

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 February 15, 2007, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-03072/02 for University Town Center, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The applicant has submitted a revision to the site plan for infrastructure for the purpose of revising the design of a loading dock screen wall and to change the proposed light fixtures for the development.
2. **Development Data Summary**

DSP-03037/04

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use(s)	None	Main street and infrastructure
Acreage	6.62 acres	6.62 acres
Number of Units	0	0
Square Footage/GFA	0	0

3. **Location:** The site is located in Planning Area 68, Council District 2. More specifically, it is located just east of the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Belcrest Road and East West Highway, with frontage along East West Highway, in close proximity to the Metro station.
4. **Surroundings and Uses:** University Town Center is bounded to the north by Toledo Road; to the west by Belcrest Road; to the east by Adelphi Road; and to the south by East West Highway. Along the east property line there are two existing churches and a public library that fronts on Adelphi Road.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The conceptual site plan (CSP 00024) for Subareas 2 and 3 of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ) was approved by the District Council on January 8, 2001. The CSP proposes a mixed-use development with a "main street" theme that includes office, retail and residential. Both subareas were reviewed as one site and combined consist of 38.62 acres in the M-X-T Zone and approximately 7.6 acres in the O-S Zone. A revision to the conceptual site plan and primary amendments to the transit district development plan for the subject property, TP-00002, were approved by the District Council on February 26, 2001. In the order approving primary amendments to Transit District Development Plan, the

District Council approved modifications to P1 and P52 of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan.

On April 25, 2002, the Prince George's County Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01092 for the project. The property is the subject of record plat REP 205@43 and REP 205@44 recorded March 7, 2005. The property is known as Prince George's Center Parcels M and N, Parcel O, being a resubdivision of Parcel F.

On June 3, 2004, the Prince George's County Planning Board approved DSP-03072, for the purpose of reviewing the plans for the creation of streets and the streetscape improvements along MD 410. On September 26, 2005, a revision (DSP-03072/01) was approved at staff level for minor changes to the plans.

Required findings for a Detailed Site Plan in the Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ) as stated in the Transit District Development Plan

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

The District Council approved several primary amendments (P1, P44, P46, P48, P50, P52, P53, P54, P58 and P59) and adopted the Planning Board's findings concerning mandatory requirements P34, P55, S28, S33, S34, S35 and S36 to the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP), which allows the development of Subareas 2 and 3 to proceed as stipulated by those amendments. The Urban Design staff has determined that the detailed site plan is in strict conformance with all mandatory development requirements, as amended by the District Council. However, this application proposes to amend S24 of the mandatory requirements.

- **S24 (TDDP, page 39)** – *“All lighting poles, fixture designs, light rendition and level of illumination shall be coordinated throughout the transit district to achieve a recognizable design, and be consistent with the streetscape construction drawings provided in Appendix A.”*

The applicant has provided the following discussion in an overview of the changes to the site plan dated September 29, 2006, Ryan to Lareuse, regarding the revision to the light fixtures:

“To revise the light fixtures along East-West Highway. The lights previously approved along East-West Highway are in accordance with the TDDP requirement S-24, which states that ‘all lighting poles, fixture designs, light rendition, and level of illumination shall be coordinated throughout the transit district to achieve a recognizable design and be consistent with the streetscape construction drawings provided in Appendix A’ (see Details 13 and 14 attached). This fixture is no longer available or maintainable by the DPW&T/SHA/Pepco. Therefore the applicant has worked with DPW&T and SHA to select a light fixture from the county and state approved list of fixtures that will be maintainable as part of their regular course of business. The county has deferred to the

state on this issue since the lights are within the MD 410 right-of-way and its fixtures are maintained by the state. This fixture is shown in Pepco drawing 4-3-1685 (attached). Therefore a secondary amendment to S-24 is requested to be approved by the Planning Board to substitute this fixture.”

Comment: Staff recommends approval of the amendment to S-24 in order to allow fixture types that are maintainable by the utility company and the jurisdictional entity.

5. **The Transit District Site Plan is consistent with, and reflects the guidelines and criteria contained in the Transit District Development Plan;**
6. **The Transit District Site Plan meets all of the requirements of the Transit District Overlay Zone and applicable regulations of the M-X-T Zone;**
7. **The location, size and design of buildings, signs, other structures, open spaces, landscaping, pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems, and parking and loading areas maximize safety and efficiency and are adequate to meet the purposes of the Transit District Overlay Zone;**

The plan proposes a revision to a loading dock wall that is proposed as a concrete masonry wall with a hardcote finish and brick piers placed approximately 22 feet on center and an additional decorative brick feature central between the brick piers. The use of the concrete masonry block and piers provide the structure of the wall and the hardcote and intervening brick decorative features are a veneer to the wall. The proposal is attractive and structurally acceptable.

8. **Each structure and use, in the manner proposed, is compatible with other structures in the Transit District and with existing and proposed adjacent development.**
9. **In addition to the findings above, the following is required for Detailed Site Plans:**
 - a. **The Planning Board shall find that the Detailed Site Plan is in general conformance with the approved Conceptual Site Plan.**

The proposed revision application is in conformance with the conceptual site plan.

Required Findings for Detailed Site Plans in the M-X-T Zone

10. **The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this Division;**

The proposed infrastructure plan is one component of the overall project known as the Boulevard at Prince George’s Metro. At the time of final build out, the boulevard will provide for high quality and distinctive architecture. As such, the proposed project, during development and at the

time of completion, will enhance the economic status of the county and provide an expanding source of desirable employment and living opportunities.

The transit district development plan (TDDP) will ensure that the detailed site plan maximizes public and private development potential and promotes the effective and optimum use of transit and other major transportation systems.

11. **The proposed development has an outward orientation, which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation;**

The proposed overall project will have both an outward orientation with new paving, street furniture, landscaping, and public spaces fronting on MD 410 and Belcrest Road, as well as an inward orientation with new pedestrian sidewalks, street furnishings, public art, landscaping, and lighting fronting on the new main street.

As this project continues to develop, other requirements of the TDDP will further ensure that new development will be physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development. Because of the magnitude of the proposed development, it also has the potential to catalyze adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation.

12. **The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity;**

This application is compatible with structures and uses that are either existing or proposed within the transit district overlay zone. The proposed light fixture is compatible in design to the light fixtures along Belcrest Road and the loading screen wall is compatible with the previously approved architecture for the project.

13. **The mix of uses, and the arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements, reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability;**

Subareas 2 and 3 are already developed with 1.237 million square feet of office buildings, and the Center for Disease Control provides for a significant employment base that will help to contribute to a stable environment. The underground parking garage and the development of the student housing will enhance the existing and proposed development on the site. Retail uses including restaurants, a cinema, and outdoor plazas, will also enhance the quality of the transit district.

14. **If the development is staged, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases;**

While this submission, DSP-03072/02, is for a revision to the infrastructure plan, detailed site plans for the development of the retail components will be presented to the Planning Board in the

near future. These submissions build upon each other such that the combined elements of the overall development will ultimately become a self-sufficient entity that will allow for effective integration of future phases of the development.

15. **The pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development;**

A major component of the infrastructure detailed site plan is the main street with wide sidewalks, special paving, street trees, landscaping, furniture, and lighting that is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity. The pedestrian system will connect into existing streets that will create convenient access to the Metro station and surrounding subareas.

16. **On the Detailed Site Plan, in areas of the development which are to be used for pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people, adequate attention has been paid to human scale, high quality urban design and other amenities, such as the types and textures of materials, landscaping and screening, street furniture and lighting (natural and artificial).**

The original plans were found to provide for the movement of the pedestrian. This revision to the plans will continue to find that the needs of the pedestrian are accommodated and that the plans have addressed the issue of high quality urban design.

Referrals

17. This revision to the plans has no impact on the original finding of compliance to the *Landscape Manual*.
18. The detailed site plan was referred to the Town of University Park and the City of Hyattsville. At the time of the writing of the staff report, the Town of University Park has not responded. The City of Hyattsville has reviewed the plans and in an e-mail dated February 5, 2007, Murphy to Lareuse, the City of Hyattsville stated no objection to the proposed changes.
19. If the conditions of approval are adopted, the detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs 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-03072/02.

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 Parker voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Clark absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, February 15, 2007, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 8th day of March 2007.

R. Bruce Crawford
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

RBC:FJG:SL:bjs