

C O R R E C T E D R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Detailed Site Plans pursuant to Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on October 25, 2001, regarding Detailed Site Plan SP-01039 for Windsor Crossing (Manchester Square Apartments), the Planning Board finds:

1. The applicant is proposing a condominium development on the subject site consisting of 15.96 acres (net lot area). The subject site is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Suitland Road and Eastern Lane. According to CB-58-2001, an ordinance regarding Residential Revitalization, the proposed condominium development is a permitted use in the R-10 Zone that requires a Detailed Site Plan application. The applicant has therefore filed the subject Detailed Site Plan application. The adjacent properties are as follows:

North -	Park Lane
South -	Eastern Lane and Suitland Road
East -	Townhouse development
West -	Shopping Center

The property is within a mile of the Suitland Metro Station.

2. The subject site is located within a designated Revitalization Tax Credit District. The applicant is proposing the following types of residential units:

Condominium -	95 units
Multifamily -	128 units
Multifamily (senior housing) -	125 units

The multifamily apartments and the multifamily senior housing are rental units. The condominium units are owner-occupied.

The bedroom percentages are as follows:

Senior rental units -	25 one-bedroom units
	100 two-bedroom units
Multifamily rental units -	104 two-bedroom units
	24 three-bedroom units

Condominiums - 57 three-bedroom units  
38 two-bedroom units

The total bedroom percentages are as follows:

One bedroom - 25 (7.18%)  
Two bedroom - 242 (69.5%)  
Three bedroom - 81 (23.3%)

The proposed development standards are as follows:

Lot size - 659,057 sq.ft.  
\* Lot coverage - [45.01%] 48.15%  
Lot width at front BRL - 935.55 feet  
Lot width at front street line - 962.41 feet  
Front building setback - 35 feet  
Side building setback - 15 feet minimum  
Rear building setback - 35 feet  
Height - 46 feet  
Distance between unattached  
multifamily buildings - 12 feet minimum  
\* Density - [21.8] 23 du/acre

Accessory buildings: None provided

3. The main entrance to the development is from Eastern Lane. A community center is proposed at the end of the main entrance drive. A swimming pool is proposed behind the community center and parking is proposed on either side of the community building. A multifamily building is also proposed on either side of the community building. The multifamily senior housing building is proposed behind the community center. Three multifamily buildings are proposed on either side of the senior housing building. On the west side of the main entrance, ten condominium buildings are proposed around a green area. On the east side of the main entrance, nine condominium buildings are proposed around a green area. Parking for the senior housing building is proposed in front of the building, parking for the multifamily buildings is proposed in front of each building and parking for the condominiums is proposed around the green area.

The applicant has designed the entrance to the development as a main gateway with superior landscaping, signage and median landscaping. The applicant has also provided

\*Denotes correction  
[Brackets] denote deletion  
Underlining denotes addition

extensive landscaping in front of the community building. The community building and the surrounding green area are intended to serve as the central recreational and green area for the development. The applicant has provided an adequate amount of green area around the community center to enhance its use as a focal point for the proposed development. This focal point also opens up to serve the senior housing building. A small percentage of green area has been provided in the parking area in front of the senior housing that connects to the green area around the community building.

A combination of landscaping, berms, fences and a future water feature along Suitland Road are intended to enhance the appearance of the project from Suitland Road. The buildings are located around green areas to give the appearance of a garden-style suburban appearance. Extensive landscaping has been provided on either side of the main entrance to screen the buildings and avoid privacy and noise impacts to the buildings.

The proposed development has the potential to be integrated with the surrounding uses to provide pedestrian and vehicular access to the surrounding uses from the development. An access point to Park Lane on the north and the shopping center to the west would provide convenient internal access to these areas without using Eastern Lane and Suitland Road to go to the transit stops or other amenities along these roads. Since the shopping center is yet to be redeveloped and Park Lane is at present not being used, additional access to these areas is not being considered at this time. However, these issues can be considered at a later date if a need for additional access is identified.

4. The applicant is proposing the following types of buildings:

Community Center This single-story building will be designed to serve as a focal point for the development. The main design feature for this building is a decorative entryway with a large, glazed arched door, molded columns, brick veneer chimneys, and rails and balustrades on the top of the central portion of the building. The other design features include arched windows, brick watertable, fiberglass roof shingles, aluminum fascia, eaves, board and trim, and decorative wall-mounted light fixtures.

Multifamily rental units and condominium units The 3-story 10-plex and 18-plex multifamily rental units and the condominium units will have a central entrance area with garages in the front and units at the rear. The garages serve some of the units in each building. In addition, surface parking is provided for the other units in front of the building. The design elements consist of fiberglass shingles over the ridge, vinyl siding that have the appearance of shaker shingles below the gables, louvered vents, brick base, aluminum fascia and trim, covered porch and decorative columns for the main entrance.

Senior Housing The four-story senior housing building is a U-shaped building around a central parking area. The design elements consist of fiberglass shingles over the ridge, shaker-style vinyl siding below the gables, louvered vents, brick base, aluminum fascia and trim, covered porch and decorative columns for the main entrance. The senior housing building will include various amenities like multipurpose rooms, recreational facilities, clinic, library, etc.

The applicant will be providing decorative monument signs on either side of the main entrance on Eastern Lane. No information regarding the proposed lighting has been provided. A condition of approval has been added to require the same.

5. The proposal is subject to the requirements of Section 4.1 (Residential Requirements) and Section 4.7 (Buffering Incompatible Uses) of the *Landscape Manual*. The applicant has provided landscaping that complies with most of the requirements of these sections. Compliance with the requirements of the *Landscape Manual* is discussed in Finding 7.
6. The proposed parking is shown below in comparison with the normal requirements of Section 27-582, Off-street Parking and Loading, of the Zoning Ordinance:

PARKING REQUIRED	PARKING REQUIRED	PARKING PROPOSED
Senior housing (0.66 per unit) for 125 dwelling units	82.5	50
Multifamily two-bedroom rental units (1.66 since within one mile of Metro station) for 104 units	172.6	226
Multifamily three-bedroom units (1.99 since within one mile of Metro Station) for 24 units	47.76	
Condominium two-bedroom units (1.66 since within one mile of Metro Station) for 38 units	63.08	194
Condominium three-bedroom units (1.99 since within one mile of Metro Station) for 57 units	113.43	

PARKING REQUIRED	PARKING REQUIRED	PARKING PROPOSED
Community Center based on uses in the center TOTAL	24	10
11-seat exercise room (1 per 4 seats)	3	
3 offices of 250 sq.ft. each (one for 250 sq.ft. of office space)	3	
44-seat lounge (1 per 4 seats)	11	
32-seat classroom (1 per 8 seats)	4	
24-seat classroom (1 per 8 seats)	3	
Swimming pool (none for a pool incidental to a multifamily development)	0	
TOTAL	503	480

LOADING REQUIRED	LOADING PROPOSED
1 for multifamily dwelling with 100 to 300 units	1

The proposed parking for the multifamily rental and condominium units includes a combination of garage spaces, driveway spaces and surface parking spaces. Compliance of the proposed parking with the requirements of CB-58-2001 is discussed in Finding 7.

7. The proposal must comply with the requirements of Section 27-445.09, Residential Revitalization, of the Zoning Ordinance. Section 27-445.09 was added to the Zoning Ordinance by Zoning Bill CB-58-2001 which was adopted by the District Council on September 11, 2001. The following sections of Section 27-445.09 apply to the subject proposal:

(a) *Applicability*

- (1) *Residential Revitalization, as defined in this Subtitle and permitted in the Table of Uses in Part 5, shall be limited to existing multifamily or attached one-family dwelling units that are located in a Revitalization Tax Credit District.*
- (2) *This section is not applicable to any property not currently developed with existing attached or multifamily dwelling units.*

The subject development is proposed on the property of the existing Manchester Square apartments (a multifamily residential development) which is located in a Revitalization Tax Credit District.

(b) *Requirements*

- (1) *Existing dwelling units as described in (a)(1) of this Section may be replaced by proposed multifamily, attached one-family or detached one-family dwelling units in a Residential Revitalization project.*

The existing dwelling units are being replaced by multifamily rental units, condominium units and senior housing units.

- (2) *The existing dwelling units as described in (b)(1) above shall have a minimum density of twelve (12) units per acre.*

The existing dwelling units have a minimum density of more than 12 units per acre of the net lot area.

- (3) *The number, location, and design of compact and standard parking spaces shown on the approved Detailed Site Plan shall constitute the parking design regulations for the development.*

The applicant has provided the number of proposed garage, driveway and surface parking spaces indicated in Finding 6 above. The design and details of the proposed parking spaces have also been shown. Proposed parking space sizes in the new development are the same as those set forth in Part 11 of the Zoning Ordinance.

- (4) *Regulations concerning the height of structures, lot size and coverage, frontage, setbacks, density, bedroom percentages and other requirements of the specific zone do not apply to uses and structures in a Residential Revitalization project. The dimensions and percentages shown on the approved Detailed Site Plan shall constitute the development regulations.*

The applicant has provided the development standards for height, lot size, coverage, frontage, setbacks, density, bedroom percentages, etc., for the proposed development as part of the Detailed Site Plan. Several of the standards are shown in Finding 2 above.

- (5) *The normal parking requirement shall be reduced by thirty percent (30%). An additional reduction may be allowed upon a determination that:*
  - (A) *An additional reduction is necessary to alleviate conditions that are particular to the proposed use, given its nature at this location, or to alleviate conditions which are prevalent in older areas of the County which were predominately developed prior to November 29, 1949;*
  - (B) *The additional reduction will not infringe upon the parking and loading needs of adjacent residential areas.*

Five hundred and three parking spaces are normally required for the proposed development. The applicant has provided 480 parking spaces. A 30 percent reduction of the required 506 parking spaces results in a requirement of 354 parking spaces. The applicant is required to provide 354 parking spaces. The applicant has provided an additional 123 parking spaces. Therefore, the proposed parking complies with the above requirement.

- (6) *The project shall comply with the requirements of the Landscape Manual to the extent that is practical.*

The proposal is subject to the requirements of Section 4.1 (Residential Requirements) and Section 4.7 (Buffering Incompatible Uses) of the *Landscape Manual*. The applicant has provided landscaping that complies with most of the requirements (almost 75 percent) of these sections. There is adequate space on the subject property to provide landscaping that fully complies with the *Landscape Manual* requirements. Full compliance will further enhance the appearance of this development and provide adequate screening for the subject property. A condition of approval has been added to require full compliance with the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.

- (c) *Findings*  
*In approving a Residential Revitalization project, the Planning Board shall find that the project:*
  - (1) *Improves a deteriorated or obsolete multifamily or attached one-family dwelling unit development by replacing or rehabilitating dwellings,*

*improving structures, or renovating and improving other facilities;*

The applicant in collaboration with Prince George=s County is proposing to demolish the existing deteriorating apartment building and build an improved multifamily development with adequate landscaping and amenities within the development.

- (2) *Maintains or improves the architectural character of the buildings so that they are compatible with surrounding properties;*

The proposed development is one of the first redevelopment projects in this revitalization area. The architectural character of the building will be superior to the existing buildings in the neighborhood. The proposed architecture will set the standard for development in the neighborhood.

- (3) *Serves a need for housing in the neighborhood or community;*

The proposed development will serve the housing needs of the community because it will replace the existing apartments with improved housing for the residents of the community.

- (4) *Benefits project residents and property owners in the neighborhood;*

The proposed development will be an improvement over the existing development. It will benefit the project residents by providing them various on-site amenities and it will help the redevelopment of the properties in the neighborhood.

- (5) *Conforms with the housing goals and priorities as described in the current >Housing and Community Development Consolidated Plan= for Prince George=s County;*

The Department of Housing and Community Development supports the Detailed Site Plan and has stated that the proposal conforms with the housing goals and priorities as described in the current AHousing and Community Development Consolidated Plan@ for Prince George=s County.

- (6) *Conforms to either specific land use recommendations or principles and guidelines for residential development within the applicable Master Plan.*

The proposed development conforms with the Master Plan recommendations for a multifamily residential development on the subject property.



*d. Site Plans*

- (1) *A Detailed Site Plan shall be approved for all Residential Revitalization, in accordance with Part 3, Division 9, of this subtitle*

The applicant has filed the subject Detailed Site Plan application

- (2) *Site plan review shall include the approval of architectural elements including but not limited to building materials, typical building elevations, signs and outdoor lighting.*

The site plan review for the subject Detailed Site Plan includes the approval of architectural elements, signs and outdoor lighting.

*(e) Mandatory Referrals*

*After the Planning Board accepts an application for processing, copies shall be referred for review and comment to the County=s Department of Housing and Community Development, any municipality whose boundaries are located within one-half mile of the project and any other agencies determined by the Planning Director.*

Referral copies were sent to the county Department of Housing and Community Development. No municipalities are located within one-half mile of the project.

Referral Comments

8. The Department of Housing and Community Development (Farrar to Srinivas, August 27, 2001) has stated that the department is in favor of the legislation and the Detailed Site Plan.
9. The Department of Environmental Resources (De Guzman to Srinivas, August 28, 2001) has stated that the site does not have an approved stormwater management concept plan. A condition of approval has been added to require the same.
10. The Redevelopment Authority (Greene to Srinivas, September 4, 2001) has stated that the Redevelopment Authority is in favor of the legislation and the detailed site plan as submitted.
11. The State Highway Administration (McDonald to Srinivas, September 3, 2001) has stated

that they have no objections to this proposal.

12. The Department of Public Works and Transportation (Hijazi to Srinivas, September 10, 2001) has stated that all improvements within the rights-of-way must be in accordance with the county Road Ordinance, DPW&T specifications and standards, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.
13. The Transportation Planning Section (Masog to Srinivas, August 22, 2001) has stated that they have no objections to the proposal. The circulation is acceptable and the new housing replaces existing multifamily housing.
14. The Community Planning Division (Osei to Srinivas, August 27, 2001) has stated that there are no master plan issues raised by this proposal.
15. The Permit Review Section (Windsor to Srinivas, August 31, 2001) has requested minor clarifications regarding the site plan. The applicant has provided the clarifications.
16. The Subdivision Section (Del Balzo to Srinivas, August 23, 2001) has stated that the proposal is exempt from the Subdivision Regulations as per Section 24-111 (c)(4). The division has stated (Hirsch to Warfel, June 27, 2001) that the property is currently fully developed. The applicant will be replacing the existing apartments with a multifamily development. The applicant can consolidate the existing four lots to a single lot and establish a condominium regime as a minor subdivision that does not require the filing of a Preliminary Plan. The consolidation plat will also need to reference the current conformance to Section 24-111 (c)(4) that exempts the property from the Subdivision Regulations.
17. The Environmental Planning Section (Finch to Srinivas, August 30, 2001) has stated that the property is exempt from the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. A letter of exemption must be obtained from the section. The applicant has obtained a letter of exemption. A stormwater management concept approval letter is required. A condition of approval has been added to require the same.
18. The Department of Environmental Resources (De Guzman to Srinivas, August 28, 2001) has stated that the subject site does not have a concept stormwater management approval.
19. With the proposed conditions, the Detailed Site Plan, SP-01039, is found to represent a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

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 the Detailed Site Plan for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the Detailed Site Plan:
  - a. The site/grading and landscape plans shall be revised to show:
    - (1) A lighting plan and details of proposed lighting fixtures
    - (2) Landscape schedules that show compliance with Section 4.1 (Residential Requirements) and Section 4.7 (Buffering Incompatible Uses) of the *Landscape Manual*.
  - b. The applicant shall obtain stormwater management concept approval from the Department of Environmental Resources.

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 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 Scott, with Commissioners Eley, Scott, Brown, Lowe and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, October 25, 2001, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 25th day of October 2001.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin

PGCPB No. 01-213(C)  
File No. DSP-01039  
Page 12

Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:LS:rmk