

RESOLUTION

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

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on September 8, 2005, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-04076 for Eya Hyattsville Redevelopment (formerly Lustine Properties), the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application requests approval of a mixed-use development including 124 townhome units, 13 live/work units, and 6,610 square feet of community space, which may include an exercise room, meeting space, and other space for community functions in the M-U-I/D-D-O Zones.
2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	M-U-I/D-D-O	M-U-I/D-D-O
Use(s)	Vacant/residential	Mixed-Use
Acreage	6.77	6.77
Parcels	2	2
Lots	0	137
Building Square Footage/GFA	0	6,610*

*This is the square footage for Building 1, the adaptively used Lustine showroom. Although the square footage for the live/work units on Lots 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135 136, 4, 3, and 2 is listed on the plans, the split between residential and commercial has not been provided. Therefore, staff has included a recommended condition below that would require the applicant to provide that information prior to signature approval.

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Total parking spaces	151	290/232*
Handicapped parking spaces	3	3
Loading spaces	0	0

*First number is for all standard unit types; second number is for all optional unit types.

3. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 68, Council District 2. More specifically, it is located on the west side of Baltimore Avenue (US 1), south of its intersection with Madison Street.

4. **Surroundings and Use:** The subject property is bounded to the north by DeMatha High School, single-family residential land use, and commercial retail land use along Baltimore Avenue; to the west by multifamily and single-family residential land use; to the east by commercial retail land use; and to the south by residential and commercial retail land use.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The subject site is subject to approved stormwater concept 9124-2005.
6. **Design Features:** Vehicular access into the development is provided from US 1 via Longfellow Street. Secondary vehicular accesses are provided via Madison Street to the north of the development and Kennedy Street to the southwest. A visual connection and pedestrian access to Baltimore Avenue from the development is provided by a landscaped plaza between the terminus of Kennedy Street in the development and Baltimore Avenue. Townhouse units in the development are organized in sticks as follows:

Number of Townhomes in a Stick	Number of Sticks of that Type in Development
2	2
3	2
4	2
5	1
6	5
7	3
8	3
10	1
11	1
12	1

The majority of sticks of townhomes in the proposed development front on a street in the development (44th Avenue, Longfellow Street, Road “A,” Road “B,” or Kennedy Street) and most back up to an alley. At three locations, two sticks placed perpendicularly to one another make up an individual building. These locations include:

- The southwest corner of 44th Avenue and Longfellow Street extended.
- The southeast corner of 44th Avenue and Longfellow Street extended.
- The northeast corner of Kennedy Street and Road A.
- The southwest corner of the intersection of Baltimore Avenue and Longfellow Street.
- The northwest corner of Longfellow Street and US 1.

The developer has identified each building in the development by number, with Building 1 as the

Lustine showroom to be adaptively reused as community space with an exercise room, meeting space, and other space for community functions. Buildings 2 through 14A house the townhomes. The applicant has established design mixes of the various unit types to be included for each building and have identified the materials to be utilized as follows:

- Brick
- Brick with corrugated metal panels
- Cementitious masonry panels
- Cementitious masonry panel with corrugated metal panels
- Corrugated metal panels
- Vinyl siding

The proposed architecture includes 72 percent of front facades in all brick, 23 percent in brick with corrugated panels, 3 percent cementitious masonry panels, and 2 percent cementitious masonry panels with corrugated panels. Rear elevations for the development would be developed with 24 percent brick, 3 percent brick with corrugated panels, 3 percent with cementitious masonry panels, 3 percent cementitious masonry panels with corrugated panels and 67 percent vinyl siding. The side facades of the units are proposed to be constructed of 48 percent brick, 48 percent brick with corrugated panels, and 4 percent cementitious masonry panels with corrugated panels.

The unit types include: Types A, B, C, C-1, C-2 (Live/work), D, D-1 (Live/work), E, and E-1 (Live/work).

The facades for the various buildings have been organized as follows:

Building Number	Façade/Unit Types Included
2	D, D, D, D
3	B, B, B, B, C, C
4	B, C, C, B, B, B, B,
5A	C-1, C-1, E-2, C, B, B
5	A, A, B, B, B, B
6	D, D, D, D, D, D
7	C, C, C, C, B, B, B, B,
8	A, A, A, B, B, C, C, C
9	D, D, D, D, D, D, D
10	C, B, A, A, E, C-1, A, A, A, A, A, B, B, A, C
11	C, A, B, B, C-1, E, B, C, C, C, B, B, C, C
12	B, B, B, B, C-1, E, B, B, C, C, A, A, B, B, C, C, C, C
13	C, C, B, A, A, B, B, B, B, C, C
14	E-1, E-1, E-1, C-1, C-1 C-1, E-2, C, C

The design of the architecture is well articulated. The different materials are employed to create visual interest. Elevation drawings for the Lustine showroom are not available as of the writing of this staff report.

Recreational facilities for the development include a tot lot, plaza space in front of the Lustine building and one at the terminus of Kennedy Road at Baltimore Avenue, with tables and chairs provided for passive recreation.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **The requirements of the approved sector plan and sectional map amendment for the Gateway Arts District:** The sector plan and sectional map amendment superimpose a Development District Overlay Zone over designated subareas called “character areas” to ensure that the development of the land meets the sector plan goals. The Development District Standards follow and implement the recommendations in the sector plan and sectional map amendment. The proposed project falls within the “town center” character area under the sector plan. The Development District Standards are organized in three parts to address site design, building design and public space.

Section 27-548.25 (b) requires that in approving the detailed site plan, the Planning Board shall find that the site plan meets applicable Development District Standards. In general, the subject detailed site plan meets the applicable Development District Standards as explained below in the point-by-point response to the applicable Development District Standards. If the applicant intends to deviate from the Development District Standards, the Planning Board must find that the alternative Development District Standards will benefit the development and the Development District and will not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan.

8. **Development District Standards of the Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ):**

Overall the applicant meets the development standards pertinent to achieving the town center character area in Hyattsville. The following deviations from the standards do not impair the integrity of the sector plan and, nevertheless, implement the vision of the town center character area.

- **Building and Streetscape Siting** (Table 1, page 135)—The intent of the development standards for a build-to line rather than a setback is to create a consistent street wall and a pleasant, inviting streetscape along commercial and mixed-use streets and a coherent visual appearance along neighborhood residential streets.

The preliminary sector plan established a development standard of 20 feet from the face of curb as a minimum build-to line along US 1. In approving the sector plan, the District Council amended the standard to acknowledge the build-to line from the edge of the

ultimate 60-80 foot ROW along US 1 could be reduced to 10-12 feet. The applicant notes that Buildings 1, 5A and 14 are located approximately 15.5 feet from the US 1 ROW that is in compliance with the revised standard.

(Note: Ultimate ROW includes provision for a landscape strip and sidewalk. The travel lanes of this segment of US 1 account for 54 feet, which includes a six-foot median. The median could also provide some turning lane space. However, this area may be substandard for SHA to provide turning lanes. (SHA has not provided comment at this time). If SHA requires additional ROW to accommodate adequate turning lanes, the applicant's build-to line will continue to be sufficient to achieve the goals of the town center character area to achieve a consistent building street wall and adequate streetscape.)

Residential dwelling units 97, 114, 124, and 138 vary from 7.5 to 9.7 feet from the face of curb. This variation is within the 15± feet variation allowed for residential uses for all streets other than US 1 and meets the intent of the development standards to create a coherent visual appearance along neighborhood residential streets.

- **Access and Circulation** (#6, page 138) The applicant is providing alleys that are 20 feet wide as opposed to the 18-foot maximum per the standards. This variation does not impair the integrity of the development in the town center character area and is reasonable given that they serve homes on both sides of the alley.
9. **The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the M-U-I (Mixed-Use Infill) Zone:** The M-U-I Zone was introduced in May 2001. The general purpose of the M-U-I Zone is to permit, where recommended in applicable plans (in this case the sector plan), a mix of residential and commercial uses as infill development in areas that are already substantially developed. The proposed development is primarily residential with 13 live/work units and must be considered in view of the second phase of the project. Phase II will include more commercial retail along Baltimore Avenue and allows staff to conclude that the proposed project meets the purpose and intent of the M-U-I Zone as defined in the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance.
 10. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-04192:** Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04192 is being considered by the Planning Board on the same day as the subject detailed site plan. The Transportation Planning Section has informed staff that it will not be possible to make the required findings of adequacy without SHA concurrence. If that becomes the case, staff would be prevented from recommending approval of the subject detailed site plan application because, per Section 27-270 (A)(3) and (4), when a detailed site plan is required, approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision must precede approval of the detailed site plan. The Transportation Planning Section is waiting on input from SHA in order to determine if they can make the required finding of adequacy.
 11. **Landscape Manual:** The proposed development is not subject to the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.

12. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** In comments dated June 29, 2005, Environmental Planning Section staff stated that the property is not subject to the provision of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because although the gross tract area of the subject property is greater than 40,000 square feet, there is less than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland. Further, they stated that a Type I tree conservation plan was not submitted with the review package and is not required. A standard letter of exemption (S-096-05) from the Ordinance was issued by the Environmental Planning Section, Countywide Planning Division, dated March 30, 2005.
13. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

Historic Preservation—In a memorandum dated August 2, 2005, the Historic Preservation Planning Section offered the following:

The Historic Preservation Commission reviewed this application at its July 19, 2005, meeting and voted unanimously (7-0) in favor of forwarding the following findings, conclusions and recommendations to the Planning Board:

Background

The subject detailed site plan application includes 6.8± acres near the southwest corner of the intersection of Madison Street and Baltimore Avenue within the City of Hyattsville. The subject property does not include any historic sites or historic resources or contributing resources within a locally designated historic district regulated by the Prince George's County Historic Preservation Ordinance (Subtitle 29 of the Prince George's County Code). No identified archeological resources are located within the subject property.

The applicant briefed the Historic Preservation Commission on the general details of the project at a work session preceding its March 15, 2005, meeting. Since the briefing, the Historic Preservation Commission received a number of letters about the EYA Hyattsville Redevelopment proposal and a request from Mayor Gardiner to review the proposal. Those letters, from the Maryland Historical Trust, the University of Maryland School of Architecture, the (Washington, D.C.) Latrobe Chapter of the Society of Architectural Historians, and the Hyattsville Preservation Association, among others, are included as attachments to the staff report (except as displayed on the Internet).

Findings

- (1) The entirety of the subject property is located within the Hyattsville Historic District, listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1982. The documentation and boundaries of the Hyattsville Historic District nomination were amended and expanded in 2004. Both the City of Hyattsville and the Hyattsville Historic District include

significant portions of the Baltimore Avenue/US 1 commercial corridor that has historically linked numerous communities from the District of Columbia to the City of Laurel and beyond.

- (2) The applicant proposes to redevelop the largely paved, but otherwise undeveloped property, with two mixed-use buildings along Baltimore Avenue (ground-level retail with residences above) and townhouses on the remainder of the property. In order to fulfill the applicant's proposed plan, a large existing building within the property, the Lustine Chevrolet building, is proposed for demolition. The applicant proposes to evoke the architectural character of the Lustine Chevrolet showroom in a section of the mixed-use building to the north along Baltimore Avenue by constructing a storefront with a horizontal canopy surmounted by a sign with the word "LUSTINE."¹
- (3) The Lustine Chevrolet building is a large mid-twentieth-century automobile showroom/repair shop of unique architectural form. The building, located at 5710 Baltimore Avenue, at the northeastern edge of the developing property, is identified as a contributing resource within the National Register Historic District. Constructed in 1950, the Lustine Chevrolet showroom and repair facility is a substantial masonry and glass structure with a monumentally scaled, curvilinear, glass-walled roadside display facility in the modernist idiom, attached to a massive, rectangular plan, masonry and glass repair facility of utilitarian industrial design. The focus of the composition is the street-facing showroom designed to dramatically showcase automobiles to passing pedestrians and motorists. The highly transparent and modernist design of the showroom is emblematic of the importance placed on the automobile in post World War II America.
- (4) As a contributing resource, restoration or rehabilitation expenses associated with the Lustine Chevrolet building would be eligible for both the Maryland Heritage Structure Rehabilitation Tax Credit Program (up to 20 percent of approved expenses) and the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentive Program (up to 20 percent of approved expenses).
- (5) Phase I archeological survey is not recommended on the above-referenced property. Section 106 review may require archeological survey for state or federal agencies, however.

Conclusions

- (1) The Lustine Chevrolet Building at 5710 Baltimore Avenue, Hyattsville, is a historically and architecturally important structure within Prince George's County and the State of Maryland. The building's form appears to be unique in Maryland and the Washington, D.C., region. The rear service wing of the building is a typical example of mid-twentieth-

¹ It is not clear whether or not the applicant intends to preserve the remaining sign on the historic building or to commission a replica.

century industrial design, notable for its size. Nevertheless, the more significant feature of the overall structure is the uniquely designed showroom at the street.

- (2) The applicant's proposal to merely evoke the Lustine Chevrolet building once it is demolished, with either the remaining historic sign or a replication of it, should not be considered suitable mitigation for the loss of a building of demonstrable architectural significance to the county and state, and clear significance to the twentieth-century commercial history of the City of Hyattsville. *If the historic building is considered important enough to be evoked as a design element of the "redevelopment" project, the historic building should be retained rather than demolished.*

Further, the applicant's proposed "Lustine storefront" will have only a slightly larger scale than the other storefronts in the proposed building and lack the monumentality and transparency of the dramatic 1950 showroom. The proposed one-story shop windows, will have a shallow, more rectilinear footprint, and lack the depth and curvilinear composition of the historic building. The proposed storefront will be constructed of smaller panes of plate glass separated by heavy mullions rather than the delicate mullions of the original, which were combined with the large expanses of glass to create a highly transparent and imposing effect. As a result, the applicant's efforts are effectively limited to the potential reinstallation of an historic sign (or its re-creation).

- (3) As a contributing resource in the Hyattsville National Register Historic District, the Lustine Chevrolet Building is eligible for substantial state and federal tax incentives for the rehabilitation of historic property. **Because it may be the first significant project of its type in Prince George's County, the EYA Hyattsville Redevelopment should be encouraged to respond more directly to its context—the historic inner-Beltway community of Hyattsville—in order to provide for a project that is location-specific rather than generic in character.** To set an example for the reuse of historic buildings throughout the county, and particularly in the historic communities inside the Beltway, the applicant should be strongly encouraged to explore the adaptive reuse of the showroom portion of the building and possible state and federal tax credits for doing so.
- (4) The Planning Board should direct the applicant to work with the Urban Design and Historic Preservation staff to address the retention of the Lustine Chevrolet building as a significant element in the redevelopment of this portion of the Baltimore Avenue/US 1 corridor.

Recommendations

The Historic Preservation Commission recommends to the Planning Board that the following condition should be attached to any approval of DSP-4076–EYA Hyattsville Redevelopment:

Prior to the approval of Detailed Site Plan-04076, the applicant shall revise the plans to demonstrate the retention of the street-facing showroom portion of the Lustine Chevrolet building at 5710 Baltimore Avenue in order to adaptively reuse the building as part of the redevelopment plan. Additions to the structure shall be limited to the area behind the rear wall of the showroom in order to retain the building's traditional appearance from the sidewalk, and any additions should be carried out in a manner that preserves the building's singular and monumental architectural character.

As explained below in the letter from the City of Hyattsville, the applicant has agreed to keep and maintain the Lustine Showroom (not including the garage portion) and renovate the exterior and interior in a way that preserves its historic, esthetic, and cultural character and appearance.

Archeological Review—In a memorandum dated June 6, 2005, the consulting archeologist stated that while she would not require archeological investigations for the subject property, Section 106 review may require archeological survey for state and federal agencies.

Community Planning—In comments dated August 11, 2005, the Community Planning Division offered the following comments:

- This application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan development pattern policies for the Developed Tier.
- This application conforms to the mixed-use-infill land use recommendations of the 2004 Gateway Arts District sector plan and sectional map amendment, as well as the development standards of the Gateway Arts District Development District Overlay Zone.

Transportation—In comments dated August 11, 2005, the Transportation Planning Staff stated that the adequacy of transportation facilities is not an issue in the review of a detailed site plan, as it would be during the review of the associated preliminary plan. Further, they stated that adequacy findings and off-site transportation conditions will be based on the review of the most recent traffic impact study submitted by the applicant in conjunction with the preliminary plan of subdivision 4-04192, and prepared in accordance with the methodologies in the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*. They also stated that the transportation staff, in consultation with SHA and DPW&T staff, were in the process of reviewing the study and would be making findings and recommendations to ensure that transportation facilities are adequate, which would be forwarded to the Subdivision Section. Specifically, with respect to the detailed site plan, the Transportation Planning Section stated that:

The revised site plan has incorporated the suggested modifications to the proposed site accesses to US 1 and on-site circulation patterns. However, staff has a number of comments regarding the submitted detailed site plan:

- Along US 1, the plan shows provision of two substandard 11-foot wide lanes and a 6-foot wide median, and as a proposed left turn lane. As indicated by the applicant's counsel, the proposed lane configuration for US 1 and the necessary access and traffic signal(s) modification, as well as the needed pedestrian crossings along US 1, are being coordinated with the SHA. As of this writing, staff has not been provided with the required SHA approval.
- The plan also shows a number of internal roadways with cross sections that include between 22 and 29 feet of pavement (and going down to 20 feet along the proposed private streets.) These sections are substandard and do not conform to the approved county Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) cross sections. But as all these roadways are within the City of Hyattsville, these cross sections may be deemed adequate provided that the applicant has secured approval from the city, which has the final authority to determine the appropriate cross sections for such roads.
- A proposed parking space summary is shown on sheet C2.00. It is not clear how many parking spaces will be provided and whether or not the proposed sum meets the applicable parking standards recommended by the approved Gateway Arts District sector plan and sectional map amendment.

The Transportation Planning Section correctly noted jurisdiction for regulation of the US 1 corridor to be with the State Highway Administration and the jurisdiction of the internal streets to be with the city of Hyattsville. Therefore, plans for the roadways in the proposed development will be deemed acceptable by the Transportation Planning Section if the relevant approving authority finds them acceptable. However, should the Transportation Planning Section be unable to make a finding of adequacy predicated on the State Highway Administration's expected comments on the revised plans, the Transportation Planning Section would not be able to recommend approval of the preliminary plan and staff would, by Section 27-270 (A)(3) and (4), be unable to recommend approval of the subject detailed site plan. Please see Finding 10 above for a more detailed discussion of the requirements of Zoning Ordinance regarding the order of approvals. With respect to the parking schedule, staff has required a revised parking schedule in the recommended conditions below.

Subdivision—At the time of this writing, comment has not been received from the Subdivision Section.

Trails—In a memorandum dated June 29, 2005, the senior trails planner offered the following: The Gateway Arts District Sector Plan identifies pedestrian and bicycle facilities as potential transportation modes for some trips within the study area. Having bicycle-compatible roadways and pedestrian-friendly streetscapes make it possible for residents and employees to make some trips without using their automobiles. This is especially important in urban areas and areas around mass transit where higher residential, office, and commercial densities make it more feasible for some trips to be made without an automobile (Sector Plan, page 37).

The sector plan also recognizes that pedestrian safety is a priority for the community and that measures should be taken to ensure that area roads are safe and attractive for pedestrians. Recommendation 2 requires pedestrian safety measures at road crossings and trail intersections. Painted crosswalks are indicated on the detailed site plan, but no detailed drawing is included that shows the specifics of what will be provided. Staff recommends that stamped concrete or some other contrasting surface material be used for the crosswalks. This is especially important at the pedestrian crossings along US 1, where an attractive streetscape and high visibility crosswalks should be provided. The crosswalk detailed should be submitted to the Development Review Division and be acceptable to the case reviewer.

Recommendation 1 addresses on-road bicycle facilities. It recommends that all new roads and all retrofit road projects be developed in accordance with the AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, where feasible (Sector Plan, page 41). These guidelines outline current “best practices” for accommodating bicycles on roads. The types of facilities addressed include designated bike lanes, wide outside curb lanes, paved shoulders, and shared-use roadways. More specifically, the sector plan recommends on-street bike lanes and continuous sidewalks along US 1 (Sector Plan, page 41). The provision of bike lanes or wide outside curb lanes can be considered by SHA at the time of road resurfacing or reconstruction. These types of in-road bike facilities (within the curbs) should be considered for the road as a whole, and it may not be appropriate or feasible to implement improvements incrementally for individual properties. The subject application includes approximately 600 feet of road frontage along US 1. Staff recommends the provision of bikeway signage. However, if additional dedication or construction is required along the US 1 road frontage, adequate space for a designated bike lane (a 16-foot-wide outside curb lane) should be considered.

SIDEWALK CONNECTIVITY:

An extensive network of standard and wide sidewalks is proposed on the subject application. These include standard sidewalks along both sides of all the local, internal roads, and a wide “streetscape” along US 1. The sidewalk along US 1 varies in width from approximately 6-feet to around 12-feet. Staff believes that this width is sufficient. However, it recommends that the sidewalk width be no less than six-feet in any area, including areas with street furniture, planters, or street trees.

Sufficient pedestrian amenities appear to be provided. The submitted detailed site plan reflects sidewalks along the residential roadways, as well as marked crosswalks. Baltimore Avenue includes an enhanced wide sidewalk with street trees, brickwork, trash receptacles, and benches. These features appear to be adequate to accommodate pedestrians in a safe and attractive environment throughout and along the site. Additional details are requested concerning the crosswalks.

The senior trails planner's concerns have been reflected in the recommended conditions below.

Permits—In comments dated July 5, 2005, the Permit Review Section offered several comments. The comments have been addressed by revisions to the plans or in the recommended conditions below. Please note that sign details for the community or for the on-site commercial component were not provided for review and will require a revision to the detailed site plan at the time the applicant wishes to have such signs approved.

Public Facilities—In a memorandum dated June 10, 2005, the Public Facilities Planning Section stated that the proposed project is within the time guidelines for fire engine, ambulance, paramedic and ladder truck service. In addition, the Public Facilities Planning Section stated that the proposed project meets the current test for police, which is based on the ratio of officers to population generated. This is provided for information only, as there is no requirement for a finding of adequate public facilities in connection with a detailed site plan.

Environmental Planning—In a memorandum dated June 29, 2005, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the subject property is located on the west side of Baltimore Avenue (US 1) and south of Madison Street. A review of the available information indicates that streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, severe slopes, and areas of steep slopes with highly erodible soils or Marlboro clays are not found to occur on this property. Baltimore Avenue is a planned four-lane major collector (MC-200) roadway not generally regulated for noise. The predominant soil type found to occur on the site according to the Prince George's County Soil Survey is Sandy & Clayey series. This soil series has limitations with respect to high shrink-swell potential and slow permeability, especially when steep slopes are present, which is not the case on the subject property. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program publication entitled "Ecologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George's Counties," December 1997, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. There are no designated scenic and historic roads in the vicinity of this application. This property is located in the Northeast Branch watershed of the Anacostia River basin and in the Developed Tier as reflected in the approved General Plan.

Environmental Issues Addressed in the Gateway Arts District Sector Plan

There are few specific recommendations pertaining to the environmental elements of the sector plan that relate to the subject property. This site is currently cleared of vegetation, developed and predominantly paved. The environmental elements pertaining to the subject property are noise pollution, stormwater management and woodland conservation. The applicable elements are addressed below.

"1c Stormwater Management: Existing regulations require adequate control of stormwater runoff (Subtitle 4, Division 2, Prince George's County Code)"

Comment: Stormwater management concept approval letter with conditions has been submitted with the application. The subject property involves the redevelopment of an existing developed site. No further information is required with regard to stormwater management.

- “g Protection and Restoration of Woodlands: The Woodland Conservation Ordinance requires the conservation of woodlands through preservation, reforestation and afforestation of woodland and specimen trees by meeting minimum woodland conservation thresholds (Subtitle 25, Prince George’s County Code)”

Comment: The subject property is cleared, developed and contains no qualified woodland. The site is exempt from the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it contains less than 10,000 square feet of woodland and does not have a previously approved Tree Conservation Plan. A Standard Letter of Exemption from the Ordinance is required prior to the issuance of any permit.

- “2. **Incorporate low-impact development design features and implement green building techniques that include the latest environmental technologies.”**

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of the detailed site plan, a statement regarding how the subject application meets recommendation 2 in the environment section of the sector plan shall be submitted. The statement must include specifics regarding low-impact design features and how green building techniques have been included in the design.

- “3. **Affirm county and state Smart Growth initiatives and the policies and strategies of the General Plan. New development and redevelopment should enhance existing green infrastructure elements such as wetlands, woodlands, open space, landscaped areas, street tree corridors, and sensitive species habitats. It should also establish open space linkages where they do not currently exist.”**

- “4. **Seek opportunities to create new connected green infrastructure elements. New development or redevelopment project proposals should establish landscaped areas and open space connections, wherever possible.**

Comment: The subject property is not adjacent to a designated green corridor and does not contain woodlands, wetlands or sensitive species habitat. The tree cover requirements in #5 below will serve to address the landscaping provisions above.

- “5. **Require the following tree cover areas based on ten-year tree canopies: 10 percent tree cover on all properties not in the CBCA I-D-O overlay and within the industrial areas, 15 percent tree cover on property containing an L-D-O (limited development overlay), 20 percent tree cover within mixed-use or commercial areas, and 26 percent tree cover within residential areas. Establish street trees along main**

transportation corridors. Count trees planted in the public right-of-way but within 16 feet of a property line toward a development's tree coverage."

Comment: The location of the subject property requires that afforestation be provided for a minimum of 10 percent of the gross tract area. A revised landscaping plan is required to show full compliance of this requirement. Implementations of this requirement are discussed further in the Environmental Review Section of this memorandum.

"6. Decrease impervious surfaces by sharing parking to the fullest extent, constructing green roofs, and following the County's Department of Environment Resources requirements to the fullest extent."

"7. Use micromanagement stormwater treatment methods on new development or redevelopment projects."

Comment: The subject property has an approved stormwater management concept letter with conditions; however, full compliance of these requirements is yet to be determined.

Recommended Conditions: The technical stormwater management plan shall show the use of techniques that micromanaged stormwater. The approved technical stormwater management plan shall be submitted with the first permit application to demonstrate conformance with this condition.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

1. A Forest Stand Delineation (FSD) was not submitted with this application and is not required. The subject property is predominantly cleared and developed. Woodland on-site is less than 10,000 square feet.

Comment: No further action is needed with regard to Forest Stand Delineation.

2. This property is not subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because although the gross tract area of the subject property is greater than 40,000 square feet, there is less than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan was not submitted with the review package and is not required. A standard letter of exemption (S-096-05) from the Ordinance was issued by the Environmental Planning Section, Countywide Planning Division, dated March 30, 2005.

Comment: No further action is needed at this time as it relates to woodland requirements. The letter of exemption should accompany all future applications for any grading or building permits.

3. This site is within the Gateway Arts District Overlay Zone and is subject to site design requirements for tree cover and stormwater management. The recommendation states that afforestation be provided for a minimum of 10 percent of the gross site area. This coverage is measured by the amount of cover provided by a tree species in 10 years. Street trees planted along abutting rights-of-way may be counted toward meeting this standard. A revised landscaping plan is required to show full compliance of this requirement.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of the detailed site plan submission, provide a table on the landscape plan that shows the amount of tree cover credit to be provided for each tree shown. The total tree cover area, calculated at growth in 10 years, shall be equal to or greater than 10 percent of the gross site area. Street trees on adjacent streets may be counted toward meeting this requirement.

4. A stormwater management concept approval letter (CSD 9124-2005-00) dated April 5, 2004 was submitted with the subject application. The requirements for stormwater management will be addressed during subsequent reviews by the Department of Environmental Resources.

Comment: No further information regarding stormwater management is required at this time.

Staff has included the Environmental Planning Section's recommendation in the recommended conditions below.

Department of Environmental Resources (DER)—In comments offered June 7, 2005, DER stated that the site plan for EYA Hyattsville Redevelopment (Lustine Properties) is consistent with approved stormwater concept #9124-2005.

Prince George's County Fire Department (Fire Department)—At the time of this writing, comment has not been received from the fire department.

Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)—DPW&T indicates (Hijazi to Hirsch, June 16, 2005) that the site lies within the City of Hyattsville and does not impact any county-maintained roadways. US 1 is a state-maintained roadway; therefore, coordination with the Maryland State Highway Administration is required.

Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)—In comments dated June 8, 2005, WSSC stated:

- A water extension will be required.
- Existing WSSC facilities are on the site.

- Applicant has applied for a connection.
- Applicant should call the Development Services Center to follow-up.
- Project DA426Z05 is an unapproved project within the limits of the subject site.
- Applicant should contact WSSC for further information regarding Project DA426Z05.
- Additional right-of-way is required.
- Design issues and insufficient clearance from pipeline to buildings between lots 33-40 and 59-64 need to be mitigated. Requirements are that a minimum right-of-way width of 30 feet is required for both water and lines installed in the same right-of-way at normal depth. The minimum right-of-way width for one extension, either water or sewer installed at normal depth is 20 feet. Installation of deep water and/or sewer mains will require additional right-of-way width. The minimum clearance between a building and a WSSC pipeline is 15 feet. The absolute minimum spacing between adjacent buildings with both water and sewer between them is 40 feet with a preference of 45 to 50 feet. Balconies and other building appurtenances are not to be within the right-of-way. Also, abandonment and/or relocation of WSSC appurtenances and/or meters may be required. Water and sewer hose connections will not be allowed through sandfilters.

The requirements of WSSC will be enforced through their separate permitting process.

Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)—In comments dated April 20, 2005, SHA staff stated that they are not in a position to offer support for Detailed Site Plan DSP-04076 at this time and asked that the following comments be placed in the subject staff report:

- The subject property is located along the west side of US 1 (Baltimore Avenue). The state highway location reference identifies US 1 (Baltimore Avenue) as a principle arterial state facility with an annual average daily trip (AADT) volume of 24,500 vehicle trips. According to the site plan, other road connections at 44th Street/ Madison Avenue intersection is proposed. 44th Street and Madison are local municipal facilities owned and maintained by the City of Hyattsville, Maryland.
- Coordination with SHA Engineering Access Permits Division is necessary for access to the property from the intersection of US 1 (Baltimore Avenue) and Longfellow Street. Improvements associated with ingress/egress must be consistent with State Highway Access Manual rules and regulations.
- Improvements such as deceleration/acceleration lanes, left turn lanes, bike lanes ,and stormdrain items may be necessary for adequate public facility requirements. If existing right-of-way is not available an appropriate measure of mitigation may be acceptable.

- Based on the size, scope and potential trip generation of the development, M-NCPPC Transportation Planning staff may determine that traffic data is necessary to provide an adequate measure of mitigation. SHA recognizes that the proposed development could potentially impact operations along the US 1 (Baltimore Avenue) corridor and would, therefore, request the opportunity to make recommendations in support of the above when a traffic impact study becomes available.

City of Hyattsville—In a letter dated August 10, 2005, the City of Hyattsville stated that the city and applicant have reached an agreement on contested issues described in an earlier letter dated June 27, 2005. The city withdraws its request to connect Kennedy Street to US 1 and to underground utilities along US 1. The applicant has agreed to keep and maintain the Lustine Showroom (not including the garage portion) and renovate the exterior and interior in a way that preserves its historic, esthetic and cultural character and appearance.

Town of College Park—In a telephone conversation with a member of the Urban Design staff on May 28, 2005, a representative of the City of College Park stated that they had no comment on the proposed project.

Town of Cottage City—At the time of this writing, comment has not been received from staff.

Town of North Brentwood—On July 6, 2005, the Mayor of North Brentwood verbally stated to Urban Design staff that the Town of North Brentwood had no comment on the proposed project.

Town of Bladensburg—At the time of this writing, comment has not been received from the Town of Bladensburg.

Town of Brentwood—At the time of this writing, comment has not been received from the Town of Brentwood.

Town of Edmonston—In a telephone conversation held with a member of the Urban Design staff on May 28, 2005, a representative of the Town of Edmonston stated that they had no comment on the proposed project.

Town of Riverdale Park—At the time of this writing, comment has not been received from the Town of Riverdale Park.

Town of University Park—At the time of this writing, comment has not been received from the Town of University Park.

12. As required by Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the Detailed Site Plan DSP-04076, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the plans, applicant shall revise the plans as follows:
 - a. Show a wide sidewalk along the entire length of the subject site's US 1 frontage providing at least six feet of clear space in all areas, including those with street furniture, planters and street trees.
 - b. Provide four-foot standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads.
 - c. Provide a crosswalk detail reflecting the surface material, dimensions, and other treatments to be provided. A contrasting and attractive surface material is encouraged and final design of the crosswalks shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
 - d. A "Share the Road with a Bike" sign shall be indicated to be located on Baltimore Avenue (US 1), after the State Highway Administration has the opportunity to review the proposed location to ensure that it is acceptable.
 - e. A table shall be provided on the landscape plan that shows the amount of tree cover credit to be provided for each tree shown. The total tree cover area, calculated at growth in ten years, shall be equal to or greater than ten percent of the gross site area. Street trees on adjacent streets may be counted toward meeting this requirement.
 - f. The parking schedule shall be revised and corrected to:
 - (1) Include a detailed listing of the various uses and requisite parking. In that process, the applicant shall specify the use(s) of the 6,610 square feet of community space.
 - (2) The handicapped parking shall be provided in accordance with ADA requirements.
 - g. The applicant shall specify in the plans the square footage of the commercial and residential portions of the live-work units.
 - h. The technical stormwater management plan shall show the use of techniques that micromanage stormwater. The approved technical stormwater management plan shall be submitted with the first permit application to demonstrate conformance with this condition.

- i. A statement regarding how the subject application meets recommendation 2 in the environmental section of the sector plan shall be submitted. The statement shall include specifics regarding low-impact design features and how green building techniques have been included in the design.
2. Prior to the issuance of the first building permit, a “Share the Road with a Bike” sign, shall be installed. SHA shall have the opportunity to review the proposed locations to ensure they are acceptable. The developer shall purchase the signs from the state and install them in accordance with the state’s Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices dealing with the section on bicycle facilities.
3. Where split-face block is used on front-loaded garage units, it shall be used for no more than four feet (4’) from the base of any such unit.
4. Sidewalks shall be continued across driveways, with the materials to be used at those locations to be approved by the Urban Design Section.
5. All street lamps on Route 1 shall be consistent with the existing street lamps currently installed on Route 1, south of the subject property, near the intersection of Gallatin Street.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board’s action must be filed with the District Council of Prince George’s County within thirty (30) days following the final notice of the Planning Board’s decision.

* * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Squire, seconded by Commissioner Eley, with Commissioners Squire, Eley, Vaughns and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, September 8, 2005, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 22nd day of September 2005.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator