

1 THE PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD OF  
2 THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

3  
4  
5 ALTA WOODMORE  
6 Detailed Site Plan, DSP-22034 and DDS-22002

7  
8 P A R T I A L T R A N S C R I P T

9 O F

10 P R O C E E D I N G S

11  
12 COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

13 Upper Marlboro, Maryland

14 July 6, 2023

15 VOLUME 1 of 1

16  
17 BEFORE:

18 Peter A. Shapiro, Chair

19 Dorothy F. Bailey, Vice Chair

20 Shuanise Washington, Commissioner

21 Manuel R. Geraldo, Commissioner

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C O N T E N T S

<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Andrew Shelly	3
Edward Gibbs	22
Michael Lenhart	43
Scott Zimmerly	48
Erika Fareed	54
Cynthia Gray	57
Anthony Foster	58
Derek Curtis	60
Kagame Li-A-Ping	64
Chris Duffy	65
Benjamin Ryan	67
James Hunt	70
Edward Gibbs	77
Michael Lenhart	81
Maribel Wong	88

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 MR. CHAIR: We are in process on No. 6, which will  
3 pick back up. Mr. Shelly, do we have you here?

4 MR. SHELLY: Yes, good morning, Mr. Chair. Are  
5 you able to hear me okay?

6 MR. CHAIR: We can hear you fine. So again, for  
7 the public, just a reminder -- Mr. Shelly, before you go --  
8 this is an evidentiary hearing. So I've already sworn in  
9 those who have (unintelligible) testimony. We'll start with  
10 Staff presentation; then we'll hear from the Applicants and  
11 any members of this team. We will then turn to the public,  
12 see who would like to speak. We'll give the Applicant  
13 the -- at any point, Commissioners can ask questions, of  
14 course. We'll then give the Applicant the final word. And  
15 then we will close the hearing, and we will deliberate  
16 accordingly.

17 And with all that, I will now turn to Mr. Shelly.  
18 Take it away for the Staff presentation.

19 MR. SHELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the --  
20 good morning, Mr. Chair, members of the board. For the  
21 record, my name is Andrew Shelly with the Urban Design  
22 Section. The item before you is Item No. 6, Detailed Site  
23 Plan DSP-22034 for Alta Woodmore, which seeks to develop 284  
24 multi-family dwelling units in two 5-story buildings. As  
25 part of the application, the Applicant has requested

1 departure from design standards for reduction of the parking  
2 space size and alternative compliance from the requirements  
3 of Section 4.3 of the 2010 Prince George's County Landscape  
4 Manual.

5           As a matter of housekeeping, the Applicant has  
6 provided a revised conditions memorandum titled Applicant  
7 Exhibit 1 prior to the hearing deadline on July 4, 2023.  
8 The revised conditions are agreed upon by Staff and the  
9 Applicant. Conditions regarding loading spaces,  
10 architecture, and dog park fencing have been modified and  
11 will be discussed within the presentation.

12           The Staff would also like to clarify two items.  
13 The first is that the total number of bicycle parking spaces  
14 on pages 16 and 19 of the Staff Report should be updated  
15 from 115 bicycle parking spaces to 121 bicycle parking  
16 spaces. The second is that a referral from the City of  
17 Glenarden was not received; however, Staff learned after the  
18 hearing deadline on July 4th that the referral was not sent  
19 to the current city representative and instead, was sent to  
20 a former representative -- was instead sent to former  
21 representatives.

22           Next slide, please.

23           The site shown in red is located in Planning Area  
24 73 and Council District 5.

25           Next slide, please.

1           Subject property shown in red is located on the  
2 west side of Ruby Lockhart Boulevard, approximately 312 feet  
3 north of its intersection with Saint Joseph's Drive.

4           Next slide, please.

5           The subject property shown in red consists of  
6 20.28 acres and is within the town activity center edge, or  
7 TAC-E Zone, but is being reviewed under the prior mixed-use  
8 transportation oriented, or M-X-T Zone, of the prior zoning  
9 ordinance. The subject property is bound to the north by  
10 open space and the existing Woodmore Towne Centre in the  
11 TAC-E Zone to the south by a place of worship known as Saint  
12 Joseph's Catholic Church in the rural residential, or RR  
13 Zone; to the east by Ruby Lockhart Boulevard and commercial  
14 residential uses beyond; and the TAC-E and residential  
15 multi-family-48, or RMF-48 Zone; and to the west by MD-202  
16 and the I-95/495 northbound ramp.

17           Next slide, please.

18           This slide with the subject property shown in red  
19 demonstrates the existing conditions of the site. The site  
20 currently is labeled as Out Lot A. The site is partially  
21 wooded and has an existing free-standing pylon sign that was  
22 previously approved via DSP-07011-01. This sign provides  
23 advertising panels for various uses within the Woodmore  
24 Towne Centre and will be maintained with this development.

25           In Mixed Use Zones, design standards for signage

1 are approved by the Planning Board, and approval of signage  
2 associated with this proposed development is not hindered by  
3 this existing sign.

4           Next slide, please.

5           This map with the site shown in purple  
6 demonstrates the locations of environmental features. This  
7 property is subject to the provisions of the 1991 Prince  
8 George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation  
9 Ordinance. A Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan, TCP2-053-07-06,  
10 was submitted with this DSP application. In accordance with  
11 the approved Natural Resource Inventory, NRI-021-0606, 13  
12 specimen trees have been identified on the subject property,  
13 along with 100-year flood plain, wetlands, streams and steep  
14 slopes that comprise the primary management area, or PMA.

15           The TCP-2 and DSP show all required information  
16 correctly in conformance with the NRI. The Applicant does  
17 not propose any PMA impacts or the removal of any specimen  
18 trees with this development application.

19           Next slide, please.

20           This map shows the adjacent Master Plan Rights-of-  
21 Way. The site shown in blue has frontage on Ruby Lockhart  
22 Boulevard, a major collector to the east; and MD-202, an  
23 expressway to the west. The site will be accessed via an  
24 existing single access point, or existing single point on  
25 Ruby Lockhart Boulevard. Staff does not anticipate that the

1 State Highway Association, or SHA, would grant access to the  
2 subject property via MD-202. Traffic adequacy was  
3 determined during the previously approved Preliminary Plan  
4 of Subdivision 4-06016.

5 Next slide, please.

6 This Detailed Site Plan demonstrates the proposed  
7 site layout of the property with 284 multi-family dwelling  
8 units located in two 5-story buildings. The buildings are  
9 labeled Building 1 and Building 2. Building 1 is closest to  
10 MD-202, while Building 2 is closest to Ruby Lockhart  
11 Boulevard.

12 The site will contain one lot to be known as lot  
13 28 and one out lot to be known as proposed out lot E. Out  
14 lot E has frontage along Ruby Lockhart Boulevard and poses  
15 future commercial development which will be evaluated in a  
16 separate DSP. The property will be accessed via a single  
17 existing access point on Ruby Lockhart Boulevard, providing  
18 a driveway to the multi-family residential buildings.

19 As part of its development proposal, the existing  
20 place of worship to the south will obtain a secondary access  
21 point.

22 The site provides a total of 493 onsite parking  
23 spaces, of which 35 are garage rental spaces and 18 are  
24 Americans with Disability Act, or ADA spaces. The 35 garage  
25 spaces are spread throughout the site and are located in

1 four blocks. 121 bicycle parking spaces are provided, which  
2 includes a mixture of external and internal spaces. One  
3 loading space is required by the Zoning Ordinance, but two  
4 internal loading spaces have been provided; however, neither  
5 meets the minimum dimensional requirement specified by the  
6 Zoning Ordinance.

7           The Applicant has proposed a revision to Condition  
8 1(h) to provide increased flexibility to meet the Zoning  
9 Ordinance requirement. This provision specifies that the  
10 Applicant must provide at least one loading space that meets  
11 the minimum dimensional requirements of the Zoning  
12 Ordinance. This may be accomplished through revision to an  
13 internal parking space, or by providing an external, onsite  
14 loading space.

15           Onsite recreational facilities are provided, which  
16 include a playground, pool, fitness center, and two  
17 courtyards, and two residential lounges. A dog park, dog  
18 waste stations and a pet grooming spa, while not recreation  
19 facilities, are included as unique amenities for the site.

20           The Detailed Site Plan provides the necessary  
21 plantings and schedules in conformance with the 2010 Prince  
22 George's County Landscape Manual, with the exception of  
23 Section 4.3, which we discuss later in this presentation.  
24 The Staff finds the Applicant's site layout and landscaping  
25 to be acceptable subject to the technical corrections as



1 listed on pages 48 through 50 of the Technical Staff Report.  
2 An analysis of Staff's findings is stated on pages 7 through  
3 44 of the Technical Staff Report.

4 Next slide, please.

5 This slide provides a 3D model for the site  
6 demonstrating multiple views and angles of the site. Two  
7 particular important views to Staff were that from Ruby  
8 Lockhart Boulevard and MD-202. Staff notes that a majority  
9 of the existing vegetation that is being preserved along MD-  
10 202 onsite is not shown in the model. This vegetation, plus  
11 planted landscaping behind the garages, furthest to the west  
12 of the site, will provide adequate screening from MD-202.

13 And as you can see on the screen, this is a model  
14 that was created by our GIS team --

15 MR. CHAIR: Uh-huh.

16 MR. SHELLY: -- to give the Planning Board a  
17 representation of what the site will look like in a 3D  
18 space.

19 MR. CHAIR: That's a nice tool.

20 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Yeah, very nice.

21 MR. SHELLY: And with that, let's move on to the  
22 next slide, please.

23 This slide demonstrates the provided site  
24 construction details. One important site detail to mention  
25 is the retaining wall. There are multiple retaining walls

1 onsite, but the retaining wall furthest to the south will be  
2 utilized as an additional buffer from the existing place of  
3 worship. While it will be a maximum of 13-feet high;  
4 include a 6-foot board-on-board wooden fence.

5           Next slide, please.

6           The Applicant requests alternative compliance from  
7 the requirements of Section 4.3-2 of the Landscape Manual.  
8 For Section 4.3-2, an Applicant shall provide one shade tree  
9 per 300 square feet of interior landscape area provided.  
10 The Applicant in his proposed 34,288 square feet of  
11 landscape area, of interior landscape -- of interior  
12 landscape area which provides -- requires a total of 115  
13 shade trees. Due to the unusual shape of the property,  
14 primary and management area of the site, stormwater  
15 management facilities and parking needed, so there's -- to  
16 support the 284 dwelling units, the space for trees within  
17 the interior of the lot is limited. As a result, the  
18 Applicant proposes only 49 shade trees within the interior  
19 of the parking lot.

20           Next slide, trees, please.

21           To mitigate the lack of interior shade trees, the  
22 Applicant has proposed 16 percent landscape area instead of  
23 the required 15 percent, which increases the amount by 2,432  
24 square feet. In addition, the Applicant proposes an  
25 additional 70 shade trees along the perimeter parking lot

1 which is -- which are shown in pink. However, this does not  
2 adequately address the lack of interior shade trees as there  
3 is additional space that has not been utilized internally to  
4 the parking lot. Therefore, the Planning Director  
5 recommends that at least nine additional shade trees be  
6 provided to reach half of the requirement internally,  
7 bringing the total to 58 shade trees.

8           In addition, the Planning Director recommends that  
9 all internal shade trees be planted at a minimum of three to  
10 three-and-a-half inch caliper to provide more immediate  
11 shade and visual relief. These revisions should be provided  
12 prior to the approval of the DSP. With these revisions, the  
13 Planning Director believes that the proposed alternative  
14 design will be equally effective as normal compliance with  
15 Section 4.3-2 of the Landscape Manual due to the increased  
16 landscape area, increased tree size, and perimeter shade  
17 trees.

18           Next slide, please.

19           This slide demonstrates the areas of the project  
20 where landscape plantings will be located. Staff note that  
21 the provided fence for the Section 4.6-1 buffer is adequate.  
22 The fence runs parallel to the place of worship's property  
23 line to the south, but does not screen the property boundary  
24 that faces MD-202. Therefore, a condition has been provided  
25 for the Applicant to revise the Section 4.6-1 schedule to

1 provide the necessary plant material to conform with Section  
2 4.6 of the Landscape Manual. Emphasis shall be placed on  
3 providing the plant material behind the garages fronting MD-  
4 202 to enhance their screening from the roadway.

5           The analysis of Staff's findings regarding the  
6 Landscape Plan is provided on pages 42 through 44 of the  
7 Technical Staff Report. Technical corrections for the  
8 Landscape Plan are provided on pages 49 and 50 of the  
9 Technical Staff Report.

10           Next slide, please.

11           This slide demonstrates the proposed playground  
12 and dog park facilities. The playground will be located in  
13 the northern portion of the site, while the dog park will be  
14 located in the eastern portion of the site adjacent to the  
15 proposed commercial development on proposed out lot E.  
16 Condition 1(n) has been revised by the Applicant to state  
17 that a 6-foot-high site type fence will be provided along  
18 the eastern perimeter boundary of the dog park where it  
19 abuts out lot E to separate the dog park from the proposed  
20 commercial/retail use.

21           Next slide, please.

22           The following two slides represent the recreation  
23 facility site details for the subject application. Some  
24 important features included are firepits, cabanas and  
25 numerous benches. Staff note that while not a recreation

1 facility, the Applicant is providing dog waste stations and  
2 a dog park, dog fountain within the provided dog park, and a  
3 pet grooming spa within the multi-family buildings.

4 Next slide, please.

5 The playground will have various types of  
6 equipment, as noted, which includes ADA equipment. An  
7 analysis of the site's recreation facilities is provided on  
8 pages 9 and 10 of the Technical Staff Report. The condition  
9 has been provided that requires the Applicant to provide a  
10 detailed cost estimate of the values of the planned  
11 recreational facilities.

12 Next slide, please.

13 The following slide represents one of four truck  
14 training exhibits submitted with this Application. Staff  
15 found that the site circulation was adequate and was  
16 sufficient for large vehicles subject to revised Condition  
17 1(h) requiring the Applicant to provide at least one roading  
18 space that meets the finding -- that meets the dimensional  
19 requirements. A discussion on the site circulation is  
20 included within the findings demonstrating conformance to  
21 the previously approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-  
22 06016 on pages 37 through 40 of the Technical Staff Report.

23 As part of the Application, the Applicant  
24 requested departure from design standards of the standard  
25 parking space size which requires nine parallel standard

1 parking spaces to be 9 and a half feet by 19, that allows up  
2 to one-third of the required spaces to be compact, measuring  
3 8 feet by 16 and a half feet. The Applicant is providing  
4 458 parking spaces on the site, measuring 9 feet by 18 feet,  
5 except for the required spaces for the physically  
6 handicapped. The 35-garage rental parking -- the 35 garage  
7 rental parking spaces are also not included in -- are also  
8 not included in this request. No compact parking spaces are  
9 proposed within this DSP.

10           Based on the analysis provided on pages 25 through  
11 28 of the Technical Staff Report, Staff recommends the  
12 Planning Board approve the departure from design standards  
13 to reduce the dimensions of the proposed standard parking  
14 spaces from 9 and a half feet by 19 feet, to 9 and a half  
15 feet by 18 feet.

16           Next slide, please.

17           These next slides will discuss the architecture of  
18 the two proposed buildings. These two buildings are five  
19 stories each, are U-shaped, and are designed in a  
20 contemporary architectural style. The buildings have flat  
21 roofs, a mixture of windows, including storefront windows on  
22 the first floor, and balconies with railings, and are  
23 constructed of brick and fiber cement in a variety of  
24 colors. These include white, different shades of gray and  
25 an accent blue. Each building has defining corner element

1 along the main internal driveway with a raised cornice, and  
2 top floor units with transom windows. This corner also  
3 includes building-mounted signage displaying the name of the  
4 development, which is Alta Woodmore.

5           The front of Building 1 is shown on the left and  
6 the front of Building 2 is shown on the right. As noted  
7 earlier, Building 1 will be located furthest to the west of  
8 the site near MD-202; and Building 2 will be located  
9 furthest to the east of the site near Ruby Lockhart  
10 Boulevard.

11           Next slide, please.

12           This slide illustrates the rear and side elevation  
13 of Building 1. The rear elevation is shown on the bottom  
14 and the side elevation is shown on the top. As the rear  
15 elevation faces MD-202, it is required to be in conformance  
16 with Condition 20 of the Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-03006-02,  
17 which requires that at least 60 percent of the facade  
18 consist of brick material. The Applicant has provided an  
19 exhibit, Applicant Exhibit 1, demonstrating the area that  
20 will include brick material and at least 60 percent of the  
21 facade, and Staff is in agreement.

22           Next slide, please.

23           This slide illustrates the front and side  
24 elevations of Building 1, with the front elevation shown on  
25 the top, and the side elevation shown on the bottom. This

1 front elevation has defining corner element with the  
2 building-mounted signage, with a raised cornice and top four  
3 units with transom windows.

4 Condition 1(1)-1 has been revised by the Applicant  
5 and agreed upon by Staff. This revision requires the  
6 Applicant to provide full brick to the first floor of each  
7 building elevation, with the exception of courtyards and  
8 recessed balcony areas.

9 Next slide, please.

10 This slide demonstrates the proposed architectural  
11 elevation surrounding the courtyard and pool associated with  
12 Building 1. The Applicant has considered providing  
13 residents with views of the courtyard through various  
14 balconies that enhance the architecture and quality of the  
15 project.

16 Next slide, please.

17 The following three slides illustrate the  
18 elevations for Building 2, which is closest to Ruby Lockhart  
19 Boulevard. The architecture is consistent and compatible  
20 with Building 1. This slide in particular shows the rear  
21 and side elevations of the building, with the rear shown on  
22 the top, and the side is shown on the bottom.

23 Next slide, please.

24 This slide illustrates the front and side  
25 elevations of Building 2. The front elevation is shown on



1 the top and side elevation is shown on the bottom. As the  
2 front elevation faces Ruby Lockhart Boulevard, this is  
3 required to be in conformance with Condition 20 of the  
4 Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-03006-02, which requires that at  
5 least 60 percent of the facade consist of brick material.  
6 The Applicant has provided an exhibit, Applicant Exhibit 1,  
7 demonstrating the area that will include brick material on  
8 at least 60 percent of the facade, and Staff is in  
9 agreement.

10           Next slide, please.

11           This slide demonstrates the proposed architectural  
12 elevation surrounding the courtyard associated with Building  
13 2. The Applicant has considered providing residents with  
14 views of the courtyard through various balconies that  
15 enhance the architecture and quality of the project.  
16 Overall, Staff find the proposed architecture sufficient  
17 subject to conditions listed on page 49 of the Technical  
18 Staff Report and further modified by Applicant Exhibit 1.

19           Next slide, please.

20           The following two slides demonstrate the proposed  
21 architectural elevations for the 35 garage units. This  
22 slide demonstrates the architecture for garage blocks one  
23 and two, which are consistent and compatible with the  
24 contemporary architecture for the two multi-family  
25 buildings.

1           Next slide, please.

2           Staff has provided a condition regarding the  
3 proposed architecture for garage blocks three and four.  
4 Staff finds that while the architecture of these garage  
5 blocks is consistent with the multi-family buildings, they  
6 are not compatible with the existing free-standing pylon  
7 sign. This sign is shown between the two blocks as a kind  
8 of gray rectangle. Therefore, Staff has provided two  
9 conditions to enhance the architecture. The first requires  
10 the Applicant to incorporate additional white coloring into  
11 the garages in lieu of the blue to match the existing  
12 signage. The second condition then requires the Applicant  
13 to offer a brick feature on top of garage's blocks three and  
14 four to incorporate the existing signage into the design.

15           Next slide -- next slide, please.

16           This slide illustrates the location, architectural  
17 elevations of the maintenance shed, which has been designed  
18 to be architecturally similar to the multi-family buildings.  
19 Staff finds the architectural maintenance acceptable,  
20 subject to the condition revised in the location map of the  
21 maintenance shed to conform with the DSP.

22           Next slide, please.

23           The following two slides demonstrate the proposed  
24 signage for the Application. The subject site will feature  
25 two building-mounted signs, two address signs and one free-

1 standing sign. Building-mounted and address signs are  
2 provided on each multi-family residential building, or with  
3 the address signs at 12 square feet, whilst the building-  
4 mounted sign on Building 1 is 76 square feet, and the  
5 signage on Building 2 is 82.3 square feet.

6           Next slide, please.

7           The free-standing sign is proposed to be 6-feet  
8 high by 13-feet wide on a stone stand fronting Ruby Lockhart  
9 Boulevard. The total sign area is 124.4 square feet and  
10 illustrates the name of the residential property, Alta  
11 Woodmore, which is illuminated. Staff find the proposed  
12 signage acceptable. Subject to conditions and analysis of  
13 the signage is included on page 10 of the Technical Staff  
14 Report. These conditions include providing a signage  
15 schedule in DSP coversheet, revising the free-standing sign  
16 stand material to brick to be consistent with the material  
17 of the multi-family buildings, and providing -- and to  
18 provide attractive under-story landscape surrounding the  
19 proposed free-standing signage along Ruby Lockhart  
20 Boulevard.

21           Next slide, please.

22           The following slide demonstrates the Tree  
23 Conservation Plan, which is recommended for approval subject  
24 to Condition 2 of the Technical Staff Report. An analysis  
25 of Staff's findings on TCP-2 can be found on pages 44 and 45

1 of the Technical Staff Report.

2 Next slide, please.

3 Staff notes that an opposition exhibit, Opposition  
4 Exhibit 1, was received prior to the hearing deadline on  
5 July 4, 2023. The opposition herein is concerned with the  
6 intensity of the use and the traffic impacts that this  
7 development will have on the community. Staff notes multi-  
8 family residential dwelling units are a permitted use within  
9 the TAC-E Zone and that the use meets all requirements  
10 associated with the TAC-E Zone. The number of dwelling  
11 units proposed is consistent with the previously approved  
12 Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-03006-02. The proposed traffic  
13 impacts have been analyzed with the previously-approved  
14 Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06016 and are consistent.

15 The Urban Design Section recommends that the  
16 Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and approve  
17 Detailed Site Plan DSP-22034, Alternative Compliance AC-  
18 23001, Departure from Design Standards DDS-22002, and Type 2  
19 Tree Conversation Plan TCP2-053-07-06, subject to the  
20 recommended conditions of approval within the Technical  
21 Staff Report and the revised conditions provided by the  
22 Applicant and agreed upon by Staff in Applicant Exhibit 1.  
23 This would conclude Staff's presentation. Thank you.

24 MR. CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Shelly.

25 Commissioners, questions for Staff?

1           COMMISSIONER GERALDO: I have a question. I'm  
2 happy to see the Applicant with the dog park and providing  
3 water. I think that's -- we're seeing that more and more,  
4 so I appreciate that. I didn't -- and I may have overlooked  
5 it, and if I did, I apologize, Mr. Shelly, what's the  
6 provision in the parking or in the buildings for the -- for  
7 the residents for EV charging?

8           MR. SHELLY: I do not believe -- I will allow the  
9 Applicant to speak further on this, but at this location, I  
10 do not believe the Applicant proposed EV charging stations.

11           COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Yeah. I ask because I read  
12 an article recently in terms of the amount -- what's  
13 expected within the next five to seven years in terms of the  
14 volume of electrical vehicles and the lack of -- the lack of  
15 adequate charging stations, but I'll ask the Applicant.

16 Thank you.

17           No further questions, Mr. Chair.

18           MR. CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner.

19           Other questions from Staff?

20           Just a quick one from me, and pardon me if this is  
21 more of a Preliminary Plan or a CSP stage thing, but I'm  
22 curious around the bike path access to the site. Is it  
23 connected to the retail development next to it? And also,  
24 so we're (unintelligible) discussions that you had, Mr.  
25 Shelly, around that. And also, am I understanding that this

1 is a right-in, right-out only, or can folks come out of this  
2 and take a left into the retail development?

3 MR. SHELLY: So for the record, again, Mr. Chair,  
4 this is Andrew Shelly with the Urban Design Section. It is  
5 right-in, right-out only due to there being a median on Ruby  
6 Lockhart Boulevard. And that would be a DPIE issue in terms  
7 of getting DPIE -- and also County issue -- in terms of  
8 getting an acceptance to -- across that median, or to remove  
9 the median in that location, which is not anticipated. So  
10 it would be right-in, right-out.

11 And the bicycle pathways that are on Ruby Lockhart  
12 Boulevard would have been evaluated with the Preliminary  
13 Plan of Subdivision, not with this application.

14 MR. CHAIR: Okay. Okay. That's the second. I'll  
15 bring it up with the Applicant, too. Thank you, Mr. Shelly.

16 Any other questions for Staff before we turn to  
17 the Applicant?

18 Okay. Mr. Gibbs, I'll turn it over to you. And  
19 you may or may not want to introduce members of your team,  
20 but you know, the floor is yours.

21 MR. GIBBS: Okay. Yes, good morning, Mr.  
22 Chairman, members of the Planning Board. Edward Gibbs, an  
23 attorney with offices in Largo with the firm of Gibbs and  
24 Haller. And very pleased to be here today representing the  
25 Applicant in this Detailed Site Plan and Departure from

1 Design Standards case.

2           We do have our entire client and consultant  
3 development team onboard with us today. We have -- and let  
4 me just say this. That the Applicant, per se, is WSC  
5 Woodmore, LLC. That is an entity formed by and controlled  
6 by Wood Partners, which is headquartered in Atlanta, but  
7 which is a national real estate development and construction  
8 firm. And they have three of their folks on with us today,  
9 Mr. Scott Zimmerly, who is responsible for the entire Mid-  
10 Atlantic Development Division of Wood Partners and their  
11 multi-family components; and Mr. Jason Burrell, who is  
12 responsible for all of the issues associated with  
13 development of the plan; and then Mr. Zachary Albert, who  
14 works directly with Mr. Zimmerly here locally.

15           In addition, we have two different traffic  
16 consultants who have participated in analyzing all aspects  
17 related to traffic associated with this project, including  
18 right-in, right-out, Mr. Chairman. And we certainly can  
19 answer any questions that you have about that at the  
20 appropriate time. And so those two individuals would be  
21 Michael Lenhart, of Lenhart Traffic Consulting, and Maribel  
22 Wong of Gorove Slade.

23           We have a landscape architect, Mr. Jesse Van Wick.  
24 We have representatives from the architectural firm of  
25 JDAVIS, Matt Ansley and Shannon Babski. And I think that --

1 oh, and we also have representatives from our civil  
2 engineering firm, of course, Bohler. Mira Gantzert is with  
3 us this morning as well. If I have missed anybody, I'm sure  
4 they'll let me know via text and I'll introduce them as  
5 well.

6 Let me say that I understand there is some  
7 opposition which has registered in this case; and so not  
8 wanting to try to anticipate what their precise issues are  
9 going to be, I am going to orient my initial presentation to  
10 responding to the Staff preparation -- Staff Report  
11 presentation today and giving you some information about the  
12 project, then the history.

13 I've had the good fortune to represent all owners  
14 in the development team of Woodmore Towne Centre. I started  
15 working on this project in 2003, or 2004, when really the  
16 Rouse Company, who was a client of mine, had entered into a  
17 contract to sell the property to K. Hovnanian Enterprises.  
18 And I have handled every entitlement application that has  
19 been processed for this project since that time, including  
20 revising conditions that were associated and attached to the  
21 original rezoning when McCormick Properties owned this land  
22 in 1988, as well as all of the -- all of the requirements  
23 for entitlements under the M-X-T Zone, including the  
24 Conceptual Site Plan, the Preliminary Subdivision Plan,  
25 various Detailed Site Plans and Final Plats of Subdivision.



1           I want to say a few words about Wood Partners.  
2 Like I said, they are a national real estate development and  
3 construction firm, but they have a very long history of  
4 development in Prince George's County. They have -- they  
5 had three projects which they started with down abutting  
6 or -- and inside of the Branch Avenue Metro Station. The  
7 first project was Tribeca, which they ended up selling many  
8 years ago; Chelsea East and Chelsea West within the Branch  
9 Avenue Metro Station; a project called Evolution, which was  
10 part of the Laurel Mall redevelopment into the Laurel Towne  
11 Centre; and then Alloy by Alta, which is a large multi-  
12 family building on Route 1 in the heart of College Park.

13           More recently, your Planning Board members may  
14 recall that within the last year, you also approved a  
15 Detailed Site Plan for Wood Partners called Alta New  
16 Carrollton, which is a multi-family building immediately  
17 abutting the rail tracks at the New Carrollton Metro  
18 Station. My client has just recently settled on that  
19 transaction and is now the owner of that property and is  
20 proceeding immediately with construction permitting plans.

21           So that's the history. They're very familiar with  
22 Prince George's County, and the project that they have  
23 delivered within the County has always been of the highest  
24 quality. And they have always exhibited highest attention  
25 to detail and commitment to following through on what they

1 say. I have had the pleasure of representing them on every  
2 entitlement application they have filed in Prince George's  
3 County, all of which I have just advised you about.

4           The -- we would agree, and let me -- let me just  
5 say I would congratulate Mr. Shelly for the thoroughness of  
6 his entire preparation. He asked us many questions along  
7 the way. He has been fair and transparent, and the report  
8 that he produced is, you know, quite frankly, outstanding to  
9 get as deep into the entitlement history of this project as  
10 he did. It is certainly noteworthy.

11           So a couple things I want to say. Number one,  
12 this 284 multi-family product has been envisioned to be part  
13 of Woodmore Towne Centre since the approval of the original  
14 Conceptual Site Plan which occurred in 2005. In October of  
15 2005, the Planning Board approved CSP-03006 and the District  
16 Council reviewed and approved that plan in January of 2006.  
17 And that original Conceptual Site Plan approved 900 to 1,100  
18 residential units of all types, including multi-family  
19 units, single-family detached townhomes, two over two  
20 condos, and other similar residential products.

21           It approved up to one million square feet of  
22 commercial retail space. It approved up to one million  
23 square feet of office space. It approved 360 hotel rooms  
24 and a conference center with a maximum square footage of  
25 45,000 square feet.

1           Of course, as you know, the Woodmore Towne Centre,  
2 I would like to, perhaps, selfishly say, is probably the  
3 most successful example of a mixed-use commercial  
4 concentrated development in Prince George's County. And the  
5 success of Wegmans has certainly drawn everyone's attention.  
6 They continue to be an all-star performer at the retail --  
7 in the retail venue market in Prince George's County; and,  
8 of course, there are many other support retail units.

9           Woodmore Towne Centre has recently been sold. The  
10 original developer of Woodmore Towne Centre was a  
11 combination of K. Hovnanian ventures for the residential  
12 component and Petrie Richardson for the commercial  
13 component. Petrie Richardson teamed up with their equity  
14 partner, Prudential Insurance, and so they jointly owned,  
15 built and operated the commercial component at Woodmore  
16 Towne Centre.

17           About a year and a half ago, Prudential sold most  
18 of its holdings in Woodmore Towne Centre to Urban Edge, a  
19 publicly traded real estate development and construction  
20 company headquartered in Manhattan, with commercial real  
21 estate holding throughout the United States.

22           In any event, moving forward with the  
23 entitlements. We next went through the Preliminary  
24 Subdivision Plan process, and that Preliminary -- that  
25 Preliminary Subdivision Plan was approved by the Planning

1 Board in September 2006. It's 4-06016. And that  
2 Preliminary Subdivision Plan went through the complete  
3 analysis, including adequacy of all public facilities for  
4 the entire 244.767 acres constituting all of Woodmore Towne  
5 Centre, the commercial and the residential component. Every  
6 bit of the land area and the land development proposal was  
7 subjected to adequacy of facilities, analysis testing, and  
8 approval. And at the end of the day when that Preliminary  
9 Plan was approved, it approved 1,079 residential dwelling  
10 units, which included 450 to 460 multi-family residential  
11 units, 208 single-family detached residential units, 162  
12 residential townhomes, 108 mid-rise condominiums, 53  
13 townhouse condominiums and 98 two-over-two units. 750,000  
14 square feet of commercial retail space was approved and one  
15 million square feet of commercial office space was approved.  
16 Added to that was the 360 hotel rooms. All of that was  
17 tested and approved.

18           And the developer at that time -- and this was, of  
19 course, you know, the Petrie Richardson, Prudential, K.  
20 Hovnanian partnership entity -- this project was tested at  
21 that time under what you might recall as being the 202  
22 Corridor Study. It functioned like a road club. The  
23 Transportation Impact Study that was prepared for this  
24 Preliminary Subdivision Plan tested multiple intersections  
25 using the tested level of service of -- level of service D.

1 There were multiple background developments that were  
2 included. There was a two percent growth factor, and all of  
3 this development was included in that traffic study. It was  
4 reviewed by the Transportation Division, by DPIE, and by the  
5 State Highway Administration. All agencies recommended  
6 approval.

7           Now the nuance in that is that back in those days  
8 when the 202 Corridor Study was in play, all developments in  
9 this area which were going to impact this road network --  
10 and in particular it's -- you know, it was 202 and the  
11 Beltway, and the Arena Drive interchange which had to be  
12 constructed, there was a value assigned to all of those road  
13 improvements. It was over \$45 million. And then the  
14 projects that were going to impact the Corridor Study area  
15 were assigned percentages in terms of responsibilities for  
16 road improvements. Woodmore Towne Centre was assigned a  
17 responsibility of approximately \$8.45 million.

18           I think Mr. Duffy, who now manages the commercial  
19 component of Urban Edge's holding share is going to testify  
20 today; but they made, if I'm not mistaken, they chose not to  
21 pay a fee, but to make improvements to make the roads  
22 better. And I think they were in the range of 12 to \$15  
23 million of road improvements that they made. So they went  
24 well above and beyond what their requirements were under the  
25 202 Corridor Study.

1           But suffice it to say, that -- that this project  
2 which is before you today has been tested for adequacy of  
3 transportation facilities, and in fact, when the Preliminary  
4 Subdivision Plan was approved -- and this is reflected in  
5 your Transportation Memorandum and in the Analysis of  
6 Transportation on pages 36 of the Staff Report -- there is a  
7 detailed analysis of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision  
8 that I just explained to you, and there was a trip cap for  
9 Woodmore Towne Centre which was established at that time.  
10 And so the trip cap was 3,112 a.m. peak hour trips and 3,789  
11 p.m. peak hour trips. To date, per the last Detailed Site  
12 Plan that was approved, and that was for the Children's  
13 Hospital medical office building which is in Woodmore Towne  
14 Centre, to date at that time the trip cap was 988 a.m. trips  
15 and 2,333 p.m. trips. Well below the established trip cap.

16           The trip cap for these 284 multi-family units is  
17 113 a.m. peak hour trips and 111 p.m. peak hour trips. Now  
18 as we all know, that 113 and 111 means trips coming in and  
19 going out. So what you're talking about is really about a  
20 car a minute, a car a minute, and that's during the peak  
21 hour.

22           When you add these trips, you're looking at a  
23 total trip generation rate today, if this is approved, of  
24 1,111 a.m. peak hour trips and 2,443 p.m. peak hour trips.  
25 Thousands of trips beneath what the trip cap is and has been

1 established for Woodmore Towne Centre.

2           And of course, there's a reason for all that  
3 because the M-X-T Zone was designed to encourage development  
4 at the intersection of major transportation hubs. And here  
5 we have the Capital Beltway and Maryland 202. And what we  
6 have seen really by virtue of the anchor of Wegmans and the  
7 other support retail uses, and the residential development  
8 which actually was completed by D.R. Horton, not K.  
9 Hovnanian, but we have an immensely successful synergistic  
10 mixed-use development in the heart of Prince George's  
11 County. It's very successful, but it's also well-beneath  
12 the transportation levels that have been established and  
13 approved for the development of this entire project.

14           The -- we did in 2015, and Mr. Chairman, you were  
15 not on the Planning Board at that time, but I think most of  
16 the other councilmember, or Planning Board commissioners  
17 were. In -- in 2015, we brought forward a revision to the  
18 Conceptual Site Plan.

19           MR. CHAIR: Uh-huh.

20           MR. GIBBS: The reason we did that is because the  
21 commercial developers, Petrie Richardson, had worked with  
22 national brokerage firms for over 10 years to try to attract  
23 a multi-family developer to come in and do -- to do  
24 vertically integrated mixed-use development. So in other  
25 words, it was originally thought that we were going to have

1 all of the multi-family built above ground floor retain in  
2 the heart of the town center right where the -- right where  
3 the clock circle is -- excuse me -- right where the clock  
4 tower is in one of the circles within the commercial  
5 component. That was the original plan. No multi-family  
6 developer would agree to do that. And the rationale was not  
7 because it wasn't a successful project, it was, but it was  
8 deemed to be too suburban in nature for vertically  
9 integrated mixed-use development.

10           So finally, in order to encourage more rooftops to  
11 make the commercial even more viable, my clients decided to  
12 process a revision to the Conceptual Site Plan. And what we  
13 asked the Planning Board and the District Council to do was  
14 to approve the relocation of up to 360 multi-family units  
15 out to the parcel that you see on the screen before you  
16 today, which is known as out lot A. It's 20-plus acres.

17           We went through that process and we explained why  
18 the vertically integrated mixed-use would not work in the  
19 Towne Centre. We had Mr. Terry Richardson testify at  
20 length, and his testimony is captured in the resolution of  
21 approval about the efforts that they had undertaken to try  
22 to make that happen to no avail.

23           The Planning Board approved up to 360 multi-family  
24 units to be developed on this property. The City of New --  
25 the City of Glenarden opposed the development. They



1 appealed to the District Council. The District Council also  
2 approved the Conceptual Site Plan revision to locate up to  
3 360 multi-family units on out lot A.

4           So what we're doing now is nothing more than  
5 coming in and filing, processing and seeking approval for a  
6 Detailed Site Plan for that which has been approved already  
7 to occur on this property within Woodmore Towne Centre, and  
8 that's why we're here today. We have a quality developer  
9 who is willing to undertake this effort and build a quality  
10 product. So that's just about all I'm going to say.

11           Initially going through here, I know that our  
12 traffic engineers are going to be talking afterwards. I do  
13 want to say a little bit about the property. So if you're  
14 looking at the aerial photograph right here, Saint Joseph's  
15 Church appears directly southeast of our out lot A property.  
16 They are in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of  
17 Saint Joseph's Drive and Ruby Lockhart Boulevard. For years  
18 Saint Joseph's Church has been asking for the developers of  
19 Woodmore Towne Centre to somehow provide a second point of  
20 ingress and egress for them so that their sole point of  
21 ingress and egress is not on Saint Joseph's Drive.

22           So Wood Partners has stepped up to the plate and  
23 has met with and committed to Saint Joseph's Church to  
24 provide an easement and to construct a driveway connection  
25 from Saint Joseph's Church property into what will be lot 28

1 after out lot A is replatted so that the church will have a  
2 point of access onto Ruby Lockhart Boulevard. That's  
3 significant simply because it will allow patrons at Saint  
4 Joseph's Church, particularly during Sunday services, to be  
5 able to come out, take a right on Ruby Lockhart Boulevard,  
6 and go directly across Saint Joseph's Drive. And to take  
7 Ruby Lockhart Boulevard down past the Woodmore Overlook  
8 project where a new public road has been constructed and is  
9 open to provide a second point of access onto Maryland 202,  
10 which has a free right-in, right-out turning movement  
11 associated with it as well. Or in the alternative, they can  
12 continue down Ruby Lockhart Boulevard to hit Lottsford Road  
13 and take a right or a left turn at that point in time. So  
14 basically, there are three different routes than can be  
15 taken for the church now for their worshippers to leave the  
16 Saint Joseph's Church property after their services.

17 I can tell you from my personal conversations with  
18 the church, they are absolutely delighted that this is  
19 happening. They are also delighted that we are putting a 6-  
20 foot-high site type fence above, on top of, mounted on the  
21 retaining walls which runs along our common property  
22 boundary with Saint Joseph's Church. That is going to  
23 provide, you know, a visual screen from the multi-family  
24 residential from the church property. They're very happy  
25 with that change as well.

1           The buildings themselves you've seen. I think the  
2 3D model is pretty spectacular. We have worked very closely  
3 with the Staff to address just a couple of minor issues that  
4 we came up with relative to, basically, three or four of the  
5 conditions. But you know, this is -- you know, this  
6 particular project is going to have, you know, some  
7 fantastic amenities associated, two 5-story buildings, U-  
8 shaped in nature, with courtyard, outdoor courtyard  
9 amenities, one of which includes a heated pool with water  
10 jets and areas that you can sit within the pool; lounges;  
11 cabanas; firepits; dining areas outside in the courtyard  
12 areas; dining areas inside a recreation facility; a 9,500  
13 square foot fitness center; computer capability for  
14 residents to come down and plug their computers in and work  
15 within the internal recreation areas of the building; an  
16 outdoor children's playground; a pet spa; the dog park  
17 outside. And then, of course, the plan that we have to  
18 install dog stations at every location that we can fit them  
19 throughout the project, where we also have trash cans for  
20 the use of our residents. So there are going to be many  
21 opportunities for those to be placed inside of the project  
22 as well.

23           I don't -- you know, I don't want to go too long,  
24 but there was a lot to say, particularly with regard to the  
25 history of the project. But with that being said, I would

1 like to move on and just note that I filed a letter dated  
2 July 3, 2023, and Mr. Flanagan, if you -- is Mr. Flanagan  
3 with us today? If somehow someone could bring up just the  
4 Site Plan?

5 MR. CHAIR: Which?

6 MR. GIBBS: Well, that's the aerial, there --

7 MR. FLANAGAN: Slide 8.

8 MR. GIBBS: Okay.

9 MR. CHAIR: Slide eight?

10 MR. FLANAGAN; Yes, Mr. Chair.

11 MR. GIBBS: There we go. There we go. All right.  
12 This is great. This is the rendered Site and Landscape Plan  
13 that we prepared at Staff's request. And by the way, I do  
14 want to note, if you look in the lower right-hand corner,  
15 you will see the access drive that we are constructing for  
16 Saint Joseph's Church and for their worshippers. So the  
17 entirety of what is now out lot A is, again, a little over  
18 20 acres. There appears to be a lot of green up in the  
19 upper part of the drawing and that is because we have PMA  
20 and we have flood plain, a lot of environmentally-sensitive  
21 areas up there that we really can't touch.

22 When we did the CSP revision in 2015, we noted  
23 that in conformance with the original CSP, there would be  
24 not just the multi-family residential on out lot A, but  
25 there would be a retail commercial pad as well which would

1 have frontage on Ruby Lockhart Boulevard. So you see that  
2 generally outlined on the rendered Site Plan before you, but  
3 out lot A is going to become partially, and the majority of  
4 which will become Lot 28 when we go to final plat. At that  
5 time, since there is no retail user for the pad site, we  
6 will be proposing to convert that to out lot E. And that  
7 will be in the front. But Lot 28 will go all the way out to  
8 Ruby Lockhart Boulevard. And that's the sort of -- the gray  
9 driveway that you see immediately south of the area that  
10 will be the commercial pad.

11           So Conditions 1(f) and 1(g), the Staff reasonably  
12 said to us, you know, at the time of certification of the  
13 Detailed Site Plan, please identify the access easement that  
14 out lot E, the commercial pad, will need. Unfortunately, at  
15 this point in time, not knowing what the commercial use will  
16 be -- and certainly my client will not be part of that  
17 effort, we just wanted to clarify, and we did so in our  
18 letter, that at this point we would have to say that the  
19 entire stem of that driveway could be burdened by a private  
20 access easement to benefit out lot E. And we just wanted to  
21 make that clarification.

22           And then relative to Condition 20 of the  
23 Conceptual Site Plan approval, the original Conceptual Site  
24 Plan approval, that Condition 20 said that multi-family  
25 buildings with elevations on street frontage would have 60

1 percent brick on their elevation. And so even though that  
2 condition was meant to apply when the multi-family was going  
3 to be down in the Towne Centre because all commercial  
4 buildings in Woodmore Towne Centre have to have a minimum of  
5 60 percent brick fronts, that condition still applies to us.  
6 So we wanted to work with Staff to get an understanding of  
7 what sections of the two buildings would have that 60  
8 percent brick frontage impact. And so we prepared an  
9 exhibit that I attached to my letter just simply delineating  
10 the areas of the buildings in red, the two buildings.

11 Building No. 1, which is the one on the left, has  
12 frontage on the on-ramp from 202 to the Beltway, and  
13 Building No. 2 has its eastern frontage looking out toward  
14 Ruby Lockhart Boulevard. So we simply wanted to clarify  
15 where those elevations were that need 60 percent brick, and  
16 I believe Staff agreed with that.

17 We also had the three very minimal changes to  
18 Condition 1(h) dealing with the loading space, providing the  
19 option to provide an external loading space which would be  
20 dimensioned properly. And then where we have the two  
21 internal spaces, we'll just label them as, you know, an  
22 extra internal parking space.

23 With regard to 1(1)(1), there was a Staff request  
24 to have all brick on the first floor of all the buildings.  
25 We wanted to just clarify that that would not include the

1 internal courtyard elevations and recessed balconies. The  
2 architects met with Staff and sort of explained that there  
3 was a particular architectural enhancement and look that  
4 they were trying to achieve with the balconies coming down,  
5 and so those areas, they were hoping not to have as a  
6 requirement for all brick on the first level. Staff, I  
7 think, has agreed with that.

8           And then we simply wanted to confirm that where  
9 the area was on the dark part where the Staff wanted the  
10 fence, and so we added a revision to Condition 1(n).

11           I would like to verbally add one additional  
12 condition, if I could. Mr. Shelly brought to my attention  
13 that while the dog park is not a private recreational  
14 amenity, per se, we had not provided a timeline when that  
15 dog park would be available to the residents, and so we  
16 would like to proffer that as follows, an additional  
17 condition. The dog park shall be constructed and available  
18 for use at the time of the first occupancy certificate for  
19 any unit. So we wanted to make sure that dog park was  
20 available right from the very beginning.

21           And then I would only note that with the  
22 conditions that we changed, there would be very, very  
23 minimal changes to finding two on page 5 of the Staff  
24 Report, finding six on page 8, and finding 20 on page 36 of  
25 the Staff Report, just to add the wording in that occurs in

1 these -- in those conditions that we just went over that we  
2 propose to modify.

3           So with that being said, we appreciate the Staff's  
4 recommendation of approval, and I appreciate your indulgence  
5 thus far in listening to me. And I'll be happy and will  
6 need to respond on rebuttal to any comments raised by  
7 opposition that I haven't addressed. Thank you very much.

8           MR. CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Gibbs.

9           Mr. Shelly, did you -- do you need more time from  
10 Mr. Gibbs? Did you get all the things that he brought up  
11 toward the end?

12           MR. SHELLY: Yes. Good morning, Mr. Chair, again.  
13 Andrew Shelly from the Urban Design Section. Yes, I wrote  
14 down the condition, and Staff would be in agreement with  
15 that.

16           MR. CHAIR: Thank you.

17           All right. Commissioners, we've heard from Mr.  
18 Gibbs. Any questions for him or any members of the  
19 Applicant's team?

20           COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: I do.

21           MR. CHAIR: Commissioner Washington?

22           COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

23           Yeah, my question was actually the same as yours,  
24 when you asked about the right-in, right-out. And I was  
25 just curious to understand, or better understand. So for



1 the residents of this property, if they're interested in  
2 going over to Wegmans, for example, unlike most of the  
3 circulation in that community, there are roundabouts, which  
4 keeps things moving, but I -- there's not a roundabout at  
5 Saint Joseph's and Ruby Lockhart, I don't believe. And so  
6 what is the thinking there? So if I live there and I want  
7 to go to Wegmans, I have to ride out and then U-turn at the  
8 intersection?

9 MR. GIBBS: Well, yes. Commissioner Washington,  
10 your question is very valid. First of all, let me just say  
11 this. That when this property was platted, a driveway apron  
12 was approved and constructed, in which only permits right-  
13 in, right-out turns. There is no -- there is no separation  
14 in the island separating the through lanes on Ruby Lockhart  
15 Boulevard at this location. And I'm happy to have Mr.  
16 Lenhart weigh in on this too, if you'd like to hear from  
17 him. But essentially, it was his opinion that seeking a  
18 separation in that island would create more problems than it  
19 would solve. And that, yes, there are circles that we find  
20 in many instances along Ruby Lockhart Boulevard, certainly  
21 down by Best Buy, and then certainly again up past where you  
22 would take the circle to come down to the clock tower, and  
23 then that circle as well. So three different circles there.

24 There is no circle at the intersection of Saint  
25 Joseph's Drive and Ruby Lockhart Boulevard. That was

1 determined that it needed to be a signal-controlled  
2 intersection, and that's what the original developers  
3 constructed. So the options would be, I guess you could  
4 make a U-turn there if you wanted. You could also -- you  
5 could also make a left turn there and then go up to the next  
6 circle, and go around that circle, and then come back down,  
7 and then take a right-hand turn on Ruby Lockhart Boulevard.  
8 So there is a circle that you can use to make a U-turn, but  
9 you would first make a left-hand turn at the intersection of  
10 Ruby Lockhart and Saint Joseph's Drive.

11           And I don't know, Mr. Lenhart, do you have  
12 anything you could add to that to make it a little clearer?

13           MR. LENHART: Yes, thank you, Mr. Gibbs. I --

14           MR. GIBBS: By the way, just as a matter of  
15 protocol, since there is opposition in this case, I -- you  
16 know, Mr. Lenhart is well-known as an expert in the field of  
17 transportation planning, and I'd like the Planning Board to,  
18 as it has on many prior occasions, recognize his  
19 qualifications in that regard.

20           MR. CHAIR: So recognized.

21           MR. GIBBS: Thank you.

22           Go ahead, Mr. Lenhart.

23           MR. LENHART: Yes, thank you.

24           MR. CHAIR: Have you been sworn in?

25           MR. LENHART: Yes, I was sworn in at the

1 beginning.

2 MR. CHAIR: Thank you.

3 MR. LENHART: Certainly. So the question was for  
4 people making the right turn out of the site, if they wanted  
5 to go back up to Woodmore Towne Centre, let's say to go to  
6 the Wegmans, or to the Costco, how would they do so once  
7 they got to the intersection of Ruby Lockhart at Saint  
8 Joseph's Drive? That is a signalized intersection. There  
9 is a median, and the traffic signal is specifically set up  
10 with phasing that is split phase for both directions of Ruby  
11 Lockhart Boulevard. That means that if you are going  
12 eastbound on Ruby Lockhart and you want to make a U-turn to  
13 return back to the Woodmore Towne Centre, you would have a  
14 green left-turn arrow and nobody else at the intersection  
15 would be moving, no other movements would have a green  
16 arrow, including the other side of Ruby Lockhart, which  
17 would be red at that time. And so it would be unopposed, no  
18 conflicts for that movement. It would be very safe.

19 The measurement off here indicates that there's  
20 about 51 feet diameter for that U-turn. Axco design  
21 guideline indicates that that is more than enough room for a  
22 passenger vehicle to make a U-turn, and so it would be safe  
23 and available as a U-turn for people to get back to Woodmore  
24 Towne Centre.

25 And Mr. Gibbs also indicated that there is -- if

1 someone would want to make a left turn onto Saint Joseph's,  
2 they can go north to the roundabout and at Grove Hurst Lane  
3 and make a U-turn at that roundabout, and then they could  
4 come back to the south and make a right on Ruby Lockhart to  
5 get to Woodmore Towne Centre. That would be the  
6 alternative. So there would be two safe and effective means  
7 of doing that movement.

8 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Okay. Well, that's  
9 certainly helpful to understand that there is a dedicated  
10 left-turning signal. I'm in that area often, but I never  
11 traveled that way, so I just didn't know that. So I'm glad  
12 to hear --

13 MR. LENHART: Certainly.

14 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: -- that there is that,  
15 because I worried about people trying to make a U-turn and  
16 then there's incoming -- you know, oncoming traffic across  
17 the other side of Ruby Lockhart. So --

18 MR. LENHART: Right.

19 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: -- thank you.

20 MR. LENHART: Certainly.

21 MR. CHAIR: Can I -- let me -- I'm sure you'll be  
22 able to correct something, but let me go about that,  
23 Commissioners, real quick. So if I lived at this -- we  
24 approved this and if I lived there, how am I getting into  
25 the site? I'm going off to the roundabout, the traffic

1 circle above and going around that traffic circle, and then  
2 coming into the site?

3 MR. LENHART: That's correct. That's correct.  
4 And the roundabouts are proven and shown to be one of the  
5 safest forms of traffic control. It limits the points of  
6 conflict. They are safer than signalized intersections and  
7 they operate very well and efficient. So it's -- and you  
8 know, when you would look at it and think about it, you  
9 initially would think, well, it's just a queue in this road,  
10 it takes me out of my way, but it's, you know, maybe a  
11 thousand feet and you make a U-turn and you come back.  
12 That's not far.

13 MR. CHAIR: I'm not a big fan of roundabouts. So  
14 if I lived there, I'd be going through the church.

15 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Exactly.

16 MR. CHAIR: Unless the church is going to block  
17 that off, and I'm not saying that's even a bad thing, I'm  
18 just saying -- I mean I -- Mr. Lenhart, I -- hold that  
19 thought. I mean, if Mr. Burrell, Mr. Gibbs, if we could --  
20 if I could -- if we could bring on the developers a bit on  
21 this just to be engaged in this conversation as well. I'm  
22 just curious about this.

23 MR. GIBBS: Yeah, but I would say that, first of  
24 all, I would assume that the church is going to put a gate  
25 on that driveway. But going into the church parking lot is

1 really not going to help you because that would only take  
2 you out to Saint Joseph's Drive where you'd have to make a  
3 right-hand turn and go out to 202.

4 MR. CHAIR: Right.

5 MR. LENHART: And I believe that Maryland law --  
6 and I know this used to be the case, Maryland law states  
7 that it is illegal to cut through private property to avoid  
8 a traffic control device. And so you know, for somebody who  
9 come out Ruby Lockhart, make a right turn, go down to Saint  
10 Joseph's and make a right turn, and if they decided they  
11 wanted to go through the church to avoid that movement --  
12 which I don't believe there would be any benefit in doing  
13 so, it's all right turns -- there's really no true benefit.  
14 I think it would take you the same amount of time,  
15 basically. But if they decided to do that, that would be  
16 against Maryland law. The church, Mr. Gibbs indicated,  
17 would probably put up a gate to prevent that if that's the  
18 case.

19 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Well, maybe coming  
20 home -- so if you're -- let's -- you're on 202 and then you  
21 turn onto Saint Joseph's Drive. Correct me if I'm wrong,  
22 but you can make a left turn right into the churchyard?

23 MR. CHAIR: You can.

24 MR. LENHART: You can, yes.

25 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Right.

1           COMMISSIONER GERALDO: You can -- you can do that,  
2 that's correct, yeah.

3           COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Right. So I'm saying --  
4 so that what I heard the Chairman in your question to me,  
5 that might be the way I would choose to go home as opposed  
6 to taking the left turn on Ruby Lockhart, going up to the  
7 roundabout and coming back, and then coming through the  
8 right entrance. I think that's what you were getting at.

9           MR. CHAIR: Yes. And I'm not saying there's  
10 anything fundamentally wrong with that. I mean, back to  
11 your point, Mr. Gibbs. You know, the church very well may  
12 just put up a gate to stop that pattern, but there's --  
13 setting aside what the law is, humans are humans, and this  
14 is a -- it's a pretty circuitous route to get in and out of  
15 this development. At some level, it's neither here nor  
16 there, but that's why I wanted to talk to the developers a  
17 bit just to get a sense of what their thinking is around  
18 this.

19           So I -- if I can hear from Mr. Burrell or Mr.  
20 Zimmerly or Mr. Albert on this. I mean --

21           MR. GIBBS: Sure. So --

22           MR. CHAIR: -- two questions. One is what -- as  
23 the developer, what is your thinking about the access; and  
24 also, I'm curious if there are any conversations about any  
25 kind of direct access to Woodmore Towne Centre, even if I

1 had direct access to Woodmore Towne Centre. This feels very  
2 disconnected from the Centre.

3 MR. ZIMMERLY: Again, I could speak. This is  
4 Scott Zimmerly --

5 MR. CHAIR: Sure.

6 MR. ZIMMERLY: -- with Wood Partners. I don't  
7 have too much different to say than what Mr. Lenhart already  
8 said as far as how it would function. Just given the site  
9 location, I think Ed proffered early on, like, we can't  
10 access out onto 202. It's right by an exit ramp. That  
11 would never happen. So we can't do that.

12 We're constrained with the wetlands on over half  
13 of the site next to us, and the only road frontage we  
14 have -- again, prior approved with the curb cut right  
15 there -- is in front of us at Ruby Lockhart. So it's right-  
16 in, right-out, unless someone gave us a left-in, and that  
17 was explored. And as you heard earlier, that was deemed not  
18 efficient.

19 So you know, we've been okay with the left turn up  
20 at the light that was explained. And I think it's important  
21 to note the roundabout, it's very close. I understand the  
22 question, you know, if that was, you know, a quarter mile  
23 down the road to have to come home and turn around; but it's  
24 not. It's a matter of feet. And because it's not a light,  
25 it's pretty quick to go around and very efficient. You



1 know, and it's just one more -- you know, Mike Lenhart is  
2 the expert, but it's one more turn, quote/unquote, to get  
3 home, right? Going to a light and taking a left to go down  
4 your street, to then turn into your community. This is the  
5 same thing as coming up to a circle and instead of taking a  
6 left, you're going around, coming back and taking a right  
7 into your community. It just seems circuitous because, to  
8 your point, you would -- if you're coming in off 202, you  
9 would pass the property because you can't make a left across  
10 the lane. So we don't disagree with the question, and then  
11 what you're thinking, but if you think about going home,  
12 it's just one more left turn. It's just you go past to make  
13 a left and come home. You know, it's a 20-second, you know,  
14 topic for somebody. But that's all --

15 MR. CHAIR: Thank you.

16 MR. ZIMMERLY: -- we're allowed to do. Yeah, I  
17 appreciate that.

18 MR. CHAIR: And did you -- was there any  
19 conversations about any kind of direct bike path access?  
20 Did you -- was there any conversation about a trail, bridge,  
21 or something --

22 MR. GIBBS: There is.

23 MR. CHAIR: -- that connects these two --

24 MR. GIBBS: Mr. Chairman, there is. There's  
25 already a -- an existing pedestrian sidewalk directly in

1 front of this property running down to the section of  
2 Woodmore Towne Centre, which -- where the Best -- where the  
3 Best Buy, Starbucks, Copper Canyon is located. That gets  
4 you right into the Centre. There's also already a bike lane  
5 there. Those were constructed -- those were constructed  
6 early on when the road was constructed.

7           And to your point about being separated. I mean,  
8 if you look at it, on this rendered plan, if you look  
9 directly across the street, that's L.A. Fitness. And  
10 very -- a very short distance down to your left is  
11 Starbucks, Best Buy, Copper Canyon, and everything that  
12 leads you into the heart of the Centre.

13           This -- you know, this parcel is really no more  
14 removed than any of the residential pieces are up on the far  
15 eastern section of the development.

16           MR. CHAIR: And that was my question. So the bike  
17 path access is direct and along Ruby Lockhart, and again --

18           MR. GIBBS: It is.

19           MR. CHAIR: -- was there any conversation at all  
20 about a more buried connection from the development across  
21 the wetlands, any kind of a trail access, because that's a  
22 pretty short -- I mean, that would be a nice amenity for  
23 this development. I'm just curious if -- for the  
24 developers, if you are engaged in any kind of conversation  
25 with Woodmore Towne Centre about that, or with the

1 developers.

2 MR. GIBBS: Not that I'm aware of because that  
3 entire area is so heavily burdened by sensitive  
4 environmental features. You know, we looked at the  
5 possibility of just putting some internal trail up in that  
6 area and it -- the PMA and then beyond the PMA is all flood  
7 plain. So I just don't know if you would ever get authority  
8 to build a trail through that.

9 MR. ZIMMERLY: That -- and it's hard to note on  
10 this plan, but in some areas, and Jason can correct me if  
11 I'm wrong, it's not -- most areas to the north on this plan,  
12 that's a 15-foot drop, the slope, down into those wetlands.

13 MR. CHAIR: Oh, okay.

14 MR. ZIMMERLY: So it's not -- it's not as simple  
15 as it would perceive to be, I guess, looking at it.

16 MR. CHAIR: Okay. That's helpful. I just wanted  
17 to engage this way and hear what you all were thinking about  
18 it, and --

19 MR. ZIMMERLY: Sure.

20 MR. CHAIR: -- and you've answered my questions.

21 So Commissioners, other questions? I think,  
22 Commissioner Geraldo, you had some?

23 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: I did. My only question,  
24 Mr. Gibbs, what -- is there any provision for EV charging in  
25 the multi-unit?

1           MR. GIBBS: Yes, there will be some EV charging  
2 stations. I don't know if the number has been established  
3 yet.

4           Mr. Zimmerly, can you respond to that?

5           MR. ZIMMERLY: Yes. There will be. I don't  
6 recall the exact count, but we're all for EV stations.  
7 Residents like them. We like them. I just don't know if we  
8 have the set count.

9           But Jason, if you recall the number, you could  
10 proffer it. But we will have some.

11          COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Okay. Great.

12          MR. BURRELL: Yeah, we don't have a set number at  
13 this time, but there will definitely be EV charging  
14 stations. Every one of our deals that we have done in the  
15 last eight years has EV charging.

16          COMMISSIONER GERALDO: So is that a proffer, Mr.  
17 Gibbs?

18          MR. GIBBS: Yes, it is, Commissioner.

19          COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Okay, sir.

20          MR. GIBBS: Yes, it is.

21          COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Thank you.

22          MR. GIBBS: And quite frankly, I think maybe the  
23 wording for that might be that we show those at the time of  
24 certification of the Detailed Site Plan.

25          COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Okay.

1 MR. CHAIR: That would be great.

2 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Great. Thank you.

3 No further questions, Mr. Gibbs.

4 MR. GIBBS: Thank you, sir.

5 MR. CHAIR: All right. Any other questions,  
6 Commissioners? If not, we'll turn to folks who signed up to  
7 speak. And again, the Applicant will have a chance for  
8 rebuttal.

9 I have a few folks on my list. I just want to  
10 first run through to see who is here. We have an Erika  
11 Fareed with the City of Glenarden.

12 Ms. Fareed, are you here?

13 MS. FAREED: Yes, I'm here.

14 MR. CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.

15 And Cynthia Gray?

16 MS. GRAY: Yes, I'm here.

17 MR. CHAIR: Thank you.

18 Anthony Foster?

19 MR. FOSTER: Yes, I'm here.

20 MR. CHAIR: Thank you.

21 Derek Curtis?

22 MR. CURTIS: Yes, I'm here.

23 MR. CHAIR: Thank you.

24 And Kagame Li-A-Ping?

25 MR. LI-A-PING: It's Kagame. Yes, I'm here.

1 MR. CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.

2 All right. Everyone is here. I'm going to start  
3 with the representative of the City of Glenarden. For folks  
4 who are speaking, you have up to three minutes to speak.  
5 We'll give more latitude to the representative of the City  
6 of Glenarden, representing the City such as it is. So  
7 you'll have the time that you need. And then for other  
8 folks, you'll have three minutes to speak. There will be a  
9 clock that will show up just to help you and me manage the  
10 time.

11 And we'll start with Erika Fareed. Take it away.  
12 If you could introduce yourself for the record and then --

13 MS. FAREED: Yes.

14 MR. CHAIR: -- (unintelligible).

15 MS. FAREED: Thank you. My name is Erika Fareed,  
16 and I'm a councilmember of the City of Glenarden. I  
17 represent Ward 3.

18 MR. CHAIR: Oh, (unintelligible).

19 MS. FAREED: I'm sorry?

20 MR. CHAIR: I didn't realize you were a  
21 councilmember. I apologize. Thank you.

22 MS. FAREED: That's okay. I'm a councilwoman with  
23 the City of Glenarden representing Ward 3, which is the area  
24 in which Alta Woodmore would be located. I'm pleased to  
25 hear, you know, some of the concerns that have been

1 discussed thus far because they echo some of the concerns  
2 that myself and other citizens have, particularly around the  
3 traffic.

4 I am concerned about the way that the development  
5 will be accessed. In hearing the conversation now around  
6 how people will be able to access the Woodmore Towne Centre,  
7 I think we really need to look at that and the practicality  
8 of it. We're talking about a lane -- one lane that has left  
9 turn in now, also allows people to go straight to go over to  
10 the other side of Saint Joseph's Drive where the new  
11 developments are, and expecting people to make a U-turn from  
12 that lane is going to cause, I think, a significant issue  
13 with the current traffic, as well as the fact that people  
14 coming from Saint Joseph's on the side of L.A. Fitness, they  
15 can make a right turn on red. So while potentially cars are  
16 looking to make U-turns, those cars will also be looking to  
17 make rights, and I just think that's dangerous.

18 Further, the way that people will access it when  
19 they're coming home, if they're coming from 202, they have  
20 to go through that roundabout. It doesn't seem practical.  
21 We're looking at isolated scenarios where there are one or  
22 two cars. Maybe that works, but when we're talking about a  
23 busy evening, that intersection already is extremely crowded  
24 with two turn lanes. There are four lanes, but only two of  
25 them can turn left. That is going to cause extreme

1 congestion.

2           Now of 202, if you're coming in at rush hour,  
3 you'll be sitting on 202 with that light changing for  
4 several times before you can actually even turn onto Saint  
5 Joseph's. So I think we really need to look at this  
6 traffic. I don't know when the traffic study was done, but  
7 I'm not sure that -- I think it needs to be updated.

8           I think the -- you know, one of the bigger  
9 concerns that I have as well is around the fact that this  
10 apartment development is being placed here when we have just  
11 had several other apartment developments and new townhomes  
12 built right across the street. I don't know if that was a  
13 part of the plan back in 2005, but I think when we're  
14 talking about looking at properties, or looking at  
15 developments, we need to be looking at them in the current  
16 time. 2005 was a long time ago and there's been a lot of  
17 development since then.

18           And you know, thirdly, I'm very concerned with the  
19 fact that the City of Glenarden has not been engaged  
20 throughout this process. I feel like this seems to be a  
21 typical, that things are happening even decades in advance  
22 and not really engaging the local municipalities, and then  
23 decisions are being made and we're being brought in at the  
24 point of just being able to say here's a Site Plan, give us  
25 your feedback, as opposed to really being a part of the



1 planning and design to see what is needed in our community,  
2 and make sure that whatever space is being used there is of  
3 benefit to the community. We would hate for a property to  
4 be, you know, placed there and then find that there aren't  
5 enough people, for example, to be able to rent out those  
6 apartments and we'd have a lot of vacancies that, perhaps,  
7 that space could have been used for something differently.

8           So I know I'm kind of running up on my time, but I  
9 just wanted to address those points. Primarily, if we could  
10 address the traffic concern and then address, you know, some  
11 of the concerns around the congestion and the other planning  
12 that's in that area, and what the plan is for that, that  
13 would be helpful. Thank you.

14           MR. CHAIR: Thank you, councilmember. I'm sure  
15 that the Applicant will address some of your questions and  
16 concerns on rebuttal; and I appreciate you taking the time  
17 to speak on this.

18           Let's move on to Cynthia Gray. If you could --

19           MS. GRAY: Good morning.

20           MR. CHAIR: -- introduce yourself for the record.

21           MS. GRAY: Good morning. My name is Cynthia Gray.  
22 I am a Woodmore Towne Centre resident. As a resident, I  
23 experience first-hand on a daily basis walking and driving  
24 to the shopping center, L.A. Fitness, and all the nearby  
25 amenities around the proposed dwelling. I oppose this

1 dwelling for the simple fact that having an entry and --  
2 entry and exit point on Ruby Lockhart is going to cause  
3 further congestion exiting the community and shopping  
4 center. That specific area is already congested and it  
5 would only divert traffic out onto Campus Way North, out of  
6 the shopping center. And without any current and active  
7 traffic calming initiatives, this poses a severe safety risk  
8 to me, my children, the community members, and all who  
9 frequent the park and shopping center. There needs to be an  
10 alternative entry point to alleviate these issues. There  
11 needs to be active plan traffic and safety initiatives for  
12 both Ruby Lockhart and Campus Way North.

13           Lastly, I have a major concern that these new  
14 developments are not taking into account the influx of  
15 children that will feed into our local schools without  
16 proper funding and support. Thank you.

17           MR. CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Gray.

18           Next, we have Anthony Foster.

19           MR. FOSTER: Hi. Good morning, everyone. Thank  
20 you for allowing me to provide comments on this proposal. I  
21 live on Campus Way North and I'm a member of the  
22 (unintelligible) HOA and the condo HOA that's nearby on the  
23 other side of the development. I believe this is the wrong  
24 development and the wrong place. Folks, don't be fooled by  
25 dog parks, lounges, cabanas, pet grooming spas, firepits and

1 courtyards. If you look across the street, you will see two  
2 large apartment complexes, the Woodmore Grand and the  
3 Woodmore Apartments, already in full force in our community.  
4 Notably, the GIS model, while it's nice, doesn't show the  
5 fact that there are two large apartment complexes across the  
6 street. To me, it's overkill.

7           Mr. Lenhart, I respect your expertise with  
8 transportation, but I don't think you really deal with the  
9 conditions here on a day-to-day basis. You have stats on  
10 paper, but it's another thing to live it every day.

11           With regards to the roundabouts. Folks, if you've  
12 been in the area over the past couple years, you will see  
13 people who don't know how to drive those roundabouts really  
14 safely. So I'm leery every time I go through the  
15 roundabouts because I'm afraid of someone actually going  
16 into the wrong lane. And that has happened, and that's  
17 bearing out through the accident stats which could be easily  
18 pulled at the City of Glenarden Police Department.

19           It's clear to me, I'm not sure to others, that the  
20 developer wants to build on the land, sell the finished  
21 product to maximize profit for their benefit, not for the  
22 City of Glenarden or the surrounding community. Mr. Gibbs  
23 talks about the Applicant knowing about the county and the  
24 community at large, but if he did know about the community  
25 at large, he would not have put this on the table to begin

1 with, and instead, recognized that there are other options  
2 for development in this area, such as maybe an assisted  
3 living facility, a dialysis center, a fine quality  
4 restaurant pad -- and I want to stop there. We only have  
5 Copper Canyon. So to be -- it's a no brainer if you want to  
6 bring another community to our area, or perhaps a  
7 rehabilitation center, an animal hospital, something else  
8 besides apartments. You know, we deserve better, and I want  
9 to emphasize that. We deserve better and we can get more  
10 than just apartments.

11           And I'm glad you brought up Tribeca. According to  
12 residents, it has gotten progressively worse at the change  
13 of ownership multiple times. Why in the world would we  
14 accept this here? Enough is enough. We need development  
15 that supports our quality of life and compliments the city  
16 and the county. Thank you.

17           MR. CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Foster. Appreciate you  
18 taking the time.

19           Derek Curtis?

20           MR. CURTIS: Good morning, everyone. My name is  
21 Councilmember Curtis with the City of Glenarden. I speak  
22 up -- I speak in opposition to this project. I at first  
23 want to say I do appreciate Mr. Gibbs and developers to come  
24 to our meeting late -- not -- they didn't come to the  
25 meeting late, but to speak with us about this presentation.

1 I think it was about a couple weeks ago. It was a nice  
2 presentation. But as Mr. Foster said, I just think that  
3 it's just a really bad location for this project.

4 I think one of the first things that we're doing  
5 here in the City of Glenarden is questioning, what are we  
6 doing? It doesn't make sense. Is this project going to  
7 meet the needs of the area and of the citizens? And I don't  
8 believe it does. I think the motive of the project is to  
9 make a profit, and that's to no shame of, you know, Mr.  
10 Gibbs and his clients, but you know, to make a profit  
11 shouldn't be the only thing considered when we are  
12 considering a project in our community.

13 We risk the success of the much needed Towne  
14 Centre that we have, because if you have come over here  
15 recently, you would know that with the additional  
16 construction across Saint Joseph Drive, the traffic is  
17 horrible. The traffic is backed up all the way to 202, and  
18 now you have three lanes blocked up trying to make a left  
19 turn on Ruby Lockhart. And then you go down there, and if  
20 you want the residents of those apartment buildings to go to  
21 a roundabout -- where there are many accidents on that  
22 roundabout; there are accidents every week on that  
23 roundabout of people just not driving the roundabout the way  
24 they should. It's a speedway and it just creates a lot of  
25 congestion -- and so to add an apartment building there

1 where the residents themselves to (unintelligible), they  
2 will only have one access to enter and exit, that's just --  
3 that's not fair to them.

4           And I've also heard that, oh well, they could, you  
5 know, make a left turn at Saint Joseph's Drive and make a --  
6 make a left turn or a U-turn. But imagine trying to come  
7 out -- because it curves out. It doesn't just come directly  
8 out. You -- when you go in, you curve right in and then you  
9 curve right out. There's not going to be an opportunity for  
10 those residents to cut across two lanes of traffic to make  
11 out of that left turn, or that U-turn. That's just asking  
12 for someone to get into an accident.

13           The virtual 3D tool that's been used to repeatedly  
14 show the project, it's a little bit misleading because it  
15 doesn't take into account -- I mean, it shows nice trees  
16 around the project, but it doesn't take into account that  
17 those trees are no longer there. There are apartment  
18 buildings there across the street from Saint Joseph Drive.  
19 There's a 7-Eleven that's there; there's a Chick-fil-A  
20 that's there.

21           We can spend all day trying to rationalize this,  
22 but it just -- it -- I'm sorry, it just does not make sense.  
23 This location does not make sense. There aren't enough  
24 amenities to make this make sense.

25           The bike lane for the residents that will go into

1 the apartment complex, the bike lane -- those bikers will be  
2 in danger now. The emergency vehicles -- you know,  
3 depending if you have an emergency vehicle coming off of 202  
4 and coming around, it takes them more time to get into the  
5 complex. If people are trying to get out of the complex  
6 because -- in case of a fire, or they have the option of  
7 staying in the burning building or trying to get out and  
8 retreating to a 15-foot drop in the wetlands. It -- again,  
9 I appreciate the idea; I appreciate the need to -- the  
10 desire to build something beautiful, but it's just not the  
11 right place for it.

12           We have to make it practical for not only the  
13 residents that already live here, but also the residents  
14 that they're -- that are planning to live in that apartment  
15 building. So I will ask the Planning Committee to, you  
16 know, please, you know, reconsider this. Take into  
17 consideration the City Council, the residents and the  
18 potential residents of that apartment building; that it's  
19 just not -- it's not safe.

20           And for a traffic pattern, it's not practical.  
21 And with all due respect to the traffic expert onboard, we  
22 can all find somebody that can agree with us. I mean,  
23 that's the point. You have to come here now to witness what  
24 is -- what is occurring now to really get a good sense of  
25 how it will be in the future.

1           So thank you for your time, and have a great  
2 evening, afternoon.

3           MR. CHAIR: Thank you, councilmember, I appreciate  
4 it.

5           Finally, we have Kagame Li-A-Ping.

6           MR. LI-A-PING: Thank you. My name is Kagame.  
7 I'm just a resident of the neighborhood. I echo what a lot  
8 of my fellow peers already said, and thank you to  
9 Commissioner Washington and Shapiro for your comments as  
10 well because you asked my questions.

11           My main thing is really just the one-way in, one-  
12 way out. I just don't see how that makes sense; and also,  
13 how is that safe? The last councilwoman just mentioned, you  
14 know, for police and our fire department to get in, there's  
15 no easy way for them to do that in a quick and efficient  
16 way. I mean, for example, the L.A. Fitness across the  
17 street, it is only a one-way in and one-way out, and even  
18 that's annoying. So I could imagine how that would be for a  
19 development for, you know, 284 units which is like, what,  
20 about a thousand people, which will also add to the  
21 congestion that's already in the area. Which brings me to  
22 the point about just the practicality of it. Sure, you can  
23 make a U-turn; sure, you can turn left and go around that  
24 roundabout; but let's be real, nobody wants to do that.  
25 It's just going to add more headache to other people doing



1 that and increase the chances of an accident. That already  
2 has occurred in that area as well.

3 And in addition to that congestion, how are we  
4 keeping in mind just the schooling already? Our local  
5 police force and fire department are already inundated with  
6 just requests and they're swamped, and now you're adding  
7 more people here. I just don't think we're looking at the  
8 big, big picture here.

9 So I'll just ask the Commission to just keep that  
10 in mind. And also recognize that a lot of residents  
11 actually feel this way, they just, you know, don't have the  
12 means of getting into a meeting like this. But just look at  
13 the big picture here and if it actually makes sense and it's  
14 practical for this time in that specific location. Thank  
15 you.

16 MR. CHAIR: Thank you. We have no one else signed  
17 up to speak on the --

18 MR. DUFFY: Chair, if I may, this is Chris Duffy  
19 with Heritage Partners. For some reason, I was not on your  
20 list, but I am on to speak on behalf of the proposed  
21 development and in favor of it. If I could have a few  
22 seconds to do so?

23 MR. CHAIR: Mr. Duffy, yes, you may proceed.

24 MR. DUFFY: Thank you. For those of you that  
25 don't know, I'm with Heritage Partners. I am president and

1 founder of the company. Heritage Partners is -- has evolved  
2 out of what was Petrie Richardson, the original developers  
3 of Woodmore Towne Centre, and we now manage it on behalf of  
4 Urban Edge. On behalf of both parties, we would like to  
5 pledge our support.

6           And if I could also talk briefly about traffic and  
7 the history. Woodmore Towne Centre, we could have paid \$8.5  
8 million into a road club as Mr. Gibbs suggested. We did  
9 over \$17 million in road improvements. At the time when we  
10 started this project, the intersections that didn't fail  
11 from capacity worked at a level service D. Today they work  
12 at level B or better, and that contemplates additional  
13 development, including this. So from a traffic standpoint,  
14 things have improved. And we think this is a quality  
15 development and we'd like to pledge our support for it.

16 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

17           MR. CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Duffy. That is all the  
18 folks we have signed up to speak.

19           I will turn -- Commissioners, any questions for  
20 any of the folks who speaked? I think we're -- we've heard  
21 loud and clear the concerns.

22           No questions. I'll turn to Mr. Gibbs on rebuttal.

23           MR. GIBBS: Yes, thank you.

24           MR. SHELLY: Oh, my apologies, Mr. Gibbs. I am --  
25 this is Andrew Shelly from Staff -- from Urban Design. I

1 just also wanted to ask the -- ask the Chair. Specifically,  
2 Staff had asked for a mid-block crossing analysis which was  
3 dealing with bicycle and pedestrian improvements at this  
4 location, and also wanted to ask the Chair if the Board  
5 wanted to hear from internal staff that are experts in  
6 transportation.

7 MR. CHAIR: Mr. Shelly, I'm glad you brought that  
8 up. I would like to hear, and I imagine my fellow  
9 commissioners would as well. So yes, if you and the  
10 Transportation Staff -- especially -- I mean, the traffic  
11 piece, but there's also the bike ped piece. So a few  
12 minutes from Staff would be helpful, Mr. Shelly.

13 Mr. Gibbs, hold off on rebuttal until we hear more  
14 from Staff.

15 MR. GIBBS: Surely.

16 MR. RYAN: Hi, Chair Shapiro and members of the  
17 Board. This is Benjamin Ryan with the Transportation  
18 Planning Section. Regarding the location of the site, you  
19 know, the only available frontage was along Ruby Lockhart.  
20 We didn't think it was a realistic proposal to look for  
21 access along the 202 portion near the interchange. So with  
22 that into account, we did examine that the location where  
23 vehicles would access the site was a sufficient site  
24 distance from the signal at Saint Joseph's and Ruby  
25 Lockhart, which we did find -- found it was. We did not

1 think a left turn into the site or a left turn from the site  
2 onto westbound Ruby Lockhart was really a workable idea at  
3 this location. That would have increased the traffic and  
4 the stacking immensely.

5           As Mr. Shelly mentioned, we asked for a mid-block  
6 crosswalk analysis at the time of SDRC to see if it was  
7 possible to get bike and ped movement across Ruby Lockhart  
8 Drive. The study indicated that the location of the  
9 crosswalk in relation to the intersection of Saint Joseph's  
10 and Ruby Lockhart could result in potential conflicts with  
11 bicyclists and pedestrians, and motorists. It's about 330  
12 feet, and the driver behavior may not anticipate bicyclists  
13 and pedestrians crossing. And further, as has been  
14 discussed, both sides of Ruby Lockhart have constructed  
15 bicycle lanes and sidewalks. So there is bicycle and  
16 pedestrian access throughout the site.

17           There -- as has been discussed, there are a number  
18 of circuitous routes to access the site, but again, we  
19 wanted to maintain the median to not have further traffic  
20 implications, which now if we were to allow full left turns  
21 into the site, or out of the site, that could cause longer  
22 turn delays.

23           As has been discussed on the Preliminary Plan set  
24 adequately for the site, if you think of the Woodmore  
25 shopping center, there are other portions that fall under

1 other Preliminary Plans. So we're really looking at this  
2 one in relation to 4-06016. And there is available trip cap  
3 with this.

4 The apartments themselves are anticipated to  
5 produce 113 a.m. peak trips and 111 p.m. While sizeable,  
6 this is not anticipated to add a heavy burden to the road  
7 network that's in place. That's all we would have on this.

8 MR. CHAIR: I'm sorry, Mr. Ryan, were you  
9 finished, or was it a technical issue? Are you okay?

10 MR. RYAN: No, I'm finished.

11 MR. CHAIR: Okay. A quick question, Mr. Ryan.  
12 Did -- were you a part of any conversation that was looking  
13 at any kind of alternative access, any sort of path from the  
14 development directly to Woodmore Towne Centre off of Ruby  
15 Lockhart? Was that any conversation you were a part of?

16 MR. RYAN: I'm sorry, a path along --

17 MR. CHAIR: I just -- I'm still stuck on the idea  
18 of is there some way to access the development, but not on  
19 Ruby Lockhart?

20 MR. RYAN: Yeah, the slope to the direct northwest  
21 of the site, which would lead to the commercial portion,  
22 that is a heavy slope and wouldn't provide safe movement for  
23 bicyclists and pedestrians along that area.

24 MR. CHAIR: Okay. So that's something that you  
25 were in conversation about, at least at some point?

1           MR. RYAN: Yes. when we received the plans, we  
2 did look for additional ways of providing bicycle and  
3 pedestrian connections to the commercial portion. It really  
4 is the kind of unique location of this site, with only  
5 having frontage along Ruby Lockhart, and having a heavily  
6 environmentally protected area between the site and the  
7 commercial portion.

8           MR. CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ryan. That's  
9 helpful. I'm glad you -- that that was at least talked  
10 about.

11           Commissioners, questions for Staff? Questions for  
12 Mr. Ryan?

13           VICE-CHAIR BAILEY: I do have a question. It's  
14 not for this person. I have a -- someone -- one of the  
15 individuals from Glenarden made a reference to the  
16 informational mailing, and I was wondering when did that  
17 informational mailing take place to, and did it go to folks  
18 within the City of Glenarden? I think one of the -- one of  
19 the councilmembers mentioned receiving something.

20           MR. CHAIR: So that's a question for Mr. Gibbs,  
21 the Applicant, I assume?

22           VICE-CHAIR BAILEY: I don't know. I'm just trying  
23 to find out if it occurred, if -- when and who did receive  
24 information about this project from other developers, yes.

25           MR. CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.

1           MR. HUNT: Mr. Chairman, this is James Hunt with  
2 the Development Review Division. Just to clarify here, what  
3 happened with this situation is the contact information for  
4 the City of Glenarden was not updated. So we had someone,  
5 Mr. Esdives (phonetic sp.), as well as, I think it was Mr.  
6 or Mrs. Tobias, on file as the contact person for Glenarden;  
7 however, that was the incorrect information. Once we --  
8 when we found that out, we did contact them, and that's how  
9 they were aware of that, I guess, or may have been aware of  
10 that today. I don't have the exact date the informational  
11 mailing went out, which I can turn to, I think Mr. Shelly  
12 could probably find that out for you.

13           But otherwise, we did send a referral out to the  
14 City of Glenarden. It's just the fact that that was the  
15 wrong person that we had on file because that -- their  
16 contact information was not updated at that time.

17           VICE-CHAIR BAILEY: Okay. We do have the correct  
18 information now?

19           MR. HUNT: Correct. That's absolutely correct.  
20 We do have some other development applications coming in and  
21 we've since then updated that. So they are going to be  
22 getting the referrals. The correct person will be getting  
23 the referrals.

24           MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chair, this is Councilman Curtis.  
25 Just to add to the answer, if I may?

1 MR. CHAIR: Briefly, Mr. Curtis, but yes.

2 MR. CURTIS: Yeah. So the two people that the  
3 gentleman before me referenced were -- one was the elected  
4 official who was no longer the mayor of the City of  
5 Glenarden; the other one was a former city manager from, I  
6 think, maybe like 14, 15 years ago. And so we were made  
7 aware of this very late, and which is why we only met with  
8 Mr. Gibbs and the client, I think, two weeks ago. So we  
9 were just made aware of this. So thank you.

10 MR. CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, councilmember.  
11 Thank you, Mr. Hunt.

12 Vice-Chair Bailey, other questions?

13 VICE-CHAIR BAILEY: Well, I don't have any other  
14 questions, but there has been a lot of discussion about the  
15 roundabout. And I have to tell you, the roundabouts have  
16 increased my religion because every time I go through one, I  
17 start praying because I can't follow the roundabouts and  
18 it's just always confusing for me. And as much as I enjoy  
19 going to Woodmore, that area to some of the places, the  
20 stores, the shops and all of that kind of stuff, it really  
21 is somewhat complicated to me. So I'm glad that we're  
22 looking at it carefully, and hopefully, that we can continue  
23 to improve and make it better in terms of folks visiting  
24 that area and that transportation. But to me, it's just --  
25 it -- as I said at the beginning, it has increased my



1 religion. I don't -- I really don't.

2 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Oh, boy.

3 VICE-CHAIR BAILEY: It's hard to follow.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Vice-Chair Bailey.

5 Commissioners, other questions? Commissioner  
6 Washington?

7 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: I do for Mr. Ryan. I  
8 just -- and this is a relatively short distance between like  
9 the last roundabout by the Best Buy, if you will, up to like  
10 the intersection of Saint John -- Saint Joseph's and Ruby  
11 Lockhart. And what I wonder, have there -- were there any  
12 discussions or thoughts about other -- and I say traffic  
13 calming, or just lanes, because I'm thinking if I were to --  
14 if I'm leaving the Best Buy, I'm on the roundabout, I'm  
15 headed towards the intersection of Saint Joseph's and Ruby  
16 Lockhart, I'm probably speeding up a little bit more because  
17 I know I'm only going to a red light. I'm not approaching  
18 another roundabout. I mean, I don't know, does the speed  
19 bump or -- Mr. Ryan, I would defer to your expertise, but  
20 does anything make sense because I'm thinking even for the  
21 people coming out of the development, there is -- there  
22 would be no -- and this is a question actually -- no like  
23 merge lane. I mean, they would be coming out immediately  
24 into the oncoming traffic, right? So I just wonder, was  
25 there any discussion about how to help manage that flow

1 or --

2 MR. RYAN: So in terms of residents accessing Ruby  
3 Lockhart from the site access location, the Applicant, Mr.  
4 Lenhart's study, indicated about 330 feet from the site  
5 access to the intersection of Saint Joseph's and Ruby  
6 Lockhart. Prince George's County does not have corner  
7 clearance requirements, but we look to SHA, which they  
8 recommend at least 200 for a site like this. So in that  
9 sense, the residents turning onto Ruby Lockhart do have  
10 sufficient weaving space to get to the intersection.

11 Regarding the safety of the roundabout near the  
12 Best Buy to the intersection in question, you know, it's two  
13 lanes. There's a median on one side, and a bicycle lane in  
14 place on the other. You know, the drivers would see that  
15 they are approaching an intersection and would hopefully  
16 slow down as they approach this.

17 I've heard a lot of complaints about traffic in  
18 this location. I haven't specifically -- a speed issue  
19 within the internal roadways. But yeah, I think that  
20 portion of Ruby Lockhart operates sufficiently. It doesn't  
21 necessarily need any traffic calming devices.

22 MR. CHAIR: All right. Commissioner Washington?

23 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: I'm kind of noodling  
24 what I just heard because it's just an area that I frequent  
25 often. So I'm sensitive to, you know, not only where the

1 Applicant finds themselves in terms of just few to no other  
2 options, but just the reality of movements and circulation  
3 in that area. And I guess the other thing for me, too, is,  
4 yeah, there are bicycle lanes, but if we're talking about  
5 accessing the commercial side of this from the property,  
6 then we -- I would be biking in ongoing -- in incoming  
7 traffic if I'm going down Ruby Lockhart because, otherwise,  
8 I'd have to go up to the intersection, cross over and then  
9 come -- use the bike lane down from -- on the L.A. Fitness  
10 side, right?

11 MR. RYAN: That is correct, and as I had  
12 mentioned, there was a mid-block crossing analysis where,  
13 you know, we had this exact scenario in mind. And while it  
14 would be ideal to allow a mid-block crossing at Ruby  
15 Lockhart at this location, a mid-block crossing analysis, it  
16 gives a sufficient linear foot distance from which drivers  
17 turning onto Ruby Lockhart would be able to see a mid-block  
18 crossing and see possible pedestrians and bicyclists using  
19 that path.

20 There is an anticipation when drivers turn left  
21 from Saint Joseph's onto Ruby Lockhart that they're only  
22 going to be moving straight along that roadway. The mid-  
23 block crossing analysis indicated there could be potential  
24 safety implications with vehicles turning left onto Ruby  
25 Lockhart if a mid-block crosswalk crossing was allowed at

1 that location.

2 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: No, and I understand  
3 that, and I was clear about that when you commented on it  
4 earlier. I guess my point was there's just no easy way for  
5 them to access the commercial without there being some sort  
6 of risk, whether I'm on a bike or whether I'm in my car. I  
7 mean, that's kind of where I'm landing. And I'm wanting  
8 somebody to help me understand it differently or better,  
9 quite frankly.

10 MR. RYAN: The site constraints in this case do  
11 make movement into and out of the site. It's a unique case  
12 in that sense. But yes, in this case, bicyclists would  
13 be -- would turn out of the site, go up to the intersection  
14 and use the crosswalks to cross, to then access the  
15 westbound side of Ruby Lockhart to use that bicycle lane.

16 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: And Mr. Chairman, the --  
17 he questioned access through the -- I guess the PMA area  
18 into the commercial side, and into the commercial side. Is  
19 it a 15-foot drop the entire length of the property? I  
20 mean, is it -- did you consider maybe looking at a bridge or  
21 another crosswalk, maybe lower on the property or at a  
22 different point?

23 MR. RYAN: We examined -- we did not think it was  
24 feasible. It's a very steep slope the entire way across.  
25 It was examined when the application was received but you

1 know, upon looking at the environmental slope and that area  
2 is somewhat designed as a buffer as well. It doesn't allow  
3 for a pedestrian or bicycle access to the commercial portion  
4 along that part of the property.

5 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Okay. I'll stop there,  
6 Mr. Chairman, and hear what Mr. Gibbs has to say. Thank  
7 you.

8 MR. CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner.

9 Commissioners, any other questions?

10 All right. So let's turn to Mr. Gibbs. You are  
11 on rebuttal.

12 MR. GIBBS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of  
13 the Board. I'm going to make a few preliminary comments and  
14 I'm going to ask Mr. Lenhart to address the fears and  
15 concerns that have been raised relative to traffic. But a  
16 couple comments first and then I want to just conclude after  
17 he finishes.

18 First of all, the informational mailing was sent  
19 pursuant to our affidavit on December 2, 2022m and the  
20 affidavit of mailing contains a list of all those persons  
21 who received the mailing. The current mayor of Glenarden,  
22 Mayor Cashenna Cross, received one of those mailings, as did  
23 just the City of Glenarden. The acceptance mailing, the  
24 mailing that we have to send out immediately prior to the  
25 time that the case is accepted, that was sent on April 25th

1 of 2023. So we got accepted maybe a week after that. But  
2 it was sent on April 25th of 2023, and it was sent, once  
3 again, to the list provided to us by Staff. And also, once  
4 again, included in that acceptance mailing was Mayor  
5 Casheena Cross, Councilmember Erika Fareed, and the City of  
6 Glenarden in general.

7 I would have not been able to -- the list is --  
8 the list grew from the time of the informational mailing to  
9 the acceptance mailing -- and I haven't had a chance to go  
10 through it all -- but on the very first -- there's three  
11 pages of lists of mailings and the very first one is Mayor  
12 Cross and the third one is Councilwoman Fareed. So those  
13 notices did go out.

14 And let -- and in further comment to the  
15 representation that was made about not hearing anything  
16 until recently. I personally called the City of Glenarden  
17 on April 26, 2023. I spoke to Ms. Habada, who I understood  
18 at that time was the City Manager, or City Clerk, and I  
19 asked her when she would like us to come to make a  
20 presentation to the mayor and city council. I also, on that  
21 same day at 2:45, via email, which I'm more than happy to  
22 provide, sent an email to Ms. Habada. And on that email I  
23 attached our application, our justification statement, and  
24 all of our Site Plan and elevation drawings.

25 I then, again, on May 16th, spoke directly with

1 Mayor Cross. I reiterated our willingness to meet with the  
2 mayor and city council because I had never heard anything  
3 back from Ms. Habada. And I forwarded to Mayor Cross my  
4 email of April 26th to Ms. Habada, and as well as all of the  
5 attachments that I had sent to Ms. Habada. So that was two  
6 times we contacted them and offered to meet.

7           Then more recently, I received a telephone call  
8 from an individual who identified herself, I believe, as the  
9 new city clerk, or city manager -- Ms. Habada, I guess, had  
10 left -- and I said, well, she said -- and she said, well, we  
11 want to schedule you guys to come in. And I said, sure,  
12 we'd be happy to come in; we've been trying to do it. And  
13 she said, well, will you send me the application materials?  
14 And I said, well, I've sent it twice. I'll be happy to send  
15 it a third time. And she looked and she said, oh yeah, we  
16 do have that here. But I said, don't worry, I'll send it  
17 yet again. So I sent it three times, and that led to our  
18 meeting on June 21st.

19           But to be certain -- to be certain, we were trying  
20 to outreach to the City of Glenarden since before our case  
21 was accepted and offered to meet with the mayor and city  
22 council to make our presentation, and there was little more  
23 that we could do beyond that. Once again, I'm happy to send  
24 copies of these emails to anybody who may wish to have them.

25           I would also say that having been the attorney of

1 record for every entitlement application which has been  
2 filed at Woodmore Towne Centre, I have reached out to and  
3 made presentations to the mayor and city council of  
4 Glenarden on every case that I filed; and including the  
5 revision to the Conceptual Site Plan that moved these multi-  
6 family units to this particular site. So -- and indeed, for  
7 the very first Conceptual Site Plan, that set the varying  
8 types and numbers of residential units to be developed  
9 within Woodmore Towne Centre. So you know, I respect --  
10 very deeply respect the views of all the councilmembers at  
11 the city right now, but we have really -- I mean, we've  
12 never shut the city out from any participation or knowledge  
13 of anything, historically or currently, that we've been  
14 doing at Woodmore Towne Centre.

15 I would -- almost all these comments were about  
16 traffic, and I would say many of these comments are about  
17 offsite traffic issues, which are really not part of the  
18 legal criteria for an analysis of a Detailed Site Plan. You  
19 know, how the intersection of Saint Joseph's Drive and Ruby  
20 Lockhart Boulevard, or Maryland 202 and Saint Joseph's Drive  
21 functions is, you know -- that that's -- that's a  
22 Preliminary Subdivision Plan issue, not a Detailed Site Plan  
23 issue. But I know that Mr. Lenhart has looked at -- we were  
24 asked to look at whether or not an accel, decel lane at our  
25 site entrance could be helpful or would be needed. Mr.



1 Lenhart did that study. His study was filed into the record  
2 on July 3rd. And I'd like him to address that. I mean, if  
3 the Planning Board would like us to look at that further,  
4 we're happy to do it, but I would like -- because almost all  
5 the testimony has been restricted to traffic issues, I  
6 really would like to have Mr. Lenhart go through that again  
7 with you, including his understanding of how the traffic  
8 signal at -- even though it's not a relevant issue from a  
9 legal standpoint, how the traffic signal at Saint Joseph's  
10 and Ruby Lockhart functions.

11 Mr. Lenhart, could you please help us out?

12 MR. CHAIR: And let me step in before Mr. Lenhart  
13 goes. I mean, this is (unintelligible), right? The -- that  
14 the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision was approved 17 years  
15 ago. Now, granted, as Mr. Lenhart has pointed out, you  
16 know, it meets the basic criteria, and then we all know who  
17 live and work around this area, that there's all sorts of  
18 ongoing issues. But I want to be clear with, I'm talking to  
19 myself, as well as my fellow commissioners and folks in the  
20 public, what is before us are not these traffic issues  
21 because that's something that's decided in a Preliminary  
22 Plan of Subdivision. They have a valid approval for that.

23 And so I understand Mr. Gibbs wants to be  
24 respectful and make sure that Mr. Lenhart is coming before  
25 us to answer questions that we've heard, but again, I

1 caution all of us that it's stepping beyond the bounds of  
2 what is before us at the Detailed Site Plan. I'm certainly  
3 going to allow it because I'm curious about it, folks in the  
4 community are as well, and so I'll leave it at that.

5 Mr. Gibbs, he's turned to Mr. Lenhart.

6 Mr. Lenhart, take it away.

7 MR. LENHART: Yes. So I've taken a few notes  
8 here. I'd like to address some of the comments that were  
9 raised and I'll start with the number of trips generated by  
10 the subdivision. We have 113 a.m. and 111 p.m. trips.  
11 That's combined in and out trips. That equates to about one  
12 trip per minute for in or outbound traffic. It's -- you  
13 know, it's a relative -- it's not a low traffic generator,  
14 but it's a relatively low traffic generator compared to  
15 other uses. And when you think of it in terms of one -- you  
16 know, one trip outbound per minute -- let's say if you've  
17 got a two or three-minute cycle length of the signal at  
18 Saint Joseph, that's about two to three vehicles per cycle  
19 length that it's adding. It's not -- it's relatively a  
20 small impact when you look at the overall scheme of things.

21 The accel/decel lanes, as Mr. Ryan and Mr. Gibbs  
22 indicated, DPIE had asked us to look at whether accel and  
23 decel lanes were warranted here. DPIE does not have their  
24 own criteria, but State Highway Administration does; and  
25 DPIE often defers to the State in these types of instances.

1 So we utilize the State Highway guidelines for looking at  
2 whether accel/decel lanes are warranted, and they are --  
3 it's not even close. They're clearly not warranted in this  
4 situation.

5           We've provided that information to DPIE. We --  
6 ultimately, DPIE issues the permit for the access. And so  
7 if they agree that they're not warranted, they won't be  
8 required. If they -- if we work through it with them and  
9 they say, well, we believe that they are warranted, then we  
10 will have to provide them. But it's an access issue through  
11 the permitting agency and ultimately, they have the  
12 authority to require or not require those.

13           There was some discussion about roundabout safety  
14 and the Commissioner, you know, indicated that she has some  
15 discomfort; and I think there were some other people that  
16 talked about crashes in roundabouts. We're not claiming  
17 that there are no crashes in roundabouts. There -- I mean  
18 crashes happen at nearly every intersection. But  
19 roundabouts, the data shows that roundabouts clearly have  
20 far fewer personal injury accidents. Most of the crashes  
21 that occur at roundabouts are sideswipes that -- you know,  
22 minor property damage. They're not -- I'm not saying  
23 injuries don't occur, they could occur, but the data shows  
24 that they are far, far fewer than regular signalized  
25 intersections where those experience higher amounts of --

1 higher read-end accidents and T-bone type accidents, which  
2 are more, more dramatic and typically end up in higher  
3 property damage and levels of injuries and fatalities.

4           So when we say that they're safe and effective,  
5 they are safer, more effective. Crashes can still occur,  
6 but there are typically minor property damage type  
7 accidents.

8           There was a lot of discussion about bikes and  
9 pedestrian access. So bikes, I would concur with Mr. Ryan's  
10 discussion that there is a bike lane, or there are bike  
11 lanes on both sides of Ruby Lockhart. So if somebody comes  
12 out of the site and they want to ride their bike through the  
13 Towne Centre, they would ride their bike down the -- we'll  
14 call it the eastbound direction of Ruby Lockhart to the  
15 signal at Saint Joseph's. They would cross at the  
16 pedestrian crosswalk, and then they would ride their bike up  
17 the westbound direction of Ruby Lockhart to get to the Towne  
18 Centre. There are dedicated bike lanes there; there's a  
19 safe pedestrian crossing. And really that -- you know, one  
20 might look at this and say, well, you know, I'm closer to  
21 the Towne Centre, I want to go to the Towne Centre, but in  
22 terms of distance, there's really no difference than if you  
23 take Ruby Lockhart and you go east of Saint Joseph's. And  
24 I'm looking at the aerial imagery on the screen. If you  
25 continue east of Saint Joseph's, you can see on the north

1 side of Ruby Lockhart there's -- under construction there is  
2 a multi-family housing development at that location. That  
3 the east of there, there is townhouse community that was  
4 recently completed. Anyone that lives in any one of those  
5 areas has to ride their bike a similar distance to what  
6 would be required for this project. You know, it's on the  
7 other side of the intersection, but it's the same distance  
8 bike ride.

9           Similarly, if you go north on Saint Joseph's from  
10 Ruby Lockhart and the Balk Hill community, that's around the  
11 roundabout there. All of those folks who would want to ride  
12 their bike are riding a similar distance. They ride south  
13 on Saint Joseph's, they turn right onto Ruby Lockhart up to  
14 Woodmore Towne Centre. And so you know, it's -- as the crow  
15 flies, this site -- you know, somebody might want to get  
16 through the woods or a closer route to be able to ride their  
17 bikes, but you know, there's not always a way to provide an  
18 access in terms of the shortest path the crow flies  
19 sometimes; you might need to ride your bike a little bit  
20 further. In this case an extra 3-, 4-, 500 feet. And there  
21 is safe access and provided bike lanes.

22           As far as pedestrian access, the majority of  
23 Woodmore Towne Centre is within a half mile and a 10-minute  
24 walk of this site using the existing sidewalks on the south  
25 side of Ruby Lockhart. And so there is adequate pedestrian

1 access to get to and from there. If they're doing a larger  
2 shopping trip to the Wegmans or the Costco, they're not  
3 likely to walk. They're going to get in their car, they're  
4 going to make a right turn out of the site, and they would  
5 make a U-turn under the protection of the traffic signal at  
6 Saint Joseph's to turn back to get to more Towne Centre shop  
7 and then return.

8           And so you know, it is -- could there be maybe a  
9 little better access in terms of direct bicycle or  
10 pedestrian right into the center? There could be, but it's  
11 really not feasible in this case due to the environmental,  
12 the elevations. And the alternative that we are able to  
13 provide is really not out of -- out of the ordinary. I  
14 mean, it's safe, it's effective, it's really not that far  
15 out of the way when you look at the scheme of things. So  
16 hopefully, that addresses the questions or comments. I  
17 (unintelligible).

18           COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Yeah, I have a question --  
19 I have a question, Mr. Lenhart, for you.

20           MR. LENHART: Yeah.

21           COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Within your realm of  
22 expertise as a transportation engineer, you -- did you hear  
23 the comments of some of the speakers relative to concerns  
24 over safety, being able to pull out of the project, go up to  
25 the light at Saint Joseph's/Ruby Lockhart, and then be able

1 to make a U-turn; or coming in, to go down beyond the access  
2 and go around the circle at the Best Buy parking lot and  
3 then come back up? In your realm of expertise, and based  
4 upon your studies, do you have an opinion as to whether or  
5 not those movements can be made safely?

6 MR. LENHART: Yes, absolutely, they can. This is  
7 a low-speed roadway. The -- it's restricted to a right-in,  
8 a right-out. The sight lines are more than adequate for  
9 safe ingress, egress. Is there some congestion during peak  
10 periods or you know, morning, mid-day, evening? Yes, sure,  
11 there's some congestion. This is -- you know, this is right  
12 outside of the Capital Beltway. There -- the guidelines and  
13 the subdivision ordinance, adequacy requirements do allow  
14 levels of congestion. And so you know, it wouldn't be  
15 reasonable to think that you're going to come up here and  
16 have zero wait and just be able to turn and go. There --  
17 you might have to wait for a gap; you may have to wait for  
18 someone to let you in, let you out; but that's very common  
19 in these types of situations. Again, low-speed, very good  
20 sight lines and not a heavy inbound or outbound movement.  
21 It's relatively light.

22 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Thank you. Thank you very  
23 much.

24 MR. LENHART: I would also -- one other thing I  
25 wanted to add. Someone asked the question about traffic

1 calming devices to speed humps. The Ruby Lockhart Road --  
2 Boulevard is a major collector roadway in the Master Plan.  
3 It is unlikely -- the County does have a traffic calming  
4 program. They have checklists that they follow to evaluate  
5 whether traffic calming devices such as speed humps are  
6 warranted. And it's a very quantitative analysis, you know,  
7 through the checklists, and either it meets or it doesn't  
8 meet. But then -- and there's many situations on collector  
9 or higher roadways where the County simply would not want  
10 speed humps due to emergency response, you know, fire  
11 trucks, different things like that can be slowed down or  
12 damaged by installation of those devices. So -- I wouldn't  
13 doubt that they would allow it, but there is a mechanism  
14 where the County can review those requests.

15 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Thank you very much.

16 MR. GIBBS: Mr. Chairman, I -- our other  
17 transportation engineer, Maribel Wong, of Gorove Slade, she  
18 has knowledge about whether or not there is a gate at the  
19 entrance to Saint Joseph's off of Saint Joseph's Drive.  
20 Would you like to hear that from her?

21 MR. CHAIR: Yes, please.

22 MR. GIBBS: Okay. Ms. Wong, could you please  
23 introduce yourself and answer the question whether or not  
24 the existing left turn into the Saint Joseph's parking lot  
25 off of northbound Saint Joseph's Drive is gated.



1 MS. WONG: This is Maribel Wong for the record.  
2 Yes, there is an existing gate at the existing entrance that  
3 exists off of Saint Joseph's Drive today.

4 MR. GIBBS: Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman --

5 MR. CHAIR: But they open the gate on Sundays is  
6 what you're saying?

7 MS. WONG: Yes, the church controls the access to  
8 their parking lot and close it and open as they deem fit.  
9 So in theory, yes, the assumption is that they only open it  
10 during service.

11 MR. CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.

12 Thank you, Mr. Gibbs.

13 MR. GIBBS: Thank you, sir. Just a few comments  
14 in wrapping up. You know, it's apparent from some of the  
15 comments and testimony given that, you know, people just  
16 don't want any more apartments because there are some multi-  
17 family units that have been built not within Woodmore Towne  
18 Centre, but in other nearby developments. And the only  
19 thing I would say to that is that for Woodmore Towne Centre,  
20 450 to 460 multi-family units have been approved for  
21 development since 2005. And so my client is just sort of  
22 following up on the approvals that have already been granted  
23 for this project.

24 And once again, you know, this particular  
25 location, out lot A, was examined. There's a lengthy

1 Planning Board resolution approving CSP-03006-02. The  
2 district -- after the Planning Board approved it, the  
3 district council reviewed it and approved it as well. And  
4 you know, their -- or to my knowledge in reading of those  
5 resolutions and orders, no issues raised relative to access.

6           You know, we're dealing with a project here that  
7 has a long life. Projects this large take this long to  
8 develop. You know, I did the Fairwood Community. It took  
9 us 24 years to get through that. Now we're coming into year  
10 20 of Woodmore Towne Centre and that's just the nature of  
11 major, large, mixed-use projects of this nature. It takes a  
12 long time. You have to deal with recessions. You have to  
13 deal with the fact that some of the uses that are approved  
14 are -- there's no market for them at a particular point in  
15 time, and then later years come and the market does appear,  
16 and so things have to sort of play themselves out. And that  
17 is the reason why major projects like this can develop under  
18 a Subdivision Plan that was approved years previously  
19 because they were tested for the total impact that they  
20 would generate on the surrounding roads.

21           And look, I mean, thank goodness that we have a  
22 project that is this successful. You know, when you go to  
23 successful mixed-use projects, you go to places like Tysons  
24 Corner. You have some congestion because people want to get  
25 in there and -- to me, I say, you know, I -- my office is

1 directly across off of McCormick Drive. I am in here three  
2 to four to five times a week either at lunchtime or in  
3 evening after work hours and you know, there -- yeah,  
4 there's -- there are cars but everything moves and  
5 everything moves safely. And quite frankly, by and large,  
6 you know, the driving patterns that are observed are such  
7 that many people, most people who shop here, shop here with  
8 regularity, and they're familiar with the traffic patterns.

9           You know, we have an FAR. In the M-X-T Zone,  
10 development density is approved by FAR, floor area ratio.  
11 The FAR approved for this project is 1.4. Woodmore Towne  
12 Centre, including everything, the entire Woodmore Towne  
13 Centre development presently exists at an FAR of 0.33 to  
14 0.38. That means they're at one-quarter of the approved FAR  
15 for ultimate development of the project. And the trip cap,  
16 everything is way beneath the approved trip cap.

17           So I don't want to be disrespectful in any way to  
18 concerns of the speakers who have come forward. I respect  
19 them and I respect their concerns, but major projects like  
20 this carry with it, thankfully, a lot of interest and a lot  
21 of attraction to motorists coming to shop, and that's part  
22 of success.

23           And I will only say, you know, that since we do  
24 meet all of the criteria for an approval, I would  
25 respectfully request that the Planning Board approve this

1 Application as it has been presented. And certainly, we're  
2 willing to entertain any other questions any Commissioner  
3 may have, but we do believe that we have a legal lot that  
4 has been through the platting process. It's been approved  
5 for the development that we're proposing.

6 And listen, we have two transportation experts,  
7 that's it -- two transportation experts that weighed in --  
8 well, three if you include Ms. Wong. But in terms of  
9 capacity, in terms of circulation, in terms of safety, we  
10 have two transportation experts, Mr. Ryan and Mr. Lenhart.  
11 They both say that this is okay. This meets the  
12 requirements. And so with that being said, again, I would  
13 respectfully request that the Board approve this Detailed  
14 Site Plan as it meets all legal requirements for such an  
15 approval. Thank you very much for your time.

16 MR. CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Gibbs.

17 Hey, folks, I'm sorry to do this, but I need to  
18 take a quick break. Commissioners, do we need a slightly  
19 extended break, yes? Five minutes, okay? All right. We'll  
20 take a five-minute break. We'll come right back.

21 (Recess.)

22 MR. CHAIR: Back from a brief break. Okay. We  
23 are back from our break. We have heard rebuttal and close  
24 to the Applicant. I'll close the public hearing. We are  
25 under deliberation.

1           Commissioners, let me just start off by saying,  
2 you know, which I said before, we talked a lot about issues  
3 related to potential impacts to offsite facilities like  
4 roads and intersections, et cetera. I think we all know it  
5 and I'm glad we had the discussion, but it's actually not  
6 what's before us with the Detailed Site Plan, even though  
7 I'm glad we sort of allowed the public forum related to  
8 this. So -- if we can -- as we deliberate, and as we  
9 consider action, if we can restrict this to issues related  
10 to the Detailed Site Plan, I think that keeps us on task,  
11 okay? So we are under deliberation and thoughts, reactions,  
12 Commissioners, for -- look for a motion.

13           COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Yeah, I'll -- well, I'll  
14 just start, Mr. Chairman, by thanking you for reminding us  
15 of that important context and our role and responsibility  
16 today. And I think it's also worth thanking Mr. Gibbs, and  
17 certainly, the citizens because it was a good discussion.  
18 It was a -- I think it was a really good discussion, albeit  
19 out of scope. Clearly, hearts and minds needed to be  
20 clearer and hear -- and just hear some things. So I just  
21 want to be on the record as saying thank you.

22           And also, I can't remember, I believe it was the  
23 councilwoman or councilperson that spoke, talked about not  
24 being involved or engaged earlier in the process. And  
25 perhaps, someone -- Mr. Hunt, you or someone on our team,

1 can make sure that they -- because what I was hearing was  
2 not necessarily just involved in like the DSPs or  
3 Preliminary Plans, but much earlier in the planning  
4 development process as it relates to what's going to happen  
5 in a community, because that's where really -- at least in  
6 my mind, that's where I heard that there was a need to -- or  
7 desire to be engaged. So if we could connect with the  
8 community in that regard, I think that would also be  
9 beneficial.

10 MR. CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner.

11 Other commissioners? Questions? Comments?  
12 Thoughts? If not, then I would look for a motion.

13 VICE-CHAIR BAILEY: Just one quick comment.

14 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: I --

15 VICE-CHAIR BAILEY: I'm sorry, excuse me.

16 MR. CHAIR: Yes?

17 VICE-CHAIR BAILEY: I couldn't get my mic on, but  
18 I just thank you for your comment about the -- making sure  
19 that we remember why we're here, and on this -- particularly  
20 on this particular case and staying focused. I did make a  
21 comment that had very little to do with the case about my  
22 ability to navigate roundabouts, and so that had nothing to  
23 do with the case; it had more to do with my ability to  
24 effectively and efficiently navigate a roundabout no matter  
25 where it is. So I want to make sure that everybody

1 understands that I realize that this is not a part of the  
2 case, but something that I wanted to express at that  
3 particular time.

4 And thank you, Mr. Chair.

5 MR. CHAIR: And also about your relationship with  
6 God, which was helpful to hear.

7 VICE-CHAIR BAILEY: Absolutely, because I do pray  
8 when I do those roundabouts no matter where they are.

9 MR. CHAIR: Commissioner Geraldo, anything from  
10 your side?

11 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Well, I just want to thank  
12 the citizens for coming and hope they understand that we  
13 appreciate all of their comments, you know, but at this  
14 stage of the proceeding, those issues that they've raised  
15 should have been raised, or would have been raised  
16 previously; it's not an issue now. And I understand because  
17 I go there from time to time. And I know the traffic  
18 circle, Commissioner Vice-Chair Bailey, what usually happens  
19 is not so much you, but there's people that really don't  
20 know how to navigate roundabouts, because I had the same  
21 problem on Oxon Hill Road --

22 VICE-CHAIR BAILEY: Yeah.

23 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: -- and by the new school in  
24 Fort Washington, which is -- has always been of a concern to  
25 me with the students there because people don't know how to

1 navigate; they don't understand that you have to yield to  
2 the person who is first in the circle. And so -- but I  
3 sympathize with that issue.

4 I also thank Mr. Gibbs and the developers, and the  
5 Applicants for the dog park, and for making the proffer to  
6 add the EV charging. I think that's something that our  
7 County needs to work on more. There's going -- there's  
8 already an existing shortage of charging stations for EVs;  
9 and the situation is only going to be -- get worse before  
10 better. But other than that, I just thank everybody and for  
11 their participation, Mr. Chair.

12 MR. CHAIR: Thank you. I appreciate all the  
13 thoughtful remarks.

14 And Commissioners, if there's no further  
15 deliberation, I would look for a motion.

16 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Mr. Chairman, I'll make  
17 the motion, and I'll just have one final comment, and that  
18 is to Mr. Lenhart. And I believe I'm quoting him correctly  
19 when he said the way the crow flies. I was not -- I was not  
20 familiar with that term, but every time I see him  
21 henceforth, I will think about that phrase.

22 So with that, Mr. Chairman -- with that, Mr.  
23 Chairman, I move that we adopt the findings of Staff to  
24 include the technical corrections as read into the record by  
25 Staff and approve DSP-22034, DDS-22002, AC-23001 and TCP2-



1 053-07-06, along with the conditions as outlined in Staff's  
2 report and as further modified by Applicant Exhibit No. 1.  
3 And also want to ensure that we incorporate two proffered  
4 conditions by the Applicant as they were read into the  
5 record. The first has to do with dog park shall be -- dog  
6 parks shall be constructed at the time or point of first  
7 occupancy; and the second will be to show the number of EV  
8 charging stations at the time of certification. And I would  
9 ask Staff and Council to ensure that the language is  
10 included in the resolution appropriately.

11 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: Second.

12 MR. CHAIR: A motion by Commissioner Washington is  
13 seconded by Commissioner Geraldo. Any discussion on the  
14 motion? No discussion.

15 I will call the roll. Commissioner Washington?

16 COMMISSIONER WASHINGTON: Vote aye.

17 MR. CHAIR: Commissioner Geraldo?

18 COMMISSIONER GERALDO: I vote aye.

19 MR. CHAIR: Vice-Chair Bailey?

20 VICE-CHAIR BAILEY: I vote aye.

21 MR. CHAIR: I vote aye as well. The ayes have it  
22 4-0.

23 Thanks to everyone from the (unintelligible), the  
24 City of Glenarden, councilmembers, Mr. Gibbs and your team,  
25 and Mr. Shelly. Thank you all very much.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. SHELLY: Thank you, members of the Planning Board and Mr. Chairman, members, and have a nice day.

MR. CHAIR: Thank you.

**(Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded.)**

DIGITALLY SIGNED CERTIFICATE

ESCRIBERS, LLC, hereby certified that the attached pages represent an accurate transcript of the electronic sound recording of the proceedings before the Prince George's County Planning Board in the matter of:

9113 BALTIMORE AVENUE

Detailed Site Plan, DSP-22034 and DDS-22002



By: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: August 8, 2023

Tracy Hahn, Transcriber