

## SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

### SP #430 4318 N. Carlin Springs Rd. "The Springs"

#### SPRC Meeting #2

October 17, 2013

Planning Commissioners in Attendance: Jane Siegel (Chairperson for this meeting), Steve Cole, Nancy Iacomini

---

### MEETING AGENDA

This was the second SPRC meeting for a proposed site plan for a five-story 104-unit apartment building, located at 4318 North Carlin Springs Road. The Chair, introduced herself and those in attendance introduced themselves. The applicant briefly presented responses to questions and suggestions from SPRC #1: An exhibit on setbacks on existing buildings on North Thomas Street compared to the proposed street setback for the proposed building; dooryards on the Thomas Street façade; a revised, shorter bus stop layout on Carlin Springs Road with a smaller planting area against the building in order to accommodate a straight pedestrian path; an exhibit showing the percentage of landscaped open space as required by the "R-C" ordinance; and a revised elevation eliminating the sloped penthouse at the corner of Carlin Springs and Thomas Street.

The applicant then made on presentation on the evening's topics, Transportation, Open Space, and Architecture. The applicant also brought samples of façade materials proposed to be used. As part of the transportation presentation, the applicant noted that while they proposed to provide one parking space for every dwelling unit, as the "RC" ordinance requires, actual parking demand at other APAH properties was between .7 and .85 spaces per unit.

### SPRC DISCUSSION

#### Transportation

- Greater detail on the street cross-sections was needed, as the presentation drawings the applicant used lacked detail on the exact width of each street element (curb, planting/utility strip, sidewalk). Later in the meeting the applicant showed 4.1 cross-sections.
- Concern that the development will add vehicle traffic to area intersections which are performing suboptimally or at failing levels, and that there are long waits to exit from North Thomas Street to Carlin Springs Road and Henderson Road in the rush hour peaks.
  - Applicant responded that Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) shows a net increase of about 27 net new trips in the a.m. peak and 40 net new trips in the

p.m. peak. With two access points, it is conceivable that these trips will disperse, with some traffic going to the west to Carlin Springs Road, and some going east to Henderson Road. It is likely that the new trips will have only a marginal impact on congestion in the vicinity.

- Trucks on the street make Thomas Street very crowded, and may be a problem during construction.
  - Staff response: As part of the site plan, the applicant must submit a construction staging and truck routing plan to be approved by DES staff to maintain traffic flow as much as possible during construction. After construction, all loading to the site will be at the loading dock, and no need for moving or deliver trucks to park in the street.
- It seems that some of the landscaping against the building, especially at the street corner may impinge on optimal sidewalk width. Need more information.
  - Between the First and Second SPRC meetings, the applicant reduced the planting area at the corner in order to keep a straight clear path.
- A comment that since 1:1 parking may exceed what is really needed on site, build less parking and use the savings for quality materials and design.
  - Staff response: The County Board unfortunately does not have the authority to reduce parking below one space per unit, as the “RC” regulations state that the Board may reduce residential parking to “no less than one space for each unit.”

### **Open Space and Landscaping**

- Comment from neighboring property owner that the building is too close to his and may affect the trees on his property
  - Applicant responded that the setback between the two buildings will allow for the maximum number of window openings in any redevelopment of the adjacent building. Applicant also stated commitment to help preserve the trees on the applicant’s property that may be impacted by the development of this site.
- Comment that the applicant may not be meeting the landscape requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.
  - Staff response: The applicant exceeds the 10% required open space required by the “RC” district, as courtyards and tot lots count also towards this requirement, not only planting beds. With regards to the requirements of the landscaping section of the Zoning Ordinance (size of planting beds, etc.), site plan developments almost always differ from the regulations, because staff reviews the landscape plans for site plans for: compliance with guidance in sector plans, County landscaping standards and practices, functionality, the attractiveness of the design, and survivability of the features, and not necessarily for strict compliance to standards intended for by-right development.
- There should be special emphasis on saving the large tree, perhaps a site plan condition.

**Architecture**

- Concern that since that the use of phenolic panels as outside material is relatively new, that durability may be a concern.
  - Applicant responded that hardiepanels may be used as an alternative.
- Suggestion that the Jordan is a good model for attractiveness and quality materials in an affordable housing building.
- Concern that the materials not look value engineered.
- Suggestion that the colors from an earlier façade view are preferable to the plainer façade shown in the updated views.
- Diverging opinions from the SPRC members on whether the architecture should be more traditional, like the buildings on North Thomas Street.
- Concern from CA rep that building is not compatible with rest of street.
- A comment that the façade design makes the building look larger than it is.
- A comment that while the building shouldn't be too out of character with the neighborhood, should not continue the "by-right" pattern of front yard parking.