

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and Council

THROUGH: Joseph L. Nagro, City Manager
Terry Schum, Planning Director

FROM: Elisa Vitale, Senior Planner *EV*

DATE: November 10, 2011

SUBJECT: Zoning Map Amendment (A-10018), Cafritz Property, Calvert Tract, LLC

ISSUE

Calvert Tract LLC (the Applicant) through a rezoning application, seeks to amend the boundaries of the Mixed-Use Town Center (M-U-TC) Zone of the *January 2004, Approved Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan* to include their property, which they are seeking to rezone from the Single-Family Detached Residential (R-55) Zone to the M-U-TC Zone, as well as amend the Development Plan per the requirements set forth in 27-198.05(d)(1)(A) and (B) of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance. (See Attachment 1.) The Planning Board hearing is scheduled for December 15, 2011, and the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission technical staff report will be available December 1, 2011. The Town of University Park is scheduled to take a position on the proposed rezoning on November 21, 2011 (Attachment 6) and the Town of Riverdale Park will take a position in late November or early December (Attachment 7).

BACKGROUND

The Cafritz property consists of approximately 37.34 acres on the east side of U.S. Route 1, 1,400 feet north of its intersection with U.S. Route 410 (Tax Map 42, Grid D-1, Parcel 81). The property is located in County Planning Area 68 and is primarily in the Town of Riverdale Park with a small portion (the Rhode Island Avenue right-of-way and the northeast corner of the site) located in the City of College Park. The *2002 General Plan* places the property in the Developed Tier on a designated Corridor and on the edge of a Center. The development of the Cafritz property has been contemplated for a number of years, with public meetings to discuss the development beginning in 2007. The applicant contemplated other vehicles for developing the property, including the Mixed-Use-Transportation (M-X-T) and Mixed-Use-Infill (M-U-I) Zones, but recently determined that they would proceed with the request to amend the boundary of the M-U-TC zone and rezone the subject property from R-55 to M-U-TC.

Although the specifics of the development proposal have been modified over the years, the applicant is currently proposing: 17,600 to 26,400 square feet of office; 134,560 to 201,840 square feet of retail, to include a Whole Foods Market and fitness center; 1,028,000 to 1,542,200

square feet of residential, including 647 units of multi-family condominiums, 224 units of age-restricted housing, 30 units of multifamily scholar housing, and 94 townhomes for a total of 995 units; and 92,720 to 145,080 square feet for a 120-key hotel.

SUMMARY

This application is being handled as a rezoning request, but includes three distinct components – the change to the boundary of the approved Development Plan, the rezoning of the Cafritz property, and amendments to the approved Development Plan. As part of its rezoning request, the applicant has submitted a Development Plan for the property (Attachment 2). The applicant also has submitted an Addendum to the *January 2004, Town of Riverdale Park M-U-TC Development Plan*, which modifies the Design Standards Guidelines in the M-U-TC Development Plan for the Cafritz property and provides a concept plan that lays out phasing, the street network, building placement and proposed uses (Attachment 3). The boundary change is considered a primary amendment of the Development Plan and the applicant has submitted a Boundary Exhibit (Attachment 4). This exhibit shifts the zone boundary 60 feet from the southern property line, which would result in a split zone property.

The specific purposes of the M-U-TC Zone are found at Section 27-546.09(A) and include the following:

- (1) *To create with the community a development framework that can capitalize on the existing fabric of the County's older commercial/mixed-use centers and corridors.*
- (2) *To promote reinvestment in, and the appropriate redevelopment of, older commercial areas, to create attractive and distinctive community centers for shopping, socializing, entertaining, living, and to promote economic vitality.*
- (3) *To promote the preservation and adaptive reuse of selected buildings in older commercial areas.*
- (4) *To ensure a mix of compatible uses which compliments concentrations of retail and service uses, including institutional uses, encourages pedestrian activity, and promotes shared parking.*
- (5) *To provide a mix of commercial and residential uses which establish a safe and vibrant twenty-four hour environment.*
- (6) *To establish a flexible regulatory framework, based upon community input, to encourage compatible development and redevelopment, including shared parking facilities, that will enhance the Town Center.*
- (7) *To preserve and promote those distinctive physical characteristics that are identified by the community as essential to the community's identity, including building character, special landmarks, small parks and other gathering places, and wide sidewalks.*

The criteria for approval of the M-U-TC Zone are found in Section 27-198.05(a)(1) and include the following:

- (A) *The entire Map Amendment, including the Development Plan, is in conformance with the purposes and other requirements of the M-U-TC Zone;*
- (B) *Adequate attention has been paid to the recommendations of Area Master Plans and the General Plan which are found to be applicable to property within the proposed M-U-TC Zone;*

- (C) *An approved Master Plan recommends a mixed use town center zone or the area is demonstrated to be an older, substantially developed mixed-use community;*
- (D) *The Town Center Development Plan will provide a flexible regulatory environment that will support redevelopment and development interests in the area and protect the character of the older mixed use center; and*
- (E) *The M-U-TC Zone boundaries are contiguous with no land in a different zone remaining solely within the approved M-U-TC Zone boundaries.*

The District Council is authorized to change the boundaries of the M-U-TC Zone and to amend the Development Plan. Section 27-198.05(d)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance states:

- (A) *A request to change the boundaries of an approved M-U-TC Zone, or to amend an approved Town Center Development Plan, may be made by a property owner or any municipality within which any portion of the zone is located. The request shall be in the form of an application.*
- (B) *Amendments to change the boundaries of an M-U-TC Zone shall be approved by the District Council in accordance with the provision of the Subdivision for initial approval.*

The applicant submitted the rezoning request on Friday, October 14, 2011, and the application was accepted that same day, which set in motion a 60-day review period within which the Prince George's County Planning Board is required to hold a hearing on the request. The Planning Board must take action, by resolution adopted at a regularly scheduled public meeting, not more than 45 days after the close of the hearing record and then must transmit its recommendation to the District Council within 105 days. The District Council shall hold a public hearing on the proposed M-U-TC Zone within 60 days following receipt of the Planning Board's recommendation. The Council shall take final action on the M-U-TC Zone at any time within 30 days after the close of the final public hearing record, but not later than 150 days after receipt of the recommendation from the Planning Board.

The Cafritz property (Parcel 81) is a legal acreage parcel that has never been the subject of a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and, pursuant to Section 24-107(c) of the Subdivision Regulations a Preliminary Plan is required for construction of more than 5,000 square feet of gross floor area on Parcel 81. Therefore, the applicant must submit a Preliminary Plan to proceed with development of the property should the rezoning request be successful. Although the applicant has not proposed a modification to the design review process established in the Development Plan, they have proffered submittal of a Detailed Site Plan (DSP) for all proposed development on the property.

Comment: The applicant should revise the Boundary Exhibit to prevent the creation of a split zone property. The purposes of the M-U-TC Zone are to promote redevelopment, preservation, and adaptive reuse of existing buildings in older commercial areas. Although the Cafritz property has been previously developed, the site was cleared and is currently unimproved. Because the M-U-TC Zone and Development Plan was envisioned for redevelopment and infill development in and around the Riverdale Park Town Center, there are some idiosyncrasies in how the rezoning process has unfolded and staff believes that additional issues will continue to

be identified as the process moves forward. The use of the M-U-TC Zone and Development Plan as the vehicle for rezoning the Cafritz property highlights the need to ensure that strong connections are made between the proposed development and the existing Town Center. Staff is concerned that the connection to the Riverdale Park Town Center as proposed is tenuous and believes that the developer must demonstrate how a strong connection will be made along the Rhode Island Avenue right-of-way (Trolley Trail) and through the extension of Maryland Avenue.

Staff understands that the U.S. Postal facility to the south of the subject property is on the market. It may be appropriate at this time for M-NCPPC to evaluate and possibly include the rezoning of adjoining properties (U.S. Postal facility, WMATA property, and Armory property) at this time. This could enhance the likelihood of future mixed-use development and connections throughout this area.

The subject application is not following a conventional rezoning process – a zoning map amendment (ZMA) or a sectional map amendment (SMA). ZMAs may be requested by a property owner for a single parcel of land and SMAs may be initiated by the District Council and can cover an entire community. Before approving a ZMA, the District Council must determine that there has either been a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood or that a mistake was made in the original zoning or the most recent SMA. Comprehensive rezonings, or SMAs, are not undertaken for individual properties. Instead, all the zoning within an entire geographic area, such as a subregion, sector, or planning area is examined. The result of the comprehensive rezoning process is a new zoning map or SMA for the subject area and the preparation of an SMA is generally done concurrently with preparation of an area master plan.

This subject application involves an individual property owner requesting a rezoning of a single parcel that is being accomplished through an SMA-like process with the revision of a plan, the Approved Development Plan. Under normal circumstances, the District Council would authorize the Planning Board to revise a plan when it approves the Planning Department's annual work program and the Planning Board would direct M-NCPPC staff to proceed through the regular plan revision process, which can take over a year and generally involves extensive research and analysis by staff as well as community outreach. For this rezoning, the applicant has supplanted M-NCPPC staff and has prepared the draft plan.

Given the unique nature of the process, staff believes that a number of important issues, including adequate public facilities and environmental issues, must be evaluated in greater detail at the time of Preliminary Plan and addressed through conditions of approval. It is, however, necessary to discuss certain issues related to transportation and environment at the time of the rezoning, and more detailed information can be found in the analysis that follows. Staff supports the applicant's proffer of DSP and believes that it will allow for an in-depth review of the site plan and will afford all concerned municipalities an opportunity to address design issues, including buffering, landscaping, grading, and architecture as well as design of parking, loading, and circulation; lighting; views; green area; site and streetscape amenities; grading; service areas; public spaces; and architecture.

Development Concept

The applicant is proposing a mixed-use, “smart growth” neighborhood that is poised to take advantage of existing and proposed mass transit stations: College Park/University of Maryland Metro and MARC Station, the Riverdale MARC Station, and the proposed Purple Line stations at the College Park Metro and at M Square.

The Development Plan (Attachment 2a) shows a phasing line and separates the development in two phases. The layout of Phase 1 (Blocks A – E) is fairly detailed and includes retail/commercial/office, residential, and retail/commercial/hospitality/residential. Phase 2 (Blocks F – L) is more conceptual and does not show building footprints and parking and road layouts but provides general boxes showing the approximate placement for residential, green space, and retail/commercial/hospitality/residential. The Development Plan provides a breakdown, with a range of square footage, for all proposed uses.

Use	Sq. Ft./Units
Office	17,600 – 26,400
Retail	134,500 – 201,840
Residential	1,028,000 – 1,542,200
Multifamily Condo	647
Multifamily Senior	224
Multifamily Scholar	30
Townhomes	94
Hotel	96,720 – 145,080
TOTAL	1,276,880 – 1,915,320

The development ranges result in a floor area ratio of 0.85 to 1.27. The Plan also proposes a maximum building height of 40 feet for all townhouses and 80 feet for all other buildings. The Plan proposes a 5-foot front, 3-foot side, and 5-foot rear building restriction lines. The Plan provides parking standards and proposes a parking space size of 8.5 feet by 18.5 feet. The applicant has indicated that a total of 922 spaces are required and that 874 spaces will be provided with 0 spaces in structured parking, 783 spaces in surface parking, and 91 spaces in on-street parking.

The Addendum (Attachment 3) includes a Concept Plan (Map 1), which provides a greater level of detail than that shown on the Development Plan. The Concept Plan provides detailed building footprints; proposed uses, including commercial/office, hotel, multifamily residential, and residential townhomes; road network and pedestrian amenities; and public space. The buildings on the Concept Plan are labeled and correspond to the building recommendations found in Table 1 (Attachment 3). The Concept Plan also provides phasing information and shows phasing lines labeled Phase 1A, Phase 2 Redevelopment, and Phase 2. Through the legend and building symbols, the Concept Plan appears to envision two phases with only the multifamily residential buildings at the CSX tracks being built in Phase 2.

Comment: The applicant has not clearly defined the phasing for the project and conflicting information is found throughout the submittal. The applicant should provide a clear phasing

plan, including a timetable for the ultimate build out of the property. Staff believes that it would be appropriate for the applicant to revise the Concept Plan to align more closely with the Development Plan. It appears that Phase 1 will include, at a minimum, the Whole Foods, associated retail and office, as well as a portion of the townhomes. The applicant has requested some flexibility with the development on the remainder of the site, and staff believes that it is not appropriate to provide the level of detail shown on the Concept Plan at this time. The general site layout should be shown and the Building Recommendations found in Table 1 of the Addendum will govern use and building heights. The applicant should revise the parking table to reflect the proposed development.

Design Concept

Streets and Open Space

The Development Plan (Attachment 2d – 2e) and Addendum (Attachment 3, Map 3: Street Configurations) provide proposed street sections for the development. The Development Plan proposes streets with lane widths of 10 to 12 feet wide and parallel parking at 8 feet wide. The applicant is proposing a grid of streets centered on Van Buren, which is a tree lined boulevard that runs west to east through the site. The primary site access is at a signalized intersection at Van Buren Street and U.S. 1 that features full turning movements but precludes access to Van Buren west of U.S. 1. Van Buren is the primary spine of the development and the major retail uses and hotel face this street. Running parallel to Van Buren near the north and south property lines are Woodberry Street and Underwood Street, respectively. Access at these streets is right-in/right-out only. Bisecting the property are numbered, north-south streets that begin with 45th Street near U.S. 1 and end with 48th Street near the eastern edge of the property.

South of Van Buren, 45th Street is fronted by Whole Foods to the east, and a surface parking lot to the west. North of Van Buren Street, 45th Street becomes more pedestrian oriented and is framed by retail and office uses on both sides. South of Van Buren, it appears that 45th Street terminates at Underwood near a bank drive-through aisle. 46th Street connects to additional surface parking behind the Whole Foods Market and the hotel to the south of Van Buren Street, and to a more retail oriented environment to the north. 46th Street north of Van Buren provides access to the structured parking garage that will serve the retail and residential. 47th Street is one block and connects Woodberry Street to Van Buren Street and will be a narrow street fronted by higher density 4 to 6 story residential buildings. 48th Street is fronted by higher density residential buildings and townhomes and runs from Woodberry Street to a connection to Maryland Avenue that will tie in to the Riverdale Park Town Center. The Concept Plan provides more detail and shows a possible connection to a CSX overpass that would link the subject property to the M Square development to the east. The Rhode Island Avenue right-of-way, which contains the Trolley Trail in College Park to the north, bisects the site north to south between 47th and 48th Streets and the applicant is proposing to construct the trail from Albion to the southern property line.

Comment: Although the specific details relating to the street sections will be evaluated in more detail at DSP, the applicant should consider reducing the lane and parking widths to 7 to 9 feet on less traveled commercial streets and more highly traveled residential streets and to 7 feet on slower, less traveled residential streets to create a safer street with slower vehicle speeds. Parallel parking could be reduced to 7 feet. Streets next to parks and open spaces should be the

minimum width necessary to promote access and visibility. The applicant should reduce the curb radii to a maximum of 15 feet within the development. The curb radii at the U.S. 1 entrances should be a maximum of 20 feet.

With respect to the overall street layout, staff believes that the opportunity for enhanced connections and a more robust street grid are important. By modifying the block structure to envision future development on adjoining parcels, the applicant could ensure the possibility for future east-west and north-south connections. There are a number of possibilities that should be explored.

The applicant should evaluate the use of Rhode Island Avenue as the main north-south spine for the development, or consider creating a one-way pair of north-south routes with Rhode Island Avenue and Maryland Avenue. If Rhode Island served as the main north-south road for the proposed development, 48th Street could be removed and the connection from Rhode Island over the CSX tracks could be more gradually sloped to clear the tracks. By combining the road and trail, there would be better access to the trail from adjacent communities and the trail would benefit from greater visibility, which could increase safety. As proposed, the trail is located in a tree-lined corridor and is isolated from adjoining development. Use of Rhode Island Avenue could enhance the connection between the proposed development and the existing Town Center. The industrial businesses to the south of the proposed development fronted on Rhode Island Avenue at one time, which provides a precedent for this orientation. The referral memo from the Subdivision Section indicated that additional right-of-way for Rhode Island Avenue was dedicated when the parcel for the Postal Facility was created. If it is determined that Rhode Island Avenue should serve as a north-south road, the applicant should dedicate any required right-of-way.

Another alternative would be for Maryland Avenue to continue as a main north-south route aligned with the CSX tracks. The extension of Maryland Avenue along the tracks could provide improved access and visibility for Riverine Park.

With respect to east-west connections, the applicant should ensure that the Development Plan does not preclude a rational block system and street grid should adjoining properties redevelop. This is particularly important along the northern property line at the WMATA site. Should the WMATA property redevelop, the City would like to see Woodberry Street as a residential street fronted by townhomes. The Development Plan currently places surface parking at this edge on the west side of the property and the ends of townhouses on the east side of the property. Underwood Street at the southern property line also presents an opportunity to create an east-west connection. If the Postal facility were to redevelop, the Development Plan should contemplate how the Postal facility driveway and Underwood Street could serve as an east-west connection and link to the proposed CSX overpass.

In addition to improved east-west vehicular connections, the hiker/biker trail must be better connected to existing and proposed bike routes as well as to the proposed development. The applicant should provide bike facilities on Van Buren Street.

Visual connections are another important component of the overall site design. As shown on the plan, Van Buren Street terminates at a parking access drive and 48th Street also terminates at its north and south ends at driveways. The Development Plan should be revised to provide points of interest at the terminus of important streets within the development.

Site Design

Based on the Concept Plan and Building Recommendations contained in the Addendum (Attachment 3), the applicant is proposing 1 to 3 story retail or restaurant buildings to the north and west of Van Buren and 45th. North of Van Buren and east of 45th is a 2 to 3 story building that will feature ground floor retail and restaurants with the fitness center above. Whole Foods is proposed south of Van Buren and east of 45th and will be a 1 to 3 story building with retail and office. North of Woodberry between 46th and 48th will be mews style townhomes. South of Woodberry is a 3 to 6 story residential building that wraps a structured parking garage, which is visible from 46th. South of Van Buren is a 3 to 6 story hotel. 2 to 4 story mews style townhomes with garages accessed from the rear line the west side of 48th and the east side of 48th south of the CSX overpass. North of the CSX overpass and east of 48th are two, 3 to 6 story multifamily residential buildings with partially wrapped parking structures.

Comment: Staff has concerns about the overall site layout. In particular, the surface parking at U.S. 1 presents an auto-oriented, non-pedestrian friendly environment. Although the applicant is proposing an Arts Park along the US 1 frontage, staff is concerned that this buffer will not create a gateway and will not sufficiently animate the street, nor will it diminish the view and impact of the surface parking lots. Staff understands that Whole Foods has indicated certain requirements with respect to parking and visibility and would like to better understand these site constraints. At a minimum, the applicant should explore an alternate configuration for the block north of Van Buren and west of 45th to bring the buildings closer to U.S. 1.

The Development Plan does not provide a well balanced mix of uses throughout the site. The applicant should provide more housing in Phase 1 on the western half of the site and more commercial in Phase 2 on the eastern half of the site. The current plan limits interaction and activity generated through a mixed-use design. Additionally, the applicant should explore a broader range of housing types (live/work units or apartments over retail) and a greater variety of existing housing styles (duplex, larger and smaller townhouses). Staff has serious concerns about the mews style of townhouse proposed because it creates internally focused communities and requires a number of curb cuts along the street for access. At a minimum, the applicant should revise the townhouse design to provide units that front on the street with alley access to garages.

By exploring a different block pattern, as recommended above, the applicant may find that it is possible to provide a wider variety of housing and unit types throughout the site, which could provide for a greater diversity of massing of buildings. Furthermore, greater diversity in the housing types will attract a broader range of potential tenants and increase the diversity of residents (with respect to age, income and profession). The applicant should reevaluate the design of the CSX overpass and its relation to any adjoining residential units. Staff also has concerns about what appears to be a proposed bank drive through at the terminus of Underwood Street.

Parks and Plazas

The Applicant is proposing five distinct public spaces, which are described in the Addendum to the Development Plan (Attachment 3, Table 2: Public Space Recommendations) as follows.

Arts Park

- Creates interesting and welcoming gateway for Riverdale Park and the Project
- Screens parking
- Brings internationally recognized artwork to Riverdale Park
- Provides bio-retention
- Improves pedestrian and vehicular experience along Route 1
- Provides a buffer for single family

Village Square

- Creates walkable central gathering space for surrounding communities
- Opportunity for community events
- Central meeting space for project
- Place to relax, sit, dine etc.

Hiker Biker Trail

- Pedestrian connection into and out of project
- Direct connection to Downtown Riverdale Park and College Park
- Connects to Village Green
- Accommodates walking and biking

Village Green

- Central communal green space for residential uses in project
- Connects users to Hiker Biker Trail
- Allows users of hiker Biker trail access to project
- Safe space defined on all sides, and viewed by surrounding uses

Riverine Park

- Bio-retention for site
- Buffers project from CSX tracks
- Natural area connects users with local biodiversity

Comment: To ensure safety and visibility, all parks and plazas should be fronted by buildings with active uses at the ground floor. As designed, staff has concerns about the Hiker/Biker Trail and the Riverine Park as these spaces appear isolated with minimal visibility from adjoining buildings.

Staff is concerned about the functionality of the Village Square, which is located in the 50-foot wide Van Buren Street median, and would like to better understand how the applicant envisions programming, activating, and using this space. The applicant is proposing trellises at the U.S. 1 and Van Buren entry and staff believes this important gateway must be better defined.

Transportation

Although M-NCPPC has indicated that an evaluation of the applicant's traffic study and a subsequent finding of adequacy is not appropriate at this time, the applicant has submitted a traffic study and M-NCPPC Transportation staff provided a referral memo. The applicant proposes to develop the site in two phases according to the traffic study submitted: the first phase will include 162,000 square feet of commercial retail space and 22,000 square feet of office. The second phase will include an additional 6,000 square feet of retail, a 120-room hotel, and 995 residential units (224 age-restricted units, 641 apartments, and 131 townhouses).

According to M-NCPPC Transportation Planning staff, if the property were fully built-out under the existing R-55 zoning the density would be an average of 4.6 dwelling units per acre or a total of 173 detached single-family homes. Based on typical trip generation rates, this would result in approximately 1,557 average daily trips (ADT). With the proposed rezoning to M-U-TC, the proposed development program would result in a total of 19,401 ADT or an additional 17,844 ADT. This calculation does not account for pass-by trips or internal trips. This would result in an increase of as many as 820 AM peak hour trips and 2,020 PM peak hour trips. The applicant, in the traffic study dated July 27, 2011, indicates that with intersection improvements and transportation mitigation measures all intersections will operate at an acceptable Level of Service (LOS)

Comment: Staff has identified a number of concerns related to traffic and the submitted traffic study. Again, there are inconsistencies with respect to the development program and phasing. The applicant should revise the traffic study to accurately reflect anticipated build out of the project so that it is consistent with the development plan. A trip cap should be established for the project of 548 AM peak hour trips and 902 PM peak hour trips and the Development Plan should be revised accordingly. The study should be revised to eliminate the corridor averaging methodology that was employed and is applicable only to developments in the U.S. Route 1 Corridor Sector Plan. The study also should evaluate midday and weekend traffic.

The study should be revised to incorporate all anticipated future connections, including Maryland Avenue and the CSX overpass. The applicant is showing a possible connection over the CSX railroad tracks in the concept plan but is not showing the connection in the development plan. Furthermore, the applicant's traffic study does not contemplate this connection in the analysis and if these connections are included, the scoping may need to be revised to include additional intersections. Staff believes there are a number of issues with the CSX connection that require further discussion and investigation. There are potential issues with the environmental setting for the ERCO historic site (#68-22), as well as property ownership issues. The applicant must coordinate with the University of Maryland to locate a landing for the connection on the east side of the tracks (Attachment 5). Additionally, the applicant has indicated that they do not have funding available to construct this improvement. Staff believes that the development density should be limited until such time as this connection is determined feasible and is designed, permitted, and a funding source is identified for construction.

Environment

The Development Plan shows two large retention ponds for stormwater management – along U.S. 1 in the Arts Park and along the CSX tracks in the Riverine Park. The proposed

development plan is not consistent with the approved Stormwater Concept Plan (11589-201, dated May 3, 2010).

The subject property is adjacent to the Riverdale Park, Calvert Hills, and University Park National Register Historic Districts. The applicant completed a Phase I Archaeological Assessment and should submit a Phase II report prior to acceptance of the Preliminary Plan.

The applicant has submitted a Natural Resource Inventory (NRI) (NRI-121-06), which has expired. There are no streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, or steep slopes on the subject property. The soils found on-site include Croom, Leonardtown, Sunnyside and Urban Land series, there are no Marlboro clay found to occur on the subject property. There are no threatened, rare or endangered species found in the vicinity of this property. There are no scenic or historic roads adjacent to the property. The property is located in the Northeast Branch watershed of the Anacostia River basin. The CSX right-of-way is adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site and has been identified as a transportation-related noise generator with potential vibration impacts.

Comment: Staff would like to see the applicant develop low impact development (LID) solutions at the lot, block and community level rather than relying on large retention ponds to address site wide stormwater runoff. The applicant could reduce the amount of impervious surface on the site through narrower streets, pervious pavers at walkways, alleys or parking strips, pervious concrete or asphalt at parking lots and drives, denser housing types with smaller roof areas, larger planting strips and tree wells. The applicant should provide a landscape plan at DSP that maximizes use of native, drought tolerant plants and minimizes use of turf. The applicant should incorporate water storage features such as green roofs, rain barrels for the townhomes, cisterns, rain gardens, and rain holding storage areas under parking lots. The applicant must submit a revised Stormwater Management Plan.

The Historic Preservation Commission will review the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and at that time will review potential impacts on identified archaeological features, including the vehicular access road at the ERCO historic site, as well as the adjacent National Register historic districts.

A revised NRI is not required at this time but will be review at the time of Preliminary Plan; however, a Forest Stand Delineation is required and must be provided. Where possible, the applicant should preserve existing trees and provide reforestation on site. The applicant has indicated they intend to clear the entire site but may be able to preserve some trees along U.S. 1.

The plan should clearly delineate the 65 dBA Ldn from noise generators.

The applicant stated that they are pursuing an aggressive environmental program for the site and are seeking LEED certification. Staff would like the applicant to provide a description of the environmental features of the development.

Design Standards

The applicant has proposed modifications to the Design Standards through its submitted Addendum to the Development Plan. The M-U-TC Local Design Review Committee and the Riverdale Park Town Council have reviewed the proposed modifications and will be providing input to the applicant.

Comment: Staff believes that the Town of Riverdale Park and M-U-TC Committee are best equipped to provide specific comments on modifications to these standards and defers comment but would support any revisions request by either entity.

Design Review Process

Zoning Ordinance Section 27-546.13(f) and (g) state that the Development Plan may create a local design review committee to advise the Planning Board and District Council during review of Special Permits, Special Exceptions, site plans, and other proposals. If a local design review committee is created, the Development Plan shall, at a minimum, define the committee membership, minimum and maximum review time frames, and the extent of the Committee's review responsibilities.

The Riverdale Park M-U-TC Development Plan establishes the development review process for work occurring within the M-U-TC Zone, which includes review by the Riverdale Park Local Design Review Committee that serves as an advisory body to the Prince George's County Planning Board. The Committee has the authority to review and approve building permits and these decisions can be appealed to the Planning Board. The Planning Board is required to hear Special Permit applications and requests for Departures from the M-U-TC Zone. In the case of Departures, the Riverdale Park Town Council and Local Design Review Committee provide input to the Planning Board.

The Addendum refers to the existing M-U-TC Development Plan, pages 65 and 66, and does not propose any changes. The applicant has also proffered DSP for all development on the site.

Comment: Without any changes to the Development Plan, the applicant could have a DSP under review by the Planning Board, as well as a permit under review by the M-U-TC Design Review Committee. Staff believes that this creates a potential conflict should the applicant or a party of record decide to appeal a decision made by either the Planning Board or the Design Review Committee. The applicant should revise the development plan to address this issue.

Inventory and Table of Uses

Zoning Ordinance Section 27-546.13(e) states that the Development Plan may include specific findings and criteria for uses permitted as a Special Permit in the Use Table. Such findings shall generally be limited to site planning issues not otherwise found in the Development Plan. The Addendum refers to the existing M-U-TC Development Plan, pages 67 through 77, and does not propose any changes to the required findings.

Comment: Staff believes this may be problematic because the applicant is proposing uses such as a hotel that require a Special Exception (SE). As previously state, the applicant has proffered DSP for all proposed development. It may be beneficial for the applicant to amend the M-U-TC

Development Plan to create a separate category that would require DSPs for all new development contemplated for the Cafritz property.

RECOMMENDATION

City staff recommends approval of A-10018 subject to the following conditions:

1. Submittal of the following:
 - a. Phasing plan and timetable for build out;
 - b. Description of the proposed environmental program for the development, including details regarding LEED certification;
 - c. Forest Stand Delineation;
 - d. Grading plan for the site;
 - e. Revised Traffic Impact Study that:
 - i. Establishes a trip cap of 548 AM peak hour trips and 902 PM peak hour trips for full build out of the development;
 - ii. Accurately reflects the development proposal and anticipated phasing;
 - iii. Eliminates corridor averaging for the Route 1 intersections included in the Study;
 - iv. Analyzes midday and weekend traffic impacts; and
 - v. Analyzes all proposed connections.
 - f. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision;
 - g. Detailed Site Plan for all proposed development and a description of how DSP and SP review process will be coordinated;
 - h. Revised SWM Concept Plan to provide more Environmental Site Design to the Maximum Extent Practicable; and
 - i. Revised NRI.
2. Revise the Development Plan as follows:
 - a. Shift Woodberry Street to the north and redesign the townhomes to accommodate possible future residential development on the WMATA property;
 - b. Use the Rhode Island Avenue right-of-way on-site for a north-south street with the bike lane adjacent to the road;
 - c. Continue Maryland Avenue north through the site along the CSX tracks;
 - d. Show the overpass at the CSX tracks and preserve the possibility for a future connection to the west through the U.S. Postal facility property;
 - e. Realign Underwood Street to preserve the possibility for future development to the south on the Postal facility property and the Armory property;
 - f. Add residential in Phase 1 in the area north of Van Buren Street and west of 45th Street;
 - g. Provide a greater mix of uses in each phase and a greater variety of housing types;
 - h. Revise the townhome layout to eliminate the mews style of development;
 - i. Provide buildings that front on the Riverine Park to provide for a safer environment;
 - j. Allow for possible future north-south and east-west connections should adjoining properties redevelop;
 - k. Clearly delineate the 65 dBA Ldn from noise generators on the plan;

- l. Ensure that the Development Plan conforms to Guidelines and delete any conceptual plans or clearly label these plans as illustrative in nature;
 - m. Revisit location of parks and open space to ensure better relation to and use by adjoining residential units; and
 - n. Terminate Van Buren Street at a building or enhanced park feature.
3. Dedicate any necessary right-of-way for Rhode Island Avenue.
 4. Revise the Boundary Exhibit to eliminate the creation of a split zone property to the south of the subject site.
 5. Revise the Design Review Process to address potential conflicts between the Planning Board and M-U-TC Design Review Committee.
 6. Revise the Table of Uses, as appropriate, to eliminate the requirement for a SE and DSP for uses such as a hotel.
 7. Include the U.S. Postal facility in the Town Center boundary and rezone the property to M-U-TC.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Statement of Justification
2. Development Plan (a – e)
3. Addendum to the Approved Town of Riverdale Park M-U-TC Zone Development Plan
4. Boundary Exhibit
5. University of Maryland Letter , November 3, 2011
6. Town of University Park, Draft Statement of Position on Cafritz, October 19, 2011
7. Town of Riverdale Park, Draft Letter, October 3, 2011
8. Letter from Citizens Supporting Rezoning and Responsible Development of the Cafritz Property, September 26, 2011