



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

Preliminary Plan 4-05131

Application	General Data
Project Name: QUINCY COMMONS Location: East side of Addison Road, approximately 670 feet north of Ronald Road. Applicant/Address: PDC Lincolnshire, Inc. 5840 Banneker Road, Suite 110 Columbia, MD. 21044	Date Accepted: 03/1/06
	Planning Board Action Limit: 07/19/06
	Plan Acreage: 4.93
	Zone: R-T & R-18
	Dwelling Units: 48
	Parcels/Lots: 1/0
	Planning Area: 75A
	Tier: Developed
	Council District: 06
	Municipality: N/A
200-Scale Base Map: 202SE06	

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: 12/1/05 (CB-58-2003)
	Sign(s) Posted on Site and Notice of Hearing Mailed: 05/06/2006

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

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05131
Quincy Commons Parcel A

OVERVIEW

At the writing of this staff report, in accordance with Section 24-122.01(e)(2) of the Subdivision Regulations, staff is compelled to recommend disapproval of the subject application, as discussed further in Finding 2 of this report, due to inadequate Fire Department staffing levels.

The subject property is located on Tax Map 73, Grid C-3, zoned R-T and R-18, and is approximately 4.93 acres. The property is known as part of the Walker Mill Towne Subdivision (NLP 147@81 and 147@82), which was previously subdivided into 81 lots and two parcels for the construction of townhouses.

The Walker Mill Towne Subdivision was originally approved in 1987 pursuant to Preliminary Plan 4-87179, with a density of eight dwelling units per acre and in accordance with townhouse design standards that are no longer applicable for new townhouse development (Subtitle 27). Because the applicant did not have building permits issued for ten percent of the total dwelling units before December 30, 1997, the development of this site is now subject to current code requirements, including density at six dwelling units per acre (CB-55-1996). This results in the need for a new detailed site plan (DSP) and new final plat to adjust the lot sizes and allowable density. This, notwithstanding that DSP-88050 and record plats had also been approved for the entire site (10.56 acres) in accordance with the 1987 preliminary plan approval.

To complicate the issue, CB-55-1996 revised Subtitle 27 to now require a special exception for the development of townhouses in the R-18 Zone. To address all of these issues the applicant agreed that a new preliminary plan and DSP for the entire development would be appropriate. This would ensure the vesting of adequate public facilities (APF) for the existing platted lots and the townhouse lots in the R-18 Zone to another type of dwelling unit, in order to forego the need for a special exception.

Originally the applicant proposed to re-subdivide the property (10.56 acres) into 33 lots for the construction of townhouses in the R-T zoned portion of the property fronting on the east side of Addison Road, and the construction of 48 multifamily dwelling units on Parcel 2, primarily zoned R-18 with a small amount of R-T zoned land, east of Parcel 1. The property was to be developed as one site, under one preliminary plan, one detailed site plan, and one umbrella homeowners association. Staff advised the applicant that a number of design issues were associated with the conversion of the rear portion of the site to multifamily dwelling units.

One issue related to the use of an internal private street to access the proposed multifamily dwelling units at the rear of the site (R-18) through the townhouse portion of the development. The proposed driveways serving the townhouse units would require that vehicles back onto the internal private street, a street that serves as the main access for the proposed multifamily dwelling units. That street is

proposed with a right-of-way and pavement width of 36 feet. As a result of this and other staff issues the applicant had indicated an agreement to change the proposed multifamily dwelling unit type to a two-over-two dwelling unit type (attached units).

A revised preliminary plan was submitted on June 6, 2006, and now proposes to remove almost the entire R-T zoned portion of the property (5.63 acres) (NLP 147@81) from the limit of the preliminary plan that provided the project’s street frontage along Addison Road. In addition, the revised preliminary plan does not revise the dwelling unit type on Parcel 2 (R-18 Zone) and continues to propose multifamily dwelling units, not addressing the access and circulation issue. Moreover, the new limit of the site, primarily the R-18 zoned portion of the property (NLP 147@82), would no longer have frontage on a dedicated public street. The site and limit of the preliminary plan proposed is to be served via a private 36-foot-wide private street through the townhouse (R-T zoned) portion of the Walker Mill Towne Subdivision (NLP 147@81), which fronts on Addison Road.

Section 27-442(d) Table III-Lot/Width Frontage, requires that the site have 85 feet of frontage on a dedicated public street. The “lot” was originally the entire Walker Mill Towne Subdivision (NLP 147@81 and 147@82) that was to be a designated area of land to be used, developed, and built upon as a unit with frontage on Addison Road. A “lot” as defined by Section 27-107.01(129) can be made up of one or more entire “record lots.” The revision proposed by the applicant results in the limit of the preliminary plan of subdivision no longer having frontage on a dedicated public street.

While these issues are not insurmountable they are substantive to the review of this preliminary plan of subdivision and would result in a recommendation for disapproval in themselves unless they are adequately addressed.

SETTING

The property is located on the east side of Addison Road, approximately 670 feet north of its intersection with Ronald Road. To the northwest is developed land owned by the Seat Pleasant Methodist Church, and to the northeast and east is land owned by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) zoned R-O-S. To the south are the Addison Arms Apartments, developed and zoned R-18.

FINDINGS AND REASONS FOR STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. **Development Data Summary**—The following information relates to the subject preliminary plan application and the proposed development.

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	R-T and R-18	R-T and R-18
Use(s)	Vacant	Multifamily (48 DU’s)
Acreage	4.93	4.93
Lots	44	0
Parcels	1	1
Dwelling Units:		
Townhouses	0	
Multifamily	0	48
Public Safety Mitigation Fee		No

2. **Fire and Rescue**—The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed this subdivision plan for adequacy of fire and rescue services in accordance with Section

24-122.01(d) and Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(B)-(E) of the Subdivision Ordinance. The subject application was accepted on March 1, 2006.

The Prince George's County Planning Department has determined that this preliminary plan is within the required seven-minute response time for the first due fire station Allentown Road, Company 32, using the Seven-Minute Travel Times and Fire Station Locations Map provided by the Prince George's County Fire Department.

The Fire Chief report for adequate equipment is contained in a memorandum dated March 28, 2006. That memorandum states: "the department has adequate equipment and has developed an equipment replacement program to meet all the service delivery needs for all areas of the county."

The Fire Chief report for current staffing of the Fire Department is contained in a memorandum dated March 28, 2006. That memorandum states that the number of "net operational employees" is 672, which equates to 96.97 percent of the authorized strength of 692 fire and rescue personnel.

As previously noted, the subject application was accepted on March 1, 2006. Section 24-122.01(e)(2) of the Subdivision Regulations state: "If any of the required statements in this Subsection are not provided that meet the criteria specified in this Section on the date the application is accepted by the Planning Board or within the following three monthly cycles of response time reports, then the Planning Board may not approve the preliminary pla[n] until a mitigation plan between the applicant and the County is entered into and filed with the Planning Board."

One key element to the ordinance language cited above is the creation of a window for the application of the fire and rescue adequacy test that runs from "the date the application is accepted by the Planning Board or within the following three monthly cycles of response time reports." This means that an application is afforded the opportunity to pass the test in a time frame that spans approximately 90 days. With regard to data on fire and rescue staffing levels prior to receipt of the March 28, 2006, letter from the Fire Chief, some clarity needs to be provided.

Since January 1, 2006 (the beginning of the time frame when the standard of 100 percent of the authorized strength of 692 fire and rescue personnel must be met), staff has received four memorandums from the Fire Chief (dated January 1, 2006, February 1, 2006, March 5, 2006, and March 28, 2006). The data presented in these four memorandums varies in their description of the personnel being counted as applicable to the percentage of the authorized strength standard. While the number of personnel presented varies only slightly (694, 694, 696 and 693 respectively), the description of the status of these personnel has changed or has been clarified from memorandum to memorandum.

It seems clear to staff that since the beginning of 2006, each reporting of personnel has included certain numbers of trainees and/or recruits that were not intended to be considered applicable to the minimum percentage requirement. This becomes apparent when comparing the January 1 and February 1 memorandums. Both reflect a total authorized strength of 694 personnel, but the February 1 memorandum identifies 46 members of that complement in the training academy. The March 5 memorandum does not provide a breakdown of the 696 personnel total, but the March 28 memorandum identifies 21 recruits as part of the "actual total strength" of 693.

Given the totality of the information identified above, staff concludes that since the acceptance of the subject application, the minimum staffing level for fire and rescue personnel, as required by

Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(B)(ii), has not been met. Therefore, pursuant to Section 24-122.01(e)(2), staff is compelled to recommend disapproval of the subject application at this point in time.

RECOMMENDATION

DISAPPROVAL DUE TO INADEQUATE FIRE AND RESCUE STAFFING LEVELS PURSUANT TO SECTION 24-122.01(e) OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS.