

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 December 4, 2003, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-03031 for Glenmore, the Planning Board finds:

- The applicant is proposing a multifamily apartment complex on the subject site consisting of 21.11 acres. The subject site is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of MD 202 and 75<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The existing 540 distressed rental apartments on the subject property will be demolished and replaced with 409 quality rental apartment units; a clubhouse and pool will also be constructed. According to CB-58-2001, an ordinance regarding Residential Revitalization, the proposed multifamily apartment complex is a permitted use in the R-18 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—	Multifamily Residential
South—	MD 202
East—	Church and Multifamily Residential
West—	75 <sup>th</sup> Avenue

The site is within one mile of the Landover Metro station.

- Development Data Summary**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>
Zone(s)	R-18	R-18
Use(s)	Multifamily Residential	Multifamily Residential
Acreage	21.11	21.11
Lots	0	0
Parcels	1	1
Square Footage/GFA	NA	NA
No. of units	540	409

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

Two Bedroom/Two Bath	193 units (47%)
Three Bedroom/Three Bath	216 units (53%)
Total	409 units

The proposed development standards are as follows:

Lot size	920,213 sq.ft. (21.12 acres)
Net lot area	20.99 acres
Lot coverage	51 %
Lot width at front BRL (75 <sup>th</sup> Avenue)	1930.85 feet
Lot width at front street line (75 <sup>th</sup> Avenue)	1957.35 feet
Front building setback	79 feet
Side building setback	23 feet minimum
Rear building setback	30 feet
Height	43 to 53 feet
Distance between unattached multifamily buildings -	21 feet minimum
Density	19.36 du/acre
Phasing:	
Phase I	183 two bedroom units 216 three bedroom units
Total	399 units
Phase II	10 two bedroom units

A condition of approval has been added to require the applicant to provide the total percentage of green area.

3. The main entrance to the development is from 75<sup>th</sup> Avenue. 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. Multifamily residential buildings are proposed on either side of the community building. The multifamily buildings are proposed around the green areas. Parking for the multifamily buildings are proposed in front of the buildings. Some of the multifamily buildings have garages.

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 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. Recreational amenities provided around the community center include picnic tables, bike bollards, gazebos, benches and trash receptacles. One play area is proposed in the vicinity of the community center and one play area is proposed in the green area to the north of the community center.

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 and rails and balustrades on the top of the central portion of the building. The other design features include arched windows, brick watertable, vinyl siding, aluminum fascia, eaves, board and trim, and decorative wall-mounted light fixtures.

The following amenities will be provided in the community center:

Rental center  
Multi-activity room  
Lounge with kitchen  
Business center  
Computer center  
Exercise room  
Career training  
Head Start room  
Women's and Men's Lockers/Restrooms  
Swimming Pool

**Multifamily Residential Buildings** - Most of the multifamily residential 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, louver dormers, vinyl siding and trim, covered porches, and decorative columns for the main entrance.

The applicant is proposing the following multifamily residential buildings:

<b>Building Type</b>	<b>Total Provided</b>	<b>Total Number of Units in Each Building</b>	<b>Building Height</b>	<b>Total Number of Garages Provided in Each Building</b>
10-Plex	6	10 two bed/two bath	37 feet	6
12-Plex	6	12 two bed/two bath	37 feet	None
13-Plex	7	3 two bed/two bath 10 three bed/two bath	37 feet	8
18-Plex	7	4 two bed/two bath 14 three bed/two bath	46feet	8
20-Plex	3	4 two bed/two bath 16 three bed/two bath	46 feet	None

The applicant has not provided information on the total floor area of the community building, swimming pool, and the two bedroom and three bedroom residential units. 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), Section 4.3

(Parking Requirements) and Section 4.7 (Buffering Incompatible Uses) of the *Landscape Manual*. The applicant has provided landscaping that complies with the requirements of Section 4.1 of the *Landscape Manual*. Compliance with other 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 Proposed
Two bedroom/two bath 1.66 spaces per unit) for 193 dwelling units	320	299
Three bedroom/two bath 1.99 spaces per unit) for 216 dwelling units	430	401
Clubhouse	20	20
TOTAL	770	720

Loading Required	Loading Proposed
1 for multifamily dwelling with 100 to 300 units and for each additional 200 units or fraction Total required—2	0

The proposed parking for the multifamily rental units includes a combination of garage spaces, driveway spaces, and surface parking spaces. The applicant has not provided information about the adequacy of the clubhouse parking by providing a break down of the parking required for each amenity/activity in the clubhouse. If the proposed parking for the clubhouse is not adequate based on the activities in the clubhouse, some of the excess parking spaces can be credited to the clubhouse. A condition of approval has been added to require the same. Conditions of approval have also been added to provide information on the proposed number of units, development standards, and parking on the site plan cover sheet. Compliance of the proposed parking with the requirements of CB-58-2001 is discussed in Finding 7. Pursuant to Section 27-445.09(b)(4), the standard regulations do not apply to a Residential Revitalization project.

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 Glenmore 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 residential 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 standard and compact parking spaces have also been shown. The number, location and design of compact and standard parking spaces shall constitute the parking design regulations for the development.

- (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. A condition of approval has been added to require all the information on the cover sheet. This information will constitute the development regulations for this detailed site plan.

- (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.*

The required parking for the two bedroom and three bedroom units according to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance are as follows:

Two bedroom (1.66 spaces per unit);	
Total parking spaces required for 193 units	320
Three bedroom (1.99 spaces per unit)	
Total parking spaces required for 216 units	430
Total parking spaces required	750
Total parking spaces required with a 30% reduction in parking spaces	525
Total parking spaces provided for the residential units	700

According to the above requirement, allowing a 30 percent reduction in parking spaces, the applicant is required to provide 525 parking spaces. The applicant has provided an additional 175 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 the requirements of Section 4.1 and Section 4.3.c (Interior Planting) of the *Landscape Manual*. The applicant has not provided information regarding the compliance of the proposed landscaping with the requirements of Section 4.3.a (Landscape Strip Requirements) and Section 4.7 (Buffering Incompatible Uses) of the *Landscape Manual*. A condition of approval has been added to require landscape schedules that show compliance of the proposed landscaping with the above requirements of the *Landscape Manual* to the extent practical.

(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 architectural character of the proposed buildings 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 "Housing 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 Town of Landover Hills and the City of Glenarden. No comments have been received as of this date.

#### **Referral Comments**

8. The Department of Housing and Community Development (McDonough to Srinivas, October 21, 2003) has stated that the department is in favor of the proposed site plan for Glenmore apartments. The proposed site plan conforms with the Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan for Prince George's County.
9. The Department of Environmental Resources (De Guzman to Srinivas, August 28, 2003) has stated that the site plan is consistent with the approved stormwater management concept #39387-2002.
10. The Department of Public Works and Transportation (Hijazi to Srinivas, September 10, 2003) 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.
11. The Transportation Planning Section (Masog to Srinivas, October 3, 2003) has stated that since this would be a net reduction in units, transportation has no comments on the proposal and the site plan is acceptable. Any changes to the county roads will be coordinated with the Department of Public Works and Transportation.
12. The Community Planning Division (Osei to Srinivas, September 12, 2003) has stated that there are no master plan issues raised by this proposal. The subject Detailed Site Plan to redevelop the Glenmore apartments conforms to the recommendations of the 1993 *Approved Landover and Vicinity Master Plan*.
13. The Permit Review Section (Windsor to Srinivas, September 2, 2003) has stated that all development standards are to be determined during the review of the Detailed Site Plan.



14. The Subdivision Section (Chellis to Srinivas, September 12, 2003) has stated that the subject property is part of Parcel A, recorded in land records in 1963, as WWW49@7. The final plat is known as Dodge Park View, Parcels A, B and C. Parcel A on the final plat is 39.9 acres. The site plan submitted for review indicated that Parcel A is 21 acres. The applicant should provide evidence of the legal division of Parcel A or a new Preliminary Plan of Subdivision will be required to divide Parcel A into two properties. The applicant has provided evidence of the legal division of Parcel A.
15. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (Thacker to Srinivas, September 29, 2003) has stated that the onsite plans for the proposal have been reviewed.
16. The Transportation Planning Section (Shaffer to Srinivas, September 22, 2003) has stated that there are no master plan trail issues identified with the proposal. The proposed sidewalk and path network shown on the site plan will accommodate pedestrians within the subject site. The Section has required all internal paths to be a minimum of six feet wide and asphalted to the extent feasible.
17. The Environmental Planning Section (Metzger to Srinivas, August 21, 2003) has stated that there are no steep slopes, 100-year floodplains, wetlands, streams or Marlboro Clay found on the property. The soils found on the property (Elkton, Keyport, Sunnyside and Christiana) exhibit slight to moderate limitations to development. There are no rare, threatened or endangered species found on the property. No historic or scenic roads are affected by the proposal. Landover Road is a six-lane arterial and a noise generator regulated for noise impacts. The proposed use is not a noise generator. The site is exempt from the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it contains less than 10,000 square feet of woodlands and does not have a previously approved Tree Conservation Plan. A Letter of Exemption was issued by the Environmental Planning Section on April 4, 2003. The requirements for stormwater management will be met through subsequent reviews by the Department of Environmental Resources. Since Landover Road is an arterial roadway with a noise impact zone (65 dBA Ldn noise contour) extending approximately 283 feet from the centerline of the roadway, the plan should be revised to show the 65 dBA noise contour. The proposed six-foot-high berm with landscaping along Landover Road meets the requirements for noise mitigation. A condition of approval has been added requiring that the site plan be revised to show the location of the 65 dBA Ldn contour.
18. With the proposed conditions, Detailed Site Plan DSP-03013 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 DSP-03031, 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) The total percentage of green area provided.
  - (2) Total parking for the community building with a breakdown of parking for the amenities provided within the community building.
  - (3) Total floor areas for the community building and the two bedroom/two bath and three bedroom/two bath residential units.
  - (4) Proposed number of units, development standards and parking on the site plan cover sheet.
  - (5) Landscape schedules that show compliance of the proposed landscaping with the requirements of Section 4.1 (Residential Requirements, Section 4.3 (Parking Requirements) and Section 4.7 (Buffering Incompatible Uses) of the *Landscape Manual*.
  - (6) Internal paths six feet wide and asphalted to the extent possible.
  - (7) The location of the 65 dBA Ldn contour, either based on the Environmental Planning Section's noise model (283 feet from the centerline of Landover Road) or based on a Phase I noise study submitted for review.

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 Harley, seconded by Commissioner Eley, with Commissioners Harley, Eley, Vaughns, Squire and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, December 4, 2003, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 11<sup>th</sup> day of December 2003.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:LS:rmk