

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