COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND

SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

1998 Legislative Session

Resolution No.	CR-41-1998
Proposed by	The Chairman (by request - M-NCPPC)
Introduced by	Council Member Del Giudice
Co-Sponsors	
Date of Introduction	May 12, 1998

RESOLUTION

A RESOLUTION concerning

West Hyattsville

Transit District Overlay Zone

For the purpose of proposing amendments to the Transit District Development Plan for the proposed West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment as transmitted by the Prince George's County Planning Board for District Council consideration, and establishing a public hearing date for receipt of testimony on the proposed amendments.

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 West Hyattsville 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 West Hyattsville 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. 98-94, 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

SECTION 1. NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the County Council, sitting as the District Council, that the proposed West Hyattsville Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment and accompanying Transit District Development Plan, as endorsed by the Prince George's County Planning Board in Resolution No. 98-94 are hereby proposed for amendment 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 4, Figure 3; page 31, Figure 8; and page 59, Figure 17; change reference of 29th, 30th and 31st Streets to: 29th, 30th and 31st Avenues.

AMENDMENT 5: 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 6: 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 7: On page 15, delete item 3b under Applicability.

AMENDMENT 8: 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 9: 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 10: 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 11: On page 17, delete the sixth submittal requirement pertaining to the shadow study for Detailed Site Plans, and renumber the subsequent requirements accordingly.

AMENDMENT 12: 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 13: 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 14: 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 15: 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 16: On page 39, 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 17: On page 40, delete the following text from the Introduction:

Appendix B summarizes the principal differences between the current and revised transportation provisions of the TDDP for West Hyattsville.

AMENDMENT 18: On page 41, 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 19: On page 44, Figure 12, make the following changes:

- In the fifth column, delete the word "Required" from the column heading.
- Delete the second improvement and the map depiction referring to improvements on Hamilton Street (MD 208).
- In the fifth column, under item 1, revise the text as follows: [Restripe and/or reconstruct to provide a four-lane divided collector with] Complete reconstruction to provide appropriate turning lanes.

AMENDMENT 20: On page 43 (Figure 11), eliminate the black line that represents Queens Chapel Road north of East West Highway.

AMENDMENT 21: On page 45, Figure 13, relocate symbol 5 at the intersection of Queens Chapel Road and Nicholson Street.

AMENDMENT 22: On pages 50 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 and Prince George's County 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 West Hyattsville 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 page 51, revise Table 5 as follows:

- Table [5] 4
- Delete the third transportation improvement: 3. (MD 500 at Hamilton Street); renumber remaining improvements respectively; and change the Total Estimated Cost from $2,268,750 to $825,000.
- Delete: [See P5 below.]

AMENDMENT 24: On page 51, 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 following two bullets:

· 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 the bottom of page 52 and the 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 has been amended to address 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. 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. 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.

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 West Hyattsville Transit District shall be 900 spaces in addition to the spaces already in the transit district.

P6 The Premium Parking Cap for West Hyattsville Transit District shall be 300 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 $2,700 (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 West Hyattsville 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.

Table 5
Maximum Surface Parking Ratios
West Hyattsville Transit District

Land Use	Preferred Ratio	Premium Ratio
Residential	≤1.00/D.U.	≤1.33/D.U.
Office/Research	≤2.5 spaces/1,000 GSF	≤3.35 spaces/1,000 GSF
Retail	≤4.35 spaces/1,000 GSF	≤5.8 spaces/1,000 GSF

Table 6 Parking Limits By Land Use West Hyattsville Transit District			
Land Use	Preferred Cap	Premium Cap	Total
Residential	245	85	330
Office/Research	245	80	325
Retail	410	135	545
Total	900	300	1,200

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:
  - 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 West Hyattsville Transit District shall be $900.00. (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 West Hyattsville Transit District shall be $1,350.00. (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 54, delete Figure 16, and renumber subsequent Figures accordingly.

AMENDMENT 29: On page 56, 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 57, delete the entire section titled "Mandatory Development Requirements."

AMENDMENT 32: On pages 57 and 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 coterminous 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 33: At the top of page 58, 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 34: On the bottom of page 58, 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 35: On page 63, under the heading Woodland Conservation, change S1 as follows:

S1 ...Afforestation can occur on-site or within [designated open space areas in the West Hyattsville Transit District]the Anacostia Watershed in Prince George's County with priority given to riparian zones and nontidal wetlands.

AMENDMENT 36: On page 71, Figure 22, delete the trail shown in Prince George's Plaza (Subarea 13A). Add the proposed trail shown on the PA 68 Master Plan along Northwest Drive and Dean Drive.

AMENDMENT 37: On page 72, reorient the house located at 2802 Lancer Drive (corner of 29th Avenue and Lancer Drive) to front Lancer Drive.

AMENDMENT 38: On page 76, amend Figure 25 to show that equestrians will be accommodated when crossing Queens Chapel Road.

AMENDMENT 39: 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 40: On page 90, revise the map and legend in Figure 27 as needed to show the following:

Subareas 2 and 7 (revisions)

- Maximum 6-story development along Ager Road.
- Maximum 12-story development beyond the 350-foot dimension line to the back of the subarea.

AMENDMENT 41: On page 93, delete P7 and add new P7 as follows:

If Subareas 2 and 7 are developed independently of each other, there shall be at least two uses on each property and a minimum of 20 percent of the gross floor area shall be devoted to the secondary use. Or, if

Subareas 2 and 7 are developed jointly, there shall be at least two uses with 20 percent of the gross floor area devoted to the secondary use.

On pages 154 and 155, change all entries labeled "P2" to "P" and delete the footnotes referencing "P2" in Table 4.

AMENDMENT 42: On page 97, delete P2 and add new P2 as follows:

Build-to lines as shown in the district-wide streetscape sections, Figures 7 and 8, shall not apply to Subarea 3.

AMENDMENT 43: On page 97, add new P5 as follows:

Parking lots may occupy more than 33 percent of the frontage of the subarea and may be located between the building and Ager Road, but shall limit driveway cuts which discourage pedestrian activity. In addition, a brick wall (approximately three feet high) and landscaping shall be provided to reduce the visual impact of the front yard parking.

AMENDMENT 44: On page 98, amend the following:

- UNDERLYING ZONING: C-S-C [M-X-T]
- ALLOWABLE USE(S): See Use Table 3[4]

AMENDMENT 45: On page 98, revise the purpose as follows:

- Retail is appropriate . . . shopping center. [Residential development . . . work hours.]

AMENDMENT 46: On page 98, delete P3, and renumber subsequent requirements accordingly.

AMENDMENT 47: On page 98, delete S3; also on page 99, delete Figure 30 accordingly.

AMENDMENT 48: On page 100, delete S6.

AMENDMENT 49: On pages 100 and 101, delete the language under the heading Site Design Guidelines and replace with the following:

- No additional requirements.

AMENDMENT 50: On page 102, revise the following:

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

- ALLOWABLE USE(S): See Use Table 3[4]

AMENDMENT 51: On page 102, revise the purpose as follows:

- To continue an established. . . shopping center. [and to provide. . . retail uses.]

AMENDMENT 52: On page 102, delete P2 and P4 and renumber the subsequent requirements accordingly.

AMENDMENT 53: On page 104, delete S6.

AMENDMENT 54: On page 104, delete the items B and C under the heading of Site Design Guidelines.

AMENDMENT 55: On page 108, amend as follows:

- EXISTING USES: Office and Retail
- ALLOWABLE USE(S): See Use Tables [1]3 and 4

AMENDMENT 56: On page 108, revise P1 as follows:

. . .as shown in Figure [27]32.

AMENDMENT 57: On page 115, delete P7 and add new P7 as follows:

If Subareas 2 and 7 are developed independently of each other, there should be at least two uses on each property and a minimum of 20 percent of the gross floor area shall be devoted to the secondary use. Or, if Subareas 2 and 7 are developed jointly, there shall be at least two uses with a minimum of 20 percent of the gross floor area devoted to the secondary use.

AMENDMENT 58: On page 136, Use Table 3, add Subarea 5 to the heading.

AMENDMENT 59: On pages 136 through 153, add columns for Subareas 4A and 4B to Use Table 3 and permit the same uses that are permitted for Subarea 3.

AMENDMENT 60: On page 137, add gas station as a permitted use for Subarea 8. For this subarea, the use shall only be permitted for the existing gas station.

AMENDMENT 61: On pages 154 through 160, delete Subareas 4A and 4B from Use Table .

AMENDMENT 62: Move the Site Design Guidelines pertaining to recommended

multifamily residential amenities to the District-Wide Urban Design Requirements section as follows:

- pgs. 89 and 92 (Subarea 1); guidelines B and C
- pgs. 95 and 96 (Subarea 2); guidelines A and B
- pg. 116 (Subarea 7); guidelines B and C

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

AMENDMENT 64: Revise Appendix C based on amendments to the proposed TDDP.

AMENDMENT 65: 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 66: Amend the M-X-T definition in Appendix E to reflect the revised definition per CB-47-1996.

SECTION 2. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that after holding a public hearing on the amendments, the District Council shall reconsider each amendment and may adopt any one or all of such amendments or any combination or portions thereof.

SECTION 3. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that pursuant to Section 27-213.5(b) of the County Code a public hearing be scheduled on June 1, 1998, at 7:00 p.m., in the Council Hearing Room, County Administration Building, Upper Marlboro, Maryland, to receive testimony on these amendments, and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Prince George's County Planning Board for its written comments, to be presented at or before the public hearing.

Adopted this 12th day of May, 1998.

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