

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George’s County Planning Board has reviewed DDS-595 requesting that tandem parking spaces count in fulfillment of the requirement for one of the two parking spaces required per unit 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 October 1, 2009 the Prince George's County Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** Departure from Design Standards, DDS-595, requests a departure from Section 27-551(e)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow tandem parking spaces to count in fulfillment of the requirement for one of the two parking spaces required per unit.

Development Data Summary

		Existing		Approved	
Zones		R-18 & R-T		R-18 & R-T	
Uses		Vacant		Two-family & Multifamily Residential	
Acreage	R-18	4.66		4.66	
	R-T	5.63		5.63	
	Total	10.56		10.56	
Lots		81		0	
Parcels		2		2	
Units		0	R-18	54 Multifamily & 1 two-family	
			R-T	45 Two-family	
			Total	100	

Other Development Data

	Required	Proposed
Parking:		
R-18	110	121*
R-T	90	104*
Total	200	225

2. **Location:** The subject site is located on the east side of Addison Road, approximately 300 feet north of its intersection with Ronald Road and approximately 3,000 feet south of the Addison Road metro station within Planning Area 75A, Council District 6 and the Developed Tier.
3. **Surrounding Uses:** The site is bounded to the north by the Seat Pleasant Methodist Church in the R-55 (One-Family Detached Residential) Zone and vacant M-NCPPC-owned parkland in the R-O-S (Reserved Open Space) Zone; to the east by vacant M-NCPPC-owned parkland in the

R-O-S Zone; to the south by a multifamily development known as the Addison Arms Apartments in the R-18 Zone; and to the west by Addison Road.

4. **Previous Approvals:** In October 1987, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-87179 (PGCPB Resolution No. 87-482) for the property subject to 12 conditions. Detailed Site Plan SP-88050 was subsequently approved on June 9, 1988 (PGCPB Resolution No. 88-270). A final plat was recorded pursuant to that approval at NLP 147 @ 81, showing 81 lots and two parcels. The property was never developed. In 2004, a new Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-04007, was submitted and reviewed for the subject property under the name Lincolnshire. This application was withdrawn. On July 7, 2005, the Planning Board denied Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04173 for the subject property due to the inadequacy of fire and rescue facilities. On July 27, 2006 the Planning Board denied Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05131, again due to the inadequacy of fire and rescue facilities. On March 15, 2007, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06098 (PGCPB Resolution No. 07-31) to consolidate the 81 existing lots and two parcels into two parcels.
5. **Design Features:** The subject detailed site plan proposes the construction of 100 dwelling units and associated recreational and stormwater management facilities on two parcels. The subject property is irregularly shaped and is bisected by a zoning line, creating a 4.66-acre R-18-zoned portion and 5.63-acre R-T-zoned portion. The easternmost portion of the site is characterized by steep slopes and is impacted by the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour of Addison Road. Therefore, the proposed development is set back substantially from Addison Road. A stormwater management facility is proposed to be located on a separate parcel in the eastern portion of the site, north of the main access drive. The stormwater management facility's access drive is proposed to be constructed with grass pavers to camouflage its functional use and enhance its appearance as a more naturalized facility. One main private street and several alleys are proposed to serve the dwelling units.

Although 54 of the dwelling units are proposed to be multifamily and 46 are proposed to be two-family (two-over-two) dwelling types, the architectural elevations of the two unit types are nearly identical. The multifamily façades will feature one entrance per two "buildings," thereby providing a common entrance for four units. Otherwise, the proposed multifamily and two-family models, NVR's Matisse and Picasso, feature the same combination of materials, detailing and articulation and will blend seamlessly with one another to establish a cohesive architectural character for the overall development.

Architectural Model (Two-family & Multifamily)	Square Footage
Matisse (lower two floors)	
Elevations A, B, C & D	1,642
Elevation E	1,682
Elevation F	1,659
Picasso (upper two floors)	
Elevations A, B, C, D & E	2,641
Elevation F	2,658

To ensure a minimum level of architectural quality is maintained within the development, 60 percent of the proposed buildings (two units arranged vertically) shall feature a full brick front façade. Each stick or building group shall feature a minimum average of 75 percent brick on front and side elevations. An enhanced end wall treatment to include a full-brick façade and all optional windows as standard features shall be provided on all side elevations facing interior streets. In addition, architectural shingles shall be used on all proposed buildings to add dimension to the roofs. According to the plans, dormers and reverse gables are optional features. To ensure that a single flat plane of roof is avoided, sticks containing six or seven buildings (two units arranged vertically) shall have no more than two buildings without gables or dormers and sticks containing five buildings (two units arranged vertically) or less should have no more than one. In addition, carriage style garage doors should be provided on all units. Several conditions relating to architectural treatments have been included with the companion DSP-08070 to ensure that a minimum level of architectural quality is maintained.

The proposed units feature rear-loaded garages to be accessed via alleys, many of which will be double loaded. Since many of the alleys will be visible from the main internal road, the rears of the units must feature a consistent, high-quality design. The plans show optional rear decks ranging in depth from eight to ten feet, which will be supported by brick piers. As optional features, decks would not necessarily be provided for every unit at the time of construction. However, since the units will be condominiums, a deck will be the only outdoor space designated for private use by the occupants of a specific unit. As such, it is anticipated that there will be a high demand for decks and that most units will feature decks. Due to the nature of the unit type where one unit is located directly on top of another, the decks for the two units must be integral. In addition, consistency of design and material use in deck construction is critical in alley situations where the combination of multiple design elements, colors and materials can create visual confusion. Therefore, the plans shall be revised to indicate that a deck will be a standard feature for each unit. This will ensure that the design and materials of all proposed decks will be identical and that all alleys will feature a consistent design. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall provide additional construction details for the proposed decks indicating a standard depth and high-quality, low maintenance construction materials. Decks shall not feature exposed wood left to weather.

Individual attached parking structures are proposed on the rears of the multifamily buildings and are discussed in detail in Finding 6 below. The stick or building group that is bisected by the zoning line, Building 9, features both multifamily and two-family dwelling units. Therefore, parking structures are proposed to be provided on only some of the buildings in this stick. The rear of this stick is oriented toward the rear of another stick, creating a double-loaded alley situation. In order to maintain a consistent rear treatment and continuity of design within this alley, parking structures should be provided for all of the units in Building 9. A condition has been included with the companion DSP-08070, which requires that parking structures be provided for all units within proposed Building 9.

One monument-style entrance feature is proposed on the south side of the access drive across from the proposed stormwater management facility and includes two brick piers connected by a lower brick wall with a cast stone area for project identification signage. The proposed sign is in conformance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

A central recreational area is proposed on the north side of the main access drive. The applicant proposes to construct a plaza area with decorative paving, extensive landscaping, a pergola, benches and an 18-foot gazebo. A community garden is also proposed in this area to provide an opportunity for residents to grow their own produce and/or flowers. Details of the pergola and community garden fencing should be provided prior to certification of the detailed site plan. East of the community garden, the applicant proposes to construct a multi-station adult fitness area, an open play area, and a picnic area with tables and grills. Two additional sitting areas are located in the western portion of the site, which feature benches and concrete paving with brick accent bands. The proposed bench design is utilitarian and not consistent with the high quality residential character desired for this development. The proposed benches shall be replaced with a more decorative model appropriate for use within a residential context.

6. **Departure from Design Standards:** According to Section 27-551(e)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, only parking spaces provided solely for, and on the same lot with, single-family dwellings may be located one behind the other. The companion Departure from Design Standards DDS-595, is a request to allow tandem parking spaces to meet the requirement for one of the two parking spaces required per multifamily and two-family dwelling unit. Each of the tandem spaces will be a full size standard space. The applicant has provided the following general justification in support of this request:

“This application is unique in that each of the one hundred building footprints illustrated on the detailed site plan represent two individual dwelling units of two stories over two stories. Each of the individual units has a one car garage which is located on the ground floor and accessed from a common drive running perpendicular to the rear of the units. The second required parking space for each dwelling unit has been provided just outside the garage as a full sized (9½ x 19) “tandem” space. Unlike most multifamily projects constructed in the County these tandem spaces will be assigned to the same resident who occupies the garage space.”

Section 27-239.01(7) sets forth the required findings for a Departure from Design Standards:

- (A) **In order for the Planning Board to grant the departure, it shall make the following findings:**
- (i) **The purposes of this Subtitle will be equally well or better served by the applicant’s proposal;**

The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

“The use of tandem spaces will allow the applicant to provide all of the required parking associated with the proposed 100 dwelling units, as well as providing an additional twenty-five unassigned visitor spaces on the site. This arrangement will also have the added benefits of minimizing the amount of impervious surface area (thus reducing stormwater runoff), grading, and the removal of existing forested areas to provide the required number of parking spaces.”

“The location of tandem parking spaces to the rears of the proposed units will create parking courts off of the primary vehicular access drives throughout the project. Placement of the tandem spaces behind the dwelling units will also hide the parking courts from view from Addison Road. This neo-traditional design will preserve view from the public road of existing forested areas for over fifty percent of the property’s frontage. Unlike many two-family dwellings and multifamily dwellings which are surrounded by a sea of parking the proposed arrangement will preserve, protect and enhance the residential character of the site and the surrounding area.”

“Providing the two required parking spaces for each unit immediately adjacent to the units will improve access for the residents and their guests. By contrast, in many older, more traditional multifamily projects the large common lots are located quite some distance away from the individual units. The increased proximity will also be more convenient and safer especially during periods of inclement weather and in the evenings.”

“For all of the reasons stated, the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance will be equally well or better served by this application through the provision of well designed parking garages for the safety and convenience of those who use it.”

The Planning Board concurs with the applicant’s justification and finds that the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance will be equally well or better served by the applicant’s proposal.

(ii) The departure is the minimum necessary, given the specific circumstances of the request;

The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

“This request is not to reduce the number of parking spaces, but rather to locate the required parking spaces in an alternative arrangement. The proposed tandem arrangement of one standard (9½ x 19) space and one interior garage will allow for the provision of adequate on-site parking for residents and guests. This arrangement is the most efficient and functional design, given the unique physical constraints of shape and topography. The requested parking arrangement is the most practical solution. No additional departures are necessary or requested.”

The Planning Board finds that the requested departure is the minimum necessary. As stated above, the applicant has not requested a reduction in the number of parking spaces.

Due to the nature of the unit type and the applicant's effort to clearly designate two parking spaces per unit, the proposed arrangement is necessary.

- (iii) The departure is necessary in order to alleviate circumstances which are unique to the site or prevalent in areas of the County developed prior to November 29, 1949;**

The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

“The subject property is located in the ‘Developed Tier’ in the Capitol Heights area of the County. The new upscale multifamily units are precisely the type of infill development use that the Planning Board, County Executive and County Council have been encouraging to revitalize the inner-Beltway communities. Again, the departure requested will not reduce the number of on-site parking spaces provided, it will only allow for an alternative location of those spaces.”

“The site itself is also oddly configured and is characterized by steep topography which requires the use of excessive grading and/or retaining walls to create level pads for the buildings and parking. Utilizing an alternative parking arrangement will eliminate the need for additional access drives or a reduction in the number of spaces provided.”

The Planning Board finds that the site contains substantial area of steep topography which limits the land area available for development and associated parking. Allowing tandem parking spaces to meet the requirement for one of the two parking spaces required per unit will ensure that an adequate number of parking spaces are provided for residents and visitors.

- (iv) The departure will not impair the visual, functional, or environmental quality or integrity of the site or of the surrounding neighborhood.**

The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

“The requested departure will enable the applicant to construct high quality multifamily and two-family dwelling units on the subject site along with adequate numbers of on-site parking spaces to accommodate the residents and their guests. The proposed design will screen the vehicles from public rights-of-way, locate the parking immediately adjacent to the individual dwelling units, and reduce the impervious surface area required to provide the required parking. Granting of the departure will greatly reduce the possible infringement of any of this project's residents or guests upon the existing parking for adjacent residential development.”

The Planning Board finds that the functional integrity of the development will be maintained. In addition to the 25 visitor parking spaces that are shown on the plans, the applicant shall provide a minimum of 24 additional on-street parking spaces available to

residents and visitors. The proposed 26-foot-wide street will accommodate on-street parking. The amount of impervious area is reduced through the provision of narrower driveways and the visual integrity of the site is maintained in that parking is proposed to be located behind the proposed units and will be hidden from Addison Road.

7. **Referral Agencies and Departments:**

Transportation Planning Section—The applicant seeks a departure to provide required parking spaces as tandem spaces. This would provide for the second required parking space for each of the approved dwelling units behind the garage spaces for each of the proposed dwelling units. Two spaces are required per unit. The applicant meets the required number of parking spaces. It does not reduce the required number of spaces but only their location behind the garage units.

The justifications and comments on the departure by the applicant are reasonable. The applicant is providing twenty five additional surface parking spaces for visitors on the site.

Therefore there is no objection to the granting of the departure allowing tandem spaces.

Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)—DPW&T indicated that it has no objection to the departure from design standards.

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 above-noted application.

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 Squire, seconded by Commissioner Cavitt, with Commissioners Squire, Cavitt, Clark, Vaughns and Parker voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, October 1, 2009, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 22nd day of October 2009.

Oscar S. Rodriguez
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

OSR:FJG:JS:arj

DRAFT