: The Department of Parks and Recreation staff comments have been incorporated into the recommendation section of this staff report. See Finding No. 16 for comments from the Department of Parks and Recreation staff in regard to the revised Conceptual Site Plan submitted in response to the remand order.

h. **The State Highway Administration** stated the following in a memo dated July 5, 2006:

“SHA will defer comment on the proposed traffic signal at the county maintained Ager/Lancer Drive intersection. SHA concurs with the proposed mitigation measures at the MD 500/MD 501 and MD/500/Hamilton Street intersections. Therefore, SHA recommends that M-NCPPC condition the applicant to design and construct the intersection improvements described above. Roadway improvement plans should be submitted to SHA for our review and comment.”

***Comment:** The conditions above are included in the recommendation section of this report, as Condition No. 17.

i. The **Transportation Planning Section**, in a memorandum dated May 17, 2006, indicated that the conceptual site plan proposes reasonable design alternatives for internal street network and major roadways serving the proposed site. Furthermore, staff finds all proposed cross sections are in general conformance with the West Hyattsville TDDP guidelines and requirements. However, since some of these facilities that would be constructed or improved are publicly owned, prior to the signature approval of the proposed conceptual site plan, or preliminary plan approval, the applicant should obtain approval from the city, DPW&T, and/or SHA on appropriateness of the proposed cross sections, design elements, rights-of-way limits, and provision of on-street parking.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

The pedestrian network shown on this plan is very important to achieving the levels of transit ridership, which is appropriate for this location. Therefore, future detailed site plans should, at a minimum, provide the level of pedestrian connections that are shown conceptually on the current plans, such as:

- Providing more direct pedestrian connections rather than more circuitous ones.
- Siting buildings closer to the Metrorail station, and siting parking farther away.
- Placing building entrances closer to rather than farther from the pedestrian network.

*Urban Design Comment: The Transportation Planning Section staff comments have been incorporated into the recommendation section of this staff report. See Finding No. 15 for comments from the Transportation Planning Section staff in regard to the revised Conceptual Site Plan submitted in response to the remand order.

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~striketrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

- *14. The applicant provided the discussion in response to the remand order in regard to the preferred land use map as included on the TDDP and the use table:

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

Building Envelope and Block Standards

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

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

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

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

“Building B—No ground level retail.

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

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

“Building E—No ground level retail.

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

BUILDING STREET TYPES

Height Specifications

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

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

Siting Specifications

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

Main Street (Hamilton Street)

Height Specifications

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

Siting Specifications

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

Park Drive

Height Specifications

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

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

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

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

Siting Specifications

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

Residential Streets

Siting Specifications

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

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

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

“Block G—380 feet

“Block H—440 feet

“Block I—250 feet

“Block J—530 feet

“Block K, L, M—475 feet

“Block N, O, P— 475 feet

Block Q, R—475 feet”

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

Local Access Street and Alley

Height Specifications

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

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

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

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

Siting Specifications

- 1. Building Street Façade: The façades of all buildings shall be constructed at the build-to line (or sidewalk edge) for at least 75 percent of the street frontage of each block with the following exception: Block corners are exempt from the build-to line requirement if a special pedestrian-oriented building corner treatment is provided. The street façade shall be a single plane, limited to façade jogs of less than 24 inches, interrupted only by porches, stoops, bay windows, shop fronts, and balconies.**

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

“Building Street facades will be addressed at DSP.”

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

“Modifications to Block lengths have been itemized above.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“Side setbacks will be addressed at DSP.”

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

“Rear yard lines will be addressed at DSP.”

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

STREETSCAPE STANDARDS

GENERAL DESIGN PRINCIPLES AND INTENT

Blocks and Alleys

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

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

“See previous answers regarding 400 feet requirements.”

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

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OFF-STREET PARKING

Configurations and Techniques:

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

Underlining indicates new language
[Brackets] and ~~striketrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language
[Brackets] and ~~striketrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

- a. Provide standard or wide sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, excluding alleys, unless modified by DPW&T or the City of Hyattsville.
- b. The pedestrian walkway/tunnel near the West Hyattsville Metro Station will be evaluated at the time of DSP for Infrastructure. Appropriate improvements for public safety or accessibility will be recommended at that time, if necessary.

The **Transportation Planning Section** reviewed the revised CSP and provided the following additional comments in a memo dated February 11, 2008:

The revised conceptual site plan submitted proposes to develop the property under the M-X-T zoning with mix of residential, office and retail uses that may include up to 1,400 residential units (130 to 225 townhouse units, and 1,175 to 1,270 multi-family units), 200,000 to 230,000 Gross Square Feet (GSF) of office space, 62,500 to 92,500 GSF commercial retail, with a community center of at least 13,000 GSF. The revised plan proposes provision of no more than 3,858 parking and loading spaces, of which 641 will be constructed as replacement for existing metro's Park and Ride and Kiss and Ride parking spaces, in accordance with the recommended parking ratios contained in the WH-TDDP. The suggested 3,858 parking spaces include provision of 334 on-street parking spaces, or more than eight percent, along streets and roadways within the West Hyattsville TDDP. This is done without providing any approval from the appropriate agencies having jurisdiction over these roadways. For these reasons, staff recommends that provision of on-street parking and conformance to the approved WH-TDDP parking ratios be revisited with each detailed site plan.

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

- a. Prior to the approval each detailed site plan, the applicant shall provide a detailed trip generation tabulation which will demonstrate the projected total AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trips for the proposed development and all previously approved will be at or below the approved AM, and PM peak-hour vehicle trip caps of 866 (444 inbound, and 422 outbound), and 1,037 (491 inbound, and 546 outbound), respectively.
- b. Prior to the approval of any detailed site plans (DSP) by the Planning Board for construction of any gross floor area on the subject site, a DSP for infrastructure which clearly identifies all proposed public and private roadways and includes approval from the appropriate operating agency (City, DPW&T and /or SHA) on the appropriateness of the proposed street cross sections, design elements, rights-of-way limits, provision of on-street parking and street furniture, and the required maintenance authority shall have received certificate approval.

*16. The staff of the **Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)** has reviewed the conceptual site plan. Our review considered the recommendations of the Approved Transit District Development Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zone, Master Plan for Planning Area 68, current zoning and subdivision regulations and existing conditions in the vicinity of the proposed development as they pertain to public parks and recreation facilities.

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

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

- b. The applicant shall work with the DPR staff to obtain National Capital Planning Commission approval for the disposal of parkland for road construction.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

	<u>Previously approved plan</u>	<u>Revised plan</u>
<u>Single-family attached units (townhouses)</u>	<u>193</u>	<u>130–225 (143 shown on the plan)</u>
<u>Multifamily units</u>	<u>1,170</u>	<u>1,000–1,270 (130 of the units shown on the plan are actually three-family dwellings dispersed among the townhouses)</u>
<u>Community Center</u>	<u>23,000 square feet</u>	<u>13,000 square feet</u>
<u>Retail</u>	<u>69,380 square feet</u>	<u>60,000–85,000 square feet</u>
<u>Office</u>	<u>226,620 square feet</u>	<u>200,000–230,000 square feet</u>
<u>Maximum retail/office proposed</u>	<u>296,000 square feet</u>	<u>292,000 square feet</u>

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

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

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

Another concern relating to the revised plans is that Hamilton Square was previously designed as a hard-surfaced plaza, with a variety of paving materials and even a focal point at its center. The revised plan treats that space with much more lawn area, which may not withstand the pressure of human activity expected in the urban development. Therefore, the staff recommends that the plans be revised to incorporate the same hardscape and level of detail in the treatment of the square as was shown on the original plans. This should be done prior to signature approval of the CSP plans.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Denotes Amendment
Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

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

Recommended Revisions to Previous Conditions

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

4. **[Prior to certificate approval of the CSP, the LID plan shall be revised to illustrate] At the time of submission of the detailed site plan for infrastructure, a plan showing how the run-off from each of the building roofs will be addressed using the [symbols] methods shown on the low-impact design plan dated [June 5, 2006] December 18, 2007. The plan shall clearly show the green building techniques to be employed throughout the project and which buildings will be constructed with green roofs and what portion, conceptually, will be green. Water quality green roofs shall not be located on top decks of garages that should be employed for outdoor recreational space.**

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

Underlining indicates new language
[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

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

- *19. The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) provided the following comments in a letter dated February 28, 2008 to Chairman Parker from Joel R. Washington, Director of Station Area Planning and Asset Management:

“Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the *West Hyattsville Commons site plan*. The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (“WMATA”) conditionally supports the approval of the *West Hyattsville Commons site plan*. The site plan as proposed could potentially, without more detailed site plan elements being worked out, result in unacceptable transit conflicts on the site. WMATA staff is confident these details can be resolved at more detailed levels of site planning. However, if these conflicts cannot be resolved at more detailed site planning levels, WMATA staff approval of the plan will be withheld. The remaining paragraphs provide more details on site design elements that will need to be resolved at further levels of design detail.

“(1) An "open" parking structure as required by the WMATA Design Criteria will be needed. Alternatively, a closed structure would require that sources of funds be identified to mechanical ventilators.

“(2) A shared parking program will need to be defined that can assure access for WMATA patrons to at least as many spaces as are now provided.

“(3) Access to and from the proposed replacement parking structure must be studied to determine if the traffic access proposed will accommodate Metro’s AM and PM Peak vehicular traffic to the parking structure.

“(4) The location of the Kiss & Ride facility as proposed may encourage Kiss & Ride activity elsewhere on the site. Detailed plans will need to be established to prevent Kiss & Ride activity from conflicting with bus loading/unloading, impeding bus operations or creating unsafe conditions. Additionally, detailed site plans must accommodate the need for Metro buses to layover and to re-circulate on site.

“(5) The bus bay and bus travel lanes will need to be adequately sized to accommodate buses in both directions.

*Denotes Amendment
Underlining indicates new language
[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

“(6) The sidewalk(s) adjacent to the bus bay(s) will need to be wide enough to accommodate bus passenger shelters at each bus bay and adequate spacing between the shelters and the face of buildings.

“(7) Vehicular access to and from the station must be accommodated for Metro maintenance and emergency vehicles.

“(8) All necessary ADA elements must be accommodated, including slopes, voice enunciators, straight paths, etc.

“(9) Safety and security concerns for transit patrons and bus operators will need to be addressed for areas that may be located out of view of the Metro station and/or in an isolated area, particularly during the early morning and late evening hours.

“(10) The design requirements for bus stops, shelters, lighting and passenger amenities should be clear as to whether the County or the developer is responsible for the provision or maintenance of these facilities into the future.

“WMATA’s assessment of whether these detailed requirements have been met will be guided by WMATA’s Standards and Criteria documents including the following:

“(1) WMATA’s Station Site and Access Planning Guideline, available at www.wmata.com/about/expansion/Station%20Access/SSAPM%20March07.pdf

“(2) *Adjacent Construction Manual*

“(3) *WMATA’s ADA Checklist*

“In conclusion, WMATA conditionally supports approval of the **West Hyattsville Commons Conceptual Site Plan**. We believe that we can work within the general framework of the plan, but there are many important specifics that would need to be addressed as we move forward. “

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

*Now, Therefore, be it resolved, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Planning Board of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and further:

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

Building Envelope and Block Standards

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

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

*Denotes Amendment
Underlining indicates new language
[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

Building Street Types

Height Specifications

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

Siting Specifications

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

Main Street—Hamilton Street

Height Specifications

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

Siting Specifications

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

Park Drive

Height Specifications

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

Site Specifications

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

Residential Streets

Siting Specifications

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

Local Access Street and Alley

Height Specifications

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

Siting Specifications

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

Streetscape Standards

3. Allows the block sizes to vary from the 400 linear feet as stated above.
4. Allows that all buildings do not have to be served by an alley.
8. Allows curb cuts at mid-block to the building.

Off-Street Parking

Configuration and Techniques

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

*D. APPROVED Conceptual Site Plan CSP-05006 and APPROVED Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/19/06 for the above-described land, subject to the following revised and additional conditions:

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

- *[a. ~~Building heights for all buildings H 1 and H 2 shall be six stories or more to reduce block lengths, unless the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board at detailed site plan that this is not economically feasible, or that the additional approximate 100 units gained by building more than four stories cause the project to exceed approved limits on vehicle trip, provided the additional residential units will not reduce the amount of approved office or retail space.]~~
- *a. The building height exhibit shall establish the minimum building heights reference for each portion depicted in the plan. Any revision to increase building heights beyond that shown on the exhibit will require approval of an amendment by the District Council.
- *[b. ~~Provide a direct pedestrian connection from building H 1 and H 2 to the abutting Metro Station via an elevated pedestrian plaza and/or street level concourse that shall connect to the platform level at a new Metro station entrance, unless it can be demonstrated that this is not technically feasible or will not be permitted by WMATA.]~~
- *b[c]. Provide the Park Drive east/west private street connection to accommodate vehicular traffic in addition to the pedestrian promenade, if acceptable to the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), the Department of Environmental Resources (DER), and the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR).
- *[d. ~~Provide the Hamilton Street east/west street connection under the Metro tracks, unless shown to be technically infeasible or not permitted by WMATA.]~~
- *c[e]. Provide a low impact development (LID) boulevard along the street that runs the length of the west boundary of the property on the portion of the ROW within the boundaries of the project, unless at detailed site plan for adjacent units it is demonstrated that provision of LID on one side of the road is technically infeasible or the LID features do not justify the water quality benefits that would result from them in the context of the overall LID program for the site.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

- *4. At the time of submission of the detailed site plan for infrastructure [~~Prior to certificate approval of the CSP, the LID plan shall be revised to illustrate~~] a plan showing how the run-off from each of the building roofs will be addressed using the [~~symbols~~] methods shown on the plan dated [~~June 5, 2006~~] December 18, 2007. The plan shall clearly show the green building techniques to be employed throughout the project and which buildings will be constructed with green roofs and what portion, conceptually, will be green. Water quality green roofs shall not be located on top decks of garages that should be employed for outdoor recreational space.
5. Prior to certificate approval of the TCP I, all plans shall be revised to show the same building and street layout as that shown on the CSP.
- *6. Prior to [~~certificate~~] approval of the detailed site plan for infrastructure [~~CSP~~], all proposed streets perpendicular to Northeast Branch that are not identified on the LID design plan dated [~~June 5, 2006~~] December 18, 2007, as an LID street shall be designed as green streets incorporating low impact development techniques with underground, connected soil volumes and surface tree grates. [~~Prior to approval of the Detailed Site Plan certification of the CSP, t~~]. The LID plan shall be revised to show the location of the green streets and include a [~~conceptual~~] detail of the street tree installation including a plan view and cross section of the above and below ground features. Jamestown Road and Hamilton Street shall be designed as green streets with medians that are designed with the same treatment as the trees along the green streets, unless another design is deemed more suitable.
7.
 - a. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan, the TCPI shall be revised to show disturbance of only those areas that are necessary for development and all proposed buildings and grading within the limits of disturbance shall be shown. This shall include off-site areas.
 - b. Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan, the TCPI shall be revised to add the following note: "All street trees used in conjunction with low impact development techniques may be used toward meeting the woodland conservation requirements. The credit shall be calculated using the anticipated tree canopy at ten years' growth."
8. A Phase I noise study shall be included as part of the preliminary plan application. The noise study shall address the location of the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn contour and the contour shall be shown on the revised TCPI. A Phase II noise study shall be provided with the detailed site plan.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

9. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan, a revised and approved stormwater

management concept letter and associated plans shall be submitted. The plan shall show the incorporation of all required LID techniques. The preliminary plan and revised TCPI shall reflect the elements of the concept plan.

10. At the time of detailed site plan, the DSP shall show the details of each of the proposed LID techniques.

*1[0]1. Prior to acceptance of the first detailed site plan, the application package shall be inspected to ensure that it includes a revised Type II tree conservation plan for the Chillum Park property that shows the regulated features, all proposed clearing, a clear limit of disturbance, and all information required on a TCPII.

*1[4]2. In conformance with the adopted West Hyattsville Transit District Development Plan, the applicable detailed site plans shall include the following and apply to the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees:

- a. Provide combined parking and bike lanes along the subject site's entire frontage of Ager Road per the Boulevard Street Section included on page 66 of the adopted and approved Transit District Development Plan, unless modified by DPW&T. Signage and pavement markings for the bike lanes should be in conformance with the 1999 AASHTO *Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities*.
- b. Provide the wide pedestrian zone and minimum seven-foot-wide sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of Ager Road per the TDDP, as shown on submitted street section 16-16.
- c. Curb extensions, curb cuts, crosswalks, and pedestrian refuges are to be evaluated in conformance with the TDDP streetscape standards.
- d. All construction and/or relocation of the Northwest Branch Trail shall be approved by the Department of Parks and Recreation and be in conformance with the current Parks and Recreation guidelines and standards.
- *e. Provide ~~additional~~ additional trail connections or walkways in the townhouse portion of the development to ~~more~~ more directly accommodate residents walking to Metro and/or other uses on the subject site. These connections can be made between groups of townhouses and other available open space, and appropriate locations should be identified.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

- f. The number and location of bicycle parking spaces shall be determined in conformance with the Bikeways and Bicycle Parking section of the approved TDDP.

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

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

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

*1[3]4. Total development within the subject property shall not exceed ~~[be limited to]~~ 1,400

residential units, 230,000 gross square feet of office space, and ~~[62,000]~~ 85,000 gross square feet of retail space, or any other mixture of unit type or development levels generating no more than 866 (444 inbound, and 422 outbound), and 1,037 (491 inbound, 546 outbound) **new external** AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trips, excluding the community center.

*1[4]5. Total parking that will be provided within the subject property shall be limited to ratios indicated in CR-59-2006, unless revised by the Planning Board and/or District Council, and ~~[220 spaces as]~~ on-street parking, only if determined to be acceptable by the City of Hyattsville or DPW&T; ~~[and/or SHA]~~ as to streets under their respective jurisdiction.

*1[5]6. Detailed site plans shall, at a minimum, provide the level of pedestrian connections that are shown conceptually on the conceptual site plan and shall observe the following principles to the extent possible:

- Providing direct pedestrian connections to the Metro station.
- Siting buildings closer to the Metrorail station and siting parking farther away.
- Placing building entrances closer to rather than farther from the pedestrian network.

*1[6]7. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (1) have full financial assurances through either private money or full funding in the county's capital program, (2) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (3) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:

- a. Modification of northbound Queen Chapel Road at Chillum Road to include an exclusive left-turn lane, two through lanes and a shared through/right lane, and any other intersection improvements deemed needed by SHA. All these improvements shall be implemented according to SHA standards.
- b. Modify westbound Hamilton Street at Queen Chapel Road to include an exclusive left-turn lane, two through lanes, and an exclusive right-turn lane, and any other intersection improvements deemed needed by SHA and /or DPW&T. All these improvements to be implemented according to DPW&T and/or SHA standards.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

- c. If deemed appropriate by DPW&T and /or SHA, modify northbound Queen Chapel Road between Chillum Road and Ager Road to accommodate the proposed third through lane recommended along north bound Queen Chapel at Chillum Road, and any other improvements deemed needed by SHA. All these improvements to be implemented according to SHA standards.
- d. Submission of acceptable traffic signal warrants studies to DPW&T for the intersections of Ager Road with Lancer Drive and Ager Road with Nicholson Road. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of DPW&T. If signals are deemed warranted by DPW&T, the applicant shall bond the signals prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property and install them at a time when directed by DPW&T. The requirements for the signal warrant studies may be waived by DPW&T if that agency determines in writing that there are sufficient recent studies available to make a determination regarding these two signals.
- e. Submission of acceptable detailed queue analysis using the total projected traffic for the intersection of Hamilton Street with Ager Road to DPW&T, and if deemed needed by DPW&T, the provision of double right-turn lanes along west bound Hamilton Street, and double left-turn lanes along south bound Ager Road, per DPW&T standards.

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

- [a. ~~a report on present and planned future efforts to market available office space at West Hyattsville Commons to possible tenants~~]
- [b. ~~a market study examining absorption rates and the state of the office market in Hyattsville, College Park, Riverdale Park, and Greenbelt.~~]

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

The phasing schedule for the project shall be as follows:

- a. Phase I (a),(b) and (c) shall consist of Buildings/Blocks A, B and C and Hamilton Square.
- b. Phase II shall consist of Building/Blocks G, H, K–R inclusive.
- c. Phase III shall consist of Building F
- d. Phase IV shall consist of Buildings D, E, I and J.

Buildings D and F may be issued a building permit concurrent with or earlier than a permit for any other buildings within earlier Phases so as to facilitate the completion of buildings around Hamilton Square.

Buildings within Phase II may be issued building permits any time after the construction of the WMATA garage and the interim WMATA Kiss-and-Ride facilities and after the Applicant provides the Department of Environmental Resources with a certification from a third party inspector verifying that Building A's foundation and first four (4) floors and walls have been constructed in accordance with its permit.

Except as otherwise provided above, Buildings within Phase IV may be issued building permits any time after the Applicant provides the Department of Environmental Resources with a certification from a third party inspector verifying that Building F's foundation and first four (4) floors and walls have been constructed in accordance with its permit.

Building B may be deferred to Phase II of the Applicant is pursuing the acquisition of Parcel A-9 (5600 Ager Road).

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

- a. Brick fronts shall be a standard feature for no less than 60 percent of all townhouses.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

- *[b. The pool house on Block “I” shall be placed in a visually prominent location, in a building that is clad primarily with brick or other attractive masonry.]
 - *b[e]. Entrance features including signage, landscaping, and/or landmark or identity structures shall be shown on the detailed site plan and shall be appropriately coordinated in design.
 - *c[d]. Demonstrate building massing with walls that do not exceed the 40-foot limit for blank, uninterrupted lengths without architectural features.
 - *[d. ~~Show good faith efforts to provide retail uses along the southern side of the WMATA parking structure, Building “A,” at time of detailed site plan for the WMATA parking structure.~~]
- *[19. ~~Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan:~~
- a. ~~Locate all proposed entrance features and gateways on the conceptual site plan.~~
 - b. ~~Provide a design guidelines and standards booklet for the proposed West Hyattsville Commons development. The booklet shall describe the design principals and standards, accompanied by illustrations and photographs, for the following commercial and residential components of the project:~~
 - ~~Building Envelope and Block Standards~~
 - i. ~~General Design Principals and Intent~~
 - ii. ~~Building Street Types~~
 - ~~Streetscape Standards~~
 - iii. ~~General Design Principals and Intent~~
 - iv. ~~General Streetscape Standards~~

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

~~Architectural Standards~~

~~v. General Design Principals and Intent~~

~~vi. Building Facades~~

~~vii. Window and Door/Entrances~~

~~viii. Signage~~

~~Parking Standards~~

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

~~x. Off Street Parking~~

~~xi. Bikeways and Bicycle Parking]~~

- *20. Prior to the approval of the Detailed Site Plan for Infrastructure, any issues related to the location of Park Drive shall be resolved to the satisfaction of DPR and DPW&T or the road connection shall be removed from the plans.
- *21. The applicant shall work with DPR staff to obtain National Capital Planning Commission approval for the disposal of parkland for road construction, if necessary.
- *22. Prior to the approval each detailed site plan, the applicant shall provide a detailed trip generation tabulation which will demonstrate the projected total AM and PM peak-hour new external vehicle trips for the proposed development and all previously approved new external vehicle trips will be at or below the approved new external AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trip caps of 866 (444 inbound, and 422 outbound), and 1,037 (491 inbound, and 546 outbound), respectively, excluding the community center.
- *23. Prior to the approval of any detailed site plans (DSP) by the Planning Board for construction of any gross floor area on the subject site, a DSP for infrastructure shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board which clearly identifies all proposed public and private roadways and includes approval from the appropriate operating agency (City and/or DPW&T) on the appropriateness of the proposed street cross sections, design elements, rights-of-way limits, provision of on-street parking and street furniture.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

- *24. Prior to the approval of the first final plat, the applicant shall report to the Planning Board

on the assignment of maintenance responsibility for all streets in the development.

- *25. Provide standard or wide sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, excluding alleys, unless modified by DPW&T or the City of Hyattsville.
- *26. The pedestrian walkway/tunnel near the West Hyattsville Metro Station will be evaluated at the time of DSP for infrastructure. Appropriate improvements for public safety or accessibility may be suggested to WMATA at that time, if necessary, but it is acknowledged that the pedestrian tunnel is not part of the property under the Applicant's control.
- *27. Prior to acceptance of the detailed site plan for infrastructure, the applicant shall coordinate at least one meeting that includes DPW&T stormwater management reviewers and staff from M-NCPPC's Planning Department to confer on the design of the stormwater management on the site. The stormwater management plan shall use the low impact development techniques shown on the low impact development design plan dated December 18, 2007. An approved stormwater management concept letter subsequent to that meeting shall be included in the first detailed site plan application for rough grading and infrastructure. All LID design for streets shall be subject to review and approval by DPW&T.
- *28. Prior to the approval of a DSP for Building C, the applicant should consider the use of either live/work units or retail/office uses along the street edge of Ager Road, but not in the area of the WMATA garage, and along the street edge of the street located on the north side of the parking structure, or that the façade of the garage be designed, as shown in the CDP exhibits, to mimic those of attractive commercial buildings which will screen the horizontal tier structure of the garage.
- *29. Prior to the approval of a DSP for Building B, the relationship of Building B to the internal street line should be improved by adding residential units along the frontage of the internal street, instead of 260 linear feet of parking garage.
- *30. Prior to the approval of a DSP for Building F, a shadow study should be submitted to indicate the impact of shadow on the plaza for the four seasons of the year. Adjustments to the height of the building, from what is currently shown as an 8-12 story building on the CSP, shall be considered.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

- *31. The following issues shall be considered prior to the approval of a DSP for the single-family neighborhood:

- a. The use of three-family dwellings should only be allowed at the corners of each of the blocks, with strings of townhouse units arranged between the three-family dwellings.
 - b. The mews between the units should be converted to streets in order to create a more walkable neighborhood between Blocks L and K and Q and R.
 - c. The face-of-unit to face-of-unit distance should be a minimum of a 1:1 relationship where a mews is proposed. Where two buildings are of unequal heights, the average height of the buildings shall determine the width between the buildings.
- *32. Prior to the approval of a Detailed Site Plan for Phase I of the development, the size of the community center and the determination of an entity to operate the facility shall be resolved.
- *33. The Detailed Site Plan for infrastructure shall consider the amount of hardscape and level of detail in the treatment of Hamilton Square.
- *34. At the time of Detailed Site Plan for the west side of the development, the green area within Block O shall be reviewed for appropriate size for recreational use.

*Denotes Amendment
Underlining indicates new language
[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a mandatory hearing before the District Council is required by Section 27-548.09.01.

* * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Squire, seconded by Commissioner Clark, with Commissioners Squire, Clark, Cavitt and Parker voting in favor of the motion and with Commissioner Vaughns absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, February 28, 2008 in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 20th day of March 2008.

PGCPB No. 06-218(A)
File No. CSP-05006
Page 77

Oscar S. Rodriguez
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

OSR:FJG:SL:bjs