

Cafritz Additional Information 12-6-2011

Asare, Mira A.

From: Butler, Tina T.
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2011 4:26 PM
To: Asare, Mira A.
Subject: FW: Cafritz Property Development Proposal: a No-Win for Everyone Except Developers

FYI

From: Olson, Eric
Sent: Saturday, November 26, 2011 10:28 AM
To: Butler, Tina T.; Glaros, Dannielle M.; Floyd, Ree C.
Subject: Fw: Cafritz Property Development Proposal: a No-Win for Everyone Except Developers

Please add for the Cafritz file since this is a filed project.

Thanks,
Eric

From: Greatjm <greatjm@aol.com>
To: Olson, Eric
Sent: Sat Nov 26 09:21:49 2011
Subject: Cafritz Property Development Proposal: a No-Win for Everyone Except Developers

Dear Eric,

I've followed the ongoing approval process for the Cafritz property for well over a year now. The word "process" is appropriate only if pretending away practical considerations and driving ahead under the rubric "develop at any cost" can be applied to what is increasingly becoming a nasty charade.

This is a self-defeating effort writ both large and small. On the smaller scale, it will gridlock Route 1 (did you see the 24 November *Gazette* article concerning College Park citizens' ongoing concerns about the current state of the highway?) during rush hours and make it a real bottleneck the rest of the day. I for one want no part of Van Buren Street becoming a high-speed work-around route. The street is not meant to handle it. And that's the problem with the entire project: the traffic infrastructure is simply not adequate. The calls for use of public transportation and bike paths in the face of this are either naive or downright cynical. And notice no one is offering any money to make the considerable and costly upgrades crucial to even giving traffic a chance of working.

The larger scale defeat will be for the county itself. A debacle with the Cafritz property -- and believe me, it will ultimately turn out that way -- will scare off retailers for years because the county will have proven its inability to manage smart growth.

I'm all for development of the property -- in accordance with its current zoning.

We've seen the proposal and the emperor has no clothes. For the sake of the citizens of College Park and University Park -- and ultimately the county -- I'm asking you in the strongest terms to vote for development of the property as currently zoned and against any multi-use development that does not ensure and provide for prior to development the infrastructure necessary to ensure its success.

I hope I can count on you.

Sincerely,

John Greathouse
4211 Van Buren Street
University Park 20782

Asare, Mira A.

From: Butler, Tina T.
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2011 4:29 PM
To: Asare, Mira A.
Subject: FW: Fwd: College Park, and Riverdale Park Recommendations to Cafritz
Attachments: Cafritz position statement 11-25-11.doc

FYI

From: Olson, Eric
Sent: Saturday, November 26, 2011 10:15 AM
To: Butler, Tina T.; Glaros, Dannielle M.; Floyd, Ree C.
Subject: Fw: Fwd: College Park, and Riverdale Park Recommendations to Cafritz

Please add to file/record as this is a communication on a filed project. Thanks.

From: davidcbrosch@comcast.net <davidcbrosch@comcast.net>
To: Olson, Eric
Sent: Sat Nov 26 10:02:38 2011
Subject: Fwd: College Park, and Riverdale Park Recommendations to Cafritz

Eric,

I have been told that you are unhappy about the way the Cafritz project is proceeding. Me too, though I am not sure we have the same misgivings. I have sent this attachment to John Tabori and our council yesterday. I think we can have a development at Cafritz but I think it will have to look very different than what is currently proposed to do the local community, PG Co. and even the developer right. A well designed project in the long run will give the developer the best chance for success. In this economic climate it is even more important to go about it in right manner.

Dave

From: davidcbrosch@comcast.net
To: "Tracey Toscano" <ttoscano@upmd.org>
Cc: "Suellen M. Ferguson" <Ferguson@cbknlaw.com>, "John Tabori" <mayor@upmd.org>, "Ward 1" <ward1@upmd.org>, "Ward 2" <ward2@upmd.org>, "Ward 3" <ward3@upmd.org>, "Ward 4" <ward4@upmd.org>, "Ward 5" <ward5@upmd.org>, "Ward 6" <ward6@upmd.org>, "Ward 7" <ward7@upmd.org>
Sent: Friday, November 25, 2011 4:28:37 PM
Subject: Re: College Park, and Riverdale Park Recommendations to Cafritz

Dear John and Colleagues,
Please find attachment regarding Cafritz position statement. Thanks.
Dave

From: "Tracey Toscano" <ttoscano@upmd.org>
To: "John Tabori" <mayor@upmd.org>, "Ward 1" <ward1@upmd.org>, "Ward 2" <ward2@upmd.org>, "Ward 3" <ward3@upmd.org>, "Ward 4" <ward4@upmd.org>, "Ward 5" <ward5@upmd.org>, "Ward 6" <ward6@upmd.org>, "Ward 7" <ward7@upmd.org>,

davidcbrosch@comcast.net

Cc: "Suellen M. Ferguson" <Ferguson@cbknlaw.com>

Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 12:10:20 PM

Subject: College Park, and Riverdale Park Recommendations to Cafritz

Latest letters to add to your files -- Tracey

November 25, 2011

Dear John and Colleagues,

I know we are using the time around this holiday weekend to come up with a final draft Statement of Position on Cafritz that will be discussed and voted on at our next meeting. I would like to make these comments and suggestions toward that end and hope they can be incorporated into the draft.

Timetable and schedule - The developer with the encouragement of the County (?) is pushing this along on a fast track. This is not the best way to make good decisions, to acquire the necessary data and information, to do good planning or urban design, or even to get the development pieces into place – the planning and zoning review processes, the cooperation and agreements of the many affected or contributing parties, and finally the funding. Cafritz may have been at this for several years but I do not believe their proposal or the process has matured to the point where the County should allow it to move forward.

Let us call for a delay of a year or two to get it right. Keep the zoning at R-55 until a better plan is put forward. I believe we should not recommend M-U-I or M-U-TC zoning. Either will allow possible development we may be unable to control or happy with. I see Mr. Reed is now promising to “limit” residential development to 382 units even if all of the CFX bridge efforts do not succeed. I understand that this is an involved time-consuming process but with up zoning Cafritz might be able to build all of its proposed commercial and up to a third of its residential units without the certainty of a bridge/road east. I feel extremely uncomfortable with that.

The vision thing - The developer is selling this as smart development, close to and accessible via mass transit. We are enticed by the promise of a high-end grocery store. The plan as of this date calls for a huge amount of at-grade parking, maybe a CSX bridge to the east in the future, and a significant part of the housing constructed up against nearby industrial properties and the railroad at the eastern and southern portions of the site. You know, in the past, we tended to develop our towns and cities with industrial uses near railroads so they would have access to receive and ship goods. We also placed homes at some distance from the railroads because of noise and other negative impacts. Would you want to live 100 feet from frequently passing freight trains? This may be getting into site design but maybe the Cafritz design team should consider placing the commercial at the back of the site and moving the residential closer to Rt 1 and in the more Western portions of the site.

We should expect and demand much more. Cafritz should seize this opportunity to create something far greater than is now being proposed and the County should accept no less. The developers can and should build a world-class development and will make Prince George’s County proud. I have heard some say that by opposing what is now being proposed we will be sending a message to the development community that they are not welcome here in the County. On the contrary, we do want them but we expect

smart growth development that serves the region without punishing the local community. We want residential and commercial that fits the site and the street system beyond the development. Maybe we should question the amount of housing and commercial that is being suggested by Cafritz? After all, there is a point when any site regardless of its opportunities and characteristics can be over built where the intensity of development overwhelms the supporting infrastructure. We also want a LEED-ND certified development that takes advantage of latest techniques in site planning/urban design, renewable energy, energy conservation, storm water management, and mass transit-oriented features.

Information is critical - Even with a new road running up Maryland Avenue to the MARC station and downtown Riverdale Park, a bridge/street crossing to the M Square Development, and a bus circulator and trip reduction strategies can we be certain that Cafritz will not create gridlock on our local street system? Could the number of vehicular trips increase by as much as 80-100% on our major streets as has been suggested? Can a thousand new residences, a hotel, and many new commercial enterprises be supported by local demand? How will these activities affect the market here in the County?

A traffic study and a market study must be prerequisites for a good development proposal. Only with these in hand can we really determine what is appropriate for the site and our larger surrounding community. This whole Cafritz development process should be put on hold until we have the information.

Dave

Asare, Mira A.

From: Butler, Tina T.
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2011 4:30 PM
To: Asare, Mira A.
Subject: FW: Cafritz

FYI

-----Original Message-----

From: Olson, Eric
Sent: Wednesday, November 23, 2011 8:35 PM
To: 'morris.kristin.m@gmail.com'
Cc: Floyd, Ree C.; Butler, Tina T.; Glaros, Dannielle M.
Subject: Re: Cafritz

Thank you, Ms. Morris. There is a Planning Board date of December 15. I am filing your communication with the Clerk of the Council.

Thank you,
Eric

----- Original Message -----

From: Kristin Morris <morris.kristin.m@gmail.com>
To: County Executive; Olson, Eric; Hewlett, Elizabeth; mayor@upmd.org <mayor@upmd.org>
Sent: Tue Nov 22 19:03:03 2011
Subject: Cafritz

I support the Cafritz development.

A community vision should take into account the vision of the ENTIRE community, not just a vocal few. There are many in this community who want a nice, mixed use development on the Cafritz property. The Cafritz development will help maintain the momentum started by the EYA development and probably help UTC revive. Those currently empty, blighted spaces along Route 1 will become desirable. They are not desirable now. I believe the development has the potential to turn the whole region around. Traffic will be an issue. Let's deal with it. Alternative transportation is an option for mitigating traffic, and more ways in and out of the development is another option, among the many others proposed. Stormwater runoff management is an issue. Let's keep up the push for greater controls than what has been proposed. There are issues involved with the development that can be managed.

Kristin Morris
University Park MD Homeowner and Resident

Sent from my iPad