*City of Greenbelt, Maryland*

***GREENBELT CITYLINK***

WORK SESSION of the Greenbelt City Council   
held Monday, March 6, 2006,   
for the purpose of receiving a briefing on AIMCO’s Plans for Springhill Lake.

*Mayor Pro Tem Roberts started the meeting at 8:03 p.m. It was held in the Council Room of the Municipal Building.*

*PRESENT WERE: Councilmembers Konrad E. Herling, Leta M. Mach, Edward V.J. Putens and Mayor Pro Tem Rodney M. Roberts.*

*STAFF PRESENT WERE: Michael P. McLaughlin, City Manager; Celia Craze, Director of Planning and Community Development; Terri Hruby, Assistant Director of Planning; and David E. Moran, Assistant City Manager.*

*ALSO PRESENT WERE: Joyce Chestnut, Sheldon Goldberg, Brian Gibbons, Keith Chernikoff, and George Branyon, Advisory Planning Board; and Bob Fireovid, Bill Orleans, David Lange.*

*Ms. Hruby began by updating Council on the status of AIMCO’s plans. She indicated that AIMCO had filed a detailed site plan with MNCPPC, but Planning and Community Development staff had not yet received the Detailed Site Plan. Staff had received a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision.*

*Ms. Hruby referenced some of the key elements of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision that AIMCO had not addressed in its submission to MNCPPC. She noted that AIMCO was not proposing to use the Springhill Lake Recreation Center site. Ms. Hruby reported that school capacity, mandatory dedication, dedication of roads, and police capacity were still issues that needed to be resolved.*

*Mr. Herling asked about building height. Ms. Hruby responded that the Conceptual Site Plan capped the building heights at 12 stories; however, the current proposal was for three 22-story buildings.*

*Mr. Putens asked if there was an estimate of increased open space as a result of the higher buildings. Ms. Hruby responded that there was more green space and that staff had asked AIMCO to quantify this. Mr. Roberts asked about impacts to wetlands and forested areas. Ms. Hruby responded that the loop road had created some environmental impacts.*

*Ms. Mach asked about the zoning requirement that all roads be public. Ms. Hruby responded that based on staff’s review of the subdivision regulations, the Planning Board had the authority to approve private roads in the Development District Overlay Zone. Ms. Mach asked how the for-sale units would be handled. Ms. Hruby responded that she expected large parcels would be sold off to other developers who would build the for-sale units.*

*Mr. Putens stressed that the proposed “lake” needed to be an actual functional lake. Ms. Hruby noted that staff had asked AIMCO to look at low-impact development techniques (rain gardens, green roofs, etc.)*

*Mr. Herling asked if the current school site had problems because it was in the flood plain. Ms. Hruby and Mr. Roberts responded they were not aware of any flooding there.*

*Mr. Chernikoff wondered if he could see a 22-story building from his home on Lastner Lane and indicated this would likely be a visual intrusion. Ms. Hruby responded that staff had requested perspectives from various points in the City.*

*Mr. Gibbons believed if you could see the Marriott, you could definitely see three 22-story towers. Mr. Gibbons did not believe that the increase in green space was worth the loss of “blue space.”*

*Mr. Roberts expressed the need for three ball fields. Ms. Hruby stressed that staff had made clear what the City’s recreation needs were related to mandatory dedication.*

*Mr. Branyon asked what the impact was on the City of accepting all the roads. Regarding building heights, Mr. Branyon noted that one person’s visual intrusion is another person’s breathtaking view and stressed that well-designed tall buildings were part of an urban project.*

*Mr. Roberts agreed that buildings that tall were an intrusion, especially when AIMCO was unwilling to provide the necessary community facilities (ball fields, schools, etc.). Mr. Herling agreed that the idea was to exchange density for open space and amenities and it was disappointing that AIMCO was not doing more.*

*Ms. Chestnut asked about the school capacity issues. Ms. Hruby responded that the Board of Education had not taken a position on the combined elementary/middle school site. Ms. Hruby reported that, based on the meeting held by County Councilmember Peters on February 28, AIMCO was being told that in addition to the new combined school, the Board of Education needed to retain the current Springhill Lake Elementary site or that AIMCO needed to provide a 10-15 acre site elsewhere on its property if it wanted to use the current site.*

*Mr. Lange asked if everyone was using the same development numbers. Ms. Hruby responded that County Councilmembers and Board of Education staff were present at the February 28 meeting and that Mr. Peters was going to communicate the outcome (retain SHL elementary or provide 15-acre site) to AIMCO.*

*Mr. Roberts asked about AIMCO’s plan not to use the Springhill Lake Recreation Center site and whether this affected the City’s plans to reallocate the state funds for the recreation center addition project. Mr. McLaughlin responded that since the Conceptual Site Plan requires AIMCO to pay for a 20,000 square foot recreation center, he believed this issue was addressed.*

*Mr. Putens noted that Greenbelt Station and Beltway Plaza also had a responsibility to help address school and recreation issues. Mr. Roberts favored a centrally located school site on the AIMCO property so children could walk to school.*

*Mr. Chernikoff asked about the City’s leverage over Greenbelt Station. Ms. Craze responded that Greenbelt Station was meeting the requirements of the law related to school surcharge fees and recreational dedication.*

*Mr. Herling asked about transportation and Greenbelt West. Ms. Hruby responded she had met with the county’s Department of Public Works and Transportation and discussed how “TheBus” might serve the entire Greenbelt West neighborhood following this development.*

*Mr. Fireovid asked about the amount of the TIF that AIMCO was requesting. Ms. Hruby responded that City staff had not received a concrete proposal from AIMCO that provided any numbers, but AIMCO had indicated it would be used for infrastructure.*

*Mr. Chernikoff asked about street maintenance and the public versus private issue. Staff responded that snow plowing, median landscape maintenance, striping, resurfacing, and ultimately reconstruction are required for public streets. For private streets, the apartment owner or homeowner association is responsible for these items.*

*Mr. Fireovid asked if the county could “change its mind” based upon the Conceptual Site Plan approval that it had already granted. Ms. Craze responded that at the time of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision approval there were additional adequacy tests (schools, transportation, police, etc.) and if AIMCO failed any of these tests, it could delay the project.*

*The meeting ended at 9:32 p.m.*

*Respectfully submitted,   
David E. Moran   
Assistant City Manager*