



**ADVISORY PLANNING BOARD
UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF MEETING**

Virtual Meeting

September 22, 2021

Minutes Prepared by Holly Simmons

- I. The meeting was called to order at 7:39 PM

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

STAFF PRESENT: Holly Simmons, Terri Hruby

ALSO PRESENT: Ian Black & Mike Postal of Tenacity Group; Tom Haller of Gibbs and Haller; Jackson Tan; Jess McMahon & Justin Valdez of NVR; Idris Gbadamosi; Bill Orleans

- II. Agenda approved as presented

- III. Minutes of September 1st approved as presented

- IV. 7010 Greenbelt Road – Request for zoning text amendment to support proposed development

Staff provided an overview of the request. The project team is proposing an age-restricted multifamily housing development at 7010 Greenbelt Road. The R-18 zoning for the site would allow 90 units total; however, in order to accommodate a community meeting room, which Council desires, the project team has expressed a need to add five (5) more units, for a total of 95 units. Because this exceeds the allowed density, legislation has been introduced by County Council Member Turner on behalf of the project team, which would allow for a slight increase in density, from 20 units per acre to 22 units per acre for age-restricted housing in this zone. The bill is CB-83-2021. The legislation is a preliminary step that would allow the project to move forward to the review stage with 95 units. Support for the text amendment would not indicate support for any particular plan, but would instead allow the project team to move forward with detailed engineering. The City has restrictive covenants on the site allowing the City to have full approval authority of the Detailed Site Plan (DSP), unlike other projects where the City does not have approval authority.

Mr. Black clarified that the project team had previously presented a concept plan in which one of the four buildings had a reduced height of three floors, which would allow them to conform to the density requirements; however, Council expressed a desire for a community meeting space. To meet this desire, the project team added back the fourth floor of the building with one unit converted to a meeting space and five additional units.

The Board discussed parking and possible impacts of the proposed increase in density. Ms. Gournay asked if the proposal would increase parking. Mr. Haller replied that the current proposal has 119 parking spaces to accommodate the 95 units and visitors. They are looking

to balance the need for parking onsite as there is no overflow area, without overparking the project.

Ms. Gournay questioned the height of the buildings, asking if the rear buildings could be five stories and the front buildings three stories to allow for more architectural interest and better views. Ms. McMahon replied that increasing the building height to five stories changes the applicable regulations and building code.

At the request of a Board member, the project team provided further background information. Mr. Haller provided background on the project and the team's involvement, beginning when the former nursing home was still onsite, through earlier approvals for multifamily housing with structured parking, the impacts of the Great Recession, and more recent changes to the proposed development based on earlier conversations with the Board and Council, including the addition of electric vehicle parking, movement of parking near to building entries, adjustment of color pallet, addition of green area and activity areas, and the increase in the buffer to Greenbelt Road. Mr. Haller indicated that the current proposal is the culmination of feedback from the City, from which the project team understands that including communal meeting space for residents was critical. Therefore, the project team most recently modified the site plan to provide this meeting space and added five units. The zoning text amendment is necessary for the meeting space and additional units.

Mr. Shamim questioned if all units would be for the elderly and be accessible, and Mr. Haller responded that all units will be age-restricted and all buildings would be four stories served by elevators. Mr. Shamim raised a concern regarding the provision of electric vehicle chargers. Mr. Haller responded that they are providing electric vehicle chargers. Additionally, they are providing three times the required number of handicapped parking spaces (three are required per County code, and they are proposing eight).

Mr. Friedman questioned if the text amendment would apply to the entire R-18 zone. Mr. Haller stated that it would, but it is only applicable to age-restricted housing in transportation service area 1 (generally, inside the Beltway).

The Board then discussed parking and ingress/egress. Mr. Friedman was concerned that there may not be enough parking, and there is limited access to street parking for this site. Mr. Shamim asked if the only access was from Greenbelt Road. Mr. Haller replied that this is the only ingress/egress. This will be further addressed with Council and the State Highway Administration (SHA) at the time of the DSP. Board members discussed whether it would be possible to use the street in front of armory for travel and parking. Some stated that, although the use of this street may help the project, they would need to assess this project entirely independently of the possible hand-over of the armory to the City. Staff stated that, previously, SHA indicated that the access point would only allow for right in, right out movements. Staff does not anticipate a second access off Greenbelt Road; additionally, a second access point would conflict with the desire to buffer Greenbelt Road. The burden is on the applicant to satisfactorily address the issue for City approval. They cannot rely on the availability of adjacent parcels to address concerns.

The Board and attendees then discussed the dwelling units. Mr. Orleans questioned if the units would be sold to age-restricted residents, the means of conveyance, and price point. He expressed that Council has identified a need for affordable housing. Mr. Haller stated the units will be condos sold to individual buyers. There will be a condo association. As it is early in the process, it is difficult to determine price point. The Board asked for the number of bedrooms in each unit. Ms. McMahon stated the units would be two bedroom/two bathroom, as focus groups and surveys have revealed that many older couples are not sleeping in the same bedroom for a variety of reasons. They will be 1,150sf to 1,500sf. Mr. Shamim questioned why a condo association will be used and not an HOA, and expressed concerns about condo fees. Ms. McMahon stated that a condo association is required for the type of housing and building. Mr. Haller expressed that the goal is to reduce the burden on homeowners by providing a maintenance-free environment. One benefit of a condo association is that all common areas are maintained. The fee must be reasonable for the buyer and also able to cover maintenance of common areas.

The Board referenced that there will be an opportunity for a full range of review later in the process, including further discussion of the proposed number of parking spaces. Ms. McMahon stated that, based on the team's experience in region, condo projects like this one often attract widows/widowers living alone, many of whom are not living in the residences fulltime (e.g., they are snowbirds). This can largely mitigate parking concerns in age-restricted active communities.

Members of the Board stated support for providing senior housing in this area, as it is accessible and convenient to public transportation. Additionally, the current proposal provides a community meeting room, which is a critical part of what Council has urged. Staff stated that the City has been requesting developers provide age-restricted housing projects for the last ten years. This project will fill a need that has long been identified, and which other developers have stated is not economically feasible. Members of the Board agreed.

The Board voted (5-0) to support the legislation, understanding that if the legislation passes and the development team proceeds to Detailed Site Plan the City will have the authority to review and approve the site plan. No new business was discussed.

V. The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 PM.