



**THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive  
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772  
TTY: (301) 952-4366  
www.mncppc.org/pgco

Prince George's County Planning Department  
Community Planning Division

301-952-3972

November 19, 2015

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Fern Piret, Planning Director *J.P.*  
Ivy A. Lewis, Division Chief, Community Planning Division *IAL*

FROM: William Washburn, AICP, Planner Coordinator, Community Planning Division *WW*  
Scott Rowe, AICP, CNU-A, Planner Coordinator, Community Planning Division *SR*

SUBJECT: ***Preliminary Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan and Proposed Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment – Staff Analysis of Public Hearing Testimony***

On October 22, 2015, the Prince George's County Planning Board held a public hearing to receive testimony regarding the *Preliminary Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan and Proposed Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment* (TDDP/TDOZMA). At the hearing, staff submitted the first 19 exhibits for the record, including the preliminary TDDP and proposed TDOZMA. In addition, 13 speakers testified. The public hearing record was closed on November 2, 2015. A total of 30 written statements of testimony were received by the Office of the Clerk of the Council before the hearing record closed. In summary, a total of 49 exhibits were admitted into the public record.

An additional five exhibits were received by the Clerk of the Council after the public record closed on November 2. The Clerk's office assigned this late testimony exhibit numbers T-1 through T-5. Late testimony was submitted by the Maryland State Highway Administration/Maryland Department of Transportation (SHA/MDOT), the University Hills Civic Association, Randy Fletcher (resident/owner of the historic Hitching Post Hill residence), James Menasian (a resident of the University Hills neighborhood), and Loretta Saks (a resident of University Park). We submit that testimony to the Planning Board today and recommend that all five exhibits be admitted into the public hearing record as late testimony.

This memorandum contains the staff analysis of the October 22 public hearing transcript and all of the testimony received by the Clerk's office before and after the close of the public hearing record. It focuses on several broad themes or issues that ran throughout the oral and written testimony. We

summarize those themes below. Detailed staff responses and recommendations are contained in the attached matrix of summarized testimony (Staff Analysis Table).

For the details of our broad staff analysis, we refer you to the following attachments:

1. The complete transcript of the October 22, 2015 public hearing, including the list of speakers;
2. A complete list of exhibits received by the Clerk of the Council, including submissions admitted into the public hearing record by its November 2, 2015 closing date and late testimony submitted after November 2, 2015; and
3. A Staff Analysis Table that lists each exhibit by key points raised, the staff response to that testimony, and staff recommendations.

In addition, a number of speakers and exhibits proposed technical changes or corrections to be incorporated into the preliminary TDDP before the Planning Board takes action on adoption of the plan on December 3, 2015.

### **Summary Analysis of Testimony**

Overall, the submitted public hearing testimony indicated broad support for the plan vision of a walkable, transit-centered community anchored by the Prince George's Plaza Metro Station. A number of speakers commended staff for its work in preparing the plan and expressed the hope that its vision would come to pass.

Several exhibits reflected a concern on the part of some residents of the Town of University Park that the higher-intensity development envisioned by the plan would compromise the pattern of development that they had come to enjoy. One speaker expressed concern that the proposed rezoning of her condominium community would lead to displacement. Other exhibits offered proposed technical corrections or changes to the preliminary TDDP and/or the proposed TDOZMA.

In a memorandum to the Planning Board submitted at the public hearing (Exhibit 4), Planning Department staff recommended 17 substantive changes to the TDDP/TDOZMA. These changes can be categorized as either new Strategies or new Transit District Standards. Planning staff also recommended 165 technical corrections. In Exhibit 41, Department of Parks and Recreation staff recommended one substantive change and three technical corrections pertaining to new parks and recreation facilities.

A number of concerns were raised by some of the speakers and other testimony regarding potential development impacts on existing single-family residential neighborhoods. Some of these concerns were raised even by parties who supported the overall goals and vision of the preliminary TDDP. The following broad themes ran throughout much of the testimony:

1. ***Stormwater Management*** – Flooding concerns were expressed by the Town of University Park and a number of the town's residents. These concerns focused on the Wells Run sub-watershed that drains the eastern portion of the Transit District. A number of speakers and exhibits called for a comprehensive regional solution to stormwater management (SWM); several speakers

wanted that solution incorporated into the plan. Five exhibits advocated for the construction of a proposed SWM facility known locally as “Nine Pond” Several exhibits expressed concern about the impact of development, especially on the properties through which Wells Run flows.

2. ***Building Heights Exceeding 16 Stories*** – The Town of University Park and a number of its residents expressed concern about the potential visual impacts of buildings taller than 16 stories on views from University Park. The Town of University Park and other parties requested that the tallest future buildings be located closer to the Metro station and that no buildings taller than two to three stories be allowed within a certain distance of Adelphi Road.
3. ***Traffic Impacts from Future Development*** – Both the City of Hyattsville and the Town of University Park asked that the plan require a transportation demand management district (TDMD) and/or a parking district to be put in place before the approval of new development. Several other speakers and exhibits expressed concern about the increased congestion they feared would result from future higher-density development and the replacement of the outside lanes on East West Highway with buffered bike lanes.
4. ***Future Development Impacts on Public Schools*** – Several speakers and exhibits expressed concern that future development would swamp already-overcrowded public schools in the Hyattsville area with large numbers of additional students. They were concerned that while the plan acknowledged this issue, it contained no measures for addressing it. These parties recommended that sites be identified within the Transit District for new schools.
5. ***Potential Development Impacts on the Hitching Post Hill Historic Property and Nearby Single-Family Residences*** – Several speakers expressed the concern that the wooded and undeveloped environs surrounding this historic, privately-owned mansion could be degraded or even erased by new development to the south. One speaker recommended that development of the nearby wooded Clay property be postponed until an archeological assessment of potential historic artifacts on the site could be completed. Several speakers and exhibits expressed concerns about potential traffic and visual impacts on the nearby University Hills neighborhood. They endorsed plan recommendations to retain the Clay property in the R-80 Zone and restrict access to Rosemary Lane and Calverton Drive to pedestrians and bicyclists. However, the owner of the Clay property has requested that the property be rezoned from R-80 to R-20 to permit townhouse development up to 16.33 units/acre.
6. ***Flexible Options for Future (Re)Development*** – The owners of several properties located north of Toledo Terrace requested rezoning to categories other than those recommended in the plan for their properties. The requested rezonings would allow the option of pursuing townhome or multifamily development. One property owner expressed a concern that the proposed rezoning of their property might render its current use nonconforming or subject it to more restrictive development controls. Two other property owners suggested that the proposed development standards be made voluntary guidelines or done away with in order to provide maximum flexibility.

Staff is available to answer any questions that you may have about this analysis. Thank you for your consideration and support.

#### Attachments

1. October 22, 2015 public hearing transcript, including the list of speakers
2. Complete list of exhibits received by the Clerk of the Council, including submissions admitted into the public hearing record by its November 2, 2015 closing date and late testimony submitted after November 2, 2015
3. Staff Analysis Table that lists each exhibit by author, key points raised, the staff response to that testimony, and staff recommendations

**Staff Analysis Table**  
**Preliminary Prince George's Plaza TDDP**  
**October 22, 2015 Public Hearing Record**

Below is a thorough analysis of the testimony received during the public comment period for the Planning Board's October 22, 2015 Public Hearing on the Preliminary Prince George's Plaza Transit District Development Plan and Proposed Transit District Overlay Zoning Map Amendment. The analysis is organized around key themes, and includes a staff discussion of the issues raised and recommendations.

**Staff Proposed Technical Changes**

In Exhibit 4, Planning Department staff recommended 17 substantive changes to the TDDP/TDOZMA. These changes can be categorized as either new Strategies or new Transit District Standards. Planning staff also recommended 165 technical corrections. In Exhibit 41, Department of Parks and Recreation staff recommended one substantive change and three technical corrections.

**Testimony in General Support of the Preliminary Prince George's Plaza TDDP/TDOZMA**

- 20 – National Capital Planning Commission
- 21 – Town of University Park (Mayor Len Carey, Speaker)
- 22 – William Shipp/Kiplinger Washington Editors Inc.
- 23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)
- 24 – Tom Wright
- 26 – Stuart Eisenberg/Hyattsville Community Development Corp
- 29 – Christopher Mrozinski/Pennsylvania Real Estate Investment Trust (PREIT)
- 30 – Jeffrey Berman/Berman Enterprises
- 37 – Brad Hess
- 42 – John Tabori
- 43 – Arlene Christiansen
- 47 – Catherine N. Donnelly
- T4 – Gregory Johnson/State Highway Administration
- T5 – Loretta Saks

**Testimony Expressing General Concern About Potential Development Impacts on Preferred Neighborhood Character**

- 33 – Chris Demers
- 34 – Tristia Bauman
- 46 – Jayson L. Amster

## Stormwater Management

<b>Exhibit #/Name</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Recommendations</b>
21 – Town of University Park (Mayor Len Carey, Speaker)	Wants a comprehensive stormwater management (SWM) solution incorporated into the plan.	Prince George's Plaza is split by two watersheds; the western part of the Transit District flows into the Northwest Branch of the Anacostia River, and the eastern part of the Transit District flows into Wells Run, which travels through the Town of University Park before merging with the Northeast Branch of the Anacostia River. Much of the Transit District was substantially developed by 1970, prior to SWM regulations. As a result of the preponderance of impervious surface with no stormwater controls, properties along Wells Run within the Town of University Park have experienced repeated and sometimes severe flooding.	If a preferred SWM alternative can be definitively identified by the Department of the Environment before TDDP approval, it should be expressly referenced within the TDDP.
32 – Linda Verrill	Wants the "Nine Pond" stormwater control solution to be incorporated into the plan.		
35 – Katherine Stewart	The recommended regional SWM plan should be designed to prevent further flooding along Wells Run.		
36 – Melissa Ho	Wants SWM to be prioritized more strongly in the plan.	Several years ago, a consultant study was commissioned that explored a potential SWM facility, called "Nine Pond," in the northeastern part of the Transit District. This proposal enjoys broad endorsement within University Park, and was cited in several testimonies.	
37 – Brad Hess	Wants the "Nine Pond" stormwater control solution to be incorporated into the plan.	Strategy NE1.1 (pages 98, 138) recommends a district-wide study of flood control volumes and the determination of appropriate measures that address shared solutions for handling stormwater volumes.	
42 – John Tabori	Concerned that the TDDP allows for high-density development in areas that include the proposed "Nine Pond" SWM facility.	Early in the project, staff recognized the need to mitigate existing and future SWM impacts of development at Prince George's Plaza and, in collaboration with the Office of the County Executive, the Department of Public Works and Transportation; and the Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement; the Planning Department and the Department of the Environment initiated a multi-phase evaluation of potential SWM solutions in the Wells Run drainage area, including the previously-identified "Nine Pond" system. (continued on next page)	
43 – Arlene Christiansen	Advocates for the "Nine Pond" SWM Project.		

## Building Heights (Outside University Town Center)

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
21 – Town of University Park (Mayor Len Carey, Speaker)	The town previously opposed a proposed 31-story building at Belcrest Plaza and opposes the proposed 32-story height limit.	Prince George's Plaza is a Regional Transit District. The regional real estate market requires flexibility to meet demand for a considerable amount of development in a constrained physical space. Several property owners within the Transit District indicated a desire to build buildings taller than 16 stories but could not due to the restrictions of the 1998 TDDP.	Recommend no action.
25 – Alyson Reed	Thirty-two stories is an "inappropriate" height in an area with no comparable buildings.	The proposed 32-story height provision does not mandate tall buildings, but gives property owners the flexibility to build taller than 16 stories, should market conditions dictate. Development at this height exists or is under construction in other comparable regional centers, including the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor, Tysons Corner, Silver Spring, and Bethesda.	
34 – Tristia Bauman	Opposes additional 16-story buildings.		
37 – Brad Hess	"Thirty-two story buildings are not necessary...DC limits building heights to about 12 stories and attracts plenty of development."	There are no comparable buildings in the Transit District due to past market conditions. Market conditions that favor vertical mixed-use TOD are steadily improving at Prince George's Plaza.	
35 – Katherine Stewart	Wants tall buildings limited to 16 stories and located closer to the Metro station.	See the market analysis performed as part of this TDDP and summarized on page 72 in Table 14.	
43 – Arlene Christiansen	Opposes 32-story buildings.		
32 – Linda Verrill	Doesn't want tall buildings near the perimeter of the Transit District; restrict them to the vicinity of the Metro station.		

## Stormwater Management

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
47 – Catherine N. Donnelly	No tall buildings should be built in natural stormwater collection (drainage) areas.	<p>This study has been underway since spring 2015. The results of this study will inform next steps for SWM in the Transit District, <i>regardless of the outcome or schedule of this TDDP</i>.</p> <p>The solution is anticipated to be a regional stormwater volume control system but the details and exact location of this system and its various elements are yet to be determined. No facility type, specific location, cost, or pathway to property acquisition for the SWM solution in the Wells Run subwatershed has been identified at this time and may not be identified before the TDDP is approved.</p>	
48 – Shawn Turonis	Wants Stormwater Management (SWM) studies to be completed before any development without an approved SWM plan is cleared for permits.	<p>The proposed “Nine Pond” site is located largely on one property in the northeast corner of the Transit District. The subject property is currently zoned M-X-T and is approved for mixed-use development through CSP-00024.</p> <p>Development within the Transit District is subject to current County and state SWM requirements, including a requirement that all stormwater runoff be managed. Pursuant to Section 32-184 of the County Code, building or grading permits cannot be issued until a final SWM plan has been approved by the Department of Public Works and Transportation.</p>	
T5 – Loreta Saks	Leverage “Nine Pond” as part of a well-funded SWM system.	<p>For more information concerning CSP-00024 and previously approved development on this site, see the discussion of Building Heights (University Town Center) beginning on page 6.</p>	

## Building Heights (University Town Center)

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
21 – Town of University Park (Mayor Len Carey, Speaker)	<p>The area encompassed by Zoning Change 5 should be limited to six stories, with a two-story maximum along the Adelphi Road buffer.</p> <p>Bonus densities should not be permitted in the area of Zoning Change 5.</p>	<p>The area in question is currently identified as Subarea 2 in the 1998 <i>Prince George's Plaza Approved Transit District Development Plan</i>. The 1998 TDDP required a portion of the property then zoned O-S (Open Space) to remain "undisturbed as a tree preservation area." For the M-X-T-zoned portion of the property, buildings are required to be constructed to a minimum of 4-6 stories and a maximum of 16 stories.</p>	<p>Page 243: Revise the second standard under <b>Stepbacks and Transitions</b> to read: "All buildings and portions of buildings within 500 feet of the western boundary of the Adelphi Road right-of-way shall be a maximum of [six]four stories."</p>
35 – Katherine Stewart	Buildings fronting Adelphi Road should be no more than 3 stories to blend in with the adjacent housing.	In 2000, the Planning Board approved CSP-00024 for the subject property. This Conceptual Site Plan permits the construction of up to 1.4 million square feet of new office, 250,000 square feet of retail, and 1,900 dwelling units in Subarea 2 and Subarea 3 (the existing University Town Center). Some of that development occurred in Subarea 3 from 2000 to the present. The Planning Board required the CSP to show no development in the O-S portion of the property.	Page 246: Revise Adelphi Road buffer on Map 34 to reflect the four-story height area.
36 – Melissa Ho	Wants a transition zone between tall buildings and the western edge of University Park.	Based on available public information, the property appears to have been entirely rezoned to M-X-T at a later date. Staff is seeking to verify the date of that action.	
37 – Brad Hess	Keep Adelphi Road development consistent with current redevelopment activity...the library reconstruction is purposely limited to two stories. "It makes no sense to allow any six-story buildings here."	Given the approval of CSP-00024 and the requirements of the current TDDP, the property owner is effectively approved to proceed with the proposed development through the construction of buildings 4-16 stories in height.	
47 – Catherine N. Donnelly	"Locate high rise 16-story buildings well away from the low density residential areas, in particular avoid the east side along Adelphi Road which abuts an area of single-family homes and which features a one-to two-story library, community center, and churches which are crucial to the area."	(continued on next page)	

### Building Heights (University Town Center)

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
T5 – Loretta Saks	Reduce allowed building height and shift tall-building zone toward the center.	<p>Staff is proposing a limit of four stories on buildings within 500 feet of Adelphi Road (See Exhibit 4). This 500-foot buffer is more or less the same area that was previously zoned O-S for which the existing TDDP attempts to limit development. It is also a potential location for a regional stormwater management facility and a proposed greenway. (Strategy HDD4.6 and PR1.1)</p> <p>In addition, the subject property is the largest contiguous undeveloped parcel in the Downtown Core, abuts the existing Prince George’s Plaza Community Center, and enjoys considerable access from Adelphi and Belcrest Roads. It is an attractive location for other needed regional public facilities, including those that may trigger density bonuses. Density bonuses are prohibited for buildings within 500 feet of Adelphi Road.</p>	

## Transportation Demand Management (TDM) District/Parking District

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendation
21 – Town of University Park (Mayor Len Carey, Speaker)	Want a mandatory TDM program and parking district.	Strategy TM20.1 (page 97) recommends creation of a TDM District, and Short-Term Action Item 3, Table 19, identifies amending Section 20A of the County Code to allow a TDDP to create a TDM District as a critical legislative action.	Should Section 20A be amended to permit a TDDP to establish a TDM District, language should be added to the Foreword, Introduction (page 6), and Chapter 4 clearly stating that this TDDP formally establishes a TDM District for the Prince George's Plaza Transit District. The exact language is dependent on the legislation.
23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)	Advocates for creation of TDM and Parking District.	Section 20A, Division 2 of the County Code, was written in 1993 and ties the creation of a TDM District to intersections that fail to meet minimum level of service (LOS) requirements. The traffic analysis conducted as part of this TDDP only identifies one inadequate portion of one intersection, and anticipates that this inadequacy will be resolved through system expansions that occur as part of redevelopment. No intersections in the Transit District are projected to reach LOS F at buildout; accordingly, the existing 20A triggers for a TDM District will not occur.	
37 – Brad Hess	Advocates for a TDM District.		
42 – John Tabori	Advocates for creation of TDM and Parking District.		
43 – Arlene Christiansen	Advocates for a TDM District.	<p>Legislation to amend Section 20A will be drafted for the 2016 Legislative Year. The goal is to permit the creation of a TDM District a) in advance of, and to prevent, failing intersections; b) to provide transportation alternatives regardless of congestion; and c) to allow the County Council to establish a TDM District through approval of a Transit District Development Plan.</p> <p>In the meantime, staff will work with neighboring Transportation Management Associations, municipalities, and the County to create a TDM District.</p>	

**Transportation Demand Management (TDM) District/Parking District**

<b>Exhibit #/Name</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Recommendation</b>
<p>47 – Catherine N. Donnelly</p>	<p>A transportation demand [management] district should be created to manage other transit modes and help create a walkable environment.</p>	<p>Should this legislation not occur prior to approval of the TDDP, Strategy TM20.4 states that the City of Hyattsville or the Planning Board should petition the County Council, pursuant to the current requirements of Section 20A, to establish a TDM District.</p> <p>The Transit District Standards prohibit issuance of permits for any applicant who is not a member of the Transportation Management Association, once it is created.</p>	
<p>T5 – Loretta Saks</p>	<p>Advocates for a TDM District. Parking policy should encourage pedestrian-friendly development and preserve historic neighborhoods.</p>	<p>A Parking District was created for the Transit District in 1993 and Short-Term Action Item 10 recommends evaluation of the existing parking district for potential amendment.</p>	

## Clay Property and Hitching Post Hill

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
24 – Tom Wright	<p>Supports retention of the Clay Property in the R-80 Zone.</p> <p>Concerns about the evolution of recommendations for the Clay Property.</p>	<p>The Clay Property is a 12.87-acre undeveloped, wooded parcel located at the northern terminus of Dean Drive. The property is zoned Single-Family Detached Residential (R-80). During the initial evaluation of the boundaries of the Transit District, staff decided to explore reclassification of this property into the T-D-O Zone.</p> <p>Property owner feedback indicated that the market for multifamily housing could be met at properties closest to the Metro Station through the proposed zoning, and that properties on the periphery may need to develop single-family housing to a) meet market demand for single-family homes within walking distance of a Metro Station and b) provide a range of housing that allows families to stay in the Transit District as they grow.</p> <p>In our outreach in the early stages of the project, the property owner indicated a desire to develop the property with townhomes, and an early illustrative concept plan developed by the consultant team showed townhouses.</p> <p>The proposal to develop this property is controversial. There was a general community perception that this property was not developable or was somehow protected from development, and a consensus that it should be so protected.</p>	<p>Edit “Public Rezoning Requests” on page 150 to reflect the request of reclassification from R-80 to T-D-O/R-20.</p> <p>Should the District Council reclassify this property to the T-D-O/R-20 zone, all references, strategies, and Transit District Standards pertaining to single-family detached residential development should be deleted from the TDDP. If the District Council grants the request for T-D-O/R-20 zoning, Map 34 should be amended to show this property in the four-story height area.</p> <p>On pages 115-116, revise Table 18, the proposed park south of Hitching Post Hill Historic Resource, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Park Type: Resource Park[Neighborhood Park]</li> <li>2. Ownership: Private or M-NCPPC.</li> <li>3. Comment: [Delete last sentence].</li> </ol> <p>Add a new floating park symbol on the Clay Property to Map 19 and add the following to Table 18:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Location: Clay Property</li> <li>2. Park Type: Neighborhood Park</li> <li>3. Ownership: M-NCPPC or Private</li> <li>4. Comment: Park to provide recreational facilities for the proposed residential development. Land to be acquired through potential swap with property owner for developable land in Rosemary Terrace Park.</li> </ol>
25 – Alyson Reed	<p>Concerned about proposals to “develop currently wooded sites and pave new roads through those sites.”</p> <p>Recommends reclassifying properties “so as to protect the fragile watershed and wildlife habitats to which these wooded sites contribute.”</p>		
26 – Stuart Eisenberg/Hyattsville Community Development Corp  Speaker – Mary O’Connell	<p>Single-family housing is inappropriate for a Regional Transit District.</p>		

### Clay Property and Hitching Post Hill

<b>Exhibit #/Name</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Recommendations</b>
<p>27 – Matthew Palus</p>	<p>Concerned with the archaeological and historical impact of development of the Clay Property.</p>	<p>That the property was zoned R-80 and that single-family detached houses could be constructed on the property by right was not widely understood by the neighboring community. Nonetheless, the proposal to construct townhouses on the property is opposed by the community. Staff heard this message loud and clear in 2014.</p>	<p>On page 114, include a new floating location symbol on Map 19 in the center of the Clay Property.</p> <p>Staff recommends no action on the property owner's proposal to rezone the Clay property.</p>
<p>39 – Christopher L. Hatcher/Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan &amp; Silver LLC</p> <p>RE: Clay Property</p>	<p>Requests that the Clay property be rezoned from R-80 to R-20 to permit townhouse development up to 16.33 units/acre.</p> <p>Residential-low is an inappropriate land use designation for a Transit District.</p> <p>A 2.5-story height limit is inconsistent with the requested T-D-O/R-20 Zoning.</p>	<p>The preliminary TDDP retained the current R-80 zoning for the property in order to permit single-family detached residential development that will be compatible with adjacent residential neighborhoods and with Hitching Post Hill.</p> <p>Despite wide opposition to the development of this property, no testimony was received advocating for a classification to a specific less-intense zone. The current Zoning Ordinance contains few tools to reclassify private properties into zones that would preserve natural resources without drastically affecting the ability of property owners to recognize the economic potential of their property.</p> <p>The next less-intense residential zone, R-R (Rural Residential) would yield approximately half the dwelling units. The Clay Property is surrounded by private properties zoned R-55 (up to 6.7 dwelling units per acre) and more intense. Staff believes that a less intense zoning would be inappropriate given the size of the property, the development capacity of its current zoning classification, and its proximity to a Regional Transit District.</p>	

**Clay Property and Hitching Post Hill**

<b>Exhibit #/Name</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Recommendations</b>
T1 – Randall Fletcher	Important to preserve Hitching Post Hill.	<p>The preliminary TDDP proposed the reclassification of this property into the TDOZ with the intent that, in doing so, the access to, character and nature of the development could be regulated to promote walkability and ensure compatibility with neighboring communities and with Hitching Post Hill.</p> <p>This justification was communicated in a number of presentations to the public and stakeholders. Community feedback on these issues that was received after the release of the preliminary TDDP highlights several challenges in achieving these goals:</p> <p>1) The neighboring community strongly urged that vehicular connections to neighborhoods to the north and east not be shown in the plan (See Testimony T2).</p>	

### Clay Property and Hitching Post Hill

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
<p>T2 – Ronald Pedone/Elizabeth T. Payer/University Hills Area Civic Association</p>	<p>Endorses vision for preservation of Hitching Post Hill.</p> <p>Endorses R-80 zoning for the Clay Property.</p> <p>Recommends a buffer of at least 200 feet from Hitching Post Hill.</p> <p>Supports Strategy HNS.1 “because it mitigates the impact on Rosemary Terrace by maintaining the existing [termini] of Calverton Road and Rosemary Lane, neighborhood streets, thereby preventing cut through traffic from parts of the TDOZ... Calverton Road and Rosemary Lane should stay as they are, closed to through traffic.</p>	<p>Further staff analysis of this request finds that such a restriction is difficult to enforce through a TDDP, as vehicular connections are determined on a case-by-case basis at the time of subdivision and can be based on public safety considerations that may supersede community desires and TDDP strategies.</p> <p>2) The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR, Exhibit 41)) proposed technical changes to the preliminary TDDP regarding protection of the environmental setting for Hitching Post Hill (see below). If the proposed changes are incorporated into the final approved Prince George’s Plaza TDDP, <i>Formula 2040 Functional Master Plan for Parks, Recreation and Open Space</i> would be amended to recommend the development of two parks on or adjacent to the Clay Property. The property owner has argued that they previously met the requirements for mandatory dedication of parkland (Sec. 24-124). Discussions are ongoing between the property owner, DPR, and other stakeholders on how best to provide an adequate buffer for Hitching Post Hill.</p>	

## Clay Property and Hitching Post Hill

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
<p>T3 – James Menasian</p>	<p>Strongly opposed to opening Clay Property to motorized vehicles from the north and east.</p> <p>Keep R-80 zoning on the Clay Property.</p> <p>Supports a land swap to protect Hitching Post Hill.</p>	<p>It is clear, however, that these issues will be resolved prior to, or during, the preliminary plan of subdivision. It is unclear the extent to which such buffers can be required at Detailed Site Plan.</p> <p>Close to the time of public release, the property owner re-approached staff, the community, and the City of Hyattsville with a proposal to develop the Clay Property with townhouses and seeks a rezoning to the T-D-O/R-20 zone; their testimony also requests an increase in the height limit should this rezoning be granted.</p> <p>The property owner was advised to secure City and community support for this proposed change.</p>	
<p>Speaker – Judy Robinson</p>	<p>Keep Clay Property R-80 and keep Calverton Drive closed.</p>	<p>The City of Hyattsville declined to endorse the owner's proposal to rezone the Clay Property to R-20 (which would permit townhouse development up to 16.33 units/acre). Community members who testified either opposed all development of the property or advocated for its retention in the T-D-O/R-80 zone (which would permit single-family detached residential development up to a maximum of 4.5 units/acre).</p>	

## Clay Property and Hitching Post Hill

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
<p>Speaker – Joyce McDonald</p>	<p>Advocated for retention of the Clay Property’s current R-80 zoning and avoidance of vehicular connections to University Hills. She expressed a concern that vehicular street connections would facilitate cut-through traffic in University Hills.</p>	<p>Regardless of the outcome of this TDOZMA, all properties will be evaluated for their archaeological potential at the time of subdivision and an Architectural Survey may be required at that time.</p> <p>The height limit tables on Page 244 clearly identify a four-story height maximum for properties zoned R-20.</p> <p>Strategy HD5.2 (page 107) recommends avoiding construction that negatively impacts the Hitching Post Hill watershed. Policy HD10 and supporting strategies (page 109) recommend minimizing and mitigating potential impacts to the undeveloped land surrounding Hitching Post Hill. Recommendation PR1.1, as amended by DPR’s testimony, recommends two parks in the vicinity of Hitching Post Hill.</p>	
<p>41 – Eileen Nivera/Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation</p>	<p>Recommended several technical changes to provide a visual buffer for Hitching Post Hill (through a new Resource Park) and note the need for land and financial resources to be available in order to locate the planned Regional Multigenerational Center within the Downtown Core area.</p>	<p>Staff notes and concurs with the recommended changes.</p>	<p>Incorporate the proposed technical changes as part of staff’s overall recommended technical changes and corrections to the preliminary plan.</p>

## School Impacts

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
21 – Town of University Park (Mayor Len Carey, Speaker)	The plan makes no proposal or suggestion as to what should be done to address current and anticipated school overcrowding.	<p>Current enrollment at TDDP-area schools shows that enrollment exceeds state-rated capacity at most schools. To help mitigate this issue, Prince George’s County Public Schools opened Rosa L. Parks Elementary School in 2006 and Edward M. Felegy Elementary School (within the Transit District) in 2014.</p> <p>PGCPS testimony offers analysis that shows that current overcrowding conditions are forecast to subside by 2025. In addition, during development of the TDDP, PGCPS calculated the current-year yield of several multifamily developments in the Transit District constructed since 2007 and found minimal increases in enrollment generated by the newer housing constructed in the Transit District since 2006. The 1960s-era apartments in the Transit District generated pupil yields that were among the highest in the County. PGCPS recommends using a different approach for estimating future enrollment.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(continued on next page)</p>	<p>Add a text box to page 58 that states: <u>"The PGCPS Master Plan Support Project recommends a full renovation or replacement with an addition of approximately 219 seats at Lewisdale Elementary School and a limited renovation at University Park Elementary School, which would address facility conditions and education adequacy concerns.</u></p> <p><u>The FY2017-FY2022 CIP includes funds for construction of a new high and middle school in this area. Additionally, Hyattsville Middle School is included in this CIP for a major renovation/replacement and addition project."</u></p>

## School Impacts

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
<p>28 – Rupert McCave/Prince George’s County Public Schools Capital Programs</p>	<p>Replace the standard procedure for estimating pupil yield and use the 2024-2025 PGCPs projection that shows a lower pupil yield.</p> <p>The PGCPs Master Plan Support Project recommends a full renovation or replacement with an addition of approximately 219 seats at Lewisdale Elementary School and a limited renovation at University Park Elementary School, which would address facility conditions and education adequacy concerns.</p> <p>The FY2017-FY2022 CIP includes funds for construction of a new high and middle school in this area. Additionally, Hyattsville Middle School is included in this CIP for a major renovation/replacement and an addition project.</p>	<p>The M-NCPPC has used the same process for anticipating future pupil yield (applying proposed residential buildout numbers to the current adopted pupil yield factors and adding that yield to existing enrollment figures) for master planning processes for decades. The pupil yield factors used in the analysis in this plan are based upon the largely suburban products created in Prince George’s County to date. Data on the pupil yield of multifamily products close to transit is too limited at this time to use for a countywide pupil yield factor. Changing procedures this “late in the game” could raise more questions than answers. In addition, using figures that point to a low point in the standard cycle of enrollments could create a perception that we are arbitrarily picking a date along the continuum of a 25-year plan where we anticipate enrollment to be the lowest to evaluate demand on schools.</p> <p>Using the current countywide pupil yield factors reflects a consistent approach to school planning and allowed staff to estimate the “worst case scenario” for pupil yield: no redevelopment of the existing multifamily stock.</p> <p>In our outreach to PGCPs, they indicated a clear preference for addressing capacity demands systemwide through redrawing of attendance boundaries, rather than addressing spot overcrowding with additional time-consuming and expensive school construction.</p> <p>PGCPs testimony also notes that funding is present in the current Capital Improvement Program for capacity enhancements at Lewisdale Elementary</p>	

## School Impacts

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
	<p>Recommend as condition of approval requiring the applicant to address over-enrollment resulting from proposed development in accordance with Sec. 24-122.01, 24-122.02 and HB-1433.</p>	<p>School and construction of a new high and a new middle school in the general area of the Transit District.</p> <p>Given a) the cyclical nature of student enrollment; b) the anticipated replacement of the 1960s apartment stock with modern 1- and 2-bedroom units at market rates, and c) the reality that, by the time a new traditional public school is constructed, enrollments will have likely ebbed, staff recommended no new school sites.</p> <p>In coordination with Prince George's County Public Schools, Policy PF2 recommends the provision of a density bonus for new school construction and the adjustment of school attendance boundaries to reflect shifts in current and anticipated population growth, but does not amend the 1994 Approved <i>Master Plan for Planning Area 68</i> to add a master-planned school.</p> <p>This approach allows PGCPS and the Planning Board to work with property owners to identify creative solutions to school location and construction.</p> <p>Adding a master plan school a) may require a property owner to dedicate a significant portion of property to PGCPS in a fiscal climate where they may not have the means to construct a new school and b) may not be enforceable given the various exemptions to subdivision applicable to properties within the Transit District.</p>	
32 – Linda Verrill	<p>Didn't see any planned new school sites in the plan.</p>		
35 – Katherine Stewart	<p>The plan should include measures to accommodate additional public school students without overcrowding existing public schools.</p>		

## School Impacts

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
36 – Melissa Ho	Wants the Planning Board to consider impacts of planned development on public schools, traffic, and parking	Properties within the Transit District are exempt from the School Facilities Tests in Sec. 24-122.02. Funding for school facilities within the Transit District may be considered through alternative financing through the recommended infrastructure authority but additional impact fees should be waived.	
47 – Catherine N. Donnelly	Existing public schools are already overcrowded; sites should be identified within the Transit District for future public schools to accommodate future growth		
T5 – Loretta Saks	Plan to increase school capacity so that new residents can be absorbed.		
Speaker – Laura Mayberry	Concerned about impact on schools and that buildout analysis does not include other proposed developments.		
Speaker – Judy Robinson	Concerned about school overcrowding.		

### School Impacts

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)	Clarify that the proposed pedestrian connection to Northwestern High School should be on the south side of the campus.	Staff notes and concurs with the proposed clarification.	Incorporate the proposed change into the technical changes and corrections recommended for the preliminary TDDP.

### TDOZMA: Zoning Change 4

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
<p>45 – Thomas Haller/Law Offices of Gibbs and Haller/RE: Americana Plaza</p>	<p>Wants the R-18 zoning to be retained and maximum building height increased to six stories.</p> <p>Use table should be modified to allow townhouse units up to 16.33 units/acre as recommended in the plan.</p>	<p>Like Americana Plaza, most, if not all, of the multifamily developments currently in the R-18 zone within the proposed Transit District exceed 16.33 units per acre. The current R-18 zoning may not allow new multifamily housing to achieve the density of existing multifamily development. The R-18 zone permits multifamily mid-rise dwelling units up to 20 units per acre.</p> <p>Section 27-548.06(a)(1) states that “Development within a Transit District shall not exceed the specified maximum residential density and any floor area ratio (FAR) requirements of the underlying zones, as those requirements would normally be applied if the property were not zoned T-D-O.” [emphasis added]</p> <p>Townhouses are permitted in the R-18 zone at up to six units per acre. Six units per acre is an inappropriately low density for townhouses in a Regional Transit District.</p> <p>The zoning strategy for the preliminary TDDP was to retain garden apartment complexes in the Neighborhood Edge in the R-18 zone, unless specifically requested for change by the property owner. The property owner previously indicated a desire to redevelop to townhouses and was recommended for reclassification into the T-D-O/R-20 zone. To limit nonconformity on this property, the Preliminary TDDP indicated that multifamily housing is permitted within the T-D-O/R-20 zone while being otherwise prohibited in the R-20 zone.</p> <p>This approach may be inconsistent with Sec. 27-548.06 and will need to be changed.</p> <p>The Table of Uses for the preliminary TDDP prohibits townhouses in the R-18 zone.</p>	<p>The following staff-recommended actions are intended to help modify the R-18 Zone to permit townhouse development.</p> <p>Delete Zoning Change 4.</p> <p>On page 265, edit the third Standard under Walls, Fences, and Gates to read: “Fences enclosing all or a portion of a rear yard and garden walls are permitted only in the R-18, R-20 and R-80 zones and shall not occur forward of the rear of a primary building.”</p> <p>On page 270, edit Figure 29 to show townhomes and two-family attached as permitted in the R-18 and R-20 zones.</p> <p>On page 271, delete R-20 from Figure 30.</p> <p>On pages 278, 297, 312, and 341, delete Footnote b.</p> <p>Edit Tables 28 and 29 accordingly.</p> <p>Delete all existing instances in the Tables of Uses to Footnote b and renumber subsequent footnotes accordingly.</p> <p>Amend the T-D-O/R-18 Table of Uses to permit the following uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dwelling, quadruple-attached</li> <li>• Dwelling, three-family</li> <li>• Dwelling, two-family detached</li> <li>• Dwelling, two-family (in general)</li> <li>• Townhouse, cluster development, shown on a</li> </ul>

**TDOZMA: Zoning Change 4**

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
		<p>Staff supports the applicant's request to retain the property in the R-18 zone. Staff further supports the applicant's desire to potentially construct townhouses by amending the Table of Uses to permit townhouses.</p> <p>The owner of the R-55 property adjacent to the subject property did not request reclassification or provide testimony.</p>	<p>preliminary plat of subdivision approved prior to September 1, 1986</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Townhouse, shown on a detailed site plan approved prior to December 30, 1996, and in compliance with Section 3 of CB-55-1996</li> <li>• Townhouse, shown on a preliminary plat of subdivision approved pursuant to Part 4A</li> <li>• Townhouse, Transit Village</li> <li>• Townhouse, if located within a designated Revitalization Tax Credit District</li> <li>• Townhouse, all others</li> </ul> <p>Amend the T-D-O/R-20 Table of Uses to prohibit the following uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dwelling, multifamily, in general</li> <li>• Dwelling, multifamily, subject to applicable bedroom percentages</li> <li>• Dwelling, multifamily, in excess of applicable bedroom percentages</li> </ul>

### TDOZMA: Zoning Change 12

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
<p>38 – Christopher L. Hatcher/Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan &amp; Silver LLC/RE: Plaza Towers Property</p>	<p>Requests that the plan retain the current R-10 zoning on Land Unit 4 of the Landy Property (the Plaza Towers site) to permit future medium- to high-density multifamily residential development.</p>	<p>The TDDP was originally drafted with an anticipated R-10 Zone that permitted multifamily dwellings with ground floor and top floor uses. As the Landy Property was the only property that was zoned R-10, and the property owner indicated a desire to be reclassified to R-20, most references to the R-10 zone were eliminated from the Preliminary TDDP.</p> <p>In addition, retaining Plaza Towers and Land Unit 4 in the R-10 zone, as requested, will allow for an appropriate transition from the Downtown Core to the rear of the Neighborhood Edge. Coupled with the request to reclassify the rest of the property to a less-intense residential zone, this permits development of the Landy Property at densities less than what is already permitted through their existing approvals.</p>	<p>Edit Zoning Change 12 to reflect a proposed rezoning for a portion of the Landy Property from R-10 to R-20. Retain Land Unit 4 in the R-10 Zone and delete from Zoning Change 12.</p>

## TDOZMA: Zoning Change 12

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
<p>40 – Isabella Demongeat Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan &amp; Silver LLC RE: Landy Property</p>	<p>Supports the plan recommendation to rezone the Landy property from R-10 to R-20 to permit townhouse development up to 16.33 units/acre.</p> <p>Supports the proposed greenway/linear park, but notes that the shape of the parcel may require the greenway to be discontinuous.</p> <p>Opposes recommendation for a Community Park.</p>	<p>The position of the property owner concerning parks and other community amenities has evolved over time; staff will recommend changes to the park recommendations based on the property owner's new position.</p>	<p>Revise the Discussion of Zoning Change 12 on page 185 to state:</p> <p>“[This property is located in the Residential Edge and is currently developed with one mid-rise apartment building and one mid-rise condo building.]This TDDP envisions redevelopment of this property with single-family attached and townhouse development. Section 27-548.06(a)(1) states that development “within a Transit District shall not exceed the specified maximum residential density and any floor area ratio (FAR) requirements of the underlying zones.” Single-family attached housing is prohibited in the R-10 zone and is limited in other residential and mixed-use zones to 6-8 dwelling units per acre. This density is wholly inadequate and inappropriate for modern real estate products, especially in a Transit District. Conversely, the R-20 Zone permits single-family attached dwelling units at up to 16.33 dwelling units per acre. [The Table of Uses in this TDOZMA permits multifamily housing in the R-20 Zone to allow flexibility in the future redevelopment of properties within the Transit District zoned R-18].</p> <p>Revise the first sentence on page 198, under Uses, to read: “The Prince George’s Plaza Transit District includes properties proposed for classification in the M-X-T, M-U-I, R-10, R-18, R-20, R-80, O-S, and R-O-S Zones.”</p>

## TDOZMA: Zoning Change 12

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
<p>31 – Marlene M. Turner/The Seville, A Condominium</p>	<p>Concerned that the plan vision will require the demolition of The Seville Condominiums complex.</p>	<p>The inclusion of the Seville Condominiums in Zoning Change 12 was a mapping error. The illustrative concept of the Transit District at buildout clearly shows the Seville. The Seville is a condominium complex with several hundred individual owners. Redevelopment of this site would require several hundred real estate transactions, would be extremely costly, and take many years to complete. The Seville should remain classified R-10.</p>	<p>Amend Table 18 under Strategy PR1.1 to change the location of Recommended Park and Recreation Facility #2 to "<u>Floating</u>".</p> <p>On page 271, edit Figure 30 to replace the R-20 Zone with the R-10 Zone (see Item 40).</p> <p>Add a Table of Uses for the T-D-O/R-10 Zone.</p> <p>Edit Tables 28 and 29 accordingly.</p> <p>Amend the table containing the areas of height restrictions, and Map 34, to place properties zoned T-D-O/R-10 in the 10-story height area.</p> <p>Edit Zoning Change 12 to delete the Seville parcel (Parcel A).</p>

**TDOZMA: Other**

<b>Exhibit #/Name</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Recommendations</b>
<p>22 – William Shipp/Kiplinger Washington Editors Inc.</p>	<p>Proposed Zoning Change 9 erroneously recommends rezoning a portion of the Kiplinger property from C-S-C to M-X-T.</p> <p>The area proposed for rezoning is owned by WMATA, not Kiplinger.</p>	<p>Staff identified and corrected the mapping error on which the proposed rezoning is based and recommends deletion (See Exhibit 4). The WMATA-owned property is proposed for rezoning under proposed Zoning Change 10.</p>	<p>Delete proposed Zoning Change 9 property table and zoning change map. Update Tables 28 and 29 accordingly.</p>
<p>44 – Edward C. Gibbs, Jr. Law Offices of Gibbs and Haller/RE: Belcrest Center Retail</p>	<p>Opposes “any change which would render existing uses nonconforming,”; “impose more restrictive standards or use lists which would make it more difficult to change tenant mix, expand existing uses, or renovate existing improvements.”</p>	<p>The subject letter does not mention that the referenced retail operation is located on property owned by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and abuts the Prince George’s Plaza Metro Station.</p> <p>While Section 27-109(b) considers M-X-T to M-U-I to be a “downzoning” per se, the reality is that M-X-T contains a cap on maximum density, and M-U-I does not. This flexibility is critical on what is the prime location within the Transit District.</p> <p>A broad variety of retail uses is permitted within the T-D-O/M-U-I zone reflective of the reality that several integrated shopping centers are operating within the Transit District. All uses advertised on the Metro Shops website on November 9, 2015 are permitted in the proposed Table of Uses for the T-D-O/M-U-I zone.</p>	<p>Recommend no action.</p>

**TDOZMA: Other**

<b>Exhibit #/Name</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Recommendations</b>
49 – Bernard Weisz/Dean Manor LLC	Requests zoning change from R-18 to R-10.	<p>Dean Manor Apartments are located on a small, topographically challenged parcel on Dean Drive. The complex contains approximately 40 units on 1.77 acres. The property is currently zoned R-18 and includes an office use. The R-18 zone limits construction of multifamily units to 12 units per acre, or 20 units per acre for buildings with an elevator greater than four stories.</p> <p>Due to the stormwater management challenges presented by the topography of the site and the stormwater impacts of adjacent development, coupled with the density maximums of the R-18 zone and the parking requirements of the TDDP, staff feels that redevelopment of this site is highly challenged within the R-18 zone. It is unlikely the property owner could economically construct new units with this zoning. Any development yield would be drastically less than the current level of development.</p> <p>The vision of this TDDP is for multifamily or single-family attached development in this area of the Neighborhood Edge. Staff feels, after further analysis of Dean Manor Apartments, that such development is nearly impossible at Dean Manor given the constraints described above.</p> <p>Staff supports the proposed reclassification of this property only into the R-10 zone, which would allow development up to a maximum of 48 units per acre. Staff also supports ground floor and certain top floor uses in the R-10 zone to permit limited commercial uses in residential buildings while avoiding the extensive flexibility of mixed-use zones.</p>	<p>Add a Zoning Change within the TDOZMA to reclassify the 1.77 acre Dean Manor Apartments from the R-18 to the T-D-O/R-10 Zone. Add the first three paragraphs of the Discussion to the left as the Discussion within the Zoning Change.</p> <p><u>Tax Map and Grid: 41-F1</u>  <u>Tax Account: 1921493</u>  <u>Legal Description: PARCEL 3</u></p> <p>Amend Maps 28 and 29 accordingly.</p> <p>Add a Table of Uses for the T-D-O/R-10 Zone.</p> <p>Edit Tables 28 and 29 accordingly.</p> <p>Amend the table containing the areas of height restrictions, and Map 34, to place properties zoned T-D-O/R-10 in the 10-story height area.</p>

## Transportation and Traffic

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)	Add definition of minor urban arterial.	The recommendation for reclassification is proposed for deletion by staff (See Exhibit 4) because it has already occurred.	Delete the last sentence of Strategy TM4.1.
23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)	Is the re-striping of MD 410 a permanent road diet or an interim step?	Striping the lane re-tasking from a continuous right turn lane to a buffered bike lane allows for the analysis of the traffic and safety impacts of permanently eliminating this lane. SHA has indicated that a) they want to test the concept before committing to it with hardscape and b) permanent elimination of this lane through physical reconstruction may require undoing if a cross-county BRT system is installed in the future.	Recommend no action.
23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)	Add specific improvements to the pedestrian bridge to increase utility of the pedestrian bridge.	TM 9.4, exploring feasibility of adding head-on stairwells or escalators, is the only way the utility of the bridge can be expanded if the City simultaneously wants to not require above-grade connections.	Recommend no action.
23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)	Delete strategy and standard to require at-grade connections to the pedestrian bridge.	Staff recommends changing this requirement to a recommendation and guideline. (See Exhibit 4)	<p>Edit TM9.5 to read: “[Require]Allow above-grade connection.”</p> <p>Page 257: Revise the third bullet under Building Entrances Standards to replace “shall” with “should” and relocate it to the Guidelines.</p>
23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)	Do not envision bus rapid transit (BRT) along MD 410.	MD 410 provides an opportunity for a premium east-west transit service on a regional scale. Bicycle traffic will have multiple east-west through options at buildout, but only one ROW is sufficient to support bus priority measures.	Recommend no action.

## Transportation and Traffic

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)	Add definition of bike box for TM1.14.		Add text box with definition of bike box.
23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)	Significant road improvements should also qualify for a density bonus, such as the replacement of the pedestrian lighting network and dedicated bicycle cycle track placed on Belcrest Road.	These improvements are a required condition of approval of development.	Recommend no action.
24 – Tom Wright	Concerned that lane reductions on MD 410 could create traffic congestion with impacts on neighborhood streets.	The lanes proposed for conversion to buffered bike lanes are not through travel lanes, but continuous right-turn lanes. An extensive analysis of the traffic impact of the proposed development coupled with a reduction in lanes on MD 410 found that MD 410 would continue to function within the established Level-of-Service standard for areas of the County within the Capital Beltway (I-95/I-495).  The City of Hyattsville and the Town of University Park have instituted a number of traffic control measures to limit cut-through traffic east of the Transit District; it is assumed that these tools may be used in other neighborhoods to address cut-through traffic.	Page 80: Add Strategy TM1.18: Evaluate appropriate traffic calming measures in neighborhoods surrounding the Transit District to <u>discourage or eliminate potential cut-through traffic.</u>

## Transportation and Traffic

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
28 – Rupert McCave/Prince George’s County Public Schools Capital Programs	Recommend requiring applicants to put in sidewalks on both sides of all the streets within 1.5 miles of elementary and 2 miles of middle/high schools.	Sidewalks outside the Transit District are outside the purview of the Transit District Standards; all new construction within the Transit District is required to construct sidewalks on the property’s street frontage. The City or infrastructure authority may construct sidewalks to close gaps in the network.	Add Strategy 7.7 to read: " <u>Create, and prioritize maintenance of pedestrian connections between the Transit District and Lewisdale and University Park Elementary Schools and Northwestern High School.</u> " Add to implementation matrix.
30 – Jeffrey Berman/Berman Enterprises	Wants the LOS traffic impact requirement to be eliminated to enhance the competitive advantage of this location.	<p>The County’s current transportation impact analysis guidelines incorporate LOS criteria as an important element. Staff recognizes the need for multimodal approaches to transportation impact analysis that deemphasize vehicular LOS as their exclusive focus.</p> <p>Staff also recognizes the potential impact of additional traffic on “downstream” intersections outside the Transit District and the need to effectively meter new trips originating in the Transit District by limiting intersections to a maximum number of trips per hour by setting a cap at LOS E (1,600 trips per hour).</p>	Recommend no action.
47 – Catherine N. Donnelly	Future development should include sufficient parking to prevent spillover into adjacent residential neighborhoods.		Add Strategy 17.6 that states: " <u>Explore opportunity for residential parking permit programs in neighboring communities to discourage or prohibit spillover parking on residential streets outside the Transit District.</u> "

### Transportation and Traffic

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
<p>T4 – Gregory Johnson/State Highway Administration</p>	<p>SHA is analyzing the potential traffic and operational analysis of the proposed road diet on MD 410; this analysis is part of an effort to explore various improvements and strategies that will make the intersections on MD 410 operate at an acceptable level of service. The road diet analysis should be done by early January 2016.</p>	<p>Included for information purposes.</p>	<p>Edit Strategy TM1.8 to read: "Provide street trees to [protect pedestrians from traffic,]make streets more pedestrian-friendly[,] and reduce urban heat island effects. "</p>
<p>T4 – Gregory Johnson/State Highway Administration</p>	<p>The use of bike boxes (Strategy TM1.14) should be evaluated on a case-by- case basis.</p>	<p>Strategy TM1.14 calls on intersection designers to "consider" the use of bike boxes. Case-by-case application is implied.</p>	<p>Recommend no action.</p>

## Transportation and Traffic

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
T4 – Gregory Johnson/State Highway Administration	The use of acceleration/deceleration lanes (recommended not to be used by Strategy TM1.16) should be evaluated on a case by case basis.	The use of acceleration/deceleration lanes prioritizes the car over pedestrians. The TDDP anticipates a high level of pedestrian crossing activity.	Recommend no action.
T4 – Gregory Johnson/State Highway Administration	Discretion should be used in recommending a local street connection through the Prince George's Plaza Metro Station; such a connection could complicate circulation and safety.	These considerations should be taken into account when such a connection is designed.	Recommend no action.
T4 – Gregory Johnson/State Highway Administration	SHA will continue its ongoing coordination with the County to make the MD 410/MD 500 intersection (just outside the Transit District) more pedestrian, bicycle, and transit-friendly.	Concern about the operation of this intersection was a key point raised during the stakeholder outreach process. Staff will continue to work with County agencies, municipalities, and SHA to ensure that key intersections outside of the Transit District function at acceptable levels of service.	Recommend no action.

**Transit District Standards and Tables of Uses**

<b>Exhibit #/Name</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Recommendations</b>
23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)	Only native or native select species should be used in the Street Tree and Furnishing Zone.	Appendices 2, 3, and 4 of the Landscape Manual address this issue and should apply to the TD DP.	Edit Table 42 on page 198 to add Appendices 2, 3, and 4 and clarify that they apply to development within the Transit District.
23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)	Shade trees shall be planted with spacing of no less than 25 feet on center.	The requirement that street trees be located at least 15 feet from street lights has the same spacing effect.	Recommend no action.
23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)	Consider excluding not only those plants with thorns or sharp protrusions, but also potentially messy fruit bearing plants. Additionally, the City recommends that American National Standards Institute (ANSI) A300 guidelines be followed for all planted materials. Any plant materials not installed per ANSI standards will be subject to replacement and property installation.	Appendices 2, 3, and 4 of the Landscape Manual address this issue and should apply to the TD DP.	Edit Table 42 on page 198 to add Appendices 2, 3, and 4 and clarify that they apply to development within the Transit District.

## Transit District Standards and Tables of Uses

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
25 – Alyson Reed	Concerned about a lack of architectural design standards.	<p>Architectural design standards are largely a function of the period in which they were developed. The County contains a number of overlay zones, Mixed-Use Town Center Development Plans, and site plan approvals that contain excessive, cost-prohibitive, and outdated architectural design requirements.</p> <p>Many of these requirements have been instituted with little regard to their feasibility or cost.</p> <p>Architectural design quality is almost completely subjective and difficult to regulate given the inability to easily amend overlay zones and the ease with which property owners may seek amendment to the requirements of those zones.</p> <p>During the course of this and other concurrent projects, staff heard widespread criticism from property owners and the real estate industry about the County's various architectural design standards. The project team made a conscious decision to regulate form and function, while allowing the market to largely regulate subjective aesthetics.</p>	Recommend no action.
26 – Stuart Eisenberg/ Hyattsville Community Development Corp  Speaker – Mary O'Connell	Retain Sec. 27-602(a)(1) with amended language.		Revise Exemption E19 to read " <u>Wayfinding, destination, and community signs, or signs directing drivers, bicyclists, or pedestrians to a public/shared parking facility, installed by a public.</u>

## Transit District Standards and Tables of Uses

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
26 – Stuart Eisenberg/ Hyattsville Community Development Corp  Speaker – Mary O’Connell	Allow undefined uses.	<p>There is no process or procedure permitted within the current Zoning Ordinance to allow undefined uses. All uses not listed in the Table of Uses are prohibited.</p> <p>While such processes and procedures are under consideration as part of the comprehensive Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations Rewrite, to allow undefined uses through an overlay zone in the current regulatory environment creates a significant opportunity for unintended consequences.</p> <p>The development of this comprehensive TDDP has involved a significant amount of community and stakeholder involvement and will ultimately reflect the uses the community desires at this location.</p>	Recommend no change.

## Transit District Standards and Tables of Uses

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
29 – Christopher Mrozinski/Pennsylvania Real Estate Investment Trust (PREIT)	<p>Prefers the 25% cap for exempting additions to existing uses contained in the approved College Park- Riverdale Park TDDP but will accept a 15% or 50,000 sq. ft. (whichever is <i>greater</i>) exemption proposed for the Prince George’s Plaza TDDP.</p>	<p>The TDDP (page 200) proposes a 15 percent or 50,000 sq. ft. threshold for additions that would be subject to TDDP and site plan review requirements. Staff notes the need for an exemption threshold that will not place the existing shopping mall at a competitive disadvantage. However, the purpose of this plan is to require construction of a walkable urban environment reflective of current real estate market trends and the site’s proximity to a Metro Station.</p> <p>An exemption from the transit district standards subjects the property owner in the M-U-I Zone to the regulations of the C-S-C Zone; these regulations require or permit the property owner to construct auto-oriented, pedestrian-unfriendly products wholly inappropriate for a) the year 2015 and b) a Regional Transit District.</p>	<p>Edit Exemption E8 to read: “An attached nonresidential addition to any existing building that is part of an integrated shopping center that was lawful or could have been certified as nonconforming pursuant to Section 27-244 of the Zoning Ordinance on the date of TDDP/TDOZMA approval is exempt from the Transit District Standards and detailed site plan review if the addition (and the accumulated sum of all additions since approval of the TDDP/TDOZMA) does not increase the GFA by more than 15 percent of the total GFA of the integrated shopping center (excluding single-use pad sites) as it existed on the date of TDDP/TDOZMA approval, or 50,000 square feet, whichever is smaller].</p>
29 – Christopher Mrozinski/Pennsylvania Real Estate Investment Trust (PREIT)	<p>Wants improvements on pad sites to be exempted from TDDP and site plan review requirements.</p>	<p>Exemption E8 consciously permits the addition of gross square footage to The Mall at Prince Georges, but clearly implies the intent that a) expansions beyond this threshold comply with the Transit District Standards or that b) the property owner formalize the internal street network pursuant to Strategy TM2.1, which would allow the existing mall structure to potentially meet the build-to line requirements of the TDOZ.</p> <p>The inspiration for the standard as proposed is a similar exemption that applies to another integrated shopping center, the Beltway Plaza Mall, within the Greenbelt Metro Area and Route 193 Corridor Development District Overlay Zone.</p> <p>Standalone single use development is permitted within the M-U-I property, pursuant to the Transit District Standards.</p>	<p>No change recommended.</p>

### Transit District Standards and Tables of Uses

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
		<p>Exempting pad site improvements from TDDP and site plan review requirements would promote continuing auto-oriented, suburban-style (re)development even as walkable urban places become the amenity of choice for the Washington metropolitan region's changing real estate market, <i>including</i> Prince George's County. While they are not anchored by a shopping mall, the continuing commercial success of mixed-use development at National Harbor and in central Hyattsville attest to the growing demand for walkable urban places in Prince George's County.</p> <p>Retail businesses, including most national chains, have built walkable urban, pedestrian-oriented outlets in neighboring jurisdictions, even as they claim that such products are "not feasible" in Prince George's County. Requiring such building types and orientations in Prince George's County does not place properties at a competitive disadvantage to transit-adjacent locations in other jurisdictions that require the same type of building size, bulk, lot placement, and orientation.</p>	No change recommended.
<p>29 – Christopher Mrozinski/Pennsylvania Real Estate Investment Trust (PREIT)</p>	<p>Wants to eliminate the requirement for a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision simply to create one or more lots.</p>	<p>The TDDP cannot address issues related to Subtitle 24. Also, the County is currently re-writing the Subdivision Regulations; such comments are appropriate for that forum.</p>	No change recommended.
<p>29 – Christopher Mrozinski/Pennsylvania Real Estate Investment Trust (PREIT)</p>	<p>Wants the plan to recognize the right of property owners to provide dedicated/exclusive parking for selected tenants.</p>	<p>Dedicated or exclusive parking is highly discouraged within the Transit District, but will invariably be desired by certain tenants or residential property managers.</p>	No change recommended.

## Transit District Standards and Tables of Uses

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
29 – Christopher Mrozinski/Pennsylvania Real Estate Investment Trust (PREIT)	Wants all mandatory standards eliminated or retained only as guidelines.	Accordingly, the TDDP is silent on this. The right to provide dedicated/exclusive parking for selected tenants is not infringed upon by the TDDP, but adding specific language to the TDDP acknowledging this could be misinterpreted as an endorsement of the practice. The elimination of mandatory development standards in the plan would increase the likelihood of development that fails to support the plan vision for the Transit District.	No change recommended.
29 – Christopher Mrozinski/Pennsylvania Real Estate Investment Trust (PREIT)	Wants the prohibition on new drive-through restaurants to be lifted.	Drive-through aisles create environments that are less attractive and less safe for pedestrians and bicyclists. They are designed to serve cars, not people. They are inherently incompatible with transit-oriented, walkable communities (especially sidewalks).  The City of Hyattsville, the Planning Board, and the District Council are on record (as recently as the District Council decision on DSP-99044-07 in October 2014) as opposing new drive-throughs within the Transit District for the same reasons.	No change recommended.
30 – Jeffrey Berman/Berman Enterprises	Wants the plan to recognize the right of property owners to provide dedicated/exclusive parking for selected tenants.	See Discussion of these items in Item 29 above.	See Discussion of these items in Item 29 above.
30 – Jeffrey Berman/Berman Enterprises	Wants all mandatory standards eliminated or retained only as guidelines.	See Discussion of these items in Item 29 above.	See Discussion of these items in Item 29 above.

### Transit District Standards and Tables of Uses

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
40 – Isabella Demongeate Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan & Silver LLC RE: Landy Property	Supports elimination of Conceptual Site Plan requirements and increased ability for Planning Director approvals.	No comment.	Recommend no action.
40 – Isabella Demongeate Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan & Silver LLC RE: Landy Property	Frontage zones should be outside the public rights-of-way.	The frontage zones begin at the street curb. Unfortunately, few or none of the public rights-of-way in the Transit District end at the street curb. In a perfect world, the public rights-of-way would either end at the street curb or at the end of the frontage zones. This is not possible within this Transit District.	Recommend no action.
40 – Isabella Demongeate Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan & Silver LLC RE: Landy Property	On-street parking on all new private A and B Streets should not be considered “off-street parking” for application of the Parking (General) and Transportation Adequacy standards and guidelines.	Agreed.	On page 258, add a Standard to state: <u>“On-street parking spaces on private streets shall not count toward off-street parking requirements.”</u>

## Transit District Standards and Tables of Uses

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
<p>40 – Isabella Demongeant Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan &amp; Silver LLC RE: Landy Property</p>	<p>In the Neighborhood Edge, a crosswalk width of 8 feet is a more appropriate width.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Delete the first guideline on page 212.</p> <p>Add a guideline under Downtown Core General on page 266: <u>“On private streets in the Downtown Core, all pedestrian crosswalks should be a minimum of 12 feet wide.”</u></p> <p>Add a guideline under Neighborhood Edge General on page 270: <u>“On private streets in the Neighborhood Edge, all pedestrian crosswalks should be a minimum of 8 feet wide.”</u></p>
<p>40 – Isabella Demongeant Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan &amp; Silver LLC RE: Landy Property</p>	<p>The guideline that recommends crosswalks on private streets be “enhanced with some form of special decorative paving or artistic painting that clearly defines the area as a pedestrian crossing” could invite liability should a driver not recognize the marking as a crosswalk.</p>	<p>In its proposed technical changes, staff recommended deleting a similar guideline because it was repetitive. This testimony suggests that the guideline staff recommended for deletion is actually the more appropriate one to retain.</p> <p>Upon further evaluation, staff found the guideline cited in this testimony in conflict with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.</p>	<p>Delete the second guideline on page 212 and amend the third guideline to read: “Decorative paving [or artistic painting] that clearly defines an intersection of private streets is encouraged.”</p>
<p>40 – Isabella Demongeant Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan &amp; Silver LLC RE: Landy Property</p>	<p>A 10- or 15-foot minimum curb radius may be too tight for vehicles to navigate.</p>	<p>The National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) urban street design manual identifies “standard” curb radii as 10-15 feet, and advocates for smaller curb radii.</p>	<p>No change recommended.</p>

## Transit District Standards and Tables of Uses

<b>Exhibit #/Name</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Recommendations</b>
<p>40 – Isabella Demongeat Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan &amp; Silver LLC RE: Landy Property</p>	<p>Suggests adding delineations for the location of the existing and proposed rights-of-way line; the design standards will require dedication of additional rights-of-way.</p>	<p>Staff concurs with the need for greater illustration.  The TDDP does not add additional horizontal rights-of-way to what is currently recommended in the 2009 <i>Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation</i>. Further dedication of rights-of-way will be on a case-by-case basis, to allow property owners, the City of Hyattsville, and/or Prince George’s County to negotiate maintenance agreements, if so desired, outside the existing rights-of-way.</p>	<p>Existing and master planned rights-of-way and build-to-lines will be shown on graphics in the Approved TDDP. See Exhibit 4</p>
<p>40 – Isabella Demongeat Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan &amp; Silver LLC RE: Landy Property</p>	<p>Identifies inconsistencies in the illustrations of dimensional Transit District Standards.</p>	<p>Staff identified these inconsistencies and recommends clarifications in its technical corrections memo.</p>	<p>See Exhibit 4.</p>
<p>40 – Isabella Demongeat Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan &amp; Silver LLC RE: Landy Property</p>	<p>Consider allowing front-loaded townhouse garages on B Streets.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Amend the standard for maximum Residential Frontage Zone depth on pages 229 and 231 to read: “Except where necessary to accommodate a public utility easement or residential driveway, no Residential Zone shall exceed 10 feet in width. Residential Zones may only be expanded beyond 10 feet to the extent necessary to accommodate a public utility easement or residential driveway.  Edit the third standard under <b>Neighborhood Edge General</b> on page</p>

## Transit District Standards and Tables of Uses

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
40 – Isabella Demongeat Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan & Silver LLC RE: Landy Property	A minimum sidewalk clear zone in an Alley is appropriate for the Downtown Core but not for the Neighborhood Edge.		270 to read: “Residential driveways are permitted in alleys and B Streets and shall not exceed 18 feet in length. <u>Front-loaded garages are permitted only for dwelling units 22 feet wide or greater.</u> ”
40 – Isabella Demongeat Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan & Silver LLC RE: Landy Property	The illustration contains a distance between build-to- lines without specifying whether or not this is a minimum distance.	Staff previously identified this issue and recommends clarifications in its technical corrections memo.	Edit the first standard on page 232 to read: “Alleys in the Downtown Core shall have a Sidewalk Clear Zone: the sidewalk clear zone shall be a minimum of four feet wide and a maximum of eight feet wide.”
40 – Isabella Demongeat Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan & Silver LLC RE: Landy Property			Eliminate references to minimum distances between build-to-lines within the Transit District Standards and associated graphics. See Exhibit 4.

## Transit District Standards and Tables of Uses

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
<p>40 – Isabella Demongeat Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan &amp; Silver LLC                      RE: Landy Property</p>	<p>Requirement of minimum 1.5 major shade trees and one ornamental tree per dwelling unit located on individual lots and/or common space is appropriate at a suburban scale (6-8 units per acre) but not for the density of R-20 (16.33 units per acre), especially given the small lots sizes and yards envisioned.</p>		<p>Edit the first standard under “Townhouses, One-Family Semidetached, Two-Family, and Three-Family Dwellings Arranged Horizontally” on page 272 to read: “Plant a minimum of one and one-half major shade trees and one ornamental or evergreen tree per every two dwelling units located on individual lots and/or common open space. <u>Trees planted in the Street Tree and Furnishing Zone shall count towards this requirement.</u>”</p>
<p>40 – Isabella Demongeat Rifkin, Weiner, Livingston Levitan &amp; Silver LLC                      RE: Landy Property</p>	<p>Clarify that the distance between build-to-lines, as amended by staff’s proposed technical changes (See Exhibit 4), can vary by ten feet in the Downtown Core and twenty feet in the Neighborhood Edge.</p>	<p>Staff also recommended deleting references to minimum distances between build-to-lines within the Standards and associated graphics, to account for such variations.</p>	<p>Recommend no action.</p>

## General Issues

General Issues		Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
<p><b>Exhibit #/Name</b> 23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)</p>	<p><b>Issue</b> City of Hyattsville is currently a "Healthy Eating, Active Living" City.</p>	<p><b>Staff Response</b></p>	<p>Add the following language in a text box on page 55: <u>"On October 6, 2014, the City of Hyattsville passed a resolution to be designated as a HEAL (Healthy Eating Active Living) City. Since that time Hyattsville has been recognized at the gold level in the HEAL Leaders Club for implementation of four new policies. Those policies include nutrition education and transportation to the "Farmers Market", guidelines for hosting "Healthy Meetings And Events", the "Any Time Fitness Challenge" for city employees, and redevelopment and low impact design considerations for "Green Streets Initiatives".</u></p> <p><u>By encouraging active communities, improving access to nutritious food and promoting a healthy municipal workplace, Hyattsville contributes to the physical well-being of its citizens, while also aiming to improve overall quality of life and promote business investment in the city."</u></p>
<p>23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)</p>	<p>If the purpose of the Security Task Force is to create a "Safe and Clean" model, clarify language in the document.</p>	<p>While the purpose is to meet many of the goals of Safe and Clean initiatives (see <a href="http://www.cityofventura.net/page/safe-and-clean-initiative">http://www.cityofventura.net/page/safe-and-clean-initiative</a>) as an example, these initiatives are often operational in nature, and should be evaluated for fiscal impact, practicality, and community acceptance. It is certainly the goal of the TDDP to promote public safety and a clean, attractive, welcoming environment.</p>	<p>Amend PF5.1 and the corresponding implementation action item to read: " ..to coordinate foot, vehicular, bicycle, and equestrian patrols; plan, prepare, and train for coordinated joint response to high-impact events; share intelligence and data; <u>engage the public and property owners in an ongoing dialogue on</u></p>

### General Issues

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)	Change "home maintenance" in EP4.1 and corresponding implementation item on page 130 to "property maintenance".		Make change as recommended.
23 – City of Hyattsville (James Chandler, Speaker)	Do not feel that the Mosaic residential property vista should be specifically preserved.	The Mosaic residential property provides one of the few existing terminating vistas in the Transit District. The geometry of its location on a curve along Belcrest Road limits the ability of any future development to obstruct it.	Recommend no action.
25 – Alyson Reed	Concerned about proposals to “develop currently wooded sites and pave new roads through those sites.” Recommends reclassifying properties “so as to protect the fragile watershed and wildlife habitats to which these wooded sites contribute.”	The current Zoning Ordinance contains few tools to reclassify private properties into zones that would preserve natural resources without drastically affecting the ability of property owners to recognize the economic potential of their property.	Recommend no action.
25 – Alyson Reed	Concerned about safety and a perceived lack of property maintenance.	Short-Term Action Item #5 (pages 126-127) recommends the creation of a permanent management entity, such as a Business or Special Improvement District, to, among other things, maintain the physical appearance of the Transit District.	Recommend no action.

## General Issues

Exhibit #/Name	Issue	Staff Response	Staff Recommendations
30 – Jeffrey Berman/Berman Enterprises	Supports most of the action items recommended for implementation but recommends further prioritization of specific actions.	<p>Strategy EP2.3 (page 75) recommends a collaborative effort to improve the “accessibility, appearance, and safety” of the Mall at Prince Georges.</p> <p>Strategy PF5.1 (page 113) and the corresponding implementation item recommend the formation of a Prince George’s Plaza Security Task Force to address security issues.</p>	
31 – Marlene M. Turner/The Seville, A Condominium	Appreciated plan recommendations for tax relief for older homeowners.		
41 – Eileen Nivera/Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation			<p>Add the following comment to Item 10 in Table 18, the recommended Regional Multigenerational Center: "<u>A move to the Downtown Core will be dependent on available land and financial resources.</u>"</p>

**General Issues**

<b>Exhibit #/Name</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Recommendations</b>
42 – John Tabori	<p>Construction of a stormwater management system should not be subject to a density bonus.</p> <p>The proposed density bonus program could lead to bartering between agencies and developers in private, with no clear avenue for public participation. This could raise public suspicions of the process and outcomes and eliminate market price signaling.</p> <p>Density bonuses for land and construction do not provide any clear income stream for maintenance or operations.</p>	<p>Major infrastructure projects, such as the proposed regional stormwater management facility, are critical to the redevelopment of the Transit District. Prince George’s County has few resources to construct these expensive projects through its General Fund, and few incentives in place at this time to offer property owners for joint or private finance or construction; the density bonus is one tool available that allows property owners to potentially recoup some of their investment in the County’s infrastructure.</p> <p>The size of the infrastructure amenities eligible for the major density bonuses require the approval of land transfers, construction partnerships, or lease conditions by public boards such as the Commission, WMATA, or the Board of Education. The provision of the density bonus is subject to public deliberation and approval by the Planning Board. Additional public hearing requirements for implementing agencies would need to be instituted legislatively or through those agencies administrative processes, not through the TDDP.</p> <p>While market price signaling is a concern, the basic situation is that the Transit District requires several major infrastructure projects potentially costing tens of millions of dollars.</p> <p>Allowing additional development, which will help achieve Plan 2035 goals of concentrating development in Regional Transit Districts, beyond the artificial caps proposed through a height limit on a zone (M-U-I) that otherwise would have no density limit, is one of the few tools the County has to pay for needed infrastructure.</p>	<p>Recommend no action.</p>

**General Issues**

<b>Exhibit #/Name</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Staff Recommendations</b>
		<p>No construction funding source for a capital project contains a clear income stream for maintenance or operations. The option here is to pay a reduced cost for an infrastructure project, or pay the entire cost; the construction and maintenance costs will be similar no matter who pays for its initial construction.</p>	

