

**COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND
SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL
2010 Legislative Session**

Resolution No. CR-50-2010
Proposed by The Chairman (by request – Planning Board)
Introduced by Council Members Harrison and Olson
Co-Sponsors _____
Date of Introduction June 1, 2010

RESOLUTION

1 A RESOLUTION concerning

2 The Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Proposed Sectional Map Amendment

3 For the purpose of approving with amendments, as an Act of the County Council of Prince
4 George’s County, Maryland, sitting as the District Council, the Central US 1 Corridor Sector
5 Plan and Sectional Map Amendment (SMA), thereby defining long-range land use and
6 development policies, and setting forth and adopting detailed zoning proposals in Planning Area
7 66 for the area generally comprised of the properties bounded by the city boundaries of College
8 Park to the north, the southern limit of mixed-use properties south of Guilford Road to the south,
9 and commercial, mixed-use, vacant and related properties fronting or oriented to US 1 to the east
10 and west, including established residential areas along Guilford Drive, Knox Road, and Cherry
11 Hill Road, and commercial and residential properties located in the Hollywood community at the
12 intersection of Rhode Island Avenue and Edgewood Road and all properties inclusive of 47th
13 Place West between Lackawanna Street and 48th Place

14 WHEREAS, upon approval by the District Council, this Sector Plan will amend portions of
15 the 1989 *Approved Master Plan for Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt and Vicinity*, and
16 1990 *Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 65, 66 and 67*, 2001 *Approved*
17 *Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Greenbelt Metro Area*, 2002 *Approved*
18 *College Park US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Portion of Planning
19 Area 66), the 2002 *Prince George’s County Approved General Plan*, the 1983 *Functional*
20 *Master Plan for Public School Sites*, the 1992 *Prince George’s County Historic Sites and*
21

1 *Districts Plan*, the 2005 *Countywide Green Infrastructure Functional Master Plan*, the 2008
2 *Approved Public Safety Facilities Master Plan*, and the 2009 *Master Plan of Transportation*; and

3 WHEREAS, the District Council adopted CR-96-2008 on October 28, 2008, initiating an
4 amendment to the 1989/1990 *Approved Master Plan for Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt*
5 *and Vicinity and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 65, 66 and 67*, 2001
6 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Greenbelt Metro Area*, and 2002
7 *Approved College Park US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Portion of
8 Planning Area 66) in order to develop a comprehensive approach to implement the
9 recommendations of the 2002 *General Plan*, and to ensure that future development is consistent
10 with County policies; and

11 WHEREAS, on October 28, 2008, the District Council endorsed the Goals, Concepts,
12 Guidelines and Public Participation Program as approved by the Planning Board, and established
13 the Plan boundaries for portions of Planning Area 66 pursuant to Sections 27-641 and 27-643 of
14 the Zoning Ordinance; and

15 WHEREAS, the Planning Board staff, as part of the plan's Public Participation Program,
16 held more than 30 meetings with community and agency stakeholders including civic association
17 discussions, a stakeholder information meeting, a 6-day community design charrette, a
18 community post-charrette, municipal briefings with the mayors and councils of College Park and
19 University Park, meetings with transportation agencies, the University of Maryland, and
20 environmental stakeholders, and a community briefing on the contents and organization of the
21 preliminary sector plan and proposed sectional map amendment; and

22 WHEREAS, the Planning Board granted permission to print the Preliminary Central US 1
23 Corridor and Proposed Sectional Map Amendment on June 18, 2009; and

24 WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 27-645(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the County Executive
25 and the District Council reviewed the public facilities element of the preliminary plan and
26 endorsed the inclusion of the proposed public facilities in the preliminary plan; and

27 WHEREAS, the District Council and the Planning Board held a duly-advertised joint public
28 hearing on the Preliminary Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Proposed Sectional Map
29 Amendment on September 15, 2009; and

30 WHEREAS, the Planning Board held two worksession to consider the public hearing
31 testimony on November 19, 2009 and December 3, 2009; and

1 WHEREAS, on December 10, 2009, the Planning Board, in response to the public hearing
2 testimony, adopted the sector plan and endorsed the sectional map amendment with revisions, as
3 described in Prince George’s County Planning Board Resolution PGCPB No. 09-170, and
4 transmitted the plan and sectional map amendment to the District Council on January 4, 2010;
5 and

6 WHEREAS, on February 16, 2010, the District Council held a worksession, to review the
7 Planning Board’s recommendations on the public hearing testimony; and

8 WHEREAS, on March 2, 2010, the District Council decided to propose amendments to the
9 adopted Sector Plan and endorsed Sectional Map Amendment and to hold a second joint public
10 hearing to allow public comment; and

11 WHEREAS, on April 6, 2010, the District Council and the Planning Board held a duly
12 advertised joint public hearing on the proposed amendments contained in CR-18-2010, and
13 received comments on the proposed amendments and other elements of the adopted sector plan
14 and endorsed sectional map amendment; and

15 WHEREAS, on April 29, 2010, the Planning Board reviewed the digest of testimony from
16 the April 6, 2010 public hearing and transmitted written comments on the proposed amendments
17 to the District Council on May 5, 2010 in accordance with Section 27-646(a)(3) of the Zoning
18 Ordinance; and

19 WHEREAS, on May 11, 2010, the District Council reviewed the digest of testimony from
20 the April 6, 2010 public hearing and directed Technical Staff to prepare a resolution of approval
21 incorporating amendments.

22 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the County Council of Prince George’s
23 County, Maryland, sitting as the District Council for that part of the Maryland-Washington
24 Regional District in Prince George’s County, Maryland, that the Central US 1 Corridor Sector
25 Plan and Sectional Map Amendment as adopted and endorsed on December 10, 2009, by
26 PGCPB No. 09-170, are hereby approved, with the following amendments and revisions:

27
28 **AMENDMENT ONE:** Delete all references and text in the adopted sector plan (consisting of
29 the preliminary plan document and PGCPB 09-170) dealing with “future walkable nodes” and
30 “proposed walkable nodes.” Revise the captions for images on pages 68 and 69 to appropriately

1 describe the images without referencing these terms. Delete text referencing designation of
2 future corridor nodes on page 50 accordingly.

3
4 **AMENDMENT TWO:** Revise street cross-section drawings included in the adopted sector
5 plan and development district standards as necessary to clearly indicate the preferred cross-
6 section dimensions for US 1 based on continued stakeholder coordination with the State
7 Highway Administration, Department of Public Works and Transportation, and City of College
8 Park.

9
10 **AMENDMENT THREE:** Ensure the preferred ultimate/long-term cross-section dimensions for
11 US 1 contain bicycle side-paths/buffered bicycle lanes along the majority of US 1. These
12 dedicated bicycle facilities shall be designed to maximize convenience and safety to encourage
13 use of the bicycle as a true alternate to the automobile. The continuation of side-path/buffered
14 bicycle lane materials across curb cuts whenever possible should be encouraged.

15
16 **AMENDMENT FOUR:** Retain Capital Beltway as the boundary line between the Developed
17 Tier and the Developing Tier. Delete all references and revise all maps that indicate a revision to
18 the General Plan tier boundaries in this area.

19
20 **AMENDMENT FIVE:** Add the following text to page 50: “Corridor nodes located north of MD
21 193 shall not be considered for future application of Subtitle 27A of the County Code.”

22
23 **AMENDMENT SIX:** Add a new policy and strategies to the Corridor Infill Policies section on
24 pages 72-73 as follows, and revise the Development District Standards as appropriate to
25 implement the strategies:

26 “Policy 4

27 Establish appropriate residential densities within the corridor infill areas to ensure
28 preservation of existing single-family neighborhoods.

29 Strategies

30 1. Limit residential density by reducing the maximum number of dwelling units per acre
31 permitted in the M-U-I Zone.

1 2. Require acquisition of at least one and a half acres of property under single ownership to
2 permit rezoning to the M-U-I Zone through the Detailed Site Plan process detailed under
3 Section 27-548.26 of the Zoning Ordinance.”
4

5 **AMENDMENT SEVEN:** Revise the land use and urban design discussions on Seven Springs
6 Village on pages 96-97 to place emphasis on minimizing impacts on the floodplain, preserving
7 open space, directing density and height to the center of the property with smaller-scale buildings
8 along the northern and southern boundaries, providing a trail dedication along the northern
9 portion of the property, and maximizing attention to innovative stormwater management
10 techniques to preserve and enhance the Paint Branch stream valley. Revise the land use and
11 urban design discussions on the Autoville community on page 96 to address the desire to
12 encourage senior housing, townhome, and professional office development; to preclude big-box
13 retail stores, fast food restaurants, convenience stores, and gas stations; to preclude any future
14 connection to the end of Kiernan Road; to preclude future vehicular connections between
15 Autoville Drive North and Autoville Drive South or US 1 and encourage roundabouts along
16 Autoville Drive North; and to discourage through traffic from Cherry Hill Road. See Attachment
17 One.
18

19 **AMENDMENT EIGHT:** Replace the detailed illustrative concept drawings and the “general
20 recommendations” text box featured on page 97 with a detailed illustrative concept drawing that
21 reflects the testimony from the public hearings. See Attachment One.
22

23 **AMENDMENT NINE:** Revise the Uptown land use and urban design discussions on page 98 to
24 discourage big-box retail stores, emphasize the desire and potential for high-intensity office uses,
25 and clearly indicate the desired pattern of development, while allowing for tall office buildings
26 as the market evolves, should be compatible with the smaller-scale, mixed retail and office uses
27 north of the Ikea entrance drive on the Camden/Roadside property. See Attachment One.
28

29 **AMENDMENT TEN:** Indicate in the sector plan text that while the need for land reservation
30 for a trail on the northern side of Cherry Hill Road exists, the preferred alignment of the
31 continuation of the Paint Branch Stream Valley Park Trail is along the southern side of Cherry

1 Hill Road, through the northern edge of the Seven Springs property, and across the Capital
 2 Beltway on the western side of Cherry Hill Road into the Subregion I Master Plan area. See
 3 Attachment One. Revise the trails maps to reflect the revised alignment of the trail.
 4

5 **AMENDMENT ELEVEN:** Add the following text on page 157 after Table 11:

6 **“Pupil Yield**

7 Table 12 shows the current pupil yield rates for each dwelling unit type. The pupil yield is the
 8 estimated number of elementary, middle, and high school students per dwelling unit. The current
 9 pupil yield rates are based on 2008 enrollment numbers. It is important to note that the current
 10 pupil yield rates are for single-family detached dwelling units, single-family attached, multi-
 11 family garden-style, as well as multi-family dwelling units with structured parking. The Planning
 12 Department observed a decrease in household size as a result of the 2000 census figures, which
 13 could affect the pupil yield. The current elementary pupil yield for each dwelling unit type is
 14 significantly lower than the previously used elementary rate developed in 2001. Prior to the
 15 update, the pupil yield rates for all housing types were 0.24, 0.06, and 0.12 for elementary,
 16 middle and high schools respectively. See Appendix Five for more information on the pupil yield
 17 methodology used in this sector plan.”

18
 19 Add the following text as new Appendix Five after page 424:
 20

21 **“Pupil Yield Methodology**

22 **Development of Pupil Yield for Single-Family Dwelling Units**

23 The Planning Department used a listing of all single-family dwelling units in Prince George’s
 24 County as of October 24, 2006. From this listing, the department determined the total number of
 25 addresses needed to represent a five percent sample of attached and detached single-family
 26 dwelling units in each Subregion of the county. The Maryland State Tax Assessors File was
 27 queried and ten percent of the properties classified as single-family detached or townhouses in
 28 Prince George’s County were returned. The department then sorted the addresses by Subregion
 29 and dwelling unit type. To achieve the five percent sample size, the department selected one
 30 dwelling unit for each street represented in the ten percent sample, then manually selected
 31 random dwelling units using a number of techniques. The techniques used included sorting the

1 entire table by street number and selecting, the first, third, fifth, etc., line, and selecting random
2 lines until a five percent sample was achieved. This sample was submitted to Prince George's
3 County Public Schools (PGCPS) in order to determine the pupil yield for each dwelling unit
4 type.

5
6 *Development of Pupil Yield for Multifamily Dwelling Units*

7 The Planning Department used a listing of every multifamily housing unit in the county as of
8 November 8, 2006. From this the total number of addresses needed to represent a five percent
9 sample in each Subregion was determined. Because this file drew from a number of sources,
10 including the county permits database, city permits databases, the Department of Housing and
11 Urban Development, and the Maryland Department of Assessments and Taxation, and was
12 crosschecked against Census and postal data, it is considered to be the best source of information
13 about multifamily dwelling units in the county. The multifamily sample was then provided to
14 PGCPS and they submitted their results.

15
16 *Development of Pupil Yield for Multifamily Dwelling Units in Centers and Corridors*

17 The 2002 General Plan directs intensified growth around designated centers and corridors.
18 Residential development around activity nodes in centers and corridors are to include significant
19 numbers of mid- to high-rise buildings. In the past, the Planning Department has integrated such
20 structures with a general pupil yield factor that encompasses all apartments. However, in
21 recognition of the diversity of housing types in these communities, as well as to attract
22 development to these nodes, it is important to look at them separately from the garden
23 apartments that are more prevalent in the county's multifamily housing stock.

24
25 Montgomery, Arlington, and Fairfax Counties all have considerably more transit-oriented or
26 transit-adjacent residential development than does Prince George's County. High-rise
27 multifamily housing stock in the county tends to be located away from transit services and
28 outside designated centers and corridors. The department contacted each of these counties to
29 determine their pupil yield factors for mid- and high-rise development surrounding transit
30 stations. The range for each county's pupil yield was approximately the same. After consulting
31 with Montgomery County and comparing their multifamily housing stock and planning efforts

1 around centers and corridors to that of Prince George’s County, the department decided to go
 2 with Montgomery County’s pupil yield factors until such point in the future where Prince
 3 George’s County has enough mid- to high-rise housing stock in centers and corridors to conduct
 4 a full survey.”

5
 6 **AMENDMENT TWELVE:** Revise policy 2 on page 159 to read: “Preserve, retain, and support
 7 existing public school facilities, existing and former school sites, and properties owned by the
 8 Board of Education.” Add a new strategy to policy 2 on page 159 to read: “Consider reuse of the
 9 Calvert Road School as a public choice school.”

10
 11 **AMENDMENT THIRTEEN:** Revise references to the acquisition of property for a playground
 12 to serve the College Park Youth and Family Service Building from the sector plan and Appendix
 13 One to indicate that this would be an interim use, and add text to recommend the construction of
 14 a community center in the Hollywood Commercial District over the short-term (0-10 years) to
 15 the Development Pattern, Parks and Recreation, and Implementation elements and to Appendix
 16 One. See Attachment Two.

17
 18 **AMENDMENT FOURTEEN:** Add a new Corridorwide phasing recommendation in the short-
 19 term on page 210 as follows: “Establish a tax increment financing (TIF) strategy for the corridor
 20 to support the construction of public improvements. Evaluate additional implementation
 21 techniques simultaneously with the discussion of TIF districts to fully explore all implementation
 22 options available for the Central US 1 Corridor.”

23
 24 **AMENDMENT FIFTEEN:** Add a new Corridorwide phasing recommendation in the short-
 25 term on page 210 as follows: “Establish a corridor-wide Transportation Demand Management
 26 (TDM) District and a self-sustaining Transportation Management Association (TMA) to manage
 27 it. In addition to the overall goals of TDM districts to manage traffic, the corridor-wide TDM
 28 district may include specific elements such as a coordinated transit system for the Central US 1
 29 Corridor, a trolley line from the south to the Uptown Walkable Node/Beltsville Agricultural
 30 Research Center, shuttle service to and from the College Park/University of Maryland and
 31 Greenbelt Metro stations and nearby proposed Purple Line stations, bike-sharing programs, and

1 shuttle service to and from designated parking structures to serve University of Maryland
 2 commuter and special event traffic.” Add similar language on the establishment of a TDM and
 3 TMA to Table 15 on pages 205-206, with the following potential parties identified: Prince
 4 George’s County government, Revenue Authority, SHA, DPW&T, City of College Park,
 5 University of Maryland, WMATA, Maryland Department of Transportation, and developers.
 6

7 **AMENDMENT SIXTEEN:** Replace the second sentence in the 6th paragraph on page 225 with
 8 the following wording: “All new development and redevelopment of existing structures within
 9 the DDOZ shall comply with the Development District Standards and the general intent and
 10 goals of the Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan.”
 11

12 **AMENDMENT SEVENTEEN:** Delete the third bullet on page 242 and replace the fourth
 13 bullet with the following language: “Within a public parking district established by a public
 14 entity, required parking may be waived if a fee-in-lieu is paid on a per space basis to the public
 15 entity that manages the parking district, at a rate to be determined by the public entity and based
 16 on a preliminary engineering cost estimate for the parking facility, provided that public parking
 17 is available within one quarter mile of the development.”
 18

19 **AMENDMENT EIGHTEEN:** Revise the parking requirements on page 242 as follows:

- 20 • Revise bullet one to read: “The number of parking spaces permitted in the Central US 1
 21 Corridor sector plan area is specified in this section for residential, lodging, office, and
 22 retail (including eating or drinking establishments) uses. Any deviation from this
 23 standard shall require a modification.”
- 24 • Revise bullet two to read: “The number of parking spaces permitted for uses not listed
 25 here shall be reduced fifty percent from the number of required off-street parking
 26 spaces in accordance with Section 27-568(a) of the Zoning Ordinance. Any deviation
 27 from this standard shall require a modification.”
- 28 • Add the phrase “(INCLUDING EATING OR DRINKING ESTABLISHMENTS)”
 29 after “RETAIL” on both the second and third tables on the right-hand column.
 30

1 **AMENDMENT NINETEEN:** Revise bullet one under Drive-Throughs on page 246 to read:
 2 “Drive throughs shall not be permitted in the walkable nodes, [or] existing residential areas,
 3 south of Delaware Street, or along Cherry Hill Road and Autoville Drive. However, due to the
 4 difficulties relating to the development of Parcels 1 and 19 on Block B of Cherry Hill Road, a
 5 bank with a drive-through may be permitted in this location.”

6
 7 **AMENDMENT TWENTY:** Add a new section to the building form development district
 8 standards on page 246, and re-title the page header, to address bedroom percentages as follows:

9 “Bedroom Percentages

10 Bedroom percentages for multifamily dwellings as specified in Section 27-419 of the
 11 Zoning Ordinance shall not apply within the Central US 1 Corridor development district.”

12
 13 **AMENDMENT TWENTY ONE:** Retain the properties endorsed as SMA Change 5 in the C-O
 14 (Commercial Office), and C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) Zones (6.3 acres, Tax Map 25,
 15 Grid E2, Baltimore Boulevard Plaza, Plat 21160080, p/o Lot 1; Tax Map 25, Grid E2, Parcel 31
 16 and p/o Parcel 34; Tax Map 25, Grid E2, Townplace Suites, Plat 21228071, Lot 1; Tax Map 25,
 17 Grid D2, Cherry Hill, p/o Parcel 25). Delete the designation of this area as a present corridor
 18 node (as reflected on page 50), but note that it may be a viable future corridor node. Change the
 19 land use and character area designation of this location from walkable node to corridor infill.
 20 Add a new corridor node centered at the Cherokee Lane intersection, including the properties
 21 within the DDOZ boundary from Route 193, north on both sides of Route 1 up to the middle of
 22 Delaware Street. Due to the character of the area, heights should be limited to 2-6 stories, but
 23 with any 6 story fronting on US 1 with a step down towards the existing residential communities.

24
 25 **AMENDMENT TWENTY TWO:** Revise the DDOZ (Development District Overlay Zone)
 26 boundaries specified in endorsed SMA Change 14 to exclude the residential neighborhoods of
 27 Autoville North (including the properties zoned R-55), Autoville South, Hollywood (along 47th
 28 Place from Lackawanna Street to 48th Place), and Edgewood; the Ikea, Holiday Inn, Wynfield
 29 Park, and Camden/Roadside properties north of the Capital Beltway; and the portion of the Paint
 30 Branch Stream Valley Park located north of MD 193, south of Cherry Hill Road, and west of
 31 US 1.

1 **AMENDMENT TWENTY THREE:** Add new paragraphs two and three on page 204 to clarify
2 the need to work with all stakeholders as follows:

3 “To fully achieve the shared vision of this sector plan, greater cooperation at all levels—
4 planning, financing and bonding, construction, and operation—is necessary to implement the
5 recommended programs, infrastructure improvements such as streets, sidewalks, and utilities,
6 and public facilities. The public sector financing role for most jurisdictions in the United States is
7 participative, particularly with regard to transportation financing. This means that there should be
8 local policy guiding the allocation of financing in order to “steer” the funding available from all
9 sources toward the local policy goals. The General Plan and this sector plan provide the basis for
10 this policy.

11
12 Given the current economics of urban transportation, infrastructure, and public facilities
13 improvements, increases in corridor congestion are certain and the options to improve livability
14 and revitalize the area are limited. If financing and implementation are not addressed
15 collaboratively, no mitigation of adequacy of public facilities or other development extraction
16 processes will be successful. It will be more important than ever that Prince George’s County
17 participate in financing partnerships with federal, state, and municipal government, as well as
18 other entities, in order to secure the needed funding to support the implementation of this sector
19 plan and to evaluate and monitor progress. It is the intent of this sector plan and the Prince
20 George’s County government to foster full cooperation and to ensure all potential parties with a
21 stake in implementing these recommendations are responsible for the necessary planning and
22 financial commitments to build and maintain these essential elements to the revitalization of the
23 Central US 1 Corridor.”

24
25 **AMENDMENT TWENTY FOUR:** Replace Strategy 8 of Policy 1 on page 64 with the
26 following language: “Encourage the State Highway Administration (SHA) to work with the City
27 of College Park, the University of Maryland, and the county Department of Public Works and
28 Transportation (DPW&T) to fully evaluate existing travel patterns (including trips to and from
29 the university) along US 1 and other nearby parallel facilities. SHA, the city, the university, and
30 DPW&T should closely coordinate to implement effective measures to encourage alternate
31 routes for directing university-oriented traffic away from US 1 and toward other routes such as

1 the Capital Beltway, MD 193, Kenilworth Avenue, New Hampshire Avenue, University
2 Boulevard, Metzert Road, and Adelphi Road. Focus on Kenilworth Avenue and New
3 Hampshire Avenue as potential alternates for through traffic between the Capital Beltway and
4 Washington, D.C.”

5
6 **AMENDMENT TWENTY FIVE:** Revise the caption for the bottom picture on page 88 to read:
7 “Proposed conditions: US 1 is transformed into a walkable parkway. Brick pavers, stamped
8 asphalt, or other measures that indicate a shift to a more pedestrian-oriented environment should
9 be used in appropriate locations. [Pavers are added to the roadway.]...”

10
11 **AMENDMENT TWENTY SIX:** Provide a new strategy on page 129 in the walkable streets
12 section to read: “Provide well-designed, safe street crossings at all intersections for pedestrians to
13 cross US 1 and other major streets. Ensure these crossings are located for maximum
14 convenience, include pedestrian safety amenities such as count-down crossing lights, and allow
15 for sufficient crossing time.”

16
17 **AMENDMENT TWENTY SEVEN:** Add descriptions of the Metrobus, The Bus, and
18 University of Maryland transit services to page 22. Add text mentioning the Metrobus B-30 bus
19 route, which provides express service between the Greenbelt Metro Station and BWI-Thurgood
20 Marshall Airport, on the same page.

21
22 **AMENDMENT TWENTY EIGHT:** Revise the paragraph on “Inadequate Transit Service” on
23 page 28 to read: “The Greenbelt and College Park Metro Stations, while within a comfortable
24 distance for bicyclists, are too far away from commercial centers....”

25
26 **AMENDMENT TWENTY NINE:** Revise the first sentence on page 31 to read: “The Central
27 US 1 Corridor is approximately 3.4 miles long, similar in length to the Rosslyn-Ballston Transit
28 Corridor in nearby Arlington County, Virginia.”

1 **AMENDMENT THIRTY:** Revise the diagram on page 46 to reflect the Paint Branch Stream
 2 Valley Park Trail and the Rhode Island Avenue Trolley Line Trail with dashed lines to
 3 distinguish them from roadways.

4
 5 **AMENDMENT THIRTY ONE:** Revise the first bullet on page 53 to read: “Concentrate
 6 pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly, transit oriented....”

7
 8 **AMENDMENT THIRTY TWO:** Add the following paragraph to the section entitled
 9 “Placemaking” on page 55:

10
 11 “The Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation recognizes the importance of
 12 accommodating all modes of transportation in new road construction or improvements to
 13 existing roads. The idea of “complete streets” involves adequately accommodating all
 14 modes of transportation along roadways, including bicycles, pedestrians, and those with
 15 disabilities. It places a priority on ensuring that all users are safely, comfortably, and
 16 adequately accommodated along area roads. This concept is evolving through congressional
 17 legislation that is gaining support, and Maryland legislation that is in the process of being
 18 drafted for public review. The principles of complete streets should be incorporated into
 19 land use planning and urban design, and also utilized during the review of development
 20 applications, road frontage improvements, and for more comprehensive multimodal capital
 21 improvements, for roadways or intersections. It is crucial that all modes of transportation
 22 are incorporated into all phases of planning, design, and implementation.”

23
 24 **AMENDMENT THIRTY THREE:** Revise the second sentence of the first full paragraph on
 25 the right-hand column on page 55 to read: “This new configuration will change US 1 in College
 26 Park from an auto-oriented commercial strip to a series of walkable places served by an efficient
 27 trolley, electric bus, or shuttle system, or accessible by bicycle.”

28
 29 **AMENDMENT THIRTY FOUR:** Add the following sentence after the first sentence in
 30 Strategy 3 of Policy 1 on page 63: “Create an eastbound counterflow bike lane/route on the
 31 existing one-way westbound segment of Metzert Road between the Paint Branch Trail and US”

1 1.” Revise the last sentence of Strategy 3 as follows: “Support increased bicycle use by
2 improving connections to the University of Maryland, providing bicycle parking [at the
3 beginning and end of every trip,] and offering bike racks on transit buses.” Add a new sentence
4 at the end of Strategy 3 to read: “Investigate the expansion of the ‘weBike’ bike sharing program
5 currently offered on the university campus.”
6

7 **AMENDMENT THIRTY FIVE:** Add illustrations/photographs in the vicinity of pages 64-65
8 of the pedestrian wayfinding signage currently used in the Old Town area of College Park, and
9 bicycle destination signage consistent with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices
10 (MUTCD).
11

12 **AMENDMENT THIRTY SIX:** Add the following text at the end of Strategy 10 of Policy 1 on
13 page 64: “These wayfinding signs should be designed primarily for pedestrians and bicyclists.
14 Wayfinding signs for bicyclists should be consistent with the standards of the Manual of
15 Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).”
16

17 **AMENDMENT THIRTY SEVEN:** Revise the first sentence of Strategy 2 of Policy 3 on page
18 73 to read: “Establish pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly street connections to existing residential
19 neighborhoods and trails.”
20

21 **AMENDMENT THIRTY EIGHT:** Revise the second sentence of the diagram label “RIGHT”
22 on page 75 to read: “Pedestrian-friendly and bikeable east-west connector streets....”
23

24 **AMENDMENT THIRTY NINE:** Revise the bottom left diagram on page 75 to reflect the Paint
25 Branch Stream Valley Trail as a dashed line and to add a label for Metzert Road. Add
26 Metzert Road to the caption.
27

28 **AMENDMENT FORTY:** Add the following sentence to the end of Strategy 3 of Policy 4 on
29 page 77: “Install standard street name signs at trail/roadway intersections and install bike route
30 signs with destination information on the trail departure legs of trail/roadway intersections
31 consistent with the MUTCD (e.g. ‘Bike Route to University of Maryland/Bladensburg).”

1 **AMENDMENT FORTY ONE:** Revise the diagram on page 77 to improve legibility by
2 ensuring text labels are appropriately sized and located, remove trail connections that pass
3 through the golf course west of US 1, and remove the east-west trail connection just north of Erie
4 Street leading west from US 1 through the golf course.

5
6 **AMENDMENT FORTY TWO:** Add the following sentence at the end of the first full
7 paragraph on the right hand column on page 82: “Install appropriate bicycle racks along the
8 sidewalks, space permitting.”

9
10 **AMENDMENT FORTY THREE:** Revise the last sentence of the first paragraph on the left
11 hand column of page 86 to read: “The introduction of a new transit line to this area will have the
12 dramatic effect of reducing automobile dependence and encouraging new levels of walkability
13 and bikeability in downtown and at the University of Maryland.”

14
15 **AMENDMENT FORTY FOUR:** Add the following sentence at the end of the first paragraph
16 on the left hand column on page 89: “Furthermore, there are options for selecting functional
17 bicycle racks that double as works of civic art.”

18
19 **AMENDMENT FORTY FIVE:** Delete the third sentence from the third paragraph on the left
20 hand column on page 89: “[Sidewalks are widened and partitioned to create a designated path for
21 bicyclists separate from US 1’s travel lanes.]”

22
23 **AMENDMENT FORTY SIX:** Revise the diagram and text box on page 90 to locate a new “P”
24 as follows: “Create a two-way bikeway through the placement of sharrows and an eastbound
25 bicycle contra-flow lane on the one-way westbound portion of Metzerott Road between the Paint
26 Branch Trail and US 1.” Add dashed lines and text labels to reflect the Paint Branch Stream
27 Valley Park Trail.

28
29 **AMENDMENT FORTY SEVEN:** Delete the word “bicyclists” from the third sentence of the
30 first paragraph in the left-hand column on page 101, as bicyclists should not be relegated to the
31 service lanes of a roadway.

1 **AMENDMENT FORTY EIGHT:** Revise the second goal on page 124 as follows: “Enhance
2 the existing trail networks in the Central US 1 Corridor to meet the [recreational] needs of
3 existing and future users.
4

5 **AMENDMENT FORTY NINE:** Revise the fourth bulleted strategy at the top of page 128 to
6 read: “Provide marked bike lanes and multiuse paths where appropriate.”
7

8 **AMENDMENT FIFTY:** Revise the plan text on pages 129-132 to be consistent with the new
9 street cross-sections proposed for US 1.
10

11 **AMENDMENT FIFTY ONE:** Delete the second sentence under the header “Upper Midtown”
12 on page 132: “[The proposed redesign of this section with accompanying increased in intensity
13 (see rendering on page 131).]”
14

15 **AMENDMENT FIFTY TWO:** Revise the last sentence on page 132 as follows: “The
16 recommended section is shown on the following page, and includes the addition of [a] bicycle
17 lanes and street trees.”
18

19 **AMENDMENT FIFTY THREE:** Insert the following sentence after the first sentence of the
20 second paragraph on page 133: “The provision of appropriate bicycle parking facilities at transit
21 hubs and bicycle racks on all transit buses and within Purple Line train cars will increase the
22 utility of both transit and bicycling.”
23

24 **AMENDMENT FIFTY FOUR:** Revise the street network diagram on page 136 to reflect the
25 Paint Branch Stream Valley Park Trail and Rhode Island Avenue Trolley Line Trail alignments
26 as dashed lines.
27

28 **AMENDMENT FIFTY FIVE:** Revise Policy 1 on page 137 as follows: “[Provide greater
29 connectivity using pedestrian and bicycle connections and walkable street designs with
30 appropriate design speeds no greater than 25 to 30 miles per hour on the local street network.]
31 Improve bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular accessibility throughout the internal street network

1 and to US 1 and Rhode Island Avenue by filling in missing linkages and ensuring the internal
 2 network is bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly through appropriate design including traffic calming
 3 techniques.”
 4

5 **AMENDMENT FIFTY SIX:** Add two new strategies to Policy 1 on page 137 as follows:

- 6 “• Create an east-west bikeway connection along Metzerott Road by converting the
 7 existing one-way westbound segment between the Paint Branch Stream Valley Park
 8 Trail and US 1 by adding sharrow pavement markings and a contraflow bike lane in
 9 the eastbound direction, while retaining the one-way only traffic flow restriction for
 10 motor vehicles.
- 11 • Improve the safety of the Rhode Island Avenue Trolley Line Trail where it crosses
 12 Paint Branch Parkway for bicyclists and pedestrians.”
 13

14 **AMENDMENT FIFTY SEVEN:** Revise the second sentence of the first bulleted strategy on
 15 page 138 as follows: “Consider techniques such as color, style, and iconography to enhance
 16 roadway signage, consistent with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).”
 17

18 **AMENDMENT FIFTY EIGHT:** Change the titles of Maps 13 and 14 on pages 139-140 to
 19 “Proposed Master Plan Trail and Bicycle Facilities North/South.”
 20

21 **AMENDMENT FIFTY NINE:** Revise the legend subheading “Trail Type” on Maps 13 and 14
 22 to read: “Proposed Facility Type.”

23 **AMENDMENT SIXTY:** Replace the top photograph on page 141 with a different image that
 24 better illustrates an example similar to the recommended future conditions of US 1.
 25

26 **AMENDMENT SIXTY ONE:** Revise the first sentence on page 141 as follows: “On roads,
 27 [other than US 1] use of the shared lane marking or “sharrow” to indicate where cyclists [should
 28 share] are expected to ride within the lane [is recommended] should be considered.”
 29

30 **AMENDMENT SIXTY TWO:** Revise the third sentence on page 141 to read: “The sharrow
 31 [should] may be used on [residential and business] streets where motor vehicle traffic volumes

1 and speeds warrant marked bike lanes but there is insufficient room for them. [flanking the entire
2 length of the corridor to serve as connectors to major trails and buffered bike lanes or shared use
3 paths on the corridor.] The creation of on-road bikeways featuring sharrows, combined with bike
4 lanes and shared use paths, will provide a bikeway network for the sector plan area.”

5
6 **AMENDMENT SIXTY THREE:** Revise the third bulleted strategy at the top of page 143 to
7 read: “[Consider bicycle and pedestrian signalization at] Review existing signalized intersections
8 along US 1 to ensure the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians (including pedestrians with
9 disabilities) are being met and make any needed adjustments accordingly in order to facilitate
10 these modes of [transportation on] travel along the corridor.”

11
12 **AMENDMENT SIXTY FOUR:** Revise Strategy 1 of Policy 2 on page 143 to read: “Provide
13 bicycle parking, including bicycle racks and lockers, to encourage and facilitate bicycle travel.”

14
15 **AMENDMENT SIXTY FIVE:** Replace Strategy 3 of Policy 2 on page 143 with the following
16 language: “Study new bicycle facility types and programs, such as bike stations and shared use
17 bicycle programs, and if appropriate, consider applying them in the sector plan area.”

18
19 **AMENDMENT SIXTY SIX:** Revise the second sentence of the second paragraph on page 186
20 as follows: “Many streets do not have sidewalks; however, Rhode Island Avenue’s shoulders are
21 [paved for bicycle paths] designated bike lanes.”

22
23 **AMENDMENT SIXTY SEVEN:** Revise Table 15 on page 205 for clarity by providing
24 abbreviations and numbers for each line item to allow for easier reference in the future.

25
26 **AMENDMENT SIXTY EIGHT:** Add “DPW&T” as one of the “Potential Parties Involved” to
27 the sixth line item of Table 15 on page 205.

1 **AMENDMENT SIXTY NINE:** Add two new action steps to Table 15 on page 205 as follows:
2

Objective	Proposed Action Steps	Potential Parties Involved	Timeframe
Transportation	<u>Improve the level of safety and service at the intersection of the Rhode Island Avenue Trolley Line Trail and Paint Branch Parkway.</u>	<u>City of College Park; DPW&T</u>	<u>Short-term</u>
	<u>Convert the one-way westbound-only segment of Metzert Road between US 1 and the Paint Branch Stream Valley Park Trail to a two-way bikeway by adding sharrow marking and a contraflow bike lane in the eastbound direction.</u>	<u>City of College Park; DPW&T; SHA; M-NCPPC</u>	<u>Short-term</u>

3
4 **AMENDMENT SEVENTY:** Add a new standard to the section on Drive-Throughs on page 246
5 to read: “Drive throughs should provide service to bicyclists, and to both bicyclists and
6 pedestrians if access to the drive through window is the only way to be served.”
7

8 **AMENDMENT SEVENTY ONE:** Revise definition 8 on page 276 to read: “Bicycle Lane: A
9 [dedicated lane for bicycle use demarcated by striping] portion of a roadway that has been
10 designated by signs and/or pavement markings for preferential or exclusive use by bicyclists.”
11

12 **AMENDMENT SEVENTY TWO:** Add the following new definition to page 276: “Complete
13 Streets: A street designed and operated to enable safe access for all users. Pedestrians, bicyclists,
14 motorists, and public transportation users of all ages and abilities are able to safely move along
15 and across a complete street.”
16

1 **AMENDMENT SEVENTY THREE:** Add the following new definition to page 279: “Shared-
 2 Use Path: A bikeway outside the traveled way and physically separated from motorized
 3 vehicular traffic by an open space or barrier and either within the highway right-of-way or within
 4 an independent alignment. Shared-use paths are also used by pedestrians (and skaters, users of
 5 manual or motorized wheelchairs, and joggers) and other authorized and non-motorized users.”

6
 7 **AMENDMENT SEVENTY FOUR:** Add the following new definition to page 279: “Shared-
 8 Use Bicycle Program: A program which provides rental bicycles to members and has a fee
 9 structure that encourages quick turnover of the bicycles by users so as to increase the chances of
 10 availability to others (e.g. no use charge for the first 30 minutes).”

11
 12 **AMENDMENT SEVENTY FIVE:** Change Map 23, Map 25, and the diagrams on pages 63,
 13 67, and 72 to:

- 14 • Reflect the changes to the four lots southeast of Knox Road and Yale Avenue to the
- 15 corridor infill development character
- 16 • Reflect the walkable node development character for the properties located west of the
- 17 Friends School between US 1, Calvert Road, and Guilford Road
- 18 • Reflect the walkable node development character for the properties located north of
- 19 Knox Road in the “Knox Boxes” area which are rezoned to the M-U-I Zone by the
- 20 approved sectional map amendment

21
 22 **AMENDMENT SEVENTY SIX:** Amend the table added by Planning Board Resolution of
 23 Adoption PGCPB 09-170 as item IV.27 on page 12 to remove the on-street parking references in
 24 Downtown, University of Maryland, and Lower Midtown.

25
 26 **AMENDMENT SEVENTY SEVEN:** Add a new statement to Exemption 6 on page 226 to
 27 read: “New required or provided parking areas that result in the addition of between one and five
 28 parking spaces are exempt from the Development District Standards and site plan review, but
 29 shall comply with any applicable parking and landscaping regulations of the Zoning Ordinance
 30 and the *Landscape Manual*.”

1 **AMENDMENT SEVENTY EIGHT:** Remove the Mandatory Shop Frontage requirement for
2 the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Edgewood Road and Rhode Island Avenue. Amend
3 the maps on pages 231 and 232 to reflect this change.
4

5 **AMENDMENT SEVENTY NINE:** Add a new bullet under “Site Plan Submittal
6 Requirements” on page 227 as follows: “A LEED® (Leadership Through Energy and
7 Environmental Design) scorecard as developed by the U.S. Green Building Council to illustrate
8 how the proposed development addresses issues of sustainability.”
9

10 **AMENDMENT EIGHTY:**

11 Change the zoning of the Lin-Roy LLC, Gamber Properties LLC, Dunn, Chang, Kong,
12 Buchheister, and Burke properties located east of US 1 along Guilford and Calvert Roads from
13 the M-U-I (Mixed-use Infill) Zone and the R-18 (Muntifamily Medium Density Residential)
14 Zone to the R-55 (One Family Detached Residential) Zone to implement the sector plan policies
15 and recommendations for existing residential development (1.28 acres, Tax Map 33, Grid C4,
16 College Park Homes Subdivision, Plat A21-0632, Lots 1-3; College Park – Changes Addition,
17 Plat 21191051, Lots 1 and 2; College Park Homes Subdivision, Plat A-21-0638 Lots 10 and 11).
18 Map 25 on page 233 shall indicate these properties in the existing residential character area.
19 Revise Map 25 on page 233 and the diagrams on page 67 and 74 to reflect these properties in the
20 existing residential character area. Retain the properties zoned M-U-I between Calvert Road and
21 Guilford Road in the Downtown Walkable Node character area.
22

23 **AMENDMENT EIGHTY ONE:**

24 Make technical amendments to the Development District Overlay Zone Table of Uses Permitted
25 to ensure consistency with revisions to the Zoning Ordinance for Eating and Drinking
26 Establishments pursuant to CB-19-2010.
27

28 **AMENDMENT EIGHTY TWO:**

29 Change the zoning for the Shaban properties from the C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) Zone to
30 the O-S (Open Space) Zone (0.72 acres, Tax Map 25, Grid F1, Hollywood Addition, Parcel A3 and
31 Lot at SE corner of Parcel A).
32

AMENDMENT EIGHTY THREE:

Place the ZH Investments LLC property in the M-U-I (Mixed-Use-Infill) Zone (1.0 acre, Tax Map 25, Grid E1, Hollywood Station, Plat 13 01228073, Parcel A). Add text to provide the following: “This site is a key entranceway to College Park, therefore, high quality development is critical. It is challenged by being undersized, at a difficult intersection, and surrounding residents are opposed to significant density on the property. No drive-through use shall be permitted. The property should develop predominantly as retail or office. Residential uses above the ground floor may be permitted, but density is limited to 12 units to the acre.”

AMENDMENT EIGHTY FOUR:

Retain the C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) Zone for the Hollywood Commercial District as recommended by the Planning Board, but revise the language on pages 100-101 to better describe how the residents desire to redevelop the Hollywood Commercial District to better serve the surrounding community. See Attachment Two.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the planning staff is authorized to make appropriate text and map revisions to correct identified errors and inconsistencies, reflect updated information and revisions, and incorporate the zoning map changes reflected in this Resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Sectional Map Amendment is an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance and to the official Zoning Map for the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Prince George’s County. The zoning changes approved by this Resolution shall be depicted on the official Zoning Map of the County.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the approval of this Sectional Map Amendment shall repeal and readopt with amendments that portion of the Zoning Map encompassed by the Amendment, and that the conditions and findings attached to previously approved zoning applications are considered part of this Sectional Map Amendment where the previous zoning category has been maintained and noted on the Zoning Map.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the provisions of this Resolution are severable. If any provision, sentence, clause, section, zone, zoning map, or part thereof is held illegal, invalid, unconstitutional, or unenforceable, such illegality, invalidity, unconstitutionality, or unenforceability shall not affect or impair any of the remaining provisions, sentences, clauses, sections, zones, zoning maps, or parts hereof or their application to other zones, persons, or

1 | circumstances. It is hereby declared to be the legislative intent that this Resolution would have
2 | been adopted as if such illegal, invalid, unconstitutional, or unenforceable provision, sentence,
3 | clause, section, zone, zoning map, or part had not been included therein.

Adopted this 1st day of June, 2010.

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE’S
COUNTY, MARYLAND, SITTING AS THE
DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PART OF
THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTON REGIONAL
DISTRICT IN PRINCE GEORGE’S COUNTY,
MARYLAND

BY: _____
Thomas E. Dernoga
Chair

ATTEST:

Redis C. Floyd
Clerk of the Council

NOTE: ATTACHMENTS AVAILABLE AS AN INCLUSION FILE IN LIS