



Hyattsville City Council Agenda Item Report

Meeting Date: August 5, 2019

Submitted by: Jim Chandler

Submitting Department: Community & Economic Development

Item Type: Planning & Development

Agenda Section:

SUBJECT

DSP-19039 - 3599 East-West Highway (20 minutes)

HCC-40-FY20

Recommendation:

Sponsor(s):

At the Request of the City Administrator

Co-Sponsor(s):

N/A

ATTACHMENTS

[DSP-19039_-_3599_East_West_Hwy_-_Discussion_Memo_-_Final.docx](#)

[NSR DSP Plan Set.pptx](#)

[NSR Statement of Justification for DSP.pdf](#)

[NSR DRD Application.pdf](#)

[NSR DSP Plan Set.pdf](#)

[Planning Committee Minutes - 04.18.2017 Adopted.pdf](#)

Summary Background:

The subject property is located at 3599 East West Highway, at the southwestern intersection of East West Highway (MD 410) and Belcrest Road. The site currently operates as a Sunoco gas station. The property is zoned M-U-I (mixed-use-infill) and lies within the "downtown core" character area of the Prince George's Plaza Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ). The property owner is proposing to redesign the site, expand the number of gas pumps, demolish the existing convenience store, and build a new two-story commercial/office building on the southern end of the site.

The site currently has four (4) gas bays, allowing for eight (8) pumps. The applicant proposes to double the number of bays, allowing for a total of 16 pumps on site. The applicant also plans to demolish the existing convenience store, which is in the center of the site, and rebuild it along the southern edge of the property. The new store building is proposed as 9,592 sq.ft. (4,796 sq.ft. footprint) two-story structure, with the convenience store occupying the first floor, and the second floor will be offices for the owner's management company. The ATM on site will be relocated as a stand-alone machine on the east side of the site.

Next Steps:

This item is scheduled for City Council discussion and action on September 16, 2019.

Fiscal Impact:

N/A

City Administrator Comments:

Presentation

Community Engagement:

The applicant met with the Planning Committee on July 16, 2019 to present and discuss the development application. Since the Planning Committee has already reviewed a version of this site plan, they recommended that the relevant comments from the April 17, 2018 meeting be put into record, as they are pertinent to the discussion of the updated DSP submitted by the applicant.

At the April 17, 2018 Planning Committee meeting, recommendations unanimously approved by the Planning Committee included:

- The applicant should consider the inclusion of “some form of artistic or attractive feature” along the south facing rear wall of the convenience store building;
- The applicant should consider reducing the number of curb cuts and enhancing pedestrian access and safety on the site.

In the revised DSP, the applicant addressed the number of curb cuts by reducing the number from a total of four (4) curb cuts to (2) curb cuts, with one (1) curb cut along East-West Highway and one (1) curb cut along Belcrest Road. However, the applicant did not address the Planning Committee’s recommendation to include some form of artistic or attractive feature to the proposed building. The Planning Committee reiterated this recommendation during the July 16, 2019 meeting.

During the Planning Committee’s July 16, 2019 meeting, the majority of the Planning Committee’s discussion focused on the applicant’s requested variances. The Planning Committee supports the applicant’s first three (3) amendments without any major contention, which include an 8-foot sidewalk and 6.3-foot tree and furnishing zone along East-West Highway, canopy set back of 25.6’ from East-West Highway, and a 43’ build-to line on Belcrest Road. In addition, the Planning Committee supports the canopy branding presented in the DSP, with one (1) member opposed stating the highway-styled branding is not in the spirit of the TDDP.

The fourth variance request concerns the permitted use of the property. The Planning Committee discussed whether this issue was within their scope, as it will ultimately be a legal determination. A vote specific to supporting the fourth variance and the applicant’s interpretation of the zoning ordinance failed due to most Planning Committee members abstaining from the vote. Abstentions were based on the belief that this variance will need to be legally determined and this decision is outside the purview of the Planning Committee.

However, the Planning Committee did vote to support the current use of the site as a gas station with the renovations and reconstruction proposed by the applicant; this vote was premised on the value members believe this use brings to the community, and not on any legal basis.

Strategic Goals:

Goal 2 – Ensure the Long-Term Economic Viability of the City

Legal Review Required?

N/A