



Note: Staff reports can be accessed at www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm.

Preliminary Plan 4-05082

Application	General Data
Project Name: SPRINGHILL LAKE Location: Southeast of Cherrywood Lane, southwest of the Capital Beltway, northwest of Edmonston Road, and north of Breezewood Drive in Greenbelt Applicant/Address: Springhill Lake Partnership 15800 Crabbs Branch Way, Suite #250 Rockville, MD 20855 Attn. David Douglas	Date Accepted: 01/04/06
	Planning Board Action Limit: 06/03/06
	Plan Acreage: 165.08
	Zone: M-U-I/DDO
	Lots: 341
	Parcels: 59
	Planning Area: 67
	Tier: Developed
	Council District: 04
	Municipality: Greenbelt
	200-Scale Base Map: 211NE05/06

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
MIXED-USE: TOWNHOUSE/MULTIFAMILY/LIVEWORK WITH A TOTAL OF 5,800 DWELLING UNITS	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: 10/04/05 (CB-58-2003)
	Sign(s) Posted on Site and Notice of Hearing Mailed: 04/25/06

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Whitney Chellis	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
		X	

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05082
Springhill Lake Lots 1-341 and 59 parcels

OVERVIEW

At the writing of this staff report, in accordance with Section 24-122.01(e)(2) of the Subdivision Regulations, staff is compelled to recommend disapproval of the subject application, as discussed further in Finding 2 of this report, due to inadequate Fire/EMS Department staffing levels. Of note is that in addition to inadequate staffing levels there are a number of other outstanding issues.

The property is located in the City of Greenbelt, and is located within the limits of the approved sector plan and section map amendment for the Greenbelt Metro Area (CR-63-2001). The application is for the redevelopment of Springhill Lake, an existing rental-housing complex constructed in the 1960s, consisting of 2,889 dwelling units, and a public school site (Springhill Lake Elementary School). The proposal is to raze all of the existing development and construct a total of 5,800 dwelling units consisting of townhouses, multifamily, live/work dwelling units, and a minimum of 15,000 square feet of mixed-use retail. The proposed dwelling units are to be a mix of rental and for sale units.

The subject property received District Council approval with conditions of the required conceptual site plan (CSP-05001) on January 27, 2006, to redevelop the existing apartment complex and school site if agreed to by the Board of Education. With the approval of CSP-05001 the District Council rezoned the property to the M-U-I/D-D-O Zone, from the R-18 and C-A Zones. CSP-05001 was approved with 39 conditions that include a requirement that prior to the approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision the applicant would demonstrate the intent of the Board of Education to transfer interest in the existing School Board property to the applicant for redevelopment. Also required is that the preliminary plan shall address mandatory dedication of parkland requirements. In general, specific public recreational facilities are required on site to be constructed by the applicant for conveyance to the City of Greenbelt upon their agreement. At the writing of this staff report the applicant has not obtained agreement from the Board of Education or the concurrence of the City of Greenbelt. Individually these issues are substantive to the staff recommendation resulting in a recommendation of disapproval of the preliminary plan of subdivision.

The subject property is located on Tax Map 26, Grids A-4, B-2, B-3, B-4, C-3 and C-4, and is known as Parcels 1-7, 9-14, and 60. The referral comments received to date are attached for informational purposes.

SETTING

The subject property is located southeast of Cherrywood Lane, southwest of the Capital Beltway (I-95/I-495), northwest of Edmonston Road, and north of Breezewood Drive in Greenbelt. Beltway Plaza

Shopping Center abuts the site to the south; to the north is the Capital Beltway (I-495); to the east is Edmonston Road and existing office; to the west is Cherrywood Lane and the existing City of Greenbelt Recreational Center. Beyond Cherrywood Lane to the west is the Greenbelt Metro Station and the proposed Greenbelt Metro Center, a Planned Metro Community with an approved conceptual site plan (CSP-01008).

FINDINGS AND REASONS FOR STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. **Development Data Summary**—The following information relates to the subject preliminary plan application and the proposed development.

Zone	EXISTING M-U-I/DDO	PROPOSED M-U-I/DDO
Use(s)	Multifamily and school	Townhouses/ multifamily/ mixed use
Acreage	165.08	165.08
Lots	0	341
Parcels	12	59
Dwelling Units:		
Townhouse	0	253
Multifamily	2,899 (to be razed)	5,499
Live-work units	0	48 (TH/retail)
Public Safety Mitigation Fee		No

2. **Fire and Rescue**—The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed this subdivision plan for adequacy of fire and rescue services in accordance with Section 24-122.01(d) and Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(B)-(E) of the Subdivision Ordinance. The subject application was accepted on January 4, 2006.

The Prince George's County Planning Department has determined that this preliminary plan is within the required seven-minute response time for the first due fire station, Bowie, Company 19, using the 7 Minute Travel Times and Fire Station Locations Map provided by the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department.

The Fire Chief report for adequate equipment is contained in a memorandum dated March 28, 2006. That memorandum states that the "...Department has adequate equipment and has developed an equipment replacement program to meet all the service delivery needs for all areas of the County."

The Fire Chief report for current staffing for the Fire/EMS Department is contained in a memorandum dated March 28, 2006. That memorandum states that the number of "net operational employees" is 672, which equates to 96.97 percent of the authorized strength of 692 fire and rescue personnel.

As previously noted, the subject application was accepted on January 30, 2006. Section 24-122.01(e)(2) of the Subdivision Regulations state: "If any of the required statements in this Subsection are not provided that meet the criteria specified in this Section on the date the application is accepted by the Planning Board or within the following three (3) monthly cycles of response time reports, then the Planning Board may not approve the preliminary pla[n] until a mitigation plan between the applicant and the County is entered into and filed with the Planning Board."

One key element to the ordinance language cited above is the creation of a window for the application of the fire and rescue adequacy test that runs from "...the date the application is accepted by the Planning Board or within the following three (3) monthly cycles of response time reports...." This means that an application is afforded the opportunity to pass the test in a time frame that spans approximately 90 days. With regard to data on fire and rescue staffing levels prior to the receipt of the March 28, 2006, letter from the Fire Chief, some clarity needs to be provided.

Since January 1, 2006 (the beginning of the time frame when the standard of 100 percent of the authorized strength of 692 fire and rescue personnel must be met), staff has received four memorandums from the Fire Chief (January 1, February 1, March 5, and March 28, 2006). The data presented in these four memorandums varies in the description of the personnel being counted as applicable to the percentage of the authorized strength standard. While the number of personnel presented varies only slightly (694, 694, 696 and 693 respectively), the description of the status of these personnel has changed or been clarified from memorandum to memorandum.

It seems clear to staff that since the beginning of 2006, each reporting of personnel has included certain numbers of trainees and/or recruits that were not intended to be considered applicable to the minimum percentage requirement. This becomes apparent when comparing the January 1 and February 1 memorandums. Both reflect a total authorized strength of 694 personnel, but the February 1 memorandum identifies 46 members of that complement in the training academy. The March 5 memorandum does not provide a breakdown of the 696 personnel total, but the March 28 memorandum identifies 21 recruits as part of the "Actual total strength" of 693.

Given the totality of the information identified above, staff concludes that since the acceptance of the subject application, the minimum staffing level for fire and rescue personnel, as required by Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(B)(ii), has not been met. Therefore, pursuant to Section 24-122.01(e)(2), staff is compelled to recommend disapproval of the subject application at this point in time.

RECOMMENDATION

DISAPPROVAL DUE TO INADEQUATE FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICES PURSUANT TO SECTION 24-122.01(e) OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS.