



Loiederman
Soltesz Associates, Inc.

December 6, 2012

Ms. Quynn Nguyen
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772



Re: Cafritz Property 4-12004
LSA No.: 2411-01-00

Dear Quynn:

We have reviewed the comments from staff regarding our submission on November 29, 2012 for the Cafritz property 4-12004. Our responses to those comments are noted below and were applicable we have provided additional supporting information.

a. Comments from Paul Sun, December 5, 2012.

Comment: "I received the revised drawings yesterday after your requested meeting began. I have done a cursory review of the plans and they do not address any of the mandatory Dedication of parkland requirements as noted during the SDRC and subsequent follow-up meetings. The minimum requirement is dedication on 3.91 acres of land). Should the applicant choose an alternative to mandatory dedication of parkland, we need to review the complete package describing and showing what the applicant has proposed. The allowable alternatives to dedication are private facilities or fee in lieu or a combination of allowable items.

Response: We have attached a memo outlining our proposal to address the parkland dedication requirement for the project.

Comment: With respect to the Trolley Trail which will be main feature of the project (and throughout Hyattsville and beyond), it should be a straight connection through the site, not turned and re-routed through their development. Unfortunately, based on the applicant's current site design, it will mean the trail is along of the back of the townhouse units along the southern boundary of the property.

Response: It is our intent to provide adequate recreational facilities for each of the multifamily residential buildings to satisfy the requirement for those buildings and construct the trolley trail through the site as a private recreational facility available for public use.

P:\24110100\DOCS\CORRES\Nguyen_120612thd.doc

b. Comments from Fred Schaffer, December 5, 2012.

Comment: When we last met with the applicant, we requested that the Trolley Trail be relocated to its original location along the old r-o-w. This was requested because staff wants to make the trail a real community and regional amenity that will complement the trail that the Department and Parks and Recreation is constructing elsewhere in the corridor. Also, as a commuter trail and an important regional connection, staff feels that the trail will be better served in its own r-o-w, not along the road in front of dwelling units. The design of the trail corridor can address concerns such as lighting, visibility, and "eyes on the street" at the time of DSP. A wide sidewalk can still be provided along the "new" Rhode Island Avenue, but the master plan, commuter trail shall be shown along the former trolley r-o-w.

Response: The trail is proposed to be as it was shown on the consensus plans, agreed to in late 2011 with the property owner and the surrounding municipalities. Our current plan shows the trial running along, the primary north south roadway east of the original trial location.

Comment: The ownership of the trail corridor should be clearly marked and labeled on the plans.

Response: The trail is currently proposed on the Preliminary plan to be a private facility.

Comment: The road cross sections need to be revised to reflect public roads consistent with the "Conceptual Public/Private Road Exhibit". The cross sections should clearly show the limits of the public r-o-w. The revised plans show only private roads on-site, which is not consistent with the basic plan approval.

Response: The road sections as shown reflect the street as private streets. The sections and the plan are coordinated in this manner.

c. Environmental Planning, Megan Riser December 5, 2012

Comment: On November 30, 2012, EPS received a referral package containing a TCPI, a Preliminary Plan, CSX road crossing exhibit, lot depth variance request, and noise study, variance request for removal of specimen trees and justification statement for proposed impacts to regulated environmental features. Specimen tree condition rating score summary sheets (A condition rating score has been added to the specimen tree table on the TCPI; however, the condition rating score summary sheets that are used to determine this score need to be submitted).

Response: We have included with this letter the rating summary sheets for the specimen trees.

Comment: Written evaluation of specimen trees to be preserved

Response: We have included the specimen tree rating computations which include a written evaluation of the specimen trees, as requested.

Comment: Tree Canopy information

Response: We are including the tree canopy coverage schedule 25-128; this will provide some idea on the potential tree canopy that could be anticipated as the design progresses.

Comment: Revised noise report (The noise report previously reviewed was dated February 24, 2012. The noise report submitted with the current referral is dated February 23, 2012 with no other indication of a revision date).

Response: The noise report provided and dated February 2012 was the update of the original report prepared for the site in 2007.

Comment: Vibration analysis report (No separate vibration report has been received, and it appears that the noise report was not revised to include this information).

Response: The September 21, 2012 letter submitted was prepared by Phoenix to specifically state that there was no change in vibration levels and no need of mitigation. When the update was prepared in February 2012, they omitted this information simply because there was no change in their initial findings. The letter was prepared at our request to state these results.

Comment: Revised Stormwater Concept.

Response: We submitted a copy of the previously approved SWM concept as well as the concept as revised to include ESD; we have included an additional copy of the SWM for Megan.

Comment: Statement of Justification for proposed impacts to regulated environmental features (The soj appears to have been revised, but is not in the standard format as provided to the applicant at SDRC. 8 ½ x 11 exhibits should be included with a SOJ. The standard format can be found here: <http://www.pgplanning.org/Assets/Planning/Environment/Sample+Statement+of+Justification+for+Impacts+to+regulated+Environmental+Features.pdf>.)

Response: The Statement of justification has been formatted per the link provided and attached with our resubmission as requested by Megan.

Additionally we have included a Concept Phasing Grading and timeline exhibit. If you have any further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Sincerely,

LOIEDERMAN SOLTESZ ASSOCIATES, INC



Timothy H. Davis, RLA, AICP, LEED BD+C
Associate