

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND
SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL
2010 Legislative Session

Resolution No. CR-18-2010
Proposed by The Chairperson – (by request- Planning Board)
Introduced by Council Members Dernoga and Olson
Co-Sponsors _____
Date of Introduction March 2, 2010

RESOLUTION

1 A RESOLUTION concerning

2 The Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Proposed Sectional Map Amendment

3 For the purpose of proposing amendments to the Adopted Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and
4 Endorsed Sectional Map Amendment and directing that a public hearing be held to receive
5 testimony on the proposed amendments.

6 WHEREAS, the District Council adopted CR-96-2008 on October 28, 2008, initiating an
7 amendment to the 1989/1990 *Approved Master Plan for Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt*
8 *and Vicinity, and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 65, 66 and 67, 2001*
9 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Greenbelt Metro Area, and 2002*
10 *Approved College Park US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Portion of
11 Planning Area 66) in order to develop a comprehensive approach to implement the
12 recommendations of the 2002 *General Plan*, and to ensure that future development is consistent
13 with County policies; and

14 WHEREAS, the *Adopted Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Endorsed Sectional Map*
15 *Amendment* is proposed to amend the 1989 *Approved Master Plan for Langley Park-College*
16 *Park-Greenbelt and Vicinity, and 1990 Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas*
17 *65, 66 and 67, 2001 Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Greenbelt*
18 *Metro Area, 2002 Approved College Park US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map*
19 *Amendment* (Portion of Planning Area 66), the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General*
20 *Plan*, the 1983 *Functional Master Plan for Public School Sites*, the 1992 *Prince George's*
21 *County Historic Sites and Districts Plan*, the 2005 *Countywide Green Infrastructure Functional*

1 *Master Plan, the 2008 Approved Public Safety Facilities Master Plan, and the 2009 Master Plan*
2 *of Transportation; and*

3 WHEREAS, the sector plan area being part of Planning Area 66 is generally comprised of
4 the properties bounded by the city boundaries of College Park to the north, the southern limit of
5 mixed-use properties south of Guilford Road to the south, and commercial, mixed-use, vacant
6 and related properties fronting or oriented to US 1 to the east and west, including established
7 residential areas along Guilford Drive, Knox Road, and Cherry Hill Road, and commercial and
8 residential properties located in the Hollywood community at the intersection of Rhode Island
9 Avenue and Edgewood Road and all properties inclusive of 47th Place West between
10 Lackawanna Street and 48th Place; and

11 WHEREAS, the Planning Board granted permission to print the Preliminary Central US 1
12 Corridor and Proposed Sectional Map Amendment on June 18, 2009; and

13 WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 27-645(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the County Executive
14 and the District Council reviewed the public facilities element of the preliminary plan and
15 endorsed the inclusion of the proposed public facilities in the preliminary plan; and

16 WHEREAS, the District Council and the Planning Board held a duly-advertised joint public
17 hearing on the Preliminary Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Proposed Sectional Map
18 Amendment on September 15, 2009; and

19 WHEREAS, the Planning Board held two worksession to consider the public hearing
20 testimony on November 19, 2009 and December 3, 2009; and

21 WHEREAS, on December 10, 2009, the Planning Board, in response to the public hearing
22 testimony, adopted the sector plan and endorsed the sectional map amendment with revisions, as
23 described in Prince George's County Planning Board Resolution PGCPB No. 09-170, and
24 transmitted the plan and sectional map amendment to the District Council on January 4, 2010;
25 and

26 WHEREAS, on February 16, 2010, the District Council held a worksession, to review the
27 Planning Board's recommendations on the public hearing testimony and the Planning Board's
28 recommendations contained in PGCPB No. 09-84; and

29 WHEREAS, on March 2, 2010, the District Council decided to propose amendments to the
30 adopted Sector Plan and endorsed Sectional Map Amendment and to hold a second joint public
31 hearing to allow public comment.

1 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the County Council of Prince George's
2 County, sitting as the District Council for that part of the Maryland-Washington Regional
3 District in Prince George's County, Maryland, that at the forthcoming joint public hearing,
4 testimony shall be accepted concerning the following amendments proposed by the District
5 Council and concerning other aspects of the adopted Sector Plan and endorsed Sectional Map
6 Amendment:

7
8 **AMENDMENT ONE:** Delete all references and text in the adopted sector plan (consisting of
9 the preliminary plan document and PGCPB 09-170) dealing with "future walkable nodes" and
10 "proposed walkable nodes." Revise the captions for images on pages 68 and 69 to appropriately
11 describe the images without referencing these terms. Delete text referencing designation of
12 future corridor nodes on page 50 accordingly.

13
14 **AMENDMENT TWO:** Revise street cross-section drawings included in the adopted sector
15 plan and development district standards as necessary to clearly indicate the preferred cross-
16 section dimensions for US 1.

17
18 **AMENDMENT THREE:** Ensure the preferred cross-section dimensions for US 1 contain
19 bicycle side-paths/buffered bicycle lanes along the entirety of US 1. These dedicated bicycle
20 facilities shall be designed to maximize convenience and safety to encourage use of the bicycle
21 as a true alternate to the automobile. Encourage continuation of side-path/buffered bicycle lane
22 materials across curb cuts whenever possible.

23
24 **AMENDMENT FOUR:** Retain the portion of the City of College Park north of the Capital
25 Beltway in the Developing Tier. Delete all references and revise all maps that indicate a revision
26 to the General Plan tier boundaries in this area.

27
28 **AMENDMENT FIVE:** Add the following text to page 50: "Corridor nodes located north of MD
29 193 shall not be considered for future application of Subtitle 27A of the County Code."
30

1 **AMENDMENT SIX:** Add a new policy and strategies to the Corridor Infill Policies section on
2 pages 72-73 as follows, and revise the Development District Standards as appropriate to
3 implement the strategies:

4 “Policy 4

5 Establish appropriate residential densities within the corridor infill areas to ensure
6 preservation of existing single-family neighborhoods.

7
8 Strategies

9 1. Limit residential density by reducing the maximum number of dwelling units per acre
10 permitted in the M-U-I Zone.

11 2. Require acquisition of at least one and a half acres of property under single ownership to
12 permit rezoning to the M-U-I Zone through the Detailed Site Plan process detailed under
13 Section 27-548.26 of the Zoning Ordinance.”

14
15 **AMENDMENT SEVEN:** Revise the land use and urban design discussions on Seven Springs
16 Village on pages 96-97 to place emphasis on minimizing impacts on the floodplain, preserving
17 open space, providing tall buildings in the center of the property with smaller-scale buildings
18 along the northern and southern boundaries, trail dedication along the northern portion of the
19 property, and maximizing attention to innovative stormwater management techniques to preserve
20 and enhance the Paint Branch stream valley. Revise the land use and urban design discussions on
21 the Autoville community on page 96 to address the desire to encourage senior housing and
22 professional office development; to preclude big-box retail stores, fast food restaurants,
23 convenience stores, and gas stations; to preclude any future connection to the end of Kiernan
24 Road; to preclude future vehicular connections between Autoville Road North and Autoville
25 Road South; to discourage through traffic from Cherry Hill Road; and to consider alternative
26 zoning categories to implement these policies.

27
28 **AMENDMENT EIGHT:** Delete the detailed illustrative concept drawings and the “general
29 recommendations” text box featured on page 97.
30

1 **AMENDMENT NINE:** Revise the Uptown land use and urban design discussions on page 98 to
 2 discourage big-box retail stores, emphasize the desire and potential for high-intensity office uses,
 3 and clearly indicate the desired pattern of development, while allowing for tall office buildings
 4 as the market evolves, should be compatible with the smaller-scale, mixed retail and office uses
 5 north of the Ikea entrance drive on the Camden/Roadside property.

6
 7 **AMENDMENT TEN:** Indicate in the sector plan text and on the trails maps that while the need
 8 for land reservation for a trail on the northern side of Cherry Hill Road exists, the preferred
 9 alignment of the continuation of the Paint Branch Stream Valley Park Trail is along the southern
 10 side of Cherry Hill Road, through the northern edge of the Seven Springs property, and across
 11 the Capital Beltway on the western side of Cherry Hill Road into the Subregion I Master Plan
 12 area.

13
 14 **AMENDMENT ELEVEN:** Add the following text on page 157 after Table 11:

15 **“Pupil Yield**

16 Table 12 shows the current pupil yield rates for each dwelling unit type. The pupil yield is the
 17 estimated number of elementary, middle, and high school students per dwelling unit. The current
 18 pupil yield rates are based on 2008 enrollment numbers. It is important to note that the current
 19 pupil yield rates are for single-family detached dwelling units, single-family attached, multi-
 20 family garden-style, as well as multi-family dwelling units with structured parking. The Planning
 21 Department observed a decrease in household size since the year 2000 census, which would
 22 affect the pupil yield. The current elementary pupil yield for each dwelling unit type is
 23 significantly lower than the previously used elementary rate developed in 2001. Prior to the
 24 update, the pupil yield rates for all housing types were .24, .06, and .12 for elementary, middle
 25 and high schools respectively. See Appendix 5 for more information on the pupil yield
 26 methodology used in this sector plan.”

27
 28 Add the following text as new Appendix Five after page 424:

29
 30 **“Pupil Yield Methodology**

31 **Development of Pupil Yield for Single-Family Dwelling Units**

1 The Planning Department used a listing of all single-family dwelling units in Prince George's
2 County as of October 24, 2006. From this listing, the Department determined the total number of
3 addresses needed to represent a 5 percent sample of attached and detached single-family
4 dwelling units in each Subregion of the county. The Maryland State Tax Assessors File was
5 queried and 10 percent of the properties classified as single-family detached or townhouses in
6 Prince George's County were returned. The Department then sorted the addresses by Subregion
7 and dwelling unit type. To achieve the 5 percent sample size, the Department selected one
8 dwelling unit for each street represented in the 10 percent sample, then manually selected
9 random dwelling units using a number of techniques. The techniques used included sorting the
10 entire table by street number and selecting, the first, third, fifth, etc., line, and selecting random
11 lines until a 5 percent sample was achieved. This sample was submitted to Prince George's
12 County Public Schools (PGCPS) in order to determine the pupil yield for each dwelling unit
13 type.

14 *Development of Pupil Yield for Multi-Family Dwelling Units*

15 The Planning Department used a listing of every multifamily housing unit in the county as of
16 November 8, 2006. From this the total number of addresses needed to represent a 5 percent
17 sample in each Subregion was determined. Because this file drew from a number of sources,
18 including the county permits database, city permits databases, the Department of Housing and
19 Urban Development, and the Maryland Department of Assessments and Taxation, and was
20 crosschecked against Census and postal data, it is considered to be the best source of information
21 about multifamily dwelling units in the county.

22 The multifamily sample was then provided to PGCPS and they submitted their results.

23 *Development of Pupil Yield for Multifamily Dwelling Units in Centers and Corridors*

24
25 The 2002 General Plan directs intensified growth around designated Centers and Corridors.
26 Residential development around activity nodes in centers and corridors are to include significant
27 numbers of mid- to high-rise buildings. In the past, the Planning Department has integrated such
28 structures with a general pupil yield factor that encompasses all apartments. However, in
29 recognition of the diversity of housing types in these communities, as well as to attract
30 development to these nodes, it is important to look at them separately from the garden
31

1 apartments that are more prevalent in the county's multi-family housing stock.

2
3 Montgomery, Arlington, and Fairfax Counties all have considerably more transit-oriented or
4 transit-adjacent residential development than does Prince George's County. High-rise
5 multifamily housing stock in the county tends to be located away from transit services and
6 outside designated centers and corridors. The Department contacted each of these counties to
7 determine their pupil yield factors for mid- and high-rise development surrounding transit
8 stations. The range for each county's pupil yield was approximately the same. After consulting
9 with Montgomery County and comparing their multifamily housing stock and planning efforts
10 around centers and corridors to that of Prince George's County, the Department decided to go
11 with Montgomery County's pupil yield factors until such point in the future where Prince
12 George's County has enough mid- to high-rise housing stock in centers and corridors to conduct
13 a full survey."

14
15 **AMENDMENT TWELVE:** Revise policy 2 on page 159 to read: "Preserve, retain, and support
16 existing public school facilities, school sites, and properties owned by the Board of Education."
17 Add a new strategy to policy 2 on page 159 to read: "Consider reuse of the Calvert Road School
18 as a public choice school."

19
20 **AMENDMENT THIRTEEN:** Delete references to the acquisition of property for a playground
21 to serve the College Park Youth and Family Service Building from the sector plan and Appendix
22 One, and add text to recommend the construction of a community center in the Hollywood
23 Commercial District over the short-term (0-10 years) to the Development Pattern, Parks and
24 Recreation, and Implementation elements and to Appendix One.

25
26 **AMENDMENT FOURTEEN:** Add a new Corridorwide phasing recommendation in the short-
27 term on page 210 as follows: "Establish a tax increment financing (TIF) strategy for the corridor
28 to support the construction of public improvements."

29
30 **AMENDMENT FIFTEEN:** Add a new Corridorwide phasing recommendation in the short-
31 term on page 210 as follows: "Establish a corridor-wide Transportation Demand Management

1 (TDM) District and a self-sustaining Transportation Management Association (TMA) to manage
 2 it.” Add similar language to Table 15 on pages 205-206, with the following potential parties
 3 identified: Prince George’s County government, Revenue Authority, SHA, DPW&T, City of
 4 College Park, University of Maryland, WMATA, Maryland Department of Transportation, and
 5 developers.

6
 7 **AMENDMENT SIXTEEN:** Replace the second sentence in the 6th paragraph on page 225 with
 8 the following wording: “All new development and redevelopment of existing structures within
 9 the DDOZ shall comply with the Development District Standards and the general intent and
 10 goals of the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan.”

11
 12 **AMENDMENT SEVENTEEN:** Add a new bullet under “Site Plan Submittal Requirements” on
 13 page 227 as follows: “A LEED (Leadership through Energy and Environmental Design)
 14 scorecard as developed by the U.S. Green Building Council to illustrate how the proposed
 15 development addresses issues of sustainability.”

16
 17 **AMENDMENT EIGHTEEN:** Delete the third bullet on page 242 and replace the fourth bullet
 18 with the following language: “Within a public parking district established by a public entity,
 19 required parking may be waived if a fee-in-lieu is paid on a per space basis to the public entity
 20 that manages the parking district, at a rate to be determined by the public entity and based on a
 21 preliminary engineering cost estimate for the parking facility, provided that public parking is
 22 available within one quarter mile of the development.”

23
 24 **AMENDMENT NINETEEN:** Revise bullet one under Drive-Throughs on page 246 to read:
 25 “Drive throughs shall not be permitted in the walkable nodes, [or] existing residential areas,
 26 south of Delaware Street, or along Cherry Hill Road.”

27
 28 **AMENDMENT TWENTY:** Add a new section to the building form development district
 29 standards on page 246, and re-title the page header, to address bedroom percentages as follows:

30 “Bedroom Percentages

1 Bedroom percentages for multifamily dwellings as specified in Section 27-419 of the
 2 Zoning Ordinance shall not apply within the Central US 1 Corridor development district.”
 3

4 **AMENDMENT TWENTY ONE:** Change the zoning of the Lin-Roy LLC, Gamber Properties
 5 LLC, Dunn, Chang, Kong, Buchheister, and Burke properties located east of US 1 along
 6 Guilford and Calvert Roads from the M-U-I (Mixed-Use Infill) Zone to the R-55 (One Family
 7 Detached Residential) Zone to implement the sector plan policies and recommendations for
 8 existing residential development (1.28 acres, Tax Map 33, Grid C4, College Park Homes
 9 Subdivision, Plat A21-0632, Lots 1-3; College Park – Changs Addition, Plat 21191051, Lots 1
 10 and 2; College Park Homes Subdivision, Plat A-21-0638 Lots 10 and 11).
 11

12 **AMENDMENT TWENTY TWO:** Retain the zoning of the ZH Investments LLC property in
 13 the C-O (Commercial Office) Zone (1.0 acre, Tax Map 25, Grid E1, Hollywood Station, Plat
 14 01228073, Parcel A).
 15

16 **AMENDMENT TWENTY THREE:** Change the zoning for the Hollywood Commercial
 17 District, excluding the REI shopping center, to the L-A-C (Local Activity Center) Zone at the
 18 Neighborhood scale (8.3 acres, Tax Map 25, Grids F1 and F2, Hollywood Addition, Plat A01-
 19 4086, Parcels A1 and A2; Hollywood Addition, Plat A01-1836, Outlot 5; Hollywood, Plat A21-
 20 4889, Lot 10; Hollywood Addition Plat A01-3539, Parcel B; Hollywood Resubdivision, Plat
 21 21111005, Lot 12; Hollywood Addition, Plat A01-1659, Parcel A1 of Parcel A 9/15/04 and Part
 22 of Parcel A; Hollywood Addition, Plat A01-1836, Parcel A2; Hollywood Addition, Plat A01-
 23 4086, Parcels A1 and A2; Hollywood, Plat A21-5264, Lot 11; Hollywood Addition, Plat A01-
 24 1836, Cen Part of Parcel A, S Part of Parcel A, Part of Parcel A, Parcel A, Part of NE Part of
 25 Parcel A, NW Part of Parcel A, and Part of NE Part of Parcel A). Specify that the alternative
 26 base density zone recommended in the Sectional Map Amendment shall be the C-S-C
 27 (Commercial Shopping Center) Zone.
 28

29 **AMENDMENT TWENTY FOUR:** Change the zoning for the Shaban properties from the C-S-
 30 C (Commercial Shopping Center) Zone to the O-S (Open Space) Zone (0.72 acres, Tax Map 25,
 31 Grid F1, Hollywood Addition, Parcel A3 and Lot at SE corner of Parcel A).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

AMENDMENT TWENTY FIVE: Retain the properties endorsed as SMA Change 5 in the R-55 (One Family Detached Residential), C-O (Commercial Office) and C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) Zones (6.3 acres, Tax Map 25, Grid E2, Baltimore Boulevard Plaza, Plat 21160080, p/o Lot 1; Tax Map 25, Grid E2, Parcel 31 and p/o Parcel 34; Tax Map 25, Grid E2, Townplace Suites, Plat 21228071, Lot 1; Tax Map 25, Grid E2, Hollywood on the Hill, Plat E21-0772, Block 13, Lots 1-5, 15-20, and 26-40; Tax Map 25, Grid D2, Cherry Hill, p/o Parcel 25).

AMENDMENT TWENTY SIX: Revise the DDOZ (Development District Overlay Zone) boundaries specified in endorsed SMA Change 14 to exclude the residential neighborhoods of Autoville North, Autoville South, and Edgewood, the Ikea, Holiday Inn, and Camden/Roadside properties, and the Paint Branch Stream Valley north of MD 193 and west of US 1.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the District Council, after holding a joint public hearing with the Planning Board, may reconsider each amendment, and may approve the sector plan and sectional map amendment with all, any one or more, or none of the proposed amendments.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, pursuant to Section 27-646 of the Zoning Ordinance, a public hearing shall be scheduled to receive testimony on these proposed amendments, and a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the Prince George’s County Planning Board, to request that its comments be submitted to the Council prior to action on the amendments.

Adopted this 2nd day of March, 2010.

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S
COUNTY, MARYLAND, SITTING AS THE
DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PART OF
THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTON REGIONAL
DISTRICT IN PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY,
MARYLAND

BY: _____
Thomas E. Dernoga
Chair

ATTEST:

Redis C. Floyd
Clerk of the Council