

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board has reviewed ROSP SE-3307/07 requesting revisions to the approved special exception site plan 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 April 17, 2003, the Prince George's County Planning Board finds:

- A. Location and Field Inspection:** The subject property is located on the north side of Good Luck Road, 100 feet east of its intersection with Hanover Parkway. The subject property is an irregularly shaped parcel situated in the midst of an established residential community. The topography contains steep slopes and generally slopes downgrade to Good Luck Road. The highest elevation is reached at approximately the site of the hospital and slopes slightly downgrade toward the rear (north). The property is improved with a 274-bed, 240,280-square-foot hospital, a 7,500-square-foot medical building directly north of the hospital, a 167-bed nursing home south of the hospital and an 1,800-square-foot MRI building. A recently constructed parking garage and additional surface parking lots are located adjacent to the above-described uses. Also, there is an existing 910-square-foot house and a 960-square-foot shed in proximity to Mallery Drive, set back 205 and 217 feet, respectively, from the south boundary adjacent to Good Luck Road. Another single-family detached dwelling and associated grounds are located in the eastern portion of the site and are not part of this application. The remainder of the site contains landscaping and woodlands.

The property is surrounded by the following uses:

North—Across Brae Brook Drive is a PEPCO right-of-way and single-family homes in the R-55 Zone.

East—The Magnolia Elementary School and Magnolia Spring subdivision with single-family detached homes in the R-80 Zone. Across Mallery Drive is a church in the R-80 Zone.

South—Across Good Luck Road is Washington Bible College in the R-80 Zone.

West—A PEPCO right-of-way in the R-R Zone, undeveloped woodland and the Dresden Green subdivision with single-family detached homes in the R-55 Zone.

- B. History:** The subject property was classified in the R-80 Zone by adoption of the 1990 Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt Sectional Map Amendment. Special Exception No. 730, approved June 14, 1962, allowed the construction of a 104-bed nursing home on 5.3" acres (Lot 4 of Magnolia Springs). Special Exception No. 1120, approved November 8, 1965, allowed the applicant to establish a 200-bed proprietary hospital with associated required off-street parking. A revised site

plan for Special Exception No. 1120 was approved January 5, 1978, to permit the construction of additions to the emergency, operating and boiler rooms for a total of 7,298.8 square feet.

Special Exception No. 3117 (September 11, 1978) was a request for an enlargement of Special Exception No. 1120. The requested use was for a 100-bed addition to the hospital, a 63-bed addition to the nursing home, additions to the laundry and hospital offices, a staff nursery, an ambulatory care center, a parking structure and a 100,000-square-foot medical office building. The hospital and nursing office space was approved; however, the staff nursery, ambulatory care center and the medical office building were denied.

On December 4, 1980, a Minor Change application was approved by the Planning Board permitting a 37,000-square-foot addition for office space, subject to a condition that the site plan be amended to delete 16 parking spaces along the eastern side of the existing driveway.

On December 1, 1981, the District Council approved SE-3307, a request to convert the previously approved 24"-acre hospital to a health campus in accordance with Section 27-362(c) of the Zoning Ordinance. That action also approved the addition of 7,400 square feet of office space, an 11,200-square-foot addition to the west end of the hospital, and 38 staff housing units.

On April 7, 1982, the District Council approved a revision to Special Exception No. 3307, adding five acres to the health campus approved on December 1, 1981. No additional improvements were proposed at that time.

On June 10, 1985, the District Council approved a request to construct a 960-square-foot storage shed (existing), which was intended to replace an assortment of smaller sheds. The Council also approved a request to relocate 101 parking spaces to the north of the office addition and a correction to the site plan to illustrate the location of an existing single-family dwelling on Mallery Drive.

On March 9, 1987, the District Council approved a request to revise the site plan to construct a freestanding, 1,800-square-foot, one-story medical building in the southeastern portion of the site. On January 24, 1994, the District Council approved a revision of site plan (ROSP-SE-3307/4, Zoning Ordinance No. 6-1994), for these purposes: to add a 4-story, 44,000-square-foot addition to the northwest corner of the existing hospital, to house a main lobby, an outpatient physical therapy wing, a surgery suite, an emergency department and pre- and post-surgery care units, plus 20 more emergency room parking spaces, one more loading space, as well as a redesigned parking lot.

On January 9, 1997, the District Council approved a revision of site plan (ROSP-SE-3307/5) to enlarge the hospital building to provide 24 additional beds in the ICU, and eliminate 24 standard beds and reduce the medical office space.

On January 13, 2000, the District Council approved a Revision of Site Plan (ROSP-SE-3307/06) for conversion of an existing parking garage to an emergency department and for the provision of 16 additional parking spaces.

The seventh revision of this site plan was originally filed in December 2000 as a major revision of site plan. The proposed revisions requested at that time are similar to the current application. A technical staff report was prepared that recommended approval (with conditions) of these revisions. The Zoning Hearing Examiner, however, recessed the case in February 2002 to allow the application to be refilled and reviewed under new legislation (Council Bill 21-2002). The application was refilled to request a review under the newly created “optional method of amending a site plan” on February 4, 2003.

- C. **Master Plan Recommendation:** The Master Plan for Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt recommends public or quasi-public use for the subject property, in recognition of its current use as a health campus.
- D. **Request:** The applicant originally requested an amendment to the Special Exception site plan to add a 98,000-square-foot medical office building; a four-level, 370-space parking garage; and a 115-space surface parking lot. The applicant has revised the request to provide a 72,000-square-foot medical office building and a four-level, 370-space parking garage. The 115-space surface parking lot has been eliminated from the applicant’s request.
- E. **Specific Special Exception Requirements:** Section 27-362(6)(A) provides that “Notwithstanding other provisions of this Subtitle concerning revision of site plans, requests to amend a site plan for a health campus shall only be approved by the Planning Board under paragraph 27-362(a)(7)...”

(7) **Optional Method of Amending Site Plan.**

- (A) **Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 27-362(a)(6), the procedures in this paragraph 27-362(a)(7) may be followed, at the applicant's option, to amend a Special Exception Site Plan for a health campus approved before January 1, 1982, if the application involves at least ten (10) but no more than fifteen (15) acres; if the lots or parcels which are the subject of the application contain a hospital; if all site plan amendments are confined to those lots or parcels; and if the amendments meet all requirements in this paragraph.**

The proposed revision to the approved site plan is eligible for the optional method of amending the plan. District Council approved SE-3307, a request to convert the previously approved 24-acre hospital to a health campus on December 1, 1981. The application involves new construction on 13.64 acres of land, which is confined to the parcel containing a hospital. The entire hospital campus, however, is 33.48 acres.

- (B) **The applicant shall meet all filing requirements for site plan amendments under paragraph (6). The application shall be accepted for processing if it is signed by the owner of the subject lots or parcels where the hospital is located and the improvements will be built.**

The subject application meets all filing requirements for site plan amendments under paragraph (6) and has been signed by the owner of the lot where the hospital and proposed improvements are located.

(C) Proposed site plan amendments under this paragraph (7) shall meet the following requirements:

(i) Amendments may not reduce any setbacks required in this Subtitle or the Landscape Manual;

The proposed site plan does not reduce any setbacks required in the Zoning Ordinance or the *Landscape Manual*. Staff notes, however, that Alternative Compliance (AC-94006) was previously granted to reduce the required 40-foot-wide landscaped strip to 10 feet along the western property line of the Ripley property (located near the center of the hospital site). The AC application also reduced the required 50-foot building setback by 8 feet.

(i) The site plan as amended shall show compliance with all parking and loading requirements in Part 11;

The parking schedule provided on the site plan indicates that a minimum of 1,026 parking spaces are required for the subject health campus. The proposed number of parking spaces is 1,080 spaces. However, with the recent amendment reducing the medical office building to 72,000 square-feet, a total of 896 parking spaces will be required. In addition, the elimination of the 115-space surface parking lot reduces the total spaces provided to 965. To ensure that all parking spaces meet the design requirements, the site plan should provide details for a typical standard and handicap space for the proposed garage. The site plan must also be revised to reflect the recent amendments made by the applicant. In addition, five loading spaces are provided as required.

(ii) Amendments may not reduce the greenspace on the subject lots or parcels below twenty percent (20%) of the area of the subject lots or parcels, but if site plan amendments reduce the greenspace on the subject lots, then the greenspace requirement on all property covered by the Special Exception shall also be reduced to twenty percent (20%); and

The proposed revision provides 24.5 percent greenspace on the subject lots. Green space on the entire 33-acre site is 59.2 percent.

- (iii) **Amendments may show the following improvements only: additions to the hospital building; one medical office building; and parking structures required for the hospital or office building;**

The proposed amendment involves one medical office building and parking structures required for the hospital or office building.

- F. **Landscape Manual Requirements:** The proposed landscape plan, with the inclusion of previously approved AC-94006, demonstrates compliance with the *Landscape Manual*.
- G. **Zone Standards:** No additional variances are required.
- H. **Sign Regulations:** No additional signs are proposed.
- I. **Required Findings:**

Section 27-317(a) of the Zoning Ordinance provides that a special exception may be approved if:

- (1) **The proposed use and site plan are in harmony with the purposes of this Subtitle.**

The proposed use and site plan are in harmony with the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance. These purposes as set forth in Section 27-102, seek generally to protect and promote the health, safety, morals, comfort, convenience and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the county. The proposed expansion will enhance the ability of the health campus to provide medical services to the community.

- (2) **The proposed use is in conformance with all the applicable requirements and regulations of this Subtitle.**

With recommended conditions, the proposed use conforms to all the applicable requirements and regulations of the Zoning Ordinance

- (3) **The proposed use will not substantially impair the integrity of any validly approved Master Plan or Functional Master Plan, or in the absence of a Master Plan or Functional Map Plan, the General Plan.**

The proposed use will not substantially impair the integrity of the 1989 Approved Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt Master Plan, which recommends public/quasi-public use for the site. The Community Planning Division, in a memo

dated February 6, 2003, submits that the proposed revision does not raise any master plan issues.

(4) The proposed use will not adversely affect the health, safety or welfare of residents or workers in the area.

With the recommended conditions, the proposed use will not adversely affect the health, safety or welfare of residents or workers in the area. This expansion of the hospital facilities will make it a more accessible place where residents can accommodate their medical needs.

In a memo dated March 11, 2003, the Transportation Planning Section submitted the following comments:

“On April 2, 2001, staff received a traffic study in support of the proposed amended site plan. The study identified the following intersections as the ones on which the proposed development would have the most impact:

EXISTING CONDITIONS		
Intersection	(LOS/CLV) AM	(LOS/CLV) PM
MD 193/Hanover Parkway	C/1256	C/1161
Good Luck Road/Hanover Parkway	B/1140	B/1018
Good Luck Road/Cipriano Road	A/942	A/966
Good Luck Road/Hospital Entrance A**	27.8 sec.	40.4 sec.
Good Luck Road/Hospital Entrances B**	22.7 sec.	21.4 sec.
Good Luck Road/Mallory Drive**	n/a	23.2 sec.
**Unsignalized intersections are analyzed using the highway capacity software. The results show the level of service and the intersection delay measured in seconds/vehicle. A Level-of-Service E, which is deemed acceptable, corresponds to a maximum delay of 50 seconds/car. For signalized intersections, a CLV of 1,450 or less is deemed acceptable as per the <i>Guidelines</i> .		

“Citing trip generation rates from the *Guidelines For The Analysis Of The Traffic Impact Of Development Proposals*, the study has indicated that the proposed development will be adding 276 AM peak-hour trips and 368 PM peak-hour trips. In addition to the proposed expansion, the study also included 15,900 square feet of unbuilt hospital space that was the subject of a previous special exception approval. Finally, the study assumed a growth rate of 2 percent and 1 percent per year for through traffic volumes along MD 193 and Good Luck Road, respectively.

Combining the site-generated traffic along with the future expansion to the hospital, the following results were determined:

TOTAL CONDITIONS		
Intersection	(LOS/CLV) AM	(LOS/CLV) PM
MD 193/Hanover Parkway	C/1,272	C/1,183
Good Luck Road/Hanover Parkway	C/1,237	C/1,197
Good Luck Road/Cipriano Road	A/954	B/1018
Good Luck Road/Hospital Entrance A**	296.9 sec.	923.5 sec.
Good Luck Road/Hospital Entrances B**	25.1 sec.	23.5 sec.
Good Luck Road/Mallory Drive**	N/A	25.2 sec.
**Unsignalized intersections are analyzed using the highway capacity software. The results show the level of service and the intersection delay measured in seconds/vehicle. A Level-of-Service E, which is deemed acceptable, corresponds to a maximum delay of 50 seconds/vehicle. For signalized intersections, a CLV of 1,450 or less is deemed acceptable as per the <i>Guidelines</i> .		

“The traffic study was referred to the State Highway Administration (SHA) and the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) for review and comment. Of the six intersections analyzed, only the MD 193/Hanover Parkway intersection falls within the jurisdiction of SHA. SHA, in its review, was in general agreement with the study findings regarding that intersection. DPW&T, however, identified some operational problems along Good Luck Road at the main entrance (entrance A) to the hospital complex. In order to ameliorate these problems, DPW&T recommends the following:

“At the main entrance on Good Luck Road, the applicant should provide:

- “An exclusive left-turn lane of 180 feet, plus taper along Good Luck Road.
- “Acceleration and deceleration lanes, lengths to be determined by DPW&T.

“The applicant should also submit to DPW&T a traffic signal warrant study, **AND**, if deemed necessary by DPW&T, install said signal.”

- (5) **The proposed use will not be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties or the general neighborhood.**

With the recommended conditions of approval to address traffic impact, the proposed use will not be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties or the general neighborhood.

(6) The proposed site plan is in conformance with an approved Tree Conservation Plan.

The subject property is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it is more than 40,000 square feet in size and contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodland. There is a previously approved Tree Conservation Plan (TCP II/16/97). The latest revision is dated January 21, 1999. The Environmental Planning Section, in a referral reply dated March 6, 2003, notes that the application is in conformance with previously approved TCP II /16/97.

J. Additional Findings:

1. Members of the Wallbrook Civic Association and an adjacent property owner requested a continuance of the public hearing. The citizens testified that signs were not posted on the property and notices were not sent to Parties of Record in a timely manner. The record however, showed that two sets of signs were posted in February and April 2003 along all street frontages. In addition, the Technical Staff Report, which also provides notice, was mailed to Parties of Record in accordance Zoning Ordinance requirements. The Planning Board believes that the fact that the citizens were in attendance was further proof of notification.
2. The Planning Board also found that the subject application is essentially the same case that was before them over a year ago. The adjacent property owner in attendance at the public hearing on April 17, 2003, was also at both the Planning Board and Zoning Hearing Examiner hearings (and gave testimony) over a year ago for this case. The facts before the Board at this public hearing (on April 17, 2003) suggest that this property owner is familiar with the subject application and was duly notified.

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 recommends APPROVAL the above-noted application, subject to the following conditions as revised at the public hearing:

1. Prior to signature approval, the site plan shall be revised to include the following:
 - a. At the main entrance to the medical campus on Good Luck Road, the applicant shall provide:
 - (1) An exclusive left-turn lane of 180 feet, plus taper along Good Luck Road.

- (2) Acceleration and deceleration lanes, lengths to be determined by DPW&T.
 - b. The site plan shall provide details for typical standard and handicap parking spaces for the proposed garage.
 - c. The size of the proposed medical office building shall be reduced from 98,000-square-feet to 72,000-square-feet of gross floor area.
 - d. The parking schedule shall correctly reflect the minimum number of required parking spaces for the reduction in size of the proposed medical office building.
 - e. The proposed 115-space surface parking lot shall be removed from the plan.
2. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall submit a traffic signal warrant study AND, if deemed to be necessary by DPW&T, install said signal.

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 Lowe, seconded by Commissioner Scott, with Commissioners Lowe, Scott, Eley and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, April 17, 2003, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 15th day of May 2003.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:JJ:rmk