

CITY OF HYATTSVILLE
PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA
JUNE 2, 2020

Register in advance for this webinar:

https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_b5aXaFMDQHCRdxmQFIWYNQ

1. Introduction of Committee & Guest Members (7:00 PM)
 - Todd Dengel
 - Ben Simasek
 - Maureen Foster
 - Wil Maxwell
 - D. Marshall
 - Bart Lawrence
 - Thomas Sheffer
 - Jonathan Mueller
 - Nkosi Yearwood
 - Kate Powers
 - Jim Chandler
 - Tom Haller
 - David Bickel
 - Brandon Gurney
 - Josh Woolridge

2. Committee Business (7:35 PM)

3. DSP-19050-01: Dewey Development, Parcels 1, 2, & 3
 - Presentation
 - Tom Haller, Gibbs and Haller, Representative for the Applicant
 - Overview of Project
 - The Planning Committee has seen multiple applications related to this project. Now we're bring it all together.
 - Mr. Haller showed the Committee a map of the site.
 - This property went through two separate PPS applications as the property was under contract at different times.
 - Dewey East was comprised of Parcel 5, and part of Parcel 2. This site plan will fill in the rest of the project.
 - Parcel 1 will consist of a rental residential multifamily building to be constructed by NRP.

- Parcels 2 and 3 will consist of a multifamily condominium project to be constructed by Stanley Martin, who also designed units for the Landy and Riverdale Park projects.
- Parcel 4 will house the Nine Ponds stormwater pond to be owned and maintained by Prince George's County and used as a regional stormwater facility.
- Parcel 5 was the subject of DSP-19050 and consists of a multifamily rental building with a commercial space to be constructed by Fairfield.
- Parcels 2 and 3 are separated by a stormwater management pond.
- During the subdivision process, the applicant was conditioned to provide a pedestrian connection between Parcels 2 and 3.
- Mr. Haller then provided an overview of the location of the stormwater trail.
- There was some discussion about completing the trail loop, but it is likely infeasible due to existing structures. Park and Planning owns the land along the southeast corner property line of Parcel 4.
- The extension of Toledo Terrace will be publicly dedicated.
- Mr. Haller showed the Committee the cross section of road submitted in the DSP, as seen in the TDDP.
- The applicant conducted signal warrant analysis, which indicated the need for a signal at the intersection of Belcrest Road and Toledo Terrace. The applicant will construct the intersection and crosswalks.
- Parcel 1 will be a residential product built by NRP.
- Josh Woolridge from NRP shared some background on the developer, which has five local projects in process.
- Parcel 1 is a "wrap" 361-unit building. The structured garage is hidden from view externally. Residents can drive and park on the level of their rental unit.
- The building is pushed up to the corner to Toledo Road and Belcrest Road, providing a presence on the corner close to the Metro.
- The building will have a large courtyard, pool, social spaces, cornhole, shuffleboard, etc. as well as bioretention areas.
- The public amenity space and leasing office is present at the southwest corner of the building. This corner of the building includes a transit lounge, TV screens, bus and metro schedules, fitness center, as well as spaces to work from home. Based on current work-from-home trends, multifamily developers are now office developers, too. There will be computer niches in the clubhouse space.
- Bike amenities are developed based on resident demand. There will be internal bike storage, via key fab access, in the structured parking garage.
- This building is unique as it has four fronts (there is no backside to the building).
- We have designed the building in a way that breaks up the facades, so it does not appear to be one continuous design element. It has a contemporary feel.

- The south elevation fronts Toledo Road and the west elevation fronts Belcrest Road. The east elevation is across from the Fairfield building on Parcel 5.
- This development has a total of 850 units.
- Brandon Gurney provided background on Stanley Martin, including being founded in 1966 and constructing its first building in Prince George's County.
- Last year, Stanley Martin sold 580 homes in Maryland with the majority in Prince George's County, making it the third largest builder in Maryland last year.
- Stanley Martin will be designing and constructing the multifamily condominium product on Parcels 2 and 3 which will be for sale.
- The lower units will be smaller in square footage than the upper units. Upper units will have the option to include a 515 square foot terrace rooftop.
- We have integrated a mix of colors and materials, and will utilize brick, hardie panels, and metal seam roofs.
- In the rear of building, each unit will have its own garage and back deck.
- Side units will have 10 windows. Highly visible side units will include brick exterior features.
- Amenities on the property will include tot lots and open space fronting the stormwater facility.
- Clarifying Questions
 - Marshall: Do the condominiums have a covered entrance?
 - Tom Haller: There is no outside door to the vestibule. You can walk right into the covered vestibule.
 - Todd Dengel: How does everything connect? Can you elaborate on the circulation of the connecting properties?
 - Tom Haller: There is a new public road proposed – it is an extension of Toledo Terrace at Belcrest Road. There will be a new traffic signal constructed at this intersection. The road then turns south to Toledo Road. There is an internal road for Parcel 2 that can be accessed from New Road A and Belcrest Road. Parcel 3 has a right-in, right-out single entrance on Adelphi Road for the 32 units on the parcel.
 - Todd Dengel: Whatever happened with the transformers and powerlines on the Fairfield property?
 - Tom Haller: We have had issue with undergrounding the transformers. There are four total transformers on Parcel 1. They have been configured to reside across the street from the proposed transformers on Parcel 5. There is no “back door,” the transformers must go somewhere. The transformers on both Parcels 1 and 5 will be screened, and these screens will provide protection and an opportunity for artwork.
 - Todd Dengel: You had mentioned breaking up the exterior façade of the NRP product – is there still some work left to be done there? Do you plan to modify the façade further?

- Josh: What is presented is where we are today. We are here for your feedback.
- Todd Dengel: What is M-NCPPC recommendation related to the transformers?
- Tom Haller: They are recommending that the transformers be underground. We are currently in discussion with them. We believe it is not a requirement to have the transformers subgrade. We are following requirements by placing the transformers on the B street and screening the equipment. We believe we have complied with the TDDP. Pepco makes it very costly to put transformers underground. Parcel 1 will be double the cost of Parcel 5 as they have proposed double the number of transformers. Transformers have not been hidden in the past. We will screen transformers in an artistic and skillful way.
- Thomas Sheffer: Building on Todd's question, what art elements beside screens are included in the design?
 - Tom Haller: No additional art elements are on the plan yet. We are familiar with the city's interest in art. NRP is talking about putting an additional art feature on the property. Staff has suggested an art element be near the entrance monument sign. This means the element could be shared along property lines (Parcels 1 and 2).
 - Thomas Sheffer: As for the playground spaces, can you point out where those will be located? Will they be publicly accessible?
 - Tom Haller: These recreational amenities will be located adjacent to the trail. They will be publicly accessible but on private property.
 - Thomas Sheffer: Will the trail be public?
 - Tom Haller: Yes.
 - Thomas Sheffer: I am curious about the access between Parcels 2 and 3. Why is there not a more direct entrance on the north side of Parcel 4?
 - Tom Haller: The current configuration is to ensure ADA compatibility. There are very steep slopes present on the site.
 - Thomas Sheffer: Has the applicant considered stairs for direct access?
 - David Bickel: Not particularly - there is a proposed retaining wall on the west side of Parcel 3. It is between 4 and 6 feet.
 - Thomas Sheffer: The landscaping in front of the condominiums is very small, while more mature trees are behind. Is the applicant proposing additional shade trees be planted?
 - Tom Haller: There are no trees in front of the buildings in the rendering to best show the architecture. The landscape plan outlines where trees will be located. There will also be street trees planted.
 - Thomas Sheffer: Is fencing in front yards being proposed?

- Tom Haller: A small decorative fence is being proposed for those properties fronting Belcrest Road. We are not proposing fencing interior to the development.
- Nkosi Yearwood: Are there any public streets proposed on the new townhouse component?
 - Tom Haller: No, the roadways are private on Parcels 2 & 3.
 - Nkosi Yearwood: The road that continues north from new road A (Toledo Terrace extension) – Has there been any discussion on making this a public street?
 - Tom Haller: Based on TDDP content and City interested, the Toledo Terrace extension will be public, while the HOA will control and maintain roads within Parcels 2 and 3.
 - Nkosi Yearwood: I would encourage you to explore the option of including public roadways with city. It makes sense to have them be public for maintenance reasons (snow removal) and would reduce HOA burden.
 - Nkosi Yearwood: On the Parcel 1 building, are there Romeo and Juliet balconies or real balconies?
 - There is a combination. We will follow up with specifics. We tend to do Romero and Juliet balconies on the exterior of the building with larger balconies interior to the building.
- Wil Maxwell: Regarding parking on the NRP property, will bike parking interior to the garage be present on the ground floor only?
 - Bike storage will only be present on the ground level for safety reasons.
 - Wil Maxell: Will there be EV charging stations inside the garage?
 - Yes, six stations are standard with our multifamily products. The number of stations is based on current demand and disperses on different levels.
- Ben Simasek: Where are the entrances present for the building on Parcel 1?
 - There will be an entrance on the corner of Belcrest and Toledo. There will be numerous egress entrances along the building accessed via key fab. Individuals can also access the building via the garage.
- Marshall: What are the negatives associated with public roads along the proposed condominiums? This could simplify the entrance and exit point.
 - Tom Haller: It is up to the City which roads are dedicated publicly. Roadways on Parcels 2 & 3 are essentially internal driveways and are not designed to public road standards.

- Peter Ciferri: On behalf of my client, my firm has submitted a letter to the Mayor of Hyattsville. There is an issue with the development of this site as the Metro 3 building relies on the current surface parking lot, with original approvals dating back to the 1970s. When Metro 3 and surface parking lot was jointly development, an appropriate legal arrangement was made to prevent encroachment on the building's rights and entitlements. UTC has

not completed any redevelopment that would disrupt these original plans. Metro 3 has a continuing and valid right to rely on entitlements from 1970. My client has not been considered as part of this project, which will disturb their rights and entitlements established in the 1970s. The applicant has attempted to resolve or explain this issue with reliance on private agreements rather than public approvals. I can respond to further questions and rebuttals.

- Jim Chandler: The City has received Mr. Ciferri's letter. It is up to Park and Planning to decide if this agreement is relevant. It is unlikely the City will take a position on rights of individual parties
- Tom Haller: My client preserved the right to relocate parking when Dewey would be ultimately redeveloped. In 1998, a lease agreement was entered by the owner of Metro 3 and this property, which allowed for the relocation of parking. The owner of Metro 3 accepted this lease agreement, which indicates that certain areas of parking can be relocated. The applicant provided written notice to Metro 3 of their intention to relocate parking as allowed under the leasing agreement. We have been in communication with the owner and their litigation counsel. We intend to resolve this matter, and do not believe it will impact the application in front of you.
- Marshall: I have seen a couple proposals for this property over years, and there has been no indication of opposition to these proposals based on elimination of the surface parking. In all this time, where has the owner of Metro 3 been with their opposition of relocating parking?
 - a. Peter Ciferri: The current ownership purchased the building in 2015. I can't speak to prior owners, but the current ownership has never had that view.
- Nkosi Yearwood: Are these agreements embedded in any land records or prior approvals?
 - a. Peter Ciferri: The approvals are embedded in codes and have been carried through as a reference. The applicable code is Section 24-222 of the 1970 zoning ordinance. The applicant has not been granted a waiver regarding permanent parking location. The site plan approval is linked back to the zoning ordinance.
- Jonathan Mueller: Does Metro 3 have a structured parking garage? What are the parking capacities and needs of Metro 3?
 - a. Peter Ciferri: Metro 3 does not have its own garage, though there is a garage behind it. Metro 3 relies on the surface parking across the street.
 - b. Jonathan Mueller: When the applicant presented the Dewey East project to the Committee, they discussed where the parking was going to be relocated. These questions have already come up and have been discussed previously. We

were presented with information indicating that existing garages would provide sufficient parking for UTC. It was my understanding that all parking need would be met.

- c. Scott DeCain: You are correct in your recollection. The applicant hired an independent parking traffic company to conduct a parking analysis, which was shared with the group last time. To summarize the results, the parking requirements of Metro 3 will be more than satisfied by the parking capacity in garage A on Toledo Road as well as the garage behind Metro 3. Under stable occupancy, even with the elimination of surface lot, there will be an excess of 1,000 spaces that will not be utilized. No one will be disenfranchised regarding parking.

- Committee Comments

- Jonathan Mueller: I support the project but believe the parking for the UTC buildings need to be addressed. The City will need to have an answer regarding this issue.
- Marshall: The condominium end units should include additional brick features. There should not be large walls of vinyl, regardless of where they are located. It creates a vacant look and is tacky, especially at its price point.
 - Multifamily building on Parcel 1 should have more color, beyond the gray, white, and black coloring proposed. The applicant should utilize a larger variety of colors.
 - Playground features should be available to the public.
 - In terms of the issues brought forward by Metro 3, it should be resolved between the two property owners. As a committee member, I believe the parking garage where parking will be relocated is a reasonable distance from Metro 3. There should have been a better plan in place from the beginning but stepping on this project is not a solution.
- Todd Dengel: I believe transformers should be buried. In response to the comment that it wasn't a requirement in the past and that the current applicant should not be subjected to this measure now – it was a mistake of the past that needs to be rectified. I proposed we recommend the transformers related to this application be buried.
 - In relation to the architectural renderings, I find the aesthetics and architectural features to be uninspired and more of the same.
 - I do not recommend we support Metro 3. This is a legal issues not within the purview of the Committee. We have not seen the legal documents. As a parking professional, I am in agreement that there is an overabundance of parking in that area. There is sufficient existing parking to be leased out for other uses.
- Thomas Sheffer: I second Todd's comment that we should not take a position either way. I also agree that there is a sufficient amount of parking

available to Metro 3. And beyond that, there is a greater trend of decreased demand for parking.

- The design doesn't bother me. I think we need to be careful of utilizing a color palette that will soon be out-of-date.
- I believe there should be a focus on architectural accents and public art, as well as street trees to add more interest.
- On Parcel 3, the condominium side elevations should include some added interest, either with brick or different color use, regardless of if it is located in a highly visible area. I think some simple additional architecture features could really improve the design.
- I believe mature shade trees should be preserved wherever possible.
- In relation to the pedestrian circulation and connection between Parcels 2 and 3, I encourage the developer explore the option to include a stair access point. Maybe a place where the slope is gentler.
- Nkosi Yearwood: My main comments are regarding the condominiums. The design could be stronger.
 - I encourage the applicant look at the design of The Edition on East-West Highway. I believe that building has a stronger design than what is proposed. The development team should look at local examples.
 - There should be a strong articulation of the brick pattern along the condominiums, not just along main streets.
- Wil Maxwell: I like the colors used on the front facades of the products on Parcels 2 and 3. I just hope it is not the same pattern on every building.
 - I recommend the applicant not utilize the gray vinyl siding on the side and rear of the condominiums. It is a tired aesthetic.
 - Thank you for your presentation. We appreciate it.
- Recommendations
 - **Regarding the legal dispute between the applicant and the owner of Metro III, the Planning Committee has no comment as the issue is between private property owners. Passed; 7-0.**
 - **The Planning Committee recommends the applicant expand the design and architectural elements utilized, especially on condominium facades facing public streets. This can include additional brick features. The applicant should look to recent local multifamily examples, such as The Edition on East-West Highway, for inspiration. Passed; 7-0.**
 - **The Planning Committee recommends the applicant bury all transformers related to the project. Passed; 7-0.**

- **The Planning Committee recommends the applicant make an effort to preserve mature trees wherever possible and plant native canopy street trees on the subject property. Passed; 7-0.**
- **The Planning Committee recommends the applicant relocate relevant utilities and design and construct the north-south section of roadway on Parcel 2 to a public standard so the City can accept public dedication of the roadway. Passed; 5-2.**
- **The Planning Committee recommends the applicant construct stair access from Parcel 3 to the public trail on Parcel 4, in addition to the ADA compliant switchback. Passed; 5-1 with 1 abstention.**

4. Development Update

- Trolley Trail – *CSX Coordination with SHA*
- CPTED Certification Training – *Starting July 8*
- City COVID-19 Business Relief Fund – *Volunteers for Application Review*
- Affordable Housing Strategy Virtual Open House – **June 9, 2020** at 7 pm
Register in advance at the following link:
https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_jzt8zTQuQjOcTLdVAlBJsA

5. Additional Questions & Discussion

6. Adjourn (9:08 PM)

- July 21 next meeting