

PGCPB No. 06-104

File No. DPLS-310

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board has reviewed DPLS-310, The Preserve at Piscataway, Edelen Village, requesting approval of a reduction in the parking requirement in accordance with Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, after consideration of the evidence presented at the public hearing on May 4, 2006, the Prince George's County Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject request is for a departure from the number of parking and loading spaces required to reduce the parking requirement from 108 to 65 spaces. It is a companion case to Specific Design Plan SDP-0318/02 requesting a community building, two swimming pools and a recreation area.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	R-L	R-L
Use(s)	Residential	Residential
Acreage	130.66	130.66
Lots	256	256
Square Footage/GFA	0	6,968
Attached Dwelling Units	108	0

3. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 84, Council District 9. More specifically, it is located south of the intersection of Danville Road with Floral Park Road. The subject parking area is located centrally in the development adjacent to the proposed community building, pool and recreation area.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The subject parking area is located within Edelen Village North. It is adjacent to other portions of the Villages at Piscataway development including the community building, pools, half basketball court and preteen lot that are the subject of SDP-0318/02, townhomes and single-family detached units and environmentally sensitive homeowner's land.
5. **Previous Approvals:** On September 14, 1993, the District Council adopted CR-60-1993 approving the master plan and the sectional map amendment for Subregion V in Prince George's County. Comprehensive Design Zone Amendment Three (Zoning Applications A-9869 and A-9870), known as Villages at Piscataway, rezoned 858.7 acres in the R-A Zone to the R-L Zone (Residential-Low Development, 1.0 to 1.5 du/acre) and 19.98 acres to the L-A-C Zone (Local Activity Center-Village Center). The basic plan was approved with 39 conditions and 11 considerations. The base residential density of the R-L Zone was approved as 818 dwelling units; the maximum residential density in the R-L Zone was approved as 1,000 dwelling units.

On March 24, 1994, the Prince George's County Planning Board reviewed and approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9306 for the subject property, known as Villages at Piscataway, as described in PGCPB Resolution No. 94-98(C). The comprehensive design plan (CDP) was

PGCPB No. 06-104
File No. DPLS-310
Page 2

approved with 36 conditions. The CDP included the entire 878.7 acres of land zoned R-L and L-A-C to be developed as a village community with a golf course component. The CDP was reconsidered by the Planning Board and approved with revised conditions on November 18, 2004.

On June 17, 2003, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan 4-03027 for The Preserve for 836 dwelling units, which includes the area that is the subject of this application. A revised Type I tree conservation plan was included in that approval

On June 24, 2004, the Planning Board approved SDP-0318. That SDP approved the lot layout, landscaping, and recreational facilities, as stated in PGCPB Resolution No. 04-135.

On January 1, 2006, the Planning Board approved SDP-0318/01 for the addition of townhomes to the approved architecture for Edelen Village of the Preserve at Piscataway. That approval was formalized in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-14, adopted February 16, 2006.

6. **Design Features:** The subject parking lot serves the community center, the competition pool, a separate tot pool, a half-basketball court and a preteen playground.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Departure from Parking and Loading Standards**—DPLS-310 requests a reduction in the parking requirement from 108 to 65 spaces. The applicant made the following arguments in favor of his request:

- Swimming pool is only open for three months of the year and during that time is used predominantly on weekend afternoons.
- The subdivision will not have a swim team.
- A number of swimmers will walk to the pool.
- The community center will be utilized in the late afternoon or evening when the swimming pool has fewer attendees or is closed.
- The meeting rooms will only be sporadically used; the larger one only in the evening.
- The 25-seat meeting room was added at the request of M-NCPPC.
- Less parking reduces impervious surface and is therefore more environmentally friendly.
- The reduction in parking allows the development of the pre-teen play area and half basketball court that can be used more months of the year than the swimming pool.

Staff has reviewed the subject request against the required findings for a departure from parking and loading spaces contained in Section 27-588(a)(8). Each required finding is listed in boldface type below and is followed by staff's comments:

PGCPB No. 06-104
File No. DPLS-310
Page 3

- (i) **The purposes of this Part (Section 27-550) will be served by the applicant's request.**

Comment: The purposes of as stated in Section 27-550 of the Zoning office are to:

- Require off-street parking and loading areas sufficient to serve the parking and loading needs of all persons associated with the buildings and uses;
- 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;
- Protect the residential character of residential areas; and
- Provide parking and loading areas that are convenient and increase amenities in the Regional District.

Urban Design staff is of the opinion that the 65 off-street parking spaces that would be provided should the departure be granted would be sufficient to serve the community building and recreation area. The facts supporting this opinion include that many people will walk from their residences to the amenities and some people will utilize two of the facilities at once. Similarly, the departure would not create traffic congestion on the public streets because the 65 parking spaces offered should be sufficient for the proposed use. By the same reasoning, granting the departure should not negatively impact residential character, as the parking provided is sufficient. Lastly, granting the departure would provide convenient parking and would certainly increase amenities by adding a pool, community building, and recreational area to the Villages at Piscataway development.

- (ii) **The departure is the minimum necessary, given the specific circumstances of the request.**

Comment: The departure is the minimum necessary as 65 is the maximum number of spaces that can be provided if the project is to fulfill its current design program including a pool, community building, and recreational area.

- (iii) **The departure is necessary in order to alleviate circumstances which are prevalent in older areas of the County which were predominantly developed prior to November 29, 1949.**

Comment: This finding is inapplicable to the subject development.

- (iv) **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; and**

Comment: All methods for calculating the number of spaces according to the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance have been used or found impractical.

PGCPB No. 06-104
File No. DPLS-310
Page 4

- (v) **Parking and loading needs of adjacent residential areas will not be infringed upon if the departure is granted.**

Comment: Since the parking offered appears to be sufficient because a number of people will walk to the facilities from their residences or will be arriving at the common area to utilize not one, but several, of the community amenities, parking and loading needs of adjacent residential areas should not be infringed upon if the departure is granted.

- d. The mandatory considerations listed in Section 27-588 are listed in bold type below and are followed by staff's comments:

- (i) **The parking and loading conditions within the general vicinity of the subject property including numbers and locations of available on-and off-street spaces within five hundred (500) feet of the subject property:**

Comment: Although staff has considered parking and loading conditions within 500 feet of the subject property, additional parking within this radius has no impact on the subject project as sufficient parking will be provided in the immediate locale of the proposed common facilities and attendees should not have to park in the surrounding area.

- (ii) **The recommendations of an Area Master Plan, or County or local revitalization plan, regarding the subject property and its general vicinity:**

Comment: Recommendations of the applicable area master plan were considered at the time of the approval of the subject specific design plan and found to be met.

- (iii) **The recommendations of a municipality (within which the property lies) regarding the departure; and**

Comment: This consideration is not applicable to the subject project, as it does not lie within the boundaries of a municipality.

- (iv) **Public parking facilities which are proposed in the County's Capital Improvement Program within the general vicinity of the property.**

Comment: There are no public parking facilities proposed in the county's Capital Improvement Program within the general vicinity of the property. Therefore, this consideration is inapplicable to the subject project.

- e. The optional considerations listed in Section 27-588 are listed in bold type below and are followed by staff's comments:

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

Comment: Public transportation is not currently available in the area. It is possible, however, that as development goes forward in the Preserve at Piscataway that bus service may be extended to it.

PGCPB No. 06-104
File No. DPLS-310
Page 5

- (ii) **Any alternative design solutions to off-street facilities which might yield additional spaces;**

Comment: The applicant in this case has considered alternative design solutions to off-street facilities but has ruled them out because of expense or impracticability.

- (iii) **The specific nature of the use (including hours of operation if it is a business) and the nature and hours of operation of other (business) uses within five hundred (500) feet of the subject property.**

Comment: The notion of shared use raised by this consideration is not in issue in the subject project.

- (iv) **In the R-30, R-30C, R-18, R-18C, R-10A, R-10, and R-H Zones, where development of multifamily dwellings is proposed, whether the applicant proposes and demonstrates that the percentage of dwelling units accessible to the physically handicapped and aged will get increased over the minimum number of units required by Subtitle 4 of the Prince George's County Code.**

Comment: The development of multifamily dwellings is not proposed in the subject project.

PGCPB No. 06-104
File No. DPLS-310
Page 6

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George=s County Code, the Prince George=s County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED Departure from the number of parking and loading spaces required DPLS-310, authorizing a reduction in the parking requirement for the subject application by 43 spaces from 108 to 65 spaces.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board=s action must be filed with the District Council for Prince George=s County, Maryland within thirty (30) days of the final notice of the Planning Board=s decision.

* * * * *

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 Eley, seconded by Commissioner Clark, with Commissioners Eley, Clark, Vaughns, Squire and Parker voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, May 4, 2006, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 1st day of June 2006.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:RG:bjs