| 1 | OFFICE OF THE ZONING HEARING EXAMINER | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | FOR PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY | | | |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | |
| 5 | x : | | | |
| 6 | : Case No. SE 4852 | | | |
| 7 | : : | | | |
| 8 | x | | | |
| 9 | | | | |
| 10 | A hearing in the above-entitled matter was held on | | | |
| 11 | December 14, 2022, at the Prince George's County Office of | | | |
| 12 | Zoning, County Administration Building, Room 2174, Upper | | | |
| 13 | Marlboro, Maryland 20772 before: | | | |
| 14 | | | | |
| 15 | Maurene McNeil | | | |
| 16 | Hearing Examiner | | | |
| 17 | | | | |
| 18 | | | | |
| 19 | | | | |
| 20 | | | | |
| 21 | | | | |
| 22 | | | | |
| 23 | | | | |
| 24 | | | | |
| 25 | | | | |

Deposition Services, Inc.

P.O. Box 1040
Burtonsville, MD 20866
Tel: (301) 881-3344 Fax: (301) 881-3338
info@DepositionServices.com www.DepositionServices.com

APPEARANCES

On Behalf of the Applicant:

Nathaniel Forman, Esq.

On Behalf of People's Zoning:

* * * * *

| | | | Page |
|-----------|----|-------------------|------|
| Testimony | of | Shraga Rabinowitz | 6 |
| Testimonv | of | Kevin Foster | 25 |

PROCEEDINGS

AUTOMATED SPEAKER: This conference will now be recorded.

MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Good morning, everyone.

I'm Maurene McNeil. I'll be the Hearing Examiner today and we're here on Special Exception 4852, a request to revise a certified non-conforming use. And today is December 14, 2022. If counsel would identify himself for the record?

MR. FORMAN: Good morning, everyone. My name is Nate Forman and I'm an attorney with O'Malley, Miles, Nylen & Gilmore, with offices in Greenbelt, Maryland.

MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Forman, the People's Zoning Counsel, Mr. Stan Brown, had a prior court commitment today and he will try to join use and apologizes that he's not here now. He wasn't aware of this hearing when he scheduled the other. And do you have any objection to proceeding without him?

MR. FORMAN: No objection to proceed without him, Madam Examiner.

MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. And is there anyone here signed in on this link that's opposed to this application?

(No affirmative response.)

MADAM EXAMINER: Everybody is pretty much your witness, Mr. Forman?

MR. FORMAN: Yes, Madam Examiner.

MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Then you may proceed, but just before you do, because we have a new counsel and because we have a new Zoning Ordinance, could you, even though I know it's in the Technical Staff Report, would you just touch on briefly a short opening explaining which code we're going under today and why? Thank you.

MR. FORMAN: Of course, Madam Examiner. So, to answer her, the question and talk about the proceedings, we are going to be proceeding under the prior Zoning Ordinance; and to the option, the reason we're doing that is this case has, was in the process of getting accepted, getting to this point prior to the adoption of the new Zoning Ordinance. So, that's why we have chosen to proceed and just continue along the path that we had started with, which was the prior Zoning Ordinance.

MADAM EXAMINER: And to your knowledge, and, and there's a provision in the new Zoning Ordinance that allows you to do this, correct?

MR. FORMAN: Yes, thank you, yes. Under 27-19, that section, there's the option for any applicant to proceed under the prior or the current Zoning Ordinance for a period of two years beginning in April 1, 2022, until April 1, 2024. So, even though this case wasn't actually accepted until after the enactment or adoption of the new Zoning Ordinance, we were still allowed to proceed under the

prior Zoning Ordinance.

MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. You may continue.

MR. FORMAN: All right. Thank you, Madam

Examiner. I'd just like to begin with just a, another quick

preview as to the purpose of today's testimony and today's

hearing, and it's to request a special exception approval to

increase a number of permanent dwelling units at Westgate at

Laurel Apartments on which are owned by the Applicant,

Westgate at Laurel, LLC; and the purpose is to increase a

number of permitted dwelling units by seven for a total of

225 dwelling units.

A special exception is required because Westgate at Laurel Apartments are certified, non-conforming use, and any enlargement or expansion of a non-conforming use requires special exception approval. This case was, the property, which you will hear from testimony, was constructed around 1965 and it became a certified, non-conforming use in 2001.

The unique feature of this application is that to accommodate the seven additional dwelling units. No external construction is required. The existing buildings can accommodate the additional units through internal construction only. There is space for all of them. More details will be provided regarding the property history, the nature of this request and its satisfaction of requirements

for special exception approval through the testimony of the two witnesses I plan to call.

My first witness is Mr. Shraga Rabinowitz, who also goes by Sha Rabinowitz; and he will testify on behalf of the Applicant. And my second witness is Mr. Kevin Foster, a land use planner with Gutschick, Little & Weber. And don't worry, Madam Examiner, we'll be sure to make sure you know how to spell Mr. Rabinowitz's last name.

So, unless there are any preliminary issues or concerns that will need to be addressed, I would like to call Mr. Shraga Rabinowitz as my first witness.

MADAM EXAMINER: Mr., please forgive me, Shraga Rabinowitz, also known as Sha, do you swear or affirm --

MR. RABINOWITZ: Perfect, first try.

MADAM EXAMINER: Do you swear or affirm under the penalties of perjury the testimony you shall give will be the truth and nothing but the truth?

MR. RABINOWITZ: Yes, I do.

MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. And do, please, spell that for the record for us, your name.

MR. RABINOWITZ: First name is, first name is Shraga, S-H-R-A-G-A, and my last name is Rabinowitz, R-A-B-I-N-O-W-I-T-Z.

MR. FORMAN: All right. Thank you. And, Mr. Rabinowitz, what is your address?

```
MR. RABINOWITZ: I live at 2408 Steel Road,
 1
 2
   Baltimore, Maryland 21209.
             MR. FORMAN: Okay. And what is your connection
 3
 4
   with Westgate at Laurel, LLC, the Applicant in this case?
 5
             MR. RABINOWITZ: I'm a Senior Regional Manager for
   the entity that owns Westgate at Laurel, LLC, as well as a
 6
 7
   resident agent for Westgate at Laurel, LLC.
             MR. FORMAN: Are you authorized to speak on behalf
 8
 9
   of Westgate at Laurel, LLC?
             MR. RABINOWITZ: Yes, I am.
10
11
             MR. FORMAN: Okay. Is Westgate at Laurel, LLC,
12
   currently in good standing with the state of Maryland?
13
             MR. RABINOWITZ: Yes, it is. We submitted a
   certificate of good standing that was issued by the state of
14
15
   Maryland. It should be included in the record.
16
             MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. And --
17
             MADAM EXHIBIT: Exhibit 31 for the record.
18
             MR. FORMAN: Oh.
19
                               Thank you.
             MR. RABINOWITZ:
20
             MR. FORMAN: Thank you. What type of business is
21
   Westgate at Laurel, LLC?
22
             MR. RABINOWITZ: We're owner and operator of a
23
   multi-family apartment complex called Westgate at Laurel.
24
             MR. FORMAN: And where is Westgate at Laurel
25
   located?
```

```
MR. RABINOWITZ: The main address is 8200 Gorman
 1
 2
   Avenue, Laurel, Maryland. There's 20 addresses for the
 3
   property. Nineteen of them have various residential units
    and the other one is the leasing office.
 5
              MR. FORMAN: Would you mind naming the, all the
 6
    addresses for the record, please, and make sure you, you
 7
    denote just specifically, again, which one is the leasing
   office?
 8
 9
              MR. RABINOWITZ: All of them are on Gorman Avenue.
10
    So, buildings 8100, 8102, 8104, 8106, 8108, 8110, 8112,
11
    8114, 8116, 8118, 8120; and then there's 8200, which is the
12
    leasing office; and then, again, residential buildings is
13
    8202, 8204, 8206, 8210, 8212, 8214 and 8216, again, all on
   Gorman Avenue.
14
15
             MR. FORMAN:
                          Thank you. And did you say 8208, or
   did I just miss that?
16
17
             MR. RABINOWITZ: I, I think I did. If I didn't,
18
   it's, there is 8206, 8208 and 8210.
19
             MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. That, just to be
20
    sure, I'm, probably with me just missing it, but I wanted to
   be clear.
21
22
             MR. RABINOWITZ:
                              No problem.
23
             MR. FORMAN: When was Westgate at Laurel
   Apartments purchased by Westgate at Laurel, LLC?
24
```

MR. RABINOWITZ: January of 2020.

MR. FORMAN: And have there been any improvements to Westgate at Laurel since it was purchased in January of 2020?

MR. RABINOWITZ: Yes, we made a number, number of improvements, specifically in the hallways. We put in LED lighting; we refreshed all the carpets there; and installed secure access to all the buildings. We have been renovating units as they become vacant. We've constructed a brand-new playground in a more central location. New appliances has been a very big thing at the property. HVAC units have been replaced as needed, which ended up being a lot of them. We did a, new signage and fresh paint for the exterior of the buildings. We've been replacing a lot of old roofs. We refreshed the parking lots with asphalt and paint; and we've dug up and replaced a couple of main sewer lines that needed replacing.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Do you have an approximate idea of how much was spent on these improvements?

MR. RABINOWITZ: Yes. So, in 2020, 2021, we've spent approximately \$520,000. I don't have the numbers for 2022 because it hasn't been closed out yet; but, again, we're talking hundreds of thousands of dollars each year.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. So, you, but you did make improvements in 2022, correct?

MR. RABINOWITZ: Correct, more of the same. Not

- new signage because that's a one-time thing, but the rest of the stuff are mostly as we go.
 - MR. FORMAN: And, and do you just have kind of a rough idea as to how much was spent this year?
 - MR. RABINOWITZ: I don't have that exact number, but I'm just based off of previous years, it's usually somewhere between 200 and \$350,000 each year.
 - MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. So, in the three years that you've owned it, you basically have spent almost three-quarters of a million dollars, if not more?
 - MR. RABINOWITZ: Correct.
- MR. FORMAN: Okay.

- MR. RABINOWITZ: And this is besides for, this is besides for regular maintenance that needs to be done to the property.
- MR. FORMAN: Okay. And what would you, what is kind of the, what is regular maintenance compared to these improvements that you have made?
- MR. RABINOWITZ: It's really whatever our maintenance, whatever tickets are put in by the tenants, whatever complaints they have, that, it would include a lot of the pipe replacement that I haven't included in the bigger improvements, but it ends up really adding up over the course of a year.
- MR. FORMAN: Okay. So, like, you know, broken

locks or maybe faulty windows, that type of stuff, is not --2 MR. RABINOWITZ: It includes lines, it could be 3 drywall work, it could be just general repairs as, as the 4 resident needs. 5 MR. FORMAN: Okay. Perfect. Thank you. 6 the occupancy rate for Westgate at Laurel Apartments? 7 MR. RABINOWITZ: It's a steady 95 percent. 8 MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. And when you 9 bought Westgate at Laurel Apartments, how many dwelling 10 units were there? MR. RABINOWITZ: Two hundred and nineteen. 11 12 MR. FORMAN: And when you applied for and 13 ultimately received a use and occupancy permit for this property, as shown on Exhibit 16, how many dwelling units 14 15 were actually allowed? 16 MR. RABINOWITZ: Two hundred and eighteen. MR. FORMAN: But when you bought the property, 17 18 there were 219 dwelling units in existence? 19 MR. RABINOWITZ: Correct. 20 MR. FORMAN: How was there 219 units if only 218 were there? 21 22 MR. RABINOWITZ: So, after we bought the property, 23 we learned that the former owner had converted a storage/old 24 laundry room into a unit. Only after we bought the property 25 and learned more about the history did we realize that this

was done without any approvals or permitting by the County.

MR. FORMAN: And are you still operating this property with 219 dwelling units?

MR. RABINOWITZ: Yes, we are.

MR. FORMAN: If you know your permit only allows for 218, why are you still operating with 219 units?

MR. RABINOWITZ: Yeah. The unpermitted unit was, was and still is occupied by the same resident from before the sale before we evicted the tenant or we wanted to see if there was some process to allow a 219th unit. Also, we bought the property in January of 2020. Pretty much right afterwards is when the pandemic happened and evictions for any reason was extremely hard to do. So, we, we, we also bought the property at 219 units and we wanted to try to keep the minimum of the property at 219 units.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. And how did you know that the unpermitted unit was occupied? I mean in, in theory, wouldn't it look like any other unit?

MR. RABINOWITZ: So, all other units on, on the entire property are all, it's all from an entrance on the front of the building. You go into a hallway. There are staircases going upstairs, downstairs. They all look the same. This unit is where a storage unit would be on any other building. There are a bunch of these storage units throughout the property, but this on over here has a unit

number on it on the outside of the building.

MR. FORMAN: And, thank you. And, Madam Examiner,
I believe Mr. Rabinowitz's point can be made better if we
have, if we can look at Exhibit 4, which is in the record,
please?

MADAM EXAMINER: Ms. Neal, could you pull up Exhibit 4?

MR. FORMAN: Can you scroll down, please? Can everyone see the, these images?

MR. RABINOWITZ: The best, the best images to be able to prove this is the bottom two images. If you want to zoom into that so people can see it better?

MR. FORMAN: The, yeah, the bottom right and the bottom left, correct?

MR. RABINOWITZ: No, just the bottom, the bottom middle. Yeah, the bottom, yeah, those two units. So, you can see that there's a main entrance to the building. All the units are through those glass doors. It goes up two flights and down one flight.

What we're looking at over here, I can't make out what building I'm looking at; but you can see a door on the right of the entrance and that's, that's a storage room.

That could be a, a maintenance shop. It could be a storage room. And at Building 8104, where the current tenant lives, that actually is a door with, that has a unit and has an

address on it.

MR. FORMAN: And that's how you could tell that where the unpermitted unit was located in that it was clearly in an area that had been previously marked and reserved for a storage area/a laundry room?

MR. RABINOWITZ: Correct.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. How many extra storage areas/laundry rooms exist on the property?

MR. RABINOWITZ: So, there's one in every single building, but there are seven altogether that could be converted into units. One of them has already been converted before we bought the property and there's another six that could be converted in the same exact way.

MR. FORMAN: And why are these spaces no longer necessary for storage or laundry facilities?

MR. RABINOWITZ: So, every single unit in Westgate at Laurel has their own laundry inside the unit, washer and dryer. Previously, it wasn't like that, so once they put it in every single unit, it no longer was needed.

MR. FORMAN: And I believe you had mentioned that not every storage/laundry room in the building can be converted. How many cannot be converted? There are 12.

MR. RABINOWITZ: There's 12 units, 12 cannot be converted and it would be 13, including Building 8200, which is the leasing office.

1 MR. FORMAN: Okay. And for, but seven can be 2 converted into dwelling units? MR. RABINOWITZ: Correct. 3 4 MR. FORMAN: Okay. And for, and why can the 12 5 units not be converted outside, 12, 12 areas not be converted? 6 7 MR. RABINOWITZ: So, there's, there's a couple different reasons, but for the most part, you're talking about they have gas meters, electrical meters, mechanical stuff like water heaters and stuff like that. So, those 10 11 theoretically have the space for a unit, but it would be a 12 lot harder to convert them. 13 MR. FORMAN: So, so, the only, really, 14 realistically, the only additional units you can, you could 15 ever get on this site through just internal construction would be the seven that are the subject of this special 16 17 exception, is that correct? 18 MR. RABINOWITZ: That is correct. 19 MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. And what is 20 required, or to convert the storage areas into dwelling 21 units, I mean is there anything that makes them 22 uninhabitable basically? 23 MR. RABINOWITZ: No, so, there's no external

construction. It's pretty easy to make it into a one-

bedroom apartment. They already have the hook-ups for gas,

24

and electric, and plumbing. I'm guessing that's because they used to be laundry rooms. It's, all hook-ups are there and it would mostly be about running the plumbing, electric, 3 gas where as needed and kind of drywall and framing. 5 MR. FORMAN: Okay. And how would these units be 6 accessed from the building? 7 MR. RABINOWITZ: So, they would basically have an access, a private entrance, as you can see in this exhibit that we're looking at; but they would also be able to get access from the main entrance by entering the glass doors, 10 11 going downstairs and there is a hallway that runs through 12 the basement that they could also have access from. 13 MR. FORMAN: And now many bedrooms would be able 14 to be supported through the conversion of these units? 15 MR. RABINOWITZ: It's, it's, it can only be a one-16 bedroom apartment. 17 MR. FORMAN: Just given the size of it, it's just, 18 it's only one bedroom? 19 MR. RABINOWITZ: I mean it's, it would be a decent 20 size living space; but putting a second bedroom would be 21 making it very, very tight. 22 MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. And, and --23 MR. RABINOWITZ: From --

MR. FORMAN: -- Madam Examiner, the, the typical

layout for one of these one-bedroom units can be seen on

24

Exhibit 19 if you would like to mark it for the record, at least look at it for right now.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Just if I could add to what I just said before, there's also a very, very high demand in our area for one-bedroom apartments. Westgate at Laurel mostly has two bedrooms. We have a few one-bedrooms and there's a very high demand for that.

MR. FORMAN: So, that you, you anticipate that if these are converted and made for lease, that they would be snapped up pretty quickly is what you're saying?

MR. RABINOWITZ: Correct.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. Where would these additional one-bedroom units be located?

MR. RABINOWITZ: So, Building 8100, we would call it Apartment A because most of our units are numerical; 8104, Apartment A is already in existence; 8110-A, 8116-A, 8204-A, 8208-A and 8216-A.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. And, and, Madam Examiner, the actual locations of these units are shown on the Site Plan, can be seen on Exhibit 30. They are the, the red boxes that are outlined throughout the property. And 8104-A, I, is the second from the leftmost one.

MR. RABINOWITZ: Right.

MR. FORMAN: So, that's the existing unit. Mr. Rabinowitz, I would like to ask you about the parking

situation at Westgate at Laurel and the type of impact you think these, the additional units might have on it. What was the parking situation like at Westgate at Laurel when you bought it in 2020?

MR. RABINOWITZ: Yeah. So, when we bought it in 2020, as I do by most new properties that we buy, I spend a lot of time at that specific property. Almost immediately, within the first week, I, I had multiple residents complaining to me about how bad the parking lots were. They said that people commuted to jobs, would park in our parking lot and leave the car there during the day. There would be people having multiple cars for even one-bedroom apartments. There were broken-down vehicles that weren't moved for, for weeks or even months. So, we, we, it took some time for us to get a parking system in place; but once we got it in place, it's really helped and there really hasn't been much of an issue.

MR. FORMAN: Could you please describe the, the parking enforcement system that you now use?

MR. RABINOWITZ: Yes. So, it's an online parking system that people have to register their cars with their real registrations and that has to match up to the rent roll. So, if there's any illegal occupants in a unit, he wouldn't be able to park his car there. Family and friends can't just keep their vehicles for, you know, an extended

```
period of time. And they, this company shares that
   information with a towing company who scans their plates and
   matches it up.
 3
 4
             MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. And if this
 5
    special exception were approved, as a practical matter,
   would the parking lot be able to handle the additional cars
 6
 7
   from these additional units?
              MR. RABINOWITZ: For sure. Under the system,
 8
 9
    there hasn't been an issue; and since there's only one-
   bedrooms, the maximum amount of spots we'd be adding is six
10
11
   more spots because that's what we allow for a one-bedroom
12
   apartment.
13
              MR. FORMAN: I, I think you mean, you mean seven
   because there's already the one existing that's not --
14
15
             MR. RABINOWITZ: That is correct.
16
             MR. FORMAN: -- (unintelligible).
17
             MR. RABINOWITZ: I apologize, seven more spots.
18
             MR. FORMAN:
                          No, no problem. And do you have any
19
   visitor parking at, on that, onsite?
20
             MR. RABINOWITZ: Yes, we have 10, 10 visitor
21
    spots.
22
             MR. FORMAN:
                          Okay. Thank you very much.
23
             MR. RABINOWITZ: And those are near the leasing
   office.
24
```

MR. FORMAN: Located near the leasing office?

MR. RABINOWITZ: (No audible response.)

1

5

2 MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Rabinowitz.

3 | Those are all the questions I have this morning. Madam

4 | Examiner, do you have any questions for Mr. Rabinowitz?

MADAM EXAMINER: I don't know if it's for Mr.

6 Rabinowitz, the next witness, or proffer from you, but you

7 can see, your examiner has slight vision issues. So, on

8 Exhibit 30, I was going to ask you this, on Exhibit 30 and

9 on the Site Plan that was approved in the ERR, do we show

10 actual notes that say how many one-bedrooms are like in

11 | Building 1, you know what I mean, in each building; because

12 there's got to be a way to make sure that say the next owner

13 doesn't determine that they want those 12 units that you so

14 | kindly don't want, Mr. Sha. You know, we can't allow this

15 to continue to grow in units without approval from the

16 | County. So, I need to know how many units are in each

17 | building right now? And I'll accept your floorplan. I

18 don't think we need more elaborate floorplans; but I need to

19 know each building, how many two-bedrooms, how many one-

20 | bedrooms, how many units like they used to do on the, and

21 | maybe it's on there, is it on the multi-family permit?

22 | Well, then that one won't have these seven, so you need to

23 | leave the record open to give me -- you'll need another

24 permit, correct? And, anyway --

MR. RABINOWITZ: A new record --

MADAM EXAMINER: -- I think we need to see it now and then you can show it to them when it's time for the permit.

MR. RABINOWITZ: I believe, and I, and I actually, if you, I can proffer, I believe, from the case history in the ERR, that had been one of the conditions of the approval; but in an exception request from, a file that was by Mr. Haller who was the attorney in the case, I believe he requested to not actually have to list the types of units because that way there could be some conversion of one bedrooms to twos, or twos to one, would still limit the total maximum to what had been permitted by the rental licenses.

MADAM EXAMINER: See, and I didn't notice that.

By the way, I'm glad you brought this up, the prior record, of course, is incorporated in this record and will be referenced herein; and I do have at least a digital copy of that prior file.

Okay. I hear what you're saying, but that will have to match-up with what the counsel said in its approval; and I think they were sort of silent on that issue because we don't get that many of them. I'm not --

MR. RABINOWITZ: Yeah.

MADAM EXAMINER: -- sure, you can't convert any of the one-bedrooms to two-bedrooms if this, I mean this is a

certified non-conforming use at this point. I don't know. 2 Maybe that's not considered; maybe that's intensification instead of -- how about --3 4 MR. FORMAN: Well, that actually would be, I 5 think, sorry for interrupting you, but if you converted a one-bedroom, two one-bedrooms into a two-bedroom, you 7 actually would have fewer dwelling units. It would be a decrease. 8 9 MADAM EXAMINER: That's true. MR. RABINOWITZ: It would be a -- I can't think of 10 the, off the top of my head what the opposite of an 11 12 intensification is, a de-intensification? 13 MADAM EXAMINER: Look, look, not intensified. 14 MR. RABINOWITZ: There we go. 15 MADAM EXAMINER: The English language always has a way to handle it. Okay. Let me think about that for now. 16 17 You're probably correct; but I at least want to know where 18 the, the 12 are there we're not changing; and I think you 19 said that verbally, but is it --20 MR. RABINOWITZ: It, yeah, on that Site Plan that 21 you have, I can show you, there, they're all in the same 22 areas as where the red boxes are --Uh-huh. 23 MADAM EXAMINER:

25 MADAM EXAMINER: I mean does the floorplan say it?

MR. RABINOWITZ: -- but --

That's all we need because, you know, as you all probably know, files get missing; UNO's for apartment dwellings disappear depending on when it was constructed; and I'm just a big fan of anybody else picking up this record later and knowing exactly what it was we approved. So, this isn't to delay you; it's just something I'm thinking about and, and, and Mr. Forman will figure out how to make me happy if, indeed, this is approved. Okay.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you. If, indeed, it is approved. There is another limitation that is actually going to be coming up with my next witness, Mr. Kevin Foster, about parking; and, basically, as you can see and will hear, that the parking itself can actually really only accommodate the seven additional units. Any more units than that is going to require more of a substantive change to the parking area that would then certainly be more significant than all just internal construction.

MADAM EXAMINER: Uh-huh.

MR. FORMAN: So, I think that in some respects you, from a legality standpoint, the parking can't support any more than seven one-bedroom units; and I think at that point there's a, a maximum, and we can put the maximum level of parking just based upon that reality.

MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Okay.

MR. FORMAN: But I also understand what you're

```
saying, Madam Examiner, and we can, maybe we can, we can
    discuss it a little bit more after Mr. Foster's testimony if
   that's okay?
 3
 4
              MADAM EXAMINER: Okay.
                                      Thank you, Mr. Rabinowitz,
 5
   unless you have other questions?
              MR. RABINOWITZ: I don't have any questions.
 6
 7
             MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. I really meant Mr. Forman,
   but it's good to know you don't have any questions either.
 8
 9
   You're finished, Mr. Forman?
10
             MR. FORMAN: Yes, I am. And if it, if it's okay
   with Madam Examiner, Mr. Rabinowitz actually was able to
11
12
   accommodate us this morning, but he actually has a meeting
13
   he needs to run to. So, if it's okay if he leaves, if
    that's all right?
14
15
             MADAM EXAMINER: Yes, that's fine with me.
16
             MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.
17
             MR. RABINOWITZ:
                               Thank you.
18
             MADAM EXAMINER:
                               Thank you, Mr. Rabinowitz.
19
             MR. FORMAN: Thank you for your testimony this
20
   morning.
21
             MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Foster, do you swear or
    affirm under the penalties of perjury that the testimony you
22
23
    shall give will be the truth and nothing but the truth?
24
             MR. FOSTER: I do.
```

MR. FORMAN: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.

MADAM EXAMINER: And, just before Mr. Foster 1 2 starts, I apologize, I'm not sure I made it clear in the beginning, but there doesn't appear to be anyone here today 3 4 opposed to this hearing. I need to state that for the 5 record. Thank you. 6 MR. FORMAN: Thank you. And, Mr. Foster, can you 7 please state your address for the record? MR. FOSTER: For the record, Kevin Foster with the 8 9 firm of Gutschick, Little & Weber. Our offices are 39, 3909 National Drive, Burtonsville, Maryland. 10 MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. And what is your 11 position with Gutschick, Little & Weber? 12 13 MR. FOSTER: I'm a principal, an owner within the 14 firm, and I'm Director of Planning and Landscape 15 Architecture. 16 MR. FORMAN: All right. Thank you. So, are, have 17 you ever qualified previously as an expert in the field of 18 land planning before this Zoning Hearing Examiner for Prince 19 George's County? 20 Yes, I have, two other occasions. MR. FOSTER: 21 MR. FORMAN: Thank you. And I believe your resume 22 has, and CV has been submitted as part of the record as 23 Exhibit, is it 34?

MADAM EXAMINER: I have to admit, I didn't see it;

but that doesn't -- Ms. Neal, do you have an Exhibit 34 from

```
Mr. Foster, his resume?
 2
             MS. NEAL: No, I do not.
             MADAM EXAMINER: You do not? You know what, you
 3
 4
   sent that --
 5
             MR. FORMAN: I think it was Friday afternoon.
             MADAM EXAMINER: You, yeah, yes, we have it.
 6
 7
   We'll find it and put, make sure it's Exhibit 34 in the
   record. And also --
 8
 9
             MR. FORMAN: Okay.
10
             MADAM EXAMINER: -- Mr. Foster, for the record,
    could you spell out the name of the firm because this is
11
12
   going to be recorded, I mean transcribed --
13
             MR. FOSTER: Sure.
14
             MADAM EXAMINER: -- and I'm not sure they would
15
   pick it up.
16
              MR. FOSTER: Okay. It's, it's Gutschick, Little &
   Weber, and Gutschick is spelled G-U-T-S-C-H-I-C-K, Little,
17
18
   L-I-T-T-L-E, Weber is W-E-B-E-R.
19
             MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. We'll work on that,
20
   getting that exhibit up shortly; and you may continue, Mr.
   Forman.
21
22
             MR. FORMAN: Thank you, Madam Examiner; and I, I
23
   do move to have Mr. Foster qualified as an expert in the
   field of land planning for this hearing.
24
```

MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. I'm going to play People's

```
Zoning Counsel for a second. Mr. Foster, have you ever been
   denied the opportunity to testify as an expert in land use
 3
   planning?
 4
             MR. FOSTER: I, I have not.
 5
             MADAM EXAMINER: Were you --
             MR. FOSTER: Never been denied.
 6
 7
             MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. And in this County, did
 8
   you appear before, was it before the Planning Board, the
 9
   ZHE, the District Council, court, where were you accepted?
10
             MR. FOSTER: Hearing Examiner, and I've, I've,
11
   I've, I've testified in numerous cases in front of the
12
   Planning Board.
13
             MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. And please tell me it's
14
   not this Hearing Examiner.
15
             MR. FOSTER: No, it's not.
             MADAM EXAMINER: Do I look familiar? Okay.
16
17
             MR. FOSTER: No.
18
             MADAM EXAMINER: Okay.
                                      Thank you. You will be
19
   accepted as an expert in the area of land use planning.
20
             MR. FOSTER:
                          Thank you.
21
             MR. FORMAN: Thank you. Mr. Foster, have you
22
   viewed the exhibits in this case, including Park and
23
   Planning's Technical Staff Report and PowerPoint
24
   presentation?
```

MR. FOSTER: Yes, I have.

MR. FORMAN: Have you personally visited the subject property and surrounding area?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, on multiple occasions.

MR. FORMAN: Have you reviewed the 2010 approved Sub-Region 1 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment, as well as the County General Plan, Plan Prince George's 2035, with regard to this property?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, I have reviewed both documents.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. I would like to point you towards Exhibit 6, if that could be brought up, please? Thank you. And I know this, this usually would work better in person, but we can try to, if you can help orient Madam Examiner using this exhibit, can you please explain what is going on and what you can kind of see in this, in this exhibit?

MR. FOSTER: Certainly. So, now I'm referring to Exhibit 6. This is an aerial photograph with the site outlined in red. So, the site is a very linear, almost an arrow shaped running side to side on the property is, in the, the exhibit is Maryland Route 198; on the left side of the exhibit, running up and down, or north/south, is Van Dusen Road. The subject property is outlined in red; and then outlined in tan, kind of superimposed on that as well, are the corporate limits of the city of Laurel and Prince George's County.

MR. FORMAN: Is any portion of the property, I mean it looks like a portion of the property is in the city of Laurel; but are all the improvements located in this county, in Prince George's County?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, they are. In the northeast corner of the property, there is a little panhandle, or a little finger that touches Tenth Street, and that finger is within the city of Laurel, and that's actually where our sewer goes, sewer access is to the property. The remainder of the site is within Prince George's County, and all improvements, built improvements are within the County limits.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you very much. And I, I think you kind of touched on this in your explanation, but could you maybe just for the record specify the neighborhood that this property is located in, please?

MR. FOSTER: Sure. The northern property, the northern boundary of the neighborhood would be Sandy Spring Road and West Street. So, if, if you're looking at Exhibit 6 toward the top, Sandy Spring Road is running left to right, and that intersects with West Street. So, the area between the site and West Street, there's Tower Federal Credit Union office building, the city of Laurel's municipal buildings, another retail complex and townhouses along West Street. The western boundary is, is Van Dusen Road; the

- southern boundary is Maryland 198, Gorman Road, which is running right to left on the property; and below that is R-55, single-family residential neighborhood; and the eastern boundary is Tenth Street where there's single-family houses to the east.
 - MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. And so, I believe you also went into the uses in the zoning for all the adjoining properties in the neighborhood? Can you just explain briefly the neighborhood that's across the street, across, I'm sorry, the street is very vague, across MD-198 from the property?
 - MR. FOSTER: Yes. It's on the opposite side of 198 from the subject property. It's a very stable R-55 single-family, detached neighborhood. It looks like it was built probably in the 50s and 60s by the style of the housing, but it is very well kept and it's certainly a very stable neighborhood.
 - MR. FORMAN: Okay.
- 19 MADAM EXAMINER: If I may, Mr. Forman?
- 20 MR. FORMAN: Yes, ma'am.
- 21 MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Foster, I, I sort of know 22 this area, but not very well.
- 23 MR. FOSTER: Okay.

3

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

MR. FORMAN: I always go to restaurants or shopping, so do you know an area up there that's called

Second Avenue, it's some type of consignment Shop? 2 MR. FOSTER: No, I do not. MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Or do you know, if you 3 4 were leaving, say we're way up on 198 and you're leaving, and you're headed down this way from Baltimore Washington 6 Parkway --MR. FOSTER: From the other side of --7 MADAM EXAMINER: -- after the racetrack, all of 8 9 this is after the racetrack, I take it, because that's not 10 our county and --11 MR. FOSTER: Yes, you're, you're crossing over --12 MADAM EXAMINER: And the bingo parlor is after 13 that? 14 MR. FOSTER: Yes, you --15 MR. FORMAN: That's all Anne Arundel County, yeah. 16 MR. FOSTER: Yeah, it's Anne Arundel County where 17 the track is. Then you get into --18 MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. 19 MR. FOSTER: -- the city of Laurel, cross over 20 Route 1, and 198 continues; and it's actually two 21 directional, 198; and they join up just east of the 22 property, both lanes of 198 come back together and then come 23 across the front of the site. And then if you continue on past Van Dusen, you'll, the next thing you'll run into is 24

25

the on-ramp, on-ramp to 95.

```
1
             MADAM EXAMINER: Ninety-five?
 2
             MR. FOSTER: Yeah, this is really close to 95.
 3
             MADAM EXAMINER: Okay.
 4
             MR. FOSTER: It's on the, it's on the --
 5
             MADAM EXAMINER: I never have been here.
             MR. FOSTER: It's on the --
 6
 7
             MADAM EXAMINER: Okay.
             MR. FOSTER: -- western side of the city of
 8
 9
   Laurel.
10
             MADAM EXAMINER: I understand now. Thank you so
11
   much.
12
             MR. FOSTER: Certainly.
13
             MR. FORMAN: And my apologies for not going into
   more of the bigger picture of the location.
14
15
             MADAM EXAMINER: No, it's not your fault. It just
16
   helps me picture it. Thanks.
17
             MR. FORMAN: Mr. Foster, you heard the testimony
18
   from Mr. Rabinowitz earlier regarding the property.
19
             MR. FOSTER: Yes.
20
             MR. FORMAN: I was hoping you could go into a
21
   little more detail regarding its configuration and sort of
22
   set-up using Exhibit 30, which is the Site Plan for this
23
   case.
24
             MR. FOSTER: Certainly. If I could get Exhibit 30
25
   brought up?
```

MR. FORMAN: Would it be possible to zoom in a little bit more on just the illustrative portion of, of the Site Plan, please? Could we, yeah, thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FOSTER: Great. So, I'm, I'm now referring to Exhibit 30, which is the Special Exception Site Plan; and as it was described earlier by Mr. Rabinowitz, there are 218, there, well, there are 218 dwelling units on the property; and they're really organized in three separate buildings. And then these three buildings are also delineated into blocks. So, if we start on the western edge of the west, northwestern edge of the property, you'll see it on Exhibit 30, there's a long, linear building there. That is Building No. 1 and it's made up of individual blocks that contain 12 dwelling unit, 12 possible dwelling units apiece; but some of those lower-level units, obviously, are not yet dwelling units. Some are maintenance rooms, old laundry rooms; and then below that is Building No. 2, which is three blocks together. In the middle of the site is the leasing office, and there's a rec area, swimming pool; and then on the eastern portion of the site, there's a U-shaped building, which is Building 3, which, again, comprises blocks of units.

There's surface parking that is distributed throughout the property. There are three entrances along Maryland Route 198. There's one on the west, one in the

middle, one on the east, and the one in the middle is signalized. So, that's, that's how you get out onto eastbound 198 because there's a median, so the, the eastern and the western entrances are right in, right out only.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. And could you please describe kind of the, what you mean by a block as forming the portions of the building? Like what does it mean for it to be a block?

MR. FOSTER: Okay. Can I, can we scroll over a little bit to the left and up a bit? There's a, okay, that's good. On the Site Plan, we had, we had put a typical layout of a, one of these apartment blocks. And as you can see on the left, typical existing dimensions, there are, on each floor there are four units and a center hallway; and each one of these blocks is three stories. The lower level is a bit depressed in the ground, so in some places it's close to being at grade; some places it's below grade. It just depends on the individual, individual units, or individual blocks; but they're, in theory, you could have had 12 units per block if this entire property had been built-out in these, for these individual units.

MR. FORMAN: And so, so during construction, it seemed like the lowest level unit, which may have been Unit 4, was usually reserved; or maybe Unit 4 or Unit 3 was reserved for the storage area or the laundry room when it

was constructed?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, it depends on which unit, which, what location; but it was always a unit in the front that had direct access to the front of the building. I guess they wanted separated access for those laundry rooms not coming into the middle corridor, but they could have; but, yes, all of those extra spaces all faced the parking lots.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. And, Mr. Foster,
Mr. Rabinowitz made reference to Exhibit 4 when describing
the, the area of the additional dwelling units. Would you
mind kind of going through this exhibit in a bit more detail
to really kind of highlight and explain what you are
mentioning about the blocks and the layout?

MR. FOSTER: Sure. If I could have Exhibit 4 brought up, please?

MS. NEAL: I'm sorry, you said Exhibit 4?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, ma'am.

MR. FORMAN: Yes, please.

MR. FOSTER: Thank you. So, Exhibit 4 is an exhibit that, it shows a number of site photos, and all of these photos are basically individual photos of the buildings; but if you look at, like on the, on the right in the middle, it shows Building 1, and that's where you see the center hallway and the, the units on either side. You can see there's three units on each side. So, it's three

floors and there's four units. That is a block where there would be a center hall and four units on either side, three stories tall, and it's also a very good one because you can see the lower level is a little bit, a little bit depressed; so, it, that's kind of a condition we see in a lot of them.

If you could scroll to the lower right-hand corner? That gives, gives us a very good view on the lefthand side and in the one on the middle there of what these unused spaces look like. They have separate entrances; they have a window, but that's where the laundry room, meter room, storage rooms were located in each one of the blocks, so it gives a good sense of how they relate. So, the proposal for adding, you know, newer units is all internal construction. There's already a door; there will be no external construction. There's already windows. So, it's a matter of, you know, interior framing and whatever to get the units done; but it will not have a, a material effect on the property itself.

MR. FORMAN: And --

MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Foster, if I may, do you, do you know the code for habitability of these units? Do they only need that one window, or are there more windows, or are you all, are you all averring that all of these things will be allowed as dwelling units? I meant to ask that earlier of Mr. Rabinowitz. So, you're not, I know that there's

certain requirements --2 MR. FOSTER: Yes. 3 MADAM EXAMINER: -- for a dwelling. 4 MR. FOSTER: Yes, there are certain requirements 5 typically tied to fire egress and, yes, the plan is to have all these units meet all the, all the building codes, yes. 7 MADAM EXAMINER: Well, how many windows do they have right now? Just that one? The, yes, they, they just have the 9 MR. FOSTER: one. If you notice on the ones next to them, the lower 10 11 level, those are the, that's a screen door out to the patio. 12 So, there's, and then the rest of the unit doesn't have any 13 windows. So, each unit has windows on the facade that they face. So, the units in the rear have windows in the back 14 15 and the units in front have, have windows in the front. There are no other windows for each individual unit. 16 17 MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. And, and what I'm looking 18 at right now, Ms. Neal, doesn't show that. Is there a way 19 to like make this bigger again and you show me the, you said 20 there's a window and then there's an access to a patio or 21 something? Did you say that? 22 MR. FORMAN: For the typical dwelling unit on the 23 bottom level is a patio with a sliding glass door. 24 MR. FOSTER: Yes.

MR. FORMAN: These are just the doors and the

windows.

1

2

3

4

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MADAM EXAMINER: I got you. Okay. Thank you. MR. FORMAN: But they, thank you, there will be both two points of egress and ingress because you can get through the door directly to the outside, or the door that's in the internal hallway. And I do, you know, to proffer, I, I, you know, we need to double-check whether it's the building code; but I, you know, given the demand for onebedroom units, I'm, you know, this, people may be satisfied with this type of situation. You know, sometimes young professionals or just single workers, you know, it's just a place to rest their head at night. They're not necessarily, you know, looking for a lot of bells and whistles. really just need a place to rest their head; and I think when this is being leased out to a future tenant, as long as they know what they're getting, it's, you know satisfactory, assuming it does comply with building codes which, of course, we're not going to violate. MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. And if we left the record

MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. And if we left the record open, could you submit or, either submit the site or submit a copy of those requirements for rental of units? I know that it's, you're right, in Subtitle 4, or in the International Codes that we've adopted is somewhere.

MR. FORMAN: Okay.

MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you.

1 MR. FORMAN: And would you, in addition to just 2 submitting the, the codes themselves, would you like some 3 sort of response to the requirements from an expert? 4 MADAM EXAMINER: Even better, thank you. 5 MR. FORMAN: However, we make it easy for you, 6 Madam Examiner, we, we're willing to do it. 7 MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you. I appreciate that. MR. FORMAN: So, Mr. Foster, based on your 8 9 experience as a land planner, is there any reason to suggest 10 that these areas being converted into additional dwelling 11 units would be harmful or injurious to future residents? 12 MR. FOSTER: No, I don't think there's, at all, I 13 don't think there would be any reason. The, the, the blocks, the building area is already there. 14 It's all 15 internal construction. So, it's, it's not going to have any 16 material impact on the current residence. Okay. And, Mr. Foster, you heard the 17 MR. FORMAN: 18 testimony earlier from Mr. Rabinowitz regarding the, why the 19 Applicant is requesting up to seven additional one-bedroom 20 units. Can you please explain why a special exception is 21 necessary to add the requested seven dwelling units? 22 MR. FOSTER: Sure. The existing apartment complex 23 is a certified, non-conforming use; and any expansion,

alteration, or extension of a certified non-conforming use

requires a special exception approval. Adding seven

24

dwelling units is considered an expansion or enlargement, even though there's, it's all internal construction, and there is no, you know, expansion of the overall building.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. And can you please explain why this apartment building is considered a non-conforming use and now it became certified as a non-conforming use?

MR. FOSTER: Sure. Over the years, there were some changes to the Zoning Code, and also some changes to the property, and they all contributed to making this a non-conforming use. The property was originally constructed in roughly 1965 with the Zoning Ordinance in effect at that time, with the exception of density. You know, the, there's an approved Site Plan that shows 206 dwelling units, but it certainly seems that 218 were built somewhere along the line.

Originally, it was zoned RR-18 from the 1963 standards. And one of the other changes that occurred on the site was the state highway acquired land from this property when Maryland Route 198 was upgraded, and that reduced the site area which caused some of the non-conformity. So, by the year 2000, the property was non-conforming on the basis of lot coverage, minimum green area, front yard setback, parking and loading, you know, dense, in addition to the, to density.

And regarding the certification property process, excuse me, the property was certified as a non-conforming use twice, first in 2000 through CNU41302-2000; and then the next year through validation of permit issued in error, Case ERR-180.

MR. FORMAN: Why was this property certified twice?

MR. FOSTER: I can't tell you for sure, but it, it certainly appears the NCU41302-2000 was approved administratively for 2000, excuse me, for 206 dwelling units, which was the quantity on the original Site Plan. The non, non-conforming use, you know, could have, could only support 206 dwelling units because that was the maximum that in theory could have been built in 1965 based on the size of the property and the density of the R-18 Zone in effect in '65. The maximum density for the RIT was 21.78 dwellings per acre, and at 9.64 acres, that would have only permitted 206 dwelling units.

The reason you really can't know for sure is there were no use and occupancy permits issued back then; so, it was clear how many units were actually built and approved by the County in '65. When the first building opened, it, there's also some, some inclinations in the record that some spaces may have been used for an engineer's office and also for a doctor's office.

The history of the property definitely supports the existence of 218 units, not the original Site Plan approved, 206; and the same 206 that were in the original non-conforming use. The first definitive instance of listing of dwelling units on a document issued by the County, and Park and Planning, was the first rental license in '71, the first year the rental licenses were issued in the county; and they've been issued every two years thereafter; and they were originally issued for 218 dwelling units. Because there was evidence to support the 218 through the issuance of the rental licenses, previous applicants submitted and received approval for the 218 dwelling units through a validation of a permit issued in error which was ERR-180, which was in 2001.

MR. FORMAN: And, Mr. Foster, if I understand your testimony correctly, you had mentioned that when this building was opened, it did have some commercial uses in it; not, it wasn't solely used residential?

MR. FOSTER: That's what it seems. There's some indications in the record that there, there may have been some commercial uses in some of these spaces, yes.

MR. FORMAN: And does that help support the, your finding and understanding why it's difficult to understand how many of the actual available units were used for dwelling units and maybe not some, you know, related

commercial purpose?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, it's very difficult to, to determine that at this point.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you very much. And so, if I understand you correctly, the operative case for the non-conforming use certification is ERR-180, which allowed for 218 dwelling units, is that correct?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, that's correct.

MR. FORMAN: All right. Thank you. And with that property history kind of out of the way, and the need for the special exception explained, I would like to ask you more about the, this proposed use and whether the subject application meets the requirements for approval of a special exception? Are you familiar with the specific requirements for the extension or enlargement of a, of a certified non-conforming use within an existing building as set forth in Section 27384 of the prior Zoning Ordinance?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, I'm familiar with that.

MR. FORMAN: Regarding the specific criteria posited in Section 27384 of the Zoning Ordinance, in your expert opinion, does this application comply with the requirements to extend or enlarge a certified, non-conforming use throughout a building?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, it does.

MR. FORMAN: Was the property a single lot under a

single ownership when it became non-conforming?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, based on the deed, history of the property which is shown in Exhibits 15, 17 and 18, it was a single property under single ownership. Obviously, it's been sold over time; but it still remained under single ownership.

MR. FORMAN: And so, just to be clear, since this use became non-conforming, had the lot remained a single lot under a single ownership entity?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, it has.

MR. FORMAN: It's just been kind of sold to successors in interest, correct?

MR. FOSTER: Correct.

MR. FORMAN: All, are the requirements of Part 11 met with regard to the extended area?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, the, there are sufficient parking spaces to support the additional seven dwelling units; seven, one-bedroom dwelling units. When the property was constructed in 1965, the Zoning Ordinance at that time would have required 1.25 dwelling units, excuse me, 1.25 parking spaces per dwelling unit. With 218 dwelling units, the total number of required spaces would have been 273 spaces. Parking for a one-bedroom dwelling unit is calculated at a rate of two spaces per unit now. With seven dwelling units, the parking lot must provide an additional

14 spaces to those already previously required for the, for the site, which was 273. Thus, the total parking for the existing units and the additional proposed units would be 287 parking spaces. The site currently provides 288 parking spaces. For this reason, the requirement is satisfied.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you. Having asked you about the specific requirements for a special exception to extent or enlarge a certified, non-conforming use, I would like to ask you about the general requirements for special exception approval. Yes?

MR. FOSTER: Okay.

MADAM EXAMINER: Mr. Forman, I'm so sorry. Can I back up a minute just to make it really clear on this record? So, what, so your opinion is, Mr. Foster, that whatever parking that was approved with the, the two non-conforming use certifications is all the parking that's required presently; but this request to expand would have to satisfy the current law and that's just two spaces per the seven units? You don't believe that the parking has to now be, meet the current law totally?

MR. FOSTER: No, I, I believe that the, the previously approved standards needs to be met for the existing units; and that the new units need to meet the new standard.

25 MADAM EXAMINER: I just want to make that clear on

the record. I'm not saying I disagree with you; but go, go ahead. I'm sorry.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you. And I think for legality purposes, and just for the record, I believe the justification can also be found under Zoning Ordinance Section 27584 of the prior ordinance.

MADAM EXAMINER: Thank you.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you. Let me get back to, so,
Mr. Foster, I haven't asked you about the specific
requirements for a special exception to extend or enlarge a
certified, non-conforming use. I would now like to ask you
about the general requirements for special exception
approval found under 27317 of the Zoning Ordinance.

MR. FOSTER: Okay.

MR. FORMAN: In your opinion, is the proposed use and Site Plan in harmony with the purposes of the Prince George's County prior Zoning Ordinance?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, in my opinion, the additional seven dwelling units are in harmony with the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance. There's no exterior changes proposed.

Only interior renovations are required to create these seven dwelling units. The existing multi-family buildings will continue to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

MR. FORMAN: All right. Thank you. In your opinion, is the proposed use in conformance with all of the

applicable requirements and regulations of Subtitle 27 of the prior Zoning Ordinance?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, the subject property previously certified as a non-conforming use through NCU41032-2000 and ERR-180 a year later. All non-conformities have existed and have been certified most recently by the approval of ERR-180. In fact, the basis for that approval was that the property was constructed in excess of the density required under the R-18 Zone back in '65. The site has never been in conformance with density and that has not caused any issues over the years. Moreover, the limited increase in density from 23.7 dwelling units an acre to 24.3 units an acre will have very limited impact on the property.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you. And in your opinion, will the proposed use substantially impair the integrity of the Sub Region 1 Approved Sector Plan for the General Plan for Prince George's County?

MR. FOSTER: The limited increase in density will not substantially impair the integrity of, of either of these plans. The site is located within an established community's growth policy area in accordance with the Plan Prince George's 2035. Established communities are areas appropriate for context-sensitive infill. Moreover, within the Sub Region 1 Sector Plan, the site is designated for medium to high-density residential.

MR. FORMAN: And in your opinion, would you consider the proposed dwelling to be in conformance with the denotation or designation of it as being medium/high-density residential?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, I would.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you. In your opinion, will the proposed use adversely affect the health, safety or welfare of the residents or workers in the area of the subject property?

MR. FOSTER: No, there's no reason to believe that the additional seven dwelling units will have any adverse impact on the health, safety or welfare of the residents, or workers in the area. The conditions proposed by Park and Planning Staff for sidewalk connections, bike racks will enhance the property above and beyond what would otherwise have been required had this application not been filed. With proposed site improvements, greater benefit would be provided to the residents of Westgate should a special exception be approved.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you. And in your opinion, will the proposed use be detrimental to the use or development of adjacent properties, or the general neighborhood?

MR. FOSTER: No, since, since nothing about the property will change, there's no reason to believe that the seven additional dwelling units will be detrimental to the

use or development of adjacent properties, or the general neighborhood for that fact. Most of the neighborhood is built out and the site will remain residential as it is today.

MR. FORMAN: Thank you. Is the Site Plan in conformance with the Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan for this property?

MR. FOSTER: This site was developed prior to the enactment of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The site would quality for an exemption. For this reason, no TCP-2 is required for this application.

MR. FORMAN: All right. Thank you. Does the site demonstrate preservation and/or restoration of the regulated environmental features in a natural state to the fullest extent possible?

MR. FOSTER: Based on my review, there are no regulated environmental features on the site.

MR. FORMAN: All right. Thank you. Is the subject property located in the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area?

MR. FOSTER: It is not.

MR. FORMAN: All right. In your opinion, are there any facts or circumstances that show that the particular use proposed upon the subject property through this application at the particular location proposed would

- have any adverse effects above and beyond those inherently associated with the proposed use, irrespective of its location within the R-18 Zone?
 - MR. FOSTER: My opinion, there is nothing about the additional seven dwelling units at this particular location that would have any adverse effects above and beyond those inherently associated with an apartment complex, irrespective of its location within the R-18 Zone.
 - MR. FORMAN: Thank you. And do you agree with all of the conditions that are set forth in the Planning Board resolution?
- 12 MR. FOSTER: Yes, I do.

- MR. FORMAN: Thank you very much for your testimony this morning, Mr. Foster. Those are all of the questions I have for you. And, Madam Examiner, that concludes the Applicant's testimony this morning, although we will ask to keep the record open to submit the additional material that the Madam Examiner has requested.
- MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. I just have one other question. Mr. Foster, did you play any role in preparing the statement of justification?
- MR. FOSTER: The statement of justification, yes. I worked with Mr. Forman in all the analysis and putting that together, yes.
- 25 MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. Good. So, you agree with

everything in there? 2 MR. FOSTER: Yes, I do. 3 MADAM EXAMINER: I'm also playing People's Zoning 4 Counsel right now, Mr. Forman, as well. So, thank you. have no further questions. MR. FORMAN: You play it very well, Madam 6 Examiner. 7 MADAM EXAMINER: So, then, this is your case. 8 9 You're keeping the record open just for that information 10 about compliance with any, anything in the building code, et 11 cetera, regarding habitability of apartment dwellings? 12 MR. FORMAN: Yes. And you had raised the question 13 earlier about the limitation in the conversion of units. that still of a concern about highlighting the plan, or 14 15 making sure that the, it's limited to 225? MADAM EXAMINER: That's not so much of a concern 16 17 because if it's approved, then I'm sure something, we'll 18 discuss that. 19 MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you very much. 20 MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. All right. I thank you 21 all for being here. I thank Staff as well and I wish you 22 all happy holidays. And the record will close as soon as 23 you submit that --24 MR. FORMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.

appreciate that. And we will have an expert go through and

make sure that we can meet those requirements, too. 2 MADAM EXAMINER: Oh, I'm remiss with one thing. 3 Did you all talk to the city of Laurel about this? 4 MR. FORMAN: Yes, we did. 5 MADAM EXAMINER: Because there's nothing in the record from them. I just wanted to make sure they were 6 7 aware. 8 MR. FORMAN: I mean we had communications early on 9 with the city because, to be perfectly frank, we saw that it 10 was completely encompassed by the city and we talked about 11 annexation and they were not interested. So --12 MADAM EXAMINER: Okay. 13 MR. FORMAN: -- with the County. 14 Okay. Thank you very much then. MADAM EXAMINER: 15 And, again, happy holidays to everyone. 16 MR. FOSTER: Thank you. 17 MR. FORMAN: Thank you. 18 MR. FOSTER: Happy holidays. 19 Thank you. MADAM EXAMINER: 20 (Whereupon, the hearing was concluded.) 21 22 23 24 25

Ū

DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC., hereby certifies that the attached pages represent an accurate transcript of the electronic sound recording of the proceedings before the Prince George's County Office of the Zoning Hearing Examiner in the matter of:

WESTGATE APARTMENTS

Case No. SE 4852

By:

Tracy Hahn, Transcriber