



**ADVISORY PLANNING BOARD  
APPROVED MINUTES OF MEETING**

**Virtual Meeting  
December 2, 2020**

Minutes Prepared by Molly Porter

- I. The meeting was called to order at 7:01 pm

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Syed Shamim, Ben Friedman, Maria Silvia Miller, Keith Chernikoff, James Drake, Matthew Inzeo, and Isabelle Gournay

**STAFF PRESENT:** Molly Porter

**ALSO PRESENT:** Alex Villegas (Rodgers Consulting), Jim Riviello, David Polonsky, Drew Romanic (Martin Architecture), Jason Staley, Kap Kapastin (Quantum Companies), Matt Tedesco (McNamee Hosea), Matthew Leakan (Rodgers Consulting), Nat Ballard (Rodgers Consulting), Steve Mast, Zelda Bell

- II. Agenda approved as amended

- III. Minutes of November 19, 2020 approved as amended

- IV. Beltway Plaza Proposed Redevelopment- Phase 1 Detailed Site Plan

The Board continued their discussion about the Phase 1 Detailed Site Plan for the proposed redevelopment of the Beltway Plaza Mall. The Board's discussion started on the topic of the proposed architecture including concerns about communal space and how those spaces connect with the outdoors. The Board also wanted to discuss the access to parking, blank facades and instances where there is no proposed architectural treatment, and a desire to see buildings with changing heights to break down the regularity of the façade. Members of the Board noted that the landscaping had improved, but still had concerns about quality of life within the proposed redevelopment.

Mr. Drake noted that the buildings appear massive and that the buildings are the same height all the way around. He questioned whether this was because of the limitations related to wood construction. A representative from the development team responded that the proposed building height is limited because of wood frame construction. He also spoke about the functionality of the "donut parking" design proposed. He did note that there might be opportunity to adjust the parapet heights. Ms. Gournay asked about the uniformity in the type of units and raised examples, such as a project in Wheaton, that incorporated penthouses on the top floor of the building. She also raised a concern about affordability and that these units

would not be family-friendly. Mr. Shamim asked for details about the lobby areas and whether there was an elevator planned for the buildings. The development team responded that there would be elevators. Ms. Gournay then gave a presentation to demonstrate to the development team architectural elements that could be incorporated into the design to create interest and to reflect architecture in Historic Greenbelt.

A representative from the development team then spoke about the materials that are proposed and their efforts to incorporate multiple textures in the design. Mr. Drake noted that Building 1A does have more variability than other proposed buildings, but Building 1B is monolithic. Ms. Gournay expressed that the buildings should not have exactly the same dwelling units and that different types of units could be incorporated.

Mr. Chernikoff asked about the unit mix proposed. The development team responded that Buildings 1A and 1B are proposed to have one (1) and two (2) bedroom units and that there would be some different unit options on the corners of the buildings. Ms. Gournay spoke about the public face of the buildings on Breezewood Drive and noted that the proposed architecture gives a sense of a wall along Breezewood Drive. The development team responded that the distance between the buildings and Franklin Park would be 200 feet and there would be trees and a street separating them.

Mr. Friedman raised questions about the proposed Building 1A courtyard. He asked about sunlight and potential problems with noise because the courtyard would be surrounded by the building on all sides. He asked about consideration of the courtyard being placed on the rooftop over the garage and questioned whether this could facilitate larger units within the building. The development team shared a sun study in response to concerns about sunlight and also discussed how the team is looking at a rooftop amenity such as a landscaped patio.

Mr. Drake then asked questions about the types of units and asked why the development team chose to focus on one (1) and two (2) bedroom units. The development team responded that a market study was conducted, that these types of units are marketable, and that this development is not geared for lots of children. They also noted that one target demographic is active adults. Mr. Shamim asked about the accessibility of the buildings. The development team responded that all dwelling units would be accessible and that for all projects they engage with an ADA consultant.

Ms. Gournay asked about guest parking for the residential buildings. The development team responded that these spaces would be on the main floor of the parking garage. Members of the Board then asked about EV Charging Stations. The development team responded that ten (10) charging stations are planned for Building 1A and infrastructure for an additional ten (10) charging stations is proposed.

Mr. Drake then asked the development team to explain the common spaces. The development team responded that the proposed common spaces for Building 1A are, a two (2) story sports bar, lounge/conference room, coffee area, game room, fitness room, and dog run.

Mr. Drake noted that Building 1A seemed reasonable, but that Building 1B is not interesting and urged the development team to rethink the overall height profile. A member of the development team noted that they are currently revisiting Buildings 1B and 1C and that building colors have yet to be determined. Mr. Drake asked that the development team provide a design for the rooftop at the next meeting.

- V. No new business was discussed.
- VI. The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 pm.