

**AGENDA ITEMS: 21 & 22**

**AGENDA DATE: 5/30/13**


**Cafritz Property  
DSP-13009 and SP-130002  
Additional Back-Up 5-29-13**

May 29, 2013

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Prince George's County Planning Board

**VIA:** Steve Adams, Supervisor, Urban Design Section, Development Review Division

**FROM:** Susan Lareuse, Master Planner, Urban Design Section, Development Review Division  
Jill Kosack, Senior Planner, Urban Design Section, Development Review Division 

**SUBJECT:** **Detailed Site Plan DSP-13009**  
**Special Permit SP-130002**  
**Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCP2-010-13**  
**Cafritz Property at Riverdale Park**

**Staff Proposed Additional Conditions**

Based on the hearing for Detailed Site Plan DSP-13009 and Special Permit SP-130002 on May 23, 2013, staff has prepared the following additional conditions for consideration by the Planning Board:

8. Prior to approval of a use and occupancy permit for Parcel C, the applicant shall install the on-site commemorative/interpretive features for the ice house and complete other agreed-upon outreach and education measures.
9. Prior to approval of a detailed site plan or special permit for Parcels K, L, or M, the applicant shall provide evidence of good faith efforts to work with the Town of Riverdale Park to obtain a "Quiet Zone" in regard to the CSX noise impacts on the town center.
10. At the time of approval of final plats for the townhouse lots, the diversity in the width of the lots shall be maintained as shown on the approved detailed site plan/special permit.
11. Prior to issuance of the third building permit, public art shall be incorporated into the greenway entrance feature along Baltimore Avenue (US 1), subject to review by the Town of Riverdale Park and the Urban Design Section (M-NCPPC) as designee of the Planning Board.

12. Prior to approval of permits for construction of the bridge, the applicant shall submit the following to the Urban Design Section (M-NCPPC) and the Prince George's County Police Department for review for aesthetic and functional impacts, and for crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) measures as follows:
  - a. The elevations of the bridge design with sufficient detailing to address the materials and design of retaining/abutment walls and or posts. All surfaces should be designed to limit graffiti.
  - b. The plans shall be reviewed and comments provided in regard to proposed enclosures of space under the bridge, such as fencing or walls, lighting, and access control.
13. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan/special permit, the applicant shall revise the plans as follows or provide the specified documentation:
  - a. Revise the plan to provide at least 59 feet of right-of-way dedication from the existing center line along the property's frontage with Baltimore Avenue (US 1) for the provision of standard travel lanes, standard center turn lanes, on-road bike lanes, and continuous sidewalk along US 1 within the proposed dedicated right-of-way for US 1, or provide evidence of approval of a reduction to not less than 52 feet from the State Highway Administration (SHA).
  - b. Revise the plans to provide for porous pavement in the surface parking compound areas to the extent that subsurface conditions are suitable in regards to percolation and structural support, as stated in the soils report.
  - c. Indicate the lots and parcels that are the subject of the special permit.
  - d. Revise the plans to show the interim grading and landscaping proposed for Parcels K, L, M, and the portion of Parcel F where the future hotel is proposed.
  - e. Revise the M-U-TC Guidelines Compliance Matrix to correspond to the lots, parcels, and building designations as shown on the approved detailed site plan/special permit.
  - f. Revise the plans to show an additional exterior entry to Building 5.
  - g. Revise the plans to show an additional exterior entry to Building 6b.
  - h. Revise the plans to show and identify shrubs and trees to buffer and/or screen the CSX railroad tracks to the extent feasible in the space available.
  - i. Revise the plans to show street planting strips a minimum of six feet wide.
  - j. Revise the plans to show the Baltimore Avenue (US 1) landscaping/pedestrian amenity strip with shade trees planted approximately 30 to 40 feet on center. The size of the trees to be planted shall be a minimum of 2.5- to 3-inch caliper, subject to State Highway Administration approval.
  - k. Provide a timetable with estimated dates for grading of the site and construction of buildings.



- l. Prior to issuance of a rough grading permit, a plan shall be submitted to the Urban Design Section (M-NCPPC) and the Town of University Park to demonstrate phasing of the grading of the property to maintain as much as possible of the mature tree canopy and other screening in the greenway entrance feature on Parcels A, B, and C, until such time as grading is required by construction activity on adjacent parcels.
  - m. Revise the site plan to show the building height in feet for all buildings.
14. Prior to the release of any building permits for Buildings 6B, 7, 8, or 9, the applicant shall provide evidence of good faith efforts to work with the Town of Riverdale Park to create a shared parking district.
15. The applicant should consider participating in a regional economic partnership along the corridor with existing business groups in neighboring jurisdictions and proximate developments to the east and west to: enhance regional connections and overall economic vitality, support and help recruit small/local businesses, coordinate and co-promote programming of activities, exhibits, thematic events, etc., and help ensure mutual success.

**AGENDA ITEMS: 21 & 22**  
**AGENDA DATE: 5/30/13**

**Cafritz Property**  
**DSP-13009 and SP-130002**  
**Additional Back-Up 5-29-13**  
**(PART 2)**



Prince George's County Planning Department  
Office of the Director

Rec'd MAY 29 2013 Log No. Same  
Distribution FP, AD, Log

Original to DRD

TESTIMONY for DSP 13009 and SP 130002  
Hearing, Thursday, May 30, 2013

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD  
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

RECEIVED 5/29/2013 LOG NO. G13-052903

DISTRIBUTION CMH-FYI

To: Planning AA

CC: Jessica Jones

Dear Chairman Hewlett and Planning Board Members:

I was at last week's meeting, but there had been no time for anyone to look at the latest changes (some presented THAT morning) so I (and some others) declined to address the DSP. I did wish to speak at that time about other issues, but was discouraged to take any more time (we had been there about 6 hours already), so I reluctantly waived my right to do so.

I am still not as informed as I would like to be about the detailed site plans, because AT THAT HEARING, University Park and College Park, as well as some individual speakers, did have many changes to request of the developer regarding the plans as submitted. I do not know at this time which, if any, of these changes may have been made. I do not know if the developer has made changes. I do not know how I – OR EVEN THE BOARD – can realistically expect to discuss/absorb (and in the Board's case VOTE on) all the changes/amendments/etc. that will have been made over the ONLY THREE working days prior to Thursday's hearing. And, these changes, delays, and missed deadlines are a major problem with this development.

We have gone over and over the serious concerns to all in surrounding areas that this development is just WAY to big. The number of people and cars will overwhelm local roads, parks, and schools. The "apartment" city (only 126 townhomes out of 1,000 housing units) is a total misfit with the nature of the surrounding towns. We have voiced concern over the Prince George's tax dollars needed to help build the bridge, fix existing roads, supply water and emergency services. No one has even mentioned the frequent blackouts and can Pepco will handle the additional load. But these concerns have been to no avail.

So, now I want to address the concern regarding the way this entire process has been handled. From the start, there has been misinformation. The early open houses, held by the developer, asked for citizen input, resulting in long lists: green initiatives and requests for senior housing among some of the most mentioned suggestions ignored. (A promised set aside of a number of apartments does not constitute "senior" housing—the developer is assuming no cars will be owned by seniors as his definition.) They spoke of upscale housing then (not 900 apartments; and no indication of how many rental vs. owner occupied units) and of public art. The detailed site plan calls for nothing like any of this. Those of us who attended feel these meetings were public relations shams.

From the start of the rezoning process rules and regulations have been skirted beginning with way the developer worked with supporters to misuse the MUTC rezoning. We had a hearing that should have been adversarial and WAS NOT. After that hearing,



future meetings and hearings saw missed deadlines, late changes, allowing no time for others to respond properly, and even misrepresentation (in the case of the letter purported to be from the American Physical Society presented by a Cafritz representative at a University Park hearing, actually written by him and later disavowed by APS) that was immoral if not illegal. Then there was the hearing where neither University Park nor College Park had legal representation because of a conflict of interest charge by Riverdale Park which left those towns in the lurch just in time for that hearing.

This constant bait and switch, late changes, the conditions agreed to and then amended (such as a hedge instead of a fence, trees will be left/no they wont) by the developer is why so many of us have spent so many hours of our time at these meetings and hearings. We hope to mitigate the damaging impact from this ill fitting, overly dense and overly populated town to be set down in our midst.

I know the Board has worked hard to absorb all the changes and rushed meetings. I only question why this is necessary. Why is the County not taking the time needed to be sure that this development is as good as promised? Why are they not insisting that the developer be held to their agreements with the towns of University Park and College Park? When rules and regulations are flaunted for the few, it hurts the many. The injustice of granting such leeway in all of this developer's plans is a black eye to the government of Prince George's County that will not be fixed by a Whole Foods store.

Respectfully submitted,

Adele Ellis  
4608 Beechwood Road  
College Park, MD 20740  
301-927-5875  
adelrichellis@yahoo.com



## Hutchison, Lorrie

---

**From:** PGCPB  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2013 7:52 AM  
**To:** Hewlett, Elizabeth; Jones, Jessica; Proctor, Marie; Kratka, Leigh; Piret, Fern; Hirsch, Alan; Harrison, LaTasha; Hutchison, Lorrie  
**Subject:** FW: DSP-13009 Testimony

**PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**  
**OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN**  
RECEIVED 05/29/2013 LOG NO. C13-052904  
DISTRIBUTION EMH - FYI  
To: Planning AA  
CC: Jessica Jones

**From:** Kate Kelly  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2013 7:51:46 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)  
**To:** ehewlett@co.pg.md.us; PGCPB  
**Cc:** EOlon@co.pg.md.us  
**Subject:** DSP-13009 Testimony

George's County Planning Department  
Office of the Director  
MAY 29 2013 Log No Same  
Distribution EP, AD, Log  
original to DRD

Dear Ms. Hewlett.

I hope you will do me the kindness of passing this note along to the rest of the Planning Board. I present it for the record in tomorrow's hearing, in lieu of my personal appearance to testify on the Detailed Site Plan and related items concerning the Cafritz development in Riverdale Park. I too am working late and cannot attend.

My immediate concern is procedural, but it also is emblematic of the way this application has proceeded from the very beginning. I am unable to speak to the facts of the applicant's compliance with the DSP because I, like the rest of the public, cannot know what those facts are. As of last week, the application had unmet conditions. It seems to me that the application should not be approved until all of the conditions are met.

There has been insufficient public notice concerning tomorrow's hearing. Although some people could consider it hearsay, I have it on good authority an oral announcement was made last week that the Planning Board would continue its hearing Thursday, May 30, at 3:00 p.m. As of 6:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 29, however, the published agenda showed no such item, and the related case file and other documents were not posted in association with that hearing. I am not sure state law intends an oral announcement at one meeting to be adequate notice for the next. If that's the case, then perhaps it's time for an amendment. Maryland State Government Article §10-501 et seq., reads:

"10-501 (c) Except in special and appropriate circumstances when meetings of public bodies may be closed under this subtitle, it is the public policy of the State that the public be provided with adequate notice of the time and location of meetings of public bodies, which shall be held in places reasonably accessible to individuals who would like to attend these meetings."

Because tomorrow's meeting is not closed, that seems clear enough.

Public input is crucial to orderly land use and urban planning. Despite what some elected officials might have indicated there is in fact a literate citizenry that takes an active and well-considered interest in this matter. We believe that we are not alone in our frustration with this case and its process. Surely the Planning Department's staff would have been better served in executing its function had it had adequate time to review all of the documents before writing its report. Several submissions of various kinds, as you well know, were presented after deadline (some even mentioned that way in the staff report) and several more were presented as late as the day of the last hearing. Surely the Planning Board should be given more time to consider the thousands of details. Surely the applicant should be expected to present an organized set of plans and assurances that conditions have been met in a form that can be read and understood in advance of the decisionmaking process.



I never heard back about the receipt of my testimony for last week's meeting, so I attach a copy here. I understand it arrived too late to be considered on the day of the meeting, but I would appreciate the courtesy of an acknowledgment of this communication and that both in fact will be placed in the record for the application under consideration.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kate Kelly  
4522 Tuckerman Street  
Riverdale Park, MD 20737  
[301-277-7524](tel:301-277-7524)

May 23, 2013

Dear Ms. Hewlett,

I hope you will do me the kindness of passing this note along to the rest of the Planning Board. I present it for the record of today's hearing in lieu of a personal appearance to testify on the Detailed Site Plan and related items concerning the Cafritz development in Riverdale Park. Like so many others, I must be at my job today.

I note first an objection to the scheduling of today's hearing as not allowing sufficient time for reasonable deliberation by the members of the Planning Board, Planning Department staff, municipalities, or the public. At the least, the record should be closed today and the hearing postponed to allow compliance with the spirit of the regulations, if not in fact with their letter. There seems to be some disagreement concerning the latter, and I expect that will be sorted out later in another proceeding.

Given the applicant's track record of late and incomplete filings, it seems unreasonable to expect the members of your board--as well-versed as all of you are in these matters--to consider what has not yet been written about a case. I noted that the staff report published May 9 indicated that staff had not as of that writing received the Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Committee's report. Whether or not the M-U-TC committee's referral has been received in the interim, I think it's best not to expect staff or anyone else to exhibit their powers of extrasensory perception in these matters.

As I testified on the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (hearing May 16, 2013; exhibit 1 in opposition), many conditions of the zoning ordinance (A-10018, changing from R-55 residential to M-U-TC) are unmet. They were unmet last week, they are unmet today, and in all probability they will still be unmet a week from now. The application should be denied until every single condition in the zoning ordinance is demonstrably met. When the applicant has demonstrated full compliance with the ordinance, the application can be resubmitted to allow a full expression of the process to occur.

If rules are not for everyone, they are for no one. And if that's the case, then your function should be removed from the county's governance structure.

Thank you for your time and attention. I will be grateful for an acknowledgement of receipt of this note and of its inclusion in the record for today's proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kate Kelly  
4522 Tuckerman Street  
Riverdale Park, MD 20737



**Hutchison, Lorrie**

**From:** PGCPB  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2013 9:25 AM  
**To:** Hewlett, Elizabeth; Jones, Jessica; Proctor, Marie; Kratka, Leigh; Piret, Fern; Hirsch, Alan; Harrison, LaTasha; Hutchison, Lorrie  
**Subject:** FW: Detailed Site Plan DSP-13009 and SP-130002 Name of Project: Cafritz Property at Riverdale Park

Prince George's County Planning Department  
 Office of the Director

Rec'd MAY 29 2013 Log No. Same  
 Distribution EP, AD, Lag

**From:** Marybeth Shea  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2013 9:25:02 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)  
**To:** PGCPB; [ehewlett@co.pg.md.us](mailto:ehewlett@co.pg.md.us); [EOlson@co.pg.md.us](mailto:EOlson@co.pg.md.us)  
**Subject:** Detailed Site Plan DSP-13009 and SP-130002 Name of Project: Cafritz Property at Riverdale Park

Original to DRD

**Detailed Site Plan DSP-13009 and SP-130002**  
**Name of Project: Cafritz Property at Riverdale Park**

Dear Planning Board Members:

I am writing to express my dismay, disappointment, and, now, disgust regarding the lack of professionalism and transparency about the development planned on Route One between Albion Road and East-West Highway.

The Cafritz Property process is yet again marred by the special privilege enjoyed by this DC-based developer and their retained representatives.

Clearly, this property will be developed. However, here are my concerns:

**Dismay** at another round of late-entered documents by the developer/retained attorneys. How can I as a citizen even look at these documents in a timely manner? I am busy making a living as a teacher and my head reels with this deeply suspect practice by the well-heeled developer. This lateness is not occasional, but is a way of conduct for them. If I worked this way -- late to class, missing reporting deadlines -- I would lose my job. As it is, I cannot go to these county meetings because I am working.

The Cafritz team demonstrates **disregard** for your -- indeed, OUR -- county process. Please hold them to professionalism. As it is now, this poorly timed dance looks like they know that this is a "done deal." This casts poorly on our County, increasingly a place of poor reputation that does not reflect the majority of decent and hardworking residents.

**Disappointment** that the County, in both Planning Board work and in Park/Planning analysis, do not seem to object to the developer's now standard practice of late-timed documents. Why do the Cafritz principals and retainers get what amounts to extra-ordinary hearings and courtesies? You act on time, asking that Park/Planning analysts do as well. Require that the developer does as well. If they lose an expression of interest by Whole Foods or other "select" corporations, that is the fault of the Cafritz team. They wield this carrot -- one approved by many of our elected officials that do not live nor work on Route One -- more as a velvet bat against you, and, indeed, all of us.

**Disgust** at what looks like a thinly disguised "pay to play" process in our Country. Do you not understand the trust you hold must be to ensure fair and transparent process? This is your charge as our representatives.



Finally, despite having named these three problems in such a way that is likely uncomfortable for you, both personally and professionally, I ask this: please consider your discomfort at my observations. That discomfort is the tiny, yet important, voice about making choices that reveal your ethical commitment to just process.

Today, consider this. You have the power and authority to shape the last steps in this process. We who live here, apparently, do not. I see that the Cafritz family and company will get most of what they want. How we who live here will experience the "devil in the development details" rests in your hands. Please conduct today's meeting, and all those meetings hence, to ensure that we will live in some sort of sunshine and not the shadow that this development looks to cast on Route One communities.

Respectfully,

Marybeth Shea  
3100 Kimberly Road  
Hyattsville, MD 20782

Professional Writing Program  
English Department  
University of Maryland at College Park

**Harrison, LaTasha**

---

**From:** PGCPB  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2013 10:41 AM  
**To:** Hewlett, Elizabeth; Jones, Jessica; Proctor, Marie; Kratka, Leigh; Piret, Fern; Hirsch, Alan; Harrison, LaTasha; Hutchison, Lorrie  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed Cafritz Development

**PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**  
**OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN**  
RECEIVED 05/29/2013 LOG NO. 013-052906  
DISTRIBUTION EMH PYE  
To: Planning AA  
cc: Jessica Jones

---

**From:** Barbara Morris  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2013 10:40:18 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada) Prince George's County Planning Department  
**To:** [ehewlett@co.pg.md.us](mailto:ehewlett@co.pg.md.us); PGCPB  
**Cc:** Eric Olson  
**Subject:** Proposed Cafritz Development

Prince George's County Planning Department  
**Office of the Director**  
Rec'd MAY 29 2013 Log No. Same  
Distribution FP, AD, Log

Original to DRD

Dear Ms. Hewlett,  
Thank you, once again, for the opportunity to speak at last Thursday's Hearing regarding the Cafritz property. I have to say that I continue to be confounded by the myriad changes that have been thrust upon us at lightning speed and at the last minute regarding this property. I fear that the old adage "haste makes waste" will apply to this development. I'm wondering why this development is being pushed forward when there are so many conditions that haven't been met and so many details that have not been finalized. To add to the sense of mystery and confusion, I have searched the Planning Board's website and cannot find reference to any Hearing tomorrow on the Cafritz property.

I respectfully request that this whole project be slowed down so that all of the parties involved, including the District Council, Planning Board, and the citizens of Prince George's County, be given the opportunity to give it the careful study that it deserves. This careful study can only be done after all of the moving pieces stop moving.

Respectfully submitted,  
Barbara E. Morris, Ph.D.  
Citizen of Prince George's County  
Resident of University Park



## Hutchison, Lorrie

---

**From:** PGCPB  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2013 11:25 AM  
**To:** Hewlett, Elizabeth; Jones, Jessica; Proctor, Marie; Kratka, Leigh; Piret, Fern; Hirsch, Alan; Harrison, LaTasha; Hutchison, Lorrie  
**Subject:** FW: Postponement of Cafritz Hearing

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD  
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN  
RECEIVED 05/29/2013 LOG NO. 018-DS2907  
DISTRIBUTION EMH-PYT  
To: Planning AA  
CC: Jessica Jones

---

**From:** Susan Dorn  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2013 11:24:23 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)  
**To:** [ehewlett@co.pg.md.us](mailto:ehewlett@co.pg.md.us); PGCPB  
**Cc:** [EOlson@co.pg.md.us](mailto:EOlson@co.pg.md.us)  
**Subject:** Postponement of Cafritz Hearing

Prince George's County Planning Department  
Office of the Director  
Rec'd MAY 29 2013 Log No Same  
Distribution FP, AD, Log

Dear Ms. Hewlett:

I respectfully request on behalf of myself and other similarly situated citizens and persons of record, that you put off the Cafritz hearing, begun on May 23rd, that you announced would continue tomorrow no earlier than 3:00 pm.

By the Planning Board's own agenda established on May 23rd, this matter need not be acted on by the Planning Board until June 14th. Planning Board staff distributed two pages, single spaced, proposed conditions on Friday afternoon. While staff, the developer, and representatives from one of the three affected towns met on Tuesday morning to discuss these conditions, the conditions were not transmitted to citizens and they were not posted to the planning board website. Moreover, the Planning Board has not distributed any of the additional materials to persons of record, nor has it notified in any way (other than orally at Thursday's hearing) persons of record of the continuation of the hearing. The hearing is NOT included in the posting of the planning board's May 30th agenda on line, nor are any of the new materials provided on line.

I interpret Sec. 27-125.05. (excerpted below, emphasis added, in italics) to require actual postponement of a hearing, rather than the continuation of a hearing which has commenced. However, on Thursday you began the hearing--you did not postpone it. I suspect that a reasonable interpretation of acceptable relief would be to begin the hearing anew, preferably on NEXT Thursday, June 6, so that all persons of record may be (and are, affirmatively by the Planning Board) given notice.

I look forward to your determination to proceed *ab initio* with the hearing.

Regards,  
Susan

"Where the Planning Board is authorized to conduct a public hearing in a zoning or site plan case, the Planning Board shall send by first class mail a copy of the technical staff report to the applicant and all parties of record no less than two (2) weeks prior to the scheduled public hearing on the application. At the same time and in the same manner, the Planning Board shall send a copy of the technical staff report to every municipality located within one (1) mile of the property which is the subject of the application and to all civic associations registered with the Commission for the area which includes the property. If new information is provided by the applicant

or any governmental agency after the technical staff report is completed, any party of record shall be allowed a one (1) week *postponement* if such party so requests."



PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD  
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

RECEIVED 5/29/2013 LOG NO. C13-052908  
DISTRIBUTION EMH-FJI  
TO: Planning AA  
CC: Jessica Jones

**Lareuse, Susan**

**From:** Randy Davis <randy@laastudio.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 29, 2013 11:56 AM  
**To:** ehewlett@co.pg.md.us  
**Cc:** Lareuse, Susan  
**Subject:** Comments Regarding DSP-13009 and SP-130002

Prince George's County Planning Department  
Office of the Director  
Rec'd MAY 29 2013 Log No. Same  
Distribution FP, AD, Log  
original to DRD

Re: Application Numbers DSP-13009 and SP-130002

Dear Ms. Hewlett,

As a 20 year resident of University Park, I am writing to express my serious concerns about the Detailed Site Plan and Special Permit Applications submitted for the Cafritz Property at Riverdale Park. As had been my initial concern, it appears to be coming to fruition that the developer has no intention of transforming this property into a true mixed-use town center, where pedestrians enjoy the informal day-to-day interactions with a vibrant community. Instead, the application shows that the developer plans to focus on the commercial development, including a drive-through bank, which conflicts with pedestrian activity and is strongly discouraged by the Planning Board. The developer has only included the commercial development, and no residential development, in the DSP, as was the case in the Preliminary Plan. There has not been a construction schedule set forth for the development of the residential portion of the project and we could be left with a non-MUTC developed site for an unknown period of time.

The project has begun the LEED for Neighborhood Design certification process, but I do not see how this can actually be achieved. The commercial portion of the entire development plan does not meet the density criteria, and if the team is basing the meeting of the Development density requirement on the residential portion of the project, then the residential portion meeting the required density would need to be obtained within five years of the first building to be occupied. If the developer does not have this commitment, I believe the application for the LEED ND certification is without merit.

Thank you,  
Randy Davis

Randy Davis, AIA, LEED AP BD+C  
Principal Owner  
t: 240-441-2702  
e: randy@laastudio.com  
w: laastudio.com

Twitter - Facebook - Blog

**LA+Astudio**llc  
DESIGNS FOR THE HOME AND GARDEN

 Please consider the environment before printing this email.



