January 31, 2006

The Honorable Thomas E. Dernoga, Chairman
Prince George’s County Council
County Administration Building
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

RE: Bowie and Vicinity Adopted Master Plan and Endorsed SMA

Dear Chairman Dernoga:

The Bowie City Council has considered the specific amendments that are advertised for public hearing in CR-1-2006. Consistent with past City positions, the Council wishes to offer the following comments:

Amendment #1 – The City opposes rezoning of the Autotech property from the C-S-C zone to the C-M zone. The proposed rezoning would be the only C-M zoning in the Bowie Mainstreet area and would allow intensification of the existing auto repair use and the possible introduction of incompatible redevelopment on the site. Any rezoning should await the findings of the recommended Sector Plan for the Bowie Mainstreet area.

Amendment #4 – The City supports downzoning the MD 3/US 301 median properties to the lowest density possible. We applaud your efforts in this regard. The City Council also wishes to indicate our opposition to Amendment #21, which proposes rezoning of property in the US 301/MD 214 median area from the R-A zone to the I-1 zone.

Amendment #6 – The City opposes rezoning of the Chesley-Gibraltar property from the R-A zone to the C-S-C zone. We request that you honor our Preliminary Master Plan recommendation by retaining existing zoning and returning the property to the Rural Tier.

Amendment #8 – The City opposes Amendment #11 retaining R-R zoning and supports rezoning of the Santos Property located on Woodcliff Court and the other adjoining parcels to the C-M zone per Change Number 12 in the Preliminary Master Plan. Providing additional commercial zoning will help enhance the commercial vitality of West Bowie Village.

Amendment #16 – The City supports downzoning of the entire Zehner property, from the V-L zone to the O-S zone and revising the Master Plan text to place this land into the Rural Tier. The City appreciates your response to our recommendations.

Amendment #17 – The City supports rezoning of the Dimensions property from the C-O zone to the R-18 zone as the latter zone will allow development of age-restricted, multi-family housing in the Bowie Town Center.
Bowie City Council Position Statement  
Re: Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan Public Hearing

Amendment #18 - The City supports reduction of the area of the proposed Old Town Bowie Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ) to be superimposed only on the commercial and industrial zoned properties in Old Town Bowie. However, the City Council recommends that only parking standards be applied at this time, and the building envelope standards, streetscape standards and architectural/landscaping standards not be imposed.

Amendment #19 - The City supports retaining existing R-R and R-55 zoning on residential properties located in Old Town Bowie and changing the zoning of properties zoned C-S-C to the M-U-I zone.

Amendment #20 - The City opposes this amendment, which would revise the plan text and Map 20 to remove hiker/biker trails from the former PT-1 and A-44 rights-of-way. This change is inconsistent with the City Council’s approved Trails Plan, which includes a major north-south trail corridor and greenway using the A-44 right-of-way. Retaining the PT-1 alignment would provide a much-needed direct access from the Church Road corridor to the Bowie Town Center.

Several other items previously mentioned by the City do not appear to be included in CR-1-2006. These include the following:

- In the Transportation Chapter, text describing MD 197 should state that the road will be a maximum of four (4) lanes, not 4-6 lanes.
- The Plan should include a reference to a new interchange on US 50 at MD 193.
- The Plan text describing Transportation Policy Exception Areas (TPEAs) should be deleted.
- City-owned park properties should be placed in the O-S or R-O-S zones, depending on the acreage.
- The Plan text should identify the transitional nature of the Kirk-Martin Partnership property, adjacent to Old Town Bowie on Duckettown Road, and contiguous parcels that are in public ownership and recognize the appropriateness of a Comprehensive Design Zone to facilitate development in this area.

In closing, the City Council urges you to include all of these City recommendations in your approval of the Master Plan and SMA. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this very important planning effort.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Bowie City Council
G. Frederick Robinson
Mayor

cc: The Honorable Douglas J.J. Peters
    The Honorable Samuel H. Dean
MEMORANDUM

TO: City Council
FROM: David J. Deutsch, City Manager
SUBJECT: Bowie Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment
DATE: December 5, 2005

Attached for your information is a copy of CR-90-2005, the County Council Resolution approving the Bowie Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment. CR-90-2005 was approved last Tuesday. However, due to an advertising error, public notice requirements for the second public hearing held on November 21, 2005 were not met and CR-90-2005 will be reconsidered. The County Council is also scheduled to introduce a new Resolution, CR-1-2006, at their meeting tomorrow. The new Resolution will correct several factual and typographical errors and will include all of the amendments and revisions contained in CR-90-2005, with the addition of several new “text” changes.

Prior to their approval of CR-90-2005 last week, amendments were made to eliminate the proposed downzoning of the unbuilt Beall Crossing subdivision on Race Track Road (from the R-80 zone to the R-E zone) and the upzoning of the former Behnke Nursery parcel located at MD 193/Oak Grove Road (from R-E to R-R). In addition, an amendment was made to retain the A-44 trail alignment while deleting the PT-1 trail alignment. Finally, a new amendment was proposed to rezone a small property owned by the Hopkins family, east of the US 301/MD 214 median from the R-A zone to the I-4 zone.

Attachment
November 21, 2005

The Honorable Samuel H. Dean, Chairman
Prince George’s County Council
County Administration Building
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

RE: Bowie and Vicinity Preliminary Master Plan and SMA

Dear Chairman Dean,

The Bowie City Council has considered the 29 specific amendments that are advertised for public hearing on November 22, 2005. Consistent with past City positions, the Council wishes to offer the following comments:

Amendment #2 – The City opposes rezoning of the Autotech property from the C-S-C zone to the C-M zone. The proposed rezoning would be the only C-M zoning in the Bowie Mainstreet area and would allow intensification of the existing auto repair use and the possible introduction of incompatible redevelopment on the site. Any rezoning should await the findings of the recommended Sector Plan for the Bowie Mainstreet area.

Amendment #3 – The City opposes placement of M-X-T (Mixed Use Transportation Oriented) zoning on the Maryland Science and Technology Center property. The City Council is adamantly opposed to the conversion of the current employment land use to any other use. The recommendation for M-X-T zoning cannot be implemented under the current City covenants on the property.

Amendment #7 – The City supports downzoning the MD 3/US 301 median properties to the lowest density possible. We applaud your efforts in this regard.

Amendment #9 – The City opposes rezoning of the Chesley-Gibraltar property from the R-A zone to the C-S-C zone. We request that you honor our Preliminary Master Plan recommendation by retaining existing zoning and returning the property to the Rural Tier.

Amendment #11 – The City opposes Amendment #11 retaining R-R zoning and supports rezoning of the Santos Property located on Woodcliff Court and the other adjoining parcels to the C-M zone per Change Number 12 in the Preliminary Master Plan. Providing additional commercial zoning will help enhance the commercial vitality of West Bowie Village.

Amendment #12 – The City opposes upzoning of the Mt. Nebo Church property located in the Rural Tier at the northeast quadrant of the US 301/MD 214 interchange from the R-A zone to the R-E zone. There is no justification for this change, which will introduce one-acre zoning east of US 301 for the first time.
Bowie City Council Position Statement
Re: Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan Public Hearing #2

Amendment #20 – The City supports downzoning of the entire Zehner property, from the V-L zone to the O-S zone and revising the Master Plan text to place this land into the Rural Tier. The City appreciates your response to our recommendations.

Amendment #21 – The City supports rezoning of the Dimensions property from the C-O zone to the R-18 zone as the latter zone will allow development of age-restricted, multi-family housing in the Bowie Town Center.

Amendment #22 – The City supports reduction of the area of the proposed Old Town Bowie Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ) to be superimposed only on the commercial and industrial zoned properties in Old Town Bowie. However, the City Council recommends that only parking standards be applied at this time, and the building envelope standards, streetscape standards and architectural/landscaping standards not be imposed.

Amendment #25 – The City supports retaining existing R-R and R-55 zoning on residential properties located in Old Town Bowie and changing the zoning of properties zoned C-S-C to the M-U-1 zone.

Amendment #27 – The City supports the Hall Road Village Activity Center zoning and recommends specifically that the Master Plan’s Mixed-Use Activity Center Chapter include a section regarding the Hall Road Local Activity Center. The new narrative should reflect the District Council’s approval conditions regarding Zoning Map Amendment A-9838-C and should state that the site shall contain no more than 30,000 square feet of retail use, all commercial uses must be compatible with the library, the design of the library should have the potential to be expanded to 50,000 square feet via a second story addition, and the upper limit of residential development will allow not more than 120 dwelling units.

Amendment #28 – The City supports revising the plan text, Historic Preservation Chapter, to only designate as historic sites those properties that have owner consent. The City Council greatly appreciates your attention to this need, which was related repeatedly by City residents at the May 17, 2005 Joint Public Hearing.

Amendment #29 – The City opposes this amendment, which would revise the plan text and Map 20 to remove hiker/biker trails from the former PT-1 and A-44 rights-of-way. This change is inconsistent with the City Council’s approved Trails Plan, which includes a major north-south trail corridor and greenway using the A-44 right-of-way. Retaining the PT-1 alignment would provide a much-needed direct access from the Church Road corridor to the Bowie Town Center.

Several other items previously mentioned by the City do not appear to be included in the Amendments Package. These include the following:

- In the Transportation Chapter, text describing MD 197 should state that the road will be a maximum of four (4) lanes, not 4-6 lanes.
- The Plan should include a reference to a new interchange on US 50 at MD 193.
- The Plan text describing Transportation Policy Exception Areas (TPEAs) should be deleted.
- City-owned park properties should be placed in the O-S or R-O-S zones, depending on the acreage.
Bowie City Council Position Statement
Re: Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan Public Hearing #2

- The Plan text should identify the transitional nature of the Kirk-Martin Partnership property, adjacent to Old Town Bowie on Duckettown Road, and contiguous parcels that are in public ownership and recognize the appropriateness of a Comprehensive Design Zone to facilitate development in this area.

In closing, the City Council urges you to include all of these City recommendations in your approval of the Master Plan and SMA. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this very important planning effort.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Bowie City Council
G. Frederick Robinson
Mayor

cc: The Honorable Douglas J.J. Peters
November 21, 2005

The Honorable Samuel H. Dean, Chairman
Prince George's County Council
County Administration Building
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

RE: Bowie and Vicinity Preliminary Master Plan and SMA

Dear Chairman Dean:

The Bowie City Council has considered the 29 specific amendments that are advertised for public hearing on November 22, 2005. Consistent with past City positions, the Council wishes to offer the following comments:

Amendment #2 – The City opposes rezoning of the Autotech property from the C-S-C zone to the C-M zone. The proposed rezoning would be the only C-M zoning in the Bowie Mainstreet area and would allow intensification of the existing auto repair use and the possible introduction of incompatible redevelopment on the site. Any rezoning should await the findings of the recommended Sector Plan for the Bowie Mainstreet area.

Amendment #3 – The City opposes placement of M-X-T (Mixed Use Transportation Oriented) zoning on the Maryland Science and Technology Center property. The City Council is adamantly opposed to the conversion of the current employment land use to any other use. The recommendation for M-X-T zoning cannot be implemented under the current City covenants on the property.

Amendment #7 – The City supports downzoning the MD 3/US 301 median properties to the lowest density possible. We applaud your efforts in this regard.

Amendment #9 – The City opposes rezoning of the Chesley-Gibraltar property from the R-A zone to the C-S-C zone. We request that you honor our Preliminary Master Plan recommendation by retaining existing zoning and returning the property to the Rural Tier.

Amendment #11 – The City opposes Amendment #11 retaining R-R zoning and supports rezoning of the Santos Property located on Woodcliff Court and the other adjoining parcels to the C-M zone per Change Number 12 in the Preliminary Master Plan. Providing additional commercial zoning will help enhance the commercial vitality of West Bowie Village.

Amendment #12 – The City opposes upzoning of the Mt. Nebo Church property located in the Rural Tier at the northeast quadrant of the US 301/MD 214 interchange from the R-A zone to the R-E zone. There is no justification for this change, which will introduce one-acre zoning east of US 301 for the first time.
Bowie City Council Position Statement
Re: Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan Public Hearing #2

Amendment #20 – The City supports downzoning of the entire Zehner property, from the V-L zone to the O-S zone and revising the Master Plan text to place this land into the Rural Tier. The City appreciates your response to our recommendations.

Amendment #21 – The City supports rezoning of the Dimensions property from the C-O zone to the R-18 zone as the latter zone will allow development of age-restricted, multi-family housing in the Bowie Town Center.

Amendment #22 – The City supports reduction of the area of the proposed Old Town Bowie Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ) to be superimposed only on the commercial and industrial zoned properties in Old Town Bowie. However, the City Council recommends that only parking standards be applied at this time, and the building envelope standards, streetscape standards and architectural/landscaping standards not be imposed.

Amendment #25 – The City supports retaining existing R-R and R-55 zoning on residential properties located in Old Town Bowie and changing the zoning of properties zoned C-S-C to the M-U-I zone.

Amendment #27 – The City supports the Hall Road Village Activity Center zoning and recommends specifically that the Master Plan’s Mixed-Use Activity Center Chapter include a section regarding the Hall Road Local Activity Center. The new narrative should reflect the District Council’s approval conditions regarding Zoning Map Amendment A-9838-C and should state that the site shall contain no more than 30,000 square feet of retail use, all commercial uses must be compatible with the library, the design of the library should have the potential to be expanded to 50,000 square feet via a second story addition, and the upper limit of residential development will allow not more than 120 dwelling units.

Amendment #28 – The City supports revising the plan text, Historic Preservation Chapter, to only designate as historic sites those properties that have owner consent. The City Council greatly appreciates your attention to this need, which was related repeatedly by City residents at the May 17, 2005 Joint Public Hearing.

Amendment #29 – The City opposes this amendment, which would revise the plan text and Map 20 to remove hiker/biker trails from the former PT-1 and A-44 rights-of-way. This change is inconsistent with the City Council’s approved Trails Plan, which includes a major north-south trail corridor and greenway using the A-44 right-of-way. Retaining the PT-1 alignment would provide a much-needed direct access from the Church Road corridor to the Bowie Town Center.

Several other items previously mentioned by the City do not appear to be included in the Amendments Package. These include the following:

- In the Transportation Chapter, text describing MD 197 should state that the road will be a maximum of four (4) lanes, not 4-6 lanes.
- The Plan should include a reference to a new interchange on US 50 at MD 193.
- The Plan text describing Transportation Policy Exception Areas (TPEAs) should be deleted.
- City-owned park properties should be placed in the O-S or R-O-S zones, depending on the acreage.
Bowie City Council Position Statement
Re: Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan Public Hearing #2

- The Plan text should identify the transitional nature of the Kirk-Martin Partnership property, adjacent to Old Town Bowie on Duckettown Road, and contiguous parcels that are in public ownership and recognize the appropriateness of a Comprehensive Design Zone to facilitate development in this area.

  In closing, the City Council urges you to include all of these City recommendations in your approval of the Master Plan and SMA. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this very important planning effort.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Bowie City Council
G. Frederick Robinson
Mayor

cc: The Honorable Douglas J.J. Peters
Joe Meinert

From: Joe Meinert
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2005 2:44 PM
To: David Deutsch; John Fitzwater
Subject: Dick Padgett phone call - Bowie Master Plan
Importance: High

I called Dick (DP) today to point out some discrepancies in the Table that Doug Peters introduced at last week’s County Council COW meeting. My points were:

1. Pointer Ridge - what does the Peters recommendation for "mixed use" mean? A: leave zoning the way it is now and allow for future mixed use. Master Plan already recommends use of L-A-C to do this. The only practical benefit to what is written is that if any property develops under C-S-C in the interim, it can’t be big box and needs site plan review.

2. Sandyhill Landfill and Other MNCPPC properties - these, along with Nash are recommended for O-S or R-O-S zone. I mentioned that our public hearing letter had other recommended properties, including numerous City parcels, that we wanted downzoned in a similar fashion. DP asked me to send him the list again and he’d incorporate it.

3. Spriggs/Mills - I confirmed that the Peters recommendation for C-M was to support the MNCPPC proposal for the front part of the property along Route 301 to be zoned C-M. This change does not include any other property (i.e. Melvin).

4. Historic Properties - the Peters table says "Postpone Policy 2 evaluations". I asked DP what that meant. A: need to rewrite to say "Policy 2 evaluations should require owner’s permission" to satisfy the City’s recommendation.

5. 3720 Crain Hwy - Peters recommends C-M with site plan review. This is the 2-acre Grasso piece across the street from Lowe’s at 197/301. DP agreed with me that downzoning to R-R made sense, especially if SHA is likely to acquire it for the interchange, but then said zoning attorneys have been pressuring Peters all over the planning area. When I pointed out that the approved Preliminary Plan of subdivision for Grasso says a Detailed Site Plan is required and therefore this recommendation of Peters’ was redundant, DP said leaving it this way is the best thing, so we’re doubly protected. I didn’t push this.

6. Trail facilities, eliminate PT-1 and A-44 trails in favor of a Church Road trail—I pointed out that this is inconsistent with the City’s trails plan and we are making strides to acquire property in these corridors to allow for better access to Church Road Park from the neighborhoods and create an off road trail connecting MD 214 to Mount Oak Road. I noted that this Peters recommendation would be a major setback for us. He asked me to supply some reasons and commentary and he would show it to Doug. He hoped to just delete the trail item from the Table in favor of what the City was asking.

7. DP also added that the table was being revised, yet again. The new item is the Berwyn Rod and Gun Club and nearby properties to downzone to the R-E zone. DP also added that there is movement to place the entire area north of the WB &A and west of Race Track Road into the Rural Tier. I empathized and reminded DP that the Information Brochure for the Master Plan identified inadequate public facilities as the biggest challenge and that I suspected that MNCPPC would have recommended downzonings to address this issue but they did not. The recent Peters recommendations seem to work in the direction of doing something about this challenge.

9. I volunteered that some of the City’s other recommendations, such as eliminating the Transportation Policy Exception Areas (TPEAs), were not included among the Peters items unveiled last Wednesday. DP said I should point out what these other items are so he could show them to Doug before the revised table goes out to the County Council. I plan to communicate the following priority items from the Agenda discussed at the Belair Mansion on 9/14/05: (1) The Old Town Bowie DDOZ recommendation should include parking design standards ONLY; (2) MD 197 text should state 4 lanes, not 4-6 lanes; (3) The plan should include reference to a new interchange at US 50/MD 193; (4) TPEAs should be eliminated from the plan. I feel that, while important, the other priorities listed on our agenda are more involved and stand less of a chance of being advanced at this stage.
Dick - here is the Table from the City's May 10, 2005 position letter dealing with public property rezoning. Please include all of the items identified as Public Parkland items in the Sectional Map Amendment.

You also asked for a justification regarding retaining the PT-1 and A-44 trail facilities in the Plan. As I mentioned, this is inconsistent with the City Council's approved Trails Plan, and we are making strides to acquire property in these corridors to allow for better access to Church Road Park from the neighborhoods and create an off road trail connecting MD 214 to Mount Oak Road. The current recommendation to eliminate the PT-1 and A-44 trails in favor of a Church Road trail would be a major setback for us. The 1991 Bowie Master Plan, as well as the Planning Board's Adopted Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan, include PT-1 and A-44 trail networks.

Regarding the other priorities we spoke of:

(1) the Old Town Bowie DDOZ recommendation should include parking design standards ONLY not building envelope standards, streetscape standards or architecture/landscape standards; (2) MD 197 text should state 4 lanes, not 4-6 lanes; (3) The plan should include reference to a new interchange at US 50/MD 193; (4) Transportation Policy Exception Areas (TPEAs) should be eliminated from the plan.

Joseph M. Meinert, AICP
Director of Planning and Economic Development
City of Bowie
2614 Kenhill Drive
Bowie, MD 20715
301-809-3047 (office)
301-809-2315 (fax)
AGENDA
Meeting of Bowie City Council
County Council Members Doug Peters and Sam Dean
Bowie and Vicinity Area Master Plan
Belair Mansion
September 14, 2005

I. Welcome – Mayor G. Frederick Robinson

II. City Master Plan Recommendations – Remaining Items from Aug. 18 Letter

Top Priorities
- The Maryland Science and Technology Center should be preserved as a high quality employment center, given its vital role in the future economic development of the City.
- The proposed Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ) should be limited to the existing C-S-C and I-1 areas of Old Town Bowie.
- Properties should not be designated Historic Sites or Resources without the property owner’s permission.
- Expansion of existing commercial uses and introduction of new development in the US Route 301/MD 3 corridor should be prohibited.
- More intense development forecast for the Bowie Regional Center should be deferred until the necessary transportation facilities are in place to support it.
- Maryland Route 197 should be designated as an ultimate four-lane, divided arterial road (with no more than two through lanes in each direction).
- The Master Plan should describe a future interchange on US 50 between MD 704 and MD 197. However, this interchange should not be located at Church Road.

Medium Priorities
- The Maryland Science and Technology Center should be included in the Regional Center.
- The Master Plan’s mixed-use policy should be rewritten to encourage mixed-use and moderate- to high-density development only in designated centers.
- The Plan should establish a Residential Neighborhood Conservation area and zoning district to protect the original Levitt sections. This zoning tool should establish uniform zoning standards, such as lot coverage standards, and should also prohibit unwanted special exception uses from encroaching on the established neighborhood character.
• The concept of Transportation Policy Exception Areas should be eliminated from the Plan.
• The lowest acceptable traffic Level of Service in the Regional Center should be LOS “D”.
• The entire Zehner property, located between the Longleaf subdivision and US 50, should be designated for a low-density rural character and zoned O-S (Open Space).
• The concept for West Bowie Village should be limited to basically non-residential uses within the existing business district. Live-work units should be the only residential uses allowed. The activity center boundary should be revised to include the entire business district, but exclude any portion of the Stewart’s Landing subdivision and City-owned property.
• The Master Plan’s Mixed-Use Activity Center Chapter should include a section regarding the Hall Road Local Activity Center. The new narrative should reflect the District Council’s approval conditions regarding Zoning Map Amendment A-9838-C, which established a limit of 29,000 square feet of retail commercial use, a minimum 25,000 square foot library and residential development at densities between 10-15 dwelling units per acre over the remaining land on the site. The Master Plan should specify that all commercial uses must be compatible with the library and should suggest the possibility of future enlargement of the library to 50,000 square feet via a second story addition.
• The City’s environmental recommendations should be included in the Master Plan. The Plan should include specific goals and objectives for mitigating air, light and noise pollution in addition to water pollution. The Plan should contain policies and recommended regulations for all of the items listed in the City Council’s May 10, 2005 public hearing transmittal.

Additional City Priorities

• Returning the Chesley/Gibraltar property to the Rural Tier
• Specific recommendations for the Rural Tier
• Expansion of the Bowie Mainstreet boundary and provision of small lot, affordable housing within the central Mainstreet core
• Clarifying that no access, including indirect access through parking lots, should be allowed to Pointer Ridge Drive from the Amber Ridge Shopping Center
• Retaining Jericho Park Road as a local road rather than designating it as a collector road through Bowie State University
• Adding a Housing chapter to the Master Plan.

III. Any Other Business

IV. Conclusion – Mayor G. Frederick Robinson

2
August 18, 2005

The Honorable Douglas J.J. Peters
Prince George’s County Council
County Administration Building
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

RE: Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan

Dear Council Member Peters:

The Bowie City Council has reviewed the actions of the Prince George’s County Planning Board taken in July regarding the Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan (see Planning Board Resolution PGCPB No. 05-169). The City Council is greatly concerned with the large number of City recommendations that were not adopted by the Planning Board. The purpose of this letter is to identify many of the items the Planning Board did not accept and to prioritize them for your further consideration.

The following are the City’s most important remaining priorities:

- The Maryland Science and Technology Center should be preserved as a high quality employment center, given its vital role in the future economic development of the City.
- The proposed Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ) should be limited to the existing C-S-C and I-I areas of Old Town Bowie.
- Properties should not be designated Historic Sites or Resources without the property owner’s permission.
- Expansion of existing commercial uses and introduction of new development in the US Route 301/MD 3 corridor should be prohibited.
- More intense development forecast for the Bowie Regional Center should be deferred until the necessary transportation facilities are in place to support it.
- Maryland Route 197 should be designated as an ultimate four-lane, divided arterial road (with no more than two through lanes in each direction).
- The Master Plan should describe a future interchange on US 50 between MD 704 and MD 197. However, this interchange should not be located at Church Road.
Other high priorities of the City Council not currently addressed in the Master Plan include the following:

- The Maryland Science and Technology Center should be included in the Regional Center.
- The Master Plan’s mixed-use policy should be rewritten to encourage mixed-use and moderate- to high-density development only in designated centers.
- The Plan should establish a Residential Neighborhood Conservation area and zoning district to protect the original Levitt sections. This zoning tool should establish uniform zoning standards, such as lot coverage standards, and should also prohibit unwanted special exception uses from encroaching on the established neighborhood character.
- The concept of Transportation Policy Exception Areas should be eliminated from the Plan.
- The lowest acceptable traffic Level of Service in the Regional Center should be LOS “D”.
- The entire Zehner property, located between the Longleaf subdivision and US 50, should be designated for a low-density rural character and zoned O-S (Open Space).
- The concept for West Bowie Village should be limited to basically non-residential uses within the existing business district. Live-work units should be the only residential uses allowed. The activity center boundary should be revised to include the entire business district, but exclude any portion of the Stewart’s Landing subdivision and City-owned property.
- The Master Plan’s Mixed-Use Activity Center Chapter should include a section regarding the Hall Road Local Activity Center. The new narrative should reflect the District Council’s approval conditions regarding Zoning Map Amendment A-9838-C, which established a limit of 29,000 square feet of retail commercial use, a minimum 25,000 square foot library and residential development at densities between 10-15 dwelling units per acre over the remaining land on the site. The Master Plan should specify that all commercial uses must be compatible with the library and should suggest the possibility of future enlargement of the library to 50,000 square feet via a second story addition.
- The City’s environmental recommendations should be included in the Master Plan. The Plan should include specific goals and objectives for mitigating air, light and noise pollution in addition to water pollution. The Plan should contain policies and recommended regulations for all of the items listed in the City Council’s May 10, 2005 public hearing transmittal.
Letter to The Honorable Douglas J.J. Peters
RE: Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan

Additional City priorities include, but are not limited to: (1) returning the Chesley/Gibraltar property to the Rural Tier; (2) specific recommendations for the Rural Tier; (3) expansion of the Bowie Mainstreet boundary and provision of small lot, affordable housing within the central Mainstreet core; (4) clarifying that no access, including indirect access through parking lots, should be allowed to Pointer Ridge Drive from the Amber Ridge Shopping Center; (5) retaining Jericho Park Road as a local road rather than designating it as a collector road through Bowie State University; and, (6) adding a Housing chapter to the Master Plan.

Among the many issues addressed in our May 10th public hearing letter, the City Council has identified the above items as key recommendations that should not be overlooked in the Master Plan. We appreciate your cooperation in ensuring that all of these points are included in the revised Master Plan before it is approved.

Thank you for your assistance in making a Master Plan that benefits all of Bowie.

Sincerely,

G. Frederick Robinson
Bowie City Council
G. Frederick Robinson
Mayor

cc: Council Member Samuel H. Dean
The Honorable Douglas J.J. Peters  
Prince George's County Council  
County Administration Building  
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive  
Upper Marlboro, Maryland  20772  

RE:  Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment (SMA)  

Dear Council Member Peters:  

On Monday, August 1, 2005 the Bowie City Council reviewed a number of land use proposals submitted after the May 17th Joint Public Hearing but before the close of the public record on June 2, 2005. As you know, the City Council conducted its own public hearing on the Preliminary Master Plan on May 2, 2005. The purpose of this letter is to inform you of the City Council’s current position regarding nine (9) specific proposals made after the City’s public hearing. We encourage you to strongly consider the City’s position on each of these items and work to incorporate as many of them as possible in any final revisions to the Master Plan made by the District Council.

   **COMMENT:** There is no economic justification for additional commercial centers in the Bowie area. With the recent approval of over 300,000 square feet of retail commercial at Karington, the amount of retail commercial space envisioned to be supportable in the 1991 Bowie Master Plan for the area south of US Route 50 has been satisfied. In fact, the area has developed with a smaller average household size and fewer homes than anticipated in the Master Plan, resulting in even less demand for retail uses.

2. Willowbrook – Exhibit #30. Requesting the R-S (Residential Suburban) Comprehensive Design Zone (CDZ) on the north side of Leeland Road, adjacent to the Safeway distribution center.  
   **COMMENT:** The City provided public hearing comments on the original request to rezone this property to the R-L (Residential Low Density) CDZ during Bowie Master Plan review. The City found that the proposed change in land use would be compatible with nearby residential properties including Oak Creek Club and Beechtree. The City noted that the majority of the property is oriented to Leeland Road, which will become a major collector road serving numerous low-density residential developments and the site does not have a practical way of becoming integrated into the adjacent...
Collington Center employment park. The City found that the residential downzoning proposed in Preliminary Master Plan is appropriate. Although the revised request (also filed in Zoning Map Amendment A-9968) is for the R-S (1.6 – 2.6) zone, rather than the R-L (1.0 – 1.5) zone, the City’s position remains the same as that provided in testimony on the Preliminary Master Plan (see July 19, 2005 letter from the City Council to the Planning Board). The City concurred with the findings of the M-NCPDC Technical Staff Report, which concluded that the R-S zone is not appropriate for the subject site. The City Council reiterates this position with regard to Exhibit #30 in the Sectional Map Amendment (SMA).

3. Melford – Exhibits #31 and #75. Requesting M-X-T (Mixed Use Transportation Oriented) zoning for the Maryland Science and Technology Center property.  
   **STAFF COMMENT:** Although MNCPPC staff and the County Planning Board continue to recommend mixed-use zoning for this site, this recommendation is inconsistent with the City’s testimony, presented at the public hearing, which adamantly opposed the conversion of employment land use to any other use. According to the Zoning Ordinance, the M-X-T zone requires at least two of the following three uses: (1) retail; (2) office, research or industrial; or (3) residential, including hotels or motels. The existing City covenants on the property do not permit residential uses. Since the recommendation for M-X-T zoning cannot be implemented under the current covenants, the City opposes this rezoning proposal.

4. Chesley-Gibraltar Property – Exhibit #45. Requesting the C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) zone.  
   **STAFF COMMENT:** In the Preliminary Master Plan statement, the City opposed retention of this property in the Developing Tier and recommended that it revert to the Rural Tier. For the same reasons given in the Master Plan testimony regarding the development pattern east of US 301, the City opposes this proposal.

5. Dimensions/Shelter Development – Exhibit #47. Requesting the R-18 zone for 13 acres of land located on Health Center Drive.  
   **STAFF COMMENT:** The applicant was aware of the City Council’s recommendation on the Preliminary Master Plan (endorsing either the M-X-T zone or M-U-TC zone) when the testimony in Exhibit 47 was written. Subsequent to the City Council’s May 2, 2005 public hearing, the applicant met with City staff to further explain the reasons for their request. Due to the limited area available on the property for development because of environmental constraints, multiple utility easements and the irregular shape of the property, the City Council finds that age-restricted housing in a multi-family dwelling unit format developed under the R-18 zone is a supportable land use for the property. The City therefore recommends Council support the request for age-restricted housing in the R-18 zone.

6. AutoTech – Exhibit #48. Requesting the Commercial Miscellaneous (C-M) zone on a small parcel located on the south side of MD 450, east of Superior Lane.  
   **STAFF COMMENT:** The proposed zoning would be the only C-M zoning in the Bowie Mainstreet area, which is primarily zoned C-S-C. MNCPPC points out in the
transcript analysis that many of the uses allowed in the C-M zone are typically automobile-oriented and are incompatible with the vision and goals to create a pedestrian-friendly environment along Bowie Main Street. The current auto repair use occupies space previously used for a full service gas station. Introduction of C-M zoning would allow for intensification of the existing use and the possible introduction of incompatible redevelopment on the site. For the reasons stated by MNCPPC staff, the City opposes this request.


**STAFF COMMENT:** The City Council notes that a Special Exception application (SE #4529) is currently pending for a Planned Retirement Community on this property, which is located on the edge of the Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville and Vicinity planning area. The concept of providing additional senior housing is in keeping with current City policy. Based on this conformance, the City supports this proposal in the SMA.


**STAFF COMMENT:** On July 25, 2005 the District Council voted to rezone the property to the L-A-C zone in A-9838-C. The rezoning approval included a large number of conditions that were fashioned by residents of the adjoining communities. The most significant aspect of the recent rezoning was the reduction in proposed retail use from 140,000 square feet to 30,000 square feet. Another important aspect was a condition requiring a public library site on the property. The rezoning of the site to the L-A-C Comprehensive Design Zone will allow for further review of specific land uses and site details through the required Comprehensive Design Plan (CDP) and Specific Design Plan (SDP) submissions. In addition, the site will have to undergo Preliminary Plan of subdivision review to assess impacts on public facilities. Although the City opposed the original proposal in A-9838, with the conditions of approval now in place and the additional safeguards of the CDP, SDP and Preliminary Plan of subdivision review phases, the designation of the property as an activity center in the L-A-C zone is appropriate, since it is in keeping with both the recommendations of the 1991 Master Plan and the City’s desire to have a library located on the property. The City Council recommends the addition of text in the Master Plan specifically characterizing the type of activity center approved in A-9838.

9. Kirk-Martin Partnership (Duckettown Road) – Exhibit #91. Requesting rezoning from the R-R (Rural Residential) zone to the M-U-I (Mixed Use Infill) zone.

**STAFF COMMENT:** The development of the Kirk-Martin Partnership property includes possibilities for senior and/or affordable housing. The property is located adjacent to the City limits, but within the area recommended by MNCPPC for the Old Town Bowie Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ). During the Master Plan charrette process the property was identified as a potential senior housing site. While providing senior housing or affordable housing would complement neighborhood revitalization efforts in Old Town Bowie and would be in keeping with established City policies, the requested M-U-I zone with the DDOZ overlay is
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inconsistent with the City’s recent recommendations on the Preliminary Master Plan. The City recommended scaling back the area proposed for M-U-I and DDOZ zoning to correspond to the existing C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) business district. On July 5, 2005, the City Council also decided to support extension of the DDOZ to include the I-I (Light Industrial) area between the commercial district and Zug Road and all of the I-I zoned properties on Zug Road. To address the need for flexibility in the development on the Kirk-Martin Partnership property, the City supports a new recommendation in the Master Plan for R-S (2.7-3.5) zoning for the subject property. This option recognizes the transitional nature of the property, lying between Old Town Bowie, developed in the R-55 zone (4.2 dwelling units per acre) and Severn Crossing (2.17 units per acre) and environmental constraints present on the property. The R-S zone would also be compatible with the Low Density Residential recommendations already contained in the Preliminary Master Plan for the site.

The City Council thanks you for the opportunity to provide comments on these additional proposals, which were not available for the City’s hearing. We urge you to approve the City’s recommendations in finalizing the Bowie Master Plan and SMA.

Sincerely,

G. Frederick Robinson  
Mayor

✓cc: Council Member Samuel H. Dean
CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

The Regular Meeting of the Bowie City Council was held on Monday, August 1, 2005 in the Council Chambers at City Hall. Mayor Robinson called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m.

QUORUM:

In attendance were Mayor Robinson, Mayor Pro Tem Jenkins, Councilmembers Aleshire, Booker Jones, Brady, Kroemer and Lyles; City Manager Deutsch, Asst. City Manager Fitzwater, City Attorney Robert Levan, Members of the Staff, the Press and the Public.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG:

The Council led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:

A. Mr. Michael Rogers, spoke against the City contributing money towards the Crime Solvers reward.

CITY BOARDS AND COMMITTEES:

Mayor Pro Tem Jenkins moved the appointment of Camilla Gaines as an alternate member of the Board of Elections. Councilman Brady seconded the motion. Mayor Robinson swore Ms. Gaines into office in accordance with Sec. 93A of the City Charter.

COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Mayor Robinson announced that Councilman Dennis Brady was elected as First Vice President of the Maryland Municipal League at the June convention. He reported that Councilman Brady has since been elevated to President. Mayor Robinson offered congratulations on behalf of the entire Council and staff.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT:

City Manager David Deutsch reported on the following items: 1) Last weeks storm resulted in the suspension of the rules for yard waste pick-up and storm debris will be picked up as part of the regular trash pick-up. 2) There have been recent newspaper reports about other communities working on franchise agreements with Verizon for video; negotiations are ongoing and expect that within the next 90-120 days a recommended franchise agreement will be brought to Council; there is pending federal legislation that would preempt all governments...
abilities to franchise and the National League of Cities and other organizations are working to try prevent this from happening. 3) Police Staffing - The County Police Chief indicated in a communication to the City in September, 2004 he was planning to double the number of patrol officers assigned to Bowie from District II; the commitment was that there would be 40 officers by July 31. After checking with the District II Commander and as of last week there are 22 officers.

CONSENT AGENDA:

Mayor Pro Tem Jenkins moved approval of Consent Agenda Items: A) Approval of Minutes of May 16, 2005 Council Meeting; B) Approval of Minutes of June 6, 2005 Council Meeting; C) Approval of Minutes of June 20, 2005 Council Meeting; D) Approval of Resolution R-48-05, Waiving the Competitive Bidding Requirements of Section 61 "Purchasing and Contracting" of the Charter of the City of Bowie to Allow the Rental of Leaf Collection Trucks, and Authorizing the City Manager to Enter into a Contract With Hertz Equipment Rental in the Amount of $45,642; F) Approval of Resolution R-50-05, Accepting Bid Proposal for the annual Supply of Polymer Utilized by the Wastewater Treatment Plant; G) Approval of Resolution R-51-05, Waiving the Advertising Requirements of Section 61 "Purchasing and Contracting" and Authorizing the Purchase of Toughbooks; H) Approval of Resolution R-52-05, Waiving the Advertising Requirements of Section 61 "Purchasing and Contracting" and Authorizing the Purchase of Personal Computers; I) Approval of Resolution R-53-05, Approving Entering Into a First Amendment to Agreement of Sale With Winchester Homes Pertaining to City Owned Property on Central Avenue Commonly Known As the Entzian Property; J) Approval of Resolution R-54-05, Accepting Bid Proposal for Street Repair; K) Approval of Resolution R-55-05, Accepting Bid Proposal for Street Resurfacing; L) Approval of Resolution R-56-05, Adopting the Recommendations of the Bowie Advisory Planning Board in the Case of BV-1-05; M) Introduction of Ordinance O-8-05, Amending Chapter 14, "Motor Vehicles and Traffic", Article I, "In General", Section 14-1, "Definitions", To Amend the Definition of the Term "Abandoned Vehicle" and to Add Definitions for the Terms "Commercial Vehicle" and "Inoperative Vehicle"; Amending Article III, "Stopping, Standing and Parking", Section 14-11, "Parking of Commercial Vehicles Prohibited", To Change the Cross-Reference Therein From Section 26-1 to Section 14-1; Amending Article III, "Stopping, Standing and Parking", Section 14-13, "Leaving Vehicle on Street, Etc. for Continuous Period Longer Than Seventy-Two Hours; Penalty", to Delete the Term "Unattended" and Substitute the Phrase "Without Being Moved a Distance of at Least One Vehicle Length" and Prohibiting the Parking of Abandoned Vehicles on City Streets, Modifying the Requirements Concerning Notice to Vehicle Owners, and Making a Violation of That Section a Municipal Infraction; Amending Article III, Section 14-14, "Impoundment of Abandoned Vehicles", to Refer to All Vehicles Subject to Impoundment; Amending Article III, Section 14-15, "Impoundment of Vehicles From Public Property Without Prior Notice", To Provide for the Immediate Impoundment of Vehicles That Have Been Subject to a Notice of Intent to Impound Within the Preceding Sixty (60) Days; Amending Article III, Section 14-17, "Repossesson of Impounded Vehicles", to Refer to Vehicles Impounded Under Any Section of Chapter 14; and Making Other Minor Stylistic Changes to Certain Provisions of Chapter 14, Including Sections 14-11 and 14-25; N) Approval of Resolution R-35-05, Authorizing the City Manager to Execute an Annexation Agreement With Timberlake Homes, Inc., Establishing the Terms and Conditions Governing the Proposal Annexation of the Coleman Property Subdivision Including Approximately 8.41 Acres of Land Located on the West Side of Heatherstone Drive, Approximately 0.1 Mile South of the Old Stage Road Intersection, Into the Corporate Limits of the City of Bowie; O) Introduction of Resolution R-57-05, Enlarging the Corporate Boundaries of the City of Bowie By Annexing Land contiguous and Adjoining to the Existing Area of the City of Bowie Residential Property Known as the Coleman Property Subdivision Consisting of 8.4087 Acres of Land Located on the West Side of Heatherstone Drive, Approximately 0.1 Mile
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South of the Old Stage Road Intersection, Into the Corporate Limits of the City of Bowie; and P. Approval of Resolution R-58-05. Accepting Bid for Construction of Gallant Fox Restoration Project. Councilman Jenkins seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

A. Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment - Mr. Joe Meinert, City Planning staff, summarized the staff report dated July 28, 2005, a copy of which is on file at City Hall. He reported that the current schedule for the Master Plan calls for work sessions by the County Council beginning in September. He said the purpose of bringing this item to Council this evening is to 1) brief Council on the status of their recommendations which were presented at the May 17 joint public hearing; and 2) to look at other items that came up subsequent to the May 17th hearing, which were filed in the record but not available for Council review when the City held its own hearings. Mr. Meinert handed out the Park and Planning staff's revised recommendations on the Preliminary Master Plan, which he then summarized. He then reviewed major requests that have been submitted to Prince George's County and presented the staff recommendation on each: Mount Oak Estates-Outparcel A, Willowbrook, Melford, Chesley-Gibraltar Property, Dimensions/Shelter Development, Auto Tech, Turner Property, Hall Road Property, and Kirk-Martin Partnership.

Public Hearing:

1. Mr. Bob Stoddard, 218 N. Charles St., Baltimore, Development Director with Shelter Development, spoke about the Dimensions/Shelter Development item and said they were in agreement with the staff recommendation.

2. Mr. John McDonough, an attorney with O'Malley, Miles and representing MIE Properties, said that the Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment recommends M-X-T for the Science and Technology Center which his firm supports, and the Master Plan also recommends an Illustrative Plan and 29 Guidelines; the next speaker will review those guidelines.

3. Mr. Robert Goodill, 1300 Spring Street, Silver Spring, noted that the Science & Technology Center is emphatically an employment center and a mix of uses is an important aspect of creating a place that has value that can lure the kinds of companies to a place such as this Center. He added that the concept plan that Park and Planning has fashioned with respect to their own plan differs in 3 places: is more flexible, a different street plan is crafted, and a public use is located in a residential neighborhood to the north and east of a little retail area located in their proposed center.

4. Mr. Lyle Thorpe, representing Melford, said an archeological survey has been done; there are 3 sites on the tract one of which is associated with the Melford House, the second is the cemetery and the third is a prehistoric site that was found in the development area. He noted that reports were submitted to the County, reviewed and approved, and the final copy is on file with the County and the Maryland Historical Trust. Mr. Thorpe then said that the second study done is a condition assessment for the Melford House and out buildings.

5. Stanley Robinson, President and CEO for Oakhurst Development, said he is interested in the Kirk-Martin Property and the adjacent properties in order to tie the surrounding public and private properties together and create a revitalization program in Old Town Bowie. He said they agreed with the staff recommendation.
6. Mr. Bruce Pletsch, 16520 Abbey Drive, Sherwood Manor, spoke about the Maryland Science and Technology Center. A copy of his statement is attached.

7. Mr. Bill Knight, representing the Hall Road application, said they support the staff recommendation consistent with the recent decision of the Prince George's County Council which endorsed a compromise for this property.

Mayor Robinson summarized each item and the staff recommendation.

In the matter of Mount Oak Estates, Outparcel A, Councilwoman Booker Jones moved to accept the staff recommendation that there is no justification for additional commercial centers in the Bowie area. Councilman Aleshire seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Councilman Lyles moved approval of the staff recommendation for the Willowbrook application to reiterate the City’s position with regard to Exhibit 30 in the Sectional Map Amendment. Councilman Brady seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

With regard to the Melford request, Mayor Pro Tem Jenkins moved approval of the staff recommendation in opposition to the M-X-T zoning. Councilwoman Booker Jones seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

With regard to the Chesley-Gibraltar Property, Councilwoman Booker Jones moved approval of the staff recommendation in opposition to the proposal. Councilman Aleshire seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Councilwoman Booker Jones moved approval of the staff recommendation with regard to the Dimensions/Shelter Development to support the request for age-restricted housing in the R-18 zone. Councilman Brady seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Mayor Pro Tem Jenkins moved approval of the staff recommendation in the matter of the Auto Tech to oppose the request. Councilman Aleshire seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Councilman Brady moved approval of the staff recommendation regarding the Turner Property in support of the request. Councilwoman Booker Jones seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Councilman Lyles moved approval of the staff recommendation regarding the Hall Road Property in support of the addition of text in the Master Plan specifically characterizing the type of activity cent4er approved in A-9838. Councilman Brady seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Councilman Kroemer moved the approval of the staff recommendation regarding the Kirk-Martin Partnership to support a new recommendation in the Master Plan for R-S zoning for the subject property. Councilman Brady seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 6-1 (Booker Jones).

Mayor Pro Tem Jenkins moved that the City send a letter to County Councilman Doug Peters endorsing the additional Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment recommendations presented in the staff report. Councilman Brady seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.
B. Crime Solvers Reward - Councilman Kroemer reported that Crime Solvers has collected funds to help solve crimes and that the County has contributed $25,000 towards this effort. He moved that the City of Bowie contribute $2500 to Crime Solvers in order to support them in solving the crime, which had recently occurred in our City. Councilman Brady seconded the motion and it carried with a vote of 5-1 (Lyles - nay; Booker Jones - absent).

COUNCIL COMMENTS:

Mayor Pro Tem Jenkins referred to a major power outage, which had recently occurred in Bowie and commended the Public Works Department for their efforts in clearing away the debris from the storm quickly. He also commended Assistant City Manager Fitzwater for his role in keeping Council up-to-date. Mr. Jenkins added that he was concerned about the need to be in a better position in terms of communications. He asked for consensus to ask staff to do some creative thinking to come up with a plan. Council concurred.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mayor Pro Tem Jenkins moved to adjourn the meeting and move into an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel matters. Councilman Brady seconded the motion and it carried by those members present. The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela A. Fleming, CMC
City Clerk
MSTC and the Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan

1) The upcoming Master Plan should **not** reflect residential development at MSTC that is in conflict with The City of Bowie covenants
2) The upcoming Master Plan should **not** reflect residential development at MSTC that is inferred only by a text amendment already being challenged in court
3) The Maryland Science and Tech Center should **not** be placed in the Regional Center that supports mixed use including high density residential development, and was so recommended by the County appointed Charrette personnel.
4) The Maryland Science and Tech Center **should** be designated as a separate, specific zone for economic development and employment opportunity.

The current proposal has MSTC designated in the Developing Tier. The highlights of the proposed Master Plan state that for the Developing Tier: mixed use development, including residential, should be used (page viii) "**where infrastructure exists**" to support it. The infrastructure (schools, police and emergency service response, transportation development) does not exist to support high density residential development at MSTC.

**Policy 5** (page 11) is: "**Reduce traffic congestion ... while allowing limited, low traffic-generating development ...**" along the US 301/Md 3 corridor. Additionally, of the general guidelines stated in the Sectional Map Amendment, one is to: (page viii) "... **provide land use compatible with adjoining development, and mitigate impacts on public facilities**.” Proposing high density residential development at MSTC fails in these regards.

One of the goals listed for the Developing Tier is to (page 9): "**Preserve and enhance environmentally sensitive areas**”. Placing high density residential development immediately on the edge of the Patuxent River wetlands fails in that regard as well.

Placing MSTC in the Regional Center falls short on the Master Plan criteria of (page viii) "**refinement of the boundaries based on 5 to 10 minute walking distances from ... possible transit hubs**”. This type of transportation does not exist at MSTC currently nor is it in any part of the plan.

In the “Strategic Economic Development Vision for Bowie 2016” there are several specific success oriented recommendations germane to Maryland Science and Tech Center. These recommendations are that Bowie should:
1) “**Generate revenue from sources other** than homeowners”, and
2) “**Have diverse professional employment and business opportunities** within the City”.

The report further notes: “**Within the current jurisdictional limits of the City of Bowie, only one** sizeable parcel exists for development as an employment center”

This **one** site, MSTC, needs special consideration in the new Master Plan, not including residential development, but a separate zone for economic development and employment opportunity as was recommended by the County Charrette staff.

---

Bruce D. Pletsch – Sherwood Manor Civic Association sherwoodmanon@comcast.net
16520 Abbey Drive - Bowie, Md. 20715 (301) 343-0396
City of Bowie
2614 Kenhill Drive
Bowie, Maryland 20715

March 26, 2002

The Honorable Peter A. Shapiro, Chairman
Prince George's County Council
County Administration Building
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

The Honorable Elizabeth M. Hewlett, Chairman
Prince George's County Planning Board
County Administration Building
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

RE: Preliminary General Plan

Dear Chairman Shapiro and Chairman Hewlett:

On Monday, March 18, 2002 the Bowie City Council conducted a public hearing on the Preliminary General Plan. After hearing the testimony and recommendations of several residents, City Committees and other civic representatives, the Council voted to endorse the General Plan with the specific changes and additions identified in this letter. We appreciate the work that went into this policy plan and the work of Commission 2000 that led up to this Plan. We have organized our recommendations along the same lines as the General Plan format, as follows: (1) Development Pattern; (2) Infrastructure; (3) Economic Development, Housing and Community Character; and, (4) Implementation.

I. Development Pattern Element

Like the County's Biennial Growth Policy, the primary growth strategy of the Preliminary General Plan is achieved through separation of the County into three (3) specific growth policy areas: the Developed Tier, the Developing Tier, and the Rural Tier. In addition to this, growth is specifically encouraged in designated Centers and Corridors. The City Council finds this approach to be a useful planning tool, in that public sector expenditures can be directed to those areas where the County wishes to emphasize growth. The City therefore endorses the growth management philosophy identified in the Development Pattern Element, with the following specific comments:

1. There is a need for countywide analysis of the development pattern contained in this Plan in relation to all of the public facilities referenced in the Plan. This level of analysis was used in the 1982 General Plan, but very little data is provided about baseline conditions in this General Plan. The only public facilities addressed comprehensively in this Plan update are fire stations. If the Preliminary General Plan does not include a comprehensive review of the above, the Plan should certainly recommend that the implications of the Development Pattern Element be addressed as soon as possible through subsequent Functional Master Plans.
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2. The Developing Tier should be segmented into two sub-parts: the portion identified an Environmentally Sensitive Area and the portion that is not. A large portion of this Tier is environmentally constrained, including the Patuxent River, Collington Branch, Western Branch, Mattawoman Creek and Piscataway Creek watersheds. It is recommended that the General Plan be revised to recognize the need to include differing standards for each of these two parts of the Developing Tier and show the Environmentally Sensitive Area on the General Plan map. This would be consistent with one of the principal visions of the Smart Growth emphasis: that sensitive areas are protected. The General Plan should specifically establish the desired percentage thresholds for the accommodation of future growth in each portion of the Developing Tier (e.g. the 66% overall growth absorption shown for the Developing Tier in Table 1 on page 30 should be revised to reflect a lesser proportion of growth in the Environmentally Sensitive Area portion). The General Plan should also be revised to include a new policy that discourages public expenditures as a catalyst for growth in the environmentally sensitive portion of the Developing Tier, as well as requiring Best Management Practices for all future development.

3. Consistent with the General Plan’s objectives and definitions, a slight reconfiguration of the Bowie Center is recommended to: (a) include the public facilities located adjacent to Bowie Town Center (senior center, gymnasium, health center and potential fire station site); (b) include the high density housing area (on a portion of the former Jenkins-Heim property) north of Excalibur Road; and (c) delete the Heather Hills single-family detached subdivision. (see attached map)

4. To avoid potentially incompatible development extending into the Developing and Rural Tiers, the designated boundary of the Maryland Route 450 Corridor should be revised to exclude the area outside the Capital Beltway.

5. To protect the integrity of already existing communities from land use incompatibility, the General Plan should include specific concepts and policies necessary to create Neighborhood Conservation Areas. Neighborhood Conservation Areas are communities where existing character is fixed and stable and little potential exists for infill development or redevelopment. One strategy that would fit well within such areas is the encouragement of community commercial uses of an appropriate scale and the specific discouragement of big-box or miscellaneous commercial uses that are harmful to neighborhoods.

6. The Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program discussed on page 34 is supported as a valid technique for permitting density transfers out of the Rural Tier to areas more appropriately located for development. However, the designated receiving areas should not be limited only to Centers and Corridors, but should also include the entire Developed Tier, the area where public expenditures for public facilities is likely to be maximized. This is logical and would be in concert with the County’s growth management philosophy. However, it is recommended that the APF Test for Transportation not be waived for the density increment permitted by the TDR for centers and corridors in the Developing Tier.

II. Infrastructure Element

This section of the General Plan, beginning on page 47, addresses the areas of Environment, Transportation and Public Facilities. These sections are supported with the changes recommended below.

• Environmental – Green Infrastructure

The Environmental Infrastructure section does, for the first time in Prince George’s County, include a requirement for a Green Infrastructure Plan to be created. The City Council
Preliminary General Plan

applauds this effort to provide a framework for addressing emerging environmental concerns. As you may be aware, over the past year the City has been actively engaged in studying the County's development process in relation to wildlife habitat conservation needs. It is noted that the Preliminary General Plan does not currently include any specific objectives or policies for wildlife habitat protection. While some benefits to wildlife may be inherent in several of the proposed policies, new, more specific objectives, policies and implementation strategies regarding wildlife habitat are needed.

The City Council recommends your endorsement of the following revisions to the Environmental section of the General Plan:

(Suggested new language is in bold italics.)

Goal: To preserve, enhance, and restore the natural environment and its ecological functions as the basic component of a sustainable development pattern.

A comprehensive approach is needed to preserve and enhance the remaining ecosystems native to Prince George's County, for the benefit of the natural environment itself and to provide for a sustainable living and working environment for existing and future county residents and workers. The comprehensive approach outlined in this plan, coupled with the development of a designated green infrastructure,1 form the basis for then environmental objectives, policies, and strategies.

In addition to the identification of the green infrastructure elements, this plan includes policies that are important to sustainable, livable communities. Preserving ecological functions, providing for energy conservation, reducing light pollution, and encouraging construction that uses green building techniques are essential elements of sustainable communities in the twenty-first century and are addressed in this plan.

The vision for the future of the environment in Prince George's County is to:

- Preserve, enhance, and where appropriate, restore environmentally sensitive features through the identification of green infrastructure elements.

- Implement the desired development pattern throughout the county while protecting sensitive environmental features [insert the phrase: "and habitat protection areas while"] meeting the full intent of environmental policies and regulations.

- Restore and enhance water quality in areas that have been degraded by a high percentage of impervious surfaces and preserve water quality in areas not degraded.

- Preserve some [strike the word: "some"] portions of the county from future development, improve water quality, and restore important ecological functions to degraded ecosystems.

- Reduce overall energy consumption and implement more environmentally sensitive building techniques.
Objectives

- Protect, preserve, and enhance and/or restore designated green infrastructure component [insert the phrase: *by setting periodic, interim, attainable goals every five years*] by [strike the word: “by” and replace it with the word: “through”] 2025.

- Protect and enhance [Strike the word: “enhance” so the phrase reads: *Protect, improve and restore*] water quality in watersheds by, at a minimum, maintaining the [replace the reference to the year 2001 with “1985”] condition ratings of all watersheds countywide.

- Meet or exceed the following forest and tree cover goals within each Tier and countywide by [insert the phrase: *setting periodic, interim attainable goals every five years through*] 2025: Developed Tier—26 percent; Developing Tier—38 percent [staff recommends replacing 38 percent with “45 percent”]; Rural Tier—59 percent; and countywide—44 percent.

- Promote an awareness of environmental issues related to land use through the provision of environmental education and/or stewardship programs.

- [Add a new Objective: “Ensure that wildlife habitat protection is integrated into the development planning process.”]

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

Strategies
I. Prepare a countywide Green Infrastructure Plan as a functional master plan in concert with the desired development pattern in this General Plan [strike the phrase: “of this General Plan” and replace it with: “within two (2) years of adoption of this Plan.”]

II. [Add a new strategy: “A Green Infrastructure Plan will be incorporated into each Master Plan update.”]

III. [Add a second new strategy: “Establish interim goals for the implementation of the Green Infrastructure Plan.”]

IV. Revise appropriate regulations to ensure implementation of the Green Infrastructure Plan.

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

Strategies
I. Prepare and implement major watershed plans to address the preservation and restoration of ecological functions within watersheds, with an emphasis on the restoration and maintenance [strike the word: “maintenance”] and replace it with the word: “improvement” of water quality [insert the phrase: *based on the Chesapeake Bay Program’s baseline year 1985*], protection of aquatic living resources, and the control of water quantity with consideration of the development pattern of this General Plan.
II. Include in each area/sector plan an ecosystem evaluation and comprehensive
watershed management section for the area that provides guidance [replace the word:
“guidance” for the phrase: “standards, goals and explicit objectives”] for
preservation, enhancement, and/or protection of water-related resources.

III. Periodically [Strike the word: “Periodically”] Employ a [strike the word: “a” and
insert the phrase: the County’s Watershed Planning System] water-quality model
that evaluates [insert the phrase: every 3 to 5 years] existing water quality [insert the
word: “data”] and use the results to determine where additional efforts are needed.

IV. Evaluate the effectiveness of current ordinances and regulations regarding stream
and wetland buffer widths. Consider revising the current regulations to provide
varying [strike the word “varying”] buffer widths [insert the phrase “modeled after
the Chesapeake Bay Program’s 3-Zone Buffer System”].

V. [Add the phrase: Enforce and augment] Augment current forest conservation and
sediment and erosion control enforcement efforts.

VI. Continue [insert the word “passive”] parkland acquisition in key stream valleys and
seek additional funding sources for acquisition and conservation easements.
Institute a system of mandatory conservation easements on existing and future
passive parkland.

VII. Continue implementation of available federal and state programs to control flooding
and losses due to flooding without impairing water quality. Seek additional funding
sources to augment current efforts.

VIII. Implement through existing ordinances the use of systems and processes for treating
stormwater runoff that preserve and/or reestablish natural resources and systems,
such as reducing natural vegetation removal, reducing impervious surfaces, and
increasing infiltration. Encourage the use of Low Impact Development (LID)
techniques.

IX. Evaluate current regulations that result in the construction of required impervious
surfaces. Encourage the use of innovative designs that reduce the amount of
impervious surfaces.

X. Prepare a study of aquifer recharge areas, including well-head protection as a
measure of restoration of ecological functions.

POLICY 3:
Preserve existing woodland resources and replant woodland [insert the phrase:
including protection of, and retention of, native plant communities], where possible,
while implementing the desired development pattern.

Strategies
I. Revise the Woodland Conservation Ordinance to achieve the forest and tree cover
objectives countywide and in each Tier [staff recommends adding the phrase:
“including to allow planting of street trees to be counted as tree mitigation”].

II. Evaluate the Woodland Conservation Ordinance’s provisions for exemptions to
determine their appropriateness and whether they support the forest and tree cover
objectives of this plan.

III. [Add a new strategy: Use native plants in woodland restoration and the
development review process.]

IV. [Add a new strategy: Control the spread of invasive, non-native plant species in the
landscape through the use of conservation landscaping techniques.
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V. [Add a new strategy: Reduce habitat fragmentation especially associated with forest interior.]

VI. [Add a new strategy: Protect mature forest habitat areas.]

POLICY 4:
Reduce energy consumption countywide.

Strategies
I. Develop a countywide energy conservation and efficiency policy with measurable objectives.

II. Evaluate [insert the phrase: “and update”] land development regulations and building codes to provide opportunities for green building and energy reducing techniques.

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

Strategies
I. Develop lighting standards for development review and provide standards that are appropriate [delete the phrase: for each Tier.]

II. Evaluate lighting design standards and practices for public [insert the phrase: “and private”] buildings and [insert the word: “open”] spaces, [insert the phrase: “active recreation and commercial land uses”] and prepare lighting guidelines for these spaces with consideration of safety, energy conservation, and the minimization of light spill-over.

III. Ensure that new roadway lighting meets the guidelines for minimization of light spill-over and sky glow.

POLICY 6:
Use existing natural resources wisely.

Strategies
I. Clarify regulations with regard to timber harvesting and the protection of sensitive resources to ensure that harvesting operations are conducted in a manner that protects the resources after the harvest.

II. Prepare a special study to analyze sand and gravel mining operations with regard to sensitive extraction and compatibility with existing communities.

III. Provide an environmental impact analysis for sand and gravel mining, rubble fill and Class III fill applications.

POLICY 7:
Minimize impacts [insert the phrase: “of noise pollution.” and delete the remaining language in this policy] on new and redeveloped residential uses due to transportation-generated noise.

Strategies
I. Adopt a noise ordinance to regulate noise pollution.

II. Revise appropriate ordinances to require the mitigation of existing and future transportation generated noise levels to 65 dBA in outdoor activity areas and 45 dBA in interior areas on sites with existing or proposed residential uses.

III. Recommend appropriate land uses in areas impacted by unacceptable noise levels. [Rewrite this strategy so it reads: “Recommend unacceptable noise levels by specific land use.”]

IV. [Add a new strategy: Reduce noise pollution onto the natural areas and passive parkland sites.]
POLICY 8:
Promote environmental stewardship as an important element to the overall success of the environmental initiatives contained in this plan.

Strategies
I. Through the public school system, create and promote an environmental education program that focuses on land use decision-making. [Reword this strategy so that it has several considerations as follows:

Create and promote environmental education programs that have target audiences including:
- Curriculum for public and private school age children (Grades 1 through 8)
- Public outreach to the development community with emphasis on sustainable development
- Workshops and continuing education events with printed materials for County residents about the benefits of conservation landscaping techniques in residential communities and day-to-day environmental stewardship practices.

II. Develop a public [Insert the phrase: and private] sector awards program for projects that are developed using environmentally sensitive and/or energy efficient designs.

III. Evaluate the costs and benefits of sustainable development practices and guidelines and prepare an analysis of broad distribution.

IV. Publish and update periodically a Prince George’s County resource directory of services that promote resource conservation, environmental responsibility, and sustainable development techniques.

[Add a new policy and five strategies as follows:]

POLICY 9: Incorporate environmental and habitat retention considerations in the County development review process as best management practices (BMPs).

I. Increase quality habitat to protect wildlife species and the biological diversity of the County.
II. Encourage retention of wildlife habitat on sites beginning at the pre-development for the framework of greenway corridors and an area-wide Green Infrastructure.
III. Outline measures to minimize disturbance and mortality to wildlife during and after development, including habitat fragmentation reduction.
IV. Improve the quality of life by preserving a system of open spaces and viewsheds.
V. Provide a protocol for inventorying the natural resources within the County.

- Transportation

I. Policy 3 on page 31, regarding provision of multimodal options in the Developing Tier in order to reduce the need for new arterial or collector roads, is supported. Specific additional strategies recommended for this policy include the following:

   i. Eliminate unnecessary master planned roadways that do not directly serve centers or corridors.

   ii. Eliminate master planned circumferential roadways in favor of strong multi-modal corridors identified in this General Plan.
iii. Study the effectiveness of multimodal options in helping to attain conformity with regional air quality standards (e.g. ozone).

2. Also in Policy 3, include a specific statement in Strategy I to remove A-44 from the Master Plan of Transportation. In Strategy V, include a statement precluding traffic mitigation in the Developing Tier (e.g. Routes 3/301).

3. Revise Transportation Objectives on page 53 and Policy 3 on page 54 to include an emphasis on achieving land use compatibility around general aviation airports.

4. Revise Transportation Objectives to encourage the development and use of methodologies that assess the traffic impact of development on local (including municipal) residential streets.

5. Regarding traffic Levels of Service (LOS) policies, revise Policy 2 on page 43 to require LOS “D” (rather than LOS “E”) in Regional Centers within the Developing Tier.

- Public Facilities (Schools, Police, Fire, Library, Parks, Water/Sewer)

1. The General Plan should set unique public facility standards for each respective Tier, given that there are unique characteristics to each of the three tiers. LOS standards should be developed that are based on measurable indices such as calls-for-service or persons-per-square mile.

2. On page 58, the Plan should include a footnote for Policy 2, Strategy IV that states consideration should be given to advancing funding for the medical portion of recommended new fire stations (such as at Bowie Town Center) where a large proportion of calls-for-service are for medic service.

3. The following policy should be included: “Public improvements should be sized to accommodate only the levels of development envisioned in local master plans.”

4. The General Plan should recommend policies that seek to offset the public sector’s portion of providing public facilities, such as commercial development impact fees. Impact fee revenues should be used to resolve specific inadequacies in the area where the fees are collected.

5. The objective of using 100% of capacity as a benchmark for school capacity (noted in Table 1 on page 23) is supported.

6. While the many policies of the Plan that emphasize pedestrian facilities are supported, the Plan should include a measurable objective for trails, such as one (1) mile of trail for every 3,000 residents.

7. A clarification should be made to the Public Facilities Objective for parkland on page 23 so that it is clear that parkland provided by a municipality is not included in this ratio.

8. The Developing Tier policy for public facilities (Policy 4) is supported. However, in Strategy VI, the phrase “if noncontiguous development is authorized” should be deleted. In addition, Strategy VII should be expanded to include language that states that if development is proposed in sensitive watersheds or in the Environmentally Sensitive Area portion of the Developing Tier, the developer shall be required to use more Best Management Practices in order to develop.

9. Policy 3 on page 44 regarding public facilities in Centers and Corridors should be revised to show a High priority for public sector investment in Regional Centers and Corridors.
10. A new policy should be added that states: “Public facilities tests should be performed at the municipal level. This would include a police test, as well as separate fire and medic tests at the municipal level, and a schools test at the individual school level.”

11. The Public Facility Objective for libraries should be revised to include an accessibility range of a three (3) mile radius as a planning guideline for the Developing Tier. On page 58, Policy 2, Strategy 1, the sentence should continue stating: “for libraries within the Developed Tier.” Also, a new sentence should be added to this strategy stating: “It should be a goal to establish libraries within a three (3) mile radius in the Developing Tier”.

III. Economic Development, Housing and Community Character

This section of the General Plan, beginning on page 61, addresses economic development, housing, revitalization areas, urban design and historic preservation. These sections are supported with the suggested changes discussed below.

- Economic Development
  1. To ensure that older commercial areas needing revitalization in the Developing Tier also are recognized, the words “and Developing” should be added to the second line on page 6 and the second line on page 66.
  2. An additional goal should be added to page 30 that reads: “Renew/redevelop older commercial areas.”
  3. In order to fully appreciate the change being suggested in the objective on page 61, the current base-line data should be added.
  4. To ensure the future availability of the County to allow for continued business expansion, it is recommended that a percentage (e.g. 20%) of sewage treatment plant capacity be reserved to promote economic development. This should be added as a new strategy (VI) under Policy 2 on page 62.

- Revitalization
  1. On page 66, Old Town Bowie should be included as a designated neighborhood revitalization area. Alternatively, the text should be revised to include discussion of revitalization areas in the Developing Tier (not only the Developed Tier).

IV. Implementation Element

There are several areas where regulatory revisions beyond those mentioned in the Implementation Element are badly needed. These include, but are not limited to, revising the APF tests for police (to include calls for service, as well as facilities), fire and rescue (decoupling the fire/ambulance test), updating the Public Safety Master Plan and other Functional Master Plans, and adopting regulations that address airport land use compatibility. A strategic protection plan for aquifer recharge areas is also recommended as an additional implementation task to be added to those listed on page 78.
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However, the single most important aspect of implementation is the need to directly link a comprehensive, Countywide cumulative analysis of the emerging development pattern and public facilities needs into an effective prioritization and programming of capital projects in the County’s capital improvement program (CIP). To provide this critical guidance, it is recommended that the above actions (especially the Functional Master Plans and revisions to APF regulations) be given the highest priority for implementation.

As a final comment, we remind you that an update to the 1991 Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville and Vicinity Area Master Plan is extremely overdue. Since much of the County’s future growth will occur within our planning area, we reiterate our request to have this plan updated as soon as possible.

The City Council recognizes the hard work of MNCPPC staff, Commission 2000 and the members of the Planning Board and County Council in drafting this important guidance document for the County’s future growth and development. We appreciate all the efforts to solicit citizen participation in this endeavor. With the recommended changes, the City Council believes the proposed Preliminary General Plan can and should be approved. There is an urgent need to adopt a comprehensive growth management plan so that other needed plans can begin being prepared.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the plan formulation process and for your serious consideration of these recommendations.

Sincerely,

G. Frederick Robinson
Mayor

Attachment – Revised Map of Bowie Center
RECOMMENDED REVISION TO BOWIE CENTER BOUNDARY
June 4, 2003

The Honorable Elizabeth M. Hewlett, Chairman
Prince George’s County Planning Board
County Administration Building
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

RE: Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville and Vicinity Area Master Plan Update
Public Forum Testimony

Dear Chairman Hewlett:

The Bowie City Council appreciates the opportunity to provide these Public Forum comments. We applaud the effort to update the 1991 Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan, since so much time has passed and many of the concepts proposed in that document are no longer valid. The City appreciates the Commission’s assistance and commitment of staff resources for this major effort, since a thorough, comprehensive analysis of the planning area will provide the best opportunity to fashion recommendations for the future growth and development this portion of Prince George’s County.

Our understanding is that all future County plans will follow the format of the approved General Plan and will be organized under several major plan elements: (I) Development Pattern; (II) Infrastructure, including Environment, Transportation and Public Facilities; (III) Economic Development, Housing and Community Character; and (IV) Implementation. The City’s Public Forum comments are also organized according to this format.

The City Council recommends that the Master Plan update address, at a minimum, the following major items:

**Development Pattern Element**

- Revise the Rural Tier Boundary to re-incorporate the Chesley-Gibraltar property at Mill Branch Road into the Rural Tier. Replacement of this property within the Rural Tier will correct an egregious mistake in land use policy committed by the previous County Council. A zoning moratorium should be put into effect as soon as possible to deter property owners from inflating the cost of acquisition for transportation improvements.
- Designate the Nash Property in the northwest quadrant of the US 50/301 and MD 3 interchange for preservation as open space and downzone it accordingly.
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- Reconfigure the Bowie Center boundaries to include development areas along Northview Drive and the Covington/Pin Oak Village area and delete the subdivision of Heather Hills. Hand-in-hand with this should be a closer examination and updating of the boundaries of the County's Priority Funding Area outside of the corporate limits of the City. The City Council would like to be a part of that process.
- Evaluate the establishment of new Centers at Route 450 Mainstreet and at the Karington development (Collington Center North).
- Create Neighborhood Conservation Areas to protect community character, especially in areas that have an established character, such as the Old Town Bowie, the Levitt sections of Bowie and the area east of US 301. Establishment of Neighborhood Conservation Areas will protect existing communities from the unwanted intrusion of objectionable special exception uses. The burden to prove a change in land use should be on the applicant, not the community opposing the change.
- Continue Crain Highway preservation and access control, including a prohibition on expansion of nonconforming commercial uses. Ideally, the Master Plan should be revised to prohibit any development in the median and, if possible, remove existing development.
- Use Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) to protect the Rural Tier and direct additional growth to planned Centers.

Infrastructure

- Provide the needed public facilities (schools, police, fire/rescue, library) to serve the planning area prior to, or simultaneous with, any new growth. The Public Forum Information Brochure recognizes (on page 21) that the adequacy of public facilities is a concern because of the high rate of growth in the Bowie planning area. Even the MNCPPC staff admits that public facilities implementation in this planning area has not been a high priority in the past. The existence of the Bowie Town Center Fire Station in the County's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) since 1977 is the most glaring example of neglecting necessary public facilities while more and more development relying on these facilities is approved, constructed and occupied. Since 1996, almost two (2) million square feet of commercial space and over 1,800 new dwelling units have been built in the Town Center area. With increases in levels of traffic and activity at the Bowie Town Center, Bowie Senior Center, Municipal Gymnasium and the Bowie Health Campus, the number of calls for service is expected to increase rapidly. The Public Forum Brochure concludes that "the rate of development has far exceeded the pace projected by the plan" and that "development levels have exceeded projections and should be reevaluated."

Strict standards for public facilities and services should also be adopted and adhered to in the development review process. Advancement of the planned Leelane Road Fire Station to the Capital Improvement Program is one example of providing needed facilities to serve areas of new growth.

The proposal to examine a location for a new library facility in the central portion of Bowie is counter to the recommendations of recent studies that identified the center
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of a future service area in the vicinity of Church Road/MD 214. This demand is accentuated by the County’s approval of several new communities including Oak Creek Club, Woodmore at Oak Creek and Karington.

- Eliminate unnecessary master planned roadways that do not directly serve Centers, including A-44 (the Intercounty Connector), the A-58 “Secondary Alignment” and A-19.

- Revise current transportation policies such that the roadway system proposed to serve the planning area is not overdesigned. The finite limits of the roadway system’s capacity should be recognized. The policy should encourage the best circulation system within the planning area as its primary goal, rather than the need to accommodate all peak hour traffic volumes.

- Include a new interchange on US 50 between MD 197 and MD 704.

- Prohibit traffic mitigation in this portion of the Developing Tier (e.g. on Routes 3/301 and 214). A higher standard Level-of-Service (LOS) “C” is already being used for the portion of US 301 in the Rural Tier.

- Use a Level-of-Service “D” standard for traffic APF tests throughout the Developing Tier (including Centers).

- Examine the systematic use of the “major collector” road design as a means of creating an improved network of local roads serving the community, apart from regional traffic flows.

- Address emerging transit solutions, such as the “flexible circulator and hub” concept. The MARC station at Bowie State University and Old Town Bowie should be integrated into an additional “hub” within this system. The current County Five-Year Transit Master Plan indicates that planning for transit in the Bowie area has lagged behind other efforts identified in that Plan. This matter is deserving of immediate attention as improvements to the transit system are long overdue.

- Provide expanded trail facilities, including on-the-road routes and trails along the Patuxent River, to supplement a multi-modal transportation network.

- Expand the Patuxent Primary Management Areas to protect aquifer recharge areas, create greenways and reduce forest fragmentation. Consider extending the protections afforded the portion of the Patuxent River in the Critical Area to these expanded protection areas.

- Revise the County’s Woodland Conservation/Tree Preservation Ordinance to include habitat considerations in the development review process.

- Examine how fee-in-lieu funds collected by the Commission can best be used to satisfy the recreational needs within the planning area.

**Economic Development, Housing and Community Character**

- Designate Old Town Bowie as a County Revitalization Area.

- Examine the use of mixed-use overlay zoning for the Route 450 Mainstreet area.

- Reassess the current three-to-one ratio for employment zoning.
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The City Council feels strongly that the Plan update should address issues of sustainability for each element and that the recommendations be more comprehensive than in past plans. The 1997 Calvert County Comprehensive Plan is a good example of how these important items can be incorporated into a master plan. Another recommendation for the upcoming planning process is to recognize this planning project as a stepping stone to future Sector Plans that cover more limited geographic sub-areas of the current planning area.

The City Council wishes to emphasize that the planning concerns outlined in this letter are preliminary in nature and cover only some of our major planning issues. The Council will provide more specific comments and recommendations as the process moves forward.

We truly appreciate your genuine interest in conducting this Plan update. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Bowie City Council
G. Frederick Robinson
Mayor

CC: The Honorable Douglas J.J. Peters
The Honorable Samuel Dean

P:/masterplanpublicforumpositionstatement
March 26, 2002

The Honorable Peter A. Shapiro, Chairman
Prince George’s County Council
County Administration Building
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

The Honorable Elizabeth M. Hewlett, Chairman
Prince George’s County Planning Board
County Administration Building
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

RE: Preliminary General Plan

Dear Chairman Shapiro and Chairman Hewlett:

On Monday, March 18, 2002 the Bowie City Council conducted a public hearing on the Preliminary General Plan. After hearing the testimony and recommendations of several residents, City Committees and other civic representatives, the Council voted to endorse the General Plan with the specific changes and additions identified in this letter. We appreciate the work that went into this policy plan and the work of Commission 2000 that led up to this Plan. We have organized our recommendations along the same lines as the General Plan format, as follows: (1) Development Pattern; (2) Infrastructure; (3) Economic Development, Housing and Community Character; and, (4) Implementation.

I. Development Pattern Element

Like the County’s Biennial Growth Policy, the primary growth strategy of the Preliminary General Plan is achieved through separation of the County into three (3) specific growth policy areas: the Developed Tier; the Developing Tier, and the Rural Tier. In addition to this, growth is specifically encouraged in designated Centers and Corridors. The City Council finds this approach to be a useful planning tool, in that public sector expenditures can be directed to those areas where the County wishes to emphasize growth. The City therefore endorses the growth management philosophy identified in the Development Pattern Element, with the following specific comments:

1. There is a need for countywide analysis of the development pattern contained in this Plan in relation to all of the public facilities referenced in the Plan. This level of analysis was used in the 1982 General Plan, but very little data is provided about baseline conditions in this General Plan. The only public facilities addressed comprehensively in this Plan update are fire stations. If the Preliminary General Plan does not include a comprehensive review of the above, the Plan should certainly recommend that the implications of the Development Pattern Element be addressed as soon as possible through subsequent Functional Master Plans.

Address the Biennial Growth Policy
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2. The Developing Tier should be segmented into two sub-parts: the portion identified an Environmentally Sensitive Area and the portion that is not. A large portion of this Tier is environmentally constrained, including the Patuxent River, Collington Branch, Western Branch, Mattawoman Creek and Piscataway Creek watersheds. It is recommended that the General Plan be revised to recognize the need to include differing standards for each of these two parts of the Developing Tier and show the Environmentally Sensitive Area on the General Plan map. This would be consistent with one of the principal visions of the Smart Growth emphasis: that sensitive areas are protected. The General Plan should specifically establish the desired percentage thresholds for the accommodation of future growth in each portion of the Developing Tier (e.g. the 66% overall growth absorption shown for the Developing Tier in Table 1 on page 30 should be revised to reflect a lesser proportion of growth in the Environmentally Sensitive Area portion). The General Plan should also be revised to include a new policy that discourages public expenditures as a catalyst for growth in the environmentally sensitive portion of the Developing Tier, as well as requiring Best Management Practices for all future development.

3. Consistent with the General Plan’s objectives and definitions, a slight reconfiguration of the Bowie Center is recommended to: (a) include the public facilities located adjacent to Bowie Town Center (senior center, gymnasium, health center and potential fire station site); (b) include the high density housing area (on a portion of the former Jenkins-Heim property) north of Excalibur Road; and (c) delete the Heather Hills single-family detached subdivision. (see attached map)

4. To avoid potentially incompatible development extending into the Developing and Rural Tiers, the designated boundary of the Maryland Route 450 Corridor should be revised to exclude the area outside the Capital Beltway.

5. To protect the integrity of already existing communities from land use incompatibility, the General Plan should include specific concepts and policies necessary to create Neighborhood Conservation Areas. Neighborhood Conservation Areas are communities where existing character is fixed and stable and little potential exists for infill development or redevelopment. One strategy that would fit well within such areas is the encouragement of community commercial uses of an appropriate scale and the specific discouragement of big-box or miscellaneous commercial uses that are harmful to neighborhoods.

6. The Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program discussed on page 34 is supported as a valid technique for permitting density transfers out of the Rural Tier to areas more appropriately located for development. However, the designated receiving areas should not be limited only to Centers and Corridors, but should also include the entire Developed Tier, the area where public expenditures for public facilities is likely to be maximized. This is logical and would be in concert with the County’s growth management philosophy. However, it is recommended that the APF Test for Transportation not be waived for the density increment permitted by the TDR for centers and corridors in the Developing Tier.

II. Infrastructure Element

This section of the General Plan, beginning on page 47, addresses the areas of Environment, Transportation and Public Facilities. These sections are supported with the changes recommended below.

- **Environmental – Green Infrastructure**

The Environmental Infrastructure section does, for the first time in Prince George’s County, include a requirement for a Green Infrastructure Plan to be created. The City Council
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applauds this effort to provide a framework for addressing emerging environmental concerns. As you may be aware, over the past year the City has been actively engaged in studying the County’s development process in relation to wildlife habitat conservation needs. It is noted that the Preliminary General Plan does not currently include any specific objectives or policies for wildlife habitat protection. While some benefits to wildlife may be inherent in several of the proposed policies, new, more specific objectives, policies and implementation strategies regarding wildlife habitat are needed.

The City Council recommends your endorsement of the following revisions to the Environmental section of the General Plan:

(Suggested new language is in bold italics.)

Goal: To preserve, enhance, and restore the natural environment and its ecological functions as the basic component of a sustainable development pattern.

A comprehensive approach is needed to preserve and enhance the remaining ecosystems native to Prince George’s County, for the benefit of the natural environment itself and to provide for a sustainable living and working environment for existing and future county residents and workers. The comprehensive approach outlined in this plan, coupled with the development of a designated green infrastructure, form the basis for then environmental objectives, policies, and strategies.

In addition to the identification of the green infrastructure elements, this plan includes policies that are important to sustainable, livable communities. Preserving ecological functions, providing for energy conservation, reducing light pollution, and encouraging construction that uses green building techniques are essential elements of sustainable communities in the twenty-first century and are addressed in this plan.

The vision for the future of the environment in Prince George’s County is to:

- Preserve, enhance, and where appropriate, restore environmentally sensitive features through the identification of green infrastructure elements.

- Implement the desired development pattern throughout the county while protecting sensitive environmental features [insert the phrase: “and habitat protection areas while”] meeting the full intent of environmental policies and regulations.

- Restore and enhance water quality in areas that have been degraded by a high percentage of impervious surfaces and preserve water quality in areas not degraded.

- Preserve some [strike the word: “some”] portions of the county from future development, improve water quality, and restore important ecological functions to degraded ecosystems.

- Reduce overall energy consumption and implement more environmentally sensitive building techniques.
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Objectives

- Protect, preserve, and enhance and/or restore designated green infrastructure component [insert the phrase: *by setting periodic, interim, attainable goals every five years*] by [strike the word: *by* and replace it with the word: *through*] 2025.

- Protect and enhance [strike the word: *enhance*] so the phrase reads: *Protect, improve and restore* water quality in watersheds by, at a minimum, maintaining the [replace the reference to the year 2001 with *"1985"*] condition ratings of all watersheds countywide.

- Meet or exceed the following forest and tree cover goals within each Tier and countywide by [insert the phrase: *setting periodic, interim attainable goals every five years through*] 2025: Developed Tier—26 percent; Developing Tier—38 percent [staff recommends replacing 38 percent with *"45 percent"*]; Rural Tier—59 percent; and countywide—44 percent.

- Promote an awareness of environmental issues related to land use through the provision of environmental education and/or stewardship programs.

- [Add a new Objective: *Ensure that wildlife habitat protection is integrated into the development planning process.*]"}

POLICY 1:

Preserve, protect, and enhance the designated green infrastructure elements.

Strategies

I. Prepare a countywide Green Infrastructure Plan as a functional master plan in concert with the desired development pattern in this General Plan [strike the phrase: *of this General Plan* and replace it with: *within two (2) years of adoption of this Plan.*]

II. [Add a new strategy: *A Green Infrastructure Plan will be incorporated into each Master Plan update.*]

III. [Add a second new strategy: *Establish interim goals for the implementation of the Green Infrastructure Plan.*]

IV. Revise appropriate regulations to ensure implementation of the Green Infrastructure Plan.

POLICY 2:

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

Strategies

I. Prepare and implement major watershed plans to address the preservation and restoration of ecological functions within watersheds, with an emphasis on the restoration and maintenance [strike the word: *maintenance* and replace it with the word: *improvement*] of water quality [insert the phrase: *based on the Chesapeake Bay Program’s baseline year 1985*], protection of aquatic living resources, and the control of water quantity with consideration of the development pattern of this General Plan.
II. Include in each area/sector plan an ecosystem evaluation and comprehensive watershed management section for the area that provides guidance [replace the word: "guidance" for the phrase: "standards, goals and explicit objectives"] for preservation, enhancement, and/or protection of water-related resources.

III. Periodically [Strike the word: "Periodically"] Employ a [strike the word: "a" and insert the phrase: the County’s Watershed Planning System] water-quality model that evaluates [insert the phrase: every 3 to 5 years] existing water quality [insert the word: "data"] and use the results to determine where additional efforts are needed.

IV. Evaluate the effectiveness of current ordinances and regulations regarding stream and wetland buffer widths. Consider revising the current regulations to provide varying [strike the word “varying"] buffer widths [insert the phrase “modeled after the Chesapeake Bay Program’s 3-Zone Buffer System”].

V. [add the phrase: Enforce and augment] Augment current forest conservation and sediment and erosion control enforcement efforts.

VI. Continue [insert the word “passive”] parkland acquisition in key stream valleys and seek additional funding sources for acquisition and conservation easements. Institute a system of mandatory conservation easements on existing and future passive parkland.

VII. Continue implementation of available federal and state programs to control flooding and losses due to flooding without impairing water quality. Seek additional funding sources to augment current efforts.

VIII. Implement through existing ordinances the use of systems and processes for treating stormwater runoff that preserve and/or reestablish natural resources and systems, such as reducing natural vegetation removal, reducing impervious surfaces, and increasing infiltration. Encourage the use of Low Impact Development (LID) techniques.

IX. Evaluate current regulations that result in the construction of required impervious surfaces. Encourage the use of innovative designs that reduce the amount of impervious surfaces.

X. Prepare a study of aquifer recharge areas, including well-head protection as a measure of restoration of ecological functions.

POLICY 3: Preserve existing woodland resources and replant woodland [insert the phrase: including protection of, and retention of, native plant communities], where possible, while implementing the desired development pattern.

Strategies

I. Revise the Woodland Conservation Ordinance to achieve the forest and tree cover objectives countywide and in each Tier [staff recommends adding the phrase: "including to allow planting of street trees to be counted as tree mitigation"].

II. Evaluate the Woodland Conservation Ordinance’s provisions for exemptions to determine their appropriateness and whether they support the forest and tree cover objectives of this plan.

III. [Add a new strategy: Use native plants in woodland restoration and the development review process.]

IV. [Add a new strategy: Control the spread of invasive, non-native plant species in the landscape through the use of conservation landscaping techniques.
POLICY 4:
Reduce energy consumption countywide.

Strategies
I. Develop a countywide energy conservation and efficiency policy with measurable objectives.
II. Evaluate land development regulations and building codes to provide opportunities for green building and energy reducing techniques.

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

Strategies
I. Develop lighting standards for development review and provide standards that are appropriate (delete the phrase: for each Tier.)
II. Evaluate lighting design standards and practices for public buildings and insert the phrase: “and private” buildings and insert the word: “open” spaces, insert the phrase: “active recreation and commercial land uses” and prepare lighting guidelines for these spaces with consideration of safety, energy conservation, and the minimization of light spill-over.
III. Ensure that new roadway lighting meets the guidelines for minimization of light spill-over and sky glow.

POLICY 6:
Use existing natural resources wisely.

Strategies
I. Clarify regulations with regard to timber harvesting and the protection of sensitive resources to ensure that harvesting operations are conducted in a manner that protects the resources after the harvest.
II. Prepare a special study to analyze sand and gravel mining operations with regard to sensitive extraction and compatibility with existing communities.
III. Provide an environmental impact analysis for sand and gravel mining, rubble fill and Class III fill applications.

POLICY 7:
Minimize impacts and delete the remaining language in this policy) on new and redeveloped residential uses due to transportation-generated noise.

Strategies
I. Adopt a noise ordinance to regulate noise pollution.
II. Revise appropriate ordinances to require the mitigation of existing and future transportation generated noise levels to 65 dBA in outdoor activity areas and 45 dBA in interior areas on sites with existing or proposed residential uses.
III. Recommend appropriate land uses in areas impacted by unacceptable noise levels. [Rewrite this strategy so it reads: “Recommend unacceptable noise levels by specific land use”].
IV. [Add a new strategy: Reduce noise pollution onto the natural areas and passive parkland sites.]
POLICY 8: 
Promote environmental stewardship as an important element to the overall success of the environmental initiatives contained in this plan.

Strategies
I. Through the public school system, create and promote an environmental education program that focuses on land use decision-making. [Reword this strategy so that it has several considerations as follows:

Create and promote environmental education programs that have target audiences including:
- Curriculum for public and private school age children (Grades 1 through 8)
- Public outreach to the development community with emphasis on sustainable development
- Workshops and continuing education events with printed materials for County residents about the benefits of conservation landscaping techniques in residential communities and day-to-day environmental stewardship practices]

II. Develop a public [Insert the phrase: and private] sector awards program for projects that are developed using environmentally sensitive and/or energy efficient designs.

III. Evaluate the costs and benefits of sustainable development practices and guidelines and prepare an analysis of broad distribution.

IV. Publish and update periodically a Prince George's County resource directory of services that promote resource conservation, environmental responsibility, and sustainable development techniques.

[Add a new policy and five strategies as follows:]

POLICY 9: Incorporate environmental and habitat retention considerations in the County development review process as best management practices (BMPs).

I. Increase quality habitat to protect wildlife species and the biological diversity of the County.

II. Encourage retention of wildlife habitat on sites beginning at the pre-development for the framework of greenway corridors and an area-wide Green Infrastructure.

III. Outline measures to minimize disturbance and mortality to wildlife during and after development, including habitat fragmentation reduction.

IV. Improve the quality of life by preserving a system of open spaces and viewsheds.

V. Provide a protocol for inventorying the natural resources within the County.

Transportation

1. Policy 3 on page 31, regarding provision of multimodal options in the Developing Tier in order to reduce the need for new arterial or collector roads, is supported. Specific additional strategies recommended for this policy include the following:

   i. Eliminate unnecessary master planned roadways that do not directly serve centers or corridors.

   ii. Eliminate master planned circumferential roadways in favor of strong multi-modal corridors identified in this General Plan.
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iii. Study the effectiveness of multimodal options in helping to attain conformity with regional air quality standards (e.g. ozone).

2. Also in Policy 3, include a specific statement in Strategy I to remove A-44 from the Master Plan of Transportation. In Strategy V, include a statement precluding traffic mitigation in the Developing Tier (e.g. Routes 3/301).

3. Revise Transportation Objectives on page 53 and Policy 3 on page 54 to include an emphasis on achieving land use compatibility around general aviation airports.

4. Revise Transportation Objectives to encourage the development and use of methodologies that assess the traffic impact of development on local (including municipal) residential streets.

5. Regarding traffic Levels of Service (LOS) policies, revise Policy 2 on page 43 to require LOS “D” (rather than LOS “E”) in Regional Centers within the Developing Tier.

- Public Facilities (Schools, Police, Fire, Library, Parks, Water/Sewer)

1. The General Plan should set unique public facility standards for each respective Tier, given that there are unique characteristics to each of the three tiers. LOS standards should be developed that are based on measurable indices such as calls-for-service or persons-per-square mile.

2. On page 58, the Plan should include a footnote for Policy 2, Strategy IV that states consideration should be given to advancing funding for the medical portion of recommended new fire stations (such as at Bowie Town Center) where a large proportion of calls-for-service are for medic service.

The following policy should be included: “Public improvements should be sized to accommodate only the levels of development envisioned in local master plans.”

3. The General Plan should recommend policies that seek to offset the public sector’s portion of providing public facilities, such as commercial development impact fees. Impact fee revenues should be used to resolve specific inadequacies in the area where the fees are collected.

4. The objective of using 100% of capacity as a benchmark for school capacity (noted in Table 1 on page 23) is supported.

5. While the many policies of the Plan that emphasize pedestrian facilities are supported, the Plan should include a measureable objective for trails, such as one (1) mile of trail for every 3,000 residents.

6. A clarification should be made to the Public Facilities Objective for parkland on page 23 so that it is clear that parkland provided by a municipality is not included in this ratio.

7. The Developing Tier policy for public facilities (Policy 4) is supported. However, in Strategy VI, the phrase “if noncontiguous development is authorized” should be deleted. In addition, Strategy VII should be expanded to include language that states that if development is proposed in sensitive watersheds or in the Environmentally Sensitive Area portion of the Developing Tier, the developer shall be required to use more Best Management Practices in order to develop.

8. Policy 3 on page 44 regarding public facilities in Centers and Corridors should be revised to show a High priority for public sector investment in Regional Centers and Corridors.

Revising Centers and Corridors in Developing Tier dilutes the distinction in Plan favoring Developing Tier.
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10. A new policy should be added that states: "Public facilities tests should be performed at the municipal level. This would include a police test, as well as separate fire and medic tests at the municipal level, and a schools test at the individual school level."

11. The Public Facility Objective for libraries should be revised to include an accessibility range of a three (3) mile radius as a planning guideline for the Developing Tier. On page 58, Policy 2, Strategy 1, the sentence should continue stating: "for libraries within the Developed Tier." Also, a new sentence should be added to this strategy stating: "It should be a goal to establish libraries within a three (3) mile radius in the Developing Tier."

III. Economic Development, Housing and Community Character

This section of the General Plan, beginning on page 61, addresses economic development, housing, revitalization areas, urban design and historic preservation. These sections are supported with the suggested changes discussed below.

- Economic Development

1. To ensure that older commercial areas needing revitalization in the Developing Tier also are recognized, the words "and Developing" should be added to the second line on page 6 and the second line on page 66.

2. An additional goal should be added to page 30 that reads: "Renew/redevelop older commercial areas."

3. In order to fully appreciate the change being suggested in the objective on page 61, the current base-line data should be added.

4. To ensure the future availability of the County to allow for continued business expansion, it is recommended that a percentage (e.g. 20%) of sewage treatment plant capacity be reserved to promote economic development. This should be added as a new strategy (VI) under Policy 2 on page 62.

- Revitalization

1. On page 66, Old Town Bowie should be included as a designated neighborhood revitalization area. Alternatively, the text should be revised to include discussion of revitalization areas in the Developing Tier (not only the Developed Tier).

IV. Implementation Element

There are several areas where regulatory revisions beyond those mentioned in the Implementation Element are badly needed. These include, but are not limited to, revising the APF tests for police (to include calls for service, as well as facilities), fire and rescue (decoupling the fire/ambulance test), updating the Public Safety Master Plan and other Functional Master Plans, and adopting regulations that address airport land use compatibility. A strategic protection plan for aquifer recharge areas is also recommended as an additional implementation task to be added to those listed on page 78.
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However, the single most important aspect of implementation is the need to directly link a comprehensive, Countywide cumulative analysis of the emerging development pattern and public facilities needs into an effective prioritization and programming of capital projects in the County’s capital improvement program (CIP). To provide this critical guidance, it is recommended that the above actions (especially the Functional Master Plans and revisions to APF regulations) be given the highest priority for implementation.

As a final comment, we remind you that an update to the 1991 Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville and Vicinity Area Master Plan is extremely overdue. Since much of the County’s future growth will occur within our planning area, we reiterate our request to have this plan updated as soon as possible.

The City Council recognizes the hard work of MNCPPC staff, Commission 2000 and the members of the Planning Board and County Council in drafting this important guidance document for the County’s future growth and development. We appreciate all the efforts to solicit citizen participation in this endeavor. With the recommended changes, the City Council believes the proposed Preliminary General Plan can and should be approved. There is an urgent need to adopt a comprehensive growth management plan so that other needed plans can begin being prepared.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the plan formulation process and for your serious consideration of these recommendations.

Sincerely,

G. Frederick Robinson
Mayor

Attachment – Revised Map of Bowie Center
RECOMMENDED REVISION
TO BOWIE CENTER
BOUNDARY
The Honorable Samuel H. Dean, Chairman  
Prince George's County Council  
County Administration Building, Second Floor  
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive  
Upper Marlboro, Maryland  20772

RE:  Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan  
Public Facilities Element

Dear Chairman Dean,

The Bowie City Council has reviewed the proposed Public Facilities Element for the Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan. Overall, the City Council is very pleased to see so many critical public facilities, such as a new high school, library and emergency medical services station, included in the proposal. The Council's review focused on the consistency of the recommended policies and strategies contained in the Public Facilities Element with approved City plans and policies. As a result of this review, the City offers the following comments for your consideration:

1. School facilities - The Public Facilities map uses the incorrect symbols identifying the elementary and high school sites and does not show a symbol for a floating middle school site. The Public Facilities recommendations for schools appear to be consistent with the City Council's emphasis on school construction. However, to be consistent with current City policy, the text should be clarified to state that the existing Samuel Ogle school is being converted to a middle school and the former Meadowbrook school building is being converted back to an elementary school. If the former addresses the need for a second middle school in the planning area, the middle school symbol should be shown at Samuel Ogle and not identified as "floating."

2. Library facilities -- The City's position of record regarding library facilities recommends four (4) possible sites for a future library facility, two on public property (Church Road Park and Tall Oaks Vocational) and two on private property (Hall Road and Oak Creek Club). The Public Facilities Element recommendation is generally consistent with City policy, although it could be more specific as to location.

3. Transportation adequacy -- The City Council's policy position regarding levels-of-service in the Regional Center is that the standard should be no lower than the rest of the Developing Tier. This recommendation was made in the 2003 Public Forum position statement and should be addressed now.

4. Roads -- The removal of A-44 and A-58 by the District Council satisfied a major City policy objective. The removal of A-19 is not inconsistent with City policy, and the upgrading of Laurel Bowie Road north of Ninth Street is logical because Ninth Street and Eleventh Street are already classified as collector roads and they converge in Old Town
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Bowie. The references in this section of the Public Facilities Element to MD 450 and MD 197, however, must be revised in order to be consistent with the City Council’s policy of absolutely no more than four (4) through lanes for these roadways.

5. Trails -- Providing a pedestrian bridge over US 301 is not specifically recommended in the City Trails Master Plan. However, the City Master Plan recommends an on-road bike route “along the roadway where the elevated link to the east side of US 301 is provided.” For this reason, the City will continue to endorse a connection, although it should not be specifically identified in the Public Facilities Element as a pedestrian bridge.

Providing a second pedestrian crossing of the MARC line in Old Town Bowie would be consistent with the City’s policy of connecting neighborhoods; however, no location for this facility has been identified or technical analysis given to support it. Since this facility is not shown on current City plans, it is recommended that it be removed from the Public Facilities Element.

Lastly, the City’s Tanglewood Park is considered to be a natural area. The park’s existing woodchip trails are in keeping with the desire to maintain an undeveloped atmosphere in the park. Additional discussions can occur regarding this proposal in the future, however, it should be removed from the Public Facilities Element because the recommendation is inconsistent with current City plans.

There are many other major City trail facility recommendations that are not reflected in the Public Facilities Element, such as:

- Use of the A-44 alignment for a pedestrian greenway, improved with a multi-use trail connecting to adjacent neighborhoods including a pedestrian bridge over MD 214;
- Construction of a trail along Chestnut Avenue to connect the WB & A Trail to Old Town Bowie; and
- Construction of a pedestrian bridge over MD 450 in the Bowie Mainstreet area.

Including these facilities, as well as revising Policy 2 to specifically encourage full pedestrian improvements (sidewalks on both sides of streets and a network of interconnected trails), would make the Public Facilities Element consistent with City Council policy.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our input regarding the proposed Public Facilities Element of the Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan.

Sincerely,

G. Frederick Robinson
Mayor

CC: The Honorable Elizabeth M. Hewlett
CITY OF BOWIE

Findings and Recommendations

On

Preliminary Master Plan & SMA
For
Bowie and Vicinity

May 10, 2005
This document contains the City’s analysis and recommendations regarding the Bowie and Vicinity Preliminary Master Plan. The Preliminary Master Plan updates and amends the 1991 Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville and Vicinity Area Master Plan (BCMP). The document also includes the proposed Sectional Map Amendment (SMA) that proposes rezoning of certain properties in the planning area in accordance with the Plan’s recommendations. A Summary of City Recommendations is included as Appendix 1. A Table of Zoning Recommendations for the SMA is included as Appendix 2.

This document is organized in the same manner as the Master Plan text.

I. Amendments to the 2002 County General Plan (page 1)

Several changes are proposed in the Bowie and Vicinity Preliminary Master Plan (“the Plan”) that are intended to amend the County General Plan.

A. Bowie Regional Center Boundary

The Plan proposes to redefine the existing Regional Center boundary found in the 2002 General Plan based on a maximum 10-minute walking distance from the ultimate location of a yet-to-be-determined site for a transit hub. The Plan recognizes that the Maryland Science and Technology Center (MSTC) is located beyond this 10-minute walking distance and is further separated from the rest of the existing Regional Center properties by a major highway (US 50).

COMMENT: The City does not concur with the rationale provided in the Plan for this change. Since the ultimate transit hub location is not known at this time, it is not possible to determine the Regional Center boundary based on a 10-minute walking distance, as discussed in the Plan. Even if the transit hub location were determined, the City does not agree with the assumption that a 10-minute walking distance radius should determine the boundaries of the Regional Center. A 10-minute walking distance may be appropriate in drawing the boundaries of a transit-oriented development district; however, this same district should not be equated to the Regional Center boundary.

The 2002 General Plan, on page 48, provides a framework for defining “core areas” for centers.

“The core, in most cases, should generally include the area that is between one-quarter and one-third of a mile walking distance from a transit station or stop. The edge of a Center, in most cases, will generally be located an additional one-quarter to one-third distance beyond the primary core... At more land-extensive Centers, the edges may extend farther and may require implementation of local transit shuttles or people movers to link the area together.”

The boundaries of the Regional Center should be determined using the 2002 Regional Center boundary (which does include the MSTC property) and expanding it to include the more intensely developed and densely populated portions of the City, all of which would meet the above criteria, assuming the core area is coterminous with the proposed Regional Center boundary. The boundaries of the Bowie Regional Center should be adjusted to include the Maryland Science and Technology Center (MSTC) property, reflecting the boundary adopted in the 2002 County General Plan, and also to include all of the property in the original Bowie New Town Center (BNTC) Comprehensive Design Plan (CDP) area, a mixed use
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retail/residential/office development. Further, to add to the variety of housing types of the Regional Center's residential component and to reflect the synergy and proximity of this area to the core sub area of the retail portion of the BNTC, the boundary of the Regional Center should expanded to include: the Bowie Health Center campus (including adjacent facilities); the Bowie Crossing development and adjacent County Park-and-Ride lot; the Heather Hills residential community; the M-A-C and R-S zoned lands between MD Route 197 and Old Collington Road; the Northview Elementary School property and the portion of the “Northview” section north of that property; Pin Oak Village and Covington; the Longleaf cluster subdivision; and, Prince George’s Stadium. Inclusion of these additional areas, as noted above, will serve to make the Bowie Regional Center a true city center.

B. Rural Tier/Developing Tier Boundary

Amendments to the Rural Tier/Developing Tier boundary line are proposed at three (3) locations shown on Map 1 (page 3):

Change #1 - adjacent to the PEPCO power lines and MNCPPC properties located north of Old Town Bowie, where a transfer from Developing to Rural Tier is proposed;

Change #2 - MNCPPC parkland and WSSC property adjacent to the former Bowie Race Track property, and the City’s Wastewater Treatment Plant and Public Works Facility, which is recommended to be transferred from the Developing to Rural Tier; and

Changes #3 (A) and #3 (B) - along the eastern edge of the Chesley/Gibraltar property, where an addition to the Rural Tier and a deletion from the Rural Tier are proposed.

COMMENT: With the exception of Change #3, the City concurs with the changes proposed. Staff recommends the entire Chesley/Gibraltar property be returned to the Rural Tier. See further discussion of the Chesley/Gibraltar property provided in the Developing Tier section below.

C. Future Community Center

Map 1 also identifies a “Future Community Center” in the vicinity of Bowie State University. Further discussion of this future center is found in the Developing Tier section on page 10. Policy #1, Strategy #3 for the Developing Tier states that a possible future Community Center should be designated in the vicinity of Bowie State University and the MARC station to take advantage of possible future transit oriented development opportunities. The Plan recommends that the MARC station parking lot and its surrounding properties be redeveloped for a pedestrian and transit supportive development that is a vertical mixed-use development including housing and retail uses with structured parking.

COMMENT: While the proposal to maximize the benefits of transit-oriented development associated with the MARC train station is interesting and logical from a general planning standpoint, it should be noted that there is no specific development proposal under discussion at
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this time. At the April 18, 2005 City Council meeting, Bowie State University President Dr. Calvin Lowe stated the University's interest in acquiring neighboring properties to foster development opportunities (not necessarily university-related) that would provide a revenue source for on-campus construction of facilities already included in the Campus Master Plan. It should also be noted that the Plan proposal conflicts with an existing City policy that encourages the area around the MARC station to develop in a low-density, single-family development pattern. Given the potential to create the only transit-oriented development in the planning area centered around an existing rail transit station, the City finds the Plan's designation of this center as a "Future" community center is justified. However, there are no specific recommendations in the Plan for establishment of such a center in the immediate future.

The 2002 County General Plan states on page 48 that:

Community Centers are concentrations of activities, services and land uses that serve the immediate community near these Centers. These typically include a variety of public facilities and services—integrated commercial, office and some residential development—and can include mixed-use and higher density redevelopment in some communities. Community Centers should also be served by mass transit.

The City concurs with the designation of a "Future Community Center" and the characterization of the type of development on page 10 of the Plan. However, to ensure that the future center's development is coordinated both internally and externally, a recommendation should be added that requires a Sector Plan for the center to determine its scale and magnitude prior to any development.

II. Development Pattern Element/Rural Tier Recommendations (page 6)

The Rural Tier portion of the Development Pattern Element contains many new policies and strategies for Bowie and the Vicinity, including recommendations for Conservation Subdivision Design and Transfers of Development Rights (TDRs). Many of the goals, objectives and strategies of the 2002 General Plan and the recently published Preliminary Green Infrastructure Plan have been incorporated into this section of the Master Plan.

COMMENT: The issues facing the Rural Tier are not clearly identified in the Plan, although numerous policies and strategies are recommended. There is no mention of appropriate areas for large-lot estate housing, for the purchase of development rights, wellhead protection areas, aquifer recharge areas, etc. In addition, the City notes that there are no changes in land use or zoning densities from the current Master Plan proposed in this Plan. Given the emphasis on maintaining rural character, the zoning pattern should be adjusted to permit R-A zoning on the more developable land within the Rural Tier, especially east of Route 301 where the east-west direction of stream valleys separates the land into more developable high ground suitable for the R-A zone and lowland areas that should be zoned O-S. Wellhead protection areas should be among the values expressed in Policy #1, Strategy #3 on page 6.

There should be policies and recommended regulations for the following:

a. Designated areas appropriate for large-lot estates;
b. Downzoning of property within and adjacent to the environmental network from R-A to O-S.
c. The protection of agricultural uses by limiting non-agricultural, non-compatible uses within a minimum distance of existing agricultural uses.
d. Encouraging the purchase/transfer of development rights for all land within the designated Green Infrastructure network.
e. Maximum lot coverage and building bulk standards to avoid overly imposing new structures.
f. The use of conservation and wildlife habitat landscaping.
g. The avoidance of non-native, invasive plants.
h. Encouraging meadows and woods and restricting the size of the lawn from all structures.
i. Allowing the use of aesthetically pleasing vinyl and aluminum siding.
j. The retention of agricultural uses on lands more than 600 feet distant from the environmental infrastructure network.
k. Utilizing LID techniques and restricting the use of stormwater management (SWM) ponds.
l. Increasing the use of porous paving materials and minimizing the use of impervious paving materials.
m. The use of fully shielded fixtures with timing devices on public and private property.
n. Limiting the use of signalized road intersections and increasing the use of traffic circles at high volume intersections.
o. Rezoning land adjacent to high-volume roads to non-residential uses that are more compatible with existing noise pollution levels.
p. The creation of rural road design standards that allow for soft-shoulders and pervious surfaces where appropriate.
q. The platting of continuous rural roads to accommodate future development and assure Level of Service (LOS) C at a minimum.

III. Development Pattern Element/Developing Tier Recommendations (page 9)

The largest number of land use and zoning recommendations in the Plan pertain to the Developing Tier, which includes all of the mixed-use activity centers. Where applicable in the analysis below, the related Sectional Map Amendment (SMA) change numbers and pages from the latter part of the Plan are noted.

Mixed-Use Policies

The specific policies for the Developing Tier in this Plan reflect the 2002 General Plan's preference for mixed-use development. One of the General Plan's goals for the Developing Tier is to develop compact, higher-intensity, mixed uses in Centers and Corridors and to maintain low- to moderate-density land uses (except in Centers and Corridors). A specific policy strategy of the General Plan is to promote a greater mix of uses and housing choices in neighborhoods and communities focused around human-scale, mixed-use centers accessible by multiple transportation modes. Another strategy is to discourage new isolated commercial activities and promote new commercial development primarily in designated Centers and Corridors. Also, the General Plan encourages the revitalization and redevelopment of existing, underutilized commercial areas.
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Similar to the 2002 General Plan's policies, the City's Development Review Guidelines and Policies state: Commercial and office development should be concentrated in the Bowie Town Center area. Highest densities and most intense commercial activity should be located in the vicinity of the Bowie Town Center.

Per page 9 of the proposed Plan: The plan concept for the future growth pattern steers most of the additional development toward the Bowie Regional Center and the mixed-use activity centers identified in this plan, including Old Town Bowie, Bowie Mainstreet, West Bowie Village and Pointer Ridge. The Plan's Policy #1 for the Developing Tier (on page 18) encourages moderate- and high-density, mixed-use development at existing and possible future activity centers.

The City is concerned that the proposed Plan appears to be encouraging high-density, mixed-use development throughout the Developing Tier, rather than in Centers and Corridors only, as recommended in the 2002 General Plan. The City believes the greater emphasis, following the General Plan, should be on the concentration of higher-density and mixed-use development within the Regional Center (and the future Community Center) while encouraging only low- and moderate-density development and revitalization of existing centers in the Developing Tier. Mixed-use development, especially at higher residential densities, is therefore not appropriate throughout the Developing Tier portion of the planning area. The City recommends rewording of Policy #1 to encourage moderate-density and mixed-use development only at existing activity centers.

SMA Change #14 on page 96 proposes to eliminate zoning for an undeveloped Local Activity Center located on the south side of Race Track Road, east of MD 197 (formerly known as the Northpeak development). For the reasons stated above, the City supports the proposed downzoning of approximately four (4) acres from L-A-C to R-R and further recommends downzoning of the adjacent R-S zoning to the R-R zone.

In addition to the above, the City notes that the Plan is silent regarding a pending L-A-C rezoning application for an activity center at Hall Road. In keeping with the true intent of the General Plan regarding locations of new commercial uses and revised Policy #1 above, the Plan should specifically recommend retention of the Hall Road property in the R-R zone.

One additional Plan revision relating to mixed-use development should be made to the Developing Tier. The approved Karington and Fairwood developments, shown on the Proposed Land Use Plan for mixed-use, should be identified as mixed-use activity centers and discussed in the text.

Neighborhood Conservation

Policy #3 for the Developing Tier is to protect, maintain and enhance the unique historical, cultural and architectural identity, heritage and character of the City of Bowie. The City notes there are only three (3) implementation strategies. The first strategy recognizes the Levittown character of a large part of the City and advocates its preservation by designating a section of the City as having historical significance, such as the Sussex Lane model home area. Another strategy encourages compatible infill development. The City supports these efforts, but recommends the plan also establish a Residential Neighborhood Conservation Area and zoning district to protect the original Levitt sections and conserve the City's older neighborhoods. This zoning tool should establish uniform zoning standards, such as lot coverage standards, and should
Site Specific Land Use and Zoning Policies in Proposed Plan

A. Route 3/301 Median Properties (page 11)

The Plan states a new policy for the Route 3/301 median in Policy #5 on page 11. The policy is intended to reduce traffic congestion, improve safety and facilitate improvements while allowing limited, low traffic-generating development. The Plan recommends that land within the median be designated for limited employment land uses such as storage or warehouses. The Plan further recommends future commercial uses for these properties when the Route 301 service road system (A-61) is built. Zoning Changes #2, #3 and #4 (A) and #4 (B) in the SMA (see pages 84-86) are proposed to place median properties within the I-4 (Limited Intensity Industrial) zone.

COMMENT: The City does not support the new policy of allowing additional development within the Route 3/301 median areas. The current policies of the 1991 BCMP address median development through use of the R-R zone, emphasizing no new commercial uses and grandfathering of existing commercial uses. This policy has worked well in terms of avoiding a proliferation of commercial uses in the corridor. The current policy is also fair in that it allows existing commercial uses to continue.

Encouraging uses such as mini-warehouse storage facilities is directly in conflict with City policy prohibiting additional storage facilities. *Existing properties in the R-R zone should be retained* in the R-R zone. This does not mean that residential uses are appropriate in the median; but rezoning will encourage additional uses not currently permitted that will result in commercial intensification. Any traffic generated by new uses will contribute to an already failing transportation system. Non-residential uses in the R-R zone would generally be subject to Special Exception review that places the burden on the applicant to show that the use will not have any adverse impact. The 1991 BCMP specifically downzoned undeveloped commercial properties to limit the future intensification of commercial uses; staff recommends this policy be retained.

The Plan does not address the expansion or enlargement of existing commercial uses in the median area. The City recommends that expansion of existing commercial uses be discouraged, as they, too, will further contribute to an already over-burdened transportation system and create the potential for increased vehicular conflicts. In addition, such expansions would make future land acquisition for road improvement purposes more costly. It should be reiterated from the 1991 BCMP that future commercial rezoning of residential properties to commercial zones is discouraged. Finally, the consolidation of existing commercial properties should be encouraged to provide more coordinated and attractive development. Any improvement to median properties should include adequate turning lanes and accl/decel lanes.

Although the I-4 zone is intended for warehouse or storage uses, the zone also allows a wide range of commercial and manufacturing uses. The purpose of the zone was to restrict multi-story or other intense employment development in the areas surrounding Andrews Air Force Base. The City concludes that I-4 zoning would spur development in the Route 3/301 corridor and that development would be detrimental to public safety and contrary to many years of land use policy history, emphasizing little or no development in the median. The current BCMP...
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policy for the Route 3/301 median should remain in place until the time that A-61 is constructed and open to traffic.

B. Spriggs/Mills Properties (page 11)

The Plan proposes future development of service commercial uses along the property’s Route 301 frontage to allow for expansion of the existing auto-related uses, which border the property to the north. The remainder of the property is recommended for development with single-family detached homes at R-R zoning density. Zoning Change #6 on page 88 recommends rezoning of approximately 17 acres of these properties to the C-M zone.

COMMENT: The proposal to extend the existing auto-related uses on Route 301 southward to Mitchellville Road appears to have merit, from the City’s perspective. There is a general lack of zoning inventory for additional service commercial uses in this portion of the planning area. Also, because of impacts associated with Route 301 traffic, it would be inappropriate to develop residential uses within the first 300 feet of the road. The remainder of the property is appropriate for cluster development in the R-R zone. The cluster technique is recommended in order to address buffering issues between commercial and residential uses as well as to provide density compatibility with lots in the adjoining Amber Meadows subdivision, which have a minimum lot area of 10,000 square feet. Access to the residential subdivision should be provided from Ayrwood Lane in Amber Meadows. Access to the commercial area should include a driveway connecting to Mitchellville Road. The existing ballfield, which has historical significance to the local community, should be considered for protection during the development review process.

C. Maryland Science and Technology Center (page 12)

The Plan recommends a mixture of office, residential and parkland on the property. The Plan recommends an “average” density of not more than eight (8) dwelling units per acre for the residential portion. Additional recommendations are offered to protect the historic setting of the Melford Historic Site.

COMMENT: Contrary to the 1991 BCMP, which endorsed employment uses on the MSTC property (and also mentioned it by name), this Plan’s recommendations have the potential to convert the entire remaining 90 acres at the MSTC to residential use. The elimination of employment potential at this site works against establishing a better “jobs/housing” balance in Prince George’s County, as mentioned in the County General Plan. Conversion of this major employment site, located within the City, to mixed-use is not consistent with the City’s longstanding policies regarding land use and economic development. The MSTC is the only remaining parcel left in the City that has the potential for significant employment development. Employment-oriented development at the MSTC is the City’s highest economic development priority. Based on the above, the City recommends the MSTC be designated for employment use only and be included within the boundary of the Regional Center.

D. Chesley/Gibraltar Property (page 12)

The Plan identifies property at the northeast quadrant of US 301/Mill Branch Road as an additional opportunity for mixed-use development, including high-quality commercial retail uses, including a hotel, under a future L-A-C zone. An illustrative drawing is provided on page 13 of the Plan, depicting the area of mixed-use development, an internal ring road and transitional open space adjacent to the County’s Green Branch Park.
COMMENT: The City and the surrounding community opposed the designation of the subject property as part of the Developing Tier in 2002. The property was given the Developing Tier designation, as well as a Water and Sewer Plan category change by the County Council at that time, despite the objections that doing so would violate a longstanding land use policy of both the County and City. Since the approval of the 1982 General Plan, the policy for properties located on the east side of US 301 had been to retain a permanent, low-density and agricultural character and discourage public water and sewer facilities. In the 1991 BCMP, various properties were downzoned from commercial to low-density residential in keeping with this policy.

It should also be noted that the Chesley/Gibraltar property is not located within the Regional Center boundary proposed in this Plan. The property is beyond a 10-minute walking distance from the transit centers identified in the Plan. No market information has been provided to justify additional retail square footage in the planning area. The proposal is inconsistent with the Plan's emphasis of placing intense commercial activity only within established centers. The largest scale L-A-C category, the Community center, has a maximum Floor Area Ratio of 0.68 FAR, which is very intense. The proposal for the site envisioned in the Plan will also have serious traffic consequences, since the plans being developed for a new interchange at US 301/MD 197 do not take mixed-use development into consideration. Several of the options being considered are only marginally meeting Level-of-Service (LOS) criteria and this proposal will worsen traffic conditions. For all of the above reasons, staff recommends returning the property to the Rural Tier.

E. Jesuit Property (page 13)

The Plan establishes a Comprehensive Design Zone (CDZ) option for portions of the 489-acre property owned by the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen (i.e. the Jesuits). The remainder of the property is recommended for very low-density residential land use. SMA Change #1B (see page 82) proposes to downzone approximately 0.63 acre of the Jesuit property, located on the north side of MD 450, just east of Public Works Road, from R-R to R-A. Another SMA change (Change #1A) in this area involves a property owned by the Archdiocese of Washington (Sacred Heart Catholic Church). The proposal is to downzone the 34.22 acre property which is occupied by church buildings and an historic site (Sacred Heart Chapel) from the R-R zone to the R-A zone. (The original staff recommendation on the Preliminary Master Plan presented to the County Planning Board on March 31 called for downzoning of the R-R portion of the 489-acre Jesuit property to a very low-density residential zone. However, a representative of the Jesuits attended the Planning Board meeting and argued that the property's R-R zoning should be retained. The Planning Board concurred and the text was amended to recommend retention of existing zoning and endorsement of the R-S (1.6 – 2.6) category.

COMMENT: The Jesuits' representative attended the April 4, 2005 and May 2, 2005 public hearings and City Council worksessions on the Master Plan and submitted two (2) letters citing all of the factors to consider in making a land use determination for the property. Based on this evidence, the City supports the recommendations of the Preliminary Master Plan for this property.

F. Willowbrook (page 13)

The Plan proposes conversion of the 417 acre employment land use and E-I-A zoning (see SMA Change #5A on page 87) to a low-density residential use via the CDZ/R-L zone, with
development permitted at a density of 1.0 to 1.5 dwelling units per acre. Ten (10) acres of the Willowbrook site, adjacent to the Safeway distribution center, are recommended for rezoning to the I-1 zone (see SMA Change #5B). The reason given for the conversion is that most of the property is not suitable for employment land use, given the property’s substantial environmental constraints.

COMMENT: The proposed change in land use is compatible with nearby residential properties including Oak Creek Club and Beechtree. However, there is some concern that eliminating such a large potential employment area will work against the County’s jobs/housing balance. Given that the majority of the property is oriented to Leeland Road, which will become a major collector road serving numerous low-density residential developments, and does not have a practical way of becoming integrated into the adjacent Collington Center employment park, the residential downzoning proposed in Change #5A is appropriate. The recommended zoning change (Change #5B) for 10 acres of the property to the I-1 zone is also supported.

G. Zehner Property (page 14)

The Plan recommends transitional land use density for the vacant property located in the southeast quadrant of US 50/301. The Plan recommends low-density residential for the western portion of the property and very low density residential for the eastern portion. The SMA includes two (2) changes, listed on page 93: Change #11 (A) rezoning the 63-acre western part of the property from CDZ/V-L to R-E, and Change #11 (B) rezoning the 50-acre eastern part of the property from CDZ/V-L to R-A or O-S.

COMMENT: While the City agrees that the Zehner property represents an opportunity to transition from higher density uses to lower ones, the City does not agree that the western portion of the property is appropriate for estate development. The generally narrow configuration of the property and noise impacts from US 50 would make estate development undesirable. In addition, the City is concerned about the overall traffic impact on the Longleaf subdivision and Governor's Bridge Road. Prior to the approval of a Sectional Map Amendment (SMA) in 1975, the Zehner Property was zoned R-A and O-S. Under the SMA approved in 1991, all 113.54 acres of this site were placed in the Village-Low density zone, a Comprehensive Design Zone (CDZ). A more appropriate zoning for the property would be the O-S zone, which conveys a very low residential density land use. This would allow the entire Zehner property to develop at the same residential density, but with fewer homes than if a portion of the property is zoned R-E. The City's recommendation that the entire site be placed in the O-S zone would: still allow all of the property to become a transition to the Rural Tier; provide large lot/low density residential development in the neighborhood; and, be compatible with the O-S zoning of the extreme eastern portion of the original Longleaf subdivision, which has received preliminary plan approval (#4-03020) for a 14-lot single family residential development.

H. Dimensions Property (page 14)

The Plan recommends multi-family land use and zoning for the 14-acre Dimensions property on Health Center Drive. The rationale for this recommendation is that the property abuts the Bowie Regional Center, an area designated for medium- to high-density mixed-use (possibly senior housing) and pedestrian oriented development. It is noted that this property is conveniently located within walking distance of the Bowie Senior Center, the Bowie Town Center, and the Bowie Health Center. The SMA proposes Change #15 to rezone the property from C-O to R-18 (see page 97).
COMMENT: This C-O-zoned, 13.08-acre site, is a remaining portion of land from the former Bowie New Town Center West (now Bowie Crossing) property, originally proposed for 500,000 square feet of office use. This Preliminary Master Plan recommends that the properties comprising this SMA Change be rezoned from C-O to R-18, a medium density/multi-family residential district, which does not exist in the City at this time. With the existing hospital, assisted living and congregate care facilities adjacent and to the west of the subject site, and with City's Senior Center and Gymnasium, and the Bowie Commons housing development all located in the immediate vicinity, and to still allow the opportunity for medical facilities/offices to complement the existing hospital, assisted living and congregate care uses as well as to provide for multi-family and more senior housing, it is more appropriate to rezone these properties to M-U-TC (Mixed Use Town Center) or another mixed-use zone, such as the M-X-T zone. The proposed R-18 zone would not allow offices and the current C-O zone does not allow multi-family dwellings. The mixed-use M-U-TC zone would permit both types of uses, as well as public uses such as the Senior Center and Gym. The City agrees that that property's strategic location adjacent to the retail component of Bowie Town Center makes it a feasible candidate for higher density residential uses. However, the City recommends consideration of a mixed-use zone, which will allow for a variety of land uses and densities (including senior housing) to occur on this key property.

I. Mixed Use Activity Centers (page 15)

1. Old Town Bowie

The Plan discusses a mixed-use activity concept for Old Town Bowie on page 15. The recommendations include imposition of a Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ), promoting a pedestrian-friendly village center, rezoning a "core" area to the M-U-I zone and allowing a "modest" increase in residential density outside the core but still within the original street grid. The concept also creates a transition in density to the nearby Rural Tier. The Plan also recommends policy strategies to improve internal circulation, including further investigation of a "T" intersection on the north side of the railroad bridge and opening up of the "paper alley" to facilitate pedestrian movement. The Plan also encourages high-quality design that enhances the village character through use of form based codes (FBC). SMA zoning changes are included on pages 89-92.

COMMENT: There are a number of areas where the Plan concept for Old Town Bowie diverges from the City's objectives. First, the "core" area is defined as a 12-block area where a mixture of commercial, residential and other uses may be permitted, subject to FBC requirements. The City's 1999 Revitalization Master Plan did not envision any major expansion of the geography of the commercial business district. Second, the type of commercial uses recommended in the plan (e.g. antique hobbyists) is different than the character envisioned by the City's Revitalization Master Plan. The City's plan sought to create an attractive convenience center, serving the surrounding area rather than having a regional draw of customers. Third, a major assumption in the Plan is that the grid system of streets should be built out exactly as platted, including construction of alleys. There are numerous complicating factors that work against the completion of the grid system. City staff conducted an inventory of streets and sidewalks in Old Town Bowie and has determined that some streets in the grid system should be completed, but others should not. There are also legal issues associated with using the alleys depicted on the original railroad company plat of Huntington City (Old Town Bowie).
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To respond to the above issues, Policy #1 should be modified as follows:

Policy #1: Encourage a pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use development within and adjacent to the existing commercial district.

The M-U-I rezoning area proposed in SMA Change #9 (page 91) should be reduced to correspond to the boundary of the existing commercial business district and immediately adjoining properties. Zoning changes should be applied to land outside the commercial district in order to decrease the amount of additional, new residential development. This would affect SMA Change #10 on page 92. The density transition to the Rural Tier discussed in the Plan is implemented in SMA Change #7 on page 89 and is supported by the City. Regarding Policy #2, references to opening of “paper alleys” should be deleted.

Old Town Bowie Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ)

A Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ) is proposed for Old Town Bowie in SMA Change #8, beginning on page 99. At a community information meeting held on April 12, 2005 at the Knights of St. John Hall, the majority of residents expressed a desire to maintain the existing character of Old Town Bowie, without any significant changes. The community members who attended the meeting also expressed their view against additional development that would bring in new residents and further impact local streets. The City found many outstanding issues with the DDOZ development standards contained in the SMA.

The proposed Plan, in addition to including the proposed rezonings discussed above, further proposes an overlay zone (DDOZ) encompassing the greater portion of the commercial, residential, and industrial area of Old Town Bowie (OTB). The DDOZ is comprised of two basic components: the Regulating Plan (the street hierarchy system that determines what standards will apply where) and the Standards that primarily regulate design elements within the designated area. The DDOZ goes even further, however, to amend the range of uses permitted in the M-U-I zone. The mechanism is extremely complicated, and the Standards section is particularly cumbersome and inflexible. The City believes that more time will be required for community input and detailed analysis. More time is essential to fully evaluate the Standards and determine if they will produce the desired effect.

Below is a listing of possible options:

1. Eliminate the DDOZ entirely. If the DDOZ were entirely eliminated from the plan, the only way to reinstate it would be to request it as a MNCPPC Work Program item. As there are generally a number of competing projects, Countywide, there would be no guarantee as to when this would be accomplished.

2. Retain a small portion of the DDOZ (e.g. the original OTB commercial boundary). The boundary can be expanded at a later date, either by the City (with consent from all affected property owners) through the DSP process, or on a project by project basis. While the boundary can be
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expanded at a later date, a large original boundary cannot be reduced (under current law).

3. Retain the proposed DDOZ boundaries and apply the standards at a later date. Any projects which are proposed in the DDOZ in the meantime would not be subject to any requirements other than those which are currently required in the Zoning Ordinance.

4. Revise the DDOZ to only include parking standards within the business district of Old Town Bowie.

The chief reason for the City recommending an overlay zone in Old Town Bowie was to deal with parking issues and streetscape coordination. The City has been actively improving Old Town streets and sidewalks through the CDBG program and is currently implementing commercial façade grant and loan programs that aim to establish coordination in façade improvements within the business district. The Maryland State Highway Administration is considering additional assistance for streetscape improvements on Ninth Street. Since the City’s actions are addressing some of these needs, the only remaining goal relates to parking issues. The proposed DDOZ does a good job of addressing the need for parking flexibility within the district. Therefore, the City recommends that the DDOZ be limited to Parking Standards at this time. If the community is supportive, additional standards for Building Envelope, Streetscape and Architecture and Landscaping can be added subsequent to approval of this Plan.

2. **Bowie Mainstreet**

On page 22, the Plan recommends development of Bowie Mainstreet with pedestrian-friendly streetscapes and a mixture of commercial, residential, civic, institutional and recreational uses. The Plan recommends future rezoning to the L-A-C zone or other mixed-use zone to allow for an appropriate mixture of uses and intensity.

**COMMENT:** The boundaries of the Bowie Mainstreet mixed-use activity center should be expanded to include the civic uses on MD 450 (Bowie High School, Bowie Center for the Performing Arts, the public library and racquet club), the Bowie Community Center, the Levitt model homes on Sussex Lane, the adjacent townhouse communities on Millstream Drive, Marquette Lane and Scarlet Oak Terrace and the funeral home and church located east of Race Track Road.

The City recommends addition of the DDOZ technique as part of the policy encouraging a mixture of uses at the three shopping centers, as well as the commercial use area along Superior Lane. These areas should be designated as the “core” of the Bowie Mainstreet mixed-use activity center. The three “core” properties should be designated as preferred sites for small-lot, affordable residential development.

3. **West Bowie Village**

The discussion of West Bowie Village (WBV) begins on page 28. WBV is envisioned as a mixed-use center with commercial, residential, office and institutional uses integrated with open space in a pedestrian-friendly village setting. Several SMA
zoning changes are proposed in this area, including: Change #12 on page 94 and Change #13 on page 95.

**COMMENT:** The original charrette concept for WBV resulted in the land use proposal described above. A large amount of new residential uses was shown on a City-owned property located between Old Route 450 and MD 450. However, since the time of the charrette, the City Council decided to not allow City parkland to be included in the redevelopment plan and communicated this position to MNCPPC in a letter sent on December 14, 2004. At a minimum, the concept for WBV should be limited to basically non-residential uses within the existing business district. Live-work units should be specifically referenced as a residential dwelling type within the commercial district. All other references to residential development should be eliminated. The activity center boundary should be revised to include the business district, but exclude any portion of the Stewart’s Landing subdivision and the City owned property mentioned above. The Land Use Plan should show the correct configuration of the Route 450 access cut-off to West Bowie Village per the State Highway Administration’s approved plans.

Regarding the SMA zoning changes, the City supports the upzoning of approximately eight (8) acres of land zoned R-R to the C-M zone (Change #12 on page 94), since the property is a logical extension of the Woodcliff Road commercial area, also zoned C-M. However, to avoid leaving vestiges of R-R zoning between Change #12 and the former J-Mart property and east of Change #12 adjacent to the CSX railroad tracks, it is recommended that these properties also be rezoned to C-M. The City also supports the conversion of the C-M zoned Melvin Motors to the C-S-C zone in SMA Change #13 (page 95). The C-S-C zone will allow a wider range of retail uses that would take advantage of the Melvin Motors property’s visibility from MD 450, Highbridge Road and Church Road and complement the commercial revitalization effort.

4. **Pointer Ridge**

The vision for a mixed-use activity center at Pointer Ridge is described in the Plan on page 33. The Plan proposal is a community-scale commercial and employment area that supports the adjacent suburban residential neighborhoods by providing locally-serving retail, office and public uses closely integrated with the adjacent residential neighborhood. The Plan recommends future redevelopment under the L-A-C zone to allow for the appropriate mix of uses and intensity. Use of form-based design recommendations is an integral part of the L-A-C rezoning recommendations. The Plan proposal also includes an implementation strategy that considers an alternative access to the Amber Ridge parcel from Pittsfield Lane to Mitchellville Road.

**COMMENT:** The City supports the land use recommendations and policies of the Plan for the Pointer Ridge mixed-use activity center. However, no access, including indirect access via parking lots, should be allowed to Pointer Ridge Drive.

5. **Bowie Regional Center**

Discussion of the Bowie Regional Center begins on page 35. The vision for the Regional Center is a pedestrian-friendly, transit-oriented community with a regional market, including a diverse mix of moderate- to high-density and intensity residential, commercial and information technology employment uses, centered upon a transit hub.
that links the master plan area to the regional transportation network. The Plan states that
development in the Regional Center should be phased in over time. The Plan proposes to
revise the Regional Center boundary to a much smaller area than shown in the 2002
County General Plan. The new boundary is based on a 10-minute walking distance from
the transit center and includes Bowie Town Center, Bowie Gateway Center and
commercial development immediately across Route 301 from Bowie Gateway Center.
Four (4) policies are proposed to direct a mixture of uses and an emphasis on transit-
oriented development. Redevelopment under the M-X-T or M-A-C zones or other
appropriate mixed-use zone is recommended and form-based design is encouraged
through these zoning approvals.

**COMMENT:** The proposed boundary of the Regional Center is inconsistent with City
policy. The MSTC should not be deleted from the Regional Center. To the contrary, the
property should be doubly emphasized as a key employment feature of the Regional
Center. In commenting on the 2002 General Plan’s boundary for the Regional Center,
the City Council requested that the area be expanded to include Heather Hills, the Bowie
Health Center, the entire Bowie Town Center, Enfield Chase, New Haven Lane portion
of Northview, Covington and Pin Oak Village, Wal-Mart, Collington Plaza, Green
Branch Park, and Longleaf. The methodology of using a 10-minute walking distance to
establish the boundary of the Regional Center is not realistic in this situation and should
be deleted.

The key to addressing adequate public facilities challenges in the Regional
Center is to ensure that the more intense development described in the Plan does not
occur until the necessary transportation facilities are in place to support it. The Plan’s
policies should be strengthened to state this relationship clearly and unequivocally.
Recommendations should be made for staging the land use recommendation into short-
range, medium-range and long-range (ultimate) proposals tied to provision of necessary
infrastructure (e.g., completion of the US 301/MD 197 interchange, establishment of a
transit center, etc.).

**IV. Area-Wide Infrastructure**

**A. Environmental Infrastructure, page 46**

Many of the policies and strategies of the recently published Preliminary Green
Infrastructure Plan have been included in the environmental infrastructure section of the Master
Plan. While the 2002 General Plan was more holistic and comprehensive in nature, most of the
strategies in the Green Infrastructure Plan are specifically directed towards meeting the water
quality and forest coverage goals and objectives of the General Plan. The proposed Plan repeats
many of these objectives. The proposed Plan also includes all of the major environmental hubs,
nodes and linkages shown on the City’s Green Infrastructure Plan.

The City is unable to conclusively determine if the secondary corridors shown on Map 16
on page 48 will affect already developed private property because the corridor alignments are
conceptual and are not shown on a map containing existing development patterns. The City does
conclude, however, that the network is composed of stream corridors and environmentally
sensitive land that should remain undeveloped in accordance with the criteria established by the
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County’s environmental planning section. All developed land and land planned for development should have been eliminated from the Green Infrastructure network.

To finish the work of the General Plan, the Plan should include specific goals and objectives for mitigating air, light, and noise pollution in addition to water pollution. Because of this, the City’s recommendations include previously approved City policies and suggested best management practices (BMPs) that would strengthen the more holistic view of the General Plan as well the specific water and forest coverage goals of the Green Infrastructure Plan.

There should be policies and recommended regulations for:

a. The use of non-native and invasive plants.
b. The use of a minimum amount of conservation landscaping per lot.
c. The use of a minimum amount of low-impact development design methods to minimize the use of stormwater management ponds on larger sites.
d. The maximum amount of impervious surface area per lot.
e. The maximum amount of impervious surface area on steep slopes in general.
f. The maximum amount of gross floor area per lot regardless of use.
g. The maximum width of paved roads with minimal off-street parking.
h. The minimum amount of tree canopy coverage per heat generating, hard surface area (roofs, streets, parking lots, walkways, patios, etc.).
i. The use of shielded light fixtures that reduce glare and light trespass on and from private and public property.
j. The use of continuous tree buffers, shade trees, and lighting that reduces sky glow along public right of ways; etc.
k. The development of energy conservation and efficiency policies with measurable objectives.
l. The incorporation of environmental whole-site design, Green Building practices, and energy reducing techniques for all sites with a minimum amount of acreage.
m. Incentive measures that will encourage sustainable development practices and renewable energy that reduces waste and conserves natural resources on all sites, particularly publicly-owned sites.
n. The expansion of recharging facilities for Alternative Fueled Vehicles (AFV).
o. The promotion of an awareness of environmental issues related to land use through the provision of environmental stewardship programs.
p. The rezoning of residential land for more appropriate land uses in areas impacted by unacceptable noise levels such as land near highways.
q. The maximum percentage of allowable impervious surface areas above aquifer recharge areas.
r. Identify specific areas in the network where trail systems would be appropriate.

B. Parks and Recreation, page 51

This Preliminary Master Plan proposes to carry forward five (5) park sites, totaling approximately 380 acres, recommended in the 1991 Area wide Master Plan, while recommending
the acquisition of six (6) new park sites that include 200 acres. The adopted County General Plan, as well as national, state and Park and Planning standards, recommend a minimum of 15 acres of local parkland/1,000 residents, and a minimum of 20 acres of regional and countywide parkland/1,000 residents. Local parkland includes: neighborhood parks that serve the immediate neighborhood and may include park/school sites and playgrounds, usually with less than 20 acres, and, community parks and recreation or community centers, with an of between 20 and 200 acres. An example of a neighborhood park is Enfield Chase Park, while Foxhill Park is an example of a community park.

According to data in this Preliminary Master Plan, there are 1,582 acres of local parkland (23 acres/1,000 residents) and 2,145 acres of regional parkland (31.5 acres/1,000 residents). In both cases, the recognized local and regional parkland standards are exceeded. Based on the 2030 projected population contained in this Preliminary Master Plan (89,513), the parkland acreage/population ratios decrease, but remain above the adopted standards, even without additional local and regional parkland coming into the Parks Department’s parkland inventory. (Approximately 17.5 acres of local parkland/1,000 residents and 24 acres of community parkland/1,000 residents would result, based on the 2030 projected population.)

The City also recommends the following new policies:

- The areas along the Patuxent River should be the focus of the County’s efforts for acquisition, via either the land development review process or a purchase program, for the preservation of environmentally sensitive lands and the development of a linear trail network for pedestrians and equestrians.
- Directing Commission funds for the development and maintenance of land and facilities currently under their ownership and/or control.
- Rethinking the prevailing philosophy of funding recreational projects on land only owned by the County or Commission (e.g. trails within public rights-of-way).

Several existing City policies relate to provision of parks and recreation facilities and are recommended for inclusion in the Plan:

1. City-owned recreation facilities are “in addition to and not a substitute for” County facilities.

2. New developments should provide recreation facilities, including smaller recreational parks for younger children. These facilities should be located and constructed so that impacts (e.g. traffic circulation, environmental impacts, such as tree and wetland loss) are minimized. Developers should make connections to the trails network wherever the network abuts any such developer’s property.

3. Within the City, recreation facilities, including those constructed by developers on property to be dedicated to a homeowner’s association, shall meet or exceed the City’s minimum recreational design standards maintained by the City’s Department of Community Services.

4. Additional opportunities for water-related recreation, including lakes, ponds, streamside parks, and a water trail should be encouraged.
C. Public Facilities, page 55

The Public Facilities section of the Plan proposes a new library site on Hall Road, a future fire station on Mitchellville Road at Elder Oaks Boulevard, and either a middle school or high school on the Board of Education property located on Mitchellville Road across from Allen Pond Park. The Plan includes a floating symbol for a middle school in the City, south of US 50.

In a letter sent to the County Council dated February 8, 2005 the City Council noted that the Public Facilities recommendations for schools appear to be consistent with the City Council’s emphasis on school construction. However, it was recommended that the text be clarified to state that the existing Samuel Ogle school is being converted to a middle school and the former Meadowbrook school building is being converted back to an elementary school. These recommendations should be reiterated as comments on this Plan. The Mitchellville Road school site should be designated as a high school site, only, rather than a high school or middle school site as described in the Plan.

The location of a future library on the Hall Road property shown on Map 18 and the recommended fire/EMS facility on Mitchellville reflects the City’s past recommendations.

There are a number of policy areas where the Plan could be strengthened to better conform to the City’s approved guidelines. Pertinent policies from the City Council’s Development Review Guidelines and Policies that should be added to the plan are noted below:

1. All developments should be staged to coincide with the actual availability of required public facilities (such as schools, roads, libraries, fire and rescue, etc.).

2. No project should be recommended for approval unless the necessary adequate public facilities, including but not limited to roads and related improvements, are either in place or will be constructed simultaneously with the project itself. Funds approved for public facilities improvements in the latter years of an adopted Capital Improvements Program should not be considered to fulfill this requirement.

3. In general, use of fee-in-lieu to satisfy APF requirements should not be supported. However, pro-rata contributions where the entire cost of the facility is known is divided between a number of developers, such as road clubs can be used to satisfy APF requirements provided they contain sufficient enforcement ability.

4. Funds for improvements necessary to satisfy APF should be contained in the first year of a capital improvement document, not in Years 2-6.

5. School facilities in excess of 100% of their design capacity should be deemed overcrowded. Necessary actions should be taken to achieve a school system where enrollments do not exceed available capacity.

6. Efforts should be made to adopt new “Fire and Rescue” APF guidelines to better address the issue of adequacy of EMS units, ladder units, etc. Opticon traffic controls should be installed to enhance the delivery of public safety service.

7. Public improvements via capital improvement documents should be sized to accommodate only the level of development envisioned by the adopted Master Plan, and should not be used to initiate new development in excess of those levels envisioned by the adopted Master Plan.
D. Transportation Systems, page 58

1. Roadways, page 58

The Plan identifies 12 congested road segments in the planning area (see Table 2 on page 58). An interjurisdictional corridor congestion management system and Transportation Policy Exception Areas (TPEAs) are proposed to address congestion issues. Map 19 indicates that the A-44, A-58, A-19, Evergreen Parkway and PT-1 alignments are proposed for deletion. Several roadway classification upgrades are proposed, including Duckettown Road, Laurel-Bowie Road and Jericho Park Road to collector status. In addition, a future interchange is recommended at US 301/Leeland Road.

The City reviewed the Transportation Technical Bulletin prepared for this Plan and noted that several road links modeled in the analysis are impractical as proposed. C-301 (Highbridge Road/Chestnut Avenue), C-313 (Old Laurel Bowie Road) and C-314 (Lanham-Severn Road, Ninth Street and Eleventh Street) are proposed as four-lane collector roads. This level of roadway improvement would be disruptive to the existing communities and is inconsistent with the City’s Revitalization Master Plan for Old Town Bowie. It is recommended that these roadways be limited to an improved two-lane collector design, with appropriate turn lanes. In addition, the collector classification of Duckettown Road/Sixth Street (C-312) should not extend east of Maple Avenue, since upgrading of Sixth Street would be constrained by existing residential development, would be detrimental to the community and would be unnecessary since traffic would likely turn onto Maple Avenue rather than use Sixth Street to get to or from Old Laurel Bowie Road.

In addition, C-315 (Jericho Park Road) from Race Track Road to MD 197 is not practical as a collector, since a major segment of the road will eventually become part of the Bowie State University ring-road system. The City recommends that this road be maintained as a local road.

Regarding MD 197, the Plan indicates that the future roadway section should be limited to a total of four (4) lanes, until forecasted travel demands warrant further expansion. This contingency is in opposition to current City policy and should be deleted.

In order to prevent the expansion of MD Route 450 and 197 beyond four lanes through the City and to provide another north-south connection to Route 450, an interchange should be provided on US Route 50 between MD Route 197 and MD Route 704. If an interchange is constructed at US Route 50 and MD Route 193, MD Route 193 should be upgraded to a multi-lane divided roadway with an enhanced landscape package similar to that developed for MD Route 450 between MD Route 193 and Stonybrook Drive. A hiker biker trail should be provided for the entire length of MD Route 193.

The City’s policy regarding traffic Level of Service (LOS) in the Regional Center is that the maximum LOS standard should be the same as elsewhere in the Developing Tier (LOS “D”). The 2002 General Plan established a LOS “E” for Regional Centers. Because this Plan will amend the General Plan, it is recommended that a LOS “D” standard be applied specifically to the Bowie Regional Center.

Regarding TPEAs, it should be noted that this tool applies to road segments that are heavily congested with local traffic. These roads include most of MD 450, the majority of MD 197 and MD 193. The concept of TPEAs is inconsistent with the City’s longstanding policy of
requiring developers to meet adequate public facilities regulations. The City is willing to accept the consequence of not endorsing the TPEA approach (i.e. that some development in the future may have to be disapproved because the amount of local traffic has overburdened certain roadways). Therefore, it is recommended that the concept of TPEAs be removed from the Plan.

The City supports the interjurisdictional corridor congestion management system as a means to eventually alleviate heavy regional traffic on certain highways, such as US 50, US 301, MD 3 and the segment of MD 450 between MD 3 and Race Track Road. In conjunction with this approach, the County should begin advocating for construction of a major parking facility and transit hub at the northern end of Mitchellville Road in the Bowie Gateway Center. Such a facility would provide direct commuter, carpool, vanpool and shuttle bus access to and from the HOV lanes on US 50 for residents living north and south of US 50, and would also serve to intercept a portion of regional commuters who could park and ride the transit system. With the appropriate system of bridges and ramps, access should also be provided to the north via the Nash property to Belair Drive and the MSTC. The long-term success of a transit hub could serve as the impetus for future extension of Metrorail to Bowie. Multi-modal transportation approaches are supported by the City’s Development Review Guidelines and Policies.

2. Bicycle, Pedestrian and Trail Facilities, page 62

The overriding goal for bicycle, pedestrian and trail facilities set forth in this Preliminary Master Plan is to provide a safe and efficient multi-modal transportation that improves access within neighborhoods, communities and the region. Several policies are recommended in the Plan to achieve that goal. City comments in response to the Master Plan proposals are as follows:

- The installation of on-road bike route signage should be used as an interim means of identifying County roads for an on-road bike route system until those roads have been permanently improved to include either a wide shoulder for use by cyclists or the construction of an adjacent off-road, multi-use trail. Examples of where this policy should be implemented in the short term include: along Chestnut Avenue/High Bridge Road; Old Chapel Road (MD Route 450 to Race Track Road); Race Track Road (MD Route 450 to MD Route 197); Jericho Park Road (Race Track Road to the Bowie State University campus); Old Stage Road; Church Road (MD Route 450 to Church Road Park).

- Since Fletchertown Road has been identified in the City’s adopted Trails Master Plan as an on-road bike route, this Preliminary Master Plan proposes it for the same purpose, and wide shoulders exist along this facility that are able to accommodate cyclists, bike route signage should be provided along this roadway at this time between High Bridge Road and Hillmeade Road.

- To link Old Town Bowie with Bowie State University, a multi-use, off-road trail connection should be provided connecting these two destinations. These areas have been identified elsewhere in the Preliminary Master Plan for future growth and development/redevelopment.
The trail identified within the alignment of the former PT-1 corridor should be retained, from Church Road to Northview Drive. Since Church Road has been identified for cyclists as a “Shared Use Roadway”, with the opening of the Bowie Town Center retail use and the City’s dog park, and with the imminent construction of the new Northview Elementary School on Northview Drive and adjacent to the PT-1 corridor, retaining this corridor for a multi-use trail would link residential areas within the Church Road corridor with the school and Town Center.

As more land in the Patuxent River corridor comes under public ownership, or where easements can be obtained on privately owned land for trail purposes, the development of an uninterrupted linear trail network for pedestrians and equestrians should be a priority. This system should exist from the Fran Uhler Natural Area in the northern area of the Planning Area to the southern portion.

Unless it can be determined otherwise by means of field research and the City’s stakeholders process, the trails identified through the City-owned drainageways in the “I” and “O” sections, east of Race Track Road, should be deleted from this Preliminary Master Plan. The primary function of these areas is to provide the conveyance of stormwater from developed residential neighborhoods to larger water bodies. There is limited land available within these corridors to provide for this dual usage.

As part of the expansion of the trail system throughout the County, the development of service/rest areas should be provided along the network. Potential locations for these service/rest areas include: along the WB&A Trail, in the vicinity of High Bridge Road; along the WB&A Trail, at the Patuxent River; along the Patuxent River, in the vicinity of Governor Bridge Road; along the Patuxent River, in the vicinity of Central Avenue (MD Route 214); and, in Foxhill Park.

To be compatible with the City’s adopted Trails Master Plan, and to reflect an adopted City policy, a grade-separated pedestrian crossing should be provided across Central Avenue (MD Route 214) between Church Road and U.S. Route 301. This will provide a link between the residential communities and existing and future community facilities and parkland on the northern and southern sides of Central Avenue.

Since a trail connection between the Northridge community and the City-owned Tanglewood Park property has already been identified on the City’s Trails Master Plan, a second trail connection paralleling the Northeast Corridor railroad tracks, as shown on the Preliminary Master Plan, is not necessary and should, therefore, be deleted.

To eliminate a missing link, an off-road, multi-use trail should be shown on the Preliminary Master Plan and provided from Tanglewood Park,
parallel the Pope's Creek Railroad and connect with new proposed trail between Old Town Bowie and Bowie State University/MARC Station.

3. **Transit, page 66**

The transit proposal contained in the Plan is very conceptual. A phased program of transit service expansion, beginning in the Bowie Regional Center, is proposed. The Plan notes that both the Countywide Master Plan of Transportation and the Prince George's County Transit Service and Operations Plan will make transit service recommendations for the area.

While the City generally supports the concept of transit improvements, it must be emphasized that the recommended "Bowie Area Transit Shuttle" has not been studied for viability. The City Council has not discussed or come to any decision regarding this type of proposal. In fact, the City previously studied the potential for shuttle bus service and the concept was rejected because it was determined to be not supportable under existing or future ridership demand. No transportation data or evidence has been provided to justify this proposal.

The City supports the concept of a transit hub in the Regional Center, as discussed in the preceding sections of this report.

E. **Economic Development, page 70**

The City notes that no conclusive data was presented to demonstrate that the quantities of commercial redevelopment planned for the Mixed Use Activity Centers is justified from a market standpoint. The City reviewed the economic technical appendix and found that it did not assess the market supportability characteristics of the planning area. The City recommends that a planning area-wide fiscal impact analysis be undertaken before any additional commercial zoning intensity is approved.

The City observes that the Economic Development section of the Plan, on page 70, does not mention the MSTC, although it points out that the planning area is home to an estimated 1,700 business establishments and 20,000 employees, representing approximately 7% of all establishments in Prince George's County and 6% of all employment. It is also noted that the area's labor force per capita earnings and household median incomes are high and increasing.

The City believes that removal of another large employment area from the planning area's inventory of such uses must first be evaluated thoroughly, since several of the other employment areas recommended by the 1991 BCMP have already been lost to less intensive retail and residential development (e.g. Bowie Gateway Center, Governor's Green/Home Depot, Bowie Crossing). The City also believes it is critical to view requests for continued reductions in employment land use in the context of the new County General Plan's economic development objective to increase the jobs-to-population ratio by 39% by the Year 2025.

The following Economic Development Policies, contained in the City's Development Review Guidelines and Policies, are relevant to this Plan and should be included:

1. Compatible commercial development, employment uses and mixed-use development, including live-work dwelling units, should be promoted in designated centers.

2. Auto service centers or related commercial uses should be directed to highway-oriented sites on the periphery of the community.
3. Strip commercial development, particularly single-use or pad site configuration, should be discouraged. Commercial development should be located in planned or designated centers rather than on isolated, scattered sites and redevelopment of older centers is encouraged.

4. Commercial and office development should be concentrated in the Bowie Town Center area and employment uses should be concentrated at the Maryland Science and Technology Center.

5. Industrial and commercial land uses should be allowed in the planning area only on properties already appropriately zoned for those uses. Development of isolated vacant commercial properties will not be accepted. Self-storage and mini-warehouse facilities should not receive approval via the special exception, rezoning or text amendment processes.

6. Existing commercial centers should be preserved, rehabilitated or redeveloped.

7. Adequate broadband telecommunication connections should be provided to local businesses and residences to ensure continued access to high-speed technological innovations such as the Internet.

8. Continued employment and office development is encouraged at approved locations in accordance with the City’s Economic Development Plan.
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F. Historic Preservation, page 73

The Historic Preservation section proposes to evaluate 10 Historic Resources and documented properties for possible additions to the Historic Site inventory. The Mills Property is a currently undocumented site that is also recommended for evaluation. In addition, two cemeteries are proposed for evaluation. This section also identifies the rural, scenic, and historic roads within the planning area.

The Preliminary Master Plan eliminates a section in the 1991 Master Plan on Preservation Incentives that explains tax credits available to encourage designation by private property owners. It would be helpful to retain this information in the current Plan, as well as definitions and requirements for Historic Sites and Historic Resources.

Regarding those properties recommended for evaluation, the City recommends supporting the evaluations with the caveat that no designation, for either a Resource or a Site, shall be implemented without the express consent of the property owner. Therefore, even if the Mills Property is determined to be of sufficient historic significance to merit classification as a Historic Site, it should not be so classified unless the owners agree (MNCPPC Historic Preservation Staff indicated this property did not meet the criteria for designation as a Historic Site). Inclusion of the property in the Historic Sites and Districts Plan as a Resource, however, would recognize the property as having some local historic significance, without subjecting the property to the Historic Preservation Ordinance. Historic Resources may be subjected to less rigorous regulations, however, at the time of permit review (e.g. buffers). The City further recommends that two gravesites be recommended for evaluation: 1) John and Mary Mitchell; and, 2) Major Lancaster Lansdale. The Historic Sites and Resources Map (p. 75) should list the properties shown on the map and identify them, as well as those properties under consideration for evaluation.

The City also recommends that definitions be included for Scenic, Rural and Historic Roads in the Scenic and Historic Roads section.

V. Other Master Plan Issues

The proposed Plan does not have a section on Housing, although the 2002 General Plan identifies this topic as part of the Economic Development, Housing and Community Character Element. Two housing policies are mentioned in the Developing Tier section of the Plan on pages 10-11: one is concerned with attracting “high-value” housing and the other relates to guidelines for senior housing development. (MNCPPC staff repeatedly made land use recommendations for senior housing during and after the charrette; however, no comprehensive study of need was ever published. City staff was advised recently that a study was undertaken but never completed; the incomplete study only marginally addressed senior demographics in Prince George’s County as a whole and there were no specific recommendations for Bowie and Vicinity.)

There should be a separate section on housing to address the issues of affordable housing, rental housing, large-lot estates, accessory dwelling units, and the possibility of ‘tear-downs’ (redevelopment of large lots with small homes to more massive homes) within the Levitt section of Bowie and other neighborhoods in the planning area.
Demographics on the median income of current residents and the median home prices should be provided. Comparisons with the County demographics should be included. Because this area of the County has a higher homeownership rate, median income and home value than other parts of the County, the focus could be on increasing affordable rental housing through innovative means. This could be in the form of allowing accessory dwelling units, upzoning of land adjacent to existing bus routes and commercial uses, and/or the rezoning of commercial land to mixed use to accommodate residential development.

There should be policies and recommended regulations for:

a. Increasing medium-density housing by creating ‘receiving’ areas where appropriate (mapping a 1/4 mile wide transit overlay zone along existing bus routes).
b. Rezoning for medium-density housing where appropriate.
c. Creating zero lot line, medium-density, single-family development zones.
d. The allowance of accessory dwelling units.
e. Promoting an improved jobs-to-housing balance.
f. Updating zoning regulations to address maximum floor area ratio and building coverage (should not include driveways, but should include decks and other large structures) per zone.
g. Implementing contextual zones to regulate the mass and bulk of ‘tear-downs’ in established neighborhoods.

The following Housing Policies, contained in the City’s Development Review Guidelines and Policies, are relevant to this Plan and should be included:

1. Preserve and enhance the quality of the residential character of the City by maintaining a majority of single-family, detached dwelling units throughout the community and balancing it with a choice of housing types, sizes and styles, including live-work dwelling units and housing for residents of all ages and incomes and for population with special needs.

2. The inventory of housing opportunities for senior citizens and for persons with disabilities should be expanded to include Mixed Retirement Communities, Assisted Living Facilities, Nursing Homes and Congregate Care Facilities.

3. Special exception applications that significantly change the character of an undeveloped land parcel in a residential area are to be discouraged.

4. Housing opportunities for moderately low-, low- and very low-income families, as defined by the City’s Consolidated Housing Plan, are encouraged.
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**Bowie and Vicinity Preliminary Master Plan**

**Summary of City Recommendations**

1. Page 2 - Expand Regional Center Boundary.
2. Page 2 – Oppose Rural/Developing Tier Change #3 and return entire Chesley/Gibraltar Property to Rural Tier.
3. Page 3 – Bowie Race Track, downzone from R-R to O-S.
4. Page 3 – Future Community Center at Bowie State University recommended for Sector Plan prior to development
5. Page 3 – Rural Tier, adjust R-A and O-S zoning boundary; additional policies recommended.
6. Page 5 – Developing Tier/Mixed Use Policy #1 reworded to encourage moderate density and mixed use only at existing activity centers.
7. Page 5 – Downzone Northpeak property from L-A-C and R-S to R-R.
8. Page 6 – Retain R-R zoning on Hall Road property.
13. Page 8 – MSTC – Should be employment use only and include in Regional Center.
15. Page 9 – Jesuit Property – Recommend retaining existing R-R zone and development in the R-S 1.6 – 2.6 zone per the Plan
17. Page 10 – Zehner Property – Recommended for O-S zone.
19. Page 11 – Old Town Bowie – Revise Policy #1; oppose commercial area expansion, downzone residential areas; DDOZ recommended for parking in business district only.
20. Page 13 – Bowie Mainstreet – Expand boundary, recommend DDOZ approach and inclusion of affordable residential units.
23. Page 14 – Bowie Regional Center – Delete 10-minute walking distance criterion; strengthen policy to stage development based on transportation improvements.
25. Page 16 – Parks and Recreation – Oppose additional parkland acquisition in favor of new policies aimed at improving facilities. Other new policies recommended.
27. Page 19 – Transportation Systems – Reduce 4-lane collector roads to 2-lanes; do not upgrade 6th Street and Jericho Park Road; MD 197 limited to 4 lanes; Level of Service policy for Regional Center recommended for LOS “D”; Support intergovernmental congestion management system; oppose TPEAs; recommend major parking facility/transit hub.
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30. Page 22 – Economic Development – Fiscal impact analysis recommended before any additional commercial intensity approved; include MSTC in this section; additional policies recommended.
32. Page 24 – Other Issues – Housing section recommended with policies.
# APPENDIX 2

Summary Of Zoning Recommendations

## Table 1 - Bowie and Vicinity SMA

### Proposed Zoning Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change #</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>City Rec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>R-R to R-A</td>
<td>34.22</td>
<td>Sacred Heart Church</td>
<td>R-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>R-R to O-S</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>Jesuit Prop., w. of PW Rd.</td>
<td>O-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>R-R to I-4</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>MD 3/Sylvan Dr. Median</td>
<td>R-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>R-R to I-4</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>US 301/Walker Pontiac area</td>
<td>R-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>R-R to I-4</td>
<td>72.44</td>
<td>US 301 Median, s. of PR Dr.</td>
<td>R-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-M to I-4</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>US 301/MD 214 Median</td>
<td>C-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E-I-A to R-E</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>Willowbrook</td>
<td>R-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-I-A to I-1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>I-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>R-R to C-M</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>Spriggs/Mills Property</td>
<td>C-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>R-R to R-A</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>Adj. To Old Town Bowie</td>
<td>R-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>R-R to R-E</td>
<td>99.63</td>
<td>Adj. To Old Town Bowie</td>
<td>R-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7C</td>
<td>R-R to O-S</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>Adj. To Old Town Bowie</td>
<td>O-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Impose DDOZ</td>
<td>292.75</td>
<td>Old Town Bowie</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C-S-C to M-U-I</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>Old Town Bowie</td>
<td>M-U-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-55 to M-U-I</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>Old Town Bowie</td>
<td>R-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-R to M-U-I</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Old Town Bowie</td>
<td>R-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>R-R to R-55</td>
<td>61.04</td>
<td>Old Town Bowie, e. of Myrtle</td>
<td>R-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11A</td>
<td>V-L to R-E</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>Zehner Property</td>
<td>O-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11B</td>
<td>V-L to R-A/O-S</td>
<td>49.90</td>
<td>Zehner Property</td>
<td>O-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>R-R to C-M</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>Adj. To Woodcliff Road</td>
<td>C-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-R to C-M</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Adj. To Woodcliff Road</td>
<td>C-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.5/P.114</strong></td>
<td>R-R to C-M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adj. To Change #12</td>
<td>C-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>C-M to C-S-C</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>Melvin Motors Property</td>
<td>C-S-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>L-A-C to R-R</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Northpeak commercial</td>
<td>R-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.338, P.224 and P.212</strong></td>
<td>R-S to R-R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Northpeak residential</td>
<td>R-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>C-O to R-18</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>Dimensions Property</td>
<td>M-X-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or M-U-TC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 for first 300 feet adjacent to US 301
## Table 2 - Proposed Zoning Changes – Additional Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>City Rec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R-55, R-80, R-R to Neighborhood Conservation Zone</td>
<td>Levitt Bowie</td>
<td>RNC¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>R-A to C-M</td>
<td>Melvin Prop/US 301 (Map 63, Parcels 147, 149)</td>
<td>C-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>R-A to R-55/R-R</td>
<td>N.W. quad. 48th/Maple (Map 29, Parcels 4, 213)</td>
<td>R-55/R-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>C-O to C-M</td>
<td>West Bowie Village (Map 46, Parcel A-n. side MD 450)</td>
<td>C-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>C-O to M-X-T or M-U-TC</td>
<td>Bowie Crossing (Map 55, Lots 1,2,7,8,9; P. 45, P.95)</td>
<td>M-X-T or M-U-TC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>O-S to R-O-S</td>
<td>Whitemarsh Park (Map 38, Parcel 50)</td>
<td>R-O-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>O-S to R-O-S</td>
<td>Sandy Hill Landfill</td>
<td>R-O-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>R-R to O-S</td>
<td>Church Road Park (Map 62, Parcel 70)</td>
<td>O-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>R-S to O-S</td>
<td>Pope's Creek Park (Map 62, Parcel N, O, P)</td>
<td>O-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>O-S to R-O-S</td>
<td>Pr. George's Stadium (Map 55, Parcel A)</td>
<td>R-O-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>R-S/M-A-C to O-S</td>
<td>Woodland Park (Map 55, Parcels H and I)</td>
<td>O-S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ZONING MAP CORRECTIONS:

- Normal School Road: R-S zoning should be R-A
- Northridge Open Space: R-O-S rezoning criteria not met based on acreage, ownership
- Whitemarsh Park-MNCPPC: R-O-S zoning should be O-S, based on acreage

¹Residential Neighborhood Conservation zone requires new legislation
The Honorable Samuel H. Dean, Chairman
Prince George’s County Council
County Administration Building
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

RE: Bowie and Vicinity Preliminary Master Plan and SMA

Dear Chairman Dean,

On Monday, May 2, 2005 the Bowie City Council conducted a public hearing on the Preliminary Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment (SMA) for Bowie and Vicinity. After considering the testimony of 15 speakers and written testimony submitted by many others, the City Council voted to support the findings and recommendations contained in the attached document, with special emphasis on the following items:

1. The Maryland Science and Technology Center (MSTC) must be designated solely as an employment land use and retained as part of the Bowie Regional Center. The City Council strenuously objects to the proposed removal of the MSTC from the Regional Center to the extent this removal decreases the prospect for the property to become an employment center, as has always been envisioned and planned. Any additions of residential development to balance or enhance the overall development at the MSTC should not be done at the expense of the proposed level of commercial office development for which the project has approvals. Concerning page 20 “Strategies”, there needs to be an emphasis on using this valuable piece of property for its original intention to become an employment center, and that all other development and preservation interests should be secondary to that goal.

Contrary to the 1991 Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville and Vicinity Area Master Plan (BCMP), which endorsed employment uses on the MSTC property (and also mentioned it by name), this Plan’s recommendations have the potential to convert the entire remaining 90 acres at the MSTC to residential use. The elimination of employment potential at this site works against establishing a better “jobs/housing” balance in Prince George’s County, as mentioned in the County General Plan. Conversion of this major employment site, located within the City, to mixed-use is unconscionable and is not in keeping with the City’s longstanding policies regarding land use and economic development. The MSTC is the only remaining parcel left in the City that has the potential for significant employment development. Employment-oriented development at the MSTC is the City’s highest economic development priority. Based on the above, the City Council recommends the MSTC be designated for employment use only and be retained within the boundary of the Regional Center.
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2. **The MSTC should be mentioned specifically in the Economic Development chapter of the Plan as a major employment center and economic development priority.** The City Council observes that the Economic Development section of the Plan, on page 70, does not mention the MSTC, although it points out that the planning area is home to an estimated 1,700 business establishments and 20,000 employees, representing approximately 7% of all establishments in Prince George’s County and 6% of all employment. The Plan also notes that the area’s labor force per capita earnings and household median incomes are high and increasing.

The 1982 County General Plan first identified the MSTC as a major employment center. The 1991 BCMP recognized the importance of having well-designed and located employment areas which can provide ample opportunity to increase the County’s share of high quality local and regional oriented employment opportunities. The Plan identified the MSTC as Employment Area 3 as a “prestigious employment project” with local, state and federal support. The Plan also characterizes the MSTC as a “showcase employment area” that should be given high priority in marketing efforts as considerable public commitments have been made to provide the necessary public infrastructure for a successful quality employment park.

In addition, Prince George’s County’s Economic Development Corporation (EDC) has identified the MSTC and its businesses as a component of the County’s “High Technology Triangle”, an area where most of the County’s 900 high tech companies, employing some 33,600 highly skilled workers call home. The County EDC’s Strategy for Economic Development includes a focus on retaining and expanding existing businesses. To accomplish this, a supply of ready-to-use industrial and commercial space, such as that available at the MSTC, is critical. Another key point within the County EDC’s Strategy is to promote the growth and development of high tech companies. Retaining the MSTC as a major employment center and encouraging its development will allow those types of companies to locate in Prince George's County.

The City Council believes that removal of another large employment area from the planning area’s inventory of such uses is unwise, since several of the other employment areas recommended by the 1991 BCMP have already been lost to less intensive retail and residential development (e.g. Bowie Gateway Center, Governor’s Green/Home Depot, Bowie Crossing). The City also believes it is critical to view requests for continued reductions in employment land use in the context of the new County General Plan’s economic development objective to increase the jobs-to-population ratio by 39% by the Year 2025.

3. **The Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ) and Mixed-Use-Infill (M-U-I) rezonings proposed for Old Town Bowie should be limited to the area of the existing C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) zoning district, and only development standards for parking should be included. Other residentially zoned property in Old Town Bowie should not be upzoned for higher densities.** At a community information meeting held on April 12, 2005 at the Knights of St. John Hall, the majority of the 100+ residents who attended expressed their desire to maintain the existing character of Old Town Bowie, without any significant changes. The community members who attended the meeting also expressed their view against additional development that would bring in new residents and further impact local streets.

The City Council found many outstanding issues with the DDOZ development standards contained in the SMA. The chief reason for the City’s interest in an overlay zone in Old Town Bowie was to deal with parking issues and streetscape coordination in the business district. The City has been active in improving Old Town streets and sidewalks through the
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Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program and is currently implementing commercial façade grant and loan programs that aim to establish coordination in façade improvements within the business district. The Maryland State Highway Administration is also considering additional streetscape improvements on Ninth Street. Since the above actions are already addressing many of the identified needs in Old Town Bowie, the only remaining goal relates to parking issues. The proposed DDOZ does a good job of addressing the need for parking flexibility within the district. Therefore, the City Council recommends that the Mixed-Use-Infill rezoning and DDOZ be limited to the existing C-S-C zoning district and that only the Parking Standards of the DDOZ be adopted at this time. If the community is supportive, additional standards for Building Envelope, Streetscape and Architecture and Landscaping could be added subsequent to approval of this Plan.

In any event (and because it was a major issue for many of those who participated in the City’s hearings), the Council also requests that the portion of Zug Road between Chestnut Avenue and the CSX railroad tracks, which contains six (6) existing homes, not be designated an Industrial Street as shown on page 101.

4. Future collector road expansions should be minimized in existing residential areas. C-301 (Highbridge Road/Chestnut Avenue), C-313 (Old Laurel Bowie Road) and C-314 (Lanham-Severn Road, Ninth Street and Eleventh Street) are proposed in the Plan as four-lane collector roads. This level of roadway improvement would be disruptive to the existing residential communities and is inconsistent with the City’s Revitalization Master Plan for Old Town Bowie. It is recommended that these roadways be limited to an improved two-lane collector design, with appropriate turn lanes. In addition, the collector classification of Duckettown Road/Sixth Street (C-312) should not extend east of Maple Avenue, since widening of Sixth Street would be constrained by existing residential development, would be detrimental to the community and would be unnecessary since traffic would likely turn onto Maple Avenue rather than use Sixth Street to get to or from Old Laurel Bowie Road. C-315 (Jericho Park Road) from Race Track Road to MD 197 is not practical as a collector, since a major segment of the road will eventually become part of the Bowie State University ring-road system. The City Council recommends that this road continue to be designated as a local road.

5. Properties recommended for historic designation as Historic Sites or Historic Resources should not be included in the Preliminary Master Plan unless the property owner is in agreement. The City Council received testimony from numerous property owners who do not agree with the Plan’s recommendations. Properties should not be singled out for such designations, contrary to the will of the property owner, because of the designations may greatly restrict the owner’s ability to improve or sell their property.

6. The Public Facilities section, on Page 55, Policy #1, Strategy #2 should state that the Mitchellville Road school site is reserved for construction of a new high school rather than “a new high school or middle school”. The Plan text should be further clarified to state that the existing Samuel Ogle school is being converted to a middle school and the former Meadowbrook school building is being converted back to an elementary school.
7. The parkland acquisition sites identified in Table 1 on page 53 of the Plan are supported. In addition, the City also recommends the inclusion of the following new policies in the Plan:

- The areas along the Patuxent River should be the focus of the County’s efforts for acquisition, via either the land development review process or a purchase program, for the preservation of environmentally sensitive lands and the development of a linear trail network for pedestrians and equestrians.

- Directing Commission funds for the development and maintenance of land and facilities currently under their ownership and/or control.

- Rethinking the prevailing philosophy of funding recreational projects on land only owned by the County or Commission (e.g., trails within public rights-of-way).

8. The Plan should include a transportation strategy recommending the examination of a future roadway corridor connecting MD 3 to MD 197 in the vicinity of Bowie State University. There is a need to address regional traffic congestion in the Route 450 corridor, east of Race Track Road, and the heavy traffic volumes that are projected to use Race Track Road and Jericho Park Road. Examination of a possible corridor connection during the update of the Master Plan of Transportation is consistent with the philosophy behind the interjurisdictional congestion management system discussed on page 62 (Policy #2, Strategy #2).

9. A Sector Plan should be approved for the future Community Activity Center proposed at Bowie State University to determine its magnitude and scale prior to any development. Given the potential to create the only transit-oriented development in the planning area centered around an existing rail transit station, the City finds the Plan’s designation of this center as a “Future” community center is justified. However, there are no specific recommendations in the Plan for establishment of such a center in the immediate future. The City concurs with the designation of a “Future Community Center” and the characterization of the type of development on page 10 of the Plan. However, to ensure that the future center’s development is coordinated both internally and externally, a recommendation should be added that requires a Sector Plan for the center to determine its scale and magnitude prior to any development.

10. The Melvin Property, located on the east side of US 301 north of Queen Anne Bridge Road (Parcels 147 and 149 on Tax Map 63) should be rezoned to the C-M zone. This property exhibits the same characteristics of Spriggs/Mills Property, located across US 301 from Parcels 147 and 149, which is recommended for upzoning to C-M in the Plan.

11. The current MD 3/US 301 median development policy contained in the 1991 Bowie Master Plan should be retained in lieu of rezoning the median to the I-4 Zone. The City Council does not support the new policy of allowing additional
development within the Route 3/301 median areas. The current policies of the 1991 BCMP address median development through use of the R-R zone, emphasizing no new commercial uses and grandfathering of existing commercial uses. This policy has worked well in terms of avoiding a proliferation of commercial uses in the corridor. The current policy is also fair in that it allows existing commercial uses to continue. The 1991 BCMP specifically downzoned undeveloped commercial properties to limit the future intensification of commercial uses. For all of these reasons, the City Council recommends this policy be retained.

12. **The boundaries of the Bowie Mainstreet Activity Center and the Bowie Regional Center should be expanded to include additional properties (see Attachment #1). The 10-minute walking distance criterion should not be used in establishing the boundaries of the Bowie Regional Center.** The boundaries of the Bowie Mainstreet mixed-use activity center should be expanded to include the civic uses on MD 450 (Bowie High School, Bowie Center for the Performing Arts, the public library and racquet club), the Bowie Community Center, the Levitt model homes on Sussex Lane, the adjacent townhouse communities on Millstream Drive, Marquette Lane and Scarlet Oak Terrace and the funeral home and church located east of Race Track Road.

The City further recommends addition of the DDOZ technique as part of the policy encouraging a mixture of uses at the three shopping centers, as well as the commercial use area along Superior Lane. These areas should be designated as the “core” of the Bowie Mainstreet mixed-use activity center. The three “core” properties should be designated as preferred sites for small-lot, affordable residential development.

Since the ultimate transit hub location is not known at this time, it is not possible to determine the Regional Center boundary based on a 10-minute walking distance, as discussed in the Plan. Even if the transit hub location were determined, the City does not agree with the assumption that a 10-minute walking distance radius should determine the boundaries of the Regional Center. A 10-minute walking distance may be appropriate in drawing the boundaries of a transit-oriented development district; however, this same district should not be equated to the Regional Center boundary.

The boundaries of the Regional Center should be determined using the 2002 Regional Center boundary (which does include the MSTC property) and expanding it to include the more intensely developed and densely populated portions of the City, all of which would meet the above criteria, assuming the core area is coterminous with the proposed Regional Center boundary. The boundaries of the Bowie Regional Center shown in the Plan should be adjusted to include the Maryland Science and Technology Center (MSTC) property and all of the areas identified on Attachment #1. Inclusion of these additional areas will serve to make the Bowie Regional Center a true city center.

13. **The concept of an interjurisdictional congestion management system and a transit hub within the Regional Center is supported.** The City Council supports the interjurisdictional corridor congestion management system as a means to eventually alleviate heavy regional traffic on certain highways, such as US 50, US 301, MD 3 and the segment of MD 450 between MD 3 and Race Track Road. In conjunction with this approach, it is recommended that the County begin advocating for construction of a major parking facility and transit hub at the northern end of Mitchellville Road in the Bowie Gateway Center. Such a facility would provide direct commuter, carpool, vanpool and shuttle bus access to and from the HOV lanes on US 50 for residents living north and south of US 50, and would also serve to intercept a portion of regional commuters who could park and ride the transit system. With the appropriate system of bridges and ramps, access should also be
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provided to the north via the Nash property to Belair Drive and the MSTC. The long-term success of a transit hub could serve as the impetus for future extension of Metrorail to Bowie.

The key to addressing adequate public facilities challenges in the Regional Center is to ensure that the more intense development described in the Plan does not occur until the necessary transportation facilities are in place to support it. The Plan's policies should be strengthened to state this relationship clearly and unequivocally. Recommendations should be made for staging the land use recommendation into short-range, medium-range and long-range (ultimate) proposals tied to the completion of specific infrastructure (e.g. completion of the US 301/MD 197 interchange, establishment of a transit center, etc.).

14. The mixed-use policy of this Plan should be defined more narrowly. New mixed use activity centers are not supported at the Chesley/Gibraltar Property, the Northpeak Property and the Hall Road Property. The specific policies for the Developing Tier in this Plan reflect the 2002 General Plan's preference for mixed-use development. The City Council is concerned that the proposed Plan appears to be encouraging high-density, mixed-use development throughout the Developing Tier, rather than in Centers and Corridors only, as recommended in the 2002 General Plan. The greater emphasis, following the General Plan, should be on the concentration of higher-density and mixed-use development within the Regional Center (and the future Community Center) while encouraging only low- and moderate-density development and revitalization of existing centers in the Developing Tier. Mixed-use development, especially at higher residential densities, is therefore not appropriate throughout the Developing Tier portion of the planning area. The City recommends rewording of Policy #1 on page 18 to encourage moderate-density and mixed-use development only at existing activity centers. Based on this conclusion, it would be inappropriate to designate a new activity center on the Chesley/Gibraltar property.

SMA Change #14 on page 96 proposes to eliminate zoning for an undeveloped Local Activity Center located on the south side of Race Track Road, east of MD 197 (formerly known as the Northpeak development). For the reasons stated above, the City supports the proposed downzoning of approximately four (4) acres from L-A-C to R-R and further recommends downzoning of the adjacent R-S zoning to the R-R zone.

In addition to the above, the City Council notes that the Plan is silent regarding a pending L-A-C rezoning application for a future activity center at Hall Road. In keeping with the true intent of the General Plan regarding locations of new commercial uses and revised Policy #1 above, the Plan should specifically recommend retention of the Hall Road property in the R-R zone.

15. The Chesley/Gibraltar Property should be returned to the Rural Tier. The City and the surrounding community opposed the designation of the property known as the Chesley/Gibraltar Property as part of the Developing Tier in 2002. The property was given the Developing Tier designation, as well as a Water and Sewer Plan category change by the County Council at that time, despite the objections that doing so would violate a longstanding land use policy of both the County and City. Since the approval of the 1982 General Plan, the prevailing policy for properties located on the east side of US 301 has been to retain a permanent, low-density and agricultural character and discourage public water and sewer facilities. In the 1991 BCMP, various properties were downzoned from commercial to low-density residential in keeping with this policy.

It should also be noted that the Chesley/Gibraltar property is not located within the existing Regional Center or within the revised boundary proposed in this Plan. The property is well
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beyond a 10-minute walking distance from the transit centers identified in the Plan. No market information has been provided to justify additional retail square footage in the planning area. In addition, the proposal is inconsistent with the Plan's emphasis of placing intense commercial activity only within established centers. The largest scale L-A-C category, the "Community" center, has a maximum Floor Area Ratio of 0.68 FAR, which is very intense. The proposal for the site envisioned in the Plan will also have serious traffic consequences, since the plans being developed for a new interchange at US 301/MD 197 do not take mixed-use development on the property into consideration. Several of the interchange options being considered are only marginally meeting Level-of-Service (LOS) criteria and this proposal will worsen traffic conditions. For all of the above reasons, the City Council respectfully recommends returning the Chesley/Gibraltar property to the Rural Tier.

16. The Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) and Conservation Subdivision Design concepts for the Rural Tier are supported. The City Council supports these new concepts that encourage the preservation of the planning area's rural character. Conservation subdivision design should also be encouraged within the Developing Tier. To take advantage of the fine work products created by this Plan, legislation to implement these concepts should be drafted as soon as possible.

17. A fiscal impact analysis of the planning area should be conducted prior to any increases in commercial zoning. The City Council notes that no conclusive data were presented to demonstrate that the quantities of commercial redevelopment planned for the Mixed Use Activity Centers are justified from a market standpoint. City staff reviewed the economic technical appendix and found that it did not assess the market supportability characteristics of the planning area. The City Council is very concerned that the mixed-use and commercial zoning recommendations of the Plan are not supported by a traditional economic analysis. The City therefore recommends that a planning area-wide fiscal impact analysis, similar to the one conducted for the 1991 BCMP, be undertaken before any additional commercial zoning intensity is approved.

The City Council appreciates the significant commitment of time and resources to updating the 1991 Master Plan. We would especially like to thank the staff members of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission who worked so hard on producing a quality product under an expedited plan preparation process.

In closing, the City Council urges you to include all of the City's recommendations in your approval of the Master Plan and SMA. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this very important planning effort.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Bowie City Council
G. Frederick Robinson
Mayor

Attachments
CC: The Honorable Douglas J.J. Peters
The Honorable Elizabeth M. Hewlett
Bowie Mainstreet
Proposed Activity Center Boundary
City of Bowie Position Statement – Joint Public Hearing 5/17/05

Good evening Chairman Dean and members of the County Council and County Planning Board. It is my pleasure to be with you this evening. The Bowie City Council appreciates the significant commitment of time and resources to updating the 1991 Master Plan. We would especially like to thank the staff members of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission who worked so hard to produce a quality product under an expedited plan preparation process.

While I do not have time to go over all of them, the City Council has made many very specific land use and zoning recommendations for individual properties, as well as many new recommended planning policies, including environmental, parks/recreation/trails, economic development and housing policies. These are contained in the “Findings and Recommendations” document submitted by the City.

The following items are intended to highlight the City Council’s position regarding the Bowie and Vicinity Preliminary Master Plan:

- **The Maryland Science and Technology Center (MSTC) must be designated solely as an employment land use and retained as part of the Bowie Regional Center.** The City Council strenuously objects to the proposed removal of the MSTC from the Regional Center. Conversion of this major employment site, located within the City, to mixed-use is not in keeping with the City’s longstanding policies regarding land use and economic development. The MSTC is the only remaining parcel left in the City that has the potential for significant employment development. Employment-oriented development at the MSTC is the City’s highest economic development priority.

- **The MSTC should be mentioned specifically in the Economic Development chapter of the Plan as a major employment center and economic development priority.** The 1991 Master Plan identified the MSTC as a “prestigious employment project” with local, state and federal support. The Plan also characterizes the MSTC as a “showcase employment area”. In addition, Prince George’s County’s Economic Development Corporation (EDC) has identified the MSTC and its businesses as a component of the County’s “High Technology Triangle”. The City also believes it is critical to view requests for continued reductions in employment land use in the context of the new County General Plan’s economic development objective to increase the jobs-to-population ratio by 39% by the Year 2025.

- **The mixed-use policy of this Plan should be defined more narrowly.** New mixed use activity centers are not supported at the Chesley/Gibraltor Property, the Northpeak Property and the Hall Road Property. The City Council is concerned that the proposed Plan appears to be encouraging high-density, mixed-use development throughout the Developing Tier, rather than in Centers and Corridors only, as recommended in the 2002 General Plan. The greater emphasis, following the General Plan, should be on the concentration of higher-density and mixed-use development within the Regional Center (and the future Community Center) while encouraging only low- and moderate-density development and revitalization of existing centers in the Developing Tier. The City recommends commercial revitalization of West Bowie Village, a future Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ) at Bowie Mainstreet (a great opportunity to use the form-based code technique) and mixed use development within the existing commercial areas of Old Town Bowie and Pointer Ridge. The City Council also recommends the Plan designate a Residential Neighborhood Conservation Area and appropriate zoning to protect the Levittown character of the City.
• The Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ) and Mixed-Use-Infill (M-U-I) rezonings proposed for Old Town Bowie should be limited to the area of the existing C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) zoning district, and only development standards for parking should be included. Other residentially zoned property in Old Town Bowie should not be upzoned for higher densities.

• Properties recommended for historic designation as Historic Sites or Historic Resources should not be included in the Preliminary Master Plan unless the property owner is in agreement. Properties should not be singled out for such designations, contrary to the will of the property owner, because the designations greatly restrict the owner’s ability to improve or sell their property.

• Future collector road expansions should be minimized in existing residential areas. C-301 (Highbridge Road/Chestnut Avenue), C-313 (Old Laurel Bowie Road), C-314 (Lanham-Severn Road, Ninth Street and Eleven Street), C-312 (Duckettown Road/Sixth Street) and C-315 (Jericho Park Road) should be designated as two-lane, local roads.

• Let me say that the City Council is greatly pleased to see the removal of the A-44, A-58, A-19 and PT-1 alignments from the Master Plan. However, the Plan should include a transportation strategy recommending the examination of a future roadway corridor connecting MD 3 to MD 197 in the vicinity of Bowie State University as part of the forthcoming Master Plan of Transportation update. In addition, the County should examine the feasibility of an interchange on US 50 in the vicinity of MD 193. The City Council also supports the concepts of an interjurisdictional congestion management system and a transit hub within the Regional Center. The key to addressing adequate public facilities challenges in the Regional Center is to ensure that the more intense development described in the Plan does not occur until the necessary transportation facilities are in place to support it. The Plan’s policies should be strengthened to state this relationship clearly and unequivocally. Recommendations should be made for staging the land use recommendation into short-range, medium-range and long-range (ultimate) proposals tied to provision of necessary infrastructure (e.g. completion of the US 301/MD 197 interchange, establishment of a transit center, etc.). The City is willing to accept the consequences of not endorsing the Transportation Policy Exception Area (TPEA) approach (i.e. that some development in the future may have to be disapproved because the amount of local traffic has overburdened certain roadways). Therefore, it is recommended that the concept of TPEAs be removed from the Plan.

• The Public Facilities section should state that the Mitchellville Road school site is reserved for construction of a new high school rather than “a new high school or middle school”. The parkland acquisition sites identified in the Plan are supported, as are the Plan’s recommendations for a public library on Hall Road and a fire/EMS facility on Mitchellville Road.
• The current MD 3/US 301 median development policy contained in the 1991 Bowie Master Plan, which emphasizes no new commercial uses, should be retained in lieu of rezoning the median to the I-4 Zone. The City concludes that I-4 zoning would spur development in the Route 3/301 corridor and that development would be detrimental to public safety and contrary to many years of land use policy history, emphasizing little or no development in the median. The current Master Plan policy for the Route 3/301 median should remain in place until the time that the A-61 service road is constructed and open to traffic.

Some other thoughts:

• The boundaries of the Bowie Mainstreet Activity Center and the Bowie Regional Center should be expanded to include additional properties, as referenced in our “Findings and Recommendations” document.

• A Sector Plan should be approved for the future Community Activity Center proposed at Bowie State University to determine its magnitude and scale prior to any development.

• The Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) and Conservation Subdivision Design concepts for the Rural Tier are supported, as is a realignment of existing R-A and O-S zoning to place the more environmentally constrained land into the O-S zone.

In closing, the City Council urges you to include all of the City’s recommendations in your approval of the Master Plan and SMA. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this very important planning effort.
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On this date, County Councilman Douglas Peters and Mr. Richard Padgett from Councilman Peters’ staff visited Bowie City Hall for the purpose of a briefing concerning the City’s position on the Bowie and Vicinity Preliminary Master Plan and SMA as presented in the City’s letter of May 10, 2005 which transmitted the City’s Findings and Recommendations. Mr. Joe Meinert presented the briefing and City Manager David Deutsch joined Mayor Robinson and Mayor Pro Tem Jenkins in discussing the City’s expressed position and in responding to Councilman Peters’ and Mr. Padgett’s questions regarding the City’s position on the Preliminary Master Plan and SMA.
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The Hon. Samuel Dean, Chairperson
Prince George’s County Council
County Administration Building
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

The Hon. Elizabeth Hewlett, Chairperson
Prince George’s County Planning Board
County Administration Building
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

Re: Bowie-Collington Sectional Map Amendment
Rezoning request for the Maryland Science and Technology Center

Dear Councilman Dean and Chairperson Hewlett:

The City of Bowie has received correspondence from the law firm of O’Malley, Miles, Nylen & Gilmore, P.A. concerning the above-referenced 466-acre parcel. The letter is dated June 20, 2005 and encloses a letter from the firm to Councilman Dean and Chairman Hewlett dated May 17, 2005, submitted on behalf of MIE Properties, Inc.

We believe it is not a coincidence that the enclosure was sent to the County within the time period for public comment on the Bowie-Collington Sectional Map but that the correspondence to the City advising it of this filing was delayed for more than a month until after the record had closed. In the interest of fairness, the City therefore respectfully requests that you reopen the record for the limited purpose of accepting the City’s comments and objections to the proposed rezoning request.

The City’s primary objection to the rezoning request concerns the existence of covenants in the City’s favor restricting the permissible uses of the property. The covenants are inconsistent with the requested M-X-T zone in a number of respects, perhaps most significantly in that they prohibit residential development on the property.

The validity of the covenants has been litigated and upheld by the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County. The current request to rezone the property constitutes yet another attempt, in a series of attempts, by the property owner to avoid living up to its end of its bargain, a bargain which entailed an investment by the City in this property of several million dollars. According to testimony provided by Dean Morehouse of MTM Builder/Developer, Inc., one of the current property owners, the property was acquired at an extremely favorable price due to the bankruptcy of the prior owners. The current owners therefore seek to reap a windfall by circumventing the fairly-negotiated restrictions on the property.

1 An appeal by the property owner has been briefed and argued in the Court of Special Appeals and a decision is pending.
The City has viewed this property and continues to view this property, because of its size and location, as holding the key to an unprecedented economic development opportunity to create a high quality employment center that would benefit both the City and the County. The proposals set forth by the current property owner, both in the previously requested revision to the Basic Plan and in the current rezoning request, represent a fundamental departure from the previously approved vision for this property and will absolutely squander the precious opportunity presented by appropriate development of one of the County's last remaining undeveloped tracts of this size, outside of the rural tier.

For the reasons set forth herein, we urge you to reject the request for rezoning submitted on behalf of MIE Properties, Inc.

Very truly yours,

G. Frederick Robinson
Mayor
MEMORANDUM

TO: City Council

FROM: David J. Deutsch
City Manager

SUBJECT: Staff Analysis of Digest of Testimony/MNCPPC Recommendations
Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan Public Hearing Record

DATE: 7/22/05

Attached please find a copy of the Master Plan transcript analysis and recommendations prepared by M-NCPCC. This information was presented to the County Planning Board on Thursday, July 14, 2005. The Planning Board voted to accept the staff recommendations and to adopt the Master Plan with the modifications recommended by their staff. Also attached is an analysis of recommendations prepared by City staff. The table provides a thumbnail sketch of the City Council's recommendations and identifies what the County did with them. The second column in the table ("COBPg") refers to the page number of the City "Findings and Recommendations" document submitted at the May 17, 2005 public hearing.

A total of 89 City recommendations were tracked in the analysis table. Of that number, the following breakdown resulted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(+) Agrees with City</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X) Disagrees with City</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(/) Partial agreement</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S) Plan is silent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(?) Unclear</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, the percentage of recommendations where the County agrees or partially agrees with the City recommendation (44%) is the same as the number where the County disagrees with the City (44%). However, Council should be aware that, in many instances, City recommendations that contained multiple sub-recommendations (such as specific recommendations for new policies) were only recorded as a single recommendation in the attached tracking table. Therefore, the actual number of recommended items is much greater than noted above. The County did not accept most of these types of recommendations.

Staff will provide an overview of the recommendations at the August 1st City Council meeting.
# Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan
## Analysis of City Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>COBpg</th>
<th>Summary of City Recommendation</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Digest Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The boundaries of the Regional Center should be determined using the 2002 Regional Center boundary (which does include the MSTC property) and expanding it to include the more intensely developed and densely populated portions of the City...</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>...recommends the entire Chesley/Gibraltar property be returned to the Rural Tier.</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Future Community Center near Bowie State University - ... a recommendation should be added that requires a Sector Plan for the center to determine its scale and magnitude prior to any development.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SECTION II - RURAL TIER RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>COBpg</th>
<th>Summary of City Recommendation</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Digest Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rural Tier - ...the zoning pattern should be adjusted to permit R-A zoning on the more developable land within the Rural Tier, especially east of Route 301 where the east-west direction of stream valleys separates the land into more developable high ground suitable for the R-A zone and lowland areas that should be zoned O-S.</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rural Tier - Wellhead protection areas should be among the values expressed in Policy #1, Strategy #3 on page 6.</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rural Tier - There should be policies and recommended regulations for the following:</td>
<td>(/)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SECTION III - DEVELOPING TIER RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. #</th>
<th>COBpg</th>
<th>Summary of City Recommendation</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Digest Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mixed Use Policies - The City believes the greater emphasis, following the General Plan, should be on the concentration of higher-density and mixed-use development within the Regional Center (and the future Community Center) while encouraging only low- and moderate-density development and revitalization of existing centers in the Developing Tier.</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mixed Use Policies - The City recommends wording of Policy #1 to encourage moderate-density and mixed-use development only at existing activity centers.</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Northpeak Property - the City supports the proposed downzoning of approximately four (4) acres from L-A-C to R-R and further recommends downzoning of the adjacent R-S zoning to the R-R zone.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hall Road Property - In keeping with the true intent of the General Plan regarding locations of new commercial uses and revised Policy #1 above, the Plan should specifically recommend retention of the Hall Road property in the R-R zone.</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The approved Karington and Fairwood developments, shown on the Proposed Land Use Plan for mixed-use, should be identified as mixed-use activity centers and discussed in the text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The City... recommends the plan also establish a Residential Neighborhood Conservation Area and zoning district to protect the original Levitt sections and conserve the City's older neighborhoods. This zoning tool should establish uniform zoning standards, such as lot coverage standards, and should also prohibit unwanted special exception uses from encroaching on the established neighborhood character.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The City does not support the new policy of allowing additional development within the Route 3/301 median areas.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(+)= Agrees with City  
(X)= Disagrees with City of Bowie  
(/)= Partial agreement  
(S)= Plan is silent regarding City recommendation  
(?)= Fate of City recommendation is unclear
## Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan
### Analysis of City Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>6</th>
<th><strong>Route 3/301 - Existing properties in the R-R zone should be retained in the R-R zone.</strong></th>
<th>(+)</th>
<th>29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Route 3/301 - The City recommends that expansion of existing commercial uses be discouraged, as they, too, will further contribute to an already over-burdened transportation system and create the potential for increased vehicular conflicts.</strong></td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Route 3/301 - It should be reiterated from the 1991 BCMP that future commercial rezoning of residential properties to commercial zones is discouraged.</strong></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Route 3/301 - ...the consolidation of existing commercial properties should be encouraged to provide more coordinated and attractive development.</strong></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Route 3/301 - Any improvement to median properties should include adequate turning lanes and accel/decel lanes.</strong></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Spriggs/Mills Properties - ... extend the existing auto-related uses on Route 301 southward to Mitchellville Road...</strong></td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Spriggs/Mills Properties - ... it would be inappropriate to develop residential uses within the first 300 feet of the road.</strong></td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Spriggs/Mills Properties - ... The cluster technique is recommended in order to address buffering issues between commercial and residential uses as well as to provide density compatibility with lots in the adjoining Amber Meadows subdivision.</strong></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Spriggs/Mills Properties - Access to the residential subdivision should be provided from Ayrwood Lane in Amber Meadows.</strong></td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Spriggs/Mills Properties - Access to the commercial area should include a driveway connecting to Mitchellville Road.</strong></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Spriggs/Mills Properties - The existing ballfield, which has historical significance to the local community, should be considered for protection during the development review process.</strong></td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>...the City recommends the MSTC be designated for employment use only and be included within the boundary of the Regional Center.</strong></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Jesuit Property - ...the City supports the recommendations of the Preliminary Master Plan for this property.</strong></td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Willowbrook Property - ...the residential downzoning proposed in Change #5A is appropriate.</strong></td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Willowbrook Property - The recommended zoning change (Change #5B) for 10 acres of the property to the I-I zone is also supported.</strong></td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Zehner Property - A more appropriate zoning for the property would be the O-S zone, which conveys a very low residential density land use.</strong></td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Dimensions Property - ...it is more appropriate to rezone these properties to M-U-TC (Mixed Use Town Center) or another mixed-use zone, such as the M-X-T zone. The proposed R-18 zone would not allow offices and the current C-O zone does not allow multi-family dwellings. The mixed-use M-U-TC zone would permit both types of uses, as well as public uses such as the Senior Center and Gym.</strong></td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MIXED USE ACTIVITY CENTERS**

| 3.25 | 11 | **Old Town Bowie - Policy #1 should be modified as follows:** | (X) | 39 |

(+ ) = Agrees with City

(X) = Disagrees with City of Bowie

(I) = Partial agreement

(S) = Plan is silent regarding City recommendation

(?) = Fate of City recommendation is unclear
Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan
Analysis of City Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy #1: Encourage a pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use development within and adjacent to the existing commercial district.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.26 11</td>
<td>Old Town Bowie - The M-U-I rezoning area [and DDOZ] proposed in SMA Change #9 (page 91) should be reduced to correspond to the boundary of the existing commercial business district and immediately adjoining properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.27 11</td>
<td>Old Town Bowie - Zoning changes should be applied to land outside the commercial district in order to decrease the amount of additional, new residential development. This would affect SMA Change #10 on page 92.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.28 11</td>
<td>Old Town Bowie - The density transition to the Rural Tier discussed in the Plan is implemented in SMA Change #7 on page 89 and is supported by the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.29 11</td>
<td>Old Town Bowie - Regarding Policy #2, references to opening of “paper alleys” should be deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30 12</td>
<td>Old Town Bowie - The City recommends that the DDOZ be limited to Parking Standards at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31 12</td>
<td>Bowie Mainstreet - The boundaries of the Bowie Mainstreet mixed-use activity center should be expanded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.32 12</td>
<td>Bowie Mainstreet - The City recommends addition of the DDOZ technique as part of the policy encouraging a mixture of uses at the three shopping centers, as well as the commercial use area along Superior Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.33 12</td>
<td>Bowie Mainstreet - These areas should be designated as the “core” of the Bowie Mainstreet mixed-use activity center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.34 12</td>
<td>Bowie Mainstreet - The three “core” properties should be designated as preferred sites for small-lot, affordable residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.35 13</td>
<td>West Bowie Village - The concept for WBV should be limited to basically non-residential uses within the existing business district... The activity center boundary should be revised to include the business district, but exclude any portion of the Stewart’s Landing subdivision and the City owned property mentioned above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.36 13</td>
<td>West Bowie Village - Live-work units should be specifically referenced as a residential dwelling type within the commercial district. All other references to residential development should be eliminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.37 13</td>
<td>West Bowie Village - The Land Use Plan should show the correct configuration of the Route 450 access cut-off to West Bowie Village per the State Highway Administration’s approved plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.38 13</td>
<td>West Bowie Village - The City supports the upzoning of approximately eight (8) acres of land zoned R-R to the C-M zone (Change #12 on page 94)...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.39 13</td>
<td>West Bowie Village - To avoid leaving vestiges of R-R zoning between Change #12 and the former J-Mart property and east of Change #12 adjacent to the CSX railroad tracks, it is recommended that these properties also be rezoned to C-M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.40 13</td>
<td>West Bowie Village - The City also supports the conversion of the C-M zoned Melvin Motors to the C-S-C zone in SMA Change #13...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.41 13</td>
<td>Pointer Ridge - The City supports the land use recommendations and policies of the Plan for the Pointer Ridge mixed-use activity center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(+) = Agrees with City  
(X) = Disagrees with City of Bowie  
(/) = Partial agreement  
(S) = Plan is silent regarding City recommendation  
(?) = Fate of City recommendation is unclear
**Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan**

**Analysis of City Recommendations**

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>Pointer Ridge</em> - ...no access, including indirect access via parking lots, should be allowed to Pointer Ridge Drive.</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>Bowie Regional Center</em> - ...the property should be doubly emphasized as a key employment feature of the Regional Center.</td>
<td>(/)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>Bowie Regional Center</em> - the more intense development described in the Plan does not occur until the necessary transportation facilities are in place to support it. The Plan’s policies should be strengthened to state this relationship clearly and unequivocally.</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>Bowie Regional Center</em> - Recommendations should be made for staging the land use recommendation into short-range, medium-range and long-range (ultimate) proposals tied to provision of necessary infrastructure (e.g. completion of the US 301/MD 197 interchange, establishment of a transit center, etc.).</td>
<td>(/)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION IV – AREAWIDE INFRASTRUCTURE**

**ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE**

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>The Plan should include specific goals and objectives for mitigating air, light, and noise pollution in addition to water pollution.</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>There should be policies and recommended regulations for...</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARKS AND RECREATION**

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>The City also recommends the following new policies...</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Several existing City policies relate to provision of parks and recreation facilities and are recommended for inclusion in the Plan...</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC FACILITIES**

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>...the City Council...recommended that the text be clarified to state that the existing Samuel Ogle school is being converted to a middle school and the former Meadowbrook school building is being converted back to an elementary school.</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>The Mitchellville Road school site should be designated as a high school site, only, rather than a high school or middle school site as described in the Plan.</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>The location of a future library on the Hall Road property shown on Map 18...</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>...and the recommended fire/EMS facility on Mitchellville Road...</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>There are a number of policy areas where the Plan could be strengthened to better conform to the City’s approved guidelines.</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS – ROADWAYS**

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>C-301 (Highbridge Road/Chestnut Avenue), C-313 (Old Laurel Bowie Road) and C-314 (Lanham-Severn Road, Ninth Street and Eleventh Street) are proposed as four-lane collector roads. This level of roadway improvement would be disruptive to the existing communities and is inconsistent with the City’s Revitalization Master Plan for Old Town</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(+) = Agrees with City  
(X) = Disagrees with City of Bowie  
(/) = Partial agreement  
(S) = Plan is silent regarding City recommendation  
(?) = Fate of City recommendation is unclear


**Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan**  
**Analysis of City Recommendations**

| 4.11 | 18 | The collector classification of Duckettown Road/Sixth Street (C-312) should not extend east of Maple Avenue. | (I) | 84 |
| 4.12 | 18 | C-315 (Jericho Park Road) from Race Track Road to MD 197 is not practical as a collector, since a major segment of the road will eventually become part of the Bowie State University ring-road system. The City recommends that this road be maintained as a local road. | (X) | 84 |
| 4.13 | 18 | Regarding MD 197, the Plan indicates that the future roadway section should be limited to a total of four (4) lanes, until forecasted travel demands warrant further expansion. This contingency is in opposition to current City policy and should be deleted. | (X) | 82 |
| 4.14 | 18 | An interchange should be provided on US Route 50 between MD Route 197 and MD Route 704. | (X) | 82 |
| 4.15 | 18 | It is recommended that a LOS “D” standard be applied specifically to the Bowie Regional Center. | (X) | 91 |
| 4.16 | 19 | It is recommended that the concept of TPEAs be removed from the Plan. | (X) | 91 |
| 4.17 | 19 | The City supports the interjurisdictional corridor congestion management system... | (+) | 80 |
| 4.18 | 19 | The County should begin advocating for construction of a major parking facility and transit hub at the northern end of Mitchellville Road in the Bowie Gateway Center. | (I) | 91 |

**TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS – BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN AND TRAIL FACILITIES**

| 4.19 | 19 | City comments in response to the Master Plan proposals are as follows... | (I) | 88 |

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

| 4.20 | 21 | The City recommends that a planning area-wide fiscal impact analysis be undertaken before any additional commercial zoning intensity is approved. | (S) |  
| 4.21 | 21 | The City observes that the Economic Development section of the Plan, on page 70, does not mention the MSTC... | (I) | 95 |
| 4.22 | 21 | **MSTC** - the removal of another large employment area...must first be evaluated thoroughly... | (X) | 95 |
| 4.23 | 21 | The following Economic Development Policies...are relevant to this Plan and should be included... | (I) | 95 |

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

| 4.24 | 23 | The Preliminary Master Plan eliminates a section in the 1991 Master Plan on Preservation Incentives that explains tax credits available to encourage designation by private property owners. It would be helpful to retain this information in the current Plan, as well as definitions and requirements for Historic Sites and Historic Resources. | (X) | 98 |
| 4.25 | 23 | Regarding those properties recommended for evaluation, the City recommends supporting the evaluations with the caveat that no designation, for either a Resource or a Site, shall be implemented without the express consent of the property owner. | (X) | 97 |

(+)= Agrees with City  
(X)= Disagrees with City of Bowie  
(/)= Partial agreement  
(S)= Plan is silent regarding City recommendation  
(?)= Fate of City recommendation is unclear
**Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan**  
**Analysis of City Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>The City further recommends that two gravesites be recommended for evaluation: 1) John and Mary Mitchell; and, 2) Major Lancaster Lansdale.</td>
<td>(+) 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>The Historic Sites and Resources Map (p. 75) should list the properties shown on the map and identify them, as well as those properties under consideration for evaluation.</td>
<td>(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>The City also recommends that definitions be included for Scenic, Rural and Historic Roads in the Scenic and Historic Roads section.</td>
<td>(+) 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>There should be a separate section on housing to address the issues of affordable housing, rental housing, large-lot estates, accessory dwelling units, and the possibility of &quot;tear-downs&quot; (redevelopment of large lots with small homes to more massive homes) within the Levitt section of Bowie and other neighborhoods in the planning area.</td>
<td>(X) Errata Sheet page 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Demographics on the median income of current residents and the median home prices should be provided. Comparisons with the County demographics should be included.</td>
<td>(X) &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>There should be policies and recommended regulations for...</td>
<td>(X) &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>The following policies should be included...</td>
<td>(X) &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ZONING RECOMMENDATIONS

| #1   | Levitt Bowie - rezone existing R-55, R-80, R-R to Neighborhood Conservation Zone | (S) |
| #2   | **Melvin Property, East side of US 301** - The Melvin Property, located on the east side of US 301 north of Queen Anne Bridge Road (Parcels 147 and 149 on Tax Map 63) should be rezoned to the C-M zone. | (X) 8 |
| #3   | **Pin Oak Village** - rezone existing L-A-C to R-18/C-O (Map 55, Parcels 7A-F, pt. P.A) | (X) 33 |
| #4   | **Old Town Bowie** - rezone R-A to R-55/R-R at N.W. quad. 4th Maple (Map 29, Parcels 4, 213) | (X) 52 |
| #5   | **West Bowie Village** - rezone C-O to C-M (Map 46, Parcel A-n. side MD 450, opposite Woodcliff Road) | (S) |

### Public Parkland

- O-S to R-O-S: Whitemarsh Park (Map 38, Parcel 50)
- O-S to R-O-S: Sandy Hill Landfill
- R-R to O-S: Church Road Park (Map 62, Parcel 70)
- R-S to O-S: Pope's Creek Park (Map 62, Parcel N, O, P)
- O-S to R-O-S: Pr. George's Stadium (Map 55, Parcel A)
- R-S/M-A-C to O-S: Woodland Park (Map 55, Parcels H and I)

(+) = Agrees with City  
(X) = Disagrees with City of Bowie  
(+) = Partial agreement  
(S) = Plan is silent regarding City recommendation  
(?) = Fate of City recommendation is unclear
MEMORANDUM

TO: City Council

FROM: David J. Deutsch
City Manager

SUBJECT: Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan/Sectional Map Amendment
Update Regarding Public Testimony

DATE: 7/28/05

I. Background

The District Council and County Planning Board held a joint public hearing on the Bowie and Vicinity Preliminary Master Plan on May 17, 2005. The public hearing record officially closed on June 2, 2005. Many written comments were received during the open record period, including numerous requests submitted after the May 17th public hearing. The purpose of this memo and the August 1st agenda item is to update Council on several major proposals and to obtain a Council position regarding each new item (see attached exhibits). Although the public record closed in early June, County Councilman Douglas Peters has continued to encourage submission of comments. Additional comments, including a position statement from the Greater Bowie Chamber of Commerce (attached), were received after June 2, 2005.

On July 14, 2005 the County Planning Board held a worksession on the Preliminary Master Plan. At the conclusion of the worksession, the Planning Board voted unanimously to endorse the recommendations of staff (see Transcript Analysis booklet provided to you last week), to adopt the Preliminary Master Plan and to transmit the revised plan to the District Council. A Planning Board resolution adopting the Preliminary Master Plan with revisions was approved at the Board’s regular meeting today. Worksessions of the District Council will begin in mid-September.

II. New Proposals

The following major requests have been submitted to Prince George’s County:


   STAFF COMMENT: There is no economic justification for additional commercial centers in the Bowie area. With the recent approval of over 300,000 square feet of retail commercial at Karington, the amount of retail commercial space envisioned to be supportable in the 1991 Bowie Master Plan for the area south of US Route 50 has been satisfied. In fact, the area has developed with a smaller average household size
and fewer homes than anticipated in the Master Plan, resulting in even less demand for retail uses.

2. Willowbrook – Exhibit #30. Requesting the R-S (Residential Suburban) Comprehensive Design Zone (CDZ) on the north side of Leeland Road, adjacent to the Safeway distribution center.
   **STAFF COMMENT:** The City provided public hearing comments on the original request to rezone this property to the R-L (Residential Low Density) CDZ during Bowie Master Plan review. The City found that the proposed change in land use would be compatible with nearby residential properties including Oak Creek Club and Beechtree. The City noted that the majority of the property is oriented to Leeland Road, which will become a major collector road serving numerous low-density residential developments and the site does not have a practical way of becoming integrated into the adjacent Collington Center employment park. The City found that the residential downzoning proposed in Preliminary Master Plan is appropriate. Although the revised request (also filed in Zoning Map Amendment A-9968) is for the R-S (1.6 – 2.6) zone, rather than the R-L (1.0 – 1.5) zone, the City’s position remains the same as that provided in testimony on the Preliminary Master Plan (see July 19, 2005 letter from the City Council to the Planning Board). The City concurred with the findings of the M-NCPCC Technical Staff Report, which concluded that the R-S zone is not appropriate for the subject site. Staff recommends reiterating this position with regard to Exhibit #30 in the Sectional Map Amendment (SMA).

3. Melford – Exhibits #31 and #75. Requesting M-X-T (Mixed Use Transportation Oriented) zoning for the Maryland Science and Technology Center property.
   **STAFF COMMENT:** Although MNCPPC staff and the County Planning Board continue to recommend mixed-use zoning for this site, this recommendation is inconsistent with the City’s testimony, presented at the public hearing, which adamantly opposed the conversion of employment land use to any other use. According to the Zoning Ordinance, the M-X-T zone requires retail, residential and office/employment uses. A minimum of 50% of gross floor area within the project must be devoted to residential uses. The existing City covenants on the property do not permit residential uses. Since the recommendation for M-X-T zoning cannot be implemented under the current covenants, staff recommends City opposition to this rezoning proposal.

4. Chesley-Gibraltar Property – Exhibit #45. Requesting the C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) zone.
   **STAFF COMMENT:** In the Preliminary Master Plan statement, the City opposed retention of this property in the Developing Tier and recommended that it revert to the Rural Tier. For the same reasons given in the Master Plan testimony regarding the development pattern east of US 301, staff recommends City opposition to this proposal.
Memo re: Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan/SMA

5. Dimensions/Shelter Development – Exhibit #47. Requesting the R-18 zone for 13 acres of land located on Health Center Drive.

**STAFF COMMENT:** The applicant was aware of the City Council’s recommendation on the Preliminary Master Plan (endorsing either the M-X-T zone or M-U-TC zone) when the testimony in Exhibit 47 was written. Subsequent to the City Council’s May 2, 2005 public hearing, the applicant met with City staff to further explain the reasons for their request. Due to the limited area available on the property for development because of environmental constraints, multiple utility easements and the irregular shape of the property, staff finds that age-restricted housing in a multi-family dwelling unit format developed under the R-18 zone is a supportable land use for the property. Staff therefore recommends Council support the request for age-restricted housing in the R-18 zone.

6. AutoTech – Exhibit #48. Requesting the Commercial Miscellaneous (C-M) zone on a small parcel located on the south side of MD 450, east of Superior Lane.

**STAFF COMMENT:** The proposed zoning would be the only C-M zoning in the Bowie Mainstreet area, which is primarily zoned C-S-C. MNCPPC points out in the transcript analysis that many of the uses allowed in the C-M zone are typically automobile-oriented and are incompatible with the vision and goals to create a pedestrian-friendly environment along Bowie Main Street. The current auto repair use occupies space previously used for a full service gas station. Introduction of C-M zoning would allow for intensification of the existing use and the possible introduction of incompatible redevelopment on the site. For the reasons stated by MNCPPC staff, it is recommended that the City oppose this request.


**STAFF COMMENT:** Staff notes that a Special Exception application (SE #4529) is currently pending for a Planned Retirement Community on this property, which is located on the edge of the Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville and Vicinity planning area. The concept of providing additional senior housing is in keeping with current City policy. Based on this conformance with City policy, staff recommends the City support the request addressing this proposal in the SMA.


**STAFF COMMENT:** On July 25, 2005 the District Council voted to rezone the property to the L-A-C zone in A-9838-C. The rezoning approval included a large number of conditions that were fashioned by residents of the adjoining communities. The most significant aspect of the recent rezoning was the reduction in proposed retail use from 140,000 square feet to 30,000 square feet. Another important aspect was a condition requiring a public library site on the property. The rezoning of the site to the L-A-C Comprehensive Design Zone will allow for further review of specific land uses and site details through the required Comprehensive Design Plan (CDP) and Specific Design Plan (SDP) submissions. In addition, the site will have to undergo Preliminary Plan of subdivision review to assess impacts on public facilities. Although the City opposed the original proposal in A-9838, staff finds, with the conditions of approval now in place and the additional safeguards of the CDP, SDP and Preliminary Plan of subdivision review phases, the designation of the property as an activity center in the L-A-C zone is appropriate, since it is in keeping with both
Memo re: Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan/SMA

the recommendations of the 1991 Master Plan and the City's desire to have a library located on the property. It is recommended that Council support the addition of text in the Master Plan specifically characterizing the type of activity center approved in A-9838.

9. Kirk-Martin Partnership (Duckettown Road) – Exhibit #91. Requesting rezoning from the R-R (Rural Residential) zone to the M-U-I (Mixed Use Infill) zone.

**STAFF COMMENT:** The development of the Kirk-Martin Partnership property includes possibilities for senior and/or affordable housing. The property is located adjacent to the City limits, but within the area recommended by MNCPPC for the Old Town Bowie Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ). During the Master Plan charrette process the property was identified as a potential senior housing site. While providing senior housing or affordable housing would complement neighborhood revitalization efforts in Old Town Bowie and would be in keeping with established City policies, the requested M-U-I zone with the DDOZ overlay is inconsistent with the City's recent recommendations on the Preliminary Master Plan.

The City recommended scaling back the area proposed for M-U-I and DDOZ zoning to correspond to the existing C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center) business district. On July 5, 2005, the City Council also decided to support extension of the DDOZ to include the I-1 (Light Industrial) area between the commercial district and Zug Road and all of the I-1 zoned properties on Zug Road. To address the need for flexibility in the development on the Kirk-Martin Partnership property, staff recommends that the City support a new recommendation in the Master Plan for R-S (2.7-3.5) zoning for the subject property. This option recognizes the transitional nature of the property, lying between Old Town Bowie, developed in the R-55 zone (4.2 dwelling units per acre) and Severn Crossing (2.17 units per acre) and environmental constraints present on the property. The R-S zone would also be compatible with the Low Density Residential recommendations already contained in the Preliminary Master Plan for the site.

III. Recommendation

Staff recommends sending a letter to Councilman Doug Peters endorsing the additional Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment recommendations presented in this memorandum.
May 18, 2005

Joe Meinert
Planning Director
City of Bowie
City Hall
2614 Kenhill Drive
Bowie, MD. 20715

Re: Westbrook Property

Dear Joe:

Just thought I would provide you with a copy of my written testimony concerning the corner. One of the county's biggest problems is that they do not own the right of way and have made no offer to my client. In my discussions with the County, my client is willing to dedicate the right of way (saving the county millions of $ and the expenses and time of condemnation litigation) in return for the LAC.

While not a perfect world, the LAC would still give the City, County Planning Staff and the council quite a few development controls over the property in the future. In addition, while making the regional center the transportation node, it is unlikely that anyone from the church road, Mt. Oak corridor is going to drive in the opposite direction for public transit. Utilization of the cut off parcel for this use moves people out of their automobiles on the commuting track (almost like a slug line). As noted in my written note, we believe that this site with its straight shot to the Largo Metro is optimal.

Yours truly,

Charles J Ryan III
May 17, 2005

The Honorable Elizabeth Hewlett
Chairman, Prince George’s County
Planning Board
4th Floor
County Administration Building
Upper Marlboro, MD. 20772

The Honorable Samuel Dean
Chairman
Prince Georges’ County Council
County Administration Building
Upper Marlboro, Md. 20772

Re: Party of Record and statement

Dear Mr., Chairman, Madam Chairman and members of the Planning Board and District Council:

Please accept this written statement of my position on the proposed Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Bowie/Mitchellville Community. While the Proposed Plan shows tremendous work and effort, it is clear that little attention was focused on the Church Road Corridor.

As evidence by the bulldozers and for sale signs for residence over $700,000, this unique and important part of the Bowie/Mitchellville area deserves special attention. As such, I would like to draw the Planning Board and Council’s attention to the one particular property owned by Albert Westbrook Known as Mt Oak Estates.

(A) A Crossroad

The Westbrook property sits as the community crossroads for the Church Road Corridor. With the proposed upgrade of A-26 and the needed realignment of the intersection of Woodmore Road/Mt Oak Road, Outparcel A of the subdivision known as Mt Oak Estates needs special attention. Once the 4-6 lane improvement is completed the propoed will be split into a 4-6 acre residual parcel separate from the remaining portions of the 44 acre parcel. Good planning would suggest that RA is not the best designation for this property. With it design controls, it is clear that the LAC (Local Activity Center)
designation would serve the community and the development of this corner as the most appropriate mechanism for public service and development.

With the construction of the new intersection, the corner will, in a short period of time, quickly become the focal point of the Church Road corridor serving as the north/south to east/west transition point for the communities along the corridor. The intersection with its ½ mile backups at the current time already is a point of nightly frustration. When realigned, this intersection will soon become the same size and dimensions of that at the Woodmore/Lottsford (an intersection which had the left/right turns until it was corrected a decade ago. Like that intersection the LAC/Commercial component was allowed to develop. A development which complements the enterprise road corridor community

(B) Transportation

The intersection will serve as the transportation node for those individuals coming to and from the Bowie area (East/West) as well as those transferring from Route 450 and Central Ave (north/South). This service intersection can, if appropriately zoned and developed serve as the focal point for Church Road. With a clear delineation of the commercial component of an LAC limited to the triangle created by the Cemetery of Mt Oak Church and by the new road alignment – any development is clearly contained –

In addition to a small community retail component, this triangle can serve as the focal point for a transportation transfer node for either public transit (The bus) which does not serve any area along Church Road or Woodmore Road Corridor or as a small park and ride focusing on moving people out of their vehicles to the new Largo Metro Center at the other end of Woodmore/Lottsford Road

(C) Airport Transfer property

The Westbrook Property (outlots F and G) is impacted by the CB 51-2002 which created an Aviation mitigation residential subdivision policy. CB51 recommends transferring density within a property or project to other portions of the project away from the flight pattern of Freestate Airport. With the creation of the LAC on Outlot A of the Westbrook project, the corresponding outlots can remain undeveloped and meet the criteria of CB 51-2002 by moving residential units and development away from the APA 2 and APA 1 areas.

(D) Development

The redesignation of Outlot A to an RE or RR with the LAC designation for development would allow the County Planning Board, The community and the District Council the Opportunity to work with the any future development of the key parcel to ensure its future quality of development. The Property owner would note that the area lacks the “villa” style unit which has been so successful in Woodmore. 3000-4000 square foot zero lot line homes or villas in Woodmore have been selling for in excess of $500,000 (prices consistent or above many single family homes in the Planning Area.)
While naysayer will cry that it is an attempt to increase density – I remind the Planning Board and Council that as I worked on the language and community build-out of Woodmore some 205 years ago— it was those same naysayers who would have prevented the villa construction in Woodmore. – Woodmore with its housing styles is clearly the premier community of the region. More then 15 communities in the area have attempted to piggyback on Woodmore by adding its moniker to their communities name. The Planning Board and Council recognized in 1984 unique role a Villas of 3000 to 4000 square feet can play in a community. Villas are a lifestyle – not a density. It was a hard road convincing the Council in 1985 – but look at the result. As our population the need for 1 acre or two acres of grass is a detraction rather then an attraction.

(E) Proposed Master Plan Language

To implement the above recommendation, I would propose the following language added to the Master Plan:
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“Church Crossroads”

The recognition of the Church Road corridor as an expanding economic and residential community in the County is critical to ensuring the development of an identity in the Corridor. Much as the Enterprise Road Corridor was created and nurtured during the last decade, so too the Church Road Corridor must rise to recognition. As many of the new communities have used the moniker of “Woodmore” to identify their communities, care should be taken to ensure that the varied type of house styles exemplified in Woodmore are carried throughout the corridor. The Westbrook property with the realignment of Woodmore Road and signalization of a single functional intersection of 4 to 6 lanes will result in the Westbrook property becoming the crossroad point of the North and East/West elements in the corridor. The Development of a CDZ/LAC on the corridor would serve the function as the focal point of the Church Road Corridor. With an LAC residential component on the remaining portions of Parcel A, and as the receiving zone for APA 2 and APA 1 densities as directed by the General Plan, continue to meet additional objectives of the General Plan for the health and welfare of the residents along the corridor. The separated triangle created by the road alignment creates an opportunity to both plan for and contain a transportation feature in the corridor which would otherwise lack a location. This triangle can contain a small retail component that the master plan in 1991 and 1984 now develop along Woodmore Road.

Zoning Change 16

Change RA to CDZ/RR on Outlot A Area of Change 44 acres
Use and Location: Undeveloped land will change in character with the realignment and construction of a 4-6 lane signalized intersection through the property splitting the property into a 4 acre parcel (commercial/public benefit) component of LAC and the remaining 34 acres to be developed as the receiving zone for APA 1 and APA 2 areas for freestate airport. The CDZ/LAC offers the best mechanism for review and control of development of the remaining parcel while satisfying the need to improve transportation in the County in a cost effective manner and the creation of an APA 1 and APA 2 receiving zone in the corridor. Base Density of the parcel A should be 1.4 units to the Acre.

I have attached to this letter a colored diagram of the proposed concept plan.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Yours truly,

Charles J Ryan III
LAW OFFICES
O’MALLEY, MILES, NYLEN & GILMO

P. O. Box 689
Greenbelt, Maryland 20768
Street Address
11785 Beltsville Drive
Tenth Floor
Calverton, Maryland 20705
(301) 572-7900
Fax No. (301) 572-6655

MAY 9

Annapolis:
2007 Tidewater Colony Drive
Suite 2B
Annapolis, MD 21401
(301) 970-2238

Exhibit 30

May 17, 2005

The Honorable Samuel Dean
Chairman, Prince George’s County Council
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

The Honorable Elizabeth Hewlett
Chairperson, Prince George’s Planning Board
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

Dear Chairman Dean and Chairperson Hewlett:

I represent a partnership consisting of Atapco Properties, Inc., an investment entity of the Blaustein Family and Toll Brothers, Inc., a nationally recognized “Fortune 500” Home Builder, which is purchasing 1,148 +/- acres of land from Mercantile Safe Deposit and Trust, which administers the Seaton Belt Trust whose beneficiaries are the Episcopal Diocese of Washington and Queen Anne Parish and St. Barnabas Church and the Queen Anne School. As many of you know, Mercantile has managed these properties for the beneficiaries for decades. A substantial portion of this property is included in the Bowie-Collington Master Plan, specifically the 440+/- acres zoned E-I-A and 69 +/- acres of R-A zoned land. The bulk of this property, 427 +/- acres (425 +/- zoned E-I-A and 2 +/- acres zoned R-A), is the subject of A-9968, a request to rezone the property to R-S, at a density range of 1.6 to 1.7, filed by the Trust. Atapco/Toll generally are in agreement with the direction of this application, but, are very interested in the potential for additional “active senior housing” recommended in the proposed Master Plan. The remainder of the property, which is approximately 15 +/- acres, is recommended to be rezoned to the I-1 zone in the Sectional Map Amendment process, with a condition for site plan, a recommendation with which we concur. The remaining 67 +/- acres is currently zoned R-A and the Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment recommends retention in that zone. We agree with the retention of this 67 +/- acres in the R-A, although it may ultimately be included in this Comprehensive Design Zone Application for Willowbrook or another application, depending on what our analysis shows. The remainder of the Mercantile property, approximately 439.8 +/- acres, is in the Subregion VI Study Area Master Plan, Planning Area 79, to the south across Leland Road, and not part of the Bowie-Collington Master Plan and SMA. It, too, though, could be developed in a low density Comprehensive Design Zone. It is currently zoned RE.

Our primary focus is the so-called “Willowbrook” application, A-9968, which is pending with M-NCPCC and which we believe should be included in the Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment, pursuant to County Code Section 27-226 which holds that, upon a recommendation of the Planning Board, the District Council may approve a Comprehensive Design Zone in the
Sectional Map Amendment. The proposed Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville Master Plan recommends residential development of Willowbrook. As such, Willowbrook will primarily be developed as a mixed use residential community comprised of single-family dwelling units on various size lots, townhouses and senior units. Our development program is in keeping with the Master Plan which states the following at page 22:

Property located on the north side of Leeland Road and Oak Grove Road between US 301 and Church Road: The property contains approximately 417 acres. Most of this site is not suitable for employment use, as previously planned, given the property's substantial environmental constraints. Lower intensity land use would reduce the number of vehicle trips on nearby roads. Low-density residential development at 1.0 to 1.5 dwelling units per acre would provide lots layout flexibility, while protecting open space and environmentally sensitive areas. The CDZ/R-L (Residential-Low) Zone is suitable at this location because it is comparable to and compatible with the average density of 1.3 dwelling units per acre for the Oak Creek development located adjacent to the this property. Low-density residential development will have less adverse impact on available public facilities, including schools, public safety, and roads. It provides an appropriate pattern of single-family development that is in keeping with the policies of the Developing Tier. It provides a suitable transition from 3.0 dwelling units per acre found on the Beech Tree development, south of this site. Active senior housing is encouraged.

Approximately ten acres of land located at the eastern edge of the property is contiguous to existing employment development in the Collington Business Park and is recommended for employment land use. This ten-acre property is physically separated from the remainder of the property by a stream and should be developed consistent with the character of employment development in the Collington Business Park...

As I previously stated, our application is for a low R-S, at 1.6 du/acre to 1.7 du/ acres, mostly single family, with some town houses and senior units. As mentioned above, Atapco/Toll is analyzing the potential for additional active senior housing (i.e. age restricted), if desired by the County. The Basic Plan currently generates 621 units on 427+/- acres for a general density of 1.45 units per acre, which conforms to the density range called for in the Master Plan, which, as previously noted, states: “Low-density residential development at the 1.0 to 1.5 dwelling units per acre would provide lot layout flexibility, while protecting open space and environmentally sensitive areas.” The Master Plan maintains that Willowbrook should be a transition between Oak Creek at 1.3 du/acre and Beech Tree, at 3.0 du/acre. As such, a density of up to 2 +/- du/acre generally would conform to this principle. And, most or all additional density we might propose would be senior housing to better address the Master Plan charge encouraging active senior housing and would respect the environmental constraints of the property.

As recommended by the Master Plan, a low density CDZ (the Master Plan suggests RL, but, a low R-S, as we have proposed, conforms to these standards as well) is the best use of this property. This property is environmentally sensitive with many streams which make it unsuitable for its current designation of E-I-A, which is why it never developed in the past decade, even though the remainder of the Collington Employment Area did develop. The CDZ
process best allows property to be developed, with sensitivity to the environmental constraints of these multiple streams, and that is what our application attempts to do.

Willowbrook is buffered from the Employment Area to the east and north by a stream valley and parkland which is part of the Collington Employment Area Development. Further, it is compatible with the proposed residential to the west and north, Oak Creek, and our own residential to the south and west, the Locust Hill Farm, currently owned by Mercantile and to be purchased by Atapco/Toll. The institutional uses of St. Barnabas Church and Queen Anne School to the south and west are beneficiaries of the Trust, along with the Episcopal Diocese of Washington, and they are in support of this application. In fact, we are working with the Church and School to provide the land for additional facilities and a buffer as part of another Comprehensive Design Zone application for “Locust Hill,” i.e. the remainder of the Mercantile property.

In summary, the Willowbrook R-S A-9968 and the 15 +/- acres of I-1 are both rezonings that conform to the proposed Bowie-Collington Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment. While we agree the remaining 67 +/- acres ought to remain in the RA zone, they may ultimately be included in a CDZ application with “Willowbrook” or “Locust Hill,” the remainder of the Mercantile property which is a part of the Subregion VI Study Area Master Plan, Planning Area 79. This, of course, is subject to Atapco/Toll’s analysis of that property’s potential. Thank you for your attention to the enclosed. I will be in attendance at the Joint Public Hearing on Tuesday, May 17, 2005. If I can answer any questions or be of any further assistance, please be sure to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

John P. McDonough

Enclosures
May 17, 2005

The Honorable Samuel Dean  
Chairman, Prince George's County Council  
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive  
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

The Honorable Elizabeth Hewlett  
Chairperson, Prince George's Planning Board  
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive  
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

Dear Chairman Dean and Chairperson Hewlett:

I represent a partnership consisting of Atapco Properties, Inc., an investment entity of the Blaustein Family and Toll Brothers, Inc., a nationally recognized “Fortune 500” Home Builder, which is purchasing 1,148 +/- acres of land from Mercantile Safe Deposit and Trust, which administers the Seaton Belt Trust whose beneficiaries are the Episcopal Diocese of Washington and Queen Anne Parish and St. Barnabas Church and the Queen Anne School. As many of you know, Mercantile has managed these properties for the beneficiaries for decades. A substantial portion of this property is included in the Bowie-Collington Master Plan, specifically the 440 +/- acres zoned E-I-A and 69 +/- acres of R-A zoned land. The bulk of this property, 427 +/- acres (425 +/- zoned E-I-A and 2 +/- acres zoned R-A), is the subject of A-9968, a request to rezone the property to R-S, at a density range of 1.6 to 1.7, filed by the Trust. Atapco/Toll generally are in agreement with the direction of this application, but, are very interested in the potential for additional “active senior housing” recommended in the proposed Master Plan. The remainder of the property, which is approximately 15 +/- acres, is recommended to be rezoned to the I-1 zone in the Sectional Map Amendment process, with a condition for site plan, a recommendation with which we concur. The remaining 67 +/- acres is currently zoned R-A and the Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment recommends retention in that zone. We agree with the retention of this 67+/- acres in the R-A, although it may ultimately be included in this Comprehensive Design Zone Application for Willowbrook or another application, depending on what our analysis shows. The remainder of the Mercantile property, approximately 439.8 +/- acres, is in the Subregion VI Study Area Master Plan, Planning Area 79, to the south across Leland Road, and not part of the Bowie-Collington Master Plan and SMA. It, too, though, could be developed in a low density Comprehensive Design Zone. It is currently zoned RE.

Our primary focus is the so-called “Willowbrook” application, A-9968, which is pending with M-NCPCC and which we believe should be included in the Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment, pursuant to County Code Section 27-226 which holds that, upon a recommendation of the Planning Board, the District Council may approve a Comprehensive Design Zone in the...
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Sectional Map Amendment. The proposed Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville Master Plan recommends residential development of Willowbrook. As such, Willowbrook will primarily be developed as a mixed use residential community comprised of single-family dwelling units on various size lots, townhouses and senior units. Our development program is in keeping with the Master Plan which states the following at page 22:

Property located on the north side of Leeland Road and Oak Grove Road between US 301 and Church Road: The property contains approximately 417 acres. Most of this site is not suitable for employment use, as previously planned, given the property's substantial environmental constraints. Lower intensity land use would reduce the number of vehicle trips on nearby roads. Low-density residential development at the 1.0 to 1.5 dwelling units per acre would provide lot layout flexibility, while protecting open space and environmentally sensitive areas. The CDZ/R-L (Residential-Low) Zone is suitable at this location because it is comparable to and compatible with the average density of 1.3 dwelling units per acre for the Oak Creek development located adjacent to this property. Low-density residential development will have less adverse impact on available public facilities, including schools, public safety, and roads. It provides an appropriate pattern of single-family development that is in keeping with the policies of the Developing Tier. It provides a suitable transition from 3.0 dwelling units per acre found on the Beech Tree development, south of this site. Active senior housing is encouraged.

Approximately ten acres of land located at the eastern edge of the property is contiguous to existing employment development in the Collington Business Park and is recommended for employment land use. This ten-acre property is physically separated from the remainder of the property by a stream and should be developed consistent with the character of employment development in the Collington Business Park...

As I previously stated, our application is for a low R-S, at 1.6 du/acre to 1.7 du/ acres, mostly single family, with some town houses and senior units. As mentioned above, Atapco/Toll is analyzing the potential for additional active senior housing (i.e., age restricted), if desired by the County. The Basic Plan currently generates 621 units on 427 +/- acres for a general density of 1.45 units per acre, which conforms to the density range called for in the Master Plan, which, as previously noted, states: "Low-density residential development at the 1.0 to 1.5 dwelling units per acre would provide lot layout flexibility, while protecting open space and environmentally sensitive areas." The Master Plan maintains that Willowbrook should be a transition between Oak Creek at 1.3 du/acre and Beech Tree, at 3.0 du/acre. As such, a density of up to 2 +/- du/acre generally would conform to this principle. And, most or all additional density we might propose would be senior housing to better address the Master Plan charge encouraging active senior housing and would respect the environmental constraints of the property.

As recommended by the Master Plan, a low density CDZ (the Master Plan suggests RL, but, a low R-S, as we have proposed, conforms to these standards as well) is the best use of this property. This property is environmentally sensitive with many streams which make it unsuitable for its current designation of E-I-A, which is why it never developed in the past decade, even though the remainder of the Collington Employment Area did develop. The CDZ
process best allows property to be developed, with sensitivity to the environmental constraints of these multiple streams, and that is what our application attempts to do.

Willowbrook is buffered from the Employment Area to the east and north by a stream valley and parkland which is part of the Collington Employment Area Development. Further, it is compatible with the proposed residential to the west and north, Oak Creek, and our own residential to the south and west, the Locust Hill Farm, currently owned by Mercantile and to be purchased by Atapco/Toll. The institutional uses of St. Barnabas Church and Queen Anne School to the south and west are beneficiaries of the Trust, along with the Episcopal Diocese of Washington, and they are in support of this application. In fact, we are working with the Church and School to provide the land for additional facilities and a buffer as part of another Comprehensive Design Zone application for “Locust Hill,” i.e. the remainder of the Mercantile property.

In summary, the Willowbrook R-S A-9968 and the 15 +/- acres of I-1 are both rezonings that conform to the proposed Bowie-Collington Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment. While we agree the remaining 67 +/- acres ought to remain in the RA zone, they may ultimately be included in a CDZ application with “Willowbrook” or “Locust Hill,” the remainder of the Mercantile property which is a part of the Subregion VI Study Area Master Plan, Planning Area 79. This, of course, is subject to Atapco/Toll’s analysis of that property’s potential. Thank you for your attention to the enclosed. I will be in attendance at the Joint Public Hearing on Tuesday, May 17, 2005. If I can answer any questions or be of any further assistance, please be sure to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John P. McDonough

Enclosures
The Honorable Samuel Dean  
Chairman, Prince George's County Council  
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive  
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

The Honorable Elizabeth Hewlett  
Chairperson, Prince George's Planning Board  
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive  
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

Dear Chairman Dean and Chairperson Hewlett:

I represent MIE Properties, Inc. ("MIE"), the owners of 467 +/- acres of land currently zoned E-I-A located at the northeast quadrant of the intersection of US 50 and Route 301.

**History of the Property**

The property was originally zoned E-I-A in 1982 by Donald Nash and was intended to be developed as the University of Maryland Science and Technology Park, a partnership with the University of Maryland Foundation. The concept revolved around building a concentrated employment zone with the University Foundation providing the anchor, and by 1986, a partnership had been formed between Carly Capital and the University Foundation to pursue this type of development.

The Bureau of the Census Bowie Computer Center (i.e., the super computer), located at 17101 Melford Boulevard, Bowie, MD 20715 soon thereafter and little or no additional development occurred there until 2000 when MIE acquired the property. This was despite the fact a $3.2 million access road infrastructure was constructed beginning in 1989.

MIE initially pursued the build out of the original Basic Plan (A-9401) which called for up to 6.4 +/- million square feet of employment, i.e., high rise office and research and development. MIE has constructed nine buildings, 425,000 +/- square feet of office and research and development of which almost 70% is leased, with about 37 users. They just recently completed a 50,000 square feet building. As MIE began developing the property, though, a number of factors about the original Basic Plan became apparent to them. First, the basic plan was conceived and approved prior to adoption of the current of environmental statues which we all
take for granted today. As those various Environmental Regulations were adopted and evolved in
the 1990s, particularly advances in Woodland Conservation restrictions and regulation of streams
and wetlands by the Corps of Engineers and others, it became apparent this site could not support
the intense development called for in the original Basic Plan because of its topography and
environmental features. This was particularly true of the land on the eastern portion of the
property fronting on the Patuxent River. What would have been floodplain had been recaptured
with stone retention banks along the river erected over the decades when the property was a
farm. While now buildable, this land is still environmentally sensitive and not conducive to
intense high rise development, as called for in the Original Basic Plan.

Second, MIE experimented with various combinations of employment types and concluded the
market would not support as much as 6.4 +/- million square feet of High Tech employment in
high rise type construction. MIE’s Melford plan calls for approximately 2.6 +/- million square
feet of employment, i.e., office and research and development which is still very aggressive, but
feasible. Third, 2.6 +/- million square feet of employment is probably as much as MIE would be
permitted to build, anyway, given existing public facilities, particularly the road network. The
Planning Board previously imposed a condition limiting the project to an intensity of
development generating 2316 morning trips and 2717 evening trips. Based on that limitation,
our traffic study shows the property can only have an intensity of employment at maximum of
approximately 2.6 +/- million square feet. To construct up to 6.4 +/- million square feet would
require the so-called “trumpet interchange” for which there is no state funding and would have
extensive environmental impacts. (See attached Agreement (Exhibit #1) and Traffic Study
(Exhibit #1)).

Taking into consideration all of these factors, the “smart growth” planning, adequate public
facilities, environmental regulation and economic markets, MIE proposed, in 2003, a more
innovative approach to develop most of the 467 +/- acre property. This plan, Melford, is a
mixed-used development community of 1,838,700 gross square feet of Office, 65,000 gross
square feet of Retail, 499,040 gross square feet of Research and Development, 220,000 gross
square feet of Hotel/Office and 866 +/- residential units, located mostly on the environmentally-
sensitive property near the Patuxent River. The historic home of Melford is the signature for the
development and is placed in an appropriate setting and integrated into the development. Now,
Melford is still fundamentally an employment center, calling for 2.6 +/- million square feet of
employment, the maximum our Traffic Study demonstrates could be built with current
transportation facilities. It does include, though, these 866 new residential units, which can use
these same transportation facilities in an efficient manner and create a live/work concept using
the environmentally-sensitive land on the Patuxent River, unsuitable for intense high rise
development. As such Melford is “smart growth” at its best and protects the environment, both
through the preservation of the “Nash Woods” and protection of the Patuxent River and
treatment of on site environmental features.

Since the E-I-A zone did not permit as significant amount of residential as needed for the
Melford project, CB-35-2003 and CB-16-2004 were adopted by the District Council in June,
2003 and June, 2004, respectively, to allow approval of a Planned Environmental Preservation
Community (hereinafter “PEPC”) in the E-I-A zone, via an Amended Basic Plan. MIE filed
such an Amended Basic Plan on March 24, 2004, and it is now pending approval.
As you well know, MIE's efforts have generated comment, some of it supporting and applauding their efforts and others criticizing them. Specifically, some have criticized the adoption of CB-35 and CB-16, because they allegedly do not permit as thorough a review of development plans for the residential as would a rezoning (as opposed to an amended Basic Plan). While we reject this contention, we acknowledge this process issue has been raised by opponents of Melford. We assert both processes provide for public comment and approval by the District Council, the appropriate zoning authority, therefore, we will continue to pursue the Amended Basic Plan with PEPC, in the coming months.

We have, also, though requested the M-X-T zone, a mixed-use zone which permits residential and employment, in the Sectional Map Amendment for a portion of the property of approximately 179 +/- acres (see Exhibit #1), in conformance with the Master Plan. This zone, too, in conjunction with the remainder of 288 +/- acres of E-I-A (on which either construction has occurred or a specific design plan has been approved) will permit the development of Melford as MIE has proposed it and in accordance with the new Master Plan. As such, any debate about "process," as opposed to the actual content of the Melford Plan, should be moot, particularly if our request for M-X-T is granted.

**The Master Plan and Melford**

With this background, let me turn to MIE's position on the treatment of this property in the proposed Bowie-Collington–Mitchellville & Vicinity Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment. First, we support the Master Plan proposal for this property which specifically addresses the property as follows:

**Property in the northeast quadrant of US 50 and MD 3**: This entire property should be developed with a moderate-to-high density mixture of office, retail, residential and parkland/open space land uses. This will offer a mix of employment and residential uses that can create a place of activity and interaction for those who live, work, or visit in the area. The residential component should develop in such a way that the residential buildings and settings complement Melford, a National Register Historic Site. The development should conform to the following design guidelines:

a. The average density for the residential development component should not exceed eight dwelling units per acre.

b. The 12.75 acre impact review area approved for the Melford Historic Site by the Historic Preservation Commission and the Planning Board (PGCPB No. 99-28A) should be integrated into a design plan that establishes viewsheds from the Melford Historic Site to the Patuxent River. Open space should be provided adjacent to the historic site that will allow it to be seen from greater distances. A dedicated pedestrian link between the Melford Historic Site and the cemetery should be created. Trails should be provided that connect it to the regional trail system.
c. Development abutting the Melford Historic Site, outbuildings, and cemetery should be compatible in scale, design, and character with the existing historic architectural character. Sensitive and innovative site design techniques, such as careful siting, variation in orientation, roof shape, building materials, screening, landscaping, berming, and open space should be incorporated into the proposal to minimize any adverse impacts to the historic site.

d. Appropriate signage should be placed near the historic site illustrating the history of the area.

We believe the approval of either our amended Basic Plan, including the PEPC, or a rezoning of 179 +/- acres of the property to the M-X-T zone (essentially all that land zoned E-I-A on which construction has not occurred or a Specific Design Plan in the E-I-A has not been approved or filed) would conform to the proposed Master Plan recommendations. (See Exhibit #1.)

According to CB-35-2003, a PEPC (Planned Environmental Preservation Community) is “a high-quality residential community...” Further, it is a “community where dwelling units are built in clustered, attached, or multifamily development, to enhance and preserve significant environmental features on and adjacent to the community property.” The Melford Plan includes all of these elements. As previously noted, our Basic Plan submission is pending before the M-NCPPC and we intend to pursue it over the coming months, concurrently with the Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment.

The same Melford Plan could be approved as a combination of E-I-A and M-X-T, a mixed-use zone which permits both residential and employment uses (in fact, the M-X-T zone requires a mix of uses). To reassure you and others that we intend to develop the M-X-T as proposed in our Melford Plan, we have submitted to you, as part of the record an M-X-T Concept Plan essentially as required by County Code Section 27-546 so you may condition, as you see fit, any rezoning to M-X-T on this Concept Plan. Therefore, you could approve an actual plan for Melford in the SMA and not just the M-X-T zone. In addition, we have prepared a Prohibited Use List which outlines those uses that will not be permitted at Melford, even if permitted in the M-X-T zone. This will serve the purpose of assuring all parties involved as to specifically which uses are and are not permitted on the site, even if the property is rezoned M-X-T. We plan to include a similar list in our amended Basic Plan and PEPC in the E-I-A zone.

So, why do we propose the M-X-T zone even though our amended Basic Plan with PEPC in the E-I-A zone achieves the exact same type of development? We do so to answer our critics who wish to see the property go through a re-zoning, rather than the amended Basic Plan with PEPC process in the E-I-A zone. While we believe both processes are legitimate and allow substantial opportunity for public input and a review of all pertinent issues, we are proceeding with both processes so there can be no question about the opportunity for public input and adequate review by Staff. We believe by doing so we can focus debate on the actual merits of our Plan and not “process” issues, such as rezoning versus Basic Plan amendment or what uses are or are not permitted.
Let me list then, whether as a combination of E-I-A and M-X-T approval in the SMA or by the amended Basic Plan in the E-I-A with the PEPC, why our Melford Plan should be approved.

**Melford Efficiently Uses Existing Public Facilities**

Both in our amended Basic Plan and our M-X-T proposal we address in detail the impact of Melford on public facilities, specifically roads and schools and public safety. Also, as explained in our Traffic Report prepared by the Traffic Group, the amount and nature of traffic generated by employment and residential uses at the subject location maximizes use of the existing facilities, capitalizing on the live/work concept of Melford. Additionally, our residential units will pay school and/or public safety surcharge fees. Further, we believe that adequate public facilities exist in the area in which Melford is located. As to fire and rescue facilities, the engine company nearest the property is Bowie Engine Company 43, Fire and Rescue Station 3, which is located southwest of the property, at Pointer Ridge Drive and Echo Lane. Engine Company 43 provides engine, ambulance and brush fire services. It also operates a mini-squad service for auto accident calls. In addition, Bowie Engine Company 39, Fire and Rescue Station 2, provides engine, ambulance and ladder truck services. This company, also referred to as Belair Station 2, is located northwest of the subject property at Route 450 (Annapolis Road) and Marquette Lane.

Regarding police facilities, Melford will be served by the District II Police Station, located at Route 301 south of Central Avenue, approximately five miles from the site. Hospital facilities will be in close proximity to the site in that Bowie Health Center is located at Route 50 and Collington Road on Health Center Drive in the City of Bowie. And, finally, our Basic Plan demonstrates that other facilities, such as schools, libraries, and water/sewer are also adequate. In any event, our project does or will pass the necessary APF tests for these critical public services, as we proceed to subdivision or other approvals.

**Melford Is “Smart Growth”**

By locating residential near employment and institutional uses, Melford is “smart growth” helping people live near employment, preserving environmentally-sensitive areas and making efficient use of existing public facilities. Melford is ideally suited for "smart growth" because of its critical location at the major intersections of MD 301 and MD Route 50. Under Maryland’s celebrated smart-growth program, building compactly in "smart-growth areas" to preserve land elsewhere is the paramount goal. In focusing development into denser city-like or town-like settlements while leaving other areas untouched, residents of such communities as Melford could live, work and shop within these settlements, which by their compactness would reduce driving trips.

**Melford Preserves Our Heritage**

The proposed development of Melford has been designed around the unique amenity of the historic Melford House, and its adjacent cemetery. The Melford House stands as the physical and conceptual heart of Melford’s design. This prominent structure is located at a high point in the center of the subject property. Surrounding the house is a large public park, connected to the surrounding neighborhoods through sidewalks, paths, and streets. Additionally, view corridors are aligned with the Melford house to give visual identity throughout the entire subject property. Convenience/activity centers will be developed which will appropriately stem from the central
focus of the Melford House and will be accessible to residential areas through sidewalks, paths, and streets.

**Melford Preserves Our Environment**
MIE helped preserve the 100 +/- acre Nash Woods to the west and north and has incorporated residential, rather than high density employment, in the environmentally-sensitive area of our property abutting the Patuxent River. With respect to the established neighboring residential development, Sherwood Manor, Melford will be well-buffered by a stream tributary and wetlands, which provides open space to separate Melford from that residential neighborhood.

As to the details of the Melford Plan, one of Melford's main design goals is to provide greater accessibility to the natural environment, without jeopardizing the integrity of the natural system, through a carefully-planned open space network. Under our plan for Melford, trees, streams and other ecological features on the property are an essential component to the overall development of the site. As a mixed-use development, the natural assets of the site serve a prominent role in providing natural buffers and scenery that allows for a setting by which the variety of proposed uses can coexist in a harmonious fashion. Streams and their associated riparian areas are protected and enhanced by Melford. The protection stream buffers are an integral part of the design and will function as environmental corridors throughout the development. These corridors will provide essential connections between interior open space areas within Melford and the large ecologically important bottomland hardwoods of the Patuxent River Floodplain. An ecologically sensitive trail system has been designed to protect ecological resources from direct and indirect impacts associated with passive recreation. Efficient trail systems minimize the impact to the environment by encouraging the public to walk on the trail rather than haphazardly through the woods.

**Melford Helps Our Economy**
Melford helps our economy by providing a diverse and integrated mix of opportunities to live, work, shop and play, which is currently being demanded by our County's citizens and visitors. In addition, the strong retail market that we anticipate will be established at Melford will help the area to achieve regional identity and generate additional jobs and tax dollars for our County. Further, the live/work concept will keep our workers in the County, instead of commuting outside the County for work, retail and recreation.

The design of Melford will infill currently undeveloped land in a manner that is sensitive to the needs of the City of Bowie, its adjacent residents, and the master plan guidance of Prince George's County in order to create an environment that will attract the nation's best high-tech businesses. We therefore believe that Melford will have an extremely positive impact on our local economy by offering a number of employment opportunities for our County. Nearby amenities, for example, a place to jog at lunch, a café' for after-work socializing, and, of course, nearby housing, are all a part of Melford's benefit package for County residents.

Further, the proposed development of Melford would place approximately 2.6 +/- million square feet of commercial space, 866 +/- homes and a 100-room hotel on the site. Our market study also yielded the following specific findings:
At full build out, the commercial portion of Melford will support 3,650 jobs, paying on average $36,333.

At full build out, the residential units will support 570 jobs, paying on average $28,976.

At full build out, the commercial portion will generate $20.1 million in annual state and local taxes, of which $11.7 million will accrue to the City of Bowie and Prince George’s County.

At full build out, the residential units will generate $11.2 million in annual state and local taxes, of which $6.4 million will accrue to the City of Bowie and Prince George’s County.

The total tax revenue generated by the development at full build out will be $31.3 million in annual state and local taxes.

The surcharge or impact fees (both school and public safety) from the homes over the five year build out period will exceed $16 million.

The construction phase of the project will be five years and will support approximately 963 jobs annually paying on average $41,267.

Based on these results, Melford’s contribution to our County, the State of Maryland and the City of Bowie will be significant.

**Melford Is Compatible With Surrounding Communities**

The Melford property is surrounded by major roadways and naturally existing boundaries which well-insulate the site. U.S. Route 50 serves as the southern boundary of the property. MD 301 is to the west, and the 100 +/- acre Nash Woods (MIE facilitated the purchase of this tract by the Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission), is further west across MD 301. The Nash Woods provides a 100 +/- acre buffer of the Kenilworth section of Bowie to the 301/50 Interchange and Melford. To the north of Melford is a stream tributary to the Patuxent River which serves as the northern boundary of the property. This stream and its associated wetlands creates a significant buffer between Melford and the Sherwood Manor residential development. To the east of the property is the Patuxent River.

The Melford Plan makes use of these boundaries and its existing topography to achieve a development compatible with its surrounding land uses. The southern portion of Melford includes several commercial uses including a grouping of research and development buildings, located adjacent to U.S. Route 50, and the U.S. Census Bureau, located on Melford Boulevard. Also along the southern border of the property there are some residential uses buffered from Route 50. Future development of Melford will include additional research and development directly to the west of the Census Bureau, which will abut U.S. Route 301.
The western portion of the property will also include retail, office and hotel uses. A pond is also located on this western side of the site. It should be noted that Melford’s design strategy is sensitive to the needs of the surrounding community, as deliberate efforts have been made to locate the more intensive uses (i.e. commercial and research and development) on the front or west side of the property, near the property’s entrance which is adjacent to MD 301. The northern portion of Melford includes several existing uses, including one office building, the Institute for Defense Analysis and the National Masonry Institute. Future development plans include adding a pair of two-story office buildings.

The eastern portion of Melford provides residential development along the green space adjacent to the Patuxent River, with a significant pond providing an attractive setting for the residential development. This part of Melford includes a mix of multifamily residential uses and a variety of other residential types, along with traditional and townhouse office. These low intensive uses were purposely located on the eastern portion of the site, which is considered sensitive property due to its close proximity to the River.

The central feature of Melford is the Historic Melford House. Geographically, this historic house is situated at the center of Melford and is within a public green, well-buffered by trees and a park. The prominent location of this use will help to welcome visitors and potential future employees and residents to Melford and the City of Bowie.

As illustrated above, Melford will be compatible with its surrounding communities. Our prohibited use list will assure all those involved of the particular uses that will or will not be permitted at Melford, regardless of what the Zoning Ordinance allows for the M-X-T zone or the E-I-A zone. Any noxious uses or uses adverse to the health, safety and welfare of the surrounding communities will be prohibited.

**Melford Conforms to the Proposed Master Plan**

For the above stated reasons, Melford conforms to the proposed Master Plan. In particular, though, and consistent with the recommendation of the proposed Master Plan, Melford will be developed with a moderate-to-high density mixture of office, retail, residential and parkland/open space land uses. This development mix of employment and residential uses will create a place of activity and interaction for those who live, work, or visit in the area. Additionally, as previously noted, the residential component will be developed in such a way that the residential buildings and settings complement Melford, a National Register Historic Site.

As prescribed in the new proposed Master Plan, Melford’s ultimate development program will include the following mix of uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1,838,700 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>866 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>65,000 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>499,040 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Office</td>
<td>220,000 GSF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total 2,622,740 GSF
Commercial
Residential 866 Units

See Concept Book attached as Exhibit #1, which provides further detail regarding development plans. With the 866 proposed dwelling units at 128.9 +/- acres, our density does not exceed that which is recommended in the new Plan, 8 dwelling units per acre.

In addition, as prescribed in the new proposed Master Plan, Melford contains a broad range of housing types and designs to meet the needs of different household ages, sizes and income levels. Types of residential types proposed within Melford include:

- Four-story mixed-use (with retail) apartment/condominiums
- Four-story garden-style apartments/condominiums
- Three-story integral garage townhouses
- Two and a half-story detached/attached garage townhouses
- 35' wide single-family detached homes
- 55' wide single-family detached homes
- Active Adult (50+) housing/apartment/condominiums

The design's inclusion of both fee-simple and rental residences are the first step to achieving a mixed-use environment. Additionally, a number of designs for individual residences will be developed for each type, providing an even greater mix of housing opportunities for Melford's residents.

The concept of Melford and the proposed design layout is in keeping with other recommendations of the new proposed Master Plan. For instance, the Plan recommends and supports future rezoning "to a suitable mixed-use zone at the time of development and/or redevelopment in conformance with the stated land use concept and development guidelines." The M-X-T zone is just such a zone.

As to the Melford Historic Site, the proposed development has been designed around the unique amenity of the historic Melford house, and its adjacent cemetery. The plan offers a continuum of green space network includes both formal and informal greens, terminating at the eastern edge in the Patuxent River Park. These park spaces and the adjacent streets are framed by building edges. The bulk of the parking is handled internal to each block with only incidental "on-street" parking exposed to the public realm. As such, open space will be provided adjacent to the historic site that will allow it to be seen from greater distances. Streetscapes are enhanced with regularly spaced tree planting, "acorn" style lighting, as well as brick and granite pavers in certain areas crafted to made the most of the pedestrian experience. A dedicated pedestrian link between the Melford Historic Site and the cemetery will be created in accordance with the proposed Master Plan. Additionally, trails will be provided that connect the Melford Historic Site to the regional trail system.

Further, because the subject property is adjacent to the Patuxent River, the design of Melford will be sensitive to the goal of establishing viewsheps from the Melford Historic Site to the
River. A large portion of the subject property will be reserved as undisturbed open space and wetlands. The design preserves these areas, providing not only a natural amenity for the new residents, employees, and patrons of Melford, but also a natural amenity for the entire region. Further, appropriate signage will be placed near the historic site illustrating the history of the area. The applicant will take reasonable steps to ensure that appropriate signage is placed near the historic sites illustrating the history of the area.

Conclusion
For all of the above reasons, we respectfully request that, over the next six to eight months or so, you and your Staff carefully review the Melford proposal, with all of its detail, and approve it, either via the Sectional Map Amendment or by rezoning 179 +/- acres to the M-X-T Zone, or, via the amended Basic Plan, retaining the entire property in the E-I-A Zone with the PEPC. This proposal will allow all stakeholders, including the City of Bowie, environmental groups, nearby property owners, and other members of the public to comment and make suggestions about the development. At the end of the process, though, a final plan will be approved and we will be able to move forward and develop the property as intended by the proposal Master Plan, as a “a moderate to high density mixture of office, retail, residential and park land/open space land uses . . . [and] a mix of employment and residential uses that can create a place of activity and interaction for those who live, work, or visit the area.”

The ultimate test, though, should be our compliance with the new Master Plan and all of the other laws, rules and ordinances of the County. Our Melford Plan is essentially an employment center. In fact, it provides all of the employment we have the public facilities to support for the foreseeable future. To argue that the only way to develop this property is by the original Basic Plan is contrary to our County’s evolving plans, including adequate public facilities, and economic development strategy and more recent environmental considerations. As related earlier, we and others tried to develop according to that original Basic Plan and were simply unable to do so because of planning or environmental or market reasons or available transportation facilities. Your Community Plans Staff has recognized these facts by proposing a different approach; i.e., “a moderate to high density mixture of office, retail, residential and park land/open space land uses . . . [and] a mix of employment and residential uses that can create a place of activity and interaction for those who live, work, or visit the area” as did the District Council, in our opinion, with the adoption of CB-35-2003 and CB-16-2004.

We believe our plans for Melford are responsive to this Master Plan and the County’s other Land Use Plans, such as land use and environmental policies, and Economic Development Policies. We look forward to working with you, and all parties, in the coming months to get final approval of a viable plan for Melford, which MIE will be proud to build and you will be proud to have in our County.

I will be in attendance and will testify at the Joint Public Hearing on May 17, 2005, and our consultants and Mr. Benitez of MIE will be available to work with your Staff and interested parties over the coming months as you approve the Master Plan and our plan for Melford, either in the E-I-A zone with the PEPC or a combination of the E-I-A- zone and the M-X-T zone.
Thank you for your attention to the enclosed. If I can answer any questions or be of any further assistance to you, please contact me directly.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John P. McDonough

Enclosures
I. COMPLIANCE WITH SEC. 27-272 (B)

(b) General purposes.
    (1) The general purposes of Conceptual Site Plans are:

(A) To provide for development in accordance with the principles for the orderly, planned, efficient, and economical development contained in the General Plan, Master Plan or other approved plan;

Response: The proposed Master Plan for Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville and Vicinity is currently underway and was referred for public comment in March 2005 and will be adopted by the end of 2005. The new proposed Plan addresses the Melford site under Policy 6 at page 20. Specifically, Policy 6 is: “Improve site design to maximize the preservation of environmentally sensitive areas, encourage a diversity of housing types, provide a mix of land uses in appropriate locations, and reduce the cost of providing new roads and other public facilities.” The development plans for Melford incorporate all aspects of Policy 6. Our conceptual site plans show the environmentally sensitive areas that will be preserved at Melford. The natural environment is one of the hallmark features of Melford. The site will be developed in a fashion that preserves the environmentally sensitive areas. Additionally, a diversity of housing types will be provided on the site.

Further, concerning the subject property, which is located in the northwest quadrant of US 50 and MD 3, the Plan recommends the following:

This entire property should be developed with a moderate-to high-density mixture or office, retail, residential and parkland/open space and uses. This will offer a mix of employment and residential uses that can create a place of activity and interaction for those who live, work, or visit in the area. The residential component should develop in such a way that the residential buildings and settings complement Melford, a National Register Historic Site. The development should conform to the following design guidelines:

a. The average density for the residential development component should not exceed eight dwelling units per acre.
b. The 12.75-acre impact review area approved for the Melford historic Site by the Historic Preservation Commission and the Planning Board (PGVPB No. 99-28A) should be integrated into a design plan that establishes viewsheds from the Melford Historic Site to the Patuxent River. Open space should be provided adjacent to the historic site that will allow it to be seen from greater distances. A dedicated pedestrian link between the Melford Historic Site and the cemetery should be created. Trails should be provided that connect it to the regional trail system.

c. Development abutting the Melford Historic Site, outbuildings, and cemetery should be compatible in scale, design, and character with the existing historical architectural character. Sensitive and innovative site design techniques, such as careful siting, variation in orientation, roof shape, building materials, screening, landscaping, berming, and open space should be incorporated into the proposal to minimize any adverse impacts to the historic site.

d. Appropriate signage should be placed near the historic site illustrating the history of the area.

As prescribed in the new proposed Master Plan, Melford's ultimate development program will include the following mix of uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1,838,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>866 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>65,000 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development</td>
<td>499,040 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Office</td>
<td>220,000 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,622,740 GSF</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See attached Concept Book, which provides further detail regarding development plans. With the 866 proposed dwelling units at 128.9 +/- acres, our density does not exceed that which is recommended in the new Plan, 8 dwelling units per acre.
In addition, as prescribed in the new proposed Master Plan, Melford contains a broad range of housing types and designs to meet the needs of different household ages, sizes and income levels. Types of residential types proposed within Melford include:

- Four-story mixed-use (with retail) apartment/condominiums
- Four-story garden-style apartments/condominiums
- Three-story integral garage townhouses
- Two and a half-story detached/attached garage townhouses
- 35' wide single-family detached homes
- 55' wide single-family detached homes
- Active Adult (50+) housing/apartment/condominiums

The design's inclusion of both fee-simple and rental residences are the first step to achieving a healthy mix. Additionally, a number of designs for individual residences will be developed for each type, providing an even greater mix of housing opportunities for Melford's residents.

The missed use environment proposed for Melford will provide a mix of land uses in appropriate locations. The live/work concept will also decrease costs associated with providing new roads and other public facilities. Adequate public facilities exist and presently serve the subject site. Such public facilities include electric service, public water and sewer service, as well as an existing road network which serve the subject site. See Traffic Study (part of Basic Plan) (Exhibit 1). The design of Melford provides an opportunity to market and create a distinct residential neighborhood offering a variety of housing types which can be supported by the existing public facilities/services described herein. Further, the live/work concept will effectively decrease costs associated with providing new roads, as Melford is designed to be a walking community with convenient pathways and trails, in addition to options for other modes of shared transportation, such as designated car pool areas, and easy access to nearby public transportation hubs.

The concept of Melford and the proposed design layout is in keeping with other recommendations of the new proposed Master Plan. For instance, the Plan recommends and supports future rezoning "to a suitable mixed-use zone at the time of development and/or redevelopment in conformance with the stated land use concept and development guidelines." The M-X-T zone is just such a zone.

As to the Melford Historic Site, the proposed development has been designed around the unique amenity of the historic Melford house, and its adjacent cemetery. The plan offers a continuum of green space network includes both formal and informal greens, terminating at the eastern edge in the Patuxent River Park. These park spaces and the adjacent streets are
framed by building edges. The bulk of the parking is handled internal to each block with only incidental "on-street" parking exposed to the public realm. As such, open space will be provided adjacent to the historic site that will allow it to be seen from greater distances. Streetscapes are enhanced with regularly spaced tree planting, "acorn" style lighting, as well as brick and granite pavers in certain areas crafted to make the most of the pedestrian experience. A dedicated pedestrian link between the Melford Historic Site and the cemetery will be created in accordance with the proposed Master Plan. Additionally, trails will be provided that connect the Melford Historic Site to the regional trail system.

Further, because the subject property is adjacent to the Patuxent River, the design of Melford will be sensitive to the goal of establishing viewsheds from the Melford Historic Site to the River. A large portion of the subject property will be reserved as undisturbed open space and wetlands. The design preserves these areas, providing not only a natural amenity for the new residents, employees, and patrons of Melford, but also a natural amenity for the entire region. Further, appropriate signage will be placed near the historic site illustrating the history of the area. The applicant will take reasonable steps to ensure that appropriate signage is placed near the historic sites illustrating the history of the area. In the event that a sign erected, and working contained therein will be approved by the Signage relating to the Melford Historic Site will be compatible with strategies used throughout the rest of the development.

Development of Melford will also be consistent with the principles set forth in the 2002 General Plan sets the following goals (See page 3):

- *Encourage quality economic development.*

- *Make efficient use of existing and proposed county infrastructure and investment.*

- *Enhance quality and character of communities and neighborhoods.*

- *Preserve rural, agricultural and scenic areas.*

- *Protect environmentally sensitive lands.*

Particularly relating to the Developing Tier in which Melford is located, the goals established in the General Plan will largely be incorporated into the development of the subject site. These goals include the following (See page 37 of the 2002 General Plan):

- *Develop compact, higher-intensity, mixed-uses in Centers and Corridors.*
• Reinforce existing suburban residential neighborhoods.
• Develop compact, planned employment areas.
• Preserve and enhance environmentally sensitive areas.
• Increase utilization of transit.
• Balance the pace of development with the ability to of the private sector to provide adequate transportation and public facilities.
• Encourage contiguous expansion of development other public facilities and services can be more efficiently provided.

Policy items under the General Plan include the following (See pages 34-39 of 2002 General Plan):

• Preserve and enhance environmental features and green infrastructure elements.

• Provide as many multimodal options as possible for new development to reduce the need for new arterial or major collector roads.

• Plan and provide public facilities to support the planned development pattern.

• As discussed in further detail below, these policies and goals of the 2002 General Plan will be incorporated into the development of Melford.

(B) To help fulfill the purposes of the zone in which the land is located;

Sec. 27-542:

(b) The purposes of the M-X-T Zone are:

(1) To promote the orderly development and redevelopment of land in the vicinity of major interchanges, major intersections, and major transit stops, so that these areas will enhance the economic status of the County and provide an expanding source of desirable employment and living opportunities for its citizens;

Response: The subject property is located in the northeast quadrant of US 50 and MD 3. In that said property will be developed in the vicinity of these two major interchanges, this standard is achieved. As previously noted, Melford will include employment and living
opportunities for citizens of the County. In doing so, the economic status of the County will be further enhanced.

(2) To conserve the value of land and buildings by maximizing the public and private development potential inherent in the location of the zone, which might otherwise become scattered throughout and outside the County, to its detriment;

Response: The concept of Melford to be a mixed use community to include both residential, employment, retail, office, and research and development uses advances the goal of conserving the value of land and buildings by maximizing public and private development potential. business which might otherwise be located in a scattered fashion throughout and outside the County will be centralized at Melford.

(3) To promote the effective and optimum use of transit and other major transportation systems;

Response: One of the overall goals of the Master Plan is to require that all development provide a transportation network that is safe and efficient and provides for all modes of travel in an integrated manner. Melford incorporates this goal into its planned street network and circulation patterns in order to satisfy the specific guidelines set forth in the circulation and transportation section of the new proposed Master Plan.

The internal road network to serve the existing and proposed development at the property has already been dedicated and includes Melford Boulevard, Tulsa Drive and Curie Drive. Therefore, these roadways have already been dedicated and improved and any additional extension thereof must be in accordance with the County's standards for the dedication and construction of any such roadway extension.

The applicant believes that all of the necessary rights-of-way for the two (2) major highways (US 50 and MD 3), and their interchanges, have already been acquired and constructed. There should be no additional costs to the county or State or additional rights-of-way constructed, and there should be no property displacement as a result of the additional proposals made pursuant to the Basic Plan and these conceptual site plans. See generally our Traffic Study and Basic Plan.

(4) To facilitate and encourage a twenty-four (24) hour environment to ensure continuing functioning of the project after workday hours through a maximum of activity, and the interaction between the
uses and those who live, work in, or visit the area;

**Response:** The goal of the Master Plan Guidelines for Living Areas is “to create a residential structure and housing pattern that strengthens the sense of community identity, provides for a broad range of housing opportunities, fosters residential stability and community character, and enhances the overall quality of life in the Planning Areas.” With a strong sense of community, defined by the identity of the subject property’s historic assets and existing natural features, Melford is the realization of this goal through the development of a Planned Environmental Preservation Community.

Melford represents the logical evolution of the suburban office park. It represents a transformation of a site designed solely for use ten-hours a day, to one whose inhabitation will be round the clock and whose value rests in the “sense of place” evoked at its core, the historic Melford House. The proposed development provides a memorable and authentic set of streets, streetscapes, and open space networks composed of historic landscapes, environmental preserves, parks, and greens.

The design of Melford intends to minimize the adverse affects of this recommendation. By injecting residential uses adjacent to commercial uses, the subject property will encourage walking or biking between uses, provide a dynamic 24-hour a day locale, and encourage the formation of a strong community character founded in the historic and natural attributes of the subject property.

(5) To encourage diverse land uses which blend together harmoniously;

**Response:** The design of Melford is intended to make the non-residential uses more compatible with residential uses. This is achieved through a balanced mix of commercial uses, appropriate buffering, and a clear definition of front and rear access for all uses.

Instead of typical suburban single-use area, Melford contains a variety of uses. No single use is dominant. This allows for each use to contribute to the success of the entire community and, therefore, create a more dynamic environment.

In the care where commercial uses are located to adjacent to residential uses, adequate buffering is provided. These areas are designed in a variety of configurations ranging from material buffers, such as increased soundproofing in walls or floors to actual spatial buffers like planting areas or tree stands. It is, however, not the intent of this design, to segregate uses completely, rather to find the appropriate
buffer for each situation in order to create a mixed-use environment where all the uses are more successful because of their adjacencies.

Additionally, as essential to the creation of a harmonious mixed-use environment is clear definition of ‘front’ and ‘rear’. Within Melford, equal design care is given to each. Formal fronts of building face the street and parking and service are hidden from the street. The result of this is a clear definition of neighborhood where both formality and functionality of all uses can coexist in a safe and cogent manner.

(6) To create dynamic, functional relationships among individual uses within a distinctive visual character and identity;

Response: The Melford Mixed-Use Development will include office space, research and development space, retail space, as well as a variety of residential spaces ranging from low to mid-rise buildings. This proposal provides for an interconnected street network, a pedestrian-friendly streetscape, and a set of civic and park spaces that will prove capable of creating a unique identity and focus for the site and for the adjacent areas. Further, the creation of neighborhoods provides not only a harmonious relationship between residential uses, but also between residential uses and the natural environment.

(7) To promote optimum land planning with greater efficiency through the use of economies of scale and savings in energy beyond the scope of single-purpose projects;

Response: Melford represents the logical evolution of the suburban office park. It represents a transformation of a site designed solely for use ten-hours a day, accessed almost exclusively by car, to one whose inhabitation will be round the clock, with access by multiple modes of transport, (e.g., bicycle and pedestrian) and whose value rests in the “sense of place” evoked at its core, the historic Melford House. The proposed development provides a memorable and authentic set of streets, streetscapes, and open space networks composed of historic landscapes, environmental preserves, parks, and greens.

The proposal provides for residential, office, research and development, retail and even hotel spaces, an interconnected street network, a pedestrian-friendly streetscape, and a set of civic and park spaces that will prove capable of creating a unique identity and focus for the site and for the adjacent areas. Its design allows the possibility to live, work, shop and play within a village. It is easy to conceive of life at Melford without a car.
In essence, Melford is the embodiment of Smart Growth – the right plan in the right place. It helps a growing County direct residents and employers to a location where they are best served by existing infrastructure. Moreover, it provides for a memorable and vital public realm, in that location, one that will likely grow to be one of the truly beloved developed areas of the County.

In short, highlights of the plan include:

- Connectivity for both vehicles and pedestrians through an interconnected street network
- Pedestrian-friendly design as exemplified in the streetscapes, the block size and the mix of uses
- Mix of uses and mix of types potentially
- An identifiable public realm as embodied in the greenway system and pedestrian-scaled streetscapes and public spaces
- Accommodation for multiple modes of transport including busses, taxis, private automobiles, bicycling, and walking
- An appropriate transition to environmentally sensitive areas of the Patuxent River watershed via a lake (acting as stormwater management) and an extensive park system.

Carefully planned and designed circulation and access is crucial to ensuring a pedestrian-oriented environment. Both vehicular and pedestrian traffic must be handled appropriately to ultimately foster a safe road network. Streets should be wide enough not to impede vehicular traffic flows, but narrow enough to enforce slow and safe driving. To this end, the streets within Melford are crafted with ample travel lanes, parallel parking on one or both sides, planting strips with regularly-spaces street trees, and sidewalks.

Equally as important to ensuring the circulation system at Melford is pedestrian-oriented is the layout of the street network. The plan is composed of small, walkable blocks organized to promote maximum connectivity. This network minimizes the impact of vehicular traffic on any one intersection by providing multiple routes between any two points within the development. At the same time, this network is carefully-crafted to respect the existing topography and view corridors inherent in this environmentally dynamic site.
To permit a flexible response to the market; and

Response: Melford is a mixed-use development to include office, research and development, retail, as well as a variety of residential opportunities in an effort to provide the market of users with a balanced environment and sustainable lifestyle. Not only does such a mix of uses and pedestrian friendly design attract the knowledge workers needed by high-tech tenants it also represents a market strategy which is elastic and flexible.

For example, Melford contains a broad range of land use and housing types and designs to meet the needs of different household ages, sizes, and income levels. Types of residential types proposed within Melford include:

- Hotel
- Office condominiums in a “town-house style configuration
- Four-story mixed-use (with retail) apartments/condominiums
- Four-story garden-style apartments/condominiums
- Single-family detached homes
- Active Adult (50+) housing/apartments/condominiums

The design’s achieving this healthy mix inclusion of both ownership and rental residences and office space are the first steps to providing this market flexibility.

To allow freedom of architectural design in order to provide an opportunity and incentive to the developer to achieve excellence in physical, social.

Response: Melford is designed as a traditional series of neighborhoods, complete with a clear hierarchy of streets, programmed public and private open spaces, and dynamic mix of uses. Residential uses within this series of neighborhoods are located along pedestrian-friendly streets where parking is located in the center of small blocks, hidden from street view. This fundamental design strategy allows for a harmonious relationship between residences, where function and formality have equal importance.

Because the subject property is host to dynamic terrain and natural vegetative conditions, the layout of streets, buildings, and spaces has been carefully-crafted to respect the inherent amenity of these exiting natural features. In the end, the creation of this series of neighborhoods provides not only a harmonious relationship between residential uses, but also between residential uses and the natural environment.
Melford hosts a variety of both public and private open spaces. It is a purposely created balance of both public and private open spaces that allow for a wide variety of active and passive recreation as well as both social and leisure activities.

Public open spaces can be classified into two categories: formal and informal. Formal open spaces are designed with a holistically urban character. Some contain regularly-shaped lawns, while others contain a series of sitting areas surrounded by shade trees. These formal compositions are framed by symmetrically composed architecture that, together with the regular shape of the open space, form an identifiable ensemble, or 'place.' Informal open spaces are more irregular in shape. They are formed by naturally existing topographic conditions or forested areas. These spaces are characterized further by paths and trails that connect to various residential and other open space areas throughout Melford.

Private open spaces are provided in a variety of configurations for all residences in Melford. Ranging from front and back yards to balconies overlooking a street, these spaces provide a personal place for all types of households.

(C) To provide for development in accordance with the site design guidelines established in this Division; and

Response: The development of Melford will be in accordance with the site design guidelines established in this Division. Please see comments below.

(D) To provide approval procedures that are easy to understand and consistent for all types of Conceptual Site Plans.

Response: We recommend this Concept Plan be approved as a condition of the M-X-T zone as part of the Bowie-Collington Sectional Map Amendment.

II. COMPLIANCE WITH SEC. 27-272 (C), SPECIFIC PURPOSES.

(c) Specific purposes.

(1) The specific purposes of Conceptual Site Plans are:

(A) To explain the relationships among proposed uses on the subject site, and between the uses on the site and adjacent uses;

Response: In short, highlights of the plan include:
Connectivity for both vehicles and pedestrians through an interconnected street network.

Pedestrian-friendly design as exemplified in the streetscapes, the block size and mix of uses.

Mix of uses and mix of types potentially including 425,000 square feet of office space, 330,000 square feet of research and development space, 200,000 square feet of retail, and 866 residential units in a variety of low- and mid-rise buildings.

An identifiable public realm as embodied in the greenway system and pedestrian-scaled streetscapes and public spaces.

Accommodation for multiple modes of transport including buses, taxis, private automobiles, bicycling and walking.

An appropriate transition to environmentally sensitive areas of the Patuxent River watershed via a lake (acting as stormwater management) and an extensive park system.

(B) To illustrate approximate locations where buildings, parking lots, streets, green areas, and other similar physical features may be placed in the final design for the site;

Response: Our conceptual site plans illustrate approximate locations of buildings, parking lots, streets, green areas, and other similar physical features. Also see our general Basic Plan for Melford which discusses in detail how uses, buildings, parking lots, streets, green areas, etc. will be featured and arranged on the site.

(C) To illustrate general grading, woodland and tree preservation areas, planting, sediment control, and storm water management concepts to be employed in any final design for the site; and

Response: These elements are addressed in our conceptual site plans. Woodland and tree conservation areas are shown. Additionally, a tree legend is provided. Also, see Tree Conservation Specific Notes regarding specimen trees that will be preserved as part of the development.

(D) To describe, generally, the recreational facilities, architectural form of buildings, and street furniture (such as lamps, signs, and benches) to be used on the final plan.

Response: This information will be provided by the Applicant.
III. COMPLIANCE WITH SEC. 27-273 (e). SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS.

(e) A Conceptual Site Plan shall include the following:

(1) Location map, north arrow, and scale;
Response: A location map, north arrow, and scale are included on the conceptual site plans.

(2) Boundaries of the property, using bearings and distances (in feet) around the periphery;
Response: The conceptual site plans include boundaries of the property, using bearing and distances (in feet) around the periphery.

(3) Zoning categories of the subject property and all adjacent properties;
Response: Zoning categories of the subject property and all adjacent properties are included on the conceptual site plans.

(4) General locations and types of major improvements that are within fifty (50) feet of the subject property, and a general description of all land uses on adjacent properties;
Response: The general locations and types of major improvements that are within fifty (50) feet of the subject property, and a general description of all land uses on adjacent properties have been included on the conceptual site plans.

(5) Existing topography, at not more than five (5) foot contour intervals;
Response: The conceptual site plans reflect existing topography, at not more than five (5) foot contour intervals.

(6) Limits of the one hundred (100) year floodplain (if any);
Response: The Location Map reflects the limits of the one hundred (100) year floodplain. The Patuxent Management Area includes all streams, wetlands and riparian areas within the 100-year floodplain for the portions of the Patuxent River and adjacent tributaries located on site. This assures that the Primary Management Area is preserved in a natural state.

(7) Street names, right-of-way and pavement widths of existing streets and interchanges within and adjacent to the site; and
Response: Street names, right-of-way and pavement widths of existing streets and interchanges within and adjacent to the site are included on the conceptual site plans.

(8) Existing rights-of-way and easements (such as railroad, utility, water, sewer, access, and storm drainage);

Response: Existing rights-of-way and easements are shown on the conceptual site plans.

(9) Existing tree cover as shown on a forest stand delineation and any important natural features on the site (such as stream beds, steep slopes, significant stands of trees, individual trees of significant size or species, and rock outcroppings;

Response: See Specimen Tree List and Tree Conservation Specific Notes on the Location Map.

(10) Areas of existing tree cover, vegetation, or other natural features proposed to be retained as shown on the proposed Tree Conservation Plan;

Response: Need information.

(11) Proposed system of internal streets, including right-of-way widths;

Response: A proposed system of internal streets, including right-of-way widths are included in the conceptual site plans.

(12) Proposed lot lines and the land use proposed for each lot;

Response: The Location Map provides lot lines and the land use proposed for each lot.

(13) General locations of areas of the site where buildings and parking lots are proposed to be located, and the general orientation of buildings on individual lots; and

Response: See Location Map.

(14) A stormwater concept plan approved pursuant to Section 4-322 of this Code. The submittal requirements in (e), above, may be modified in accordance with Section 27-277.

IV. COMPLIANCE WITH SEC. 27-274 (1). DESIGN GUIDELINES.

(a) The Conceptual Site Plan shall be designed in accordance with the following guidelines:

(1) General.
   (A) The Plan should promote the purposes of the Conceptual Site Plan.

   Response: See above comments.

   (B) The applicant shall provide justification for, and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, the reasons for noncompliance with any of the design guidelines for townhouses and three-family dwellings set forth in paragraph (11), below.

   Response: We comply with the design guidelines for townhouses and three-family dwellings

V. COMPLIANCE WITH SEC. 27-274 (2). PARKING, LOADING, AND CIRCULATION.

(A) Surface parking lots should be located and designed to provide safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation within the site, while minimizing the visual impact of cars. Parking spaces should be located to provide convenient access to major destination points on the site. As a means of achieving these objectives, the following guidelines should be observed:

   (i) Parking lots should generally be provided to the rear or sides of structures;

   Response: Melford is designed as a traditional series of neighborhoods, complete with a clear hierarchy of streets, programmed public and private open spaces, and dynamic mix of uses. Residential uses within this series of neighborhoods are located along the pedestrian-friendly streets where parking is located in the center of small blocks, hidden from street view. Only incidental “on-street” parking is exposed to the public realm. This fundamental design strategy allows for a harmonious relationship between residences, where function and formality have equal importance.

   (ii) Parking spaces should be located as near as possible to the uses they serve;

   Response: The bulk of the parking is handled internal to each block with. Because the blocks themselves are kept to a small size, the proposed
development provides for parking spaces very near to the uses that they serve.

(iii) Parking aisles should be oriented to minimize the number of parking lanes crossed by pedestrians;

**Response:** The small block size assures that pedestrians will cross fewer parking lanes than would be possible in conventional developments.

(iv) Large, uninterrupted expanses of pavement should be avoided or substantially mitigated by the location of green space and plant materials within the parking lot, in accordance with the Landscape Manual, particularly in parking areas serving townhouses; and

**Response:** The proposed development at Melford naturally avoids large expanses of pavement by creating relatively small blocks with parking internal to the block. Within each of the blocks, plant materials are to be provided in accordance with the Landscape Manual.

(v) Special areas for van pool, car pool, and visitor parking should be located with convenient pedestrian access to buildings.

**Response:** Van pool and car pool parking within the mid-block parking areas near all buildings and sites intended for employment use.

(B) **Loading areas should be visually unobtrusive and located to minimize conflicts with vehicles or pedestrians.** To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

(i) Loading docks should be oriented toward service roads and away from major streets or public view; and

**Response:** Development of Melford will comply with this standard. Further clarification is provided in the response below.

(ii) Loading areas should be clearly marked and should be separated from parking areas to the extent possible.

**Response:** Because Melford is designed with a series of blocks that have a clear definition of front and back, employment traffic for both employee parking and truck loading are generally handled separately. This is most evident in the design of the research and development areas. Loading and truck access is handled along a service access road that borders the southern end of the subject property. Employee parking is accessed through the
regular street network, north of the research and development area. This arrangement allows both employee and truck loading circulation to access the research and development area from opposite sides of the buildings.

(C) Vehicular and pedestrian circulation on a site should be safe, efficient, and convenient for both pedestrians and drivers. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

(i) The location, number and design of driveway entrances to the site should minimize conflict with off-site traffic, should provide a safe transition into the parking lot, and should provide adequate acceleration and deceleration lanes, if necessary;

Response: Melford is specifically designed to minimize the adverse effects of heavy traffic. The plan is organized by a grid of interconnected streets. This system provides numerous ways to get between two points within the subject property. This strategy distributes the traffic burden evenly throughout the subject property so that no one intersection is overly burdened by traffic loads. Additionally, because of its creative mixing of uses and the close proximity of employment and residential uses, Melford promotes the lifestyle of working within walking distance of one’s home.

For the employment uses within Melford, service is handled by an internal system of alleys while pedestrian and employee access is handled by the external street network. Curb cuts between individual employment parcels are held to a minimum, to the extent possible, allowing for appropriate access for all employees, service vehicles, and patrons.

(ii) Entrance drives should provide adequate space for queuing;

Response: The development of Melford will comply with this standard.

(iii) Circulation patterns should be designed so that vehicular traffic may flow freely through the parking lot without encouraging higher speeds than can be safely accommodated;

Response: Carefully planned and designed circulation and access is crucial to ensuring a pedestrian-oriented environment. Both vehicular and pedestrian traffic must be handled appropriately to ultimately foster a safe road network. Streets should be wide enough not to impede vehicular traffic flows, but narrow enough to enforce slow and safe driving. To this end, the streets within Melford are crafted with ample travel lanes, parallel parking on one or both sides, planting strips with regularly-spaced street trees and sidewalks.

(iv) Parking areas should be designed to discourage their use as
through-access drives;

**Response:** Because of the small block size, "cut-through" traffic of this type is unnecessary. Further, the mid-block parking lots will be designed to discourage their use as through-access drives.

(v) Internal signs such as directional arrows, lane markings, and other roadway commands should be used to facilitate safe driving through the parking lot;

**Response:** The development of Melford will comply with this standard.

(vi) Drive-through establishments should be designed with adequate space for queuing lanes that do not conflict with circulation traffic patterns or pedestrian access;

**Response:** While drive-through establishments are not anticipated as part of Melford, the development of Melford will comply with this standard if they become part of the final site plan.

(vii) Parcel pick-up areas should be coordinated with other on-site traffic flows;

**Response:** The development of Melford will comply with this standard.

(viii) Pedestrian access should be provided into the site and through parking lots to the major destinations on the site;

**Response:** Equally as important to ensuring the circulation system at Melford is pedestrian-oriented is the layout of the street network. The plan is composed of small walkable blocks organized to promote maximum connectivity. This network minimizes the impact of vehicular traffic on any one intersection by providing multiple routes between any two points within the development.

(ix) Pedestrian and vehicular circulation routes should generally be separated and clearly marked;

**Response:** The development of Melford will comply with this standard. Every street in Melford will be lined with sidewalks on both sides. At intersections, all pedestrian crosswalks will be clearly marked and with textured paving. Pedestrian crosswalks in mid-block parking areas will be clearly marked with painted walkway areas.

(x) Crosswalks for pedestrians that span vehicular lanes should be identified by the use of signs, stripes on the pavement, change of
paving material, or similar techniques; and

**Response:** Trail systems are organized, with respect to existing topography and ecological conditions in a coherent greenway, vehicular, and pedestrian ‘circulation web’ that encompasses not only the entire subject property, but provides ample connections to circulation systems outside of the subject property.

(xi) **Barrier-free pathways to accommodate the handicapped should be provided.**

**Response:** Barrier-free pathways to accommodate the handicapped will be provided.

**VI. COMPLIANCE WITH SEC. 27-274 (3), LIGHTING.**

(A) **For uses permitting nighttime activities, adequate illumination should be provided.** Light fixtures should enhance the site's design character. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

(i) **If the development is used at night, the luminosity, orientation, and location of exterior light fixtures should enhance user safety and minimize vehicular/pedestrian conflicts;**

**Response:** Streetscapes are enhanced with regularly spaced tree planting, “acorn” style lighting, as well as brick and granite pavers in certain areas crafted to make the most of the pedestrian experience.

(ii) **Lighting should be used to illuminate important on-site elements such as entrances, pedestrian pathways, public spaces, and property addresses. Significant natural or built features may also be illuminated if appropriate to the site;**

**Response:** Where required, additional lighting will illuminate in the form of bollard, well lights, and flood lights, will illuminate, entrances, pedestrian paths, and other important site features.

(iii) **The pattern of light pooling should be directed on-site;**

**Response:** Lighting fixtures will be limited to those whose light will be directed on site.

(iv) **Light fixtures fulfilling similar functions should provide a consistent quality of light;**
Response: This requirement will be met.

(v) Light fixtures should be durable and compatible with the scale, architecture, and use of the site; and

Response: Light fixtures will be selected for compatibility with the scale of the space that they are lighting. For example, the height and style of lighting along sidewalks of residential streets will be different than those lighting mid-block parking areas. All fixtures and lenses will be made of durable materials.

(vi) If a variety of lighting fixtures is needed to serve different purposes on a site, related fixtures should be selected. The design and layout of the fixtures should provide visual continuity throughout the site.

Response: Melford's basic fixture will be an "acorn" style light mounted on a pole ranging in height from 14" to 20" depending on the location lighting requirements. Variations on this requirement may include multiple heads in more formal situations, to greater height in parking areas. However use of the "acorn" fixture will be consistent.

VII. COMPLIANCE WITH SEC. 27-274 (4). VIEWS.

(A) Site design techniques should be used to preserve, create, or emphasize scenic views from public areas.

Response: At the physical and conceptual heart of Melford's design is the Melford House. This prominent structure is located at a high point in the center of the subject property. Surrounding the house is a large public park, connected to the surrounding neighborhoods through sidewalks, paths, and streets. Additionally, view corridors are aligned with the Melford House to give visual identity throughout the entire subject property. Convenience/activity centers will be developed which will appropriately stem from the central focus of the Melford House and will be accessible to residential areas through sidewalks, paths, and streets.

As a part of Melford's overall greenway, street, and pedestrian circulation network, the subject property's historic sites will be easily viewed from a variety of vantage points. More specifically, several of the streets are located on-axis with the Melford House. This design will ensure that views of and access to the House will be indefinitely preserved.
VIII. COMPLIANCE WITH SEC. 27-274 (5). GREEN AREA.

(A) On-site green area should be designed to complement other site activity areas and should be appropriate in size, shape, location, and design to fulfill its intended use. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

(i) Green area should be easily accessible in order to maximize its utility and to simplify its maintenance;

Response: Melford hosts a variety of both public and private open spaces. It is a purposely created balance of both public and private open spaces that allow for a wide variety of active and passive recreation as well as both social and leisure activities. Additionally, the appropriation of both public and private open space more convincingly spreads maintenance responsibilities for these spaces to both public and private entities.

(iii) Green area should link major site destinations such as buildings and parking areas;

Response: One of Melford's main design goals is to provide greater accessibility to the natural environment, without jeopardizing the integrity of the natural system, through a carefully-planned open space network. At present, the majority of the natural amenities of the subject property are not easily accessible due to the lace of paths, trails, sidewalks, and/or an organized major and minor street network. An ecologically sensitive trail system has been designed to protect ecological resources from direct and indirect impacts associated with passive recreation. Efficient trail systems minimize the impact to the environment by encouraging the public to walk on the trail rather than haphazardly through the woods.

(iv) Green area should be well-defined and appropriately scaled to meet its intended use;

Response: This plan offers a continuum of green space framed by dignified buildings for living and working. This greenspace network includes both formal and informal greens, terminating at the eastern edge in the Patuxent River Park. These park spaces and the adjacent streets are framed by building edges.

(v) Green area designed for the use and enjoyment of pedestrians should be visible and accessible, and the location of seating should be protected from excessive sun, shade, wind, and noise;
Response: Formal open spaces are designed with a holistically urban character. Some contain regularly shaped-lawns, while others contain a series of sitting areas surrounded by shade trees.

(vi) Green area should be designed to define space, provide screening and privacy, and serve as a focal point;

Response: The applicant considers the trees, streams and other ecological features on the property to be an essential component to the overall development at the site. As a mixed-use development, the natural assets of the site serve a prominent role in providing natural buffers and scenery that allows for a setting by which the variety of proposed uses can coexist in a harmonious fashion. Streams and their associated riparian areas are protected and enhanced by Melford. The protection stream buffers are an integral part of the design and will function as environmental corridors throughout the development. These corridors will provide essential connections between interior open space areas within Melford and the large ecologically important bottomland hardwoods of the Patuxent River Floodplain.

(vii) Green area should incorporate significant on-site natural features and woodland conservation requirements that enhance the physical and visual character of the site; and

Response: Melford hosts a variety of both public and private open spaces. It is a purposely created balance of both public and private open spaces that allow for a wide variety of active and passive recreation as well as both social and leisure activities. Additionally, the appropriation of both public and private open space more convincingly spreads maintenance responsibilities for these spaces to both public and private entities.

Public open spaces can be classified into two categories: formal and informal. Formal open spaces are designed with a holistically urban character. Some contain regularly shaped-lawns, while others contain a series of sitting areas surrounded by shade trees. These formal compositions are framed by symmetrically composed architecture that, together with the regular shape of the open space, form an identifiable ensemble, or 'place.' Informal open spaces are more irregular in shape. They are formed by naturally existing topographic conditions or forested areas. These spaces or characterized by paths and trails that connect various residential and other open space areas throughout Melford.

(viii) Green area should generally be accented by elements such as landscaping, pools, fountains, street furniture, and decorative paving.
Response: The focus of the proposed residential development is its connection with the outdoor environment. Specifically, the applicant proposes both private and public open spaces as well as a significant system of sidewalks and pedestrian/bike trails to run through a great portion of the property. Said pedestrian/bike trails would be incorporated into the existing County-wide trail system. The applicant also intends to provide space for a traditional clubhouse to serve the proposed residential development with recreational amenities such as a pool, tennis courts, etc.

IX. COMPLIANCE WITH SEC. 27-274(6). SITE AND STREETSCAPE AMENITIES.

(A) Site and streetscape amenities should contribute to an attractive, coordinated development and should enhance the use and enjoyment of the site. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

(i) The design of light fixtures, benches, trash receptacles, bicycle racks and other street furniture should be coordinated in order to enhance the visual unity of the site;

Response: Melford’s Design Guidelines, assure that a consistent set of exterior furnishings, from light fixtures, to benches, trash receptacles, and the like, contribute to an attractive, safe and pedestrian scaled public space network, that encompasses the streets, the parks, and other public spaces.

(ii) The design of amenities should take into consideration the color, pattern, texture, and scale of structures on the site, and when known, structures on adjacent sites, and pedestrian areas;

Response: At present, the majority of the natural amenities of the subject property are not easily accessible due to the lack of paths, trails, sidewalks, and/or an organized major and minor street network.

(iii) Amenities should be clearly visible and accessible, and should not obstruct pedestrian circulation;

Response: The focus of the proposed development of Melford is its connection with the outdoor environment. Specifically, the applicant proposes both private and open space as well as a significant system of sidewalks and pedestrian/bike trails to run through a great portion of the property. Said pedestrian/bike trails would be incorporated into the existing County-wide trail system. The applicant also intends to provide space for a traditional clubhouse to serve the proposed residential development with recreational amenities such as a pool, tennis courts, etc.

(iv) Amenities should be functional and should be constructed of
durable, low maintenance materials;

Response: Melford's amenities will be designed to serve the community and will be constructed of durable materials, requiring as little maintenance as possible. The Design Guidelines that will accompany the site plan will assure that the materials will assure that these requirements are met.

(v) Amenities should be protected from vehicular intrusion with design elements that are integrated into the overall streetscape design, such as landscaping, curbs, and bollards;

Response: The site's most significant public amenity, the historic Melford House, sits within a large green that is visually linked to the historic cemetery at one end of a pedestrian axis and a major park at the other. This sequence landscape sequence is dominated by spaces designed exclusively for the pedestrian. Where vehicles are allowed, they are provided for at the edges of these spaces to serve the fronts of residences, but not so that they intrude upon the amenity of the public spaces.

(vi) Amenities such as kiosks, planters, fountains, and public art should be used as focal points on a site; and

Response: The plan of Melford uses existing site features, such as the historic residence and cemetery as major focal points, and supplements them with water features, fountains, and garden pavilions to organize a compelling spatial sequence through the site.

(vii) Amenities should be included which accommodate the handicapped and should be appropriately scaled for user comfort.

Response: This requirement will be met, consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

(7) Grading.

(A) Grading should be performed to minimize disruption to existing topography and other natural and cultural resources on the site and on adjacent sites. To the extent practicable, grading should minimize environmental impacts. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

(i) Slopes and berms visible from streets and other public areas should appear as naturalistic forms. Slope ratios and the length of slopes should be varied if necessary to increase visual interest and relate manmade landforms to the shape of the natural terrain;
Response: One of Melford's primary features relates to the site's natural landforms and features. Focused measures will be undertaken to preserve, to the extent possible, the hilltops and slopes that are a part of this site. The design of Melford takes great care to highlight the site's natural amenities it terrain. To this end, this open space network connects previously isolated open spaces and natural areas, minimizes grading, and encourages the proliferation of native vegetation and wildlife habitats.

(ii) Excessive grading of hilltops and slopes should be avoided where there are reasonable alternatives that will preserve a site's natural landforms;

Response: Melford is designed with buildings grouped on small blocks. This strategy not only provides for a more dynamic juxtaposition of densities and uses, but also allows for large quantities and contiguous dedicated open space, reducing the need for substantial regarding.

In other words, through the densification of the built development, more land is reserved for open space. This allows minimal amounts of grading and removal of existing vegetation. Moreover, the parking for a large portion of Melford's proposed residential program is located in a structured garage or in garages located under the footprint of the buildings. This technique minimizes the amount of land required for surface parking, and in turn, further minimizes the need for regarding.

(iii) Grading and other methods should be considered to buffer incompatible land uses from each other;

Response: As a mixed-use development, Melford's design assures that the non-residential uses are quite compatible with residential uses. This is achieved through a balanced mix of commercial uses, appropriate buffering, and a clear definition of front and rear access for all uses. In the cases where commercial uses are located adjacent to residential uses, adequate buffering is provided. These areas are designed in a variety of configurations ranging from material buffers, such as increased soundproofing in walls or floors to actual spatial buffers like planting areas or tree stands. It is, however, not the intent of this design, to segregate uses completely, rather to find the appropriate buffer for each situation in order to create a mixed-use environment where all the uses are more successful because of their are adjacencies.

Where buffers are required Melford hosts a variety of buffer solutions. For example, the applicant considers the natural topography, as well as the trees, streams and other ecological features on the property to be an essential component to the overall development at the site. The natural assets of the
site serve a prominent role in providing natural buffers and scenery that allows for a setting by which the variety of proposed uses can coexist in a harmonious fashion. Buffers without naturally occurring woody vegetation and/or graded areas will be afforested or reforested with native woody vegetation where practicable.

(iv) Where steep slopes cannot be avoided, plant materials of varying forms and densities should be arranged to soften the appearance of the slope; and

Response: Development of Melford will be in compliance with this standard. The landscape strategy will employ native woody vegetation or ground covers to achieve this end.

(vi) Drainage devices should be located and designed so as to minimize the view from public areas.

Response: Development of Melford will be in compliance with this standard.

X. COMPLIANCE WITH 27-274(8). SERVICE AREAS.

(A) Service areas should be accessible, but unobtrusive. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

(i) Service areas should be located away from primary roads, when possible;

Response: When possible, service areas will be located away from primary roads.

(ii) Service areas should be located conveniently to all buildings served;

Response: Services areas will be located conveniently to all buildings served.

(iii) Service areas should be effectively screened or enclosed with materials compatible with the primary structure; and

Response: Service areas, such as those that will support the employment areas within Melford, will be well screened. The employment uses within Melford are not intended to require large amounts of outdoor storage and equipment. Outdoor storage will not be allowed at all within Melford.
However, in the case that small amounts of equipment are required, such as trash receptacles, they will be screened and located to minimize their visual presence. In addition, equal design care will be given to both the fronts of buildings as well as service area behind them, providing a high quality architectural environment throughout the entire employment areas.

(iv) **Multiple building developments should be designed to form service courtyards which are devoted to parking and loading uses and are not visible from public view.**

**Response:** As stated previously, Melford has been designed with a network of streets and blocks, Buildings, will line the perimeter of these blocks framing the space of the streets, providing parking and service areas internal to the block. These arrangement will effectively screen the parking and loading from view in conformance with this requirement.

### XI. COMPLIANCE WITH SEC. 27-274(9) PUBLIC SPACES

(A) A public space system should be provided to enhance a large-scale commercial, mixed-use, or multifamily development. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

(i) **Buildings should be organized and designed to create public spaces such as plazas, squares, courtyards, pedestrian malls, or other defined spaces;**

**Response:** The open spaces that are provided adjacent to the employment areas include many usable public spaces. These spaces are arranged in a variety of forms ranging from formally composed plazas and squares, to idiosyncratically-shaped tree preserves and parks. All of these open spaces are connected by a series of sidewalks, paths, and trails providing ample access from employment areas.

(ii) **The scale, size, shape, and circulation patterns of the public spaces should be designed to accommodate various activities;**

**Response:** Development of Melford will be in compliance with this standard.

(iii) **Public spaces should generally incorporate sitting areas, landscaping, access to the sun, and protection from the wind;**

**Response:** Sitting areas will be appropriately located on site and attention will be given to areas which provide access to the sun and protection from
the wind. Aesthetically pleasing landscaping will be one of the features of Melford.

(iv) Public spaces should be readily accessible to potential users; and

Response: Public spaces will be readily accessible to potential users through the use of trail systems, pathways, sidewalks and appropriate signage.

(v) Pedestrian pathways should be provided to connect major uses and public spaces within the development and should be scaled for anticipated circulation.

Response: The arrangements of streets and public greens provide a hierarchical network of open spaces, vehicular thoroughfares and pedestrian paths to and from the Patuxent River.

XII. COMPLIANCE WITH SEC. 27-274(10). ARCHITECTURE.

(A) When architectural considerations are referenced for review, the Conceptual Site Plan should include a statement as to how the architecture of the buildings will provide a variety of building forms, with a unified, harmonious use of materials and styles.

Response: The development of Melford will be held to a high aesthetics standard. As an added measure, a series of design guidelines will be implemented to ensure materials, orientation, and architectural design of employment buildings will be of the highest quality.

(B) The guidelines shall only be used in keeping with the character and purpose of the proposed type of development and the specific zone in which it is to be located.

(C) These guidelines may be modified in accordance with Section 27-277.

XIII. COMPLIANCE WITH SEC. 27-274(11). TOWNHOUSES AND THREE-FAMILY DWELLINGS.

(A) Open space areas, particularly areas separating the rears of buildings containing townhouses, should retain, to the extent possible, single or small groups of mature trees. In areas where trees are not proposed to be retained, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or the District Council, as applicable, that specific site conditions warrant the clearing of the area. Preservation of individual
trees should take into account the viability of the trees after the development of the site.

Response: Recreation areas and activity centers will be designed to serve as focal points for development. Large portions of the areas surrounding the proposed residential development will be reserved as undisturbed space where existing trees can and will be preserved. However, any townhouse style condominiums to be developed on this site will be served by rear alleys or parking areas. Such arrangements make the preservation of significant number of mature trees difficult. However, the applicant will make every effort to preserve selected specimen trees, where practicable.

(B) Groups of townhouses should not be arranged on curving streets in long, linear strips. Where feasible, groups of townhouses should be at right angles to each other, and should facilitate a courtyard design. In a more urban environment, consideration should be given to fronting the units on roadways.

Response: The proposed plan is arranged in a rectilinear network of streets, in a series of blocks with parking in the rear either under the buildings or in mid-block parking areas. All units will front on roadways.

(C) Recreational facilities should be separated from dwelling units through techniques such as buffering, differences in grade, or preservation of existing trees. The rears of buildings, in particular, should be buffered from recreational facilities.

Response: This requirement shall be met. The existing historic structure, the Melford House, sits with a greens space that provides an ample buffer to any proposed dwelling unit. Other recreational facilities that may be proposed will be adequately buffered from adjacent dwellings.

(D) To convey the individuality of each unit, the design of abutting units should avoid the use of repetitive architectural elements and should employ a variety of architectural features and designs such as roofline, window and door treatments, projections, colors, and materials. In lieu of this individuality guideline, creative or innovative product design may be utilized.

Response: This requirement shall be met. The Melford Site Plan will include a set of Design Guidelines which will require individuality of unit design for abutting units.

(E) To the extent feasible, the rears of townhouses should be buffered from public rights-of-way and parking lots. Each application shall include a visual mitigation plan that identifies effective buffers between the rears
of townhouses abutting public rights-of-way and parking lots. Where there are no existing trees, or the retention of existing vegetation is not practicable, landscaping, berming, fencing, or a combination of these techniques may be used. Alternatively, the applicant may consider designing the rears of townhouse buildings such that they have similar features to the fronts, such as reverse gables, bay windows, shutters, or trim.

**Response:** Rears of townhouses will not face any public rights-of-way. Where the rears of townhouse style condominiums abut parking lots, fencing and or a planting strip with evergreen trees will provide a buffer and screen these homes from public view.

(F) Attention should be given to the aesthetic appearance of the offsets of buildings.

**Response:** As stated previously, the design of Melford will be held to the highest aesthetic standards. The Design Guidelines that will accommodate the site plan submission will specifically address the appearance of the offsets of buildings.

### XIV. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 27-276 (b). REQUIRED FINDINGS.

(1) The Planning Board may approve a Conceptual Site Plan if it finds that the Plan represents a most reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without deterring substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use. If it cannot make this finding, the Planning Board may disapprove the Plan.

**Response:** For the aforementioned reasons, we believe that our Conceptual Site Plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without deterring substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

(2) The Planning Board may approve a Conceptual Site Plan for a Mixed-Use Planned Community in the E-I-A or M-X-T Zone if it finds that the property and the Plan satisfy all criteria for M-X-T Zone approval in Part 3, Division 2; the Plan and proposed development meet the purposes and applicable requirements of the M-X-T Zone; the Plan meets all requirements stated in the definition of the use; and the Plan shows a reasonable alternative for satisfying, in a high-quality, well-integrated mixed-use community, all applicable site design guidelines.

**Response:** As demonstrated by our Conceptual Site Plan, we believe that our proposal satisfies all criteria for the M-X-T zone as set forth in Part 3, Division 2 of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance. Further, as discussed our Plan meets the purposes and applicable requirements of the M-X-T zone, is consistent with the requirements
stated in the definition of the use, and shows a reasonable alternative for satisfying, in a high-quality, well-integrated mixed-use community, all applicable site design guidelines.

For all the above-stated reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the attached conceptual site plans for the subject property should be approved.

Respectfully submitted,

John P. McDonough
Attorney for Applicant

Traci R. Scudder
Attorney for Applicant
May 24, 2005

Mr. John Funk
Supervisor, Community Planning Division
Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission
County Administration Building
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

Dear John:

I am writing to follow up on our meeting as to the procedure for consideration of the M-X-T Zone for some or all of the 467 +/- acres at the intersection of Md. Route 301 and U.S. 50, i.e., Melford owned by my client, MIE Properties, Inc. As you know from my testimony at the Joint Hearing, we have requested a rezoning of 179 +/- acres of the property to the M-X-T Zone, with the remaining 288 +/- acres being retained in the E-I-A Zone. The main reason we urged retention of that property in the E-I-A Zone is that it has either been actually developed or been approved for Specific Design Plan(s) by the Planning Board. After reviewing this issue with you and the Zoning Division, and, after consultation with Faroll Harner, Chief, Development Review, you believe the Planning Board can recommend Findings in the adoption of the Sectional Map Amendment affirming that these approved Specific Design Plans will become approved detailed site plans in the M-X-T Zone. It was further the consensus of the Staff this was the preferred approach, rather than divide the property into two distinct zones, i.e. M-X-T and E-I-A (even though they have a similar mixed use purpose).

We are agreeable to this procedural approach, i.e. rezone the entire property M-X-T (contingent, of course, on the Findings affirming the approved site plans). Of course if the property is retained E-I-A, we would renew processing A-9401, our amended Basic Plan application, which includes a Planned Environmental Preservation Community (“PEPC”). We do not intend to renew processing that amended Basic Plan, though, until a decision is made during the SMA work sessions as to which mixed use zone the property will be placed into, i.e., M-X-T Zone or retained in its current E-I-A.

Finally, as you know, we have filed an M-X-T Concept Plan for the entire property as part of the record of the Sectional Map Amendment. We are agreeable to work with your Staff to draft...
Prince George’s County District Council
Prince George’s County Planning Board
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772

Re: Chesley/Gibraltar properties at the northeast corner of
U.S. 301 and Mill Branch Road
Bowie Master Plan/SMA

Dear District Council and Planning Board Members:

Please accept this letter into the record of the joint public hearing on the Bowie & Vicinity Master Plan on behalf of the owners, Gibraltar Management Company and W. F. Chesley Real Estate, Inc. We respectfully request that the property be placed in the C-S-C Zone with the adoption of the Sectional Map Amendment and wholly retained in the Developing Tier with the Adoption and Approval of the Master Plan.

“Given its proximity to the Bowie Regional Center” (p.12 Draft Master Plan) and physical location in the southeast quadrant of the interchange of Route 197 and 301, the alignment and configuration of this interchange will also have a major influence on the appropriate use and development of this property. The entire property is oriented to and visible from this interchange and from Route 301 making it unsuitable for residential development from a visual as well as noise corridor perspective. As recommended by the draft Master Plan map itself, commercial land use (red) is the most appropriate use of the property in this location. In conjunction with this recommendation, the C-S-C zone is the most appropriate zone for adoption by the Sectional Map Amendment to reflect and uphold the Master Plan recommendation. Retaining the property in a residential zone is inappropriate and conflicts with the Master Plan recommendation. The current draft Master Plan recommendation for future filing of a comprehensive design zone application for the property is unnecessary. We can accomplish the guidelines of the Master Plan for this site (p.12) stated as development to include “high-end department stores” and “a pedestrian/hiker/biker system that is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian and biking activity with the development with connections to the Green Branch Regional Park and Prince George’s Stadium” through the use of the C-S-C zone. The zone’s inherent use restrictions as well as my long history and track record for high quality development in Prince George’s County will achieve the intent of the Master Plan’s recommendation. Approval of the C-S-C Zone at this time would meet the purpose of the Sectional Map Amendment process, to “bring the zoning of the planning area into conformance with the land use plan” (p. 79 draft Master Plan).
Based on the above discussions, as well as orientation of the property, proximity to the interchange, and sewerability, the entire property is appropriately located in the Developing Tier as previously determined in 2002. As you are aware this property was reviewed in significant detail at time of adoption of the General Plan. The decision was made at that time to place the entire property in the Developing Tier. As the City of Bowie Staff Report on the draft Master Plan itself points out (p. 8, April 22, 2005), “The property was given the Developing Tier designation as well as a Water and Sewer Plan category change by the County Council at that time, despite the objections [of the City]”. To reverse this recent decision and place part of the property in the Rural Tier would be contrary to the intent of both the Developing and Rural Tier Criteria of the General Plan. Specifically, the Approved General Plan, page 36, lists one of the goals of the Developing Tier as to “encourage contiguous expansion of development where public facilities and services can be more efficiently provided” and one of the goals of the Rural Tier as to “allow large lot estate residences”. This property is contiguous to significant public facilities and inappropriate for large lot estate development. The correct Developing Tier designation for this property was implemented with the adoption of the 2002 General Plan.

Additionally, based upon a recent meeting between myself, my partner Gibraltar Management and M-NCPPC, access to the adjacent 350± acre park to be developed by M-NCPPC in the immediate future can be accomplished most safely and expeditiously with public access through the subject property. Gibraltar Management and I are willing to grant this access and build a permanent access road provided the property is zoned C-S-C and wholly retained in the Developing Tier. Specifically, M-NCPPC would be provided with a temporary public access easement, fifty (50) feet in width, from Mill Branch Road along the southeastern property line of the subject property to provide immediate access to the parkland. This temporary access easement will be converted to a full, permanent access road by the property owners at the time of the development of the property with the necessary ongoing access easements to the M-NCPPC.

Lastly, it is requested that a portion of the M-NCPPC owned property to the northeast of the subject property also be placed in the C-S-C zone. I understand that M-NCPPC foresees that a portion of the park property will not be needed to develop the park. Thus, if M-NCPPC chooses to surplus the property it can be conveyed to a future purchaser at commercial land prices, rather than residential, which will produce far greater financial resources for the M-NCPPC.

Thank you for your consideration of placing the subject property in the C-S-C zone and retaining its Developing Tier designation in its entirety.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William F. Chesley
President

cc: Ms. Linda Ryan
    Mr. Richard Grossman
    Ms. Michele LaRocca
May 25, 2005

The Honorable Samuel H. Dean, Chairman
Prince George’s County Council
County Administration Building, 2nd Floor
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

The Honorable Elizabeth M. Hewlett, Chairman
Prince George’s County Planning Board
County Administration Building, 4th Floor
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

Re: Preliminary Master Plan and Proposed Sectional Map Amendment for Bowie and Vicinity

Dear Chairmen:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment for the record on the Preliminary Master Plan and Proposed Sectional Map Amendment for Bowie and Vicinity ("Bowie Plan") on behalf of Shelter Development ("Shelter"). As you may be aware, Shelter is a regional developer of multifamily, condominium and age restricted communities and is the contract purchaser of the 13 acre site owned by Dimensions and adjacent to its Bowie Health Campus. The property is located at the southwest quadrant of the Maryland 197/US 50 intersection. Within the Bowie Plan it is the site that is proposed for multifamily dwellings and R-18 zoning.

Shelter concurs with this recommendation and previously, as a part of the staff process, provided information to Staff and the City of Bowie in support of this type of development. The property is very proximate to the Bowie Town Center and Bowie Health Campus and thus uniquely situated to add to the new urban town setting being developed at this general location. Shelter has had substantial experience in the review and resolution of design, construction and marketing issues that arise in similar projects which are deemed to be successful. To that end, our comments are provided with reference to some of the Bowie Plan “textural content” which may need to be modified in order to provide sufficient flexibility during the review process for the anticipated development proposal.

The Bowie Plan, on pages 14-15, expresses “Site Design” criteria that include (a) [a] minimum requirement of 75% of the parking should be in garages, and (b), the development should be a gated community with a security system to open the front gate. As regards item (a) some balance will need to be struck between the constraints of the site, which may ultimately dictate a high percentage of enclosed parking and the high cost of structured parking, which should not be mandated in a manner such that it becomes market prohibitive.
To that end, it is suggested the minimum requirement be expressed in spaces per approved dwelling unit and the appropriate number should be a \( \frac{1}{2} \) space per unit. This allows for space considerations, creation of market (desired spaces for which residents will be willing to pay a premium) and design limitations.

Relative to the latter, generally residents are more concerned about building security (i.e. front door security) and often the presence of a gate causes a concern relative to crime, or a perception thereof, in an area. Additionally, gated communities cause issues for visitors (in an aged restricted community, visitors are encouraged) and as with other development design items, there must be a market demand. This is not a design feature that is common in the area and doubt exists as to its appropriateness.

The Building Design section of the Bowie Plan expresses that (a) high quality materials that are durable and attractive should be used on the facades of all proposed buildings. Exterior Insulation and Finish Systems (EIFS), concrete, concrete masonry units, and vinyl siding are discouraged. The desire for high quality finish materials is shared by Shelter. When properly used, EIFS has been blended with other materials to create a contrast and provide a high quality appearance. Examples of this exist in a variety of uses (office, multifamily and hospitality) throughout the area including Bowie Town Center. Thus, we recommend the reference to discouraging use of Exterior Insulation and Finish Systems (EIFS) be deleted.

The remaining Site and Building Design criteria we also believe to be appropriate for the property and for the review of any development proposal submitted thereon.

Additionally, Shelter would like to comment on the response of the City of Bowie to the Bowie Plan, specifically as it relates to the Dimensions property under contract to Shelter. The City’s response indicates a preference to zone the site M-U-TC or M-X-T to allow for potential medical office.

While the overall site is 13.08 acres, the land has many constraints that make a significant percentage of it unusable due to flood plain, wetlands, dedication of a portion of the property for the walkway bridge, a large MDOT detention pond and water and sewer main easements that divide the property. The total useable land is 7.33 acres. This useable portion is bisected by the sewer easement noted which further reduces the potential development of this site. The lot is also difficult to develop due to its irregular shape. The zoning designations that the city has proposed require a mix of office and residential and also a mix of residential types. Any proposed layout for dwellings and parking will use a significant portion of the developable land. Additionally, the relocation of the MDOT pond as well as the enlargement of the pond for the stormwater will most likely absorb the remaining land from the site.

These site constraints, along with potential market constraints, do not make development of a mixed-use product on the site, feasible. As well, there is unlikely to be sufficient street or pedestrian traffic to support retail at the site, as most retailers will continue to prefer to be within the perimeter of the existing Bowie Town Center. If the community were required to be gated, such an impediment to consumer traffic further negates or reduces this as a possibility.
The demand for an office product developed with residential also appears marginal. There are currently plans nearby to build over 100,000 SF of office and the land at the Northeast quadrant of 50 and 301 (Maryland Technology Center) has available land for office type buildings. As such, the highest and best use for the site is an upscale residential project as proposed in the Bowie Plan.

We thank you for your consideration and will be present at your worksession, should you or any member have additional questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

André J. Gingles, Esquire

cc: The Honorable Douglas J. J. Peters, Prince George's County Council
    The Honorable G. Fredrick Robinson, Mayor, City of Bowie
    Clerk of the County Council
    Wendy Irminger, M-NCPPC
TO: Wendy Irmiger  
    John Funk  

FROM: Gregory Dressel  
    David Zimmerman  

SUBJECT: Bowie Master Plan Revision

We understand the Prince George's County Planning Board is presently making revisions to Bowie area master plan. We own property on Maryland Route 450, Annapolis Road in Bowie. The property is currently zoned CSC. For a small business as our's, the expense of pursuing zoning changes thru the county's normal channels would be a financial burden. If the zoning were to be changed from it's current CSC to CM, it would enable us to operate and grow our business at this location in Bowie. We would appreciate your consideration in this matter.

Thank You

[Signature]

Gregory Dressel  
David Zimmerman
BOWIE & VICINITY
Preliminary Master Plan & Proposed
Sectional Map Amendment

Exhibit 84

NGSTON, LEVITAN & SILVER, LLC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

HAND DELIVERED

The Honorable Samuel H. Dean
Chairman
Prince George's County Council
Sitting as the District Council
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

Re: Bowie & Vicinity Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment,
Turner Property

Dear Chairpersons Dean and Hewlett:

This letter is written on behalf of Coscan-Adler Limited Partnership, the
applicant for Special Exception SE-4529 for a Planned Retirement Community on the
property consisting of 83.91 acres and located at the northeast quadrant of the Route 50
(John Hanson Highway) overpass of Route 193 (Enterprise Road) (the "Property"). The
applicant is pleased that the 1991 Master Plan for Bowie is undergoing a revision and
anxious to take this opportunity to offer comments on the Preliminary Master Plan and
Proposed Sectional Map Amendment for Bowie and Vicinity (the "Preliminary Master
Plan"), as it pertains to the Property.

A. Background

The Property is currently zoned R-E ("Residential Estate") and is largely isolated
from the surrounding community as it is solely accessible via Route 193, is bordered on
the south by Route 50, on the east by the Fairwood Planned Development, and on the
north by the Marleigh Planned Development, its internal parkland, as well as a few
large-lot single family residential units. Within the context of the 1991 Bowie,
Collington, Mitchellville & Vicinity Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map
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Further, recommendations for the community in the 1991 Master Plan were described in this way:

This community is recommended to develop in a comprehensive planned manner resulting in distinct neighborhoods and/or villages having an overall planned community character. Given the expanse of the turf farm operations, the large undeveloped tracts, and naturally wooded tributaries, an opportunity exists to create a planned community which incorporates the Plan's living area principals and takes advantage of natural features. ... Notwithstanding the planned community designation for the area, it is appropriate to consider low-density comprehensive development techniques as an alternative to traditional estate development for the large, mostly undeveloped lands along Enterprise Road...

Developed in accordance with the land use recommendations of this Plan, Community VI will grow from 251 existing dwellings to a buildout of 3,375 dwellings. This corresponds to an increase in population from 774 persons to approximately 9,150 persons.

Please see 1991 Master Plan at 87.

Generally, the 1991 Master Plan envisioned an increased population for Community VI, placing great emphasis on the “planned development” of the community.

B. Senior Housing Design Guidelines in the Developing Tier May Exclude Premier Properties

The Preliminary Master Plan continues to recommend R-E Zoning of the Property, and recommends the Property for Residential Low-Density land-use. The Preliminary Master Plan also locates the Property in the Developing Tier, as established through the 2002 Prince George's County General Plan. In a list of overall planning issues for the Developing Tier the “need for senior housing” is included in the Preliminary Master Plan. Please see Preliminary Master Plan at 9. To meet this need, strategies for development of the Developing Tier include providing “high-value housing in a variety of price ranges and types” by enacting “housing regulations that incorporate features (such as one-level residences, ramps, low-maintenance yards, transit shelters) that enable people of all ages to remain in housing as they age or develop disabilities that affect their mobility." Please see Preliminary Master Plan at 10. The Preliminary Master Plan also recommends:
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Re. Preliminary Master Plan and Proposed
Sectional Map Amendment for Bowie and
Vicinity; Hall Road Village Activity Center

Dear Chairmen Dean and Hewlett:

On behalf of Devonshire Investment, LLC, I am writing to address the recommendation contained in the Preliminary Master Plan and Proposed Sectional Map Amendment for Bowie and Vicinity for the 14.6 acres of land located immediately south and west of the City of Bowie, on the north side of Central Avenue (MD Route 214) and on the south side of Hall Road. This property is commonly referred to as the Hall Road Property (the “Hall Road Property”).

In 1990, the Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville and Vicinity Master Plan was adopted by the Prince George’s County Planning Board of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (the “Adopted Master Plan”). The Adopted Master Plan recommends the retention of the Hall Road Property in the R-R Zone but designates this property as the site of a future village activity center. The Adopted Master Plan specifically notes that at the time of its adoption (1990) there were sufficient commercial uses distributed throughout the planning area, but as a result of the emerging residential development in the Central Avenue and Church Road Communities, there would be a need for additional commercial development in the future. Thus, this recommendation to designate this property as the site of a village activity center was made to address the future growth in the surrounding community.
Finally, the Preliminary Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity designates the Hall Road Property as a future library site. However, such a recommendation is premature given the pending application to rezone the Hall Road Property and given the fact this property is in private ownership. The Preliminary Master Plan makes a number of recommendations as to the location of other public facilities throughout the Planning Area. However, each of the other sites is in public ownership and therefore viable sites for public uses. The designation of the Hall Road Property for a public use anticipates a future acquisition of the property by Prince George's County. In light of this, the removal of the designation of the Hall Road Property as the site of a future village activity center would appear to be an attempt to lessen the value of the property for a later acquisition by eminent domain proceedings.

In light of the above, Devonshire Investment, LLC would respectfully request the Hall Road Property retain the designation as the site of a future village activity center in the Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and that this property be placed in the L-A-C Zone in the Sectional Map Amendment.

Sincerely,

KNIGHT, MANZI, NUSSBAUM & LAPLACA, P.A.

By: [Signature]

cc: Gary Rappaport
    Redis Floyd, Clerk of the Council
May 29, 2005

The Honorable Samuel Dean  
Chairman, Prince George's District Council  
County Administration Building  
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

The Honorable Elizabeth Hewlett  
Chairman, Prince George's County Planning Board  
County Administration Building  
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

Re: Preliminary Master Plan and Proposed Sectional Map Amendment  
for Bowie and Vicinity

Dear Chairman Dean and Chairman Hewlett:

I represent the Kirk-Martin Real Estate Investment Partnership, which is the owner of certain real property described as Parcel 31 on Prince George's County Tax Map 29, Grid A-2, located on the south side of Duckettown Road. Within the proposed SMA, this property is shown to be located within the area noted as Change No. 8, on page 90 of the Plan. This proposed change includes my client's property within a larger area upon which a Development District Overlay Zone ("DDOZ") is to be superimposed. Although a core area of Old Bowie is proposed to be rezoned to the M-U-I (mixed-use infill) zone, as shown in proposed Change No. 9, the SMA proposal would leave my client's property within its current R-R zone, but with a DDOZ overlay.

My client suggests that the M-U-I zone be expanded to coincide with the proposed DDOZ, being all of Change No. 8. Additionally, we request that the proposed DDOZ be expanded to also include Parcel A, immediately west of the westernmost boundary of the DDOZ, as proposed. Parcel A is parkland that is currently owned by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and while publically-owned, this should, I submit, logically be included within this proposed development area as well.
The M-U-I zone is, as you well understand, a very flexible zone that promotes redevelopment and revitalization. The combination of a DDOZ overlay with the underlying M-U-I zone is a combination that will certainly help promote the redevelopment of the Old Bowie area, with the establishment of development standards that can help to maintain the character of this area. I suggest that the proposal to limit the M-U-I zoning to the core area as shown in Change No. 9 is far too limiting, and will have the effect of inhibiting the revitalization of this entire area.

For all of the above-stated reasons, therefore, I respectfully suggest that if a DDOZ is to be superimposed upon all of the area shown as Change No. 8 within the proposed SMA, that the entire area of Change No. 8 also be rezoned to the M-U-I zone. Additionally, I also request that the area of the proposed DDOZ, and also the underlying M-U-I zone, be expanded to include Parcel A, immediately west of the proposed westernmost boundary, as well.

Thank you for your kind attention to all of the above. If you have any questions, or require additional information, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Lawrence M. Taub

LNT/mp

cc: Kirk-Martin Real Estate Investment Partnership

Mr. Stanley Robinson
Oakhurst Development
May 29, 2005

The Honorable Samuel Dean  
Chairman, Prince George's District Council  
County Administration Building  
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

The Honorable Elizabeth Hewlett  
Chairman, Prince George's County Planning Board  
County Administration Building  
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772

Re: Preliminary Master Plan and Proposed Sectional Map Amendment  
for Bowie and Vicinity

Dear Chairman Dean and Chairman Hewlett:

I represent the Kirk-Martin Real Estate Investment Partnership, which is the owner of certain real property described as Parcel 31 on Prince George's County Tax Map 29, Grid A-2, located on the south side of Duckettown Road. Within the proposed SMA, this property is shown to be located within the area noted as Change No. 8, on page 90 of the Plan. This proposed change includes my client's property within a larger area upon which a Development District Overlay Zone (“DDOZ”) is to be superimposed. Although a core area of Old Bowie is proposed to be rezoned to the M-U-I (mixed-use infill) zone, as shown in proposed Change No. 9, the SMA proposal would leave my client's property within its current R-R zone, but with a DDOZ overlay.

My client suggests that the M-U-I zone be expanded to coincide with the proposed DDOZ, being all of Change No. 8. Additionally, we request that the proposed DDOZ be expanded to also include Parcel A, immediately west of the westernmost boundary of the DDOZ, as proposed. Parcel A is parkland that is currently owned by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and while publically-owned, this should, I submit, logically be included within this proposed development area as well.
Chairman Dean and Chairman Hewlett  
May 27, 2005  
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The M-U-I zone is, as you well understand, a very flexible zone that promotes redevelopment and revitalization. The combination of a DDOZ overlay with the underlying M-U-I zone is a combination that will certainly help promote the redevelopment of the Old Bowie area, with the establishment of development standards that can help to maintain the character of this area. I suggest that the proposal to limit the M-U-I zoning to the core area as shown in Change No. 9 is far too limiting, and will have the effect of inhibiting the revitalization of this entire area.

For all of the above-stated reasons, therefore, I respectfully suggest that if a DDOZ is to be superimposed upon all of the area shown as Change No. 8 within the proposed SMA, that the entire area of Change No. 8 also be rezoned to the M-U-I zone. Additionally, I also request that the area of the proposed DDOZ, and also the underlying M-U-I zone, be expanded to include Parcel A, immediately west of the proposed westernmost boundary, as well.

Thank you for your kind attention to all of the above. If you have any questions, or require additional information, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]  
Lawrence M. Taub

LNT/mp

cc: Kirk-Martin Real Estate Investment Partnership

Mr. Stanley Robinson  
Oakhurst Development
Greater Bowie
Chamber of Commerce

June 30, 2005

The Honorable Douglas J.J. Peters
Council Member, District 4
Prince George's County Council
County Administration Building
14741 Governor Oden-Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772

Dear Doug:

Enclosed please find the Greater Bowie Chamber's position on the pending Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan.

These recommendations were prepared by our Economic Development Committee and approved by our Greater Bowie Chamber Board of Directors.

I hope this input is valuable to you – give me a call if I can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

Art Widmann, CFP
President

cc: Joe Meinhardt
City of Bowie

Greater Bowie Chamber of Commerce
Board Members

6911 Laurel Bowie Road, Suite 302, Bowie, MD 20715
(301) 262-0920  -  Fax: (301) 262-0921
e-mail: info@bowiechamber.org
www.bowiechamber.org
June 4, 2005

To: Jimmy Marcos – President, GBCC
    Art Widmann – President-Elect, GBCC
    Ben Woolery – Immediate Past President

From: Joe Edwards
      Chairman, GBCC EDC

Re: Chamber's letter on the Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan & SMA

At the EDC meeting on Thursday, June 2, 2005 we were urged to write the County Council a letter outlining the Chamber's concerns and positions on the Bowie Plan & SMA. The deadline of June 1, 2005 has been extended to June 14.

Several people in attendance indicated they would help draft these concerns. As of this writing on June 4, I have heard from Ben Woolery, Becky Sunday, Bobby Hoffstetter, Dick Padgett and Joe Meinert. Two others, Mark Melvin and Ron Skotz, promised their input but have not contacted me with any information.

I suggest you frame the Chamber's response (Is it legally the GBCC position without a vote?), and send on Chamber stationery as soon as possible. I have provided some backup, some suggestions for the City and County ... and for a future workforce for the Chamber.

My personal views, without backup, are on a separate sheet.

I have taken the April 2005 Preliminary Master Plan and Proposed Sectional Map Amendment for Bowie and Vicinity, (MNCPPC) and the City of Bowie's response dated May 10, 2005. These I have used as a basis for our recommendations.

Additionally, I have letters from R. J. Sunday, Stuart Title, President Corridor Transportation, Robert Hoffstetter, etc. A City Overview Study done for PGC Workforce Services, SHA Reports, etc.
MARYLAND SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY CENTER (MSTC)

MNCPPC Preliminary Plan states this entire property should be developed with a moderate to high density mixture of office, residential, and parkland/open space uses.

- Average residential should not exceed eight dwelling units per acre.
- Historic buildings, vistas, etc. should be incorporated.

City of Bowie's proposal calls for the MSTC to remain as a major employment center. The City believes that a housing mix will not enhance the potential for high level employment in this Quadrant.

The Chamber has not taken a position. It may wish to recommend that this quadrant, and the northwest quadrant both be set-aside for a special study area. (See my backup notes.)

My personal opinion is to place a guideline of use mixes. When a level of jobs-on-site, of a minimum average income is in place, high density mid-rise condominiums, age/restricted be allowed to be developed on the site.

In 1979 the University of Maryland began an extensive search for the "right location" to develop a research park for the University. The concept was presented to Governor Harry Hughes who endorsed the program. On August 1, 1980, DECD Secretary Jim Roberson and the U of MD considered establishment of a State Research Authority similar to the Maryland Wholesale Food Authority. So 26 years later the City of Bowie and Prince George's County must address the continuing dilemma ... An employment center, a warehouse center, or mixed use residential and employment center.

The historic process included a far-sighted project that is more viable today than when it was proposed in June 1990. The Mid-Atlantic Center for Collaborative Education and Research (MAC-CER).

The MAC-CER would have been the facilitator for collaborative interactions between the tenants (high tech) of the campus ... The Bowie State University, US Naval Academy, NSA, NASA, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), etc. would become part of the MAC-CER. This writer believes this is still a viable program.

The Maryland Science and Technology Center (MSTC) was originally master planned (1982 County General Plan) as a full-service high-technology community designed around a center core of business services including retail (local-service), restaurants, a hotel, conference center, and similar supportive businesses to provide an environment tailored to the needs of growing high technology companies.

This flexible mix of business and support activities from research and development, light industry through sales and administration, corporate and regional headquarters and service centers, provides a productive and adaptable Regional Center.
While high technology businesses from telecommunications to information technology to biotechnology have changed in scope and growth patterns, there is still reason to believe that the MSTC could have significant employment development.

There have been instances in the past that Master Plans and Sectional Map Amendment processes have set aside areas as significant as the MSTC, as Special Study Areas. Perhaps this may be a solution to the property owners' interest in developing residential as part of a mixed use process, and the City of Bowie and Prince George's County's designation of the MSTC as a component of the County's "High Technology Triangle". A concentrated analysis by appropriate public and private leaders with the MSTC's Owner involved may help reach the optimum use and value for all concerned.

The location of the MSTC provides a most unique opportunity to the region that must not be lost. But then, this parcel of land has been in various stages of flux for almost three decades. A limited time study may resolve the major issues of all concerned.
BOWIE REGIONAL CENTER

This area, as proposed, has some natural boundaries but does not consider potential growth. The MSTC is not part of MNCPPC Regional Center. The proposal recommends that a transit hub be located in the Bowie Regional Center (BRC).

A multimodal pedestrian-friendly transportation system is envisioned. It calls for the establishment of a Transportation Management Agency to promote the area, encourage car/van pool, transit use, etc.

This appears to be another layer of government, where an independent community-based transit system such as the Corridor Transportation Corporation (CTC) could provide.

The Chamber should endorse the concept with recommendation that all 4 Quadrants of Rt. 50/301 be included in the Bowie Regional Center. The Zehner property should be part of the BRC. The Zehner property, because of its proximity to US Rt. 50, should be viewed as very low density if residential, and low rise commercial in the western portion of the property.
BOWIE MAIN STREET

Mainstreet should be linked, by a community-based transit system to Bowie State University, Rt. 197 Residential and Businesses, the Town Center, etc. The Bowie Main Street boundaries should begin at Sacred Heart Catholic Church and go east on Rt. 450 to the intersection of Rt. 197.

This would include several diverse housing communities, 4 shopping areas, a civic center with Bowie High School, St. Pius, Bowie Library, the Center for Performing Arts, the Racquet Club, the Community Center and several parks.

Accelerate Rt. 450 Improvements with appropriate streetscape as recommended by the SHA Rt. 450 Advisory Committee.

Encourage the three shopping centers on Rt. 450 to recognize the potential mixed use including small lot residential and/or age/restrictive mid-rise. The City and County may wish to consider converting some adjacent public property to increase residential yield.

The possibility of mixed use provides opportunities for additional pedestrian traffic utilizing the core centers. It would enhance the civic area's usage by nearby residents. Encourage mid-rise (1st floor retail-service, 2nd floor office, 3-5 residential condominium). Utilize mature vegetation and trees as buffers.

The Chamber recommends a Task Force including the 3 Shopping Center Owners, Public Schools, Library System, one or 2 small business owners, a City and County Representative to immediately look at this area and provide the County Council with a more mature proposal on Mainstreet. The Shopping Centers are in the planning stages, SHA is in the final Streetscape planning. Now is the time.
OLD TOWN BOWIE

The proposed plan calls for a Development District overlay Zone (DDOZ) for Old Town Bowie. The DDOZ covers several components: A Regulating Plan and Standard that regulate design elements, ranges of uses permitted in the Mixed Use Activity (M-U-I) zone. The proposed plan should be reviewed with the possibility of further study and a phasing plan where citizens and businesses can have more input into the process.

The Chamber has concerns regarding the Industrial Area in the Zug Road Industrial area being placed in the DDOZ. There is no valid reason for this process in an enclave that is isolated from the remainder of Old Town Bowie by railroad tracks and other boundaries. Historically, DDOZ’s do not address Industrial uses along with residential and business uses in the same processes.

The Vision for Old Town to become "what it was" is not necessarily a viable economic development plan.
WEST BOWIE VILLAGE

MNCPPC's vision is West Bowie Village (WBV) as a mixed-use center with residential, office, commercial and institutional uses integrated with open space in a pedestrian-friendly village setting.

The West Bowie Village is located west of the Railroad Tracks along old 450 and bounded by new 450 to the north. The western boundary is Church Rd./High Bridge Rd. There is about 145,000sf of retail and employment uses.

The MNCPPC has residential development on City Parkland. If this were limited to one-level-slab based, age restricted housing with dwelling designs compatible to WBV, it is conceivable that a live-work-customer community of about 50 residences might make the business economics more viable.

Property next to new 450 to the southside should be re-zoned commercial.

The Chamber supports WBV's business group but encourages them to become more involved in this process.
TRANSIT SYSTEM

In every part of the proposed plan there are references to transportation issues. The Chamber’s EDC has had several work sessions on these needs.

We point to a successful form of business/worker friendly, fixed-route bus service that has been performing a community service since 1989. The Corridor Transportation Corporation (CTC) is a private non-profit firm that could serve Bowie’s needs.

The Chamber should make a supportive effort for CTC to begin reviewing the area and provide the City and County with recommendations.

This will address many of our issues.
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The major issues in the proposed plan that I am recommending the Chamber comment on are:

- Maryland Science and Technology Center
- Bowie Main Street
- Regional Center
- Old Town Bowie
- West Bowie Village
- Senior Citizen Age/Restricted Housing
- Community-based Transit System

**Important**: Please review. Make changes, additions, corrections.

- Draft cover letter on GBCC Stationery.
- Send to Clerk of Council, City of Bowie, All Board Members, and GBCC EDC Members.

This must be done by June 13, 2005.

HJE:lb