

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board has reviewed Major Revision of Site Plan SE-3307/7 requesting an amendment to the Special Exception site plan to add a 96,800 square foot medical office building with 62 optional parking spaces beneath; a four-level 322 parking deck and a 116 space surface parking lot. A 104 space surface parking lot is also proposed as an interim use until such time as the parking deck is constructed 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 September 20, 2001 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, staff housing consisting of 18 two-bedroom and 10 one-bedroom apartments adjacent to the east boundary, and an 1,800-square-foot M.R.I. 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.
- 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 of R-R-zoned land (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 $\frac{1}{2}$ 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, 1982. 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 four-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.

3. Request: The applicant requests an amendment to the Special Exception site plan to add a 96,800-square-foot medical office building with 62 optional parking spaces beneath; a four-level, 322-space parking garage and a 116-space surface parking lot. A 104-space surface parking lot is proposed as an interim use until such time as the parking deck is constructed.

4. Neighborhood and Surrounding Uses: 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 wooded land and the Dresden Green subdivision with single-family detached homes in the R-55 Zone.

The neighborhood is dominated by single-family detached homes, but includes some retail and office uses to the northwest in the City of Greenbelt. The neighborhood was established in the District Council's 1978 approval of SE-3117 which increased the size of the subject health campus is defined by the following boundaries:

North Greenbelt Road

East Cipriano Road

South Lanham-Severn Road

West Capital Beltway (I-495)

In the center of the subject property is a two-acre lot in the R-80 Zone that is developed with a farm. This farm, which includes a residence and outbuildings, is under separate ownership and is not affiliated with the health campus.

5. **Section 27-362(a)** provides the following specific requirements for a health campus:

(a) A health campus may be permitted, subject to the following:

(1) General requirements.

- (A) The subject property shall be suitable for the integration of a hospital and other medical facilities with any proposed residences, services, and recreational facilities.**

Comment: The suitability of the site was confirmed by approval of SE-3307 in December 1981. The District Council found that the request to convert the former hospital to a health campus met the suitability requirement. The site is also suitable for the integration of the proposed medical office building and parking garage. The proposed revision will increase the ability of the health campus to serve the community.

(2) Special requirements.

- (A) The subject property shall contain at least twenty-five (25) contiguous acres, except as provided in paragraph (5), below;**

Comment: The subject property contains 33.49± contiguous acres. The applicant notes that the size of the property has changed since the last revision from 33.5979 to 33.4856 acres as a result of right-of-way dedications along the Good Luck Road and Mallery Drive frontages.

(B) The subject property shall have frontage on, and direct vehicular access to, a street with sufficient capacity to accommodate the traffic generated by the campus;

Comment: The subject property has direct access onto Good Luck Road and is served by 2 one-way driveways. Good Luck Road is a collector road. The applicant submitted a traffic study to address concerns raised during the previous revision of site plan application (ROSP-SE-3307/06). The Transportation Planning Section, in a memo dated June 19, 2001, submits 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/Mallery 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 1450 or less is deemed acceptable as per the *Guidelines*.

■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/1272	C/1183
Good Luck Road/Hanover Parkway	C/1237	C/1197
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/Mallery 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 1450 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 (6) 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.●

(C) All buildings and structures shall be located at least:

- (i) Fifty (50) feet from all adjoining property lines (except street lines); and**

Comment: Variances were granted for the required 50-foot setback in 1994. The main hospital building (labeled ■A● on the site plan) is located 42 feet from a residential parcel and a staff housing building (■J●) is located 40 feet from residential property. No additional variances from bulk regulations are needed for the proposed addition.

- (ii) Twenty-five (25) feet from all adjoining street lines;**

Comment: The use meets this requirement.

(D) All off-street parking and loading facilities shall be located at least:

- (i) Fifty (50) feet from any adjoining land in a Residential Zone, or land proposed to be used for residential**

purposes on an approved Basic Plan for a Comprehensive Design Zone, approved Official Plan for an R-P-C Zone, or any approved Conceptual or Detailed Site Plan;

- (ii) Six (6) feet from any adjoining street; and**
- (iii) Ten (10) feet from any other land than that in (i) and (ii), above;**

Comment: The use meets these requirements.

- (E) All of the parking and loading needs of employees and residents of, and visitors and delivery services to, the site shall be met on the subject property;**

Comment: A total of 1,050 parking spaces are provided on site. A total of 1,026 spaces are required, and 5 loading spaces are required and provided.

- (F) All perimeter setback areas of the site shall be buffered or screened in accordance with the provisions of the *Landscape Manual*. The applicant shall demonstrate that the required buffer yards will provide reasonable sight and sound barriers;**

Comment: The subject application is subject to the *Landscape Manual* because an increase of more than 5,000 square feet of gross floor area (GFA) is proposed. The landscape plan demonstrates compliance with the *Landscape Manual*. Alternative Compliance was granted by the District Council (Z.O. No. 6-1994) for 30 feet of the required 40-foot-wide bufferyard and 8 feet of the required building setback

along the Ripley Property near the center of the subject site. No additional landscaping is required.

- (G) Not less than forty percent (40%) of the site shall be devoted to green area; and**

Comment: The site plan indicates that 51.5 percent green area is provided.

- (H) **Regulations restricting location, height, coverage, density, frontage, and yards, of buildings and structures, as specified for the zone in which such campus is located, shall not apply to uses or structures provided for in this section. The dimensions and percentages shown on the approved site plan shall constitute the regulations for development under a given Special Exception.**

Comment: The applicant proposes very little change to the dimensions and percentages approved previously, and understands that their revised dimensions and percentages will govern the development.

- (I) **Notwithstanding Section 27-118.01, not more than one (1) building may be located on a lot containing a one-family dwelling.**

Comment: No one-family dwellings are associated with this application.

6. Parking Regulations: A total of 1,026 parking spaces are required. The site plan indicates that 1,050 parking spaces will be provided. In addition, five loading spaces are also provided as required.
7. Landscape Manual Requirements: The proposed landscape plan demonstrates compliance with the *Landscape Manual*.
8. Zone Standards: No additional variances are required.
9. Sign Regulations: No additional signs are proposed.
10. 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.**

Finding: 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.

Finding: With recommended conditions, the proposed use conforms with all the applicable requirements and regulations of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant has revised the plan to address deficiencies noted by the Information and Permit Review Section in a memo dated January 16, 2001. Conditions of approval are recommended to address traffic impacts anticipated from the construction of the proposed office building.

(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.

Finding: 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 December 21, 2000, 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.

Finding: 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. While this expansion may increase traffic, all affected intersections will continue to operate at acceptable levels of service.

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

Finding: With the conditions of approval which 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.

Finding: 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/16/97) dated February 26, 1997. The Environmental Planning Section, in a memo, submits that the TCP must be revised to show additional clearing which will occur with the addition of the proposed structures. The applicant has submitted the required revised TCP that meets the applicable Woodland Conservation Ordinance requirements (memo from Environmental Planning dated June 21, 2001).

11. **CONCLUSION:** The applicant has submitted a site plan which demonstrates compliance with the applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Based on the review of the Transportation Planning Section, it appears that the proposed medical office building will have an impact on roads. Conditions of approval have been prepared to address these impacts. The Planning Board, therefore recommends APPROVAL of the proposed revision subject to conditions.

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 to the District Council for Prince George's County, Maryland that the above-noted application be APPROVED , subject to the following conditions:

1. 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 should provide:
 - i. An exclusive left-turn lane of 180 feet, plus taper along Good Luck Road
 - ii. Acceleration and deceleration lanes

* * * * *

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 Brown, seconded by Commissioner Scott, with Commissioners Brown, Scott, Eley and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Lowe opposing the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, September 20, 2001, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 18th day of October 2001.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:JJ:rmk