



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

Preliminary Plan 4-08022

Application	General Data	
Project Name: Quincy Manor	Date Accepted:	01/29/09
	Planning Board Hearing Date:	03/19/09
	Plan Acreage:	17.04
Location: North and south on Newton Street, Madison Way and 54 th Avenue, approximately 200 feet from the intersection of Quincy Street and 55 th Avenue.	Zone:	R-18/R-35
	Gross Floor Area:	N/A
	Lots:	411
Applicant/Address: Quincy Manor Company, Inc. Monroe Gardens Co., Inc. 8609 Second Avenue, Ste. 502 Silver Spring, MD 20910	Parcels:	7
	Planning Area:	69
	Tier:	Developed
Property Owner: Quincy Manor Company, Inc.	Council District:	05
	Municipality:	N/A
	200-Scale Base Map:	205NE05

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
RECONSIDERATION HEARING: The preliminary plan was approved by the Planning Board on December 4, 2008 and the Resolution was adopted on January 8, 2009. Norman D. Rivera of Rifkin, Livingston, Levitan and Silver, LLC; by letter dated January 23, 2009, requested a Reconsideration of Conditions No. 12 and 14g (PGCPB Resolution No. 08-178). On February 19, 2009, the Planning Board granted the applicants request and scheduled the hearing for March 19, 2009.	Previous Parties of Record: 02/23/09

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

March 9, 2009

MEMORANDUM

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board

FROM: Whitney Chellis, Planner Coordinator, Subdivision Section

SUBJECT: Reconsideration of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision
Quincy Manor 4-08022

On February 19, 2008, the Planning Board granted the applicants request for the reconsideration of the above referenced preliminary plan of subdivision. The preliminary plan was approved by the Planning Board on December 4, 2008, and the approval (PGCPB Resolution No. 08-178) was adopted on January 8, 2009. The preliminary plan approval was for 411 townhouse lots and seven parcels to be developed as a Residential Revitalization Development.

The applicant has requested the reconsideration of two conditions which require specific standards to be met at the time of detailed site plan which relate to parking. The findings and conditions relating to these two conditions (PGCPB Resolution No. 08-178) were recommended by the Urban Design Section based on their experience in dealing with urban type townhouse communities, and was not related to typical suburban parking requirements as originally indicated by the applicant. Staff recognizes that this site is an urban like setting. However, this property is not highly served by transit and is not located at or near a metro stop, which if it were could reduce the need for parking.

The Planning Board raised concerns about the adequacy of parking at the time of the preliminary plan review because parking, as a land use, is very consumptive. The lotting pattern and density proposed on the preliminary plan may have an impact on the applicant's ability to provide adequate parking. In this case, the proposed lotting pattern is very tightly arranged which was discussed at great length at the Planning Board hearing for this case on December 4, 2008. By not planning for parking, the applicant reaches a lot yield at the time of the preliminary plan on which the applicant will rely, and that may not be attainable at the time of DSP. It was the intent to raise this issue with the preliminary plan of subdivision and not wait until the review of the DSP, so that it could be properly considered by the applicant in the preparation of the detailed site plan.

However, unique to the Residential Revitalization use as defined by CB-58-2001, the detailed site plan (DSP) will establish the parking standards for this revitalization project. The applicant raised the issue of timing in the evaluation of the parking. Specifically, that conditions relating to required parking

with the preliminary plan of subdivision are premature and should be considered with the detailed site plan.

Given the Zoning Ordinance language of 27-445.10, staff agrees with the applicant that Conditions 12 and 14g (as follows) may be considered premature as part of the preliminary plan approval. Specifically,

12. **The submission of the detailed site plan shall include floor plans of the proposed units to demonstrate that each parking space within a garage is a standard-sized space (at least 9.5 feet wide by 19 feet long).**
14. **The detailed site plan shall demonstrate the following standards:**
 - g. **In addition to on-street parking that may be permitted along public streets by DPW&T, the plan shall demonstrate that each pod of development provides a minimum of one independent surface parking space for each ten townhouse units within that pod (required parking spaces rounded up). The boundaries between the seven pods of development are defined by the public rights-of-way.**

However, staff does believe that findings that relate to available land area for parking is an appropriate discussion to occur with the preliminary plan as it relates to uses on the site which may impact the applicants ability to obtain the number of lots (411) approved with the preliminary plan of subdivision. Guidance in the form of an additional finding in the preliminary plan resolution, may be appropriate to convey the Planning Board's intent of these two conditions as they would apply to the detailed site plan submittal. The additional findings may provide the applicant with guidance in designing their detailed site plan as originally intended with these two conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt all of the findings and conditions contained in the original action (PGCPB Resolution No. 08-178) as now modified by the deletion of Conditions 12 and 14g, and as supplemented by the following modifications to existing Finding 8:

Additions are **(underlined)** and deletions are **[bracketed]**.

8. **Parking**

The parking provisions assumed by the applicant's design do not appear to be adequate for the needs of the development. Although Section 27-445.10 of the Zoning Ordinance, Residential Redevelopment Regulations, allows for the reduction of parking requirements from the normal standards of the Zoning Ordinance, the **detailed site** plan should still demonstrate that parking is adequate for the needs of the development. The design proposed by the applicant **[appears to be particularly]** **may be** liable to parking shortages. Dense townhouse developments elsewhere in the county that provide the Zoning Ordinance's minimum amount of parking (2.04 parking spaces per dwelling unit) have been the subject of frequent complaints due to parking shortages. The preliminary plan proposed by the applicant utilizes primarily 15-foot-wide and 18-foot-wide townhouse lots; the smaller lots could accommodate traditional one-car garages and the larger lots could possibly accommodate standard two-car garages. The applicant has

submitted an exhibit showing how parking could be provided in these garages. The 15-foot-wide units, which constitute the majority of the units proposed on the site, are not wide enough to accommodate two cars side-by-side. Instead, the applicant **has indicated that they may [is] propose[ing]** to create a tandem parking arrangement where one car would be parked behind another within the garage. The applicant should provide floor plans to demonstrate that there is adequate space within the garage to provide both parking spaces on the lot **if determined appropriate** at the time of DSP.

On-street parallel parking spaces will probably be provided along the public rights-of-way (subject to the approval of the Department of Public Works and Transportation), but **there appears to be [is]** no space to provide any additional parking along the private rights-of-way. The sketch plan provides very few additional surface parking lots (a total of six for the entire development). Visitors to the site would find parking in the development very difficult. Particularly where the applicant has proposed rows of townhouses perpendicular to the public streets, the number of on-street parallel parking spaces on the public road will be very small in proportion to the number of units in the area. Non-residents may find it nearly impossible to find parking anywhere near the houses they intend to visit. Residents and non-residents alike might attempt to park illegally along the narrow private alleys, blocking garage entrances and circulation routes, or they might be forced into the surrounding community to find parking, resulting in an unacceptable impact to the neighboring areas. Additional areas for visitor parking should be identified in each area of the development **at the time of review of the detailed site plan. Review of the DSP may include a recommendation** to provide [a minimum of] one off-street surface parking space per ten townhouses **if determined appropriate at that time.**