

Prince George's County Departure from Parking and Loading Standards Application No. 257

Applicant: The Dolben Company, Inc., Owner

Location: The subject property is located on the west side of Harry S Truman Drive, north of New Orchard Drive

Request: Departure from Parking and Loading Standards

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the applicant is requesting approval of a Departure from Parking and Loading Standards for 102 parking spaces; and

WHEREAS, the advertisement of the public hearing was posted on the property in accordance with the adopted Rules of Procedure of the Prince George's County Planning Board; and

WHEREAS, the Technical Staff Report released December 21, 1999, recommends APPROVAL; and

WHEREAS, after consideration of the Technical Staff Report and testimony at its regular meeting on January 6, 2000, the Prince George's County Planning Board agreed with the staff recommendation; and

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board decision is based on the findings and conclusions found in the Technical Staff Report and the following DETERMINATIONS:

1. The subject development application is for multifamily dwellings consisting of 284 units. The applicant originally requested by means of DPLS-257 a departure of 144 parking spaces of the 670 spaces required for the subject property pursuant to Section 27-568 (a)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance. During the course of the review, the application was modified to request a departure of only 102 spaces. A Detailed Site Plan and a Variance application for the proposed building coverage and parking compound have also been filed as companion cases.
2. Detailed Site Plan SP-93045 (for 180 units) for the subject site was approved by the Planning Board on November 3, 1994 (PGCPB No. 94-325). The applicant applied for a Variance at that time for parking in the required front yard. The Variance request was granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals. The applicant also received approval of a departure of 100 parking spaces of the 460 spaces required for the subject property as a companion case to SP-93045.
3. The subject property is a 9.67-acre lot on the south side of Harry S. Truman Drive and Mt. Lubentia Way. The proposal consists of three residential buildings and parking compounds in the front and rear yards. One of the three proposed buildings consists of five residential structures grouped around a multi-storied structured parking building. The adjacent uses are as follows:

North - Harry S. Truman Drive
South - Undeveloped park land owned by M-NCPPC
East - Undeveloped park land owned by M-NCPPC
West - Undeveloped park land owned by M-NCPPC

Departure from Parking and Loading Standards

4. Sections 27-568 and 27-582, Off-street Parking and Loading, of the Zoning Ordinance require the following:

REQUIRED LOADING SPACES		PROPOSED
One (1) loading space for 100-300 dwelling units	1	1
REQUIRED PARKING SPACES		PROPOSED
Two (2) per dwelling unit. 2.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit (for bedrooms in excess of one per unit). The total number of dwelling units proposed are: 81 one bedroom units 203 two bedroom units Total number of units = 284	for the one bedroom units=2X81=162 for the two bedroom units = 203X2.5= 508 Total required=670	526

5. Section 27-588, Required Findings, of the Zoning Ordinance states that:

In order for the Planning Board to grant the departure, it shall make the following findings:

The purposes of this Part (Section 27-550) will be served by the applicant=s request;

- (a)(1) To require (in connection with each building constructed and each new use established) off-street automobile parking lots and loading areas sufficient to serve the parking and loading needs of all persons associated with the buildings and uses;*
- (a)(2) To aid in relieving traffic congestion on streets by reducing the use of public streets for parking and loading and reducing the number of access points;*
- (a)(3) To protect the residential character of residential areas;*
- (a)(4) To provide parking and loading areas which are convenient and increase the*

amenities in the Regional District.

The applicant originally sought a waiver of 144 parking spaces from the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance to accommodate 284 residential units on the property. The applicant has indicated that although the requested departure reduces the minimum parking requirements by 144 parking spaces, the proposed parking will be more than adequate based on the applicant's experience with other similar sites. The site is also located in proximity to public transit like Metrorail, Metrobus and the County's >The Bus= system.

The Zoning Ordinance provides minimum standards for on-site parking and loading for providing adequate parking on-site and avoiding impacts to neighboring properties due to overflow parking. The originally proposed parking (526 spaces) does not meet these minimum standards and therefore will not serve the purposes of Section 27-550.

The staff does not believe that 526 parking spaces will be adequate to serve the minimum parking requirements of the proposed units. This inadequacy could result in spill-over parking on the adjacent streets and properties. There are parking restrictions on Harry S. Truman Drive. Therefore, the overflow parking could take place on Mount Lubentia Way and on the adjacent parcels which include a residential parcel approved for a townhouse project and the Mount Lubentia Convenience Center. The reduction in parking spaces to 526 will not provide adequate parking on-site and could adversely impact the neighboring streets and properties.

The Metrorail currently stops at Addison Road which is more than four miles from the site and the proposed Largo Town Center station will be 1.5 miles from the site. Residents will not be within walking distance@ of Metro transit facilities; an automobile will be required to drive to the transit facilities. The Metrobus serves Harry S. Truman Drive infrequently (the site is served twice hourly inbound during AM peak hours and twice hourly outbound during PM peak hours). The site is served every 70 minutes on Saturdays and there is no Sunday service. Therefore, the existing transit facilities in the vicinity are not adequate to justify a reduction in the required number of parking spaces to 526.

The applicant has indicated that the proposal is a high-quality residential development with luxury units that will attract high-income professionals. Adequate parking is a necessity for high-quality luxury units. Even if the residents use transit they will own automobiles which will require adequate parking. Residents in a luxury multifamily residential development in a location such as the subject site which is not in a dense city environment will typically own a minimum of two cars. The proposed parking does not complement the proposal's intent to provide high-quality luxury apartments.

The applicant has indicated that the proposed parking is adequate based on the applicant's experience with similar sites. The applicant has not submitted any data to verify this assumption.

Sixty percent of the proposed residential units are two-bedroom units which require 2.5 parking spaces per unit. Forty percent of the proposed residential units are one-bedroom units which require two (2) parking spaces per unit. As originally proposed, the applicant would have provided 1.85 parking spaces per unit. Since the residents in a luxury multifamily residential development will typically own a minimum of two cars, the staff is of the opinion that the project should provide a minimum of two (2) parking spaces per unit.

If a departure for 102 parking spaces is requested and 568 parking spaces are proposed instead of 526, two parking spaces per unit will be available. A departure for two parking spaces per unit was previously granted for the subject property in connection with previously approved SP-93045. A departure for 102 parking spaces will meet the minimum requirements of Section 27-550. **Therefore, staff recommended and the applicant agreed that the proposal be revised to increase the proposed parking spaces to a minimum of 568 instead of the proposed 526.** The applicant has revised the proposal accordingly. The applicant has provided the additional parking by replacing some of the regular parking spaces with compact spaces and adding another level of parking on the parking structure. The purposes of this section will be served by the applicant's request because the proposed parking spaces will be provided at a rate of at least 2.0 per unit which will be adequate to serve the parking needs of the use on the property. All parking provided will be convenient to its intended users and granting of the Departure will have minimal effect on the surrounding properties. The Departure will not increase the use of public streets for parking and loading. The residential character of the subject property and the surrounding properties will be maintained by accommodating all the required parking on-site. By providing on-site parking facilities, the impacts to surrounding properties will be minimized and the amenities of on-site parking within the Regional District will be preserved.

- (a)(2) *To aid in relieving traffic congestion on streets by reducing the use of public streets for parking and loading and reducing the number of access points;*
- (a)(3) *To protect the residential character of residential areas;*
- (a)(4) *To provide parking and loading areas which are convenient and increase the amenities in the Regional District.*

The Departure is the minimum necessary given the specific circumstances of the request;

The applicant has indicated that the Departure is the minimum necessary because the proposal is unique and utilizes a combination of surface and structured parking. One of the reasons for requesting the Departure is to minimize the building coverage on the property. Even if the Departure is granted, the coverage will remain at 28% and there will be encroachment into the required yard.

Since the applicant is proposing a high-density residential complex with 284 units, the subject lot configuration and the design of the residential complex do not allow sufficient area for adequate surface parking.

Sixty percent of the proposed residential units are two-bedroom units which require 2.5 parking spaces per unit. Forty percent of the proposed residential units are one-bedroom units which require two (2) parking spaces per unit. Since the residents in a luxury multifamily residential development will typically own a minimum of two cars, the departure request should provide a minimum of two (2) parking spaces per unit. As revised, the applicant is providing two (2) parking spaces per unit. A Departure for two parking spaces per unit was previously granted for the subject property. The Departure is the minimum necessary and the proposed parking spaces will be adequate to serve the parking needs of the use on the property. All parking provided will be convenient to its intended users and granting of the Departure will have minimal effect on the surrounding properties.

The Departure is necessary in order to alleviate circumstances which are special to the subject use, given its nature at this location, or to alleviate circumstances which are prevalent in older areas of the County which were predominantly developed prior to November 29, 1949;

As indicated above, the applicant is unable to provide the required number of parking spaces due to space limitations. Since the applicant is proposing a high-density residential complex with 284 units, the subject lot configuration and the design of the residential complex do not allow sufficient area for adequate surface parking. The departure is necessary to alleviate circumstances, e.g. narrowness of the lot, which are special to the subject design of the project. Although the proposed parking is technically deficient, it is adequate to serve the minimal needs of the residents.

All methods for calculating the number of spaces required (Division 2, Subdivision 3, and Division 3, Subdivision 3, of this part) have either been used or found to be impractical;

The applicant has applied all the methods of calculation allowed by the Zoning Ordinance. Since the required number of parking spaces cannot be provided, a Departure is being requested. The applicant has also proposed 26 tandem parking spaces. The tandem spaces are proposed on the lower level of the two independent buildings not connected to the parking structure. Each tandem parking bay (consisting of two parking spaces one behind the other) will be assigned to the same unit. Staff and the applicant are currently exploring whether or not these spaces are allowable, or if a Departure from Design Standards will be necessary to make them allowable. The applicant has included the tandem parking in the parking calculations.

Parking and loading needs of adjacent residential areas will not be infringed upon if the Departure is granted.

Sixty percent of the proposed residential units are two-bedroom units which require 2.5 parking spaces per unit. Forty percent of the proposed residential units are one-bedroom units which require two (2) parking spaces per unit. Since the residents in a luxury multifamily residential development will typically own a minimum of two cars, the Departure request must provide a minimum of two (2) parking spaces per unit. As proposed, the applicant is providing two (2) parking spaces per unit. A Departure for two parking spaces per unit was previously granted for the subject property. The proposed parking will be adequate to serve the minimum parking requirements for the proposed units. This inadequacy will not result in significant overflow parking which must be accommodated on the adjacent streets and properties.

Section 27-588, Required Findings, of the Zoning Ordinance also requires the Planning Board to consider the following:

- (i) *The parking and loading conditions within the general vicinity of the subject property, including the number and locations of available on and off-street parking spaces within 500 feet of the subject property;*
- (ii) *The recommendations of an Area Master Plan, or County or local revitalization plan, regarding the subject property and its general vicinity;*
- (iii) *The recommendations of a municipality (within which the property lies) regarding the Departure;*
- (iv) *Public parking facilities which are proposed in the County=s Capital Improvement Program within the general vicinity of the property*

The parking and loading conditions within the general vicinity of the subject property are adequate to serve the surrounding residential areas. There are no specific recommendations of an Area Master Plan or municipality for this area that have an impact on parking. There are no public parking facilities in the County=s Capital Improvement Program within the general vicinity of the property.

Section 27-588, Required Findings, of the Zoning Ordinance also states that the Planning Board may give consideration to the following:

- (i) *Public transportation available in the area;*

The Metrorail currently stops at Addison Road which is more than four miles from the site and the proposed Largo Town Center station will be 1.5 miles from the site. Residents will not be within walking distance of Metro transit facilities; an automobile will be required to drive to the transit facilities. The Metrobus serves Harry S. Truman Drive infrequently (the site is served twice hourly inbound during AM peak hours and twice hourly outbound during PM peak hours). The site is served every 70 minutes on Saturdays and there is no Sunday service. Therefore, the existing transit facilities in the vicinity are not adequate to justify a reduction in the required number of

parking spaces to less than 2.0 spaces per unit.

- (ii) *any alternative design solutions to off-street facilities which might yield additional spaces*
- (iii) *the specific nature of the use and the nature and hours of operation of other uses within 500 feet of the subject property.*

Although there is a technical deficiency in the number of spaces, the total number of parking spaces provided is sufficient to serve the minimum needs of the residents if 2.0 spaces per unit are provided. The applicant has utilized an alternative design solution by providing a combination of surface parking and structured parking. In spite of the alternative approach, the proposed parking does not meet the minimum requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the applicant has requested a Departure.

Referral Comments

6. The Community Planning Division (Wilkerson to Srinivas, November 29, 1999) has stated that there are no master plan issues raised by the subject application.
7. The Transportation Planning Section (Masog to Srinivas, November 22, 1999) has stated that the requested Departure may have impacts on the surrounding properties due to overflow parking. The amount of parking proposed in the subject multifamily residential development consisting of luxury apartments may not be sufficient to serve the parking needs of the residents.
8. The Permit Review Section (Windsor to Srinivas, October 25, 1999) has required minor revisions to the site and landscape plans which will be addressed with the Detailed Site Plan application.
9. The Environmental Planning Section (Markovich to Srinivas, September 30, 1999) has expressed concerns with the Departure request because the overall site development will result in increased woodland impacts compared to previous approvals and the overall tree save area has decreased when compared to the previously approved plan. The Section suggests increasing the height of the proposed buildings to decrease building coverage and surface parking.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Departure from Parking and Loading Standards Application No. 257 is hereby APPROVED for a reduction of the required number of 670 parking spaces to 568 spaces, or no less than 2.0 spaces per unit.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with the District Council of Prince George's County within thirty (30) days following the adoption of this Resolution.

* * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner McNeill, seconded by Commissioner Boone, with Commissioners McNeill, Boone and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Brown absent, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, January 6, 2000, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 27th day of January 2000.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:LAX:aj