



Note: Staff reports can be accessed at www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm.

Primary Amendment to the Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan

A-10018

Application	General Data	
Project Name: Cafritz Property, Parcel 81 Tax Map 42, Grid D-1 Location: Approximately 1,400 feet north of the intersections of Baltimore Avenue (US 1) and East-West Highway (MD 410), on the east side of Baltimore Avenue. Applicant/Address: Calvert Tract, LLC 1666 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 250 Washington, DC 20009	Planning Board Hearing Date:	12/15/11
	Staff Report Date:	12/02/11
	Date Accepted:	10/14/11
	Planning Board Action Limit:	01/29/11
	Plan Acreage:	37.35 acres
	Zone:	R-55
	Planning Area:	68
	Tier:	Developed
	Council District:	03
	Election District	19
	Municipality:	Riverdale Park and College Park
200-Scale Base Map:	208NE04	

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates	
Primary amendment to the Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan and rezoning from the R-55 Zone to the M-U-TC Zone.	Informational Mailing:	08/17/11
	Newspaper Posting:	11/10/11
	Acceptance Mailing:	10/14/11
	Sign Posting Deadline:	11/15/11

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Susan Lareuse Phone Number: 301-952-4277 E-mail: Susan.Lareuse@ppd.mncppc.org	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Primary Amendment to the Town of Riverdale Park
Mixed-Use Town Center Zone and Development Plan
A-10018 — Cafritz Property, Parcel 81
Tax Map 42, Grid D-1

The applicant has prepared the primary amendment to the 2004 *Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan*. The following staff report presents the evaluation and findings supporting a recommendation for Planning Board APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS as described in the Recommendation section of this report.

FINDINGS

- Request:** The owner of the property, Cafritz LLC, is requesting the rezoning of the property from the One-Family Detached Residential (R-55) Zone to the Mixed-Use Town Center (M-U-TC) Zone. This request proposes to expand the Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan to include an additional 37.35 acres located along the northern boundary of the eastern portion of the existing mixed-use town center. The applicant is also requesting an amendment to the 2004 *Approved Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan* in order to accommodate the proposed development.
- Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	R-55	M-U-TC
Use(s)	Vacant	Commercial and Residential
Acreage	37.35	37.35

Proposed Development as shown on the Development Plan

Office	17,600–26,400 S.F.
Retail/Flex	134,560–201,840 S.F.
Residential (All Unit Types)	1,028,000–1,542,200 S.F.
Hotel	96,720–145,080 S.F.
Total Square Footage	1,276,880–1,915,320 S.F.

Floor Area Ratio (FAR):

Gross tract area: 37.34 acres
Floodplain: 0.06 acres
Net Acreage: 37.28 acres
37.2851 acres x 43,560 S.F. = 1,624,138 S.F.
FAR = 0.85—1.27

Dwelling Units:

Multifamily		895
Housing	641	
Age Restricted	224	
Scholar Housing	30	
Townhomes		100
Total		995 units

Applicant’s Note: “The development program is flexible. The above program was utilized to calculate approximate floor area ratio (FAR) and traffic volumes. However, amount of various uses in the overall development program may be adjusted, as long as the peak-hour traffic trips are not exceeded.”

3. **Location:** The Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center (M-U-TC) Zone is located in the Town of Riverdale Park, Council District 3, Planning Area 68, within the Developed Tier, as defined by the 2002 *Prince George’s County Approved General Plan*. More specifically, the property is located approximately 1,400 feet north of the intersections of Baltimore Avenue (US 1) and East-West Highway (MD 410), on the east side of Baltimore Avenue. The majority of the subject property is located within the Town of Riverdale Park, but a small portion in the northeast lies within the City of College Park.

4. **Existing Conditions:** This 37.35-acre site in the R-55 zone is located on the east side of Baltimore Avenue (US 1) where it intersects with Van Buren Street. A review of available information indicates that streams, wetlands, and steep slopes 15 percent or greater are not found to occur within the limits of this application. A small area of 100-year floodplain is found on the site. 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. The soils found to occur on the site, according to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDS), National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (WSS), are in the Christiana, Croom, and Beltsville series. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. There are no designated scenic and historic roads located adjacent to this property; however, a Phase I archeological survey was completed on the subject property in March 2008 and there are archeological features on the site. This property is located in the Northeast Branch watershed of the Anacostia River basin. The site is approximately 90 percent wooded, with two areas of the woodland identified as high-priority woodlands.

5. **Surrounding Uses:**

North— Vacant property owned by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) in the R-55 Zone

- East— CSX railroad tracks. Across the railroad tracks is Historic Site #68-022 located on land owned by the University of Maryland.
- South— U.S. Postal Service facility in the R-55 Zone.
- West— Baltimore Avenue (US 1) and beyond single-family detached dwellings in the R-55 Zone.

- 6. **History:** The 2004 *Approved Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan* and corresponding Mixed-Use Town Center (M-U-TC) was approved by the Prince George’s County Council on January 20, 2004 by Council Resolution CR-05-2004. The approved plan amends the 1994 Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Area 68.
- 7. **Future Processing:** If this rezoning to the M-U-TC Zone is approved, the subject property must go through the subdivision process (preliminary plan and final plat of subdivision) to address adequate public facilities (APF), mandatory park dedication, and other related issues. In addition, under the M-U-TC Zone, according to Section 27-547 (Uses Permitted) of the Zoning Ordinance, specific uses are outlined and identified as either permitted in the zone (P), subject to special exception criteria (SE), subject to certain specific criteria (PA) or (PB), or subject to special permit review (SP) in accordance with Section 27-239.02, Special Permits, as stated below:

(a) Procedures.

(1) Application.

- (A) All requests for Special Permits shall be in the form of an application filed with the Planning Board. The Planning Board shall determine the contents of the application and shall provide the application. The minimum submission requirements are:**
 - (i) Six (6) copies of a site plan, and other graphic illustrations which are considered necessary to indicate what is being proposed;**
 - (ii) Six (6) copies of a written explanation by the applicant explaining how the proposed site plan satisfies the U-L-I Zone Design Guidelines or the Town Center Development Plan regulations and development guidelines.**
 - (iii) Three (3) copies of an approved Natural Resource Inventory and a Letter of Justification stating how the proposed design ensures the preservation and/or restoration of the regulated environmental features to the fullest extent possible.**
- (B) The application may be filed prior to, or concurrently with, an application for a building or use and occupancy permit.**

- (2) Hearing.**
 - (A) Prior to making a decision on a Special Permit application, the Planning Board shall hold a public hearing on the matter. The Planning Board shall adopt the procedures under which the hearing will be held.**
 - (B) The Planning Board hearing shall be scheduled not less than forty-five (45) days from the date the application is accepted, unless waived by the applicant.**
- (3) Referral.**
 - (A) The Planning Board shall refer applications for Special Permits to the Department of Environmental Resources for its comments or recommendations. These comments or recommendations (if any) shall be available for public examination at least seven (7) days prior to the public hearing.**
- (4) Technical Staff Report.**
 - (A) The Technical Staff shall analyze the request and shall forward its comments and recommendations to the Planning Board.**
- (5) Planning Board decision.**
 - (A) After the close of the record, the Planning Board shall take action on the request. The decision of the Planning Board shall be based on the record, and shall be embodied in a resolution.**
 - (B) The Planning Board shall give written notice of its decision to all persons of record and to the District Council.**
 - (C) The Planning Board may only approve a Special Permit contrary to the recommendation of a municipality containing the subject land within its boundaries upon the affirmative vote of four-fifths (4/5) of the members of the full Planning Board.**
- (6) Required Findings.**
 - (A) The Planning Board may grant a Special Permit in the U-L-I Zone if it finds:**
 - (i) The site plan generally conforms with the U-L-I Zone Design Guidelines;**
 - (ii) The site plan generally conforms with the design guidelines in an approved Master Plan or other applicable plan; and**

- (iii) **The site plan demonstrates the preservation and/or restoration of the regulated environmental features in a natural state to the fullest extent possible.**
 - (B) **The Planning Board may grant a Special Permit in the M-U-TC Zone if it finds that the site plan is in conformance with the approved Town Center Development Plan and its guidelines and specific criteria for the particular use. In the event a Special Permit is approved by the Planning Board, the approval is conditional upon the issuance of a building or use and occupancy permit by the Department of Environmental Resources, Permits and Review Division.**
 - (C) **The Planning Board may grant a Special Permit in other zones, as provided in the use tables, if it finds:**
 - (i) **The site plan generally conforms with design guidelines in an approved Master Plan or other applicable plan; and**
 - (ii) **The site plan shows that the proposed use will not be incompatible with adjacent properties because of building or site design.**
- (7) **Conditional approval.**
 - (A) **When a Special Permit is approved, any requirements or conditions deemed necessary to protect adjacent properties and the general neighborhood may be added.**
- (8) **Appeals.**
 - (A) **A final action by the Planning Board on any application for a Special Permit may be appealed within thirty (30) days after the action is taken by any person who appeared at the hearing (in person or in writing) and who is aggrieved by the action to the Circuit Court pursuant to the Maryland Rules of Procedure governing appeals of administrative decisions. The Circuit Court may dismiss the action; affirm, reverse, or modify the Planning Board's action; or remand the action to the Planning Board for further consideration, or an appropriate combination of the above.**
 - (B) **The applicant or any party to the Circuit Court review may seek review of any final judgment by the Circuit Court by appeal to the Court of Special Appeals.**

The requirements above describing the process of review of a special permit are provided to clarify the future procedures as required under the M-U-TC Zone for development of the subject property. Conceptual and detailed site plan review, as described in Part 3, Division 9 of the Prince George's County Code, is not the subsequent process for development plans. Even though detailed site plan review is not necessarily associated with the review of the M-U-TC Zone, the District Council has the authority, per Section 27-281 (Purposes) of the Zoning Ordinance, to add

a requirement for detailed site plan review in order to address the many site and architectural design issues. Further, the applicant has repeatedly stated, in meeting with staff and the municipalities, that detailed site plan is a logical review mechanism to ensure that the guidelines and development standards and other county ordinances are adequately addressed, and they are willing to subject the property to detailed site plan review.

ZONING ORDINANCE COMPLIANCE AND FINDINGS

8. **Requirements of the Zoning Ordinance:** This application has been reviewed for conformance to the requirements for amendments of an approved Mixed-Use Town Center Zone per Section 27-198.05(d), Amendment of approved Mixed-Use Town Center Zone, of the Zoning Ordinance which states the following:

(1) **In general.**

- (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 provisions of this Subdivision for initial approval.**

The application was submitted by the property owner and proposes to change the boundary of the M-U-TC Zone and to amend the Town Center Development Plan, as allowed by Section 27-198.05(d) above. The amendment must be approved by the District Council; whereas, the Planning Board review will result in a recommendation to the approving authority.

(2) **Application.**

(A) **In general.**

- (i) **An application for an amendment to the M-U-TC Zone shall be filed with the Planning Board by the owner (or authorized representative) of the property or a municipality. The District Council may suspend the filing of applications for up to one (1) year, if it determines that it is appropriate for any statutory zoning purpose.**
- (ii) **All applications shall be on the forms provided. All information shall be typed, except for signatures.**
- (iii) **If two (2) or more pieces of property are included in one (1) application, they must be adjoining. Separate applications are required for each property if they are not adjoining. In this Section, the word “adjoining” shall include those properties which are separated by a public right-of-way, stream bed, or the like.**

(3) Contents of application forms.

(A) The following information shall be included on the application:

- (i) The name, address, and telephone number of the applicant, and an indication of the applicant's status as contract purchaser, agent, or owner;**
- (ii) The existing and requested zoning classifications of the property;**
- (iii) The street address of the property; name of any municipality the property is in; name and number of the Election District the property is in;**
- (iv) The total area of the property (in either acres or square feet);**
- (v) The property's lot and block numbers, subdivision name, plat book and page number, if any; or a description of its acreage, with reference to liber and folio numbers;**
- (vi) The name, address, and signature of each owner of record of the property. Applications for property owned by a corporation shall be signed by an officer empowered to act for the corporation; and**
- (vii) The name, address, and telephone number of the correspondent.**

(4) Other submission requirements.

(A) Along with the application, the applicant shall submit the following:

- (i) Four (4) copies of an accurate plat, prepared, signed, and sealed by a registered engineer or land surveyor. The plat shall show:**
 - (aa) The present configuration of the M-U-TC Zone, including bearings and distances (in feet), and the proposed configuration of the M-U-TC Zone property, including bearings and distances (in feet), if applicable;**
 - (bb) The names of owners of record, or subdivision lot and block numbers, of adjoining properties;**
 - (cc) The name, location, distance to the center line, and right-of-way width of all abutting streets. If the property is not located at the intersection of two (2) streets, the distance to, and the name of, the nearest intersecting street shall be indicated;**
 - (dd) The subdivision lot and block numbers of the subject property (if any);**

- (ee) A north arrow and scale (not smaller than one (1) inch equals four hundred (400) feet);
 - (ff) The total area of the property (in either square feet or acres);
 - (gg) The location of all existing buildings on the property; and
 - (hh) The subject property outlined in red;
- (ii) Four (4) copies of the appropriate Zoning Map page on which the property is plotted to scale and outlined in red;
 - (iii) Three (3) copies of a typewritten statement of justification in support of the request. The statement shall set forth the legal basis by which the requested amendment can be approved, a description of the existing components of the Town Center Development Plan and proposed changes thereto, and factual reasons showing why approval of the request will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare. This statement may be accompanied by three (3) copies of any material which (in the applicant's opinion) is necessary to clarify or emphasize the typewritten statement. This additional material, if not foldable, shall be not larger than eighteen (18) by twenty-four (24) inches;
 - (iv) A statement listing the names and the business and residential addresses of all individuals having at least a five percent (5%) financial interest in the subject property;
 - (v) If any owner is a corporation, a statement listing the officers of the corporation, their business and residential addresses, and the dates on which they assumed their respective offices. The statement shall also list the current Board of Directors, their business and residential addresses, and the dates of each Director's term. An owner that is a corporation listed on a national stock exchange shall be exempt from the requirement to provide residential addresses of its officers and directors;
 - (vi) If the owner is a corporation (except one listed on a national stock exchange), a statement containing the names and addresses of those individuals owning at least five percent (5%) of the shares of any class of corporate security (including stocks and serial maturity bonds);
 - (vii) The proposed amendment to be appended to or incorporated into the Town Center Development Plan. The proposed amendment shall include (at least) the same detail as found in the approved plan;
 - (viii) A list containing the names and addresses of all adjoining property owners and the owners of those properties directly across a street, alley, or stream, and each municipality if any part of the property in the application is located within the municipal boundaries, or is

located within one (1) mile of the municipality, and a set of preaddressed envelopes or mailing labels;

(ix) Any other data or explanatory material deemed necessary by the District Council or the Planning Board (submitted in triplicate).

(B) For the purposes of (iv), (v), and (vi), above, the term “owner” shall include not only the owner of record, but also any contract purchaser.

The applicant, Calvert Tract, LLC, has submitted an application in accordance with the provisions of Section 27-198.05(d)(2) above and has filed the appropriate forms. In addition to the information required to be filed in Section 27-198.05(d)(3)–(4) above, the applicant has submitted the following:

- a. A transportation study dated July 27, 2011—See Finding 17 for a discussion of transportation information.
- b. A stormwater management (SWM) concept plan and approval letter dated May 3, 2010—See Finding 21 for a discussion of SWM information.
- c. A tree conservation plan (TCP)—See Finding 23 for a discussion of TCP information.

(5) **Procedure.**

(A) After the request is accepted, it shall be reviewed by the Technical Staff and processed in accordance with Section 27-198.02, as if it were an original M-U-TC Amendment initiated by the Planning Board. (*Emphasis Added*)

The technical staff reviewed the plan in accordance with the provisions above “as if it were an original M-U-TC amendment initiated by the Planning Board.”

(B) Any municipality within which a portion of the zone is located shall be notified of the request within ten (10) days of its acceptance.

The Town of Riverdale Park and the City of College Park were both notified within ten days of acceptance of the application. Staff has included the two municipalities in discussions with the applicant in regard to the review of the plans, as well as, the Town of University Park.

9. **Review of the application:** The following procedures set forth in the review of the application as stated in Section 27-198.02, General Procedures, of the Zoning Ordinance:

(a) **The Planning Board may initiate an M-U-TC Map Amendment only upon the concurrence (by resolution) of the District Council. A municipality must also provide prior written approval if the affected area lies wholly or in part within its boundaries.**

This section of the Zoning Ordinance does not apply to an application submitted by the owner of the property for an amendment to the boundary of the zone. It sets forth the requirements for the initiation of the M-U-TC Zone. However, the next provision begins the process by which the plans were reviewed by the technical staff when an owner submits an amendment.

- (b) **After the Map Amendment is initiated by the Planning Board, the Technical Staff shall immediately proceed to prepare a proposed Map Amendment. The proposal shall contain the following:**
- (1) **The proposed boundaries of the M-U-TC Zone, shown on the Zoning Map. The proposed boundaries shall be continuous and shall not leave land in a different zone solely enclosed by the M-U-TC.**
 - (2) **A Town Center Development Plan prepared in accordance with Part 10, Division 2, Subdivision 3.**

The section above speaks to the map amendment procedure, but Section 27-198.05(d)(5) of the Zoning Ordinance directs staff to review the owner's application "as if it were an initial amendment." Based on Section 27-198.05(a)(3)–(4) of the Zoning Ordinance which describes the submittal requirements of the application, the logical conclusion is that staff should review the contents of the application, rather than creating the map amendment and development plan, because this information has already been prepared and submitted by the applicant.

- (c) **During the preparation of the proposed M-U-TC Zoning Map Amendment, the Technical Staff shall contact all owners of land and any municipality lying (wholly or in part) within the anticipated boundaries of the proposed M-U-TC Zone, and any municipality within one (1) mile of the anticipated boundary, to invite comments and recommendations concerning their plans and desires for development within the proposed M-U-TC Zone. The purpose of these mailings, and those required at the time of Planning Board and District Council hearings, is informational only. The failure of the Planning Board to send, or a property owner or municipality to receive, the notice shall not invalidate the adoption or approval of the Zoning Map Amendment.**

The application has been sent to the following municipalities which are located within one mile of the subject property:

- a. Town of Riverdale Park—See Finding 27
 - b. City of College Park—See Finding 28
 - c. Town of University Park—See Finding 29
 - d. Town of Edmonston—See Finding 30
 - e. City of Hyattsville—See Finding 31
- (d) **The Planning Board shall review the proposal of the Technical Staff and shall hold a public hearing on the matter pursuant to the procedures in Section 27-198.03. After the public hearing, the Planning Board shall take action on the proposal and shall transmit its recommendation to the District Council for another public hearing and final action.**

The Planning Board will review the case on December 15, 2011 and will create a resolution of their action and forward their recommendation to the District Council.

10. **Review of the amendments:** Section 27-198.03 of the Zoning Ordinance provides the specific Planning Board procedures in the review of amendments.

(a) **Notice.**

- (1) **The Planning Board shall release the proposed M-U-TC Zone for public inspection at least sixty (60) days prior to its scheduled public hearing. Written notice of the hearing shall be mailed to all property owners within the boundaries of the proposed M-U-TC Zone and to any municipality lying (wholly or in part) within the proposed M-U-TC Zone, or within one (1) mile of the proposed boundary, at least thirty (30) days prior to the hearing date. Notice of the date, time, and place of the hearing shall be published at least one (1) time in the County newspapers of record, at least thirty (30) days prior to the hearing date. At least sixty (60) days prior to the scheduled hearing date, a copy of the proposal shall be sent to all public agencies and municipalities with operational or planning responsibilities within the boundaries of the proposed Zone; and to the Historic Preservation Commission, if any property within the proposed Zone is an identified historic resource on the Adopted and Approved Historic Sites and Districts Plan of Prince George’s County, Maryland.**

The technical staff sent out referrals to all of the municipalities within a one-mile radius of the subject application on October 14, 2011, which was 60 days prior to the Planning Board hearing. The plans have been available for public inspection since the acceptance of the application. The property is not identified as a historic resource and will not be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) at this time. However, it is anticipated that the preliminary plan of subdivision application will be required to be reviewed by the HPC at that time.

(b) **Planning Board action.**

- (1) **The Planning Board may recommend approval, or approval with modifications, of the proposed M-U-TC Zone. The Planning Board shall take action, by resolution adopted at a regularly scheduled public meeting, not more than forty-five (45) days after the close of the hearing record. The Planning Board shall transmit its recommendation to the District Council within one hundred five (105) days of the release for public inspection.**

The Planning Board will review the application and take action through the adoption of the resolution in accordance with the time frame above.

REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL OF THE M-U-TC ZONE

Section 27-198.05(a)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance provides the criteria for approval of a map amendment. There are five required findings that the District Council must make in conjunction with the review of the proposed rezoning.

11. **Section 27-198.05(a)(1)(A)—The entire Map Amendment, including the Development Plan, is in conformance with the purposes and other requirements of the M-U-TC Zone;**

Comment: Section 27-546.09, Purposes, of the Zoning Ordinance states the following:

(a) The specific purposes of the M-U-TC Zone are:

- (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.**

Applicant’s Justification: “The proposed development creates a development framework which capitalizes on both the existing fabric of the county’s older commercial/mixed use center and corridor and seeks to establish a development framework which continues a street grid pattern established in the development area. A vast majority of the proposed development is within the geographic boundaries of the Baltimore Avenue Corridor and Riverdale MARC Center as defined by the Approved 2002 General Plan. Please see below ‘General Plan’ analysis for more details related to the General Plan Centers and Corridors. The proposed development is envisioned to connect to the currently established Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center. The proposed development is envisioned to conform to the M-U-TC Development Plan, as amended with the supplement. This conformance with the Development Plan will ensure consistent and/or compatible development which will retain the fabric of this established town center while creating new opportunities for the residents in these established communities.”

Comment: The M-U-TC Zone is intended to include community input in the review of development regulatory tools prior to the permit process, of which subsequent applications will be scrutinized. The intent of the zone is that it be used in areas located in older developed areas of the county, where a mix of uses exists, which is the area of the subject application. The zone proposes to “capitalize” by providing an enhanced economic revitalization to the area where existing infrastructure is located, which is the case for this property. The subject application meets the purpose stated above.

- (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.**

Applicant’s Justification: “The applicant proposes a transit-supported, mixed-use, pedestrian friendly development which is adjacent to, and will provide multiple connections with, the existing Riverdale Park Town Center. The proposed development will feature a Whole Foods Market, a fitness center, small shops and retail, office space, and residential units. The proposed development will also feature 5 distinct locations which will promote both active and passive recreation, congregation, socializing, and create a venue which will promote economic vitality. Foot traffic is the life blood of small shops and retail in a town center environment. The proposed development will increase the foot traffic through the existing Riverdale Park Town Center which may serve as the catalyst for the reinvestment, revitalization, and redevelopment of the town center. Furthermore, the proposed development is a natural extension of the Town Center development. Thus, as the proposed development becomes successful, it will gain the attention of additional retailers which will potentially want to locate in the town center.”

Comment: The plans indicate an intent of a mixed-use development that will result in an investment in the community, as well as create an attractive community center.

(3) To promote the preservation and adaptive reuse of selected buildings in older commercial areas.

Applicant's Justification: "The proposed development is not inconsistent with this purpose. The proposed development is located on currently undeveloped land. It is not possible for the proposed development to preserve or adaptively reuse buildings that do not exist. However, this development will likely act as a catalyst for the revitalization of the Riverdale Park Town Center. The proposed development is a natural extension of the Town Center and a new potential front door to the Town of Riverdale Park. Thus, as the proposed development becomes successful, it will gain the attention of additional local, regional, and national retailers which will potentially want to locate to the Town Center."

Comment: The expansion of the M-U-TC Zone to the north of the existing town center may promote and act as a catalyst for redevelopment of the industrial area and re-use of existing buildings within the town center to the south of the subject property. The key to promoting redevelopment of the existing town center is to provide greater automobile and pedestrian pass-by traffic in the area so a market for reinvestment is created; therefore, vehicular connections to the south are extremely important.

(4) To ensure a mix of compatible uses which complements concentrations of retail and service uses, including institutional uses, encourages pedestrian activity, and promotes shared parking.

Applicant's Justification: "The applicant proposes to supplement the Development Plan to ensure that the intent of the approved Development Plan can be implemented in a location which was not previously analyzed when that Development Plan was adopted. Since the supplement to the Development Plan will continue a vast majority of the guidelines outlined in the approved Development Plan, including the table of uses and the development plan pattern which seeks to congregate similar uses in distinct locations, the applicant asserts that the proposed development will conform to this purpose. Furthermore, the applicant will create numerous connections within the development and to the surrounding communities to maximize pedestrian activity. Finally, much of the parking for the residential units is located within parking garages located throughout the site."

Comment: The proposed development plan ensures a mix of retail, service uses, and residential development. Also included are a proposed hotel and some office space. Institutional uses have not been discussed in the application. The plan provides for pedestrian movement on the site. Shared parking provisions should be refined in future plans of development.

(5) To provide a mix of commercial and residential uses which establish a safe and vibrant twenty-four hour environment.

Applicant's Justification: "The applicant envisions that the proposed development will create a true mixed-use community. This safe, vibrant, mixed-use development will include commercial, office, and residential components. The street grid and numerous pedestrian connections proposed in the development should maximize pedestrian circulation throughout the existing development, and by extension the area. The applicant

envisions providing space for a police substation to further enhance the safety of the proposed development.”

Comment: The mix of retail and residential provides for a 24-hour environment; however, the transition from commercial development to residential development should include residential uses above retail, for an “eyes on the street” community, which contributes to safer neighborhoods.

- (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.**

Applicant’s Justification: “The applicant proposes to supplement the Development Plan to ensure that the intent of the approved Development Plan can be implemented in a location which was not previously analyzed when that Development Plan was adopted. Since the supplement to the Development Plan will continue a vast majority of the guidelines outlined in the approved Development Plan, including the street grid and creating distinct areas for complementary uses to locate, the applicant asserts that the supplement to the Development Plan will continue the flexible regulatory framework which the original Development Plan established. The applicant is currently and intends to continue to gather and analyze input from the community to enhance the plans and refine the supplement to the Development Plan. Specifically, the applicant has solicited input from residents and stakeholders over the course of many years. The applicant has been engaged in over twelve (12) meetings which include public hearings, municipal council work sessions, municipal council public hearings, municipal committee hearings, and applicant sponsored community work sessions.”

Comment: The M-U-TC Zone provides for community input into the development review process through the local design committee. The plan provides for compatible development, except perhaps for the location of the hotel indicated adjacent to the existing U.S. postal facility, as proposed on the illustrative plans. A better location would be to the north side of the site, adjacent to the undeveloped WMATA property in the R-55 Zone, which will be a quieter area and provide more scenic views from the hotel, which is important, particularly if the hotel is marketed as a long-term resident-type facility.

- (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.**

Applicant’s Justification: “The applicant intends to preserve, promote, and enhance several physical characteristics which the community has identified as essential to the community’s identity. For example, the applicant will preserve and enhance the ‘Trolley Trail’ which runs north to south in the middle of the Property. The community, as well as the applicant, recognize this trail as a true gem of the community and believe that it can serve as a real amenity for all. Also, the applicant intends to preserve the wide sidewalks envisioned in Riverdale Park Town Center within the development. Finally, the applicant will seek to preserve, to the extent feasible, several specimen trees located in the ‘Gateway Park’ section of the proposed development.”

Comment: As of the writing of this report, the referrals from the municipalities, who represent the community, have not yet been submitted into the record. However, many individual citizens have expressed a desire to preserve existing woodland on the site and to utilize the Trolley Trail as a connection to the north and south of the property. Staff has included conditions to preserve woodland and the Trolley Trail; however, it is not clear that any existing trees will be preserved along the trail area.

12. **Section 27-198.05(a)(1)(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;**

Applicant’s Justification: “The property is within the geographical boundaries of the 2002 General Plan which updates the outdated 1994 Planning Area 68 Master Plan.

“The 2002 General Plan provides broad strategies to guide the future growth and development of the county. It represents the culmination of an evolving definition of growth policies for the County and is, to a great extent, a departure from earlier County plans. Implementation of the General Plan strategies is guided by countywide goals, guiding principles, and priorities, as a whole.

“The General Plan identifies several countywide goals and policies that provide the guidelines and principles necessary for approval of an application. These include the following countywide goals (p. 21):

“Countywide Goals

- “• Encourage quality economic development
- “• Make efficient use of existing and proposed local, state and federal infrastructure and investment
- “• Enhance quality and character of communities and neighborhoods
- “• Preserve rural, agricultural and scenic areas
- “• Protect environmentally sensitive lands

“Guiding Principles

- “• Public health, safety and welfare
- “• Sustainability (Environment, Economy, Equity, Efficiency)
- “• Quality
- “• Meaningful public participation

“The property is located in the Developed Tier on Corridor A (US 1). This development proposal embraces the guiding policies of the General Plan Developed Tier, and will create a model sustainable community for future generations of the county. The applicant’s justification for conformance with the General Plan’s recommendation is below.

“Developed Tier Vision—The vision for the Developed Tier is ‘a network of sustainable, transit-supporting, mixed-used, pedestrian-oriented, medium- to high-density neighborhoods’

(p. 31). The 2002 General Plan provides that these types of uses and densities should be located in Centers and Corridors where they are most appropriate. The Property is within the geographical boundaries of a General Plan Corridor (U.S. Route 1) and a Center (Riverdale Park MARC).

“The property is located less than one mile from three currently existing and proposed mass transit stations. Specifically, portions of the Property are located within 0.5 miles of the College Park metro station. Portions of the Property are located within 0.5 miles of the proposed Purple line station. Finally, portions of the Property are located within 0.5 miles of the Riverdale MARC station. Between these three stations, the entire property is located within .5 miles of all three mass transit stations. The site is also served by several bus lines including WMATA, the Bus, and Shuttle U.M. The proposed mix of uses and high-quality retail will give residents many options for transit, shopping and employment near their homes.

“Developed Tier Goals—This application conforms to the General Plan Developed Tier goals (p. 31) as follows:

- “• Strengthen existing neighborhoods.

“The proposed development will maintain the grid pattern of development found in the adjoining communities of College Park (to the north), Riverdale Park (to the south), and University Park (to the west). Residential communities to the north and south will be linked by pedestrian and bicycle access only. Access onto US 1 can be designed to discourage cut through traffic into University Park. The existing residential neighborhoods will not have any pass-through vehicular traffic as a result of this proposed development. Improved pedestrian access through and around the property will improve the accessibility of existing local mass transit opportunities. This design, along with the proposed retail, commercial, and recreational opportunities and amenities within walking distance, will serve to strengthen existing neighborhoods.

- “• Encourage appropriate infill.

“The property is located in the US 1, Corridor A, as described in the 2002 General Plan, and is surrounded by properties that were developed decades ago. The property is also located on the edge of the Riverdale MARC proposed future center as described in the General Plan. Single-family residential neighborhoods exist to the north and west, with a U.S. Postal Service distribution facility and armory to the south. The CSX tracks are along the eastern edge of the site. The property is an infill redevelopment project within the General Plan US 1 Corridor and the proposed future Riverdale MARC center. Approval of the M-U-TC Zone will allow the property to be redeveloped with high quality housing in a variety of formats and provide residents with high quality shopping and employment options within walking distance of home. The development of this property will adhere to the goal of providing economic development in General Plan centers and corridors.

- “• Encourage more intense, high quality housing and economic development in centers and corridors.

“The property is located in the US 1 Corridor A as described in the General Plan and is surrounded by an established community. The property is also located on the edge of the Riverdale MARC proposed future center as described in the General Plan. Single-family residential neighborhoods exist to the north and west, with a U.S. Postal Service distribution facility and armory to the south. The CSX tracks are along the eastern edge of the site. The

property is an infill redevelopment project within the General Plan US 1 Corridor and the proposed future Riverdale MARC center. Approval of the M-U-TC Zone will allow the property to be redeveloped with high quality housing in a variety of formats and provide residents with high quality shopping and employment options within walking distance of home, thus achieving the goal of providing economic development in General Plan centers and corridors.

- “• Preserve, restore and enhance sensitive features and provide open space.

“The project’s east-to-west-aligned central market square will intersect the ‘Trolley Trail,’ providing pedestrian and bicycle access north and south into College Park and Riverdale Park, respectively.

- “• Expand tree cover through the increased planting of trees and landscaping.

“The requirements of the Tree Conservation Ordinance will be met. The applicant proposes extensive landscaping along the streets and open space areas to expand the tree cover.

- “• Capitalize on investments in transportation and other infrastructure.

“Rezoning the property from the R-55 Zone to the M-U-TC Zone will capitalize on extensive investments of transportation and infrastructure in the surrounding area. The area is currently served by several bus lines, including: WMATA, the Bus, and Shuttle UM. The property is located less than one mile from three currently existing and proposed mass transit stations. Specifically, the property is located within 0.5 miles of the College Park metro station. The property is located within 0.5 miles of the proposed Purple Line station. Finally, the property is located within 0.5 miles of the Riverdale MARC station. Between these three stations, the entire property is located within 0.5 miles of all three mass transit stations.

- “• Maintain/renovate existing public infrastructure.

“The project will benefit the community by providing improvements to existing public infrastructure around the project site. This will include street frontage improvements including paving, lighting, sidewalks, and storm drainage. The construction of the ‘Trolley Trail’ through the site will complete an important link in the local trail network. Stormwater management facilities will provide control of the 100-year storm for runoff from the site. This will reduce the impact of downstream flooding in Wells Run.

- “• Promote transit supportive, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods.

“In keeping with the intent of the 2002 General Plan, this proposed development will provide transit-supporting, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented development and provide the opportunity for residents to live, work, and shop within the project boundaries, in close proximity to a variety of mass transit options. The property represents a true mixed-use community with residential, offices, and commercial community.

- “• Renew/redevelop commercial strips.

“This goal is not applicable considering this site currently does not have a commercial shopping strip on it.

- “• Enhance industrial employment areas.

“The property is bordered by an older industrial area zoned M-U-TC to the south. Redevelopment of the property as proposed will strengthen the opportunities for redevelopment of these underutilized industrial properties.

- “• Design and site public facilities in accordance with appropriate development.

“The extension of Van Buren street will intersect with the improved ‘Trolley Trail,’ which runs north to south through the site. This configuration allows convenient access in and out of the site by both pedestrians and those on bicycles. Additionally, the ‘Trolley Trail’ will provide a link to the existing local trail network. The community space will provide educational, recreational, and social opportunities for the community.

“Developed Tier Policies—The General Plan also identifies four policies for future development. These policies and the proposal’s compliance are demonstrated below.

“POLICY 1: Encourage medium to high density, mixed-use, transit- and pedestrian-oriented development

“Strategies

- “I. Develop incentives for infill/redevelopment such as:

- “• Financial Incentives—Encourage private investment by providing public funds and/or deferring tax increases that would result from new development. Consider seeking authority for a split-rate system of property taxation.
- “• Redevelopment Assistance—Focus the programs of the county’s Redevelopment Authority (such as land assembly and public/private partnerships) on targeted areas.

“The 2002 General Plan encourages redevelopment of the Property as a mixed-use, transit- and pedestrian-oriented development. The property is unique in not only its location and proximity to mass transit but also in its size. The 37± acres provide the acreage necessary to develop an active neighborhood of sufficient size to provide housing, employment, shopping, and recreational opportunities while enhancing the existing communities. The applicant does not foresee the need for financial incentives for redevelopment assistance to create the proposed project.

- “II. Develop land use regulations and processes for infill/redevelopment such as:

- “• Rezoning - Where necessary, rezone vacant or underutilized lands through county initiation, (instead of property owner application) to achieve planned densities.
- “• Flexible development standards - Provide flexibility in building requirements or rehabilitating older buildings as recommended by state ‘smart codes’ programs.
- “• Zoning Code - Revise existing regulations to accommodate the development of older communities and to remove obstacles to quality infill and redevelopment.

- “• Simplify or streamline development review process—Eliminate cumbersome unnecessary processes to encourage compatible infill and redevelopment.

“The 2002 General Plan provides the guidelines and support to rezone the property from the R-55 Zone to the M-U-TC Zone and to allow it to be developed in keeping with the vision of the General Plan. The General Plan envisions a contemporary development to take place on the site in keeping with smart growth concepts and green building techniques. In the surrounding neighborhoods of College Park and Riverdale Park, contemporary sector plans and M-U-TC plans have been put in place to allow for redevelopment in those areas using appropriate mixed-use zones.

- “III. Develop a marketing program for targeted areas in the Developed Tier communities to attract developers skilled at developing high quality compact mixed use projects.

“The developer has developed and managed properties in the Washington D.C. area for decades. The developer has owned the property since the 1950’s. Once developed, the developer will have a vested interest in the success of the site, long after initial build out. The developer is experienced in this type of compact urban development. They also have a long history of commitment to the community.

- “IV. Improve the image and mix of uses along major roadways not designated as corridors by:

- “• Develop design guidelines and standards for new development.
- “• Encourage infill and redevelopment that contribute to the character and quality of the community.
- “• Limit zoning that allows new commercial development.
- “• Implement an incentive package for commercial strip owners to physically upgrade projects that have proven market feasibility. Priority shall be given to owner/businesses that improve their mix of goods and services or reuse commercial space for another appropriate use.
- “• Encourage land assembly and redevelopment of excess commercial for other types of land use.

“These strategies do not apply, as the property site lies within the US 1 Corridor.

“POLICY 2: Preserve, restore and enhance environmental features and green infrastructure elements.

“Strategies

- “I. Encourage the use of innovative technologies to meet the intent of the environmental regulations while encouraging the desired development pattern and implementing the green infrastructure recommendations.
- “II. Provide additional tree cover within the Developed Tier to intercept rainwater, reduce heat island effects, and improve air quality.

- “III. Provide tree cover guidelines as part of the character design elements in future area master plans and sector plans.
- “IV. Provide flexibility in the Woodland Conservation Ordinance for sites in the Developed Tier to allow for use of street trees and landscape trees.
- “V. Revise the Woodland Conservation Ordinance to require the use of woodland conservation fee-in-lieu funds collected in the Developed Tier for woodland conservation within the Developed Tier.

“The proposed development will observe best current practices in sustainability using appropriate metrics to demonstrate success, and all applicable environmental regulations will be followed. The applicant intends to provide an extensive green area along US 1 and to preserve specimen trees to the extent possible. The natural slope and existing site features will be incorporated into the design.

“POLICY 3: Provide a transportation system that is integrated with and promotes development and revitalization.

“Strategies

- “I. Encourage optimum use of all non-automotive mobility options for and in all new development, including light and heavy (regional) rail, bus transit, and integrated and safe pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
- “II. Assign high priority in the county Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Maryland Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) to Developed Tier pedestrian and transit infrastructure improvements.
- “III. Provide an integrated sidewalk, trail and bikeway network to divert as many short trips as possible from auto travel.
- “IV. Protect local neighborhoods and their residential streets from excessive or high speed through-traffic by measures such as traffic calming initiatives and pedestrian-oriented design requirements for new development.
- “V. Use traffic Level-of-Service (LOS) E (see Figure 2) as the minimum acceptable standard for road and street network capacity, wherever possible.
- “VI. Develop TOD and TSD criteria as part of transportation system analyses, the Biennial Growth Policy updates and future Developed Tier master and small area plans, that ensures the maximum possible integration of pedestrian and biker access and transit service with future development.
- “VII. Establish transit-based auto trip reduction initiatives to maximize the diversion of SOV trips to transit and non-motorized travel.

“The transportation system proposed in this development will integrate with the area’s existing infrastructure, promoting revitalization of the surrounding neighborhoods. Improvements to the transportation network will be made by the applicant; details are contained in the accompanying traffic analysis. Primary vehicular access to the site will be from US 1. The project will be

designed to be pedestrian and biker friendly; sidewalks will create an integrated pedestrian network, and the ‘Trolley Trail’ will provide a hiker/biker link between communities north and south of the property. Because of its proximity to mass transit, this site provides visitors and residents with real options to move about without the use of an automobile, and is in keeping with the intent of the Prince George’s County Preliminary Countywide Master Plan of Transportation, released in December 2008.

“General Plan Centers and Corridors—The property is located in the US 1 Corridor and on the edge of the Riverdale MARC Station center by the 2002 General Plan. The centers and corridors goals are to:

- “• Capitalize on public investment in existing transportation system
- “• Promote compact, mixed-use development at moderate to high densities
- “• Ensure transit-supportive and transit-serviceable development
- “• Require pedestrian-oriented and transit-oriented design
- “• Ensure compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods

“As demonstrated above, items 1 through 4 have been thoroughly discussed and compliance demonstrated. Compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods has been demonstrated by the placement of a large green buffer along US 1, by the attention to height limitations and by the pedestrian connections and conversion of the abandoned trolley right-of-way to a hiker/biker trail across the property.”

Comment: Staff agrees with the applicant that this application is generally consistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developed Tier. The 2002 General Plan designated the Riverdale MARC station, currently located in the existing mixed-use town center, as a possible future community center. This subject application is located in the Developed Tier. The vision for the Developed Tier is a network of sustainable transit supporting, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented, medium- to high-density neighborhoods. The property is also located along the Baltimore Avenue Corridor as designated by the 2002 General Plan.

The 2002 *Prince George’s County Approved General Plan* states the following:

Baltimore Avenue (US 1) Corridor

The property is located along the Baltimore Avenue Corridor.

The [General] Plan promotes development and redevelopment of higher intensity residential and nonresidential mixed uses at appropriate locations along key transportation routes. This development should occur at local centers and other appropriate nodes within one-quarter mile of major intersections or major transit stops along the Corridor, in concert with existing and planned investments in public infrastructure. Developed Tier Corridors: Generally contain a higher intensity of residential and nonresidential land uses, and a greater mix of uses that are regional in scope, than the Developing Tier Corridors.

The materials submitted with the application clearly indicate a higher intensity of residential and nonresidential mixed use for the ultimate development of the site and is therefore in concert with the intent of this aspect of the General Plan.

Additional findings relating to conformance with the General Plan are discussed in the Environmental Planning Section, the Transportation Planning Section, and the Community Planning North Division reviews.

13. **Section 27-198.05(a)(1)(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;**

Comment: The 1994 *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Area 68* recommends infill development via rezoning to a residential comprehensive design zone. However, the property is located in a substantially developed area within the Town of Riverdale Park, which was developed around the turn of the century.

The applicant stated in the statement of justification (received November 10, 2011) that the 2002 General Plan “updates the outdated 1994 Planning Area 68 Master Plan” (p. 6). The 2002 General Plan is not intended to be the guiding document for property specific land use patterns; rather it establishes broader, countywide policy guidance such as the creation of tiers, centers, and corridors. Aside from placing the subject property in the Developed Tier, and along the designated Baltimore Avenue Corridor, the 2002 General Plan does not amend the approved land use elements of the 1994 Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Area 68 (See Comprehensive Plan [Land-Use] Map).

The 1994 Master Plan provides the following specific recommendations for this property (P. 16):

The following comments relate specifically to the Cafritz property: While zoned R-55, the property should be considered for a residential Comprehensive Design Zone, provided that the proposed development is compatible with surrounding residential communities and continues existing design and development patterns. Specifically, design of the development should incorporate a street pattern similar to that of the surrounding community, which as right-angle blocks and alleys. Brick should also be used on all units as the primary construction material. Special attention should be given to the development’s frontage along US 1 to preserve the existing wooded image. A tree-save area should be provided and the units directly behind the tree-save area should front US 1.

Comprehensive design zones (CDZ) differ from standard “Euclidean” zones which have prescribed height, setback, and lot coverage requirements. The CDZ concept is fundamentally more flexible than standard zones. It allows an increase in residential density or commercial intensity in exchange for the provision of public benefit features such as a community park or neighborhood bike path to improve the quality of the project. This zone requires a three-tiered review process starting with a basic plan that shows general land use relationships, a comprehensive design plan which refines the basic plan by showing details regarding the location and size of structures, public benefit features, etc., and a specific design plan with detailed landscape plans, tree conservation plans, and building elevations.

The applicant is proposing to rezone the subject property from the R-55 Zone to the M-U-TC Zone. While the M-U-TC Zone is not a CDZ, it is quite similar in that it’s fundamental purpose is to allow flexibility with respect to site design and review procedures. It also does not have prescribed height, setback, and lot coverage requirements and is specifically designed to provide a regulatory mechanism for the redevelopment of more urban areas. A condition of approval requiring detailed site plan would add a layer of review quite similar to the specific design plan required as the final step of the CDZ process. Staff believes it is appropriate to use the M-U-TC

Zone for the development of the property because it is the type of urban redevelopment opportunity that the zone was designed to be applied to.

- (1) **It is within the ultimate objectives of the District Council’s authority (under Article 28 of the Annotated Code of Maryland) to use recent planning and zoning innovations;**
- (2) **The demands for housing, commercial and industrial activities, and related public facilities and services are undergoing substantial and rapid changes, requiring improved methods of land use control; and**
- (3) **There is a need to encourage the optional and imaginative utilization of land contemplated by Comprehensive Design Zones in order to:**
 - (A) **Improve the total environment;**
 - (B) **Lessen the public costs associated with land development and use;**
 - (C) **Fulfill the purposes of each individual Comprehensive Design Zone; and**
 - (D) **Fulfill the recommendations and purposes of the General Plan, Master Plans, or Sector Plans in selected areas.**

The proposed concept plan demonstrates a grid network and includes right-angle blocks with some alleys as recommended by the master plan. However, the application does not comply with the specific recommendation to preserve the existing wooded image or create a tree-save area. The application does not propose to preserve the vast majority of the wooded property, with the exception of, potentially, three specimen trees along Baltimore Avenue (US 1). Staff believes that the requirements of the Prince George’s County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance and the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance should be fulfilled on-site. Additional findings relating to conformance with the master plan are discussed in the Environmental Planning Section review.

14. **Section 27-198.05(a)(1)(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**

Comment: The proposed amendment to the Town Center Development Plan is part of the subject application and is discussed at length in Finding 16 below. If the conditions of approval are adopted, then the final plan will provide a flexible regulatory tool that will support redevelopment of the existing town center area and protect the character of the adjacent residential, institutional, and commercial uses.

15. **Section 27-198.05(a)(1)(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.**

Comment: The application does not propose to leave any land within the overall boundary in a different zone than the M-U-TC.

2004 TOWN OF RIVERDALE PARK M-U-TC DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT

16. Staff has reviewed the proposed amendment to the development plan and compared the design standards to the 2004 *Approved Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan*. The following discussion relates to the history of the M-U-TC Zone as found on pages 1 and 2 of the 2004 Development Plan:

The Mixed-Use Town Center (M-U-TC) Zone was created in 1994 to promote reinvestment and redevelopment in the county's older, more established mixed use areas. The M-U-TC Zone utilizes a local development plan to create design standards and a concept plan to manage future development in designated town center areas. The zone was developed in conjunction with the Planning Area 68 master plan, which recommended use of the M-U-TC Zone in the Town of Riverdale Park.

The Town of Riverdale Park has designated two town centers: one along the US 1 corridor and the other along the B&O Railroad line. Different design standards have been created for parts of these centers because of their common characteristics and different opportunities for development. Along US 1 and in the older industrial area north of the town's historic core, larger scale redevelopment projects are recommended. Design standards for new development for these parts of the town center will promote pedestrian-scale development by requiring, in part, an enhanced streetscape and improved architectural design.

In the review process, the question has been asked if the M-U-TC Zone amendment process may be intended to apply to a large tract of land, such as the Cafritz Property, as described in Section 27-198.05 of the Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance does not limit the size of the land area included in this type of application, which is a common requirement of certain zones and uses. Therefore, the acreage of the parcel is not an issue raised in this application review.

Goal and Overall Design Principles

The existing 2004 *Approved Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan* recommends overall design principles which are intended to guide the development of a human-scale town center. Essential to the success of the town center, they support the single stated goal of the 2004 Development Plan (p. 26):

Goal: To create a human-scale town center through attractive development that creates a sense of place and supports commercial and residential vitality.

Overall Design Principles:

- **Create a comfortable pedestrian environment and an attractive streetscape.**
- **Provide continuous interest along the sidewalk through animated storefronts and buildings that engage the passerby with visual information, variety, color, changes in building mass, shading, and lighting.**
- **Enhance pedestrian and area safety by encouraging a strong visual connection between the interiors of buildings and the sidewalk, private oversight of public space, and the provision of uniform pedestrian-oriented lighting.**

- **Provide a sense of enclosure through development that abuts the sidewalk creating a street wall.**
- **Enhance users’ interest and enjoyment of the street surroundings by retaining historic details; emphasizing the first story through architectural detailing; designing new structures to signal a hierarchy of massing (base, middle and top) highlighting building openings, defining uses, and clearly delineating public from private uses.**
- **Create an attractive town center by placing on-site parking behind, beside, or beneath buildings.**
- **Enliven the street through banners, pedestrian-oriented signage, and other decorative commercial “branding” advertisement.**
- **Soften the streetscape and increase attractiveness through flower, shade trees, and street furniture.**
- **Increase a sense of place by encouraging public art, fountains, gardens, and other amenities on private development and at gateway park locations.**

The applicant proposes to amend the 2004 Development Plan, including Maps 1–3 of the Development Plan and the design standards. The subject application retains many of the design standards from the 2004 Town of Riverdale Park M-U-TC Development Plan relating to the emphasis on the importance of the pedestrian within the town center. However, the applicant proposes a number of new or amended standards in order to accommodate the proposed new development. It should also be noted that the applicant’s proposed development plan will act as an addendum to the 2004 Town of Riverdale Park M-U-TC Development Plan and will only apply to the 37-acre Cafritz property and not the remainder of the Town of Riverdale Park M-U-TC Zone.

The following portions of the development plan and the design standards that appear in **bold** type are from the 2004 Town of Riverdale Park M-U-TC Development Plan and warrant discussion. The standards in quotations are proposed by the applicant to be added or amended in the applicant’s proposed development plan. Staff comments are based on a review of the new and amended standards and are also provided below. The 2004 *Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan* is referenced as the 2004 Development Plan.

a. **Development Concept (p. ii)**—The 2004 Development Plan (p. 18) states in part:

A key component of the development plan is flexible parking. The number of parking spaces required for residential and business uses are reduced, and commercial uses are encouraged to share parking. Businesses may also reduce the number of parking spaces required if there are employee incentives for commuting...

The applicant’s development plan (p. ii) amended the language to:

“The number of parking spaces required for residential and business uses are specified for the success of the project as driven by the marketplace.”

Comment: The applicant has amended the language to de-emphasize the reduced parking standards and shared parking provisions which are important to achieving the goal and principles of the M-U-TC, which places the pedestrian before the automobile in the design of the town center. Staff recommends that the plan, as proposed by the applicant, be revised to reemphasize the encouragement of shared parking provisions.

- b. **Map 1: Concept Plan, Map 2: M-U-TC Concept Plan, and Map 3: Street Configurations**—The applicant proposes to amend the 2004 Development Plan, including each of the maps.

Comment: Map 1: Concept Plan, Map 2: M-U-TC Concept Plan, and Map 3: Street Configurations are proposed as amendments to the 2004 Development Plan in order to fulfill the requirements of Section 27-546.13 of the Zoning Ordinance, which stipulates that certain contents be included within the development plan.

The US 1 Street and Streetscape standards in the 2004 Development Plan (p. 25) are omitted from the proposed Cafritz development plan. The US 1 streetscape development standards are specific for the build-to line as either 15 or 20 feet in depth. The plan also suggests the design of improvements within the right-of-way, such as the width of the roadbed and the incorporation of lane width and bike lanes. This information is suggestive only, as the right-of-way is governed by the State Highway Administration (SHA) and local government cannot dictate improvements in this area. However, the build-to line (which is expressed in the plan as a distance from the centerline) does apply to the private property and creates a requirement of buildings being set very close to the public right-of-way. The subject application does not adhere to the requirements of the 2004 Development Plan. In fact, the subject application proposes a large intervening parking compound between the public space of the roadway and the pedestrian zone, set back approximately 250 feet north of Van Buren Street and 400 feet south of Van Buren Street. Staff understands the applicant's desire to have parking visible from the right-of-way to appear convenient and accessible; however, the extent of the building setback is excessive and should be revised to bring the building forward to reduce the appearance of a "sea of parking" and to move some of the parking to either beneath the building or to the rear of the building. Therefore, staff recommends that a development standard be created to establish a build-to line that sets the building closer to US 1, which will reduce the amount of paving at the front of the building, but no greater than the distance shown on Map 1: Concept Plan for buildings on the north side of Van Buren Street (approximately 250 feet).

- c. **Applicability (p. iv)**—The proposed Cafritz development plan has omitted the following applicability requirement from the 2004 Development Plan (p. 28):

Development that increases existing gross floor area (GFA) by 15 percent or 7,500 square feet, whichever is smaller, shall subject the site to full review for compliance with the design standards. Lesser changes to the site, and additions to single-family residential dwellings, shall not subject the entire site to review for compliance, only the portion impacted by the improvement.

Comment: The language on the previous page should be reinserted into the proposed Cafritz development plan for future development.

- d. **Table 1: Building Recommendations and Table 3: Proposed Roadbed and Streetscape Dimensions (pages 1 through 4)**—The applicant proposes to amend the building recommendations, public space recommendations, and proposed roadbed and streetscape dimension tables of the 2004 Development Plan.

Table 1: Building Recommendations—Modifications to Table 1: Building Recommendations (p. 1) should be considered. Location 6e (see the applicant’s Map 1: Concept Plan) defines “Parking” as the recommended use. This recommendation does not comply with the overall design principles and the applicant’s proposed development plan (p. 9) Standard 1 that states:

“...Parking shall be provided behind, beside, or under the building or in a nearby common lot.”

Table 3: Proposed Roadbed and Streetscape Dimension—Additionally, consideration should be given to reducing the drive lane dimension widths. Drive lane dimension widths for all streets should be reduced to a range of 10 to 12 feet and the use of medians should be evaluated, subject to further review by the Planning Department’s Transportation Planning Section and the Development Review Division, at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision.

The proposed roadbeds and streetscape dimensions in the plan should be fully incorporated into the application of the preliminary plan so that the width and configuration of the streets can be reduced, yet adequate in design to address the traffic patterns within the development and emergency access. The use of public streets in accordance with the standards of DPW&T should also be considered to serve certain uses and to determine the future maintenance of transportation facilities, including a possible bridge over the CSX railroad.

- e. **Build-to Line (p. 5)**—The proposed development Standard 3 does not reference Table 3 in conjunction with the build-to line. The 2004 Development Plan, Standard 7 (p. 34) states:

Gas stations may add a maximum of 30 feet to the build-to line in order to place a pump between the station and the sidewalk. The additional setback may not be used for customer parking, loading or outdoor storage.

Comment: This standard was omitted from the proposed development plan. The applicant’s development plan Standard 3 should reference “Table 3: Proposed Roadbed and Streetscape Dimension” after “build-to line...”

Gas stations have not been requested to be deleted from the use table by the applicant at this time and the rezoning of the property cannot limit uses permitted in the zone. Therefore, Standard 7 should be reinserted since it pertains to a permitted use by special exception per the 2004 Development Plan use table.

- f. **Building Placement and Streetscape (p. 5)**—The 2004 Development Plan, Standard 1 states:

Buildings shall occupy a minimum of 50 percent of the net lot area.

The applicant's development plan proposes that this standard be amended as follows:

“Buildings shall occupy the net lot area ratios consistent with the development plan.”

Comment: The amended language should provide a specific lot area ratio or range; this will provide a measurable amount of minimum building coverage to the site. Staff recommends that the 2004 development standard be retained.

The 2004 Development Plan (p. 34) includes the following Standard 2:

The building façade shall occupy a minimum of 66 percent of the build-to line, except in the historic core.

The applicant's development plan proposes to amend the standard as follows:

“Buildings shall occupy the net lot area ratios consistent with the development plan.”

Comment: The amended language should retain the original language or provide a specific lot area ratio range in order to provide a measurable length of building façade to the lot frontage. In the absence of a measurable proposal, staff recommends that the 2004 development standard be retained.

g. **Access and Circulation (p. 7)**—The 2004 Development Plan, Standard 1 (p. 37) states:

Alleys should be part of new developments and shall be created in accordance with the Riverdale Park town center concept (See Map 3).

The applicant's development plan proposes to amend Standard 1 as follows:

“Alleys should be part of new developments.”

Comment: The 2004 Development Plan standard demonstrates the importance of the proposed concept plan that includes proposed streets and alleys. Map 1: Concept Plan proposes the layout of townhouses such that there will be a predominance of ends of units from the view of public spaces. Each small stick of townhomes is designed as a rear-load garage unit, combined with the units perpendicular to the main serving street, which results in a layout of alleys and end units being highly visible from traffic. A preferred layout would enclose the alleys from the view from the street and serve the units along a rear alley that is not highly visible. Staff recommends that Map 1: Concept Plan be revised and that the preliminary plan further refine the design of the units such that the units provide for an ample front yard and that the rear of the units be oriented so that the alley is parallel to the roadway serving the units. This will result in a semi-private alley, and is in keeping with the traditional use of alleys.

The 2004 Development Plan, Standard 3 (p. 37) states:

All new gas stations shall have a maximum of two 18-foot-wide driveways.

Standard 4 states:

Gas stations should minimize the area of impermeable surface.

Standard 5 states:

Car repair businesses may have a maximum of two curb cuts that are a maximum width of ten feet each.

Comment: The applicant proposes to delete Standards 3, 4, and 5. These standards should be reinserted or appropriately modified since gas stations will continue to be permitted uses as part of the Riverdale Park M-U-TC Zone.

The 2004 Development Plan, Standard 6 (p. 37) states:

Drive-through window are inconsistent with the pedestrian orientation of the town center and are strongly discouraged. Drive-through windows may only be considered if accessed by alleys and located on the rear of the property.

The applicant proposes to amend the standard to:

“Drive through windows should be accessed by alleys and located on the rear of the property.”

Comment: The 2004 Development Plan, Standard 6 should be retained because the plan discourages the use of drive-through windows and this basis for the restriction should be retained. Additionally, consideration may be given to placing a restriction to the number of drive-throughs permitted within the subject area.

The 2004 Development Plan, Standard 7 (p. 37) states:

ATM’S may be located on the front or side of the building, but may not have vehicular access.

The applicant’s proposed development plan Standard 4 amends the standard to:

“ATM’s may be located on the front or side of the building. Vehicular access should be accessed by alleys and located on the rear of the property.”

Comment: Consideration should be given to requiring that ATMs may only allow vehicular access if accessed at the rear of the building as not to be visible from US 1 and allow pedestrian ATMs on the front or side of buildings along a street line.

- h. **Parking and Loading Provision (p. 8)**—The 2004 Development Plan, Standard 1 (p. 39) states:

The maximum number of off-street parking spaces permitted for each land use type shall be equal to 80 percent of the minimum number of required off-street parking spaces in accordance with Section 27-568 (a) of the Zoning

Ordinance. If structured parking is provided, this maximum number may be increased.

The applicant proposes to amend Standard 1 as follows:

“Maximum retail parking shall be 1 space for every 200 square feet of GLA.”

Comment: A proposed increase in the maximum number of parking spaces will diminish the goal and principles of the M-U-TC which intend to create a walkable and transit-oriented town center. Further, the above standard only speaks to the number of parking spaces for retail development. Staff disagrees with the applicant’s proposed modification.

The applicant proposes to omit Footnote 3 from Standard 4 of the 2004 Development Plan (p. 39) which states:

The Town of Riverdale Park shall maintain an up-to-date inventory of shared parking facilities with accurate data on shared parking agreements and remaining capacity of shared parking facilities, until another entity is designated through the establishment of a parking district.

Comment: It appears that, at the time of the original 2004 approval, the Town of Riverdale Park was directed to maintain an inventory. A determination should be made if the Town of Riverdale Park currently maintains an inventory for shared parking facilities.

The applicant proposes to delete Standard 5 (p. 39) which states:

To encourage the construction of off-street structured parking facilities in the town center and to promote economic development, the establishment of a parking district in accordance with the requirements of Division 27, Section 399-413 of the Prince George’s County Code is recommended.

The applicant also proposes to delete Standard 7 which states:

When off-site parking is necessary to meet the parking requirements, the applicant will need to provide satisfactory documentation such as affidavits, leases, or other agreements to show that parking is provided off site.

Comment: It is recommended that these standards be retained should structured parking, parking districts, or shared parking be utilized for future development based on the statement of intent in both the 2004 Development Plan and the applicant’s proposed development plan (p. 8), which states:

To provide flexible approaches to parking provisions that support multimodal transportation, shared parking lots, and maximum use of land for development, parks and plazas.

- i. **Parking and Loading Design (p. 9)**—The 2004 Development Plan Standard 2 (p. 40) states:

Parking shall be accessed from an alley, side street, or if appropriate, adjacent shared parking.

The applicant proposes to amend Standard 2 as follows:

“Parking shall be accessed from an alley, street, side street, or if appropriate, adjacent shared parking.”

Comment: Staff supports retaining the applicant’s language to modify the 2004 Development Plan in order to provide flexibility. The applicant should try to minimize the number, location, and associated impacts that surface parking lots and parking structures may have on the streetscape and the pedestrian environment along major/primary streets, particularly along Baltimore Avenue (US 1).

Standard 8 from the 2004 Development Plan (p. 40) states:

Car repair businesses may not store vehicles in front of or alongside the building, but may store cars inside or in the rear, with appropriate screening if adjacent to a residential use.

Comment: While it may not be the applicant’s intent to incorporate car repair businesses as part of the proposed concept plan, this standard should be reinserted since car repair businesses are permitted uses, generally through special exception, within the 2004 Development Plan use table.

- j. **Signage (p. 10)**—The applicant proposes to retain all standards associated with signage, except that “approximately” has been added in proposed Cafritz Standards 3 and 4.
- k. **Landscaping (p. 11)**—The 2004 Development Plan Standard 2 (p. 44) states:

Healthy trees shall be preserved. Where they cannot be preserved on site, a professional arborist may transplant them to a new location within Riverdale Park.

The applicant proposes to amend this standard as follows:

“Healthy trees shall be preserved within proposed green areas. Where they cannot be preserved on site, a professional arborist may transplant them to a new location within Riverdale Park.”

Comment: Consideration should be given to the following suggested revised standard:

Healthy trees shall be preserved within proposed green areas, landscape strips, streetscapes, and parking lots, where feasible. Where they cannot be preserved on-site, a professional arborist may transplant them to a new location either on-site or within the Town of Riverdale Park.

- l. **Architecture (p. 13)**—The applicant proposes the following Standard 5:

“Synthetic modern sidings shall not be used. Materials facing buildings in this area, such as masonry, brick, wood, and clear glass, should be historically appropriate and generally reflect an early twentieth-century character. Alternative materials may be approved if (a) material samples and examples of existing buildings that use such materials in the proposed way are submitted and (b) it is found that they satisfy the condition of appearing to be constructed of pre-modern materials.”

Comment: This standard has remained unchanged from the original 2004 Development Plan. A recommendation for a revision to this standard was provided during the November 16, 2011 Mixed-Use Town Center Committee meeting. Consideration should be given to revising this standard as follows:

Synthetic modern sidings shall not be used, with the exception of cementitious products.

- m. **Building Openings (p. 15)**—Standard 10 of the 2004 Development Plan (p. 55) states:

Walls facing public streets or to the rear shall have windows that occupy at least 40 percent of the wall area.

The applicant proposes to amend the standard as follows:

“Walls facing public streets shall have windows that occupy at least 40 percent of the wall area.”

Comment: The applicant has deleted “or to the rear” in the proposed amended standard. The rear of façades should not be visible, and allowing flexibility in the design of the rear of buildings that are visible is a reasonable request.

- n. **Signage (p. 16)**—The applicant proposes to delete the majority of signage standards and also refers to Part 12: Signs of the Zoning Ordinance.

Comment: All signage standards should be consolidated into one location in the proposed development plan. Section 27-546.13 of the Zoning Ordinance states that signage standards should be included in the proposed development plan. The M-U-TC Design Review Committee will require standards in which to evaluate all sign permit applications. The sign standards should be equivalent to the level of detail provided in the 2004 Development Plan, which surpasses the level of detail for sign standards provided in the Zoning Ordinance.

SUMMARY OF PLAN REVIEW AND REFERRAL COMMENTS:

17. The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the zoning map amendment application, including the required information as stated in Section 27-198.05(d)(3)–(4) of the Zoning Ordinance and the traffic study dated July 27, 2011, which was provided by the applicant, but is not required at the time of rezoning of the property. A traffic study is required at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision to test the proposal for adequate public facilities to support the development of the property in accordance with Section 24-124 of the Subdivision Regulations.

Staff analysis of traffic impact of proposed development

The application proposes to develop the site in two phases. According to the traffic study, the first phase will include 162,000 gross square feet (GSF) of commercial retail space, and 22,000 GSF of general office space. The second phase will include an additional 6,000 GSF of retail space, a 120-room hotel, and 995 residential units consisting of 224 senior residential housing units, 641 apartment units, and 131 townhouse units.

It should be noted that the amount of development in the traffic study and the amount shown on Sheet 1 of 7 of the development plan is not the same, see Finding 2 for the development data as shown on the development plan. To this end, staff has evaluated the above mix of uses and levels by determining the generated peak hour and daily trip volumes for each phase as noted above. Staff utilized the AM and PM peak hour and daily trip generation rates from Figure 4 of the Planning Board’s “Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals” (Guidelines) and the applicable Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation, 8th Edition, the table below (Table 1) was developed. The information presented in this table assumes that the entire site is developable and that the practical density in the existing R-55 Zone is an average of 4.60 residences per acre as stated in the Guidelines.

Zoning or Use	Units or Square Feet	AM Peak Hour Trips		PM Peak Hour Trips		Weekday Trips (ADT)
		In	Out	In	Out	
Existing Zoning						
R-55 (residential)	173 detached residences	26	104	102	54	1,557
Proposed Zoning						
M-U-TC						
Retail	184,000 square feet	131	83	538	538	11,774
Office	22,000 square feet	40	4	8	33	440
Hotel	120 rooms	83	33	217	217	1,200
Residential – senior housing	224 units	134	20	43	94	780
Residential – apartment	641 units	64	269	250	135	4,167
Residential – townhouse	130 units	18	73	68	36	1,040
TOTAL		470	482	1,124	1,053	19,401
Difference (between bold numbers)		+444	+378	+1,022	+999	+17,844

The comparison of estimated net site trip generation indicates that the proposed rezoning would increase the traffic by as much as 820 trips during the AM peak hour and 2,020 trips during the PM peak hour.

The weekday average daily travel could increase by as much as 17,800 daily trips. Due to the proposed retail uses, the increase in the weekend average daily traffic could be as much as 1,840 daily trips. These figures do not include discounts for trips considered as pass-by and internal trips, as explained below.

Pass-by discount—A component of travel associated with retail uses is pass-by (i.e., already on the adjacent roadway). Therefore, while the estimates in the above table reflect traffic at the site entrance, off-site traffic impact of the retail use would be less than indicated in the table above. Also, while the Guidelines suggest that 50 percent of peak-hour retail trips may be pass-by, that percentage would not apply to average weekday and weekend daily trips. This is because most trips using retail uses during the midday or evening hours of a week day or on a weekend day are made specifically for that purpose, and therefore, the pass-by percentage should be assumed to be somewhat lower than the stated peak hour percentage.

Internal trip discount—Another component of travel associated with the overall site development plan is internal trips. Internal trips are a portion of trips generated that has a beginning and ending in a mixed-use development. These trip discounts could be as much as 10 percent of the generated trips. These trips do not use the external road system.

Master Plan Compliance

Given the size of the traffic impact that would occur if the subject property were to be rezoned as requested, it is appropriate to also assess the potential traffic impact of the proposed rezoning on the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of the Transportation (MPOT)*, which fully incorporated the recommendations of the 1994 *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Area 68* for Baltimore Avenue (US 1) as a collector facility.

The criteria for evaluation of zoning cases are contained in Section 4 of the Guidelines. However, there are no criteria specifically recommended for the M-U-TC Zone at this time. Staff applied the criteria for comprehensive design zone basic plans (also used for M-X-T) in Section 4 of the Guidelines be used for this purpose, since the proposed zone is not in accordance with the currently approved master plan for this area (the 1994 *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Area 68*).

The site is located in the Developed Tier, as provided in the 2002 General Plan. The applicable level-of-service (LOS) standard in the Developed Tier is LOS E. According to Figure 5 in the Guidelines (p. 35), LOS E corresponds to a volume-to-capacity ratio (V/C) of 1.0 on roadway links. For US 1 in the vicinity of the site, which is a collector roadway with a two-way center left-turn lane, the recommended maximum daily service volume is 46,800 vehicles per day.

The traffic forecasts developed for the preparation of the 2009 MPOT, by using the existing R-55 Zone for the subject property indicated 44,200 vehicle trips as the estimated average daily traffic for the portion of US 1 that the subject property fronts. This corresponds to a volume-to-capacity ratio (V/C) ratio of 0.94, or about six percent below the maximum LOS E threshold. With the proposed rezoning to the M-U-TC Zone, the projected build-out daily traffic volume, including estimated site generated trip discounts, would increase to approximately 55,500 vehicle trips, with a V/C ratio of 1.19, along US 1. Therefore, the rezoning and amount of proposed development plan depicted in the traffic study would result in a 19 percent increase of the 2002 General Plan recommended V/C level.

Staff also evaluated the impact of a new east-west road connection over the CSX railroad from the site to River Road on the forecast average daily traffic on US 1 in the vicinity of the site. The projected build-out traffic volume along US 1 would decrease from 55,500 (V/C 1.19) to about 50,500 (V/C 1.08), using the assumption that 50 percent of the traffic generated by the site would be oriented to Kenilworth Avenue (MD 201). In this scenario, the rezoning and amount of

proposed development plan depicted in the traffic study would result in an eight percent increase of the 2002 General Plan recommended V/C level.

The preceding sections indicate that the proposed rezoning would worsen the anticipated vehicle travel along US 1 in the vicinity of the subject site, with or without an east-west roadway connection over the CSX railroad to River Road.

One way to mitigate the projected impact on US 1, in addition to the construction of a new east-west road connection over the CSX railroad from the site to River Road, would be by providing a circular shuttle service operating both on weekdays and weekends with ten to twelve hours of service each day. The shuttle would provide service along US 1 between Queensbury Road and Paint Branch Parkway with stops at the proposed site, the Riverdale Marc Station, the University Park town hall, downtown College Park, the College Park—UMD Metro Station, and the Prince George’s Metro Station.

Staff review of Applicant’s Traffic Impact Report

The applicant has voluntarily submitted a traffic impact report by Wells and Associates, dated July 27, 2011, with the zoning map application; however, this traffic study is not a submittal requirement, nor does it relate to the required findings for rezoning of the property to the M-U-TC Zone. The traffic impact report was prepared in accordance with the methodologies in the “Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals” (Guidelines) for preliminary plats of subdivision. While the report indicates and evaluates the impact of the development to some degree, a finding of adequate public facilities is not required for this type of zoning change.

The information contained in the submitted report is provided for transparency purposes and to allow comment upon the scope of future studies, as a part of the development process. If the zoning is granted, detailed transportation conditions will be imposed at the time of the preliminary plan application, which is required pursuant to Section 24-124 of the Subdivision Regulations.

The traffic study was referred to the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), the Prince George’s County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), the City of College Park, the Town of Riverdale Park, and the Town of University Park. As of this writing, only DPW&T has provided staff with written comments, see Finding 23.

Given the above, staff review of the applicant’s submitted traffic report indicates that all of the intersections studied, except for the signalized intersections of US 1/Paint Branch Parkway and US 1/East-West Highway (MD 410), operate acceptably (LOS E) under existing conditions. The report finds that all intersections would continue to operate acceptably with development under the proposed development intensities noted above, with the provision of:

- a. On-site transportation demand management measures;
- b. A neighborhood shuttle service with connections to nearby Metro and MARC stations;
- c. A traffic signal at the intersection of US 1 at Van Buren Street/main site access driveway;
- d. Extension of the Rhode Island Avenue “Trolley Trail,” north and south of the site;
- e. A bike trail connection from the Rhode Island Avenue “Trolley Trail” to US 1; and

- f. A roadway connection via Maryland Avenue to the Riverdale MARC station.

However, staff noted the following issues with the submitted traffic report:

- a. The report included analysis of Intersections 1 through 6 using the procedure described in the *2010 Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment*. However, the subject property is not located within the sector plan area, so this methodology does not apply to the site.
- b. The scoping agreement indicates “TDOZ” as the type of application. However, the subject property is not located within a Transit District Overlay Zone area, so this does not apply to the site.
- c. The report did not analyze the intersections of Rivertech Court with River Road, and River Road with Kenilworth Avenue (MD 201), to evaluate the impact of additional traffic that would be oriented to these intersections with the proposed new east-west road connection and the CSX railroad crossing.
- d. The transportation facilities mitigation plan (TFMP) procedures may be applied per Section 24-124(a)(6) of the Subdivision Regulations, but this was not done in the submitted traffic report.

If the rezoning is approved, these issues and the right-of-way dedication for US 1 will be addressed at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision and should be consistent with the MPOT, the *1994 Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Area 68*, and the *2004 Approved Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan*, or as amended. A revised traffic impact study will be required at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision.

Transportation staff is aware that the adequacy or inadequacy of transportation facilities is not a legal required finding pertaining to the proposed rezoning to the M-U-TC Zone per the criteria for approval set forth in Section 27-198.05 of the Zoning Ordinance. Based on the potential trip generation, the proposed rezoning would have a sizable impact on the existing transportation facilities in the area of the subject property. While no transportation facility conditions are warranted as a means of ensuring the coordinated, harmonious, and systematic development of the regional district at the time of rezoning to the M-U-TC Zone, a number of issues have been identified that will need to be addressed during the review of the preliminary plan of subdivision.

- 18. **Subdivision Review Section**—The property is located on Tax Map 42 in Grid D-1, and is known as Parcel 81. The site is located on both the west and east side of what appears to be an extension of Rhode Island Avenue, which has been depicted on some mapping information as a 50-foot-wide right-of-way. In 1988, pursuant to a deed recorded in Prince George’s County Land Records in Liber 7227 Folio 243, Parcel 32 to the north was subdivided from Parcel 81 by a declaration of taking by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) for a “public use for construction, maintenance and operation of a rapid rail transit system and related facilities necessary.” Parcel 81 is a legal acreage parcel never having been the subject of a preliminary plan of subdivision. Pursuant to Section 24-107(c) of the Subdivision Regulations, a preliminary plan of subdivision is required for the construction of more than 5,000 square feet of gross floor area on Parcel 81.

The development plan indicates that the Capital Transit Company right-of-way has been abandoned and incorporates that land area into this application. The plan provides reference to a deed recorded in Liber 34 Folio 436. The third paragraph of that 1895 deed of conveyance to the Columbia and Maryland Railroad contains a reverter clause which states that, if the railroad was not constructed within 18 months, the contract was null and void. There is no evidence that an extension was granted or that the railroad was constructed. It appears that the application includes all of Parcel 81 and the land which contained the transit right-of-way, which is also labeled as Rhode Island Avenue. The Riverdale post office located on Parcel A (Plat WWW 69 at 62) abuts the subject property to the south and west. At the time of approval of the record plat in 1968, right-of-way was dedicated to public use for Rhode Island Avenue along the eastern property line of Parcel A. The development plan should clearly delineate the property line on all sheets of the application and label the dedicated right-of-way. The vacation of that part of the right-of-way, dedicated with Parcel A, may be appropriate in the future based on the proposed development of Parcel 81.

Site Plan Comments

- a. Revise the site plan general notes to provide the tax map, grid, and parcel number, and clearly indicate if the right-of-way is a part of the gross tract area.
 - b. Revise the site plan to correctly label that the 80-foot-wide right-of-way for ingress and egress for the post office from US 1 was conveyed to the United States of America by quit claim deed recorded in land records in Liber 3624 Folio 948.
 - c. The site plan should delineate the boundary of the Aviation Policy Analysis Zone 6 (APA-6) and the municipal boundaries of College Park and Riverdale Park.
 - d. Noise and vibration may be a variable on the layout and development for site planning purposes related to the transit right-of-way. The site plan should reflect the 65 dBA Ldn from noise generators if it is determined appropriate at this time. Section 24-121 of the Subdivision Regulations requires a 300-foot lot depth abutting a transit right-of-way for residential development. The preliminary plan could establish additional restriction on the layout if it is determined that noise and vibration issues are associated with the transit right-of-way.
 - e. The applicant should provide information and verify that the right-of-way extending north and south through Parcel 81 and the WMATA property has, in fact, been abandoned and that the issue is settled and/or provide information of the disposition of that area of land, as appropriate.
19. **Trails**—The Transportation Planning Section trails specialist reviewed the submitted basic plan application referenced above for conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT), the 2004 *Approved Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan* (MUTCD Plan), and the 1994 *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Area 68* (area master plan) in order to implement planned trails, bikeways, and pedestrian improvements.

Review Comments (Master Plan Compliance and Prior Approvals)

The MPOT and the area master plan identify two master plan trails issues that impact the subject property; the Rhode Island Avenue Trolley Trail and policies relating to the Complete Streets section. The abandoned right-of-way of the Rhode Island Avenue Trolley Trail bisects the subject

site. This former rail corridor has been identified as a master plan trail corridor. The MPOT includes the following project description for the Rhode Island Avenue Trolley Trail project:

Rhode Island Avenue Trolley Trail (MPOT, page 31)

Provide a shared-use trail along this former trolley right-of-way. Several segments of this trail have been implemented by the City of College Park. Planning work is also being done in Riverdale Park and Hyattsville. Where an existing roadway is within the former trolley right-of-way, bikeway and sidewalk improvements may be appropriate. Designated bike lanes shall be provided from Greenbelt Road north to Quimby Avenue.

The City of College Park has constructed several segments of this trail, including the segment immediately to the north of Albion Street. The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), Department of Parks and Recreation, is currently doing more detailed design work for the construction of this trail south of the subject site in the Town of Riverdale Park and the City of Hyattsville, and a segment of the trail has been approved for construction as part of the EYA development. Staff is recommending the development of the trail within the boundary of the subject property and extending improvements over the WMATA property in order to connect to the north.

The MPOT also includes several policies related to pedestrian access and the provision of sidewalks within designated centers and corridors, as well as other areas in the Developed and Developing Tiers. The Complete Streets Section includes the following policies regarding sidewalk construction and the accommodation of pedestrians.

POLICY 1: Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all new road construction within the Developed and Developing Tiers.

POLICY 2: All road frontage improvements and road capital improvement projects within the developed and Developing Tiers shall be designed to accommodate all modes of transportation. Continuous sidewalks and on-road bicycle facilities should be included to the extent feasible and practical.

The Trails, Bikeways, and Pedestrian Mobility chapter of the MPOT also includes the following policy regarding pedestrian connections between and within communities.

POLICY 9: Provide trail connections within and between communities as development occurs, to the extent feasible and practical.

Baltimore Avenue (US 1)—The development and design concepts included in the existing 2004 *Approved Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan* recommends an enhanced streetscape for Baltimore Avenue (US 1). The town center streetscape width varies from a minimum of 15 feet to a maximum of 23 feet. Within this area the following is required:

- a. **Sidewalk:** An unobstructed seven-foot-wide walkway that is located adjacent to the street wall that is formed by the buildings. The development plan proposes to set the building back from the US 1 right-of-way and provide a buffer between the development and the street.

- b. **Landscaping/Pedestrian Amenity Strip:** Include street trees, landscaping, and space for the placement of amenities such as benches, post office boxes, and pedestrian-oriented lights. The development plan indicates landscaping and amenities along the street line.
- c. **Bike Lanes:** The 2004 plan (p. 25) recommends five-foot-wide bike lanes along most of US 1 in the town center to facilitate bicycle commuting to the University of Maryland and other communities along US 1. The provision of bike lanes within the right-of-way of US 1 is contingent on approval of the State Highway Administration (SHA).

Internal Road Network—The internal road network includes:

- (a) seven-foot-wide sidewalks on commercial roads;
- (b) five-foot-wide sidewalks on residential roads;
- (c) eight-foot-wide sidewalks on the Van Buren entry configuration; and
- (d) seven-foot-wide sidewalks on the Woodbury entry configuration.

This pedestrian system proposal appears to be adequate to accommodate movement through the site and to both US 1 and the Rhode Island Avenue Trolley Trail. However, it is recommended that one east-west trail/bicycle connection be provided through the site between US 1 and the trolley trail. A connection should be determined at the time of preliminary plan and may consist of a trail or wide sidewalks with designated bike lanes along either Van Buren Street or Woodbury Street.

In conformance with the *2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* and the *2004 Approved Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan*, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees should provide the following:

- a. A development standard or guideline relating to the sidewalks and streetscape along US 1 to ensure that the pedestrian is provided for in a safe and attractive pedestrian zone. This streetscape should incorporate an unobstructed seven-foot-wide walkway and sufficient space for designated bike lanes, street trees, landscaping, public art space for the placement of pedestrian-oriented lighting and other pedestrian amenities, and designated bike lanes within the roadbed (subject to SHA approval).
- b. Consider combining a vehicular roadway with the master plan trail along the entire length of the subject site's portion of the former Rhode Island Avenue Trolley right-of-way, extending across the WMATA property, to connect with the terminus of the existing trail at Albion Street and south to Tuckerman Avenue. This trail should be dedicated to public use within a maintenance easement (or other suitable agreement) at the time of preliminary plan.
- c. Crosswalks at the signalized intersection(s) at US 1 including highly visible and attractive pedestrian crosswalks, pedestrian signals, and other pedestrian or warning signage as appropriate, subject to SHA approval. Crosswalks providing appropriate pedestrian safety features should be provided throughout the site.
- d. Bicycle parking shall be provided throughout the site, per Design Standard 4 (MUTCD Plan, p. 60). The exact number and location shall be determined at the time of preliminary plan.

- e. Provide one east-west bicycle route through the site either along Van Buren Street or Woodbury Street, in order to accommodate east-west bicycle movement through the site, to the trolley trail and to the planned bicycle facilities along US 1.

20. **The Historic Preservation Section**—The review of A-10018, Cafritz Property, found that the subject property is adjacent to two National Register historic districts: University Park to the west and Riverdale Park to the south. The subject property is one property away from the Calvert Hills National Register historic district to the north. The Cafritz Property is also adjacent to the Engineering Research Corporation (ERCO) Historic Site (#68-022), to the east. General Note 17 on the development plan, Sheet 1 of 7, should be revised to include this information concerning the adjacent historic site and the historic districts.

The proposed elevated roadway, as shown on Map 1: Concept Plan, over the CSX rail lines connecting Rivertech Court and the Cafritz Property at the unnamed street between Blocks J and L is within the ERCO historic site environmental setting. This connection is not shown on any of the development plans (Sheets 1 through 7).

The NRI should be revised to include information concerning the three identified archeological features within the Cafritz Property.

The ERCO Historic Site (#68-022), a Prince George’s County historic site, is adjacent to the southeastern portion of the subject property. Built in 1939, the ERCO building is a two-story industrial structure with a large administrative block finished in the Moderne style and a larger rear factory that is without ornamentation. This industrial building mimicked the design of contemporary transportation machinery such as ships, airplanes, and automobiles, and industrial and consumer products, such as bicycles, toasters, radios, and vacuum cleaners. Owned by Henry Berliner, the ERCO plant is representative of the significant developments in aviation that took place in the county; the factory produced the Ercoupe (the first tricycle aircraft that was touted as characteristically incapable of spinning) and was later adapted to meet defense needs during World War II.

Also adjacent to the subject property are the Riverdale Park (#68-004), University Park (#66-029), and Calvert Hills (#66-037) National Register historic districts to the south, west, and north, respectively.

The Riverdale Park National Register historic district (listed December 2002) is significant as a late 19th and early 20th century railroad and streetcar suburb that surrounds the Calvert family’s Riversdale plantation house (a national historic landmark completed in 1807). The suburb of Riverdale Park began in earnest around 1890 and includes a range of houses that reflect late 19th and early 20th century residential architectural preferences. The University Park historic district (listed in October 1996; boundary expansion pending) is an early 20th century automobile suburb begun in 1920 that reflects middle-class residential architectural styles through World War II, and in the post war period until 1960). The Calvert Hills National Register historic district (listed in December 2002); formerly a part of the Calvert family’s Riversdale Plantation is significant as a late 19th and early 20th century streetcar and automobile suburb. The earliest houses in Calvert Hills are from the 1890s, although the majority dates from the 1920s and 1930s, and reflect the architectural taste of the pre-World War II period.

The developing property was once part of Charles Benedict Calvert’s Riversdale Plantation. Charles Calvert donated land for and was the founder of the Maryland Agricultural College, now the University of Maryland. In addition, he served one term in the United States Congress from

1861 to 1863, representing the Sixth District of Maryland. After the death of Charles Calvert in 1864, his estate was divided among his wife and children. His son, Charles Baltimore Calvert, was allotted a tract comprising 203.5 acres that was approximately 600 yards wide and stretched from Baltimore Avenue on the west, across the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad tracks to Paint Branch and Edmonston Road on the east. Calvert built a residence, known as MacAlpine, and developed an agricultural and dairy farm on his property around 1868. Calvert designed and supervised the construction of the house and the various outbuildings that included a brick cow barn, a brick icehouse, a brick carriage barn, a meat house, a smokehouse, and a wooden corn shed/wagon shed. MacAlpine was built on the site of an earlier structure, occupied by a foreman of the Riversdale estate that was destroyed by fire. An old well from the earlier structure served MacAlpine until it ran dry. A new well, pump house, and water tower were placed directly behind the house and served as the water supply until public water utilities were installed in the 20th century.

Historic photographs of MacAlpine show that the structure was a Georgian-style brick residence with a full-length porch on the front with a central stairway and a low balustrade. The farm produced about 200 barrels of corn per year, as well as a substantial quantity of dairy products. Charles Baltimore Calvert died in 1906 and his family continued to reside at the MacAlpine estate until 1910. Between 1910 and 1917, MacAlpine was used as the Calvert family's summer residence. Charlotte Calvert Spence, a daughter of Charles Baltimore and Eleanor Calvert, and her husband, Thomas H. Spence, a Dean of the University of Maryland, moved into MacAlpine in 1917. Eleanor Calvert died in 1932 and Charlotte and Thomas Spence moved from MacAlpine in 1934. The Calvert family eventually rented the MacAlpine estate to the Longfellow School for Boys in 1934 and subsequent years. The subject property was acquired by the federal government in 1942 and a housing development was built for the workers in the nearby ERCO plant, known as Calvert Homes. All of the houses were built on concrete pads, some units containing two bedrooms and others just one. The Calvert Homes housing development was closed in 1954 and subsequently demolished.

In 1948, the Prince George's County Board of Education purchased a 1.4-acre tract adjacent to the MacAlpine house for use as a school for the residents of Calvert Homes. After demolition of the Calvert Homes development, the school continued to be used for physically-handicapped children. Morris Cafritz acquired the subject property in 1960 and the property remains in the possession of the Cafritz family. The MacAlpine house was subsequently demolished and there are no remaining standing structures on the subject property.

A Phase I archeological survey was completed on the subject property in March 2008. Two historic archeological sites were previously recorded on the property in 1984, 18PR259, the MacAlpine Mansion, and 18PR260, the Calvert Homes housing development. Pedestrian survey identified numerous concrete pads associated with the Calvert Homes housing development. Several features related to the MacAlpine Mansion were also noted, including a concrete-lined cellar hole, a pile of bricks where a barn is thought to have been located, and an ice house. A substantial amount of earth movement had taken place when the Calvert Homes development was built. The cellar hole is lined with concrete and measures approximately 9.5 by 8.5 meters. A circular ice house, located to the south of the house, is about 8.5 meters in diameter and is built against a steep slope. A large number of late 19th to early 20th century artifacts were scattered around the surface. A small pile of bricks was noted to the southwest of the cellar hole and probably represents a smokehouse noted in a 1934 University of Maryland honors thesis. A possible brick barn was located some distance south of the main house. Although the property is highly disturbed, further evaluation of the site may identify intact cultural deposits or shed light on the construction techniques of the buildings. Phase II investigations were recommended on the

four features associated with the MacAlpine estate. Very little cultural material was found in association with the Calvert Homes housing development. Therefore, no further work was recommended in the areas associated with the housing development.

The development plans and the natural resources inventory do not show the ERCO Historic Site (#68-022), the foundations related to the MacAlpine house and outbuildings, or the adjacent National Register historic districts.

Tree conservation and other illustrative plans for the application indicate several potential impacts on the property: (1) substantial grading that would remove all of the trees and seemingly all of the archeological features currently identified; (2) a vehicular connection between the subject property and the ERCO property to the east by means of a flyover across the railroad right-of-way. As illustrated, the eastern portion of the flyover would be located within the environmental setting of the ERCO historic site; (3) the illustrative plans for the proposed development indicate the possibility of multi-story buildings on the east side of the property that may have a visual impact on the adjacent ERCO historic site.

Summary of Historic Preservation Issues

- a. Staff concurs with the conclusions and recommendations of the Phase I archeology report that no further archeological work is necessary in Area B and portions of Area A associated with the Calvert Homes housing development on the Cafritz Property. In addition, staff concurs with the conclusions and recommendations of the report that Phase II investigations be conducted in the areas surrounding the location of the MacAlpine Estate's ice house, meat house, concrete cellar, and brick barn. A Phase II work plan is included in the report as Appendix D. Staff concurs that the Phase II work plan presented by the consultant is appropriate and sufficient to evaluate the extent and integrity of the identified features. Interpretive signage should also be developed to interpret the remains of the MacAlpine mansion and the Calvert Homes development.
- b. The development plans and natural resources inventory should identify the ERCO Historic Site (#68-022) adjacent to the southeast of the subject property, archeological site 18PR259 on the subject property, and the adjacent National Register historic districts.
- c. The proposed grading of the property may result in the removal of all currently identified archeological features. Before any decision about a preliminary plan of subdivision for the property, the character and significance of archeological features should be assessed to inform appropriate mitigation measures, if the features are proposed to be removed, through a Phase II archeology report. The development plans also provide for a potential vehicular access road to the property to be located within the environmental setting of the ERCO historic site. This would likely represent a substantial and negative impact on the historic character of the ERCO property and should be evaluated through the review of the preliminary plan of subdivision and the detailed site plan. Further, if the site is rezoned to M-U-TC, it is possible that the eastern portion of the subject property may include multi-story buildings that overlook the ERCO historic site and the adjacent National Register historic districts and may not be compatible with the character of these resources. As a result, these impacts should be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) at the time of preliminary plan and through subsequent site plan applications.

Recommendations from the Historic Preservation Section

- a. Prior to acceptance of the preliminary plan, the applicant shall provide a draft report detailing the Phase II investigations.
- b. If Phase III archeological mitigation is proposed, the applicant shall provide a final report detailing the Phase II and Phase III investigations and ensure that all artifacts are curated in a proper manner, prior to any ground disturbance or the approval of any grading permits.
- c. Prior to final plat, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a plan for any interpretive signage to be erected and public outreach measures (based on the findings of the Phase I, II, and III archeological investigations). The location and wording of the signage and the public outreach measures shall be subject to approval by the HPC and the M-NCPPC staff archeologist.
- d. The HPC shall review the preliminary plan of subdivision and any subsequent plans of development for their impact on identified archeological features, the impact of a potential vehicular access road on the ERCO Historic Site (#68-022), and the impact of proposed buildings visible from the ERCO historic site and the adjacent National Register historic districts.

21. **The Environmental Planning Section**—The Environmental Planning Section reviewed the zoning map amendment for Cafritz Property, A-10018, including a revised statement of justification, a development plan, a natural resources inventory (NRI), and a Type 1 tree conservation plan, stamped as received by the Environmental Planning Section on November 14, 2011.

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed Natural Resources Inventory NRI-121-06 for this property which was signed on September 28, 2006, and is no longer valid. The current application is a request for a primary amendment to an approved mixed-use town center (M-U-T-C) development to incorporate the subject 37.35-acre site, and rezoning the site from R-55 to M-U-T-C.

With regard to the environmental regulations that became effective September 1, 2010, the subject application is not grandfathered under Subtitle 25 and Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code with respect to the delineation of regulated environmental features, woodland conservation, and applicable submittal requirements because the proposed project does not have any previously approved development applications.

General Plan Conformance

The 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan* contains tier-specific and countywide-specific goals, objectives, and policies with regard to the protection of natural features, noise pollution, stormwater management, light pollution, and woodland conservation. Many of these policies have been implemented through updates to the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, zoning requirements, and applicable master plans.

The applicable tier-specific policy is as follows:

POLICY 2: Preserve, restore and enhance environmental features and green infrastructure elements.

The site does not contain any regulated environmental features such as streams or wetlands. The site is 90 percent wooded and contains a network gap area and evaluation area within the designated network of the *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan*. The current plans do not propose to preserve the on-site woodland nor any areas within the designated network. Woodland conservation is discussed further under conformance with the master plan, development plan, Green Infrastructure Plan, and also within the Environmental Review section.

The applicable countywide-specific policies are as follows:

POLICY 1: Preserve, protect, and enhance the designated green infrastructure elements.

See conformance with the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan below.

POLICY 2: Preserve, protect and enhance surface and ground water features and restore lost ecological functions.

Based on the current natural resources inventory for the subject site, the site does not contain any surface water features. The preservation and protection of groundwater features will be addressed during the review of the stormwater management concept plan by the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) in future phases of development.

POLICY 3: Preserve existing woodland resources and replant woodland, where possible, while implementing the desired development pattern.

The current plan does not propose to preserve nor replant woodland. Because the site is undeveloped and fully wooded, it is very possible to preserve woodlands on portions of the property while still implementing the desired development pattern. Opportunities to replant woodland will be evaluated in further detail during the final design phase. Woodland conservation is discussed in the following sections of this memorandum as well as the Environmental Review section.

POLICY 5: Reduce overall sky glow, minimize the spill-over of light from one Property to the next, and reduce glare from light fixtures.

Light pollution is discussed in the Development Plan section below.

POLICY 7: Minimize impacts of noise on residential uses during the land development process.

The site is adjacent to a CSX right-of-way which is generally regulated for noise and vibration impacts associated with railroad transportation. Noise impacts are discussed below in the section for development plan conformance.

Master Plan Conformance

The site is within the 1994 *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Area 68*, which predates the General Plan. While the environmental objectives of the master plan are superseded by current regulations for woodland conservation and stormwater management, the master plan states that the goal is to:

Maintain, restore and enhance the natural character and aesthetic qualities of the Anacostia River stream valley and preserve and expand the Planning Area's forest cover.

The goal of preserving and expanding forest cover within the planning area was reiterated in Policy 3 of the General Plan to “preserve existing woodland resources and replant woodland, where possible, while implementing the desired development pattern.” A review of 2009 aerial photos indicates that the subject site is one of the few remaining tracts of undeveloped land within Planning Area 68. The site is not within nor adjacent to a stream valley; however it is approximately 90 percent wooded and contains specimen trees, and on-site preservation is the preferred woodland conservation methodology. The on-site mature woodland and trees should be preserved to meet the site's woodland conservation threshold requirements and expand the community's existing urban tree cover to the fullest extent possible.

Development Plan Conformance

The 1994 *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Area 68* was amended by the 2004 *Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan*, approved by the Prince George's County Council on January 20, 2004. The approved development plan contains environmental standards for noise and tree preservation which are applicable to current primary amendment requests as follows:

a. **Lighting**

3. **Fixtures shall be located so that light does not spill from a parking lot of service area onto an adjacent residential property.**
4. **All lighting shall be shielded and of an intensity that minimizes light pollution**

The site is not directly adjacent to any residential lots or residential uses; however, the residential lots located on the west side of Baltimore Avenue (US 1) and the residential lots that are proposed on the subject site may be subject to light pollution from the proposed development. The proposed lighting should use full cut-off optics to ensure that off-site light intrusion into residential and woodland conservation areas is minimized, and so that sky glow does not increase as a result of this development.

Recommended Condition: At the time of site plan or permit review, whichever is required first, the lighting plan for the subject property shall demonstrate the use of full cut-off optics to ensure that light intrusion into residential and woodland conservation areas is minimized. Details of all lighting fixtures shall be submitted for review along with certification that the proposed fixtures are full cut-off optics and a photometric plan showing proposed light levels at an intensity that minimizes light pollution. The following note shall be placed on the plan: “All lighting shall use full cut-off optics and be directed downward to reduce glare and light spill-over.”

b. **Landscaping**

1. **The required tree coverage for each property shall be ten percent of the gross site area, measured by the projected ten year coverage provided by a tree. The tree coverage should be accomplished through the provision of shade rather than ornamental trees. In lieu of meeting this standard, the applicant may plant street trees in conformance with the streetscape standards (see Public Space Section) either on the property or within the abutting right-of-way.**

The required tree canopy coverage requirement of Subtitle 25, Division 3, Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, is 15 percent for sites zoned R-55 and 10 percent for sites zoned M-U-TC. The gross site of the area is 37.35 acres, resulting in a tree canopy requirement of 3.75 acres. It is unclear at this level of review how the requirement is proposed to be met. However, the site is 90 percent wooded and is in the vicinity of residential areas that exhibit a mature tree canopy cover based on a review of 2009 aerial photos. In order to achieve the mature canopy consistent with the character of the surrounding communities, the requirement should be met through the preservation of mature woodlands, specimen trees, and other larger trees on the site. The requirement for tree canopy coverage will be evaluated further at the time of permit or site plan review, whichever is required first.

Recommended Condition: Prior to the issuance of the first permit, every effort shall be made to meet the ten percent tree canopy coverage requirement through the provision of existing mature woodland, specimen trees, other large existing trees, and landscaping.

2. **Healthy trees shall be preserved. Where they cannot be preserved on site, a professional arborist may transplant them to a new location within Riverdale Park.**

The site contains several large trees, including specimen trees, which should be considered for preservation. A review of the most recent natural resources inventory (NRI) plan shows that the site contains 29 specimen trees, of which a majority are located within Forest Stand 1 (Trees 251–257) along the western portion of the site, and Forest Stand 3 (Trees 261–271) along the northeastern portion of the site. These stands have also been determined to have the highest priority for preservation on the site. The site contains other trees that do not qualify as specimen trees, but are mature and significant in size, and should be considered for on-site preservation; smaller trees located on-site are of an appropriate size to be considered for on-site or off-site transplanting, should designated receiving areas be identified.

A condition analysis of all specimen trees and other healthy trees considered for preservation outside of the proposed woodland conservation areas should be provided at the time of preliminary plan. For any specimen trees to be cleared, a variance will be required.

Recommended Condition: At the time of preliminary plan, a condition analysis shall be submitted for all specimen trees within Stands 1 and 3 that are outside any proposed woodland conservation area. Every effort shall be made to preserve the healthiest trees on-site.

c. **Noise Mitigation**

2. **The sound from the exterior to within the interior of all residences shall not exceed 45 dBA (Ldn) and should not exceed 35dBA (Ldn). This is to be achieved through material and design changes, including, but not limited to:**
 - a. **Double-glazed windows/double-pane windows.**
 - b. **Above-normal insulation in the roof and walls.**
 - c. **Above-normal insulation in doors and other construction elements.**
 - d. **The use of high mass construction materials such as concrete, masonry, and stone.**

The subject site is located between Baltimore Avenue (US 1) and the CSX right-of-way. Baltimore Avenue (US 1) is a major collector and is not generally regulated for noise. The unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour is not shown on the plans. The submitted development proposes residential units (multifamily and attached single-family) adjacent to the right-of-way. Because the noise impacts of the CSX railroad tracks cannot be determined with the submitted information, a Phase 1 noise and vibration study should be submitted with the preliminary plan application for this site. If it is determined that there are potential noise impacts on residential or residential-type uses, and vibration impacts on any of the proposed structures, a Phase 2 noise study will be required, and the associated site plans must demonstrate how the noise and vibration impacts will be mitigated prior to issuance of the first grading permit.

Recommended Condition: At the time of preliminary plan, a Phase 1 noise and vibration study shall be submitted. The study shall determine the location of the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour for the adjacent CSX right-of-way, which includes at a minimum, the associated railroad noise and the whistle blower. The 65 dBA LDN noise contour shall be shown on all future plans.

Conformance with the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan

The *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan* indicates that the property contains a network gap area and evaluation area within the designated network.

The site is significantly wooded with no existing development and contains no regulated environmental features such as streams, wetlands, or associated buffers. The site is bordered on the east by the CSX railroad tracks; to the west by US 1; to the north by Washington Metro Area Transit Authority (WMATA) tracks; and to the south by a site developed with a post office. The WMATA site to the north is partially wooded and partially developed with an existing building and WMATA metro tracks. The potential to establish a contiguous habitat corridor connection is somewhat limited due to the existing conditions of the adjacent properties; however, the site contains areas of high-priority woodland that would significantly contribute to the urban tree canopy character of the area and provide benefits that include urban wildlife habitat, water quality improvement, and the reduction of heat island effects.

Recommended Condition: At the time of preliminary plan, the Type 1 tree conservation plan (TCP1) shall demonstrate that the woodland conservation threshold has been met on-site to the fullest extent possible. At a minimum, preservation shall be focused on the highest woodland preservation priority areas (Forest Stands 1 and 3).

Environmental Review

- a. An approved Natural Resources Inventory, NRI/121/06, was submitted with the application; however, it has recently expired. While an NRI is not a submission requirement with a zoning amendment application, a forest stand delineation (FSD) is required. The associated FSD submitted as part of the NRI also expired with the expiration of the NRI. The forest stand should be updated at the time the NRI is revised, and submitted with the application for the next phase of development for this site. Because the project is not grandfathered from the submittal requirements of Subtitle 27, the NRI must be in conformance with the current environmental regulations for an NRI.

The current NRI shows that the site contains 32.73 acres of woodland divided into six stands. Stand 1 is dominated by Willow Oak and Southern Red Oak, is located along the eastern portion of the site, and is 4.91 acres. Stand 2, dominated by Black Cherry and Sweetgum, is 9.61 acres in area, and is located in the central portion of the site. Stand 3 is predominately located along the northeastern portion of the site, is 5.51 acres in area, and is dominated by White Oak, Sweetgum, and Hickory. Stand 4 is dominated by Virginia Pine, is 1.54 acres size, and is located in the central portion of the site. Stand 5 is dominated by black locust tree, is 7.77 acres in size, and is located in the southeastern portion of the site. Stand 6 is dominated by Kentucky coffee tree, is 3.39 acres in size, and is located in the eastern portion of the site. It is possible that additional woodland may have developed on the site, warranting the need for an update to the current FSD.

The site contains 29 specimen trees and no regulated environmental features.

Recommended Condition: All future applications shall include a valid, approved NRI under the current environmental regulations that addresses the required information as outlined in the current Environmental Technical Manual.

- b. This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance because the site is greater than 40,000 square feet and contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodlands. A Type 1 tree conservation plan was submitted with the application; however, tree conservation plans are not required for approval with a zoning map amendment.

The current R-55 zoning has a 20 percent woodland conservation threshold, and the proposed M-U-TC zoning has a 15 percent woodland conservation threshold. The submitted development plan and TCP indicates that the majority of the site is proposed to be cleared and the requirement to be met with off-site woodland conservation. As previously discussed, the site is predominately wooded and contains areas of high-quality woodland that should be preserved to the extent possible. Although the NRI will need to be updated, it appears that the woodland in Stands 1 and 3 are of the highest quality and should be given the highest consideration for preservation.

A tree conservation plan will be reviewed in more detail with future development applications. Recommended conditions regarding woodland conservation and the preservation of specimen trees, in accordance with Subtitle 25, Division 2 of the Prince George's County Code, have been provided in previous sections of this memorandum.

- c. A Stormwater Management Concept Plan (11589-2010) was included with the subject application; however, in a letter from the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) dated October 31, 2011, the following statement was provided:

“The proposed plan is not consistent with the approved Concept No. 11589-2010, dated May 3, 2010. A revised concept is to be submitted.”

A concept plan should be submitted with the preliminary plan application. The plan should be designed to incorporate environmental site design techniques such as bioretention, green roofs, and infiltration.

Recommended Condition: At the time of preliminary plan, a revised stormwater management concept plan shall be submitted. The proposed plan shall show the use of environmental site design techniques such as bioretention, infiltration, and green roofs. The concept shall be correctly reflected on the TCPI.

- 22. **Special Projects Section**—The Special Projects Section has reviewed the zoning map amendment and provides the following analysis, first relating to residential development as proposed:

- a. **Police Facilities:** The subject property is located in Police District I, Hyattsville. The response time standard is ten minutes for emergency calls and 25 minutes for nonemergency calls. The times are based on a rolling average for the preceding 12 months. The application was accepted for processing by the Planning Department on October 14, 2011.

Reporting Cycle	Previous 12 Month Cycle	Emergency Calls	Nonemergency Calls
Acceptance Date 10/14/2011	10/2010-9/2011	7 minutes	6 minutes
Cycle 1			
Cycle 2			
Cycle 3			

The response time standards of ten minutes for emergency calls and the 25 minutes for nonemergency calls were met on November 8, 2011.

The police chief has reported that the Prince George’s County Police Department has adequate equipment to meet the standards stated in County Council Bill CB-56-2005. Pursuant to County Council Resolution CR-69-2006, the Prince George’s County Council and the County Executive temporarily suspended the provisions of Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(A) and (B) of the Subdivision Regulations regarding sworn police personnel staffing levels.

- b. **Fire and Rescue:** The Special Projects Section has reviewed the zoning application for adequacy of fire and rescue services in accordance with Section 24-122.01(d) and Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(C) and (E) of the Subdivision Regulations.

The proposed development is within the seven-minute required response time for the first due fire station using the *Seven Minute Travel Times and Fire Station Locations Map* provided by the Prince George’s County Fire/EMS Department.

First Due Fire/EMS Company #	Fire/EMS Station	Address
7	Riverdale	4714 Queensbury Road

Pursuant to CR-69-2006, the Prince George’s County Council and the County Executive temporarily suspended the provisions of Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(A) and (B) of the Subdivision Regulations regarding sworn fire and rescue personnel staffing levels.

The fire/EMS chief has reported that the Fire/EMS Department has adequate equipment to meet the standards stated in CB-56-2005.

- c. **Capital Improvement Program (CIP):** There are no CIP projects for public safety facilities proposed in the vicinity of the subject site. The above findings are in conformance with the 2008 *Approved Public Safety Facilities Master Plan* and the “Guidelines for the Mitigation of Adequate Public Facilities: Public Safety Infrastructure.”
- d. **Schools:** The Special Projects Section has reviewed this application for impact on school facilities in accordance with Section 24-122.02 of the Subdivision Regulations and CR-23-2003 and concluded the following:

**Impact on Affected Public School Clusters
Single-family Attached Units**

Affected School Clusters #	Elementary School Cluster 7	Middle School Cluster 4	High School Cluster 4
Dwelling Units	110	110	110
Pupil Yield Factor	0.140	0.113	0.108
Subdivision Enrollment	15	12	12
Actual Enrollment	32,508	9,899	16,049
Total Enrollment	32,523	9,911	16,061
State Rated Capacity	39,039	11,571	16,314
Percent Capacity	83%	86%	98%

Multi-family Units

Affected School Clusters #	Elementary School Cluster 7	Middle School Cluster 4	High School Cluster 4
Dwelling Units	885	885	885
Pupil Yield Factor	0.137	0.064	0.088
Subdivision Enrollment	121	57	78
Actual Enrollment	32,508	9,899	16,049
Total Enrollment	32,629	9,956	16,127
State Rated Capacity	39,039	11,571	16,314
Percent Capacity	84%	86%	99%

Source: Prince George's County Planning Department, M-NCPPC, January 2007

County Council Bill CB-31-2003 established a school facilities surcharge in the amounts of: \$7,000 per dwelling if a building is located between the Capital Beltway (I-95/495) and the District of Columbia; \$7,000 per dwelling if the building is included within a basic plan or conceptual site plan that abuts an existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WAMATA); or \$12,000 per dwelling for all other buildings. County Council Bill CB-31-2003 allows for these surcharges to be adjusted for inflation, and the current amounts are \$8,565 and \$14,682 to be paid at the time of issuance of each building permit.

The school facilities surcharge may be used for the construction of additional or expanded school facilities and renovations to existing school buildings or other systemic changes.

The following analysis relates to the commercial development:

- a. **Police Facilities:** The proposed development is within the service area of Police District I, Hyattsville. There is 267,660 square feet of space in all of the facilities used by the Prince George's County Police Department, and the July 1, 2009 (U.S. Census Bureau) county population estimate is 834,560. Using 141 square feet per 1,000 residents, it calculates to 117,672 square feet of space for police. The current amount of space, 267,660 square feet, is within the guideline.
- b. **Fire and Rescue Service:** The Special Projects Section has reviewed this application for adequacy of fire and rescue services in accordance with Section 24-122.01(d) and Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(B)-(E) of the Subdivision Regulations.

Fire/EMS Company #	Fire/EMS Station Name	Service	Address	Actual Travel Time (minutes)	Travel Time Guideline (minutes)	Within/Beyond
1	Hyattsville	Engine	6200 Belcrest Road.	1.88	3.25	Within
7	Riverdale	Ladder Truck	4712 Queensbury Road	1.08	4.25	Within
55	Bunker Hill	Ambulance	3716 Rhode Island Ave.	3.50	4.25	Within
55	Bunker Hill	Paramedic	3716 Rhode Island Ave.	3.50	7.25	Within

- c. **Water and Sewerage Findings:** Section 24-122.01(b)(1) of the Subdivision Regulations states that “the location of the property within the appropriate service area of the Ten-Year Water and Sewerage Plan is deemed sufficient evidence of the immediate or planned availability of public water and sewerage for preliminary or final plat approval.”

The 2008 *Water and Sewer Plan* placed this property in water and sewer Category 3, Community System.

23. **Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)**—In a memorandum dated October 31, 2011 from Dawit Abraham, P.E., Associate Director Office of Engineering, Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) to Susan Lareuse, the following response was provided in regard to Zoning Map Amendment A-10018 (Cafritz Property):
- a. The property is located approximately 1,400 feet north of the intersection of Baltimore Avenue (US 1) and East West Highway (MD 410), on the east side of US 1. Baltimore Avenue (US 1) is a state-maintained roadway; therefore, coordination with the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) is required.
 - b. The site lies within the Town of Riverdale Park; therefore, coordination with the Town will be required for right-of-way dedication and roadway improvements.
 - c. The proposed plan is not consistent with approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 11589-2010, dated May 3, 2010. A revised concept is to be submitted.
 - d. The development includes a possible CSX railroad vehicular crossing and a road connection to Rivertech Court. Right-of-way dedication and construction of the roadway connection will be required as determined by DPW&T.
 - e. If the vehicular railroad crossing and a road connection is made to Rivertech Court, the submitted traffic impact study will need to be revised to include analysis of the following intersections: Rivertech Court/River Road, River Road/Kenilworth Avenue (MD 201), and River Road/Paint Branch Parkway. The traffic impact study will not be reviewed by DPW&T as is, since no county-maintained roadways were analyzed in the traffic impact study.
 - f. DPW&T has no objection to the Zoning Amendment No. A-10018.

24. **Department of Environmental Resources (DER)**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, comments have not been received from DER.
25. **State Highway Administration (SHA)**— At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, comments have not been received from SHA.
26. **Maryland Department of Planning**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, comments have not been received from the Maryland Department of Planning.
27. **The Town of Riverdale Park**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, the Town of Riverdale Park has not submitted written comments regarding the amendment to the 2004 *Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan* to the Planning Board.
28. **The City of College Park**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, the City of College Park has not submitted written comments regarding the amendment to the 2004 *Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan* to the Planning Board.
29. **The Town of University Park**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, the Town of University Park has not submitted written comments regarding the amendment to the 2004 *Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan* to the Planning Board.
30. **The Town of Edmonston**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, the Town of Edmonston has not submitted written comments regarding the amendment to the 2004 *Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan* to the Planning Board.
31. **The City of Hyattsville**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, the City of Hyattsville has not submitted written comments regarding the amendment to the 2004 *Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan* to the Planning Board.
32. **The University of Maryland**—In a letter dated November 3, 2011 from Robert M. Specter, Vice President for Administrative Affairs and Chief Financial Officer, University of Maryland, to Chairman Elizabeth Hewlett in response to Zoning Map Amendment A-10018, Cafritz Property:

“As an adjacent property owner, the University of Maryland has had the opportunity to review the proposed Zoning Map Amendment (ZMA) for the Cafritz Property and finds no reason to oppose a rezoning.

“Located near multiple transit stations, the project as proposed within the ZMA application, creates the kind of walkable, mixed-use neighborhood important to the revitalization of the Route 1 corridor – a development that would also enhance the economy and provide the retail, housing and other uses the community desires.

“I would like to be clear that our review of the subject application found the request to be related only to the property in its existing condition, with no underlying requirement that might contemplate taking University property to expand the subject parcel. To the degree that the ZMA is dependent on an access road over the rail lines through/to University land to the east, as shown in supplement materials accompanying the ZMA application, we would necessarily take exception as no such agreement or understanding is in place. We understand the benefits such connectivity might bring – providing a second means of ingress/egress to the Cafritz parcel,

allowing significantly increased densities to traffic that area and creating access between the two communities. Nonetheless, the University has not yet had the opportunity to participate in discussions for alternatives, advantages/disadvantages of a bridged access or other threshold questions.”

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing evaluation and analysis, staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and recommends APPROVAL of Zoning Map Amendment No. A-10018 and APPROVAL of the amendment to the 2004 *Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan* for Cafritz Property to the District Council with the following conditions:

1. Detailed site plan review shall be required prior to final plat to further address issues regarding site design, circulation, and architecture, in accordance with the Cafritz Property at Riverdale Park Development Plan (hereafter referred to as Development Plan) and the site design guidelines of Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. Prior to signature approval of the Development Plan the following revisions shall be made:
 - a. Revise the general notes on Sheet 1 of 7 of the development plan to include the adjacent historic site and historic districts, provide the tax map, grid, and parcel number, and clearly indicate if the abandoned right-of-way is a part of the gross tract area.
 - b. Revise Sheet 3 of 7 to label the right-of-way for ingress/egress for the post office from Baltimore Avenue (US 1), and that it was conveyed to the United States of America by quit claim deed recorded in the Prince George’s County Land Records in Liber 3624, Folio 948.
 - c. Revise the development plans to delineate the boundary of Aviation Policy Analysis Zone 6 (APA-6) and the municipal boundaries of the City of College Park and the Town of Riverdale Park.
 - d. Revise the development plan design standards and guidelines to include streetscape details for Baltimore Avenue (US 1) that provide for a safe and attractive pedestrian zone.
 - e. Provide information and verify that the right-of-way extending north and south through Parcel 81 and the WMATA property has, in fact, been abandoned and that the issue is settled and/or provide information of the disposition of that area of land, as appropriate.
 - f. Add a Baltimore Avenue (US 1) street and streetscape standard to the Development Plan with a new build-to line established for the frontage of the development, not to exceed the setback proposed for the buildings shown on Map1: Concept Plan, north of Van Buren Street (approximately 250 feet).
 - g. Revise Maps 1, 2, and 3 so that the townhouses front on a street, have an ample front yard for tree plantings, and that the units be oriented so that the alley is parallel to the roadway serving the front of the units.

- h. Revise the sign standards to reflect the level of detail provided in the 2004 *Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan* and consolidated into one area of the development plan.
- i. Revise the Development Plan to add the following:
 - (1) Development that increases existing gross floor area (GFA) by 15 percent or 7,500 square feet, whichever is smaller, shall subject the site to full review for compliance with the design standards. Lesser changes to the site, and additions to single-family residential dwellings, shall not subject the entire site to review for compliance, only the portion impacted by the improvement.
 - (2) Gas stations may add a maximum of 30 feet to the build-to line in order to place a pump between the station and the sidewalk. The additional setback may not be used for customer parking, loading, or outdoor storage.
 - (3) All new gas stations shall have a maximum of two 18-foot-wide driveways.
 - (4) Gas stations should minimize the area of impermeable surface.
 - (5) Car repair businesses may have a maximum of two curb cuts that are a maximum width of ten feet each.
 - (6) Buildings shall occupy a minimum of 50 percent of the net lot area.
 - (7) The building façade shall occupy a minimum of 66 percent of the build-to line.
 - (8) Drive-through windows are inconsistent with the pedestrian orientation of the town center and are strongly discouraged. Drive-through windows may only be considered if accessed by alleys and located on the rear of the property.
 - (9) Pedestrian accessed ATMs may be located on the front or side of the building along a street line. Vehicular access should be located such that they are the least visible from the right-of-way of Baltimore Avenue (US 1).
 - (10) The maximum number of off-street parking spaces permitted for each land use type shall be equal to 80 percent of the minimum number of required off-street parking spaces in accordance with Section 27-568(a) of the Zoning Ordinance. If structured parking is provided, this maximum number may be increased.
 - (11) Car repair businesses may not store vehicles in front of or alongside the building, but may store cars inside or in the rear, with appropriate screening if adjacent to a residential use.
 - (12) Healthy trees shall be preserved within proposed green areas, landscape strips, streetscapes, and parking lots, where feasible. Where they cannot be preserved on-site, a professional arborist may transplant them to a new location on-site or within the Town of Riverdale Park.

3. Prior to acceptance of an application for a preliminary plan of subdivision, the following information shall be provided:
 - a. The preliminary plan shall reflect the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn from noise generators.
 - b. The plan shall delineate the 300-foot lot depth from the right-of-way (CSX railroad tracks) for residential development in accordance with Section 24-121(a)(4) of the Subdivision Regulations. The preliminary plan may establish additional restriction on the layout if it is determined that noise and vibration issues are associated with the railroad tracks.
 - c. The applicant shall provide information and verify that the right-of-way extending north and south through Parcel 81 has, in fact, been abandoned and/or provide information of the disposition of that area of land, as appropriate.
 - d. Consideration should be given to requiring the combining of the trolley trail and vehicular roadway along the entire length of the subject site's portion of the former Rhode Island Avenue Trolley right-of-way and extending across the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) property, connecting to the terminus of the existing trail at Albion Street and south to Tuckerman Avenue.
 - e. Consideration should be given to the trail being dedicated to public use within a maintenance easement or other suitable agreement.
 - f. Provide one east-west bicycle route through the site either along Van Buren Street or Woodbury Street, in order to accommodate east-west bicycle movement through the site, to the trolley trail, to the planned bicycle facilities along Baltimore Avenue (US 1), and across the CXS crossing (if a bridge is required).
 - g. The applicant shall provide a draft report detailing the Phase II archeology investigations.
 - h. The proposed roadbeds, streetscape dimensions, and the use of medians should be fully incorporated into the application of the preliminary plan so that the width and configuration of the streets can be reduced, yet adequate in design to address the traffic patterns within the development and emergency access. The use of public streets in accordance with the standards of the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) shall also be considered to serve certain uses and to determine future maintenance of the transportation facilities, including a possible bridge over the CSX railroad.
 - i. Consideration should be given to establishing a parking district to promote shared parking within the Town of Riverdale Park town center.
 - j. Consideration should be given to residential uses above commercial uses in order to create a vertical mix of uses.
4. When off-site parking is necessary to meet parking requirements, the applicant shall provide satisfactory documentation such as affidavits, leases, or other agreements to show that off-site parking is available permanently.

5. The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) shall review the preliminary plan of subdivision and any subsequent plans of development for their impact on identified archeological features, the impact of a potential vehicular access road on the Engineering Research Corporation (ERCO) Historic Site (#68-022), and the impact of proposed buildings visible from the ERCO historic site and the adjacent National Register historic districts.
6. Prior to approval of a building permit, the following shall be provided:
 - a. The plans shall indicate that signalized intersection(s) at Baltimore Avenue (US 1) shall include highly-visible and attractive pedestrian crosswalks, pedestrian signals, and other pedestrian or warning signage as appropriate, subject to State Highway Administration (SHA) approval.
 - b. The plans shall indicate that crosswalks providing appropriate pedestrian safety features are provided throughout the site.
 - c. The plans shall indicate that the number and location of bicycle parking is provided throughout the site in accordance with Design Standard 4 of the 2004 *Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan* (p. 60).
7. Prior to approval of a detailed site plan, the plans shall minimize the amount and location of surface parking lots and parking structures and their impacts on the pedestrian zone and streetscape environment.
8. Prior to any ground disturbance or the approval of any grading permits, if Phase III archeological mitigation is proposed, the applicant shall provide a final report detailing the Phase II and Phase III investigations and ensure that all artifacts are curated in a proper manner.
9. Prior to final plat, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a plan for any interpretive signage to be erected and public outreach measures (based on the findings of the Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III archeological investigations). The location and wording of the signage and the public outreach measures shall be subject to approval by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) staff archeologist.
10. The Environmental Planning Section recommends the following conditions:
 - a. All future applications shall include a valid approved natural resources inventory under the current environmental regulations that addresses the required information as outlined in the current Environmental Technical Manual.
 - b. At the time of preliminary plan, the Type 1 tree conservation plan shall demonstrate that the woodland conservation threshold has been met on-site to the fullest extent possible. At a minimum, preservation shall be focused on the highest priority areas (Forest Stands 1 and 3).
 - c. At the time of preliminary plan, a condition analysis shall be submitted for all specimen trees within Stands 1 and 3 that are outside any proposed woodland conservation area. Every effort shall be made to preserve the healthiest trees on-site.

- d. Prior to approval of a special permit, special exception, detailed site plan, or grading permit, whichever is first, every effort shall be made to meet the ten percent tree canopy coverage requirement through the provision of existing mature woodland, specimen trees and other large existing trees, and landscaping.
- e. At the time of preliminary plan, a Phase 1 noise and vibration study shall be submitted. The study shall determine the location of the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour for the adjacent CSX right-of-way, which includes at a minimum, the associated railroad noise and the whistle blower. The 65 dBA Ldn noise contour shall be shown on all future plans.
- f. At the time of preliminary plan, a revised stormwater management concept plan shall be submitted. The proposed plan shall show the use of environmental site design techniques such as bioretention, infiltration, and green roofs. The concept shall be correctly reflected on the Type 1 tree conservation plan.
- g. At the time of site plan or permit review, whichever is required first, the lighting plan for the subject property shall demonstrate the use of full cut-off optics to ensure that light intrusion into residential and woodland conservation areas is minimized. Details of all lighting fixtures, along with details and specifications that the proposed fixtures are full cut-off optics, and a photometric plan showing proposed light levels at an intensity that minimizes light pollution shall be submitted for review.