

Case No.: TDOZ-1-98
Applicant: Prince George's Plaza
Transit District
Overlay Zone

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

ZONING ORDINANCE NO. 14-1998

AN ORDINANCE to amend the Zoning Map for the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Prince George's County, Maryland, by adopting a Transit District Development Plan.

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Council, sitting as the District Council, adopted CR-32-1997, thereby initiating preparation of a Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission for those parts of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in the vicinity of the Prince George's Plaza Metro Station; and

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission examined existing land use patterns, existing zoning, pending zoning petitions, zoning requests received as part of the Transit District Overlay Zoning process, existing and proposed subdivisions of land, and the recommendations and policies contained in the Area Master Plan for Planning Area 68, and in the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board drafted a proposed Transit District Development Plan for the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone (January, 1998) which delineates a proposed transit district adjacent to the Metro station, proposes a Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment for the transit district and sets forth a Transit District Development Plan (TDDP) consisting of mandatory requirements to control the use and development of land within the proposed districts; and

WHEREAS, the District Council and the Planning Board held a duly advertised public hearing on March 10, 1998 and the Planning Board held a worksession on March 26, 1998 to review comments contained in the hearing record and staff recommendations thereon; and

WHEREAS, on April 2, 1998, the Planning Board adopted resolution, PGCPB No. 98-93, transmitting to the District Council the Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment

and accompanying Transit District Development Plan with the recommendation that the Council adopt the proposals with the revisions described in the resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Committee of the Whole of the District Council held meetings on April 8, 13, 14, 21 and May 1, 1998 and determined specific recommended changes and provided general guidance to staff for recommended changes; and

WHEREAS, the District Council held a duly advertised public hearing on the proposed amendments on June 1, 1998, and a Committee-of-the-Whole worksession to review the hearing testimony and staff recommendations on June 15, 1998; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 27-213.05(e)(1) of the County Code, the District Council finds that:

(A) The entire Map Amendment, including the Transit District Development Plan, is in conformance with the purposes and other requirements of the Transit District Overlay Zone;

(B) Adequate attention has been paid to the recommendations of the Area Master Plans and the General Plan which were found to be applicable to property within the Transit District; and

(C) The particular area within the boundaries of the Transit District Overlay Zone requires the coordination and flexibility provided by the Transit District Overlay Zone, because of the area's potential for new development, redevelopment, or revitalization, and the ability to provide public facilities and infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, as the basis for this action, the District Council adopts the recommendations of the Planning Board, as amended, as its findings of fact and conclusions of law.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED AND ENACTED:

SECTION 1. The Zoning Map for the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Prince George's County, Maryland, is further hereby amended by rezoning the property which is the subject of Case No. TDOZ-1-1998 to the Transit District Overlay Zone and adopts the Transit District Development Plan, both as endorsed by the Prince George's County Planning Board in Resolution No. 98-93.

SECTION 2. Case No. TDOZ-1-1998 is approved with amendments as follows:

AMENDMENT 1: Remove the comparison chart shown on pages ix through xii.

AMENDMENT 2: On page xiii, revise the fifth bullet as follows:
 : Establishes . . . [peak-hour vehicle trips] the number of additional parking spaces.

AMENDMENT 3: Add a tax map after Figure 1 that shows the exact transit district boundary by parcel or lot.

AMENDMENT 4: On page 8, add a new section after Amendment Procedures as follows:

Future Plan Assessment

An assessment of the need to amend this Transit District Overlay Zone and this Transit District Development Plan shall be completed not later than July 1, 2004.

AMENDMENT 5: On page 15, revise the text under Applicability as follows:

All development [/ redevelopment] shall comply with the [standards in this TDDP, except as provided below:]requirements of the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP). Development is any activity that materially affects the condition or use of dry land, land under water or any structure as defined in Section 27-107(a)(66.1). Redevelopment, rehabilitation and renovation of existing structures are all forms of development. Any form of these types of development may be exempt from the requirements of this TDDP, as are provided below:

AMENDMENT 6: On page 15, delete item 3b under Applicability.

AMENDMENT 7: On page 15, amend 3c as follows:

3[c]b. Has adequate numbers... exceed the maximum parking [cap]ratio as set forth by this TDDP or meet or exceed the parking ratios of Part 11 of the Zoning Ordinance, whichever parking ratio results in less required parking.

AMENDMENT 8: On page 15, under Applicability, amend as follows:

4. Permits which involve an increase of not more than 10 percent of the gross floor area (GFA) of an existing structure on July 14, 1992, or 5,000 square feet, whichever is less, are exempt from meeting the requirements of this TDDP. No Special Exception for the enlargement, extension or alteration of a nonconforming building, structure or use shall be approved if it would result in a greater increase in GFA than permitted in this paragraph.

AMENDMENT 9: On page 16, delete the language under item 6 Applicability, and add the following:

- 6[8.] Permits for the restoration, reconstruction, or establishment of a nonconforming building or structure, or a certified nonconforming use that are in conformance with Section 27-243 of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance are exempt.

AMENDMENT 10: On page 17, delete the sixth submittal requirement pertaining to the shadow study for Detailed Site Plans, and renumber the subsequent requirements accordingly.

AMENDMENT 11: On page 18, amend the text under the Required Findings - Conceptual and Detailed Site Plans Section as follows:

The findings required for Detailed Site Plans in the TDDP, [are] as stated in Section 27-548.08(c) of the Zoning Ordinance, shall be required for both Conceptual and Detailed Site Plans.[These findings shall also be required for all Conceptual Site Plans.] The findings are as follows:

AMENDMENT 12: On page 18, add the following to the Required Findings - Conceptual and Detailed Site Plans Section:

6. The development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities either shown in the appropriate Capital Improvement Program or

provided as part of the private development.

In addition to the findings above, the following are required for

Detailed Site Plans:

a.[7] The Planning Board shall find that the Detailed Site Plan is in general conformance with the approved Conceptual Site Plan (if one is required).

b.[8] The Planning Board shall find that the development will preserve adequate transportation operations with existing or programmed facilities either shown in the appropriate Capital Improvement Program, the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or through trip reduction measures, or provided as part of the private development in accordance with the provisions of this Plan for determining the adequacy of transportation facilities and service in the Transit District.

AMENDMENT 13: On page 19, add a new item 3 under the "Required Findings - Preliminary Plats of Subdivision" heading:

3. The development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities either shown in the appropriate Capital Improvement Program or provided as part of the private development.

AMENDMENT 14: On page 19, delete the following heading and the three required findings under this heading:

[The following findings are required for Detailed Site Plans:]

AMENDMENT 15: On page 38, add the following text:

Recommended Multifamily Amenities

The Site Design Guidelines listed below should be followed for new multifamily construction.

Site Design Guidelines

A. All buildings with elevators should have furnished lobbies and

24-hour security systems.

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

For the residential complex:

- Party and/or community rooms with kitchen, minimum size of three square feet per dwelling unit
- A furnished lobby with a reception area for a front desk and 24-hour answering service in each building
- 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
- Porte-cochere at the entrance to each building
- Landscaped gardens which may include arbors, courtyards, fountains and custom features such as walls, fences and other ornament
- Business center with 24-hour access and a computer with a fax/modem, a printer, a fax machine and a copy machine

For each residential unit:

- Wall-to-wall carpeting and/or hardwood floors for all rooms, except kitchen and baths
- Nine-foot interior ceilings
- Crown moldings in main rooms
- Kitchens with self-cleaning ovens, microwave oven, garbage disposal, trash compactor, frost-free refrigerators with automatic icemaker, dishwasher, pantry cabinet and/or option for a gourmet kitchen with a grill, double ovens or island counter
- Individual heating and air-conditioning system
- Full size washer and dryer in each unit

- = Separate bathroom and bath for the master bedroom with a spa tub and separate shower
- = Eight-foot sliding glass patio doors
- = Six-foot-high standard windows
- = Walk-in closets
- = Gas fireplace
- = Wiring for pay/cable television and five telephone lines
- = Individual front door lock system (the capability to electronically unlock the buildings' front door from the unit with an integrated telephone/speaker system)
- = Burglar/intrusion alarms
- = Exterior balcony or sun room for the majority of units
- = For units on the top floors, cathedral ceilings and skylights

AMENDMENT 16: On page 39, delete the following text from the Introduction:
[Appendix B summarizes the principal differences between the current and revised transportation provisions of the TDDP.]

AMENDMENT 17: On page 40, add the following text to the third paragraph under Roadways and Intersections:
...Table 1 presents the intersection levels of service and proposed and recommended improvements...

AMENDMENT 18: On page 43, Figure 12, make the following changes:

- ⋮ In the fifth column, delete the word "Required" from the column heading.
- ⋮ Delete the first two improvements and the map depiction referring to improvements at New Beale Drive and MD 500 between MD 410 and Ager Road, and renumber the remaining improvements respectively.
- ⋮ Delete the bottom row that begins with "Note: Improvements..."
- ⋮ In the fifth column, delete the text as follows: Programmed for

construction to provide a 4-lane divided roadway [with appropriate turning lanes].

AMENDMENT 19: On page 42 (Figure 11), page 43 (Figure 12), and on page 44 (Figure 13), eliminate the black line that represents Queens Chapel Road north of East West Highway.

AMENDMENT 20: On page 44, Figure 13, delete symbols 1, 8, 9 and 11 that represent locations of intersection improvements and renumber the remaining symbols.

AMENDMENT 21: On pages 45 and 46, Table 1, delete the rows that refer to the following locations of intersection improvements, and renumber the remaining improvements:

- MD 410 and New Beale Drive
- Adelphi Road and Toledo Terrace
- MD 500, Belcrest Road and Queensbury Road
- MD 410 and Belcrest Road

AMENDMENT 22: On pages 49 and 51, delete the sections entitled "Methodology," "Vehicle Trip Caps" (including Table 4), and "Required Improvements" and replace with the following:

Transportation Adequacy

Methodology

The transportation adequacy provisions of this plan reflect a number of factors:

- The expected growth of existing through-traffic in the transit district, and the traffic that will be generated by development and redevelopment within the transit district.
- Opportunities and the need to divert some vehicle trips, particularly peak hour single-occupant vehicle (SOV) trips, to Metrorail and to

the WMATA, Prince George's County and University of Maryland bus systems that serve the transit district. The goal is to divert at least 25% of all peak period SOV trips to carpool, vanpool or transit trips.

- The transit district road and street network's capacity for absorbing additional through-traffic and the traffic associated with development or redevelopment.
- The need to develop a flexible method for relieving or avoiding congestion on the roads and streets that are the basis for the determination of what types, levels and densities of land uses are most consistent with the policy objectives for the Prince George's Plaza Transit District.

The plan also proposes to revise from D to E the level of traffic service (LOS) that will be the acceptable operational minimum for traffic operations in the transit district.

Required Improvements

The transit district transportation improvements shown in Table 4 are those enhancements needed to ensure that critical roadway links and intersections in the transit district operate at least at traffic LOS E.

AMENDMENT 23: On pages 51 and 52, revise Table 5 as follows:

- Table [5] 4
- Delete the following transportation improvements: 1. (MD 410 at MD 500); 2. (MD 410 at Ager Road); 3. (MD 410 at MD 212); 4. (MD 410 at Belcrest Road); and 8. (Adelphi Road at Toledo Terrace); renumber remaining improvements respectively; and change the Total Estimated Cost from \$8,968,750 to \$1,562,500.
- Delete: [See P5 below.]

AMENDMENT 24: On page 52, revise the first paragraph as follows:

A number of policy developments have occurred that were factored

into the decision to adopt LOS E as the minimal acceptable operating ... transit district.

AMENDMENT 25: On page 52, revise the bottom two bullets, as follows:

- Before approval ... [by exceeding the peak hour trip cap].
- All [if it exceeds the trip cap, the] development approved for the transit district will ... vehicle (SOV) trips [below the trip cap] to ... transit district.

AMENDMENT 26: On top of page 53, revise the following:

Given the foregoing ... listed in Table 4 [5] is designed ... LOS E [once the peak hour vehicle (PHV) trips generated by developments proposed ... are included].

This proposed ... facilities [includes a ... by allowing for] reflects the proximity of a Metrorail Station and [for] the ... service[. The feeder bus service] , which has been ... Prince George's County, to ... station.

AMENDMENT 27: On pages 53 through 56, delete the entire sections entitled

"Transportation Adequacy Determination Process" and "Transportation Demand Management" and replace with the following:

Adequacy Determination Process for Transportation Impacts in the Transit District

The primary constraint to development in the transit district is vehicular traffic congestion, particularly insofar as the congestion is caused by single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips that can be combined or converted to trips that can, or should be, taken on one of the available transit services in the district.

One method for relieving congestion is to reduce the number of vehicle, particularly SOV, trips to and from the transit district. The transit district plan addresses this requirement principally by managing the

parking supply in the transit district as an incentive to reduce SOV trips.

Parking will be managed by:

- ∴ Establishing a transit district-wide cap on the number of additional surface parking spaces (preferred cap) that can be constructed or provided in the transit district to accommodate development and redevelopment.
- ∴ Retaining a mandatory Transportation Demand Management District (TDMD), established at the time the 1992 plan was enacted. The TDMD will continue to have boundaries that are coterminous with the transit district, to ensure optimum utilization of trip reduction measures (TRM) to combine or divert to transit as many peak hour SOV trips as possible, and to capitalize on the regional rapid rail transit system's presence in the district.
- ∴ Developing an annual TDMD operations fee, based on the number of parking spaces each property owner maintains, with the fee partially discounted by the percentage of each property owner's parking spaces that are in structures, that are shared, or that are permanently reserved by the property owner for handicapped, carpool and vanpool vehicles.
- ∴ Implementing a system of developer contributions, based on the number of preferred parking spaces attributed to each development project, intended to recover sufficient funding to defray the cost of the transportation improvements (Table 4) needed to ensure that the critical roadways and intersections in the transit district remain at or above traffic LOS E.
- ∴ Providing for "premium" parking spaces to support growth and development that is desired for or best suited to the transit

district.

· Implementing a system of accompanying contributions for such “premium parking,” intended to recover sufficient funding to provide for:

= Restoring traffic operations in the transit district to at least LOS E, if the TDMD finds current levels of traffic in the transit district degrade service below the desired minimum of LOS E, and/or,

= Implementing supplemental transportation system improvements that are intended to enable the TDMD to maximize the number of SOV trips that are either combined or converted to carpool, vanpool or transit trips.

· Requiring that the TDMD prepare an annual transit district transportation and parking operations analysis that would:

= Determine whether or not the level of traffic service has been maintained at least at the operational minimum of LOS E.

= If LOS E has not been maintained, determine:

° what additional trip reduction,
transportation or parking management
measures are required to restore LOS E.

° the cost of these measures.

° whether the level of revenue collected by
the premium parking fee and the TDMD
operating fee is sufficient to cover the
cost of these measures.

= Assess the percentage of total peak hour trips to the transit district being taken in single-occupant and high-

- occupancy (HOV) vehicles, and by transit; and
- = Report on the type, number and effectiveness of all trip reduction measures (TRMs) being used by the TDMD to reduce SOV trips into and from the transit district.

Mandatory Development Requirements

- P1 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 Section 27, Part 11, of the Prince George's County Code shall be applicable.
- P2 The Preferred Parking Cap for each land use type in the transit district (Table 6) shall apply to all new development in the district.
- P3 The Preferred Parking Cap may not be exceeded except that, at the time of Detailed Site Plan:
 - (a) the applicant may request that the Planning Department apply the Premium Parking Cap (Table 6), its attendant ratios, and the fee schedule provided below, or
 - (b) the Planning Department may find that the number of surface parking spaces attributed to the development proposal in the transit district requires either:
 - 1) application of the Premium Parking Cap and its attendant ratios (Table 5) and fee schedule, or
 - 2) adjustment of the overall authorized surface parking caps (Table 6) for the district by a

corresponding, one-to-one reduction of the Preferred Parking Cap for a class of land use for each surface parking space added to another class of land use.

(c) An applicant proposing development that exceeds either of the parking caps identified in Table 6 for a class of land use may apply to have those limits adjusted by a corresponding, one-to-one reduction in other categories where the parking cap has yet to be exceeded.

P4 The parking ratios for each subarea shall be determined by the land uses proposed for the development in the subarea.

Residential development parking allocations shall be determined by the number of parking spaces per dwelling unit. All other parking allocations to development or redevelopment proposals in the transit district shall be determined by the number of parking spaces per one thousand gross square feet of each type of non-residential land use in the development.

P5 The Preferred Parking Cap for the Prince George's Plaza Transit District shall be 3,000 spaces in addition to the spaces already in the transit district.

P6 The Premium Parking Cap for the Prince George's Plaza Transit District shall be 1,000 spaces in addition to spaces already in the transit district and spaces encompassed by the Preferred Parking Cap.

P7 The authorized total (preferred plus premium) parking limits and their attendant, respective, parking ratios shall not be exceeded by any development proposal approved for the transit district, except upon the following:

(a) completion by the applicant, the Planning Department or

the TDMD of an analysis of the traffic and parking impacts of the proposed development on all roads, streets and intersections designated by the Planning Department to be critical for the analysis of that development proposal in the transit district;

- (b) a finding that either:
 - (1) the traffic impacts attributed to the proposed development do not degrade traffic operations within the transit district below LOS E, or
 - (2) if traffic or parking impacts attributed to the development proposal do degrade traffic operations below LOS E, there are specific transportation improvements, parking management measures, transit initiatives or enhancements, other trip reduction measures (TRMs), or a specific combination of these, that will relieve the adverse traffic or parking impacts sufficiently to restore at least LOS E;
- (c) determination of a specific combination of measures that restore LOS E, together with the estimated costs of and the implementation timetable for those measures; and
- (d) an undertaking or proffer by the applicant, his heirs, successors or assigns, executed upon approval of a Detailed Site Plan, of a contribution toward the cost of implementing the combination of improvements or traffic or parking relief measures required to restore LOS E in the transit district, to be calculated at the rate of \$2,100 (1998 dollars) for each surface parking space allocated to the development proposal that is above the

total authorized surface parking limit for the transit district.

Absent fulfillment of the provisions of this Mandatory Development Requirement for Transportation Adequacy, any development proposal that generates surface parking that exceeds the total authorized surface parking limit for the transit district shall be denied.

P8 Concurrent with the adoption of the Amended Transit District Development Plan (TDDP), the Prince George's Plaza Transportation Demand Management District (TDMD) shall be reauthorized with boundaries that are coterminous with those of the transit district. Membership and participation in the TDMD by all property owners in the transit district shall be mandatory.

<u>Table 5</u> <u>Maximum Surface Parking Ratios</u> <u>Prince George's Plaza Transit District</u>		
<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Preferred Ratio</u>	<u>Premium Ratio</u>
<u>[Residential]</u>	<u>[<1.00/D.U.]</u>	<u>[<1.33/D.U.]</u>
<u>Residential - M-X-T</u>		
<u>1 bedroom</u>	<u><1.00</u>	<u><1.33</u>
<u>2+ bedrooms</u>	<u><1.33</u>	<u><1.66</u>
<u>Residential (other)</u>		
<u>1 bedroom</u>	<u><1.33</u>	<u><1.33</u>
<u>2+ bedrooms</u>	<u><1.66</u>	<u><2.00</u>
<u>Office/Research</u>	<u><2.5 spaces/1,000 GSF</u>	<u><3.35 spaces/1,000 GSF</u>
<u>Retail</u>	<u><4.35 spaces/1,000 GSF</u>	<u><5.8 spaces/1,000 GSF</u>

<u>Table 6</u> <u>Parking Limits By Land Use</u> <u>Prince George's Plaza Transit District</u>			
<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Preferred Cap</u>	<u>Premium Cap</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Residential</u>	<u>920</u>	<u>310</u>	<u>1,230</u>
<u>Office/Research</u>	<u>1,170</u>	<u>390</u>	<u>1,560</u>
<u>Retail</u>	<u>910</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>1,210</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>3,000</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>4,000</u>

P9 The TDMD shall provide an annual transportation and parking operations analysis of the transit district to the Planning Board that shall:

= Determine whether or not the level of traffic service has been maintained at or above the operational minimum of LOS E,

If LOS E has not been maintained, determine:

o what additional trip reduction, transportation or parking management measures are required to

- restore LOS E,
 - the cost these measures, and
 - whether the level of revenue collected by the
premium parking fee and the TDMD operating fee
is sufficient to cover the cost of these measures.
- = Assess the percentage of total peak hour trips to the transit
district being taken in single-occupant and high-occupancy
(HOV) vehicles, and by transit.
- = Report on the type, number and effectiveness of all trip reduction
measures (TRMs) being used by the TDMD to reduce SOV trips
into and from the transit district, and
- = Recommend new, innovative or additional TRMs that may be
used to reduce, combine or convert additional SOV trips into and
from the transit district.
- P10 The staff of the Prince George's County Planning Department shall serve
as technical support for the TDMD that is to be retained, as provided
herein by these mandatory development requirements.
- P11 The annual TDMD membership fee shall be \$5.00 for each surface
parking space on each property in the transit district. Parking spaces in
structures and surface spaces that are permanently reserved for
handicapped occupant vehicles, carpools and vanpools shall be
calculated at a rate of \$2.00 for each such space.
- P12 The maximum fee for each surface parking space allocated under the
Preferred Parking Cap for the Prince George's Plaza Transit District
shall be \$400.00. (This fee may be reduced if public funds are
contributed to pay for needed transportation improvements.)
- P13 The maximum fee for each surface parking space allocated under the
Premium Parking Limit for Prince George's Plaza Transit District shall
be \$800.00. (This fee may be reduced if public funds are contributed to

pay for needed transportation improvements.)

P14 Fees assessed for surface parking allocated to development under either the Preferred or the Premium Parking Caps shall be due and collected by the Prince George's County Planning Department at the time of Detailed Site Plan.

(a) Fees collected for surface parking allocated under the Preferred Parking Caps shall be applied to defray costs of transportation improvements shown in Table 4 of this plan, unless otherwise determined or directed by the District Council.

(b) Fees collected for parking allocated under the Premium Parking Cap shall be applied by the TDMD to trip reduction measures, or to transportation or transit improvements reported by the TDMD as necessary to restore the operational minimum on transit district roads and streets to at least LOS E.

AMENDMENT 28: On page 55, delete Figure 16, and renumber subsequent Figures accordingly.

AMENDMENT 29: On page 57, amend the text under the Parking section as follows:
This section presents an overview of parking elements which are essential to the successful implementation of the TDDP, [Additionally, a series of] in addition to the mandatory development requirements [and development guidelines are] as provided above, to ensure that [each of the] parking [elements] supply management becomes an integral part of implementation of the TDDP. [Unless otherwise stated in this section, all existing County requirements relating to parking and loading shall remain in force.]

Parking Management Controls

Parking management controls will necessarily include surface parking [supply ratios] limits and on-street [and off-street] parking

[regulations]controls, as shown in Table[s 6 and] 7.

AMENDMENT 30: On page 57, delete Table 6.

AMENDMENT 31: On page 58, delete the last row on Table 7.

AMENDMENT 32: On page 58, delete the entire section titled "Mandatory Development Requirements."

AMENDMENT 33: On page 58, revise the text under the Parking District heading as follows:
Once the [trip cap (Table 5) or the] surface parking limit [(Table 6)] for the transit district is exceeded, a parking district administered by the Parking Authority of Prince George's County shall be established [contiguous] with boundaries coterminus with those of the transit district[,] in full conformance with Division 27, Section 399-413 of the Prince George's County Code. This district is intended to ensure that, at buildout, parking in the transit district is managed in a fashion that is consistent with the use of parking methodology to ensure the adequacy of transportation facilities in the transit district, and that complements both the transportation network and the approved development for the area. The parking enterprise district would be implemented in accordance with the Parking Authority's Countywide Comprehensive Parking System Funding Plan. On-street parking controls shall be as provided in Table 7.

AMENDMENT 34: At the top of page 59, revise the P1 text under the heading Mandatory Development Requirements as follows:

P1 When the [transit district trip cap or] maximum surface parking [ratio] limit is exceeded, ... to be built in the transit district.

AMENDMENT 35: On page 59, revise the P2 text under the heading Shared Parking Opportunities as follows:

P2 Once the total surface parking [ratios] limit established for the transit district [are] is exceeded, and no development proposals are approved under the provision above of P7 for transportation

adequacy, the feasibility of a structured parking facility shall be [constructed] evaluated by the TDMD as a means to accommodate parking beyond that permitted for surface parking in the transit district. The funding, construction and management of such a facility [shall] may either be undertaken by the developer(s), applicant(s) or property owner(s) within the transit district, or may be undertaken by the parking district, in accordance with all related standards, guidelines and regulations established by the Parking Authority for such purposes. The recommended locations for such a facility [is] are illustrated in Figure [17] 16.

AMENDMENT 36: On page 64, under the heading Woodland Conservation, change S1 as follows:

S1 ...Afforestation [can] *shall* occur on-site or within [designated open space areas in the Prince George's Plaza Transit District] the Anacostia Watershed in Prince George's County with priority given to riparian zones and nontidal wetlands *particularly within the Northwest Branch sub-watershed*.

AMENDMENT 37: On page 72, Figure 22 and on page 73, Figure 23, delete the trail shown through Subarea 13A. Add the proposed trail shown on the PA 68 Master Plan along Northwest Drive and Dean Drive. Also, show the proposed pedestrian overpass across East West Highway from Metro on Figure 23.

AMENDMENT 38: On page 78, Public School Facilities and Services Section, amend the text to include the school infrastructure requirements as required by the Zoning Ordinance.

AMENDMENT 39: Move the Site Design Guidelines to the District-Wide Urban Design Requirements section as follows:

- pgs. 90 and 91 (Subarea 1)

- pgs. 94 and 95 (Subarea 2)
- pgs. 97 and 98 (Subarea 3)
- pgs. 103 and 105 (Subarea 5)
- pg. 125 (Subarea 12)
- pgs. 126 and 127 (Subarea 13A)

In each Subarea where the guidelines are to be moved, add new text under the remaining heading of Site Design Guidelines as follows:

- See Part III, District-Wide Requirements and Guidelines, for list of recommended multifamily residential amenities.

AMENDMENT 40: On page 89, revise P1 as follows:

- P1 The minimum building height shall be six [eight] stories above grade.

AMENDMENT 41: On page 89, delete P3 and add new P3 as follows:

- P3 A minimum 75[100]-foot-wide undisturbed [strip of existing trees] tree preservation buffer shall be preserved along Dean Drive [and Northwest Drive] and a minimum 50[100]-foot-wide undisturbed tree preservation buffer [of existing woodland] shall be provided along Northwest Drive. A minimum 100-foot-wide undisturbed tree preservation buffer shall be provided along the [entire northern] northwest perimeter of the site. (See Figure 26.) The buffer along Northwest Drive may be reduced if the undisturbed buffer along the northwest perimeter is increased by an equal amount.
- A minimum 50-foot-wide disturbed buffer shall be provided along the northeast perimeter of the site. Afforestation and reforestation will be required in this area.

The retention of woodland along the perennial stream located on the eastern portion of Subarea 1 shall be required.

The remainder of the woodland conservation requirements shall

be [as on-site preservation and location] determined at the time of Detailed Site Plan. Such conservation requirements shall be provided on-site.

This requirement shall not preclude any necessary site entrances or utility installations. Site entrances shall be located so that they do not disturb existing specimen trees of 30 inches dbh caliper or greater.

AMENDMENT 42: On page 89, insert the following and renumber subsequent requirements accordingly:

P4 A survey of specimen or historic trees is required at the time of application for a Detailed Site Plan, Preliminary Plat of Subdivision or Grading Plan. This survey shall include the health and vigor of the trees. All efforts shall be made to preserve those specimen and historic trees identified. Justification must be provided in the event that preservation will not occur.

AMENDMENT 43: On page 96, amend P3 as follows:

The maximum building height shall be 16 stories for all uses, except as noted in P11.

AMENDMENT 44: On page 97, revise P8 as follows:

A minimum 10,000-12,000 [20,000]-square-foot urban plaza . . . feature.

AMENDMENT 45: On page 97, add new P11 which restores M13 from the 1992 TDDP for Prince George's Plaza, as follows:

Any future development in the eastern half of the site shall provide a transition in height to the existing buildings and the future building to be located in the western portion of the site. At the required setback line, for each foot the structure exceeds 30 feet in height, the setback shall be increased by two feet. (See Figure ____.) The nearest building to the eastern property line shall be no higher than six stories. This applies to

new construction only and in no way affects the existing building except in the case of a building addition.

Also, restore those portions of Figure 28 from the 1992 TDDP as necessary to illustrate P11.

AMENDMENT 46: On page 102, delete P6 and renumber subsequent requirements accordingly.

AMENDMENT 47: On page 103, revise P9 and P10 as follows:

P[9]8 [At the time of Detailed site Plan submittal] Prior to the issuance of any building permit for land including the gas station, the applicant shall [submit the Phase I, II and (if applicable) III Environmental Site Assessment as well as any correspondence from the Maryland Department of the Environment and/or the Prince George's County Health Department] provide evidence of compliance with the applicable laws and regulations regarding the [underground storage tanks] removal of any hazardous waste or contaminates associated with the existing gas station.

P[10]9 [A pedestrian plaza of no less than 6,000 square feet shall be provided as an integral part of the pedestrian system relating to the Metro. (See Figure 28.) The location shall be determined at Conceptual/Detailed Site Plan.] An urban plaza, with a park-like setting, shall be provided in order to create a pedestrian-friendly area at the base of the proposed Metro overpass. (See Figure 28.)

AMENDMENT 48: On page 106, revise the following:

- UNDERLYING ZONING: C-S-C [M-X-T]

AMENDMENT 49: On page 106, revise the purpose as follows:

- To provide for retail, service and office uses. A mixed-use

development should be considered in the future for this property given its close proximity to the Metro Station. [additional housing and employment opportunities within close proximity to the Metro station to promote Metro ridership and creates an identifiable, liveable community.]

AMENDMENT 50: On page 106, delete P1, P5, P6 and P7 and renumber subsequent amendments accordingly.

AMENDMENT 51: On page 106, revise P2, P4 and P8 as follows:

P[2]1 The minimum building height for structures containing more than three (3) office uses [other than residential] shall be four stories.

P[4]3 For structures containing more than three (3) office uses, a [A] build-to-line of 40 feet from the face of curb shall be established along East West Highway.

P[8]4 [At the time of Detailed Site Plan submittal]Prior to the issuance of any building permit for any redevelopment of the gas station parcel, the applicant shall [submit the Phase I, II and (if applicable...Health Department)]provide evidence of compliance with applicable laws and regulations regarding the [underground storage tanks]removal of any hazardous wastes or contaminants associated with the gas station.

AMENDMENT 52: [On page 107, delete S3 and add new S3, as follows:

S3 For uses other than office, the proposed building(s) shall have a side orientation with a north-south axis as shown in Figure ____.]

AMENDMENT 53: On pages 107 and 108 delete the language under the heading Site Design Guidelines and replace with the following:

∴ No additional requirements.

AMENDMENT 54: On page 109, revise the following:

- EXISTING USE(S): Printing Facility and Related Uses
- UNDERLYING ZONING: [M-X-T] C-S-C

AMENDMENT 55: On page 109, revise the purpose as follows:

- To coordinate ... ridership. A mixed-use development should be considered in the future for this property given its close proximity to the Metro Station.

AMENDMENT 56: On pages 109 and 110, delete P1, P5, P6, P7 and S3, and renumber the subsequent requirements accordingly.

AMENDMENT 57: On page 109, revise P2 as follows:

P[2]1 The minimum building height for structures containing more than three (3) office uses [other than residential] shall be four stories.

AMENDMENT 58: On page 109, revise P4 as follows:

P[4]3 For structures containing more than three (3) office uses, a [A] build-to-line of 40 feet from the face of curb shall be established along East West Highway.

AMENDMENT 59: On pages 110 and 111, delete the language under the heading Site Design Guidelines and replace with the following:

∴ No additional requirements.

AMENDMENT 60: On page 113, revise the following:

- UNDERLYING ZONING: [M-X-T] C-S-C

AMENDMENT 61: On page 113, revise the purpose as follows:

- To provide for retail, service and office uses. A mixed-use development should be considered in the future for this property given its close proximity to the Metro Station. [additional housing opportunities with safe and direct access to the Metro

station and adjacent to the open space system of the Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park.]

AMENDMENT 62: On pages 113 and 114, delete P1, P5, P6, P8 and S3 and renumber the subsequent requirements accordingly.

AMENDMENT 63: On page 113, revise P2 and P4 as follows:

P[2]1 The minimum building height for structures containing more than three (3) office uses [other than residential] shall be four stories.

P[4]3 For structures containing more than three (3) office uses, a [A] build[ing restriction]-to-line of 40 feet from the fac[t]e of curb shall be established along East West Highway.

AMENDMENT 64: On pages 114 and 115, delete the language under the heading of Site Design Guidelines and replace with the following:

∴ No additional requirements.

AMENDMENT 65: On page 120, revise the following:

· UNDERLYING ZONING: [M-X-T] C-S-C

AMENDMENT 66: On page 120, revise the purpose as follows:

· To provide for retail, service and office uses. A mixed-use development should be considered in the future for this property given its close proximity to the Metro Station. [development incentives for revitalization of an existing commercial area in an effort to integrate an auto-oriented development within the changing Metro/pedestrian-oriented context and establish a vibrant commercial core.]

AMENDMENT 67: On pages 120 and 121, delete P1, P7, P8, P11 and S6 and renumber the subsequent requirements accordingly.

AMENDMENT 68: On page 120, revise P2 and P5 as follows:

P[2]1 The minimum building height for structures containing more than three (3) office uses [other than residential] shall be four

stories except the landmark building referred to in P[4]3.

P[5]4 For structures containing more than three (3) office uses, a [A]
build-to-line of 40 feet from the face of curb shall be established
along East West Highway.

AMENDMENT 69: On page 121, revise P10 as follows:

P[10]7 An urban plaza, with a park-like setting, shall be provided in
order to create a pedestrian-friendly area at the base of [to
connect the streetscape of East West Highway and] the proposed
[pedestrian] Metro overpass, [to the existing shopping center or
any future development.] The plaza shall be constructed
concurrently with [prior to] any [additional] development of
5,000 square feet or greater of gross floor area provided that the
Metro overpass is completed or under construction. The design
of the plaza shall be coordinated with the [planned] WMATA
[pedestrian] overpass construction.

AMENDMENT 70: On pages 122 and 123, delete the language under the heading Site
Design Guidelines and replace with the following:

∴ No additional requirements.

AMENDMENT 71: On page 124, revise the following:

- UNDERLYING ZONING: [M-X-T] R-18
- ALLOWABLE USE(S): See Use Table [3] 2

AMENDMENT 72: On page 124, revise the purpose as follows:

- To provide [a variety of] redevelopment guidelines
[opportunities] for a property where an aging apartment complex
exists. A mixed-use development should be considered in the
future for this property given its close proximity to the Metro
station.

AMENDMENT 73: On page 124, delete P3 and P5 and renumber the subsequent
requirements accordingly.

AMENDMENT 74: On page 126, delete S4.

AMENDMENT 75: On page 128, revise the following:

- UNDERLYING ZONING: [M-X-T] C-O

AMENDMENT 76: On page 128, revise the purpose as follows:

- To provide for an office complex [establish a high-density, mixed-use development] in close proximity to the Metro station that will promote transit ridership. *A mixed-use development should be considered in the future for this property given its close proximity to the Metro station.*

AMENDMENT 77: On pages 128 and 129, delete P6 and S2.

AMENDMENT 78: On pages 134 through 136, revise Use Table 2 to include Subarea 12 and permit the same uses for Subarea 12 as permitted for Subarea 13A.

AMENDMENT 79: On page 140, revise Use Table 3 to permit a drug store not exceeding 3,000 square feet for Subareas 4 and 10A.

AMENDMENT 80: On page 140, revise Use Table 3 to permit a drug store (other than one that exceeds 3,000 square or one that is within an office building or complex, and not exceeding 25 percent of the gross floor area, or 2,000 square feet, whichever is less) for Subarea 10A.

AMENDMENT 81: On page 140, delete Carpet or floor covering store (with no outside storage) from Use Table 3 as a permitted use.

AMENDMENT 82: On page 143, delete Spa, (private), accessory to an allowed dwelling unit from Use Table 3 as a permitted use.

AMENDMENT 83: On pages 137 through 141, revise Use Table 3 to include Subareas 6, 7, 9 and 11. Permit the same uses for these subareas as permitted for Subareas 4 and 10A. Add the following uses as permitted uses for these subareas:

- Fast-food restaurant: within a wholly-enclosed shopping mall, or

- department, variety or drug store; within an office building;
- within a hotel; accessory to and as an integral part of an allowed recreational facility;
- Other than a drive-in or fast-food restaurant (which may include incidental carry-out service, except where specifically prohibited): Permitting no entertainment (of any sort) other than music, and no patron dancing; within an office building;
- accessory to an allowed use;
- Vehicle, parts or tire store without installation facilities.
- Artist's studio;
- Laboratory: accessory to an allowed use; dental laboratory; all other laboratories;
- Pet grooming shop, provided all animals are confined to the interior of the building and adequate measures are taken to control noise and odor;
- Shoe repair shop;
- Building supply store, wholly enclosed, except for nursery stock;
- Food or beverage goods preparation on the premises of a food or beverage store provided the goods are only sold on the premises and at retail;
- Paint or wall covering store;
- Pet (sales) shop, provided all animals are confined to the interior of the building and adequate measures are taken to control noise and odor, may include the sale of pet feed and supplies;
- Retail shop or store (not listed) similar to one permitted in Use Table 3;
- Seafood market: containing less than 3,000 square feet of gross retail space; containing less than 7,000 square feet of gross retail space; unrestricted in size;

- ⋮ Swimming pool or spa sales and service, excluding outdoor display;
- ⋮ Day care center for children in accordance with Section 27-464.02 of the Zoning Ordinance;
- ⋮ Reducing/exercising salon or health club.

AMENDMENT 84: On page 138 of Use Table 3, add printing shop as a permitted use for Subarea 7.

AMENDMENT 85: On pages 137 through 141, revise Use Table 3 to include Subarea 13B. Permit the same uses for Subareas 13B that are permitted for Subareas 4, 6, 7, 9, 10A and 11 and as permitted in the Zoning Ordinance for the C-O Zone.

AMENDMENT 86: On pages 142 through 147 delete Subareas 6, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 13B from Use Table 4.

AMENDMENT 87: In Appendix A, revise the title of Detail 3 as follows:
 TREE PLANTING WITH GRATE (Section)
Along Belcrest Road

AMENDMENT 88: In Appendix A, delete text as follows:

Note: All Trees...[See detail...typical.]
 Soil Mix [As Specified]
 [See Specs]

AMENDMENT 89: In Appendix A, revise the title of Detail 4 as follows:

TREE PLANTING WITH GRATE (Pit Details)
Along Belcrest Road

AMENDMENT 90: Delete Appendix B, which contains the chart titled Comparison of Current and Revised Transportation Provisions.

AMENDMENT 91: Revise Appendix C based on amendments to the proposed TDDP.

AMENDMENT 92: Add the following text to Appendix C:

Per Section 27-548.07(7), the following potential maximum development yields have been calculated for the West Hyattsville Transit District. These yields are theoretical in that they do not account for the adequacy of public facilities, environmental constraints and market demand. They simply denote what could be constructed within the mandates of the TDDP and the underlying zone. The extent to which these yields are realized will depend upon the ability to provide adequate public facilities (including the success of trip reduction measures), satisfaction of environmental regulations and market demand over time.

AMENDMENT 93: Amend the M-X-T definition in Appendix E to reflect the revised definition per CB-47-1996.

SECTION 3. BE IT FURTHER ENACTED that this Ordinance shall become effective on the date of its enactment.

Enacted this ____ day of ____, 1998 by the following vote:

In Favor: Council Members Russell, Bailey, Del Giudice, Estepp, Gourdine, Hendershot, Scott and Wilson

Opposed:

Abstained: Council Member Maloney

Absent:

Vote: 8-0-1

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:

Ronald V. Russell
Chairman

ATTEST:

Joyce T. Sweeney
Clerk of the Council

KEY:

___ denotes Planning Board additions

== denotes Council additions

[] denotes deletions

Italics denotes changes from CR-40-1998