



**ADVISORY PLANNING BOARD  
APPROVED MINUTES OF MEETING  
Greenbelt Community Center  
September 4, 2019  
Minutes Prepared by Judith Howerton**

I. The meeting was called to order at 7:40 pm

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Keith Chernikoff, Ben Friedman, Maria Silvia Miller, Syed A. Shamim, and Nicole Williams (arrived 8:03pm)

ABSENT WAS: Isabelle Gournay, James Drake

STAFF PRESENT: Terri Hruby, Judith Howerton

PRESENTERS: Matthew Tedesco from McNamee Hosea, Josh Wooldridge, Joe Torg, and Karl Alt from NRP Group, James Buchheister from VIKA, and Mike Lenhart from Lenhart Consulting

ALSO PRESENT: Bill Orleans (resident)

II. Agenda approved as presented

III. Minutes from previous meeting were approved as presented

IV. Introduction and Discussion of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (PPS) – NRP Multifamily Housing Development Proposal – Capital Office Park (Intersection of Cherrywood Lane and Ivy Lane)

The presenting group was introduced by Mr. Tedesco who also gave a summary of NRP, a developer builder and management company. He reminded APB that NRP had previously met with the board in January 2018 to present a concept plan for the same - Capital Office Park - parcels at the intersection of Cherrywood lane and Ivy lane. He concluded by announcing that NRP has recently filed a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision with the County and was seeking the City's support and approval of the plans.

Mr. Wooldridge took over to present the actual plans which included renderings and site layouts. He started by showing previous proposals that have been presented to the City for the same site/location of which one was an office /commercial proposal and the other was a different type of multi-family housing from what NRP was proposing. He pointed out that many NRP projects were Transit Oriented Development (TOD) projects and although this particular one did not meet the WMATA standards of 0.5miles or less to be considered 'walkable', it was only 0.6miles from the Greenbelt Metro Station, and still potentially walkable. He also stated that the NRP plan ensures that residents could also get to the metro via biking, or transit as they have made provisions for these options. They plan to improve the bus stop right outside the development by providing a bus shelter, improve sidewalks, provide ample bike parking and even work with the County to put up a Capital Bikeshare station at this location. Other amenities he talked about include; a clubhouse with wellness center, a social space (for both business and socializing), a Dog park, a Dog spa, as he went on to elaborate on each, their desirability, and how residents interacted with these features. Mr. Lenhart, a traffic consultant, joined him to discuss traffic issues and what types of calculations were made in assessing the impact of this property to circulation issues before they wrapped up the presentation. Staff was then asked to give a summary of their evaluations.

Staff commented that there were a couple of overarching issues; first, was that they felt they did not have enough information from the submitted traffic analysis to feel comfortable giving the project their full support without requiring either a traffic impact study or a signal warrant analysis. The second issue was that they felt the project would put a strain on public facilities and recreational amenities given that the project is situated in Greenbelt West, where the city has continuing concerns about recreational programming. Staff also talked about how parkland dedication and recreational amenities could potentially be addressed and stated that the only option available was fee-in-lieu. They would work with the County and the applicant to come up with figures that they could all agree upon.

The Board members also asked several follow-up questions that sought further clarification on traffic related issues and exact locations (and specifics) of amenities. Mr. Orleans asked two questions of the board; if the board thought this development proposal was the best use of this particular piece of property/land and if they had investigated the management practices of NRP. Ms. Miller stated that she felt this was the best proposal they had seen thus far for that particular site and Mr. Chernikoff stated that they previously liked NRP's proposal and that the city could stand to gain from development of this property by this developer.

Ms. Miller passed a motion seconded by Ms. Williams as the board went on to vote 5-0 in support of planning staff's recommendations to exclude no. 3 which has already been met by applicant as well as change of language on no. 4 to show that one requirement has been met.

- V. New Business  
No new business was discussed.
- VI. The meeting was adjourned at 9:03pm.