

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Detailed 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 on December 10, 2010 and January 14, 2010, regarding the rezoning of the property contained within the limits of Detailed Site Plan DSP-09006 for the Belcrest Plaza Mixed-Use Development, for:

- Parcel A, Americana Plaza,
- Parcel B, Americana Plaza,
- Parcel C, Americana Plaza,
- Parcel B, Georgian Plaza,

The Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The detailed site plan application includes a request to: rezone the property from the Multifamily Medium Density Residential (R-18) Zone to the Mixed-Use Infill (M-U-I) Zone, to amend the use table for Subareas 12 and 13A, to modify the minimum and maximum building heights, to amend mandatory development standards and to approve the detailed site plan for three noncontiguous pods of development within the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan (TDDP).

The three pods of development are located on four separate and distinct legal parcels, all of which are currently developed with existing three-story multifamily buildings, built circa 1960. One pod of development consists of two contiguous parcels of land. The other two pods of development are separated from each other by public streets. The application has been reviewed for conformance to the TDDP and the Zoning Ordinance for each pod of development. The following is the legal description and density of each of the existing pods of development:

Name	Sub Area	Plat	Acreage	Existing D.U.'s
Parcel A Americana Plaza	13 A	PBWW34 P41	3.5713	105
Parcel B Americana Plaza	13 A	PBWW35 P59	0.8811	N/A
Parcel C Americana Plaza	13 A	PBWW35 P59	7.9957	167
Parcel B Georgian Plaza	12	PBWW32 P30	12.4669	294

The detailed site plan proposes to combine Parcels A and B of Americana Plaza to create a

multifamily development with a small amount of retail or office use. Parcel C is proposed as a mixed-use development consisting of townhouses and a multifamily development with a small amount of retail or office use. Parcel B of Georgian Plaza is proposed as a development of high intensity that includes multifamily dwellings, office, and retail. Each of the pods is described and analyzed below in regard to the request for rezoning from the R-18 Zone to the M-U-I Zone, and the proposed amendments.

2. **Rezoning—Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zone(s)	R-18	M-U-I
Use(s)	Multifamily	Multifamily, Townhouses, Office and Retail
Acreage		
Americana Plaza, Parcel A	3.57	3.57
Americana Plaza, Parcel B	.88	.88
*Total acreage (A & B)	4.45	4.45
Americana Plaza, Parcel C	7.99	7.99
Georgian Plaza, Parcel B	12.47	12.47
Area within 100 year floodplain	0	0
Dwelling Units - Multifamily		
Americana Plaza, Parcels A & B	105	283
Americana Plaza, Parcel C	167	356
Georgian Plaza, Parcel B	294	1,979
Dwelling Units - Townhouse		
Americana Plaza, Parcel C	0	57
Office Square Footage/GFA		
Americana Plaza, Parcels A & B	0	0
Americana Plaza, Parcel C	0	0
Georgian Plaza, Parcel B	0	216,000
Retail Square Footage/GFA		
Americana Plaza, Parcels A & B	0	1,600
Americana Plaza, Parcel C	0	1,300
Georgian Plaza, Parcel B	0	68,050

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

3. In order for the application for rezoning to be approved, the applicant must demonstrate that the proposed rezoning meets the purposes of the Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ) and the M-U-I Zone. The following is an analysis of Section 27-548.09.01 of the Zoning Ordinance in order to address the impact of the proposed rezoning as an amendment to an approved TDOZ. As quoted below, Section 27-548.09.01 of the Zoning Ordinance requires an applicant requesting

rezoning in a TDOZ to demonstrate that the proposed development conforms to the purposes and recommendations of the transit district as stated in the TDDP:

(b) Property Owner.

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

This application must be reviewed by the District Council to change the underlying zone, to add the use list for the M-U-I Zone and to change the building height restrictions.

- (2) The owner's application shall include:**

- (A) A statement showing that the proposed development conforms with the purposes and recommendations for the Transit District, as stated in the Transit District Development Plan; and**

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

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

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

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

The Planning Board's decision will be duly filed with the Clerk of the Council and copies of the decision will be sent to all persons of record.

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

The applicant has not amended the proposed rezoning application.

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

The purposes of the TDOZ and the Prince George's Plaza Transit District are contained in Section 27-548.03 of the Zoning Ordinance and on page nine of the TDDP. The applicant has filed a detailed site plan for the entire acreage proposing the rezoning from the R-18 to the M-U-I Zone. The applicant has also filed a justification statement in support of the rezoning of the property and amendments relating to the use table and height restrictions. Section 27-548.03 lists the following specific purposes of TDOZs. The purposes are stated below in **bold** face type and following each is the applicant's justification, followed by the Planning Board's findings:

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

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

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

The purpose of the Prince George's Plaza TDDP includes enhancing the development opportunities in the vicinity of the Prince George's Plaza Metro Station as was promoted at the time of the review and approval of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan (TDDP). The TDDP sets forth the vision of future development of the transit district and was vetted through the public review process of the sectional map amendment. The plan retained the zoning of the subject properties in the R-18 Zone and approved rezoning of those properties closest to the transit station. At the same time, the plan inserted a statement for the purposes of each subarea. Subarea 12 (Parcel B, Georgian Plaza) envisions a mixed-use development in the future and Subarea 13A (Parcels A, B and C, Americana Plaza) envisions to retain housing that offers easy access to the metro station and excellent recreational opportunities.

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

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

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

The subject application will promote the use of transit facilities simply through its adjacency to the transit station, and will reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips.

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

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

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

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

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

The proposed plan may support local growth by spurring redevelopment of the property directly south of the subject site, Prince George’s Plaza Shopping Center. The design of the subject site provides a layout that may foster redevelopment to the south and could link the two properties in a coherent and harmoniously designed fashion.

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

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

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

The ability of the Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ) to adjust the underlying zone of a property provides more flexibility than a zoning map amendment, in that the review period is substantially reduced. The M-U-I Zone is more flexible than the underlying R-18 Zone in that there are not required quantitative measurements, such as minimum green area or open space, maximum lot coverage, maximum density, etc. The TDDP sets forth

its own set of requirements through mandatory development standards, however, the plan is silent in regard to some of these same development factors, allowing the site plan to set the standard.

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

Increasing the intensity of the development of the subject parcels located within walking distance of the metro station will result in more metro ridership. However, the impact of the intensity of development, as proposed, may have impacts on other public facilities such as the transportation system, stormwater management systems, water and sewer systems. The conditions of approval address these impacts.

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

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

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

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

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

With implementation of the recommendations of the Department of Public Works and Transportation, and the wide sidewalks to accommodate the pedestrian, the plan will provide for convenient and efficient pedestrian and vehicular access to the Metro.

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

The TDDP contemplated a mix of residential and retail uses in Subarea 12 and primarily residential development in Subarea 13A. The application fulfills this purpose.

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

The detailed site plan proposes residential and retail uses that line the streets in Subareas 12 and 13A, including both the public and the private streets. These uses will enhance the area by activating the streetscapes of these adjacent thoroughfares.

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

The subject plan activates the private streetscapes created in Subarea 12 by lining the streets with residential and retail uses.

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

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

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

The TDDP provides for flexibility and the proposed M-U-I zoning also provides for flexibility in the design and layout of buildings.

4. The application for rezoning is also subject to Section 27-546.15, Purposes of the M-U-I Zone, Section 27-546.17, Uses in the M-U-I Zone, Section 27-546.18, Regulations in the M-U-I Zone, and Section 27-546.19, Site Plans for Mixed Uses, of the Zoning Ordinance.

- a. Section 27-546.15(b), Purposes of the M-U-I Zone, is provided below followed by a comment relating to the appropriateness of the zone for the subject property.

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

In comments dated November 20, 2009, the Community Planning Division stated that the subject project is not inconsistent with the 2002 *Prince George’s County Approved General Plan* Development Pattern policies for the Developed Tier and the 1998 *Approved Transit District Development Plan for the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone*, and is consistent with certain subarea design and areawide standards of the transit district development plan/transit district overlay zone. The project is residential and commercial-infill development in an area where most properties are

already developed, as contemplated in the stated purposes of the M-U-I Zone. The immediate surroundings are in turn surrounded by a mix of residential and commercial land use. This mix includes:

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

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

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

The review procedure for the subject mixed-use development in an established community was greatly simplified by allowing the application to set its own standards, thereby eliminating the need for variances. In that way, the approval of the site plan sets the requirements of open space and green area, setbacks and lot coverage requirements, and so forth, for the development of the site.

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

The proposed project is innovative in design in regard to the layout as detailed in the project description, and the applicant's statement of justification.

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

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

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

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

Americana Plaza, Parcels A and B	283 units	64 units per acre
Americana Plaza, Parcel C	356 units	45 units per acre
Georgian Plaza, Parcel B	1,979 units	158 units per acre

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

The mix of commercial and residential land use on the subject property and the location of structures along the streetscape edge will help to create a community environment. The application was revised to enhance public safety by keeping more “eyes on the street” by lining the public and private streets with uses that provide a 24-hour environment. The commercial retail and office components of the project will provide employment opportunities, and the recreational package included for the project will provide recreational use, available to the project’s residents in the future.

- b. Section 27-546.16, Approval of the Zone, provides that a property owner may request a reclassification to the M-U-I Zone in conjunction with an application for a detailed site plan for such a property, provided certain procedures are followed.

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

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

Below is a list of each of the goals as stated on Page 14 of the TDDP followed by the applicant’s response and the Planning Board’s findings.

Urban Design Goals (TDDP)

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

The applicant provided the following comment:

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

The TDDP states the very first primary requirement of the transit district in P1 as follows:

- P1 Unless otherwise stated within the Subarea Specific Requirements, each developer, applicant, and the applicant’s heirs, successors and/or assigns, shall be responsible for streetscape improvements along the entire length of the property frontage from the building envelope to face of curb. (See Figures 7, 8 and 9. *Toledo Terrace: 20-foot pedestrian zone; East West Highway: 40-foot pedestrian zone; Belcrest Road: 20-40 foot pedestrian zone.*) These improvements shall be included as part of any application for building or grading permits, except for permits for interior alterations, which do not constitute redevelopment as defined in the previous chapter. No building or grading permits shall be issued without a Detailed Site Plan, which indicates conformance with the streetscape requirements of the TDDP. Construction of the streetscape improvements shall be in phase with**

development, or the construction schedule shall be determined at the time of Detailed Site Plan. (Emphasis added)

The property has frontage on both Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace. Along Belcrest Road, the detailed site plan is required to provide a 20 to 40-foot-wide streetscape as measured from face of curb to the building façade.

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

The plan as shown adheres to the requirement of the TDDP. In this case, the DPW&T is not recommending a widening of Toledo Road along the frontage of the subject property, the current 36 feet of pavement has been found to be adequate.

Inside of the property line, the applicant has shown a ten-foot-wide public utility easement (PUE). In addition, DPW&T has agreed to convey five additional feet along the property frontage in order to create a 15-foot wide public utility easement on private property. The existing utilities along Toledo Terrace also serve the Prince George's Plaza Shopping Center. There has been concern expressed by PEPCO over the impact of disturbing the existing facilities and the process of undergrounding, as well as maintaining power to the shopping mall in an effort to place these utilizes underground. As part of the normal referral process for detailed site plans, the plans are sent to the following utilities for their review:

PEPCO
Verizon
Comcast
Washington Gas
WSSC

PEPCO testified at each of the hearings that a color coded utility map should be required prior to signature approval to determine that there is adequate space available for all utilities.

The Board granted a requested amendment to P1 to adjust the minimum requirements with the understanding that all utilities would be placed underground, and adopted Conditions to ensure the requirement.

Private Streets

The original plan submitted did not clearly show if the applicant intended to connect the private streets to the driveway that loops around Prince George's Plaza Shopping Center. The applicant has not provided evidence of permission to connect to that loop road. The

applicant has provided the following letter dated November 12, 2009 from Joseph F. Coradino, Executive Vice President, PREIT Associates, LP to Lareuse:

“After a series of meetings and discussions we have had over the past few months with Contee Company, LLP (“Contee”), it is our understanding that Contee plans to redevelop its property, known as Belcrest Plaza Apartments, as a high-density, mixed-use community (the “Belcrest Redevelopment”) immediately to the north of PREIT’s Mall at Prince George’s. We support Contee’s proposed Belcrest Redevelopment substantially in the form as presented to us.

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

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

The plans were changed to clearly show that the private streets are proposed to dead-end at the loop road, since the applicant has not secured the right from the adjacent property owner to access Prince George’s Plaza Shopping Center. However, the Planning Board finds that the proposed design functions independently of the shopping center and that no connection is necessary at this time prior to redevelopment of the shopping center. The plan is designed to integrate with future redevelopment of the shopping center and future connections are desired.

The plan proposes to create a pedestrian streetscape along the property edge of Parcel B, Georgian Plaza. This property line separates Prince George's Plaza Shopping Center from the subject property. The applicant's intent is to enliven this edge of the development by placing a 36,000 square public amenity use (yet to be identified) on the southern side of the office building and other retail spaces within the remaining buildings along this edge of the development. In front of the façades of the buildings located along this southern edge is a proposed ten-foot-wide sidewalk that is located six feet from the shared property line. Within this six-foot area are proposed tree plantings that will shade the south side of the buildings and the walkway. The proposal to activate the southern edge of the development may have a positive effect on the future development of Prince George's Plaza Shopping Center.

Environment (TDDP)

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

The applicant provided the following comment:

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

The applicant clearly proffers Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified buildings in the statement above, therefore Condition 1(a) was adopted as a requirement of the approval of the plan.

The following mandatory development requirements from the approved transit district development plan are environmental in nature and are applicable to this review and support the environmental goal stated above. The mandatory development requirements are numbered in accordance with the approved plan and shown in **bold** print.

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

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

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

However, at the Planning Board hearing on January 14, 2010, the Town of University Park requested that the Planning Board adopt a condition requiring that:

Prior to issuance of any grading permit, Applicant shall revise plans to demonstrate conformance with COMAR Title 26, Department of the Environment, Part 3, Subtitle 17, Water Management, Chapter 2, Stormwater Management, 26.17.02.00 et seq., as amended, incorporating by reference 2000 Maryland Stormwater Design Manual Volumes I and II (Maryland Department of the Environment, April, 2000) Supplement 1 or as adopted by the County pursuant thereto.

The Planning Board agreed with the Town of University Park and adopted the proposed condition.

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

All stormwater management for the subject site is proposed to be provided on-site.

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

This requirement has been addressed. The landscape plan shows several trash receptacles strategically placed throughout the proposed development at a volume adequate to prevent litter accumulation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

An amendment was filed by the applicant to use tree canopy coverage to meet the 10 percent afforestation requirement. The plans submitted show the 10 percent requirement of 2.50 acres or 108,900 square feet being met through the provision of 2.56 acres or 111,400 square feet of tree canopy.

The Planning Board found that the provision of 111,400 square feet of tree canopy coverage, a total of 2.56 acres, meets the 10 percent afforestation requirement of S33, and granted the amendment.

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

Floodplain does not occur on this site.

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

Floodplain does not occur on this site.

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

Non-tidal wetlands do not occur on this site.

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

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

profile of noise emission from the road to the nearest habitable structure is required.

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

Transportation

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

The applicant provided the following comment:

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

The Planning Board has reviewed the proposed change of the underlying zone from R-18 to M-U-I, the proposed DSP application referenced above, the prepared statement of justification, and the traffic study that has been prepared by the Traffic Group in accordance with the requirements of Sections 27-546.16 and 27-548.09.01 of the Zoning Ordinance. The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon review of these materials and additional analyses conducted by staff of the Transportation Planning Section consistent with the TDDP requirements, the Planning Department’s “Guidelines

for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals,” and reviews conducted by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) and the County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T).

Background

The subject property is located along the north and south sides of Toledo Terrace, extending from Belcrest Road to just north of East-West Highway (MD 410). Toledo Terrace is a county maintained two lane roadway with 36 feet of pavement, and 70 feet of dedicated right-of-way (ROW). The existing 36-foot-wide pavement is sufficient to provide the two existing travel lanes, and center left turn lane, as deemed necessary by DPW&T. In lieu of the provision for the two five-foot-wide on-road bike lanes as recommended by the TDDP, staff concurs with the applicant’s agreement with DPW&T to clearly mark and designate this roadway as a shared bike facility.

The subject property is located within the Prince George’s Plaza TDDP, developed for the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone (PG-TDOZ). The approved TDDP guides the use and development of all properties within the PG-TDOZ boundaries. During the initial preparation of the TDDP in 1991, staff performed an analysis of all key intersections in the vicinity of the TDDP using the maximum allowable development levels resulting from the recommended zoning for all 15 Subareas in the transit district. This analysis included the current R-18 zoning on the subject property, identified as Subareas 12 and part of 13A in the TDDP. The results of this analysis are documented in a 1991 publication entitled “Transportation Study, The Prince George’s Plaza and West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zones.”

Pursuant to the concepts within the chapter of Transportation and Parking of the TDDP (pages 44-64), each application proposing a development that is generally consistent with the land use assumptions of the original transportation study used in support of the TDDP has not been required to submit a traffic impact analysis to demonstrate adequate levels of service for transportation. For applications submitted in accordance with the land use assumptions of the original transportation analysis, the required adequacy findings for the transportation network are made using the proposed number of new and non-exempt surface parking spaces that will be constructed as part of the proposed development application, in accordance with Mandatory Development requirements P6 through P19. However, this case deviates from the land use assumptions utilized in the 1991 transportation study.

The 1991 prepared TDDP and the subsequent 1998 TDDP Plan recognized the vested rights of all existing development.

Existing Development

The four parcels of land included in the submitted DSP application (totaling 24.92 acres) consist of Parcel B, Georgian Plaza (12.47 acres) located behind the Prince George’s Plaza shopping center, and Parcels A, B, and C, Americana Plaza (12.45 acres) generally located at the northwest corner of Toledo Terrace and Northwest Drive. These parcels are

currently developed with a total of 566 multifamily rental dwelling units in 27 low-rise buildings constructed in the 1950s and 1960. The existing parcels which comprise the subject property are zoned R-18. The vested existing development level of 566 units is consistent with the assumed TDDP development levels, and the maximum allowable yield for an R-18-zoned property, or 20 units per gross acre. The existing residential development on the site includes a total of 743 surface parking spaces.

Proposed Development

The DSP proposes to replace all of the existing multifamily garden apartments with a mixed-use development consisting of office, retail, public spaces, and residential units. To achieve this, the DSP requests to: (1) change the underlying zone from the R-18 to the M-U-I Zone, (2) modify the use list approved for Subareas 12, and 13A, and (3) amend several of the TDDP's Mandatory Development Requirements, and Design Guidelines.

With the requested M-U-I zone, the DSP proposes to demolish the entire 566 multifamily unit apartment building complex and construct 176,000 square feet of office space, 62,100 square feet of commercial retail space, 40,000 square feet public amenity space, 2,618 multifamily high-rise residential units, and 57 townhouses as stated in the traffic study and as analyzed by the Transportation Planning. The DSP also proposes to replace the existing 743 surface parking spaces with 3,779 new parking spaces, of which only 78 will be constructed as surface parking spaces. While this represents nearly 90% reduction in number of surface parking for these two Subareas (12, and 13A), it also represents a significant increase (more than five times) in total number of parking spaces currently existing on these two Subareas within the transit district.

Comparison of the Projected Vehicles Trips (Existing vs. Proposed)

The applicant's traffic study indicates the **existing** development (vested) is currently generating 189 AM peak-hour, and 295 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Staff finds these numbers acceptable because these numbers are closely related to numbers produced by the guidelines, even though no actual counts were provided in the traffic study to verify the numbers.

Using the *Guidelines*' recommended trip generation rates, the **proposed** development is projected to generate 1,292 AM peak-hour, and 2,294 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. The mix of uses planned on the subject site is expected to result in reductions in the projected AM and PM peak-hour trips. These reductions represent trips that would be made by those persons who choose to work, live, and shop within the confines of the development and transit district. This reduction in generated vehicle trips is referred to as internal trips. Using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) recommended internal trip generation interchange for a transit-adjacent mixed-use development, it is reasonable to assume that the generated AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trips for the proposed development would be 1,272 and 2,096 vehicle trips, respectively.

The applicant's prepared traffic study includes additional peak-hour vehicle trip reductions similar to those suggested by the TDDP, a trip reduction factor of 55% for all residential, and 35% for commercial retail and office developments. These factors were used in the 1991 transportation study for the TDDP, to evaluate the full build-out of the planned development recommended by the TDDP, assuming that the recommended Transportation Demand Management District (PG-TDMD) is authorized by the County Council ensuring the TDDP stated trip reduction measures are fully functioning for all developments within the transit district.

During the December 10, 2009 Planning Board hearing, the applicant submitted to the Planning Board a preliminary Transportation Management Plan (TMP), to justify the application of the 35 percent and 55 percent trip reduction factors. With the application of the vehicle trip reduction factors and by taking one-to-one credit for the peak-hours vehicle trips that are generated by the existing 566 apartment units, the submitted traffic study indicates that the proposed development is projected to generate 583 **new** AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 747 **new** PM peak-hour vehicle trips. These figures represent more than a 300% increase over the number vehicle trips that are being generated by the existing 566 apartment units.

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

The project proposes a multifold increase in land use intensities and the projected AM and PM peak-hour trips associated with the proposed change to the underlying zone from the R-18 to the M-U-I Zone for each of the four parcels of land forming the subject site. The requirements of Section 27-546.16(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance indicates that properties within a TDOZ may be rezoned to the M-U-I Zone if it can be shown that:

“the proposed rezoning and development will meet TDDP goals and objectives and will be compatible with existing or approved future development on adjacent properties.”

As part of the TDDP stated goals, the Transportation Goal on page 14, states:

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

Page 44 of the TDDP, as part of the Introduction Section to the Transportation Chapter, clearly states:

“the traffic Level-of-Service E (LOS E) is the operational adequacy standard for transportation facilities within the transit district.”

LOS E is also the recommended adequacy standard for Metropolitan and Regional Centers within the Prince George's County General Plan. The Prince George's Plaza

Transit District is designated as a Regional Center by the 2002 General Plan.

In order to justify the rezoning of the subject property to the M-U-I Zone, the applicant was asked to demonstrate that the TDDP goals, including the Transportation Goal with regard to “adequate levels of transportation and transit operating and service efficiency” are fully met. To do this, staff requested that the applicant submit a detailed transportation analysis in order to demonstrate conformance with the requirements of Section 27-546.16(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, and the approved TDDP. This study serves as an update to the prepared 1991 transportation study, which evaluated the recommended zoning and land uses of the TDDP. In a scoping meeting with the applicant’s traffic consultant held in October 2009, staff recommended that the updated traffic study clearly identify any additional trip reduction goals needed to maintain LOS E for the transportation system in the TDDP study area. This included recommending timely implementation of appropriate and effective elements for a Transportation Management Plan for the subject site, including enhancing the bus, pedestrian, and biking experience between the subject property and other uses in the transit district and the metro station

The Review of the Submitted Traffic Study

An updated traffic study, dated November 19, 2009, was submitted for review. This study evaluated the existing and future conditions (Year 2030; build-out) of all the intersections as determined in the scoping agreement with the applicant, as well as the impact of the requested rezoning of the site (TDDP Subareas 12, and part of 13A) from the R-18 to the M-U-I Zone.

The existing conditions analysis indicates that two (2) of the signalized intersections in the overall study area (not within the transit district) are currently operating below the level-of-service standard (LOS E). These intersections are: (1) the intersection of MD 410 with US 1, and (2) the intersection of MD 410 with MD 500 (Queens Chapel Road) and Adelphi Road. Only one of the unsignalized intersections within the transit district indicates a peak-hour delay for minor street approach exceeding the maximum acceptable level of 50 seconds. This is the intersection of MD 410 and Editor’s Park Drive. An additional analysis conducted by the applicant indicates that the combination of the existing traffic conditions with the projected traffic associated with the proposed redevelopment using all recommended vehicle trip reduction and assumption recommended by the ITE and TDDP results in very similar results.

The year 2030 TDDP build-out analysis, which includes the proposed development, evaluated all intersections within the study area. The 2030 assumed road network includes all transportation improvements recommended by the: (1) approved master plans, (2) adopted and approved CIP and CTP, and (3) all intersection and roadway improvements detailed by the TDDP. The results of this comprehensive analysis indicate that, in order to achieve LOS E conditions, a total of eight (8) signalized intersections would require improvements beyond

these lane use recommendations. These intersections are: (1) MD 410 with MD 212, (2) MD 410 with 23rd Avenue, (3) MD 410 with MD 500/ Adelphi Road, (4) US 1 with MD 410, (5) Adelphi Road with Belcrest Road/ Underwood Street, (6) MD 500 with Nicholson Street, (7) MD 500 with Hamilton Street, and (8) MD 500 with MD 501 (Chillum Street). Three of the unsignalized intersections also indicate peak-hour delay for minor street approaches exceeding the maximum acceptable level of 50 seconds. These intersections are: MD 410 and Editor's Park Drive, Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace, and MD 500 and Nicholson Lane.

Summary of the Applicant's Submitted Traffic Study Findings and Conclusions

The following is a summary of the applicant's submitted traffic study's findings and conclusions:

1. The basis for the 2030 projections came from the regional model developed by M-NCPPC and accounts for a great deal of growth from other areas of the County and not just the TDDP area.
2. The subject rezoning of this site would represent a small percentage of the traffic at all intersections within the study area. The increase in traffic associated with the proposed development ranges from the low of 1.6% to high of 11.3% of total projected traffic at the studied intersections.
3. Based on the results of this study, all of the signalized intersections within the transit district would be operating at levels of service that are not exceeding the established Level-of-Service E standard established by the approved TDDP. It would appear from this analysis that the TDMD requirements established in the TDDP should be implemented prior to the TDDP build-out.

Review of the traffic consultant's presentation during the Planning Board Hearings

During the Planning Board hearings for the above-referenced DSP the traffic consultant for the applicant made the following paraphrased comments with regard to how the applicant meets the TDDP goals and objectives:

1. The applicant claims the proposed rezoning and development meets the TDDP goals and objectives, and is compatible with existing or approved future development on adjacent properties; and the goal of the TDDP was to maintain Level-of-Service E within the transit district.

The Planning Board agrees with this statement.

2. The applicant states traffic Level-of-Service requirements stated in the TDDP Transportation Goal on page 14, should apply only to six intersections “Within the Transit District” and not to all the intersections in the “Study Area.”

The Planning Board agrees with this statement.

3. The applicant states that the TDDP differentiates the “Transit District” from the “Study Area.” In support of this statement, the applicant points out that Page 44 of the TDDP states, “Traffic Level-of-Service E (LOS E) is the operational adequacy standard for transportation facilities within the Transit District.”

The Planning Board agrees that the LOS E should only be applied to the Transit District.

4. The applicant claims that if the applicable standard required LOS E for all 19 intersections in the delineated Study Area instead of only the six intersections within the Transit District, then items #1, and #5 [from Table 1, Page 46, of the TDDP, both reported failing at LOS F with existing traffic as part of the 1991 study] would have been required to be improved, but are expressly excluded from Table 4, Page 55, of the TDDP, which lists the required improvements. To enforce this argument, the applicant points to Page 55 of the TDDP by claiming that this interpretation indicates “the transit district improvements shown in Table 4 are those that are needed to ensure that critical roadway links and intersections in the Transit District operate at least at traffic LOS E.”

The Planning Board finds that the LOS E should only be applied to the Transit District.

6. The applicant acknowledges that the proposed DSP development will require two traffic signal studies and their installation if warranted, in order for LOS E to be maintained within the Transit District’s six intersections.

The Planning Board agrees that this is part of the needed infrastructure improvements.

7. The applicant is also proffering, as part of the required trip reduction measures, a TMP (Transportation Management Plan) to reduce peak-hour SOVs (Single Occupant Vehicle) trips and to preserve the adequacy of transportation facilities within the Transit District in the event a TDDDP is not established by the District Council.

The Planning Board agrees and this should be included in any conditions of approval. However, the submitted TMP should be made to be binding and enforceable.

Review of the prepared Transportation Management Plan presented during the Planning Board Hearings

The following paraphrased comments represent findings, observations, and general strategies outlined in the applicant's Transportation Management Plan (TMP) submitted to the Planning Board on December 10, 2009:

1. The applicant claims that residents at a Transit Adjacent Development (TAD) generate ½ of vehicle trips of high density developments without transit.
2. The applicant claims that there will be “generous sidewalks” to and from transit stations and all land uses within the transit district and surrounding areas.
3. The applicant claims that there “will likely be bus service within the confines of Belcrest Apartments mixed-use community.”
4. The applicant may: (a) provide share parking spaces, (b) accommodate for bicycles, car pools, and vanpools, (c) initiate a cash-out program, and (d) promote public transit use, telecommuting, live near your work, and flex hour programs.
5. The applicant may eliminate the provision of free parking for the proposed development.
6. The applicant may provide sufficient bicycle racks or lockers in all proposed parking garages.
7. The applicant may limit the total number of parking for the proposed development to no more than 3,780 spaces, and may designate parking spaces for Zip Cars or other comparable shared use vehicles.
8. The applicant may give the employers within the office buildings incentives to set up a guaranteed ride home for anyone willing to carpool, van pool and/or use transit.
9. The TMP proposes the applicant may initiate and promote less reliance on the use of single occupant vehicles for access, and willingness not to

drive alone for access by offering a parking cash-out program of \$55 to \$100 per employee, per month.

10. The applicant may hire and designate a permanent on-site transportation coordinator as the administrator for all its TMP programs.

In response to the above paraphrased comments by the applicant, the Planning Board evaluated the submitted TMP and finds several objectives and strategies have been demonstrated as being effective in reducing single occupant vehicle trips to and from transit adjacent development.

Based on the preceding, the Planning Board adopts the following findings for the proposed rezoning request from the R-18 to the M-U-I Zone which demonstrate that the proposed rezoning and redevelopment of the subject site as planned would meet and satisfactorily address the TDDP goal: **“Ensure that all new development or redevelopment in the transit district is coordinated in a fashion that: Provides for adequate levels of transportation and transit operating and service efficiency,”** if the rezoning is subject to several transportation-related conditions of approval.

- The applicant’s prepared Transportation Management Plan for the subject site should be approved by DPW&T and M-NCPPC, and should include specific and binding recommendations with adequate monitoring and enforcement to enhance the bus, pedestrian and biking experience to and from the site and the metro station.
- The proposed development should replace the existing and vested development.
- Parcels A and B, Americana Plaza, are limited to no more than 283 new multifamily residential units, and 1,600 square feet of ancillary commercial retail/office space;
- Parcel C, Americana Plaza is limited to no more than 356 new multifamily residential units, 57 townhouse units, and 1,300 square feet of ancillary commercial retail/office space;
- Parcel B, Georgian Plaza is limited to no more than 1,979 new multifamily residential units, 216,000 square feet of office space and 68,050 square feet of commercial retail space as shown on the detailed site plan provided;
- The proposed development would replace the existing 105 garden apartments located on Parcels A and B of Americana Plaza; the existing 167 garden apartments located on Parcel C of Americana Plaza, and the existing 294 garden apartments located on Parcel B of Georgian Plaza.

- In the event a transit district wide TDMD is established by the District Council, the TMP to address trip reduction strategies solely for the applicant's development will not be necessary.

The Planning Board adopted conditions that will provide the support of the transportation network needed to support the Transportation Goals and Objectives of the TDDP. The applicant presented proposed transportation conditions (Applicant's Exhibit 2) at the Planning Board hearing on January 14, 2010. Based upon the testimony of the applicant and staff, the Planning Board supports the applicant's proposed transportation conditions, subject to certain additional provisions agreed to between the staff and applicant and read into the record. The applicant agreed to begin monitoring existing peak hour vehicle trips generated by the development prior to the issuance of building permits to construct the 284th residential unit. The applicant also agreed that the Transit Management Plan will be approved prior to the generation of 294 am peak-hour trips and 340 pm peak hour trips. Finally the applicant agreed to include in the Transit Management Plan details for monitoring and audit conditions, trip reduction estimates for each trip reduction strategy, a spreadsheet that monitors dwelling units and peak hour trips for each building permit. The transportation conditions proposed by the applicant have been modified to include the monitoring requirement, the Transportation Management Plan will be approved prior to the issuance of building permits for the 284th residential unit (which is prior to the generation of 294 am peak hour trips and 340 pm peak-hour trips) and the Transit Management Plan will include the additional provisions listed above. For ease of administration of the transportation conditions relative to the issuance of building permits for the townhomes on Americana Plaza, Parcel B, the applicant may include evaluation of all 57 townhome units with the issuance of a building permit for the first townhome, and such evaluation shall constitute satisfaction of the transportation conditions for all townhome units approved for the development.

Public Facilities (TDDP)

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

The applicant provided the following comment:

“The proposed development will contribute to creating the critical mass needed to create a vibrant, sustainable transit oriented area. As a lifestyle community, the residents will largely be committed to locating in an urban transit oriented

development. This will allow for the more efficient delivery of essential, general and educational services. In addition, the applicant has proposed the inclusion of 23,780 square feet of public space in the office building closest to the Metro station. Initially, this space is proposed to support the local library, but could be used for other public purposes if a greater need is identified.”

The Planning Board believes that the public facility issues are addressed through various laws already in place, specifically the schools facility surcharge and the public safety surcharge. In regard to the school facility surcharge, the applicant will be obliged to make payment at the time of building permit. In regard to the public safety surcharge, the applicant is exempt from that payment as it is tied to the requirement of a preliminary plat of subdivision. Since a determination has been made that the subject site is not required to subdivide, the applicant will not be required to make a public safety surcharge payment unless a condition is placed on the property through either the zoning or the detailed site plan. A similar situation occurred on the adjacent property, Post Park, where the requirement of \$2,000 per unit became a condition of approval and was required to be paid at the time of building permits.

Economic Development (TDDP)

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

The applicant provided the following comment:

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

The mix of uses in the project, the promotion of “eyes on the street,” and the encouragement of active uses in the area during the evening, are all impacted by the review and approval of the detailed site plan both through the physical development and the retail/office uses proposed. The revised plans submitted as Applicant’s Exhibit No. Seven on January 14, 2010 improved the streetscape by providing additional residential units at the street level and above on both public and private streets.

Trails (TDDP)

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

The applicant provided the following comment:

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

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

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

Findings and Observations

A comprehensive sidewalk network is provided, with wide sidewalks being proposed along Belcrest Road, Toledo Terrace, Toledo Road, and some internal roads. Sidewalks appear to be provided along all road frontages, and marked crosswalks are indicated at most locations (consistent with Mandatory Development Requirement, p 20). Also, it appears that relatively small block sizes are provided between Toledo Terrace and the loop road around Prince George’s Shopping Center, with standard or wide sidewalks

being provided along both sides of the cross streets. The crosswalk detail appears to indicate a contrasting material (per Mandatory Development Requirement S13).

Facilities provided on the submitted detailed site plan include:

- An 8-foot-wide sidewalk along Belcrest Road (Mandatory Development Requirement S8 requires a 20- to 40-foot pedestrian zone with a sidewalk of undetermined width, per Figure 8).
- A 10-foot-wide sidewalk along the southern property boundary.
- Eight-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of Toledo Terrace (Mandatory Development Requirement S8 requires a 20-foot pedestrian zone with a 12-foot-wide sidewalk, per Figure 8).
- Six-foot-wide sidewalk along both sides of Toledo Place.
- Six-foot-wide sidewalks along the frontages of Northwest Drive (south of the townhouse units).
- Six-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of the road between Buildings 3 and 4.
- Eighteen-foot-wide sidewalks along the east side of Building 2.
- Eighteen-foot-wide sidewalks along the west side of Building 1.
- Standard sidewalks along all other road frontages, excluding alleys. This is consistent with Mandatory Development, p 20.
- 294 bicycle parking spaces. This total is 7.5 percent of the total number of car parking spaces provided and is an acceptable ratio. The racks are distributed throughout the subject site. This is in conformance with Mandatory Development Requirement S29 and Site Design Guideline 49.
- 40 bicycle racks will be located around the retail stores facing the urban green. Mandatory Development Requirement requires four bike racks accommodating two bicycles each for every 10,000 square feet of retail space proposed.
- A changing room is provided in Building 1 to serve cycling residents, patrons, and office workers. This is consistent with a recommendation in the Pedestrian/Bicycle/Multiuse Trail Network Section for showers and changing facilities in all new or renovated commercial developments (TDDP, p 81). Shower facilities will be included in the changing room for full consistency with the TDDP recommendation.

Parks and Recreation (TDDP)

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

The applicant provided the following comment:

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

The applicant’s proffer of a portion of Americana Plaza, Parcel D, is not within the limits of the TDOZ and the current detailed site plan application, however, the Planning Board approved the applicant’s proffer of dedicating a portion of Parcel D, Americana Plaza to M-NCPPC, subject to conditions as stated in the recommendation section.

The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) reviewed the application and indicated that additional land for outdoor recreational purposes was needed. The applicant proffered to convey approximately 3.5 acres of Parcel D, immediately adjacent to the transit district, to address this need. Staff also proposed the possibility of eliminating Building 2 from Parcel B, Georgian Plaza, and either conveying this land to M-NCPPC or creating private open space. The applicant provided testimony and exhibits in support of retaining the proposed plaza within Parcel B. Prior to the hearing on January 21, 2010, DPR determined that it supported the applicant’s proffer to convey 3.5 acres of Parcel D to M-NCPPC and did not support public ownership of parkland within Parcel B. The

applicant and DPR also agreed to the timing for the approval and conveyance of the park facilities. However, the applicant and DPR did not agree as to the type of facilities to be constructed within the park. The Planning Board agrees with DPR that public ownership of land within Parcel B is not desirable and the portion of Parcel D proffered by the Applicant meet the outdoor recreational needs generated by this application. The Planning Board further finds that the proposed park is suitable for active recreational uses such as those recommended by DPR. The Planning Board also finds that the park should be completed prior to the issuance of building permits for any new development on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza. Conditions of approval were adopted to address these findings. The Planning Board further finds that the plaza within Parcel B, Georgian Plaza is appropriate and will be activated by the surrounding uses so as to be an attractive location for the public. These findings are based upon the PowerPoint presentation contained within Applicant's Exhibit 7 which addressed the size of the plaza and the basis for not requiring additional open space within Parcel B.

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

Uses

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

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

Building Height

The proposed buildings are to be compatible in size, height, and massing to buildings on adjacent properties and compatible with the vision for each subarea, except for Buildings 1 and 2 on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza. Building 1 is designed with a 31-story residential tower at the intersection of Toledo Terrace and Belcrest Road. A portion of Building 2 is proposed to be 17 stories. The maximum height set by the TDDP for Subarea 12, within which Buildings 1 and 2 are proposed to be located, is 16 stories. However, the Planning Board found the applicant's proposed architecture to be compelling and agreed that the proposal to vary the building heights at this location is appropriate and will be compatible with the surrounding building heights.

Architecture

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Each of the four parcels comprising the subject property is currently zoned R-18, and the list of permitted uses contained in the TDDP reflects uses consistent with the R-18 zone. The TDDP recommends, however, the redevelopment of the subject property, including mixed use. The M-U-I zone is proposed to implement this recommendation and thus a use list consistent with the provisions of the M-U-I zone is proposed. The list of

allowed uses proposed by the applicant is set forth in Exhibit “B” attached hereto and made a part hereof. In essence, the M-U-I zone permits all uses permitted by right or by special exception permitted in the C-S-C zone, except for uses in the Miscellaneous category and Residential category listed in Section 27-461(b)(3) and (b)(6). For these categories, the uses allowed in the R-18 zone are permitted. The use list attached as Exhibit “B” includes all of those uses permitted by right in the C-S-C Zone, but does not include all of those uses permitted by special exception, eliminating such uses as pawn shops and drug treatment centers.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“The Applicant has the opportunity to create a sustainable transit oriented community across 25 acres of land within walking distance of a Metro Station. It is also important that the design of the project be compatible with surrounding development. Rather than construct monolithic buildings of similar height, the design seeks to create a development which transitions in height as it nears the transit station. This transition of building heights serves several purposes. First, it concentrates the density at the point closest to the Metro Station, promoting smart growth, the use of mass transit and a pedestrian friendly environment. Second, the varied building heights encourages innovative design, allowing

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

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

The Planning Board agreed in principle with the applicant's comments above in regard to the advantages of using multiple building heights. The following chart summarizes the amendments to the proposed building heights:

Building	Maximum	Maximum	Minimum	Minimum
----------	---------	---------	---------	---------

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

*as shown on the architectural elevations

The Planning Board finds that the applicant’s request to allow construction of a 31-story building (shown on the architectural drawings as 31 stories) within Subarea 12 is wholly consistent with the standards set forth in the TDDP and the vision for the transit district. The applicant presented renderings and shadow studies showing the view of Buildings 1 and 2 from several angles to demonstrate its impact on the surrounding viewsheds and properties. A building of this height will be compatible with existing buildings on surrounding properties and the recommendations for future development/redevelopment within the transit district. The Planning Board supports the applicant’s requested amendment to exceed the maximum building heights for Buildings 1 and 2.

The Planning Board finds that the majority of Building 5 meets the minimum height requirement established by the TDDP of six stories and that the requested amendment to allow three-story townhouse models within Subarea 13A is appropriate given the nature of the unit type and the applicant’s effort to provide a variety of residential products. Townhouse models will feature a fourth-story optional loft. Therefore, many of the townhouse units may be in conformance with the minimum height requirement set forth in the TDDP. The Planning Board supports the applicant’s requested amendment to allow the townhouses to be three stories in height if because fourth-story optional loft is offered to potential home buyers.

DETAILED SITE PLAN EVALUATION

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

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

FINDINGS—DETAILED SITE PLAN REQUEST

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

PARCELS A & B, AMERICANA PLAZA

- 8. **Request:** The detailed site plan proposes development of 283 multifamily units and 1,600 square feet of retail/office space on Parcels A & B, Americana Plaza.

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

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

	Required	Provided
Parking	N/A	304
Loading	1	2

- 10. **Location:** Parcels A & B, Americana Plaza are located within Subarea 13A of the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone, at the northwest corner of the intersection of Toledo Terrace and Toledo Place.
- 11. **Surrounding Uses:** Parcels A and B, Americana Plaza, are bounded to the north by Parcel C, Americana Plaza, to the west by Toledo Plaza, an existing multifamily development in the R-18

(Multifamily Medium Residential) Zone, to the south by Post Park, an existing multifamily and retail development in the M-X-T (Mixed Use Transit Oriented) Zone, and to the east by Toledo Terrace.

12. **Design Features:** As Phase I of the project, Parcels A & B of the Americana Plaza are proposed to be developed with a four- to five-story building shown as Building 6. The building is linear and reflects the shape of the two parcels on which it is located. There is very little open space associated with this portion of the development. A small surface parking lot is proposed in the southern portion of Parcel A, which contains 42 surface parking spaces. The remainder of the 318 total proposed parking spaces is located in a one-level, podium parking structure, which makes up the first floor of Building 6. The proposed multifamily units and retail/office space are located above the single story structured parking facility in three- and four-story buildings. The parking garage will have two access points: one along Toledo Place and a second along the internal access drive located behind the building that parallels the shared property line with the existing multifamily development to the west.

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

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

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

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

Although a consistent building edge is maintained at the street level, a total of five courtyards are proposed on top of the one level of podium parking, which create recesses in the east and west façades above the first story of the building. Four of the courtyards include planting areas and separate private terraces, which are designated to specific residential units. The fifth courtyard

area is the largest and includes a swimming pool and kiddie pool, sitting areas, shade structures and landscaping areas and is available for use by all building residents. The retail/office portion of the building is located at the eastern corner of the intersection of Toledo Place and Toledo Terrace and fronts on a small pedestrian plaza with terraced seating, decorative paving and site furnishings.

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

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

13. **Conformance with any Mandatory Development Requirements of the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP):** The applicant has requested modifications from the following development standards for Parcels A and B, Americana Plaza:

Subarea 13A

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

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

“This requirement applies to Subarea 12. The vast majority of multifamily dwelling units proposed by the Applicant are one or two bedroom units. The applicant is proposing, however, to [sic] construct a total of 118 two bedroom units with a den and study. Under the provisions of Section 27-101.1 (a)(22), the term bedroom includes a habitable room included within a dwelling unit, regardless of whether it is called a “study” or a “den”. The studies proposed by the Applicant would not be considered habitable and therefore would not qualified as a bedroom. However, the proposed dens would. Thus, the two bedroom units with a study and a den are technically considered three bedroom units. Twenty four such units are provided in Building 1 and are specifically identified as condominium units. However, 94 other such units are spread throughout the remaining

four buildings (no building contains more than 46 such units), and are not set aside exclusively as condominiums. The Applicant requests a modification of P102 so that random units within a rental apartment building are not required to be sold as condominium units. Only 6% of the total dwelling units proposed are designated as two bedroom plus study and den and are offered to provide a greater diversity of unit type.”

The applicant subsequently submitted the following additional justification:

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

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

The Planning Board found that it would not be appropriate to require the sale of individual three-bedroom units, which are located randomly within the proposed buildings and that it is desirable to have a greater diversity of rental units available to potential tenants.

Architecture

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

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

Parking and Loading

S17 All parking lots shall, in general, be located behind buildings and shall not occupy more than 33 percent of the frontage of any subarea along a pedestrian street.

The surface parking lot south of Building 6 does not occupy more than 33 percent of the frontage of Subarea 13A. Due to the narrow shape of the property, the parking lot is not located behind Building 6. The applicant requested a waiver of this requirement in the event that it was determined that the location of the parking lot was not in conformance with S17. The requirement states that “in general” parking shall be located behind buildings. The applicant’s parking, which predominately is located in structured parking facilities, conforms with this requirement. Therefore, it is determined that no amendment of S17 is required.

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

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

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

The Planning Board finds that the applicant’s request is appropriate. The surface parking lot does not extend beyond the most projected portion of the front plane of the building and will be appropriately screened by a low masonry wall and landscaping.

S23 All surface parking lots shall be screened from view of roadways by the use of both a low, opaque wall and an evergreen hedge (See Figure 7), unless they are providing short-term parking for ten cars or fewer.

Initially, the surface parking lot south of Building 6 was proposed to be screened with landscaping but not with a low wall. The applicant requested an amendment of S23 to utilize only one means of screening. Staff requested that the applicant incorporate a low wall compatible with the proposed building material to supplement the screening. Revised plans were submitted screening the surface parking lot with a low wall and landscaping. While the landscaping appears

consistent with Figure 7 of the TDDP, it would not be classified as an “evergreen hedge”. A full evergreen hedge and a low wall would be redundant, and the applicant’s proposal satisfies the intent of S23 to attractively screen surface parking lots from roadways. As a result, the Planning Board recommends that the District Council approve an amendment of S23.

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

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

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

15. **Conformance to the *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual***—This portion of the development is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements, Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements, and Section 4.4, Screening Requirements of the Landscape Manual. The site plan has been found to be in conformance with the applicable Sections of the Landscape Manual except for Section 4.4. Several transformers and generators are shown on the site plan and are not proposed to be screened. The plans should be revised prior to the issuance of any building permits to demonstrate that the proposed transformers/generators will be screened with a masonry wall.

16. **Urban Design Analysis:** There are several inconsistencies between the site and landscape plans in the vicinity of the surface parking lot. The detailed site plan shall be revised to demonstrate the configuration of the freestanding walls proposed to screen the parking lot and retaining wall proposed to tie into the southeastern corner of Building 6 as shown on the landscape plans. Since the freestanding and retaining walls are integrally designed, they shall be treated with the same materials as on the main building and details shall be provided on the plans to demonstrate as much.

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

The plans indicate that the pool plaza, main entrance plaza and the plaza associated with the retail area will receive various enhanced paving treatments; however, the detail sheets only provide one paving detail. The hardscape plans shall reference a specific paving detail for each of these areas

and such details shall be provided on the plans. Areas receiving the same paving treatment should not be depicted differently on the plans. The raised concrete planter proposed within the plaza associated with the retail component is shown with an unfinished exterior, which is not appropriate within a pedestrian-oriented space that is part of a quality development. The exterior of this planter shall be finished with masonry to match the freestanding walls proposed to screen the surface parking lot.

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

PARCEL C, AMERICANA PLAZA

17. **Request:** The detailed site plan proposes the development of 356 multifamily units, 1,290 square feet of retail/office space, and 57 single-family attached townhouse units on Parcel C, Americana Plaza.

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

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

	Required	Provided
Parking	N/A	523
Loading	2	2

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

20. **Surrounding Uses:** Parcel C, Americana Plaza, is bounded to the north by Dean Drive, to the east by Northwest Drive, to the south by Toledo Terrace, and to the west by Toledo Plaza, an existing multifamily development in the R-18 (Multifamily Medium Residential) Zone.
21. **Design Features:** As Phase II of the overall project, Parcel C of the Americana Plaza is proposed to be developed with 356 multifamily units and 1,300 square feet of retail/office space within a four- to five-story building shown as Building 7 and 57 single-family detached townhouse units. The multifamily building is designed to completely fill the entire usable land area in the south portion of Parcel C, except for a 10-foot-wide public utility easement (PUE) along the perimeter of the site. The multifamily and townhouse portions of Parcel C are proposed to be separated by a private access drive. The multifamily building will be located on the southern portion of Parcel C and will taper from five stories in height along its Toledo Terrace frontage to four stories along its private drive frontage, across from the townhouse units. Building 7 consists of two, roughly square-shaped portions connected by a five-story parking structure. The parking structure is fully concealed by the building on three sides and is exposed for approximately 125 linear feet along the private drive. Although the parking structure faces the streetscape in this area, the façade is treated with materials, detailing and fenestration patterns compatible with the treatment of the rest of the building.

The proposed use is primarily residential, with a 1,290-square-foot retail/office component proposed to be located at the intersection of Toledo Terrace and Toledo Place, across from the retail/office component of Building 6. A patterned concrete plaza area is proposed between the face of the retail portion of the building and the curb. Each of the two square-shaped sections features a large interior courtyard. The courtyard within the eastern portion of the building includes two raised biofiltration planters, private terraces, and a network of paths and sitting areas for use by all residents of the building. The courtyard within the western portion of the building features private terraces, raised planters and a central amenity area with a pool, shade structures, a raised lawn area and seating areas.

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

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

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

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

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

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

One monument sign (identified as Sign Type B) is proposed to be located on the northwestern side of the intersection of the private access drive and Northwest Drive. The main monument sign features a brick base and two tapered columns between which is located a metal sign panel identifying Belcrest Plaza. The two columns are connected by accent metal bands. An additional monument sign (identified as Sign Type A) is proposed on the west side of the Northwest Drive in the front yard of one of the townhouse units. This sign is designed with materials and detailing consistent with Sign Type B and features one tapered column with a vertical sign panel identifying Belcrest Plaza, a brick base and accent metal bands.

22. **Conformance with the Mandatory Development Requirements of the Transit District Development Plan:** The applicant has requested modifications from one of the development standards for this portion of the project as follows:

Subarea 13A

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

The proposal does not meet this requirement because 24 three-bedroom units are proposed within Building 7 and are not designated for condominium ownership. The applicant has requested an

amendment from this requirement and provided justification for that request. The Planning Board finds that it would not be appropriate to require the sale of individual three-bedroom units, which are located randomly within the proposed buildings and that it is desirable to have a greater diversity of rental units available to potential tenants.

Architecture

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

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

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

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

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

24. **Conformance to the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual***—Parcel C, Americana Plaza is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements, and Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the Landscape Manual. The site plan has been found to be in conformance with the applicable Sections of the Landscape Manual. Several transformers and generators are shown on the site plan and are not proposed to be screened. Prior to the issuance of building permits the plans shall be revised to demonstrate that the proposed transformers/generators will be screened with a masonry wall

25. **Urban Design Analysis:**

Building 7: The plans indicate that the pool plaza, main entrance plaza and the plaza associated with the retail area will receive various enhanced paving treatments; however, the plans only

provide one paving detail. The hardscape plans shall reference a specific paving detail for each of these areas and such details shall be provided on the plans. Areas receiving the same paving treatment should not be depicted differently on the plans.

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

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

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

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

PARCEL B, GEORGIAN PLAZA

26. **Request:** The detailed site plan proposes development of 1,979 multifamily units, 68,050 square feet of commercial space, and 216,000 square feet of office space within five buildings on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza.

27. **Development Data Summary for Parcel B, Georgian Plaza:**

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zone(s)	R-18	M-U-I
Use(s)	Multifamily	Multifamily, Office & Retail
Acreage	12.46	12.46
Area within 100 year floodplain	0	0
Parcels	1	1
Dwelling Units		
Multifamily	294	1,979
Square Footage/GFA	0	Residential–2,231,250 Commercial–68,050 Office–216,000 Total–2,511,300
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	N/A	4.62

	Required	Provided
Parking	N/A	2,233
Loading	2*	13

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

28. **Location:** Parcel B, Georgian Plaza is located within Subarea 12 of the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone, at the northwest corner of the intersection of Toledo Terrace and Northwest Drive, between Toledo Terrace and Dean Drive.
29. **Surrounding Uses:** Parcel B, Georgian Plaza, is bounded to the north and west by Toledo Terrace, to the east by Belcrest Road, and to the south by Prince George’s Plaza, a commercial shopping center in the C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) Zone.
30. **Design Features:** Parcel B of the Georgian Plaza is proposed to be developed with 1,979 multifamily units, 68,050 square feet of retail, and 216,000 square feet of office within five buildings. Parcel B is roughly rectangular in shape and tapers to a point west of Northwest Drive. The proposed buildings range in height from three stories at the westernmost tip of the parcel, to 31 stories at the northeast corner of the parcel, at the intersection of Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace. The five buildings are separated by private access drives which create separate and

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

Building 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“The Public Amenity area will be easily accessible from the surrounding neighborhoods via walking, biking or driving. Parking will be located inside Building 1's shared

structured parking garage, with approximately one hundred parking spaces designated for patrons of the Public Amenity area.”

The office lobby wraps around the southeast corner of the building and fronts on Belcrest Road. The east elevation along Belcrest Road features five levels of parking garage between the office lobby at the southwest corner of the building and the residential lobby associated with the 31-story residential tower at the northwest corner of the building. Although the parking structure fronts the streetscape in this area, the façade is treated with materials, detailing and fenestration patterns compatible with the treatment of the rest of the building.

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

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

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

Building 2

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

Building 2 features two main building sections on top of a five-story parking podium. The north elevation, along Toledo Terrace, is designed with a central, 17-story residential tower, which is

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

A drop off area is proposed along Toledo Terrace, adjacent to the main entrance to Building 2A. Access to the parking garage is provided on the east side of the building, adjacent to the north edge of the main plaza and in the center of the building on the west side. Separate loading facilities are proposed within Buildings 2A and 2B and are conveniently located for retail and residential users.

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

Building 3

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

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

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

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

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

Building 4

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

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

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

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

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

Building 5

Building 5 is a roughly triangular-shaped building, which is located at the westernmost tip of Parcel B, Georgian Plaza. This building is proposed to contain the main recreational amenity space associated with the project, which will be available for use by all residents of the community. The building is designed in various heights ranging from 3 to 14 stories. The east portion of the building features a three-story above ground and one level underground parking podium, above which residential units and courtyard space are located. Ground floor retail uses are located along the building's Toledo Terrace frontage. Residential units are located on the second through fourteenth floors. The recreational uses are proposed in the western portion of the building and include a fitness center, locker rooms, billiard/dart room, arcade, a 80-foot by 30-foot indoor pool, a yoga room and an indoor basketball court. A business center is also proposed for use by the residents of the building.

Architecture

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

Signage

Two monument signs (identified as Sign Type A) are proposed along Belcrest Road: one at the corner of Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace and one at the corner of Belcrest Road and the private drive that accesses Prince George's Plaza. This sign is designed with one tapered column with a vertical sign panel identifying Belcrest Plaza, a brick base and accent metal bands. Five

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

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

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

31. **Conformance with any Mandatory Development Requirements of the Transit District Development Plan:** The applicant has requested modification of one of the development standards for Parcel B, Georgian Plaza.

Subarea 12

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

The proposal does not meet this requirement because 24 three-bedroom units are proposed within Building 1, 46 three-bedroom units are proposed within Building 2, 26 three-bedroom units are proposed within Building 3, 4 three-bedroom units are proposed within Building 4, and 18 three-bedroom units are proposed within Building 5 and are not designated for condominium ownership. The applicant has requested an amendment from this requirement and justification in support of this request which is provided above in Finding 14 relating to Parcels A and B, Americana Plaza:

The Planning Board finds that it would not be appropriate to require the sale of individual three-bedroom units, which are located randomly within the proposed buildings and that it is desirable to have a greater diversity of rental units available to potential tenants.

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

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

- 1. Party and/or community rooms with kitchen, minimum size of 3 square feet per dwelling unit.**

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

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

33. **Conformance to the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual***—This portion of the development is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements, and Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the Landscape Manual. The site plan has been found to be in conformance with the requirements of Section 4.1 of the Landscape Manual. The plans are not in conformance with Sections 4.7 of the Landscape Manual. Departure from Design Standards DDS-600 is a companion to this detailed site plan which was approved for departure from the requirements of Section 4.7 of the Landscape Manual along the southern property line of Parcel B, Georgian Plaza, adjacent to Prince George's Plaza, a commercial shopping center.

Several transformers and generators are shown on the site plan in the right-of-way and the streetscape and are not screened. The plans shall be revised to demonstrate that the proposed transformers/generators will be relocated and screened with a masonry wall.

REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR OVERALL DEVELOPMENT

34. **Required Findings for a Detailed Site Plan in the Transit District Overlay Zone as stated in the Transit District Development Plan:**

1. **The Transit District Site Plan is in strict conformance with any Mandatory Development Requirements of the Transit District Development Plan.**

The applicant has requested modifications from several mandatory development requirements, which apply to the entire development. Amendments that are specific to a particular land area are discussed in the analysis of each specific pod of development. The following are the amendments requested for the overall development:

Streetscape

- P1 **Unless otherwise stated within the Subarea Specific Requirements, each developer, applicant, and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assigns, shall be responsible for streetscape improvements along the entire length of the property frontage from the building envelope to face of curb. (See Figures 7, 8 and 9. Toledo Terrace: 20-foot pedestrian zone; East West Highway: 40-foot pedestrian zone; Belcrest Road: 20-40 foot pedestrian zone.) These improvements shall be included as part of any application for building or grading permits, except for permits for interior alterations which do not constitute redevelopment as defined in the previous chapter.**

No building or grading permits shall be issued without a Detailed Site Plan which indicates conformance with the streetscape requirements of the TDDP. Construction of the streetscaping improvements shall be in phase with development, or the construction schedule shall be determined at the time of Detailed Site Plan.

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

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

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

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

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

- An 11-foot-wide sidewalk along Belcrest Road (Mandatory Development Requirement S8 requires a 20- to 40-foot pedestrian zone with a sidewalk of undetermined width, per Figure 8)

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

As was testified to the January 14, 2010 hearing, a meeting was convened with the utility companies and the DPW&T on December 14, 2009, to address all of the concerns and to determine a final streetscape. DPW&T agreed that no widening of Toledo Terrace would be required, and that bicycles would be accommodated within the existing pavement. The Planning Board supports the final streetscape and approves the amendment to S-8 requested by the applicant.

S6 At the time of the first Detailed Site Plan submission, the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) Urban Design staff shall select and specify the paving material to be used for the primary and secondary pedestrian system throughout the transit district.

The applicant and Staff have worked cooperatively to select and specify paving material to be used for the pedestrian systems within the development. Based upon experience since the first detailed site plan was approved within the Transit District, the paving material does not match that approved with the first submission. The applicant requested an amendment to S6 to allow approval of paving material which did not match the paving material approved in the first submission. The paving material proposed by the applicant is appropriate and of high quality and the Staff supports the use of the paving material proposed. As a result, the Planning Board recommends that the District Council approves and amendment of S6.

Transportation and Parking

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

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

The applicant provides the following justification for this request:

“Exhibit “D” attached to the Statement of Justification filed by the Applicant sets forth a request for waivers from several of the Mandatory Development Requirements and Site Design Guidelines contained in the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District Development Plan (“TDDP”), and addressed modifications to Zoning Ordinance Requirements permitted to be made by the Planning Board pursuant to the approval of a Detailed Site Plan. One such modification addressed in Exhibit “D” as originally filed related to the size of the proposed parking spaces within the development.

“Section 27-548.08(c)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance provides that in a TDOZ, the Planning Board “may amend parking provisions concerning the dimensions, layout or design of parking spaces or parking lots.” As such, the Applicant requested that the Planning Board approve the use of a universal size parking space measuring 9’ by 19’. This request involves a reduction in .5’ from the normal width of a standard size parking space, but no reduction in the depth or length of a standard size parking space. In further discussions with Staff to address concerns related to the design of the project, the reduction in the depth or length of the spaces to 18 feet would provide greater design flexibility for the parking structures and would adequately serve the development. The zoning ordinance permits the provision of up to 30% of the proposed parking spaces as compact car spaces, which allows the width of spaces to be reduced to as small as 8’ wide and the depth to be reduced to as small as 16 feet wide. While this would provide the applicant some flexibility in design, the provision of smaller parking spaces is not consistent with current planning practices. As a result, the applicant is submitting this revised request and justification to permit a universal sized parking space measuring 9 feet wide and 18 feet deep, with no compact car parking spaces provided.

“The applicant submits that the provision of a universal sized parking space 9 feet wide and 18 feet deep will not impair the visual, functional or environmental quality or integrity of the site, and will fulfill the intent of the TDDP to provide adequate parking to serve the proposed development. Currently, the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance permits two parking space sizes, one for compact cars (8’ X 16”) and one for standard cars (9 ½’ X 19’). The Urban Land Institute (“ULI”) has evaluated the efficiency of providing parking stalls of different sizes and concluded that a single parking space works better in practice. ULI offers the following reasons why parking stalls of differing dimensions do not work in practice:

- “1. At the time the small-vehicle-only parking space was introduced, the mix of automobiles consisted of very large and very small vehicles; therefore the small-vehicle space was largely self-enforcing.
2. Vehicle manufacturers have since down-sized many large passenger cars; light trucks, vans, and sport utility vehicles have become more popular; and, more recently, certain models have been up-sized, which leads to confusion as to what

is and what is not a small vehicle.

3. If a small-vehicle space is available in a convenient location in a parking facility, many drivers of intermediate or even larger vehicles will park in the small vehicle spaces, thus impeding traffic flow and compromising safety within the facility.
4. When large vehicles park in small vehicle spaces, they frequently encroach into the adjacent parking space such that a domino effect occurs down the row and eventually renders a parking space unusable.
5. If small vehicle spaces are placed at inconvenient locations, small-vehicle drivers may park in standard sized spaces, forcing later-arriving large vehicles into inadequate and inconvenient small-vehicle spaces.

“As a result of the above factors, ULI concludes:

“Due to the convergence of vehicle sizes, small-vehicle-only parking spaces are no longer a rational parking design alternative. In addition, light trucks, vans, and sport utility vehicles are an increasingly important factor in parking design geometrics. Sales of small vehicles dropped significantly in the 1990’s as the American passenger vehicle underwent a general, slow upsizing. Therefore a rational approach to parking space and module sizing can and does support moderate module dimensions for one-size-fits-all designs.

“The use of universal sized parking spaces has been approved in Prince George’s County in several locations, including parking garages located near metro stops. For example, the City of Bowie’s Design Guidelines recommend a universal size parking space of 9’ by 18’, and Departures from Design Standards have been approved by both the Planning Board and the City of Bowie to permit such a design. The Planning Board has also approved the use of universal size parking spaces at the Largo Metro Station. Thus, not only is the use of universal sized parking spaces an accepted practice, it is considered preferable to the use of compact car spaces to provide flexibility in parking lot design.”

The applicant subsequently amended its request to reduce the length of the proposed spaces from 19 feet to 18 feet. The applicant requested this amendment to provide additional flexibility in the design of the parking garages to facilitate activating more of the project’s street frontage.

The Planning Board finds that the applicant’s requested reduction in the size of standard parking spaces from 9.5 feet by 19 feet to 9 feet by 18 feet is appropriate. The proposed parking spaces are sufficiently wide to allow such workers, residents and retail patrons to enter and leave vehicles safely without compromising adjacent vehicles or pedestrian safety.

Lighting

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

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

“The Applicant has prepared and submitted a detailed photometric plan of the entire development. While an average lighting level of 1.25 footcandles is provided for all outdoor spaces, including all primary and secondary pedestrian walkways, some areas do not provide a minimum of 1.25 footcandles. To achieve this, maximum footcandle levels of 7.3 are required directly under the fixture. In order to achieve a minimum of 1.25 footcandles in all locations, however, the maximum footcandles would have to be around 15 footcandles and would be too bright. This high level of lighting is counter to energy efficiency initiatives and night sky goals. In addition, over lighting the site is inconsistent with the goal to achieve LEED certification. One of the credits required for LEED certification (i.e. light pollution reduction) requires the light level in the exterior of a building to be at or below the levels recommended by the Illuminating Engineering Society (IES) recommended practice manual for outdoor environments. The highest minimum average light level recommended, for commercial area walkways, is only .9 footcandles. Thus, the applicant requests a waiver of S8 and S25 to allow it to provide an minimum average lighting level of 1.25 footcandles, rather than a minimum lighting level of 1.25 footcandles.”

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

The Planning Board finds that the provision of lighting at the level of 15 footcandles directly beneath the luminaires, which is necessary in order to achieve a minimum level of 1.25 footcandles, would be undesirable. One of the compatibility standards set forth in the Zoning Ordinance for the M-U-I Zone is that site design should minimize glare, light, and other visual intrusions into and impacts on yards, open areas, and building facades on

adjacent properties. The applicant's requested amendment will ensure that an adequate level of lighting is maintained on the subject site while minimizing the impact of excessive light levels on adjacent properties.

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

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

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

The Planning Board finds the selected light fixture is appropriate in terms of scale and design for use along Toledo Terrace, Toledo Place and Northwest Drive. The plans shall demonstrate that the pole and fixture will be black and the fixture shall incorporate full cut off optics to the extent possible.

Signs

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

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

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

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

The proposed way-finding signs, shown as Sign Type C on the plans, are appropriately sized given their intended purpose.

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

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

Recommended Multifamily Amenities

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

For each residential unit:

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

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

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

Full-size washer and dryer.

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

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

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

8-foot sliding glass patio door.

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

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

Walk-in closets.

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

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

Gas fireplace.

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

Burglar/intrusion alarm.

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

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

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

The applicant has indicated that there will be no cathedral ceilings or skylights provided within top floor units due to the flat roof design of the proposed building.

3. The Transit District Site Plan meets all of the requirements of the Transit District Overlay Zone and applicable regulations of the underlying zones;

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

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

- (b) Where an owner proposes a mix of residential and commercial uses on a single lot or parcel in the M-U-I Zone, the site plan as approved shall set out the regulations to be followed. The approved regulations may reduce parking requirements by thirty percent (30%), where evidence shows that proposed parking will be adequate, notwithstanding provisions in Part 11. (CB-10-2001; CB-42-2003)**

The subject detailed site plan will establish the regulations to be followed. The parking requirements set forth in the TDDP are discussed in detail in the Transportation Planning Section's analysis.

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

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

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

As previously discussed in regard to the amendments to the heights of buildings, the proposed buildings will be compatible in size, height, and massing to buildings on adjacent properties and compatible with the vision for each subarea.

The applicant proposes to construct a mix of residential, retail and office uses on the subject property. The highest concentration of non-residential uses is located in the eastern portion of the development, on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza, adjacent to the Prince George's Plaza shopping center and additional retail uses across Belcrest Road. Parcel C, Americana Plaza, contains mainly residential uses and is adjacent to existing multifamily developments to the north, east and west. Building 6 on Parcels A and B, Americana Plaza, features mainly residential uses, and is adjacent

to multifamily uses to the west and south. The retail portions of Buildings 6 and 7 are concentrated at the intersection of Toledo Place and Toledo Terrace, across from an entrance into Prince George's Plaza.

The Planning Board recommends approval of the requested amendments to the building heights requested by the applicant and finds the proposed building heights to be compatible with adjacent and proposed development based upon evidence in the record including the Viewshed Study, Applicant's Exhibit 7.

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

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

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

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

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

Conformance to the applicable standards of the TDDP is discussed in detail above.

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

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

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

The applicant proposes to construct a mix of residential, retail and office uses on the subject property. The highest concentration of nonresidential uses is located in the eastern portion of the development, on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza, adjacent to the Prince George's Plaza shopping center and additional retail uses across Belcrest Road. Parcel C, Americana Plaza, contains mainly residential uses and is adjacent to existing multifamily developments to the north, east and west. Building 6 on Parcels A and B, Americana Plaza, features mainly residential

uses, and is adjacent to multifamily uses to the west and south. The retail portions of Buildings 6 and 7 are concentrated at the intersection of Toledo Place and Toledo Terrace, across from an entrance into Prince George's Plaza.

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

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

The proposed buildings will be compatible in size, height, and massing to buildings on adjacent properties and compatible with the vision for each subarea.

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

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

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

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

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

The proposed architectural elevations of Buildings 6 and 7 feature a combination of face brick in traditional red and other accent colors and accent hardiplank panels and

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

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

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

Several unscreened transformers are shown on the plans in highly visible locations. A condition has been included which requires the screening and/or relocation of these items.

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

The proposed signs conform to the applicable Development District Standards.

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

(i) Hours of operation or deliveries;

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

(ii) Location of activities with potential adverse impacts;

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

(iii) Location and use of trash receptacles;

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

(iv) Location of loading and delivery spaces;

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

(v) Light intensity and hours of illumination; and

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

(vi) Location and use of outdoor vending machines.

No outdoor vending machines are proposed.

35. **Referral Agencies and Departments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

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

As discussed above in Finding 4 in regard to conformance to the transportation goals of the TDDP, the application meets the goal of providing for adequate levels of transportation and transit operating and service efficiency.

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

The 1998 TDDP transportation adequacy requirements are based on:

- (1) an established district-wide parking cap,
- (2) the number of additional surface parking spaces (preferred and premium) that will be constructed and/or provided in support of any new development or redevelopment plan, and
- (3) the implementation of a system for developer contributions toward construction of the needed transportation facilities, based on the number of additional new surface parking spaces.

The proposed DSP is proposing to replace the existing 743 surface parking spaces with only 78 new surface parking spaces. Since the 743 surface parking spaces existed prior to TDDP approval, they are considered exempt from TDDP parking requirements. If the rezoning were approved, pursuant to the TDDP Mandatory Development requirements P6 through P19, the existing, programmed, and planned transportation facilities would be deemed adequate to serve the mixed use development proposed by the submitted DSP.

- b. **Subdivision**—Provided the following analysis of the need for a preliminary plan of subdivision and the detailed site plan's conformance to the record plats:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- c. **Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)**—Provided the following analysis of the detailed site plan:

- (1) The property is located on the southwestern quadrant of the intersection of Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace.
- (2) All improvements within the public rights-of-way, as dedicated for public use to the County, are to be in accordance with the County Road Ordinance, DPW&T Specifications and Standards and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
- (3) Compliance with DPW&T's Utility policy is required. Based upon the plans submitted, proper temporary and final patching and the related mill and overlay in accordance with the established DPW&T Policy and Specification for Utility Installation and Maintenance Permits are required.
- (4) The private road within the site will require a DPW&T permit prior to issuance of the building permit. The roads are to be constructed in accordance with DPW&T's Specifications and Standards.
- (5) Any proposed and/or existing Master Plan roadways that lie within the property limits must be addressed through coordination between the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) and DPW&T and may involve rights-of-way reservation, dedication and/or construction in accordance with DPW&T's specifications and standards.
- (6) Conformance with DPW&T street tree and street lighting standards is required.
- (7) Sidewalks are required along all roadways within the property limits in accordance with Sections 23-105 and 23-135 of the County Road Ordinance.
- (8) All storm drainage systems and facilities are to be in accordance with DPW&T's specifications and standards requirements. (Be aware that the new Maryland Stormwater Management regulations take effect on May 4, 2010. All stormwater management practices/facilities must meet the new regulations).
- (9) An access study shall be conducted by the applicant and reviewed to determine the adequacy of the access point(s) and the need for acceleration/deceleration lanes and a by-pass lane with dedication of the necessary additional right-of-way.
- (10) A soils investigation report which includes subsurface exploration and a geotechnical engineering evaluation for public streets and proposed dwellings are required.
- (11) The bus pull-offs located on Toledo Terrace were reviewed by DPW&T and determined that the six shown on the plan are excessive and that the number needs to be reduced to four due to the close proximity of the buildings to one another.

- (12) The developer has indicated a willingness to execute a Memorandum of Understanding to provide bus shuttle services for the residents of the development. Metrobus should have access to one or more of the proposed bus pull-offs.
- (13) The location of the proposed monument signs need to be evaluated to ensure that appropriate sight distance is maintained.
- (14) A traffic impact study was reviewed by DPW&T and the specific comments were forwarded to M-NCPPC under separate cover.
- (15) The proposed site development is consistent with the approved DPW&T Stormwater Management Concept Plan 11078-2009-00 dated May 26, 2009. The stormwater management facilities proposed are in accordance with current county stormwater management regulations.
- (16) The proposed loading entrance backing directly onto Toledo Terrace, located on the south side of Toledo Terrace at the intersection of Belcrest Road, is too close to the intersection. This proposed loading entrance is not acceptable.
- (17) In conclusion, noting that this development increases the area density levels by fivefold recommended within the current, approved Transit District Development Plan and the Transit Demand Overlay Zone document, and realizing that a long-term funding mechanism will be needed to implement and maintain the transit district improvements stated above, and realizing that there is to be a plan to improve the traffic level service "E" that the traffic study indicates resulting from this development it is DPW&T's recommendation to the Prince George's County Planning Board that the County's first Transportation Demand Management District (TDMD) be authorized by the County Council as authorized under the TDMD Ordinance (Subtitle 20A of the Prince George's County Code). The implementation and oversight of the TDMD is to be the responsibility of M-NCPPC.

- e. **Town of University Park**—In a letter dated January 14, 2010, the Town of University Park stated the following:

"The Town is in support of responsible development at the Belcrest Plaza site, consistent with the Transit District Development Plan ("TDDP"). We feel that the current DSP proposal falls short of the TDDP, quality development and best practices. Unfortunately, although the Applicant was requested by Park and Planning staff to provide a conceptual site plan, so that the overall concept of the proposed development could be considered, they refused to do so. It is also an issue in this proposal that a preliminary plan was not required, which has left the provision of adequate public facilities and compliance with

the TDDP requirement of necessary public facility service levels, particularly water and other utilities, in question.

As noted in previous testimony and a letter to the Planning Board, the Town’s concerns have been: storm water management, traffic, architectural design and view-shed, density, and streetscape/street activation issues. With these overall issues in mind, we are presenting the following comments. The Town is generally in support of the Staff Recommendation, but with some important exceptions.

- “1. The Town requests that the Planning Board DISAPPROVE changes in minimum and maximum height restrictions. In particular, the Town vigorously opposes the increases in building height on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza, with respect to the 31 story tower. This building, along with other increases in density, upends the assumptions on which the Transit District Development Plan (“TDDP”) was based. The developer has stated that the height restrictions are based on old, outdated concepts. If this is in fact the case, and we do not believe it is, such a drastic change should be considered in a public process, not in the context of a DSP and zoning change. At the same time that this significant increase in density is being proposed, other requested amendments severely compromise the original plan.

2. Planning Staff has recommended amendments to the standards of the Prince George’s Plaza Transit District Development Plan in paragraph D on pages 9/10 of the report. Because specific standards are referenced by number, it is difficult for members of the community to understand what the amendments actually allow. A specific reference to what part or plan of the DSP is being permitted by the amendments would be helpful.”

The following chart has been provided in response to this request:

Standard	Requirement	Planning Board Action
P1	Frontage improvements along Toledo Terrace shall include a 20-foot-wide pedestrian area with a 12-foot-wide sidewalk	Approval of modified streetscape- 8’ sidewalk 5’ tree planting and lighting area
P5	Small regulatory signs shall not exceed 2 square feet	Approval of small directional signs 4.5 square feet in area

P6	Parking shall meet Part 11 of the Zoning Ordinance	Approval of parking standard parking spaces at 9'X18'
S3	All primary and secondary pedestrian walkways shall be lit to a minimum standard of 1.25 footcandles	Approval of minimum average of 1.25 footcandles
S6	First DSP sets the standard detail for treatment of the primary and secondary pedestrian system	Approval of a modified sidewalk along the site's Toledo Terrace frontage consistent with previous approvals along East West Highway
S8	Frontage improvements along Toledo Terrace shall include a 20-foot-wide pedestrian area with a 12-foot-wide sidewalk	Approval of modified streetscape- 8' sidewalk 5' tree planting and lighting area
S24	All lighting shall be coordinated throughout the transit district	Approval of a modified pole and fixture maintainable by Pepco, conditioned to be black and partial cut-off
S25	All lighting shall have a minimum level of 1.25 footcandles	Approval of minimum average of 1.25 footcandles
S33	Afforestation of 10% required on all properties exempt from the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance	Approval of the applicant's request to use on-site tree canopy toward the requirement for afforestation
G53	Recommended Multifamily Amenities	Minor modifications amenities within each residential unit
P102	Three Bedroom Units shall be condo	Approval of 3 bedroom units as rentals for buildings 1-5
P105	Three Bedroom Units shall be condo	Approval of 3 bedroom units as rentals for buildings 6 & 7
S18	Parking lots shall not extend beyond the front plane of adjoining buildings	Approval of location of surface parking lot, which does not extend past the most projected portion of Building 6

S23	Surface parking lots shall be screened by a low wall and hedge	Approval of a wall without a hedge
-----	--	------------------------------------

3. The Town SUPPORTS Conditions 16 through 20, as amended in the January 6, 2010 letter to the Planning Board from Famararz Mokhtari and Susan Lareuse, and asks to be added to Section 19(b).
4. The Town SUPPORTS Recommended Conditions E.1.(a) and 9 and that the public park be placed on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS

5. Prior to certification of overall detailed site plan, revise the plans to show a 43-foot right of way along the full length of Toledo Terrace to allow for two 5 foot marked bike lanes, and a 12-foot sidewalk and 8-foot tree planting strip.
6. Prior to issuance of any building permits in any of the three areas referenced in a letter from WSSC to Jonathan Genn, dated August 25, 2009, and attached diagram, the required relief or replacement of downstream sewers must be completed.
7. Prior to issuance of any building permits for any units in excess of 769 multifamily dwelling units, or the equivalent of 100,000 gallons base sanitary flow per day, the new WSSC Anacostia Storage Facility must be constructed.
8. Prior to issuance of any grading permit, Applicant shall revise plans to demonstrate conformance with COMAR Title 26, Department of the Environment, Part 3, Subtitle 17, Water Management, Chapter 2, Stormwater Management, 26.17.02.00 et seq., as amended, incorporating by reference 2000 Maryland Stormwater Design Manual Volumes I and II (Maryland Department of the Environment, April, 2000) Supplement 1or as adopted by the County pursuant thereto.
9. Prior to issuance of any use and occupancy permit Applicant shall provide a private shuttle to and from the Prince George’s Plaza Metro station, that operates with a 15 minute headway between 6:30–9:00 a.m. and 4:30–7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. Specifications and assurances for any shuttle service shall be provided prior to issuance of any building permit.
10. In the event the Planning Board supports the recommendation that the public park be placed in Parcel D, the Town requests following condition:

Prior to the issuance of any building permits on Parcel B, Georgian Plaza, the applicant shall submit to the Developmental Review Division a concept plan for a private outdoor open space of approximately 2.8 acres of land to be developed on Parcel B (where Building 2 is now shown on the plans). Applicant shall submit final plans for construction of the proposed private urban park to the Planning Board or its designee and the Town of University Park.

The Town opposes any further changes to the conditions that degrade the TDDP. While certain changes may be required over time to bring the TDDP more into line with current best practices, any request for change should be carefully scrutinized.”

- f. **City of Hyattsville**—In a letter dated December 8, 2009, The City of Hyattsville stated the following:

“The City supports the redevelopment of these parcels, and many aspects of the proposed development will enhance the recent investment around the Prince George’s Metro Station. The City supports the applicant’s goal of achieving Leadership in energy and environmental design (LEED) certification for all buildings; meeting the new storm water standards; and including office space for a public use.

“The City has concerns about the proposed transportation network, and would like to note the need to improve intersections and pedestrian access at Belcrest and East West Highway and other locations, the need to ensure all streets have public access, including along the southern border of the property, and the need for more active uses, including first floor retail, office or residential and adequate sidewalks and landscaping along street frontages (per the adopted TDDP) along street frontages. The City also has concerns regarding the increase in traffic, as a result of this project, on Belcrest Road, Adelphi Road, Queens Chapel Road, Toledo Terrace, and East-West Highway. The City requests the developer commit to making all necessary pedestrian and vehicular traffic improvements to ensure efficient circulation, minimize congestion, and encourage bicycle, pedestrian, and public transit modes of transportation.

“The project proposes a nearly fivefold increase in the number of housing units, and a much smaller amount of office and retail space. The City supports owner-occupied housing units to the extent possible. The City is supportive of a recreational space as a major amenity for the residents and larger community. Due to the complexity and size of the proposed development, and more significant concerns with the configuration of the development on the parcels immediately behind the Mall, it may be advantageous to separate the project into two phases for approval.”

- g. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In an e-mail memorandum dated November 18, 2009, WSSC indicated that they had no comment at this time.

36. As required by Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the Detailed Site Plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9 of

the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein; and

- A. RECOMMENDS that the District Council APPROVE the request to rezone the following property from the R-18 Zone to the M-U-I Zone:
- Parcel A, Americana Plaza
 - Parcel B, Americana Plaza
 - Parcel C, Americana Plaza
 - Parcel B, Georgian Plaza; and
- B. RECOMMENDS that the District Council APPROVE the proposed change to the use list to add permitted uses in the M-U-I Zone for Subareas 12 and 13A for the subject parcels; and
- C. RECOMMENDS that the District Council APPROVE the proposed change to the minimum building height for part of Building 5 and part of Building 2 within Parcel B, Georgian Plaza (Subarea 12), and the townhouse units within Parcel C, Americana Plaza (Subarea 13A), and APPROVE the proposed change to the maximum building height for Buildings 1 and 2 within Parcel B, Georgian Plaza (Subarea 12); and
- D. RECOMMENDS that the District Council APPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-09006, with the following amendments to the standards of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan:
- Overall Development:
 - P1 Approval of modified streetscape along Toledo Terrace- 8-foot sidewalk, 5-foot tree planting and lighting area.
 - P5 Approval of small directional signs-4.5 square feet in area.
 - P6 Approval of parking space size at 9 feet by 18 feet.
 - S3 Approval of minimum average lighting of 1.25 footcandles.
 - S6 Approval of a modified sidewalk paving.
 - S8 Approval of modified streetscape- 8-foot sidewalk 5-foot tree planting and lighting area.
 - S24 Approval of a modified pole and fixture maintainable by Pepco, conditioned to be black in color and partial cut-off optics to the extent possible.
 - S25 Approval of minimum average lighting of 1.25 footcandles.
 - S33 Approval of the applicant's request to use on-site tree canopy to count toward the requirement for afforestation.
 - G53 Minor modifications to the amenities provided within each residential unit.
 - Parcel B, Georgian Plaza:

P102 Approval of 3 bedroom units as rentals.

- Parcel C, Americana Plaza:

P105 Approval of 3 bedroom units as rentals.

- Parcels A & B, Americana Plaza:

P105 Approval of 3 bedroom units as rentals.

S18 Approval of location of surface parking lot, to extend past the façade of Building 6.

S23 Approval of a screen wall without a hedge.

E. RECOMMENDS that the District Council APPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-09006, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the overall detailed site plan, the applicant shall:

- a. Submit a score card for each individual building within the project, signed by a LEED Accredited Professional, that indicates the professional's opinion that each building will be designed in accordance with the most current and applicable U. S. Green Building Council's (USGBC) Green Building Rating System. The plans shall be revised in accordance with the standards to achieve this goal.
- b. Revise the plans to demonstrate how the tree credits in the tree canopy worksheet are accounted for in the plant schedules and that a minimum of 500 cubic feet of soil volume shall be provided per tree counted toward fulfillment of this requirement.
- c. Provide a sidewalk/streetscape detail for the subject site's frontage along the Prince George's Plaza loop road matching the sidewalk materials proposed along Toledo Terrace.
- d. Provide a total of 29 bicycle racks in the vicinity of the retail areas based on four racks per 10,000 square feet of retail space. The total number and location of the bicycle racks shall be indicated on the detailed site plan.
- e. Reduce the turning radius along the subject site's frontage of the Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace intersection as part of streetscape improvements proposed along both roads, consistent with SHA Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines and subject to DPW&T approval.
- f. Revise the plans to include details and specifications of security measures for residential parking, including the separation of residential parking from retail and office parking.

- g. Revise the plans to provide details of enhanced paving for each of the plaza areas. Such details shall be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
- h. Revise the plans to show all proposed stormwater management facilities consistently on all plans including the approved stormwater management concept plan, site plan, landscape plan, and hardscape plan.
- i. Revise the plans to include additional dimensioned details of the light fixtures proposed along Toledo Terrace, Toledo Place, and Northwest Drive, to be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board. The details shall confirm that the poles and fixtures will be black and incorporate partial cut-off optics as provided by PEPCO.
- j. Revise the plans to insure that all buildings and structures are shown outside of the public utility easements.
- k. Revise the plans to clearly distinguish between building footprints and cantilevered portions of the buildings.
- l. Revise the plans to provide a continuous eight-foot-wide sidewalk along the property's frontage on Toledo Terrace, separated from the curb by a five-foot-wide street tree and street light bank, except along the shuttle drop-off areas. The streetscape detail for Toledo Terrace shall be revised accordingly, prior to certification of the detailed site plan.
- m. Revise all plans (site, landscape, hardscape) to show the locations of all proposed signs.
- n. Revise all plans to show all parking spaces, except handicapped spaces, with a dimension of 9 feet by 18 feet.
- o. Revise the plans to reflect five feet of the right-of-way to be vacated in accordance with the DPW&T memo dated January 13, 2010 in order to provide a 15-foot-wide public utility easement along Toledo Terrace.
- p. Submit a color coded master utility exhibit showing planned utilities, easements, and the relationship between existing and proposed utilities and structures. The master utility exhibit shall indicate the undergrounding of overhead utilities. The master utility plan shall be revised and approved by all affected utility companies.

2. Prior to final plat of any individual parcel, the applicant shall vacate a five-foot-wide strip of the right-of-way along the property's frontage in accordance with Section 24-112 of the Subdivision Regulations to provide for a 15-foot wide public utility easement. If vacation cannot be approved, the applicant shall work with utility companies and DPW&T to revise the master utility exhibit required in Condition 1(p) above to resolve the issue.
3. Prior to the issuance of any permits for any individual parcel:
 - a. The applicant shall file a final plat of subdivision pursuant to Section 24-111(c)(4) of the Subdivision Regulations for such individual parcel to document the existing development and shall provide a ten-foot-wide public utility easement (PUE) on such final plats of subdivision, unless the vacation referenced in Condition 2 is denied, then the applicant shall fulfill Condition 2 prior to approval of the final plat.
 - b. The applicant shall provide a copy of the proposed sediment and erosion control plan and the detailed site plans indicating that the plans include notes and a detail regarding the stenciling of stormdrain inlets with "Do Not Dump—Chesapeake Bay Drainage."
4. The applicant and/or the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall be responsible for the construction and maintenance of all streetscape improvements along the entire length of the property frontage along all public roads from the façade of the building to the face of curb, unless otherwise agreed with the applicable governing authority.
5. Construction of the streetscape improvements shall be completed with each phase of the development, and phasing shall be delineated on the site plan.
6. The plans shall include notes stating that all existing overhead utilities along the property's road frontage shall be located underground unless prohibited by PEPCO. Proposed utilities for the project shall also be placed underground. If PEPCO determines that the undergrounding of the existing utilities are not allowed, then the applicant shall provide evidence of this prohibition in writing and any necessary adjustments to the site plan to the Planning Board or its designee.
7. Shared-lane markings for bicycles shall be provided along both sides of the entire length of Toledo Terrace, and the plans shall be revised to show these markings, unless modified by DPW&T. All pavement markings shall be consistent with the Federal Highway Administration's 2009 Edition of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), Section 9C.07, unless modified by DPW&T or other applicable regulatory authority.

8. In conjunction with the shared-lane markings, the applicant shall provide a minimum of eight “Bicycles May Use Full Lane” signs (R4-11, MUTCD) along Toledo Terrace, consistent with the Federal Highway Administration’s 2009 Edition of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), Section 9B.06, unless modified by DPW&T or other applicable regulatory authority.
9. Prior to final plat of any individual parcel, the applicant shall submit three original, executed recreational facilities agreements (RFA) for the exterior private facilities to be constructed within that parcel to the Development Review Division for review and approval. These recreational facilities shall be required to be constructed in conjunction with the phase of development with which they are included. Upon approval, the RFAs shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George’s County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland. Recreational facilities which are integral to and constructed as part of individual buildings shall not be required to be included in the RFA.
10. Prior to the issuance of building permits for each multifamily/mixed-use building, revise the site plan to show the location of transformers and generators. The transformers and generators will be located to minimize intrusion into the streetscape, and will be screened to the extent permitted by PEPCO with the use of masonry walls designated to be compatible with the exterior of adjacent buildings.
11. In accordance with the timing set forth below, the applicant shall convey an area of land not to exceed 3.5 acres to M-NCPPC in accordance with the following:
 - a. The land to be conveyed shall be that portion of Americana Plaza, Parcel D, proffered by the Applicant at the location shown on the Applicant’s exhibit. Land to be conveyed shall be subject to the following conditions:
 - (1) An original, special warranty deed for the property to be conveyed (signed by the WSSC Assessment Supervisor) shall be submitted to the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). Subsequent to the conveyance in accordance with subparagraph (h) below, the applicant shall file a plat for the conveyed property in accordance with Sections 24-107 and 24-108 of the Subdivision Regulations.
 - (2) Until the time of conveyance the M-NCPPC shall be held harmless for the cost of public improvements associated with land to be conveyed unrelated to the improvements to be constructed by the applicant pursuant condition 10 (c) below, including but not limited to sewer extensions, adjacent road improvements, drains, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, and front-foot benefit charges.
 - (3) The boundaries and acreage of land to be conveyed to M-NCPPC shall be indicated on all development plans and permits, which include such property.

- (4) All existing structures and paving shall be removed. Existing utilities shall be terminated and capped for future use. The applicant shall file and obtain a demolition and rough grading permit. The site shall be rough graded as shown on the approved park concept plans. The applicant shall notify DPR in writing prior to the commencement of any demolition activities.
 - (5) Any storm drain outfalls shall be designed to avoid adverse impacts on land to be conveyed to or owned by M-NCPPC. If the outfalls require drainage improvements on adjacent land to be conveyed to or owned by M-NCPPC, DPR shall review and approve the location and design of these facilities. DPR may require a performance bond and easement agreement prior to the issuance of grading permits.
 - (6) All waste matter and debris from demolition of any kind shall be removed from the property to be conveyed. All wells shall be filled and underground structures shall be removed. DPR shall inspect the site and verify that the condition of the land is acceptable for conveyance, prior to dedication.
 - (7) The applicant shall terminate any leasehold interests on property to be conveyed to M-NCPPC.
 - (8) The land to be conveyed shall not be encumbered by prescriptive or descriptive easements that are to the benefit of other properties without the expressed written permission of DPR. If encumbered, DPR shall review the location, the rights and privileges associated with those easements, and their anticipated impact on the future development of the parkland. If appropriate, DPR may require the applicant to relocate said easements.
 - (9) No storm water management facilities, tree conservation, or utility easements shall be proposed on land owned by or to be conveyed to M-NCPPC unrelated to the development proposed thereon without the prior written consent of DPR. DPR shall review and approved the location and/or design of these features. If such proposals are approved by DPR, a performance bond and maintenance and easement agreements shall be required prior to the issuance of grading permits.
- b. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Applicant shall submit the original, executed RFAs to DPR for review and approval. Upon approval of DPR, the RFA shall be recorded among the Land Records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland. The Applicant shall post a bond and complete construction in accordance with the timing set forth in this condition.

- c. Prior to the issuance of any building permits on Parcel C, Americana Plaza, the Applicant shall submit a concept plan for the proposed park to DPR for approval. The Concept Plan may include the following facilities:
- Multi-court Area (110 feet x 12 feet) – Tennis, Volleyball
 - Wall Multi-use (40 feet x 60 feet)
 - Junior Futsal (90 feet x 120 feet)
 - Adult Futsal (100 feet x 150 feet) – Artificial Surfacing
 - Multi-Age Playground (3,000 sq. ft. min.)
 - Multi-Purpose Court (96 feet x 112 feet)
 - 20 Space Parking Compound (approximate size)
 - Or other alternative outdoor recreational facilities as approved by DPR
- d. Prior to issuance of any building permits for Parcel B, Georgian Plaza
- (1) The Applicant shall file a Detailed Site Plan for Americana Plaza, Parcel D. The DSP shall propose redevelopment of the existing residential improvements at a density not to exceed that permitted in the underlying zone based upon the net lot area of the entire parcel, including the land proposed to be conveyed to M-NCPPC. The DSP for Parcel D shall identify the land to be conveyed to M-NCPPC and shall include the facilities shown on the approved concept plan.
 - (2) The Applicant must obtain a raze permit for the improvements within the proposed land dedication area.
 - (3) The parkland on Americana Plaza, Parcel D, must be conveyed to M-NCPPC.
 - (4) The Applicant shall submit to DPR a performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee for the turnkey construction of the proposed park.
 - (5) Applicant shall submit to DPR for review and approval the final construction documents for the proposed park on Americana Plaza, Parcel D.
 - (6) The construction of the proposed park shall be completed.
12. Parcels A and B, Americana Plaza shall be limited to no more than 283 new multifamily residential units and 1,600 square feet of ancillary commercial retail/office space.

13. Parcel C, Americana Plaza shall be limited to no more than 356 new multifamily residential units, 57 townhouse residential units and 1,300 square feet of ancillary commercial retail/office space.
14. Parcel B, Georgian Plaza shall be limited to no more than 1,979 multifamily units, 216,000 square feet of office/commercial/other non-residential space, 68,050 square feet of commercial retail space and 34,250 square feet of private recreational space.
15. Prior to the issuance of any building permits on Parcels A, B, and C, Americana Plaza, or Parcel B, Georgian Plaza, the applicant, and/or his successors, or assigns shall submit traffic signal warrant studies following the accepted methodology of DPW&T or the Maryland State Highway Administration, for the intersections of Toledo Terrace/Belcrest Road and MD 410/Editors Park Drive. This analysis will examine both existing and total projected traffic volumes. If signals are deemed warranted by the appropriate agency, the applicant shall fully bond the entire cost prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property, and shall agree to install the signals when directed by DPW&T, or the State Highway Administration.
16. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the second building to be constructed on Parcels A and B, and Parcel C, Americana Plaza, and Parcel B, Georgian Plaza (or would otherwise cause more than 284 new residential units or 1600 square feet of commercial retail or office space to be constructed), the applicant and/or his hers, successors and assignees shall:
 - a. Submit an annual reporting peak-hour AM trips and peak-hour PM trips actually generated from the Development by both newly constructed uses as well as the previously existing uses (the "Annual Reporting") to the Planning Department. The obligation to conduct Annual Reporting shall expire upon the implementation of the TDMD (as defined under Condition 16(c) below); and
 - b. Submit a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) for the entire development proposed on DSP-09006 substantially in conformance with the draft TMP submitted by the applicant into the record at the December 10, 2009 hearing. The TMP shall be reviewed and approved by the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), and the Transportation Planning Section of the Prince George's County Planning Department. The TMP will contain provisions to provide for the full funding of the TMP by the owners of the property. The TMP and funding obligations shall run with the land until such time as the TDMD is implemented. The TMP will also contain details for monitoring and audit conditions, trip reduction estimates for each trip reduction strategy, a spreadsheet that monitors dwelling units and peak -hour trips for each building permit, and provisions detailing the timing of implementation, monitoring, reporting, and compliance with stated objectives, strategies, and actions contained within the TMP and this condition. The TMP shall contain provisions to allow adjustments in the event the TDMD is established after the

TMP is implemented to avoid duplication of programs and services. In no event shall implementation of the TMP be required until new development constructed pursuant to DSP-09006 and remaining existing development, if any, generate in excess of 772 trips during the morning peak-hour or 1,042 trips during the evening peak-hour.

- c. In the event that the Prince George's County District Council has implemented the Prince George's Plaza Transportation Demand Management District (PG-TDMD) in accordance with the TDDP and Section 20A of the County Code, and both the Prince George's Plaza Demand Management Technical Advisory Committee (PG-TDMTAC), and the Prince George's Plaza Transportation Management Association (PG-TMA) have been established prior to the implementation of the TMP in accordance with paragraph b above, the TMP shall be succeeded by the TDMP required under Subtitle 20A.
17. No building permits shall be issued which would cause the total existing and projected site trip generation to exceed 772 AM peak-hour and 1,042 PM peak-hour trips.
 18. Prior to issuance of any grading permit, Applicant shall revise plans to demonstrate conformance with COMAR Title 26, Department of the Environment, Part 3, Subtitle 17, Water Management, Chapter 2, Stormwater Management, 26.17.02.00 et seq., as amended, incorporating by reference 2000 Maryland Stormwater Design Manual Volumes I and II (Maryland Department of the Environment, April 2000) Supplemental I or as adapted by the County pursuant thereto.

PARCELS A & B, AMERICANA PLAZA

19. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan:
 - a. The architectural elevations shall be revised to indicate that the color of the masonry used on the garage portion of the building which is not faced with brick will be changed to match the color of the brick, compatible with the rest of the building.
 - b. The detailed site plan shall be revised to demonstrate the same configuration, as shown on the landscape plan, of the freestanding walls (proposed to screen the parking lot) and retaining wall (proposed to tie into the southeastern corner of Building 6).
 - c. The retaining wall adjacent to the building and the freestanding walls shall be finished with the same masonry materials and details shall be provided on the plans. All details shall be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
 - d. The detailed site plan shall be revised to indicate that the exterior of the raised

concrete planter will be finished with masonry to match the freestanding/retaining walls proposed to screen the surface parking lot.

- e. The architectural elevations for Building 6 shall be revised to demonstrate that entrance to the parking garage will be restricted through the provision of decorative gates, and that the openings in the garage façade will be secured as well.
- f. The detailed site plan shall be revised to show the southern building entrance and the stairway adjacent to the surface parking lot of Building 6, consistent with the architectural elevations.
- g. The fencing proposed along the western property line shall be upgraded fencing to be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section, in accordance with Applicant's Exhibit Five and Six.
- h. The architectural elevations shall be revised to indicate that a high-quality, low-maintenance shingle siding material, such as composite or cementitious, will replace the proposed wood shingle siding.
- i. The architectural elevations shall be revised to indicate the building-mounted signage area for the office/retail uses.

PARCEL C, AMERICANA PLAZA

- 20. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan:
 - a. The architectural elevations shall be revised to indicate that the color of the masonry used on any exposed portion of the garage will be changed to match the color of the brick, compatible with the rest of the building.
 - b. The plans shall be revised to identify the material shown as Number 13 on the architectural elevations for Building 7.
 - c. The detailed site plan shall be revised to show the location of all proposed signs. Lighting and landscaping shall be provided at the base of each monument sign.
 - d. The Type A sign proposed between the townhouse units and Northwest Drive shall be moved closer to the intersection of the northern access drive and Northwest Drive.
 - e. The plans shall be revised to provide upgraded fencing as the safety railing for the section of retaining wall along the west side of the access drive separating Building 7 and the townhouse section, in accordance with Applicant's Exhibit

Five and Six.

- f. All fencing shall be upgraded, details of which shall be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section in accordance with Applicant's Exhibit Five and Six.
- g. The townhouse elevations shall be revised to specify the exterior finish material of the optional fourth floor loft. The loft facades shall be treated with the same brick material as proposed on the primary facade of that unit.
- h. The open space component associated with the townhouse portion of Parcel C, Americana Plaza, shall be revised to create a flatter, useable open space, which may require the incorporation of retaining walls into the design. Retaining walls shall be designed as seating and a concrete path shall be provided around the central open space.
- i. The architectural elevations shall be revised to indicate that a high-quality, low-maintenance shingle siding material, such as composite or cementitious, will replace the proposed wood shingle siding.
- j. The detailed site plan shall be revised to show all improvements proposed with the open space associated with the townhouse portion of the development as shown on the hardscape plans.
- k. The architectural elevations shall be revised to indicate the building-mounted signage location and the area for the office/retail uses.

PARCEL B, GEORGIAN PLAZA

- 21. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan:
 - a. The architectural floor plans shall be revised to demonstrate that each building shall provide a party and/or community room with a kitchen, a minimum size of three square feet per dwelling unit, and a fitness facility, a minimum size of four square feet per dwelling unit, in accordance with G53.
 - b. All plans, elevations, and floor plans shall be revised to provide residential, retail, or office uses along public and private streets on levels of Buildings 1 through 5 as shown on Applicant's Exhibit Seven (Street Activation).
 - c. Clarify how the proposed changing room in Building 1 (office) will be accessed and what facilities it will include. Shower facilities should be included, per the recommendation in the Pedestrian/Bicycle/Multiuse Trail Network Section of the TDDP (TDDP, page 81).

d. Revise the architectural elevations to address building-mounted signage.

* * * * *

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, January 14, 2010, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 4th day of February 2010.

Patricia Colihan Barney
Acting Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

PCB:FJG:JS/SL:arj