

MEMORANDUM:

To: Mayor and Town Council, Town of Riverdale Park
Sara Imhulse, Town Administrator

From: Paul Mortensen, RA, LEED-AP
Riverdale Park Planning Consultant for the Cafritz Property Development

Date: October 31, 2011

Re: Review of the proposed Cafritz Property Design Standards Guidelines within the
M-U-TC Rezoning Proposal

Project Name:	Cafritz Property
Property Owner:	Calvert Tract, LLC
Location:	Frontage on U.S. Route 1, north of MD 410
Area:	37.34 Acres
Critical Area:	N/A
Current Zoning:	Residential R-55
Current Use:	Primarily Forested Land
Proposed Zoning:	Mixed-Use Town Center (M-U-TC)
Proposed Use:	Mixed Commercial, Hospitality, Mixed Residential

THE PROPERTY

The Cafritz Property is a 37.34 acre vacant and primarily second growth wooded site located just north of the U.S. Post Office distribution facility along U.S. Route 1. It is bordered on the west by U.S. Route 1, on the north by two vacant and wooded parcels owned by the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority (WMATA), on the east by CSX Railroad tracks, and on the south by industrial development and the regional Post Office facility. The abandoned trolley right of way traverses the site north to south. The Property is within the municipal limits of Riverdale Park with a small triangular portion of the northeast corner within the town limits of College Park. The site also abuts the eastern portion of the existing M-U-TC Zone at the southeastern corner of the site. Additionally, to the west of the site, across US 1 is the community of University Park. To the north of the site and north of the WMATA site is the community of College Park, and to the east of the CSX Railroad tracks and to the south of the site is Riverdale Park.

THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST

The applicant, Calvert Tract, LLC, through a rezoning application, seeks to amend the boundaries of the Mixed-Use Town Center Zone of the approved Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan to include their property, which they are seeking to rezone from an R-55 Zone to the M-U-TC Zone, as well as amend the Development Plan per the requirements set forth in 27-198.05(d)(1)(A) and (B) of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance.

The applicant prepared a Concept Development Plan (CSP) which shows generally how the site will be developed and used if the zoning is changed. It also shows in some detail, the layout of the streets, open spaces, buildings and parking of the blocks west of their proposed 47th Street and east of US 1, which contains the land approximately 900 feet east of the US 1 right of way. This portion of the site includes the proposed Whole Foods Market and surface parking, as well as 4 retail/commercial/office buildings with surface parking. The CSP was submitted to the County Planning Department on Friday October 14, 2011 and was accepted for review which initiates a 60 day period for the County Planning Board to have a hearing on the development. The hearing has been tentatively set for December 15, 2011. Prior to this meeting, the Town of Riverdale Park shall submit written documentation of the Town's action or recommendation to the Planning Director of the Prince George's County Planning Department.

Once the Planning Board completes their hearing, they have 3 weeks to submit the Application and CDP to the District Council at the earliest on January 5, 2012. The District Council will then hold hearings on the Application and CDP between February 9 and March 8, 2012. If consensus has been reached by the Planning Board and impacted jurisdictions, a simple majority vote by the District Council passes the application and CDP. If consensus has not been reached, then a 2/3 majority vote is required by the District Council to pass the zoning change.

The CSP would lock in important parts of the development on the Property, including the arrangement of streets, open space, development sites, general land uses, and access points. It also locks in the location of the western most uses on the site including the Whole Foods Market. If the District Council approves the CSP and the rezoning, the applicant will then have to prepare a Detailed Site Plan in order to obtain required building permits. At that stage, the M-U-TC Committee review process would begin and the Town and Committee would be able to weigh in on matters of detail.

It is important to note that within existing zoning, the Town, not the M-U-TC Committee, has weight with the Planning Board regarding the rezone and revised Development Plan. The M-U-TC Committee will only have power once the new M-U-TC zoned area and Development Plan have been accepted.

CURRENT ZONING AND PLANNING

Currently the site is zoned R-55 (One-Family Detached Residential). The purpose of the R-55 zone is to provide for variation in the size and shape of single-family residential lots so as to better use the natural terrain and encourage the preservation of trees and open spaces. Some other residential types are permitted in R-55 provided certain conditions are met but the intended purpose of the zone is to promote single-family development.

DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Calvert Tract, LLC is proposing a mixed-use, “smart growth” neighborhood which will act as an extension to the existing Town Center neighborhood. This development will promote pedestrian circulation and take advantage of the Property’s proximity to three existing and proposed mass transit stations; College Park-University of Maryland Metro Station, the proposed Purple Line Metro Station, and the Riverdale MARC Station. The development of 37.34 acres is approximately the size of a “neighborhood” as first defined in the 1929 New York City Regional Plan, and as later adopted by The Congress for the New Urbanism. A neighborhood consists of an area within a circle having a quarter of a mile radius. One quarter mile takes the average person five minutes to walk at a normal pace; meaning that from the center of a neighborhood to its edge should take approximately five minutes to walk.

Within the development is proposed a grid of streets centered on Van Buren Street, which is a tree lined boulevard that runs west to east entering off of US 1 then running to the eastern end of the site. This street is the primary spine through the development and has the major retail uses and hotel facing directly onto it. The central plaza of this boulevard between 45th and 46th Streets, together with small plazas in front of both the Whole Foods Market and Fitness Center, is proposed as the primary activity space of the retail portion of the development.

Parallel to Van Buren and near the southern and northern edges of the site, are the secondary access streets of Woodbury Street and Underwood Street. These streets help to dissipate access and traffic onto and off of the site to US 1. Bisecting Van Buren Street in a north to south direction is 45th Street, which is approximately 350 feet from the eastern edge of US 1. South of Van Buren, 45th Street is fronted by Whole Foods to the east, and a surface parking lot to the west. North of Van Buren Street, 45th Street becomes a more pedestrian oriented street and is framed by buildings with retail and office uses on both sides. 250 feet east of 45th Street is 46th Street, which connects to additional surface parking behind the Whole Foods Market, and hotel to the south of Van Buren Street, and to a more retail oriented environment to the north. This street also provides the primary entrance to a large retail and residential lined parking garage north of Van Buren. Approximately 300 feet east of 46th Street is 47th Street which runs one block from Van Buren to Woodbury Street to the north. This will be a fairly narrow residential street with higher density 4 to 6 story buildings on either side. Approximately 280 feet east of 47th Street is the proposed 48th Street which runs from the northern edge of the site to the southern edge. Higher density residential buildings and townhouses face onto

48th Street. 48th also connects to the existing Maryland Avenue, which feeds into the Riverdale Park Central Square, and to an overpass street that traverses the CSX tracks and links to the office developments and residential areas to the east of the tracks.

There are five distinct landscape and park amenities for civic and passive recreation and stormwater management. These include the sculpture park buffer areas along US 1, the median plaza areas adjacent to the retail within Van Buren Street, the abandoned trolley line right of way, a small approximately ½ acre residential green park at the southern corner of Van Buren and 48th Streets, and the storm water management areas along the CSX tracks.

The applicant is proposing a mix of uses throughout the site with commercial uses being centered towards the western half of the site near US 1, and residential uses being focused more towards the eastern half of the site. A total of approximately 190,000 square feet of commercial uses are proposed which consist of the Whole Foods Market, a Fitness Center, smaller retail uses, a hotel and office space. Residential uses include 4 to 6 story multi-family flats buildings and smaller scale townhouses.

Preliminary Development Program

Uses	Units
Office	22,000 sf
Retail	168,200 sf
Hotel	120 rooms
Multi-Family Residential	632 units
Multi-Family Senior Residential	224 units
Scholars Residential	30 units
Townhouses	109 units
995 units (26.6 units/acre)*	

*Taken together, this density is a similar density to a neighborhood comprised of wood frame, 2 to 3 story courtyard apartment units, low density apartment buildings over retail, or compact 2 and 3 story townhouses similar to the Eakin Youngentob developments south of Route 410 along US 1.

CAFTRITZ PROPERTY DESIGN STANDARD GUIDELINES, FALL2011 REVIEW

This memorandum is the first of two presentations regarding the rezoning proposal put forward on Cafritz Property. This presentation deals with the Design Standards

Guidelines. The second presentation will be next week on Wednesday November 9 to discuss the proposed Concept Plan design.

Although the proposed Cafritz Property Design Standard Guidelines, Fall 2011 (Proposed Plan) does put forward that the development plan embraces the spirit of the design guidelines prepared for the Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan (Plan), and that it will meet or exceed the guidelines in most conditions, it has omitted certain elements of the Plan and modified others to “assure the successful development of the Cafritz Property into a vibrant asset to the Town of Riverdale Park.” In general, most Standards relating to existing conditions of the Town Center, and gas and car repair stations have been removed in the Proposed Plan, which we agree with. Specifically, the Proposed Plan has omitted or modified the following:

Development and Design Concept (pg. 16-27)

All writing explanations and definitions of this section including the Introduction, Development Concept and Land Use, Public Spaces, Building Design, US 1 Street and Streetscape, and Overall Design Principles on pages 16 through 27 have been removed from the Proposed Plan. Map 3: Riverdale Park Town Center Concept, and Map 4: US 1 Concept have been replaced with a proposed Map 1: Concept Plan, Map 2: MUTC Concept Plan, and a Map 3: Street Configurations plan and sections. The Table 1: Building Recommendations for the M-U-TC zoned area has been replaced with a new Table 1: Building Recommendations for the Cafritz site only, and a Table 2: Public Space Recommendations.

Recommendation: Although the Proposed Plan “embraces the spirit of the design guidelines,” and the Statement of Justification letter refers to some of the overarching goals set forth in the original Plan, it would be worthwhile to include elements of the Development and Design Concepts section that are pertinent to the overall development of this site and its relationship to the Riverdale Park Town Center in the Proposed Plan.

Table 1: Building Recommendations

Recommend that all blocks labeled with residential in Uses or Attributes, be identified as “residential” only and remove references to multifamily, or townhouses. There should be flexibility to allow for a diverse mix of uses and housing types throughout the site.

Block 6e: Suggests that the parking lot creates a “defined edge”. This is not clear.

Design Standards, Goal, Applicability, How to Use (pg. 28-29)

- The introduction to the Design Standards section featuring the primary Goal, Applicability, and How to Use sections have been omitted.

Recommendation: Same comment as above.

Design Standards, Build-to-Line (pg. 32-33)

- A proposed range of roadbed widths, lane dimensions, distance from centerline to buildings, and streetscape dimensions for the new development have been given for each of the streets proposed in the Proposed Plan.
- Standard 1: reference to US 1 has been removed.
- Standard 3: This item, referring to passages within enclosed blocks has been removed.
- Standard 7: This piece referring to gas stations has been removed.

Recommendation: We will comment on design dimensions and configurations next week on November 9. However, generally, it is suggested that street lane and parking dimensions be designed as narrow as possible to slow down traffic and make streets as safe as possible for motorists and pedestrians.

For the Cafritz site, removal of the abutting sidewalls Standard #3 should not affect this site as long as percentage of street frontage facades are maintained.

Design Standards, Building Placement and Streetscape (pg. 34)

- Standard 1: "...occupy a minimum of 50 percent of the net lot area." Has been removed and replaced with, "*occupy the net lot areas in ratios consistent with the development plan.*"
- Standard 2: "...occupy a minimum of 66 percent of the build-to-line, except in the historic core." Has been removed and replaced with, "*...occupy the built to lines in ratios consistent with the development plan.*"
- Standard 3: the words "*Where possible...*" have been added to the beginning of the item regarding building facades occupying 100 percent of frontage width.
- Standard 5: This standard referring to gas stations has been removed.

Recommendation: For the Intent, change to, "Enhance the town center's sense of place by developing a coherent identity through buildings that relate to the streets and open spaces. Create a street wall facades that encloses frame the street and open spaces, and encourages close proximity of retail, offices, residential units, and services."

Standards 1, 2 and 3 have all been made weaker by these changes in order to add flexibility. The Council should decide if this is acceptable.

Design Standards, Fencing, Screening, and Buffering (pg. 35-36)

- Standard 1: Referring to Commercial uses on transitional properties in the historic core, with sub-items a-c, has been removed.

Recommendations: This Standard #1 for the Historic Core of Riverdale Park does not affect this project so can be removed.

We suggest adding words to Standard #3 to read, “Dumpsters, HVAC units, and utility mechanical equipment shall be completely screened so as not to be visible from sidewalks, open spaces and the MARC tracks.”

Design Standards, Access and Circulation (pg. 37)

- Standard 1: The words, “...and shall be created in accordance with the Riverdale Park town center concept (see Map 3).” Referring to alleys, has been removed.
- Standard 2: Regarding alleys in the historic core, has been removed.
- Standards 3, 4 and 5: Referring to gas stations and auto repair has been removed.
- Standard 6: This item referring to drive-through windows has been changed from “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.” To “Drive-through windows *should be accessed by alleys and located on the rear of property.*”
- Standard 8: Regarding ATM machines. The words “...but may not have vehicular access.” Has been replaced with, “*Vehicular access should be accessed by alleys and located on the rear of the property.*”

Recommendations: These revised Standards still support alleys within the development and meet the intent of this section.

Design Standards, Services, Utilities, and Stormwater Management (pg. 38)

- Standard 5: This item which promotes the use of “micromanagement stormwater treatment systems” and an integral low impact design process for dealing with stormwater, has been removed.

Recommendation: We suggest this Standard #5 be reinserted as Standard #7.

We also suggest that the following be inserted as Standard #5, “Green, Low Impact Design stormwater systems should be incorporated into the overall stormwater design for the site and should use public spaces, streets, and parks to receive and absorb runoff. These systems should address all scales of the community from site to watershed.”

We also suggest a Standard #6 be inserted that reads as follows, “Deal with stormwater on three levels: (1) lot-level Best Management Practices (BMP’s) that may include green roofs, dispersion trenches, rain gardens, cisterns, rain barrels, and pervious pavements; (2) block-level BMP’s which could include swales, pervious paving and large cisterns; and (3) community-level stormwater ponds and parks. All levels should support good urbanism.”

Design Standards, Parking and Loading Provisions (pg. 39)

Nonresidential Development

- Standard 1: This Standard has been changed from, “The maximum number of off-street surface 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, the maximum number may be increased.” To “*Maximum retail parking shall be 1 space for every 200 square feet of Gross Leasable Space (GLS).*”
- Standard 3: Referring to off-site shared parking, the word “should” has been replaced with “can”, as in “Off-site shared parking can be used...”
- Standard 5: This Standard promotes the creation of a Parking District to create parking structures and to allow developers to be allowed to minimize the amount of parking to be constructed if they pay into a fee-in-lieu of assessment to the District. This Standard has been omitted in the Proposed Plan.
- Standard 7: This Standard referring to documenting off-site parking, if required, has been removed.
- Standard 8: This Standard which states that loading facilities should not interrupt the flow of traffic, has been removed.

Recommendations: In order to promote transit use and encourage greater mixed-use development, the goal of setting maximum parking space requirements is encouraged. We would recommend that Standard 1 be added back into the plan, or a mixed-use parking count Excel program such as the one created by ULI, be incorporated into developing maximum parking space requirements. We believe the changes to the Standards suggested in the Proposed Plan, would weaken this parking goal.

We also believe Standard 8 regarding loading, should be reinstated into the Proposed Plan.

Design Standards, Parking and Loading Design (pg. 40-41)

- Intent: The words, “...Especially US1.” Have been removed from the Intent.
- Standard 4: This Standard regarding the retention or relocation of existing trees within parking lots has been removed.
- Standard 8: This Standard for car repair businesses has been removed.

- The Proposed Plan has added Standard 17 which reads, “*Parking stalls shall be 8’ x 18’-6” dimension.*”

Recommendations: Because a majority of this site will be graded, the moving of trees will likely not be feasible. The remaining changes to the standards seem reasonable.

We would suggest that a reference to all structured parking being “...safe and well lit,” be added to Standard #10.

We would also suggest that Standard 12 be changed into 2 new Standards. (1) “The ground level of structured parking facing streets should feature active uses such as retail, office or residential.” And (2) “All structured parking facing primary streets should have a liner of office or residential uses at all floor levels.”

Design Standards, Signage (pg. 42)

- Standard 5: “Awning, umbrella and façade color schemes should be chosen so as not to clash with nearby commercial establishments or detract from the town center’s historic character.” Has been removed.

Recommendations: Changes to this section should be accepted.

Design Standards, Lighting (pg. 43)

- Standard 2: Referring to shielded pedestrian-oriented lighting at alleys, parking, dumpsters and service entrances, the approved height of 14 feet above ground level, has been changed to, “...30 feet above ground level.”

Recommendations: We believe that all exterior lighting relating to the pedestrian at sidewalks, and paths should be designed to a lower level such as 14 feet. However, lighting oriented to the car can be allowed to be at a height not greater than 30 feet in alleys and in the backs of buildings at service areas.

Add a Standard to read, “Pedestrian lighting at sidewalks along streets, and at pathways should use light poles not greater than 14 feet above ground level.”

Council may want to add a Standard that regulates the type of fixtures such as, “All light fixtures at streets, parking lots, parks, sidewalks and paths should be historical in character or designed to “fit” in the overall design of the community. Cobra type fixtures should be avoided.”

Design Standards, Landscaping (pg. 44)

- Standard 2: The words, "...within proposed green areas." Have been added to the sentence, "Healthy trees shall be preserved."

Recommendation: This change allows the developer to essentially remove all existing trees on site although possibly saving some trees along US 1 and the CSX tracks. If the site must be graded to make the development work, saving trees is highly unlikely.

At the end of the Intent, add "..., and provides natural habitat."

Design Standards, Building Heights (pg. 45-46)

- Standard 1: Because the Proposed Plan is an additional area to be included within the M-U-TC zone, it proposes building heights and locations that are specific to its site. However, the building heights that are proposed in the Proposed Plan do not differ in any significant way from what is allowed in the Town Center.
- Standard 2(c): Reference to buildings located in the historic core, has been removed.
- Standard 4: This standard, "Building heights should not vary more than 15 percent from the average height of abutting/attached buildings." Has been removed.

Recommendations: Changes to this section should be accepted.

Design Standards, Architecture (pg. 47-50)

- Intent: Reference to renovating and restoring historic buildings has been removed.
- Standard 1: This Standard has been slightly modified in the Proposed Plan. In the sentence, "Buildings without a tripartite design may only be permitted outside the historic core if..." the words only and outside the historic core have been removed. Likewise, the reference to "Riverdale Park's M-U-TC development plan", has been changed to, "*Cafritz Property Development Plan*".
- Standard 2: This standard which reads, "Buildings shall maintain horizontal divisions between the street level and upper floors through the use of design features such as aligned windows, awnings, brick banding, and cornices." Has been removed.
- Standard 4: This standard regarding the articulation of buildings that are more than 60 feet in width along a street frontage, and the methods for articulating buildings, has been removed.
- Standard 6: This standard which speaks to compatibility of new facades with existing structures has been removed.
- Standard 7: which refers to a prohibiting synthetic modern siding unless approved, has been removed.

- Standard 8: which refers to altering the historic character of existing buildings has been removed.
- Standard 9: This standard supports incorporating characteristics of larger single family homes into the design of multi-family housing developments, and it expresses ways of implementing this standard. This standard has been removed.
- Standard 12: The word “residences” has been replaced with “*townhouses*” in talking about the use of porches.
- Standard 14: which refers to detailing of buildings to be compatible with historic designs and conditions has been removed.
- Standard 16: which stipulates types of amenities such as washers and dryers, to be included in multi-family residential units has been removed.

Recommendations: We suggest that Standard 2, 4, and 12 be reinstated as originally written.

We believe Standard 7 should be reinstated and left to the M-U-TC Committee for permit review.

Standard 9 is a wonderful design tool that can be used on some types of multi-family housing buildings. Although it is unlikely for larger multi-family housing of over 8 to 10 units, the Council should keep this standard for smaller multi-family developments.

The remaining changes should be accepted.

Design Standards, Additional Design Standards for Transitional Properties in the Historic Core (pg. 51-52)

This entire section of the Standards has been removed.

Recommendations: Changes to this section should be accepted.

Design Standards, Noise Mitigation (pg. 53)

No changes to this section.

Design Standards, Building Openings (pg. 54-55)

- Standard 1: The last sentence, “In the historic core, this minimum shall be 70 percent.” Has been removed.
- Standard 3: Standard regarding the vertical orientation of windows has been removed.

- Standard 4: which does not allow the use of tinted, mirrored or reflective windows has been removed.
- Standard 9: This standard addresses corner locations and the words “or renovated” have been removed.
- Standard 10: In the standard “Walls facing public streets or to the rear shall have windows that occupy at least 40 percent of the wall area.” The words “...or to the rear...” have been removed.
- Standard 11: This standard talks about the amount of glass on all walls that are not the front façade. It removes the words “...mid-block walk-through sidewalk,...”

Recommendations: We suggest Standard 3 and 4 be reinstated, although Standard 4 can include tinted glass “...up to 10 percent opacity.”

Add the following Standard: “All residential units facing a street or public open space must provide windows from primary interior spaces to face the public realm of the street or park. Where single-family homes or townhouses face a street or public space, entrances to the unit should enter onto the street or space. Entrances to ground floor units in multi-family buildings are encouraged to enter off of the street or open space.”

All other changes should be accepted.

Design Standards, Signage (pg. 56-57)

- The intent has been changed from, “To encourage a positive and attractive identity for businesses and the town center, make the street more interesting for pedestrians, and allow creative commercial expression and visual variety.” To the following, “*Design user-friendly buildings through attention to the shape, position, and detailing of entrances, windows, and storefronts. These elements should clearly indicate the character (use) and entrance of the building. Improve the safety of pedestrians and parked vehicles through a strong visual connection from inside to the outside of the buildings through ample windows that overlook streets, alleys and parking lots.*”
- Standards: All standards (2-19) except standard 1 have been deleted from the Proposed Plan and replaced with a new standard 2 which reads, “*Commercial Signs shall generally conform to park 12: Signs in the zoning ordinance and will be approved by the design review committee at the time of building design review.*”

Recommendations: The modified Intent does not seem to address signage. Although the added sentences make sense, we would suggest keeping the original words as well.

The new Standards in the Proposed Plan suggest that all matters relating to signage, be reviewed by the M-U-TC Committee at the time of Building Review. Council should determine if this is reasonable.

Design Standards, Streetscape (pg. 58-61)

- Standard 2: Reference to the streetscape map has been changed to coordinate with the Proposed Plan. The words, “Map 4: US 1 Concept and Table 2: Public Space Recommendations.” Have been replaced with, “*Map 3: Streetscape Configurations and Table 3: Proposed Roadbed and Streetscape Dimensions.*”

Also, the last sentence has been removed which read, “Where expansion of the US 1 roadbed is recommended, the area between the existing face-of-curb and the future face-of-curb shall be treated as an extension of the landscaping/pedestrian amenity strip.”

Recommendations: Changes to this section should be accepted.

Sidewalks

- Standard 1: The words in italics and underlined have been added to this standard. “The sidewalk shall be constructed between the landscaping/pedestrian amenity strip and the build-to line. A seven-foot pedestrian zone on primary streets shall be preserved unobstructed in commercial configurations and a five-foot pedestrian zoned shall be preserved unobstructed in residential configurations and on secondary commercial streets. (See *Map 3: Street Configurations for configuration locations.*) The remainder of the sidewalk may contain street furniture.
- Standard 2: “*See Map 3: Street Configurations for configuration locations.*” has been added to this standard for clarification.

Recommendations: Changes to this section should be accepted.

Landscape and Pedestrian Amenity Zone

- Standard 1: The Proposed Plan has replaced, “All other streets...” with “*Other streets in commercial configurations...*” in discussing the amenity zones. Also, the clarification of “(See *Map 3: Street Configurations for configuration locations.*) has been added to Standard 1.
- Standard 3: In this standard, the Proposed Plan has added the words, “All items, in the commercial configuration including landscaping...” to the wording on the 1’-6” offset from curb to landscape amenities.
- Standard 4: The Proposed Plan has added the sentence *Multiple bike racks may be provided for groups of businesses.*” To the end of this standard.
- Standard 5: In this standard which discusses low-impact design at landscaping and tree boxes, the words, “It should be considered that all landscaping and tree boxes shall have a low-impact stormwater system...” have been added to this standard.

- Standard 6: In this standard regarding pedestrian amenity strips, the street names “Queensbury Road, East West Highway and the Rhode Island Avenue...” have been removed from the standard. This standard now only refers to US 1.
- Standard 7: This standard proposes street box dimensions and the word “*considered*” replaces the word “provided” in the following sentence. “A raised pedestrian and bicycle barrier of 3-12 inches should be considered around the perimeter of the tree box and...”
- Standard 10: The standard “Removable grates are discouraged except in the historic core.” Has been removed.

Recommendations: If the promotion of Low Impact Design is required in this development, then the wording on Standard 5 should be reinstated.

In Standard 12, add the word “Indigenous...” to the beginning of the Standard.

All other suggested changes seem reasonable.

Design Standards, Parks and Plazas (pg. 62-63)

- Standard 4: This standard which identifies and amounts of bench seating that should be provided has been altered. “...excluding landscaped town center gateway features at heavily traveled intersections (marked as such on Map 3). See the Seating Section for design standards.” Has been removed from the standard.

Recommendations: Changes to this section should be accepted.

In the Intent, add reference to the creation of habitat. Likewise, add a Standard that reads, “Where possible, add continuous lines of habitat through the use and linkages of street trees, landscaping, parks and yards.”

Design Standards, Seating (pg. 64)

No changes to this section.

Design Review Process

The Proposed Plan refers to the existing M-U-TC Plan pages 65-66 and does not propose any changes.

Inventory and Table of Uses

The Proposed Plan refers to the existing M-U-TC Plan pages 67-77 and does not propose any changes.

CONCLUSION

This memorandum identifies the changes that have been made to the existing Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan and Design Standards Guidelines, in the new Cafritz Property Plan for your review. Although it is clear that most of the changes to the Plan were generated to add flexibility to the development process and to Cafritz's designs, some should be reconsidered as recommended if the Council feels certain M-U-TC goals are being compromised. We look forward to working with you through this process.