

White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan – Worksession No. 4

 Nancy Sturgeon, Master Planner, Area 2 Planning Division, Nancy.Sturgeon@montgomeryplanning.org, 301.495.1308

 Khalid Afzal, Master Planner Supervisor, Area 2 Planning Division, Khalid.Afzal@montgomeryplanning.org, 301.495.4650

 Glenn Kreger, Chief, Area 2 Planning Division, Glenn.Kreger@montgomeryplanning.org, 301.495.4653

Completed: 07/11/13

Staff Recommendation:

Discuss and provide guidance to staff.

Planning Board members should bring their copies of the Public Hearing Draft Master Plan.

Summary

This packet is intended to serve as the staff report for all of the Planning Board's worksessions on the White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan. The attached issues matrix summarizes the oral and written testimony, provides staff responses, and indicates the Board's decisions as the worksessions proceed. The general topics to be covered in each worksession are listed below, but a session may cover more or less than the subjects outlined depending on the time and length of the discussions.

At the first worksession on June 20, the Board reviewed the testimony and staff's responses to the "General" items and most of the "Mobility" topics in the attached issues matrix (items 1-21). At the second worksession on June 27, the Board discussed several properties and made decisions on zoning and other issues that had been raised (items 22, 23, 28, and 29 on the issues matrix). Items 27 and 30 on the matrix do not require a Board decision; one notes a correction to be made to the proposed zoning map and the other is testimony in support of the Plan's zoning recommendations for several properties. At the third worksession on July 11, the Board will discuss zoning recommendations and several other property-specific issues (items 24, 25, and 26), designation of a historic site (item 31), and the staging recommendations (items 33-35). Depending on the outcome of the July 11 worksession, the Board may continue discussing staging on July 18, as well as other outstanding issues that may need to be addressed.

There are five Planning Board worksessions scheduled over six weeks in June and July, as shown below. At the Planning Board meeting on Wednesday, September 4, the Board is scheduled to review the Planning Board Draft of the Master Plan and approve it for transmittal to the County Executive and County Council. (Note: The Board is not meeting on Thursday, September 5 due to the Rosh Hashanah holiday.)

Planning Board worksessions are scheduled as follows:

- June 20, 2013 Worksession 1: Transportation
- June 27, 2013 Worksession 2: Land Use and Zoning
- July 11, 2013 Worksession 3: Land Use and Zoning, Historic Preservation, Staging
- July 18, 2013 Worksession 4: Implementation/Staging and outstanding issues
- July 25, 2013 Worksession 5: Design Guidelines and outstanding issues
- Sept. 4, 2013 Approve the Planning Board Draft for transmittal to the County Executive and County Council

Attachments:

Issues Matrix and Park Planning and Stewardship Division Staff Memorandum
O:\AREA_2\Master Plans\WOSG MP, active update\PB Worksessions\Worksession 4\cover memo

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
General						
1	Area-wide	Land Use-Transportation Balance	Pages 19-23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applaud staff for proposing Plan that is not “technically” in balance (Wilhelm/CAC) • Achieving balance would improve the Plan; consider small “tweaks” to land use (Finnegan) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieving balance by reducing recommended densities may stymie redevelopment and reinvestment and may make it more difficult for the area to support high quality transit. Postponing possible redevelopment has been tried in the past and many in the community have not been satisfied with the results. 	Board concurs with general direction of the Plan. (6/20/13)
2	Area-wide	Land Use: housing/ employment	Pages 19-20, 25-48, 97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No assurance of life sciences or other jobs; GP didn’t direct intensity to US 29 (Quinn) • Too much housing in Plan, don’t need more housing (Quinn) • Substantial residential increase is first step, “multiplier effect” will trigger job creation (Genn) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan is not dependent on life sciences jobs alone; other jobs, including high technology, will achieve the same objectives. • Recommendation for Stage 1 in the North White Oak/Cherry Hill Road Center limits residential to 1 million square feet. • Plan’s proposed CR Zones are flexible and could accommodate variety of commercial and residential uses. 	Board concurs with general direction of the Plan (6/20/13) and made property-specific zoning decisions (6/27/13, see below).
3	Area-wide	Jobs-Housing Ratio	Page 96	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J/H ratio would only be slightly improved (Quinn) • J/H imbalance is actually too little housing in relation to jobs (Genn) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ratio of jobs to housing units in an area is always dependent on the geographic boundaries. Staff estimates J/H ratio is currently 3.8/1 within Plan boundary and 1.6/1 in study area; with the proposed zoning/land use, it could be 4.4/1 within Plan area. • Increased J/H ratio within the Plan area is efficient from a transportation perspective; improving opportunities to live and work in area may reduce trips. May also increase travel in the off-peak direction. 	Board concurs with general direction of the Plan. (6/20/13)
Mobility Issues (Transit, Street Network, Pedestrians and Cyclists)						
4	Area-wide	No substantive issues to resolve.	Pages 49-68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports mixed-use, compact, walkable centers and staging • US 29 interchanges are in CTP, but are not funded • Reconcile this Plan with BRT Plan, as necessary • Various suggestions for minor edits and cross-referencing; SHA contact information provided for ongoing coordination (Halligan, MDOT) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While not funded, US 29 interchanges are not contemplated to be removed from the State’s Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) and are consistent with SHA’s long-range planning documents. • Staff will reconcile any inconsistencies between this Plan and the Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan (the “BRT Plan”) as the two plans proceed through the approval process. • Staff will address the suggested minor edits and cross-referencing of information. 	Board discussed US 29 interchanges; will revisit topic during staging discussion. (6/20/13)

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
5	Area-wide Land Use-Transportation; BRT assumptions	Pages 19-23, 49-68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concurs with need for US 29 interchanges; supports other roadway recommendations • Plan does not achieve land use-transportation balance under the TPAR roadway test • Plan assumes BRT corridors not yet approved by Council • Current NADMS should be documented (Gonzalez, MCDOT) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balance question is a key finding of the transportation analysis which speaks to the significant impact of regional through traffic and limited ability to introduce a more robust traffic network. The manner by which this finding will be addressed will be a policy decision. • The Plan will be modified, as appropriate, in accordance with the approved BRT Plan, including possible adjustments to ROW widths. • The current Non-Auto Driver Mode Share (NADMS) is 14% and was derived from the 2000 Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP); this information can be added to the Plan. 	Board discussed US 29 interchanges (6/20/13); will revisit topic during staging discussion.
6	Area-wide	Pages 52-58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions whether all intersections were tested; seems like there should be more “red dots” (Finnegan) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The critical intersections in the Plan area were evaluated. 	Staff notes that additional analysis (Highway Capacity Manual) is underway.
7	Area-wide		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area shouldn’t be constrained by regional traffic problems beyond County control (Pollin, Elmendorf, Bloom, Redicker) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impacts of regional traffic are reflected in the traffic analysis. How to handle the impacts of out-of-County traffic generally and US 29 congestion specifically are, ultimately, policy decisions. 	Board supports general direction of the Plan. (6/20/13)
8	Area-wide		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US 29 at capacity now; Plan will make bad situation worse (Hansen) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planned US 29 grade-separated interchanges will address capacity issues within the Plan area. • Intersections along US 29 south of the Plan area will exceed capacity regardless of the Plan. 	Board discussed US 29 interchanges (6/20/13); will revisit topic during staging discussion.
9	Area-wide Four Corners/ Woodmoor- Pincrest Citizens’ Association (WPCA) US 29		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes Plan: too much density will dramatically worsen traffic; promotes sprawl (Quinn) • More US 29 interchanges creates freeway to bottleneck at NH Ave-Four Corners (Quinn, Goemann) • Developers want to treat US 29 like I-495 to avoid LATR/TPAR-unacceptable to exempt them (Quinn, Goemann) • Developer assertions that majority of traffic is from outside County are overblown (Quinn) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan does not promote sprawl; it focuses future development in three distinct areas that will be served by BRT and limits the amount of development allowed until additional infrastructure is provided. • Additional interchanges are a long-standing SHA recommendation for US 29 that are reflected in the County’s Master Plans and SHA’s long-range planning documents. • Staff was asked to analyze the impacts of discounting traffic on US 29 (i.e., treating it like I-495 and I-270), but since it is not an interstate in its entirety, staff does not support this approach. • Staff does not support developer exemptions from LATR/TPAR. 	Board discussed US 29 interchanges (6/20/13); will revisit this and related topics during staging discussion.

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 intersections not analyzed • Route 29 Mobility Study should have been done to analyze corridor (Quinn, Goemann) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A significant proportion of US 29 traffic is estimated to originate from outside the County. Staff estimates that roughly half of the southbound traffic on US 29 in the vicinity of Cherry Hill/Randolph Road is currently external. This percentage is estimated to drop to roughly one-third in the context of the Plan. • All critical intersections within the Plan area were analyzed and a representative sample of intersections within the study area were analyzed. 		
10	BRT	Should lanes be taken from cars for BRT; i.e., repurposed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes taking lanes from cars for BRT south of White Oak (Graham) • Opposes lane repurposing; means more congestion, more cut through (Quinn) • Transit won't solve traffic congestion (Hansen, Goemann) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BRT Plan is addressing lane repurposing. Staff notes that more detailed study is needed to make a final determination on lane repurposing; an assessment of its feasibility was needed to determine ROW requirements. For the most constrained areas, such as US 29 south of White Oak, lane repurposing appears the only way to implement BRT since impacts/costs of building additional lanes would be too great. 	Board agrees to NH Ave. ROW of 120-130 feet for BRT. On Stewart Lane/ Lockwood Dr., ROW needs to change from 80 to 89 feet. (6/20/13)	
11	BRT	Should BRT have dedicated lanes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action Committee for Transit supports Plan, but need BRT in dedicated lanes (not in mixed traffic) on US 29 and NH Ave. (Reed, Dancis) • Supports BRT (Slater) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BRT Plan is addressing the level of treatment for BRT Corridors. • Mixed traffic, rather than dedicated lanes, is recommended where forecast BRT ridership was too low to warrant dedicated lanes and/or where traffic and/or property impacts would be too great. 	BRT Plan is addressing these issues.	
12	BRT	None.	Pages 63, 64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need Randolph/Cherry Hill Road BRT (Myo Khin) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff supports a BRT on Randolph/Cherry Hill Road; it is listed on page 63, shown on Map 13, page 64. 	No change to draft Plan.
13	Old Columbia Pike bridge	Should the Plan recommend the bridge be reopened?	Page 52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes reopening bridge to vehicular traffic (Davis-Isom, Simmons, Perlingiero, Federline, Spatafora, Esmark, Obie, Karns, Median, Mannos, Carter, Maydonovitch) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the area redevelops as envisioned in the Plan, improved vehicular circulation is necessary and options are limited; purpose of connection is for local circulation, not an alternate for US 29 commuter travel. 	A majority of the Board agrees to retain the Plan recommendation to reopen the bridge to vehicular traffic but text should note it is for local circulation. (6/20/13)

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
14	Calverton	The Plan will impact traffic in Calverton.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic is big concern, will create too much congestion on Cherry Hill Road and Calverton Blvd. (Karns, Kammel) Connect Industrial Pkwy to FDA Blvd; need intersection improvements all around; more bike paths (Karns) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calverton Boulevard and Cherry Hill Road will be impacted by traffic regardless of whether the Master Plan vision becomes reality. Plan recommends Industrial Parkway be extended and connected with FDA Boulevard. 	Board did not discuss; staff will raise at upcoming worksession.
15	Hillandale - Elton Road	Should classification of Elton Road be modified?	Pages 60-61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classification of Elton Road should reflect its dual nature as residential road with some commercial uses Trucks parked on Elton Road present hazard for residents Elton Road used as cut-through; volumes and speed pose risks for residents; proposed solutions aren't enough; need engineering solution (Finnegan, C. & J. Scott) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classification of Elton Road is currently Business District Street from New Hampshire Avenue to County line; residential classification could be considered for portion in front of single-family homes. Trucks parking on Elton Road is an operational, not a Master Plan, issue. Elton Road operational issues should be addressed by MCDOT in coordination with Prince George's County. 	Board agrees with staff suggestion to reclassify portion of Elton Road in front of single-family homes to a Primary Residential Street. (6/20/13)
16	Hillandale-National Labor College	Could there be alternative APF standards for Powder Mill and New Hampshire?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider alternative APF standards/policies to deal with Powder Mill/New Hampshire Avenue congestion (Peinovich) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CLV standards are for an entire policy area, not for a specific intersection. 	Board did not discuss; staff will raise this on 7-11-13.
17	Washington Adventist Hospital (WAH)	No substantive issue to resolve.	Pages 60-61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Show proposed road B-5 as private street with 60' width, without bus circulator; bike path on east side; text revisions submitted (Newmyer, Perrine, Morgan) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff agrees text can be revised to clarify that proposed road B-5 will remain a private street; will remove bus circulator and show on alternate streets, with language noting that operational decisions like the circulator route will be made later by DOT. 	Board agrees with staff suggestion to clarify B-5 as a private street and to make other noted changes. (6/20/13)
18	North White Oak/Cherry Hill Center	Removal of Trip Mitigation agreements	Page 99	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports recommendation to remove the trip reduction restrictions and proposes slight text revisions (Kominers) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff agrees with suggested text revision. 	Contingent on Legal Staff's review, Board agrees with suggested text revision. (6/20/13)

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
19	US 29 Bikeway	Should the type of bikeway recommended on US 29 be changed?	Pages 65-66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signed Shared Roadway on Colesville Road not sufficient; should at least be Shared Use Path (Filice, Cochrane) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff recommends that US 29 between Lockwood Drive and the Northwest Branch be changed to a Dual Bikeway with a signed shared roadway and a shared use path on the east side of the road. This will accommodate cyclists that want to ride on the road (few in this location) and those that want a protected bikeway. 	Board agrees with staff to add a shared use path in this segment. Board suggests additional language for areas with constrained ROW. (6/20/13)
20	Bikeways	No substantive issues to resolve.	Pages 65-66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Hampshire Avenue should have bike lanes (instead of signed shared roadway) if road is resurfaced (Cochrane) July Drive should be signed shared roadway (Cochrane) Bikeways that extend into Prince George’s should be coordinated (Halligan, MDOT) Plan should encourage private property owners to provide bike parking (Halligan, MDOT) Barriers on Old Columbia bridge inhibit cyclists (Halligan, MDOT) Bikeway through White Oak Shopping Center should be provided (Halligan, MDOT) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan recommends Dual Bikeway (DB-7) with shared use path and signed shared roadway. Plan could note that a cycle track and sidewalk should be considered in the future. Bikeway connection between Lockwood Drive and Old Columbia Pike in vicinity of July Drive may be possible if there is redevelopment as shown on illustrative (page 35). Proposed bike lanes on Powder Mill Road are consistent with Prince George’s County bikeway recommendation for its segment of the road. County code requires bicycle parking. Zoning Code Rewrite proposes updates to bicycle parking requirements as well. Plan recommends bridge be rebuilt, reopened; addressing bikeway “barriers” in interim is operational issue. Plan shows bikeway through shopping center (SP-63) that could occur with redevelopment. In interim, bike lane (LB-2) exists on Lockwood Drive and Stewart Lane. 	No change to draft Plan.
21	Bikeways and Pedestrians	No substantive issues to resolve.	Pages 65-66; 85-90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address several inconsistencies with bikeway recommendations; suggests pedestrian links in Parks section be referenced on page 65 (Halligan, MDOT) Improve walkability by using “paper” streets as formal paths; better maintenance needed (Finnegan) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff will clarify use of term “shared use path” on two illustratives as well as other minor edits. Staff agrees with suggestions to reference pedestrian connections discussed on pages 85-90 (Parks chapter) in the Bikeway and Pedestrian section (Transportation chapter, page 65) as well. Staff will consult with DOT regarding the future use of “paper” streets for pedestrian paths. Current maintenance of these areas is not a Master Plan issue. 	Minor changes will be made to draft Plan as noted in staff response column.

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
Property Specific Issues (Use, Zoning, Site Design)						
22	<p>White Oak Shopping Center</p> <p><i>Current Zone:</i> C-2</p> <p><i>Site Acres:</i> 28</p>	<p>Is recommended zoning/density for this site appropriate?</p> <p>Is recommended open space on this site appropriate?</p>	<p><i>Proposed Zone:</i> CR-2.5 C-1.5 R-1.5 H-200 (page 31 #1, 36)</p> <p>Open spaces (page 87)</p> <p>Illustrative (page 35) shows grid, open spaces, and FDA connection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs CR-3.5 C-3.0 R-3.0 H-250 to support redevelopment Opposes on-site neighborhood green urban park, but not urban plaza Illustrative should show more of a grid in this node per developer’s drawing County initiative needed to encourage FDA and private property owners to create connection between FDA and Lockwood Drive (Downie) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff’s recommended density for this site is substantial (3 million square feet). Owner’s requested density and height is not appropriate outside a CBD or Metro station area and was not modeled for transportation impacts. The two-acre neighborhood green urban park (and the .75-acre urban plaza) on this 28-acre site represents 7% open space (gross tract). CR optional method projects of 6 or more acres must provide minimum public use space of 10% (net tract area), approximately 2.8 acres. Intent of illustrative is to indicate desire for additional future connections should redevelopment occur; staff has shown connections along property lines and has avoided placing them through lots and buildings; Plan text can encourage more connections if redevelopment occurs. Staff agrees that language could be added regarding County initiative, but connection requires property owner agreement and possible private redevelopment. 	<p>Board agrees with Plan’s proposed zoning. (6/27/13)</p>
23	<p>11120 NH Av</p> <p><i>Current Zone:</i> C-2/C-O</p> <p><i>Site Acres:</i> 4.18</p>	<p>Should zoning density and height be increased?</p>	<p><i>Proposed Zone:</i> CRT-1.5 C-1.0 R-0.75 H-50 (page 31 #2, 37)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan density and height offers no redevelopment opportunity; property owner requests minimum 2.0 FAR and 65’ height (P. Harris) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overall recommended zoning density is comparable to the existing zone and height is eight feet more than currently allowed; housing is additional use in CR. Site is adjacent to single-family homes, so 50-foot height is appropriate, focused toward New Hampshire Avenue. 	<p>Board agrees with Plan’s proposed zoning and staff’s suggestion to increase commercial from 1.0 to 1.5 FAR; Board raises height to 60 feet. (6/27/13)</p>
24	<p>10230 NH Av Hillandale</p> <p><i>Current Zone:</i> C-T</p> <p><i>Site Acres:</i> 2.4</p>	<p>Should zoning density and height be increased?</p>	<p><i>Proposed Zone:</i> CRN-1.0 C-0.75 R-0.75 H-45 (page 31 #7, 40)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan density and height offers no redevelopment opportunity; property owner requests minimum 2.0 FAR and 65’ height (P. Harris) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommended zoning density and height are more than what is allowed in the existing zone; housing is additional use in CR. Site is adjacent to single-family homes, so 45-foot height is appropriate. Small site size limits ability to ameliorate or transition height and provide buffer for single-family. 	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
25	National Labor College (NLC) <i>Current Zone:</i> R-90 <i>Site Acres:</i> 46	Is the proposed zoning (FAR and height) appropriate? Should Plan encourage single-family in CRN and specify items for CR points?	<i>Proposed Zones:</i> Eastern area: CRT-1.5 C-1.0 R-1.0 H-75 (page 31 #5, 40) Western area: CRN-0.25 C-0.0 R-0.25 H-45 (page 31 #6, 40)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HOC and Reid Temple Church are acquiring NLC site (Marks, Watley, Kline) • Request west area residential be increased to R-0.3, height to 50' • Request 150' height for "mixed use land bay" near Beltway • More comments to follow on zoning, site issues, staging (Kline) • Plan should promote single-family on CRN portion; don't use it for surface parking. Consider CR points for public playground, path to neighborhood, adaptive reuse of buildings (chapel, Meany archives) (Finnegan) 	<p><i>Update: NLC informed staff on 6/26/13 that the HOC/Reid Temple purchase is not going forward, therefore, the issues raised by legal counsel for these two parties (Jody Kline) are no longer being considered.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CR Zone densities must be increments of 0.25 FAR, so an R-0.3 is not possible and staff believes an R-0.5 is too high. Density transfers could be considered from eastern portion. • An additional 5 feet in height on the western portion, with substantial buffers, is acceptable. • Staff is analyzing request for additional 75 feet of height on east side. • CRN allows for single-family housing • Language could be added regarding specific items for points in the CRT Zone. 	
26	Hillandale – Properties on Elton Road & residential adjacent to commercial	Is density and height on properties adjacent to residences appropriate?	<i>Proposed Zones:</i> CRT-1.5 C-1.0 R-1.0 H-75 Page 31 #5, 39 CRT-1.0 C-0.75 R-0.75 H-45 Page 31 #8, 39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider reducing FAR and height of properties adjacent to residences (Scott, Finnegan) • Review whether proposed zoning on Elton Road is appropriate given traffic problem; consider guidance (or CR points) for future development that addresses Elton Road cut-through (Finnegan) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The densities and heights are appropriate and text addresses compatibility on page 39 (...ensure adequate transitions through buffering or reduced building heights...adjoining the single-family residential lots on Green Forest Drive). • The Design Guidelines will provide additional guidance on these sensitive transition areas. 	
27	Washington Adventist Hospital <i>Current Zones:</i> I-1, I-3	None.	<i>Proposed Zone:</i> LSC Zone (page 31, 47)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entire 48 acres of WAH site should be in LSC Zone (Newmyer, Perrine, Morgan) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concur. Map on page 31 will be corrected to show entire WAH site in the LSC Zone. 	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
28	<p>Percontee/ Site 2</p> <p><i>Current Zone:</i> I-2 (overlay)</p> <p><i>Site Area:</i> 300 acres</p>	<p>Should the entire area be one CR zone?</p> <p>Should there be a new "CR/LSC" zone for these properties?</p>	<p><i>Proposed Zones:</i> CR-0.75 C-0.5 R-0.5 H-120 (page 31 #9, 46)</p> <p>CR-1.25 C-1.0 R-0.25 H-220 (page 31 #10, 46)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Want one CR zone; eliminate #9, use #10 for all 300 acres and increase residential density: CR-1.25 C-1.0 R-0.75 H-220 (Genn, Elmendorf) Ensure heights, densities are appropriate, flexible (Ossont) Adopt new CR/LSC Zone for marketing and viability of LifeSci Village (Genn, Elmendorf) Supports Percontee's Global LifeSci Village plans (Myers, Bloom, Newmyer, Bretz, Ruben, Levin, Richardson, Amir, Rosario, Dyer, W. Harris, Gillece, Myo Khin, Seyfert-Margolis) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rationale for two CR zones is to establish a higher density core district (or Town Center along Industrial Parkway extended to FDA Blvd.) and a lower density periphery, which includes an elementary school and park site. The recommended zoning includes a higher "C" in the core area and a higher "R" for the surrounding area. Staff does not support an increase in density; what is recommended is substantial. Developer request is more density than was modeled. Staff does not support a new zone. Developer's proposed CR/LSC Zone makes minor additions/deletions to use table, but reduces the minimum public benefit points and makes BLT payments optional. 	<p>Board agrees with developer request for one CR Zone for Percontee and Site 2 (300 acres) with following elements: CR-1.0 C-1.0 R-0.5 H-220. Board does not support developer's proposed CR/LSC Zone, but suggests some uses could be added to the CR Zone through the Zoning Rewrite. (6/27/13)</p>
29	<p>Percontee/ Site 2</p> <p>North White Oak/Cherry Hill Road Center</p>	<p>Should the Plan's illustrative be replaced with the developer's?</p> <p>Should this node be renamed "Life Sciences/FDA Village Center"?</p>	<p>Page 45</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percontee's illustrative is more representative of community, CAC, County input (Genn, Elmendorf, Ossont, Newmyer Wilhelm/CAC, Myers) Board should note Executive's/DED's marketing/branding efforts for the LifeSci Village (Ossont) Rename "North White Oak /Cherry Hill Road Center" to "Life Sciences/FDA Village Center" (Genn, Elmendorf) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan illustrative is schematic and conceptual, which is appropriate given the long-term development timeframe for such a large site. The Plan illustrative Plan does not preclude the type of layout shown on the developer's concept. Master Plans do not and should not include project plans created by individual property owners. The Plan illustratives are intended to convey a sense of desirable future character rather than a recommendation for a particular design. Staff does not support a name change for the "North White Oak/Cherry Hill Road Center," which includes the County/developer's 300-acre area as well as 500 acres with many existing businesses and a residential community. The names of the nodes are intended to identify areas by their neighborhood name or the geographic location. Developers ultimately select their own marketing names. 	<p>Board directs staff to put the developer's illustrative in the Appendix.</p> <p>Board agrees with developer's request to rename the "North White Oak/Cherry Hill Road Center" to "Life Sciences/FDA Village Center" and rename the "White Oak/FDA Center" to the "White Oak Center." (6/27/13)</p>
30	<p>North White Oak/Cherry Hill Road Center</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Page 31 #11, 41, 46</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports zoning for their property and overall Plan direction (Solomon) 	<p>No Board decision required.</p>	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Historic Preservation					
31	Naval Ordnance Laboratory Building/FDA	Should this property be designated for historic preservation?	Page 80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports designation of NOL in the <i>Master Plan for Historic Preservation</i> (Kirwan, Peper, Tino) • Future improvements to New Hampshire Avenue may impact the environmental setting (Halligan, MDOT) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate in the <i>Master Plan for Historic Preservation</i> as a historic resource and add to the Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites in the interim.
Environment					
32	National Labor College (NLC)	Should maps and text be changed per commenter's request?	Maps 4 and 15 (Pages 26 & 71) show stream from GIS layer NLC Environmental text (pages 73-74)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no stream on the NLC as depicted on Maps 4 and 15 and text on pages 73-74 • Approved FCP does not depict stream as identified in Plan • Delete all references to a NLC stream in this location (Peinovich) • Preserve environmental wetlands in center of site and forest conservation easements; enhance buffers for community (Finnegan) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any streams shown on maps are for illustrative purposes only and depict hydrology. Stream determinations are made through the regulatory process and not in the Master Plan. In the case of NLC, the stream bisecting the property was piped. While the stream channel is missing, the hydrology, complete with floodplain, is still present. This stream should be daylighted and restored through the redevelopment process, improving hydrology and creating a community asset. Forested areas adjacent to the existing community should be preserved and enhanced.
Staging					
33	Area-wide	Should the staging plan be modified to have six stages instead of three and different trigger mechanisms?	Pages 96-100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify staging to create six phases. Stage 1 changes: add 1 million SF, raise CLV. Stage 2: add 1,000 more DUs (Genn, Elmendorf, Wilhelm/CAC, Bloom, Pollin, Myers) • Consider more staging steps based on NADMS (Ossont) • Add "optional method pathway" to each stage with voluntary taxing to allow development without LATR (Genn, Elmendorf, Wilhelm/CAC, Pollin) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff does not support suggested changes to the staging plan, including increasing Stage 1 by 1 million square feet, raising CLV in Stage 1, or increasing housing in Stage 2. • Staging triggers are appropriate for implementation of the entire length of the BRT corridors that show more potential ridership. Building only the segment of the BRT within WOSG will not relieve the area-wide congestion. • NADMS goals need to be area-wide to be effective, not project-by-project. • TPAR and LATR requirements must be retained as critical and essential regulatory tools to analyze, mitigate, and resolve a development's traffic impact.

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
34	Area-wide Should the staging plan be retained as is?	Pages 96-100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ineffective staging, too reliant on unproven BRT (Quinn) • Supports Staff’s staging plan, which is clear and equitable; Opposes Genn’s changes, which will weaken it • “Optional pathway” eliminates TPAR, LATR; more traffic problems without funds to fix it • Retain 1475 CLV in Stage 1 • Randolph Road BRT is not equal to US 29 and New Hampshire • Opposes more housing in Stage 2 (Finnegan) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff disagrees that staging is ineffective. It is clearly defined yet flexible enough to evolve over time. Proposed staging plan ensures excessive development does not occur without transit or equivalent infrastructure. We have several approved Master Plans that include staging elements. As with those areas, this Plan recommends an implementation advisory committee be formed and a biennial report be prepared to monitor development and the delivery of infrastructure. • Staff does not recommend changes to the staging plan. 	
35	Area-wide Should suggested modifications be made to staging?	Pages 96-100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with NADMS goal of 30% in stage 3 • Concur with raising CLV to 1600 in stage 2 • Biennial report should track development, LOS, actual NADMS, transit, roads • Construction of US 29 interchanges should be prioritized and added to staging (Gonzalez, MCDOT) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that Plan could list more specific items that will need to be addressed in the biennial monitoring report. • Council staff and Council have not typically supported the inclusion of specific road improvements in Master Plan staging plans. The US 29 interchanges are in the State’s Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP). 	



Memorandum

Date: July 10, 2013

To: Nancy Sturgeon, Master Planner, Planning Department

From: Brooke Farquhar, Supervisor Park and Trail Planning *Brooke Farquhar*

Subject: White Oak Science Gateway Recommendation for an Urban Park at White Oak Center

At the June 27 work session, the Planning Board asked Parks staff to address the ownership, location, and size of the recommended Neighborhood Green Urban Park at the site of the White Oak shopping center. The property owner testified on location -- that the park should be located off of his property; on ownership -- that it should be privately owned; and on size -- that it is too big.

The Public Hearing Draft (p.87) recommends that this two-acre park would be located on the shopping center property and would "serve as a green community open space for a variety of activities including picnicking, pick-up sports, and relaxing on the lawn. The park could include other local amenities such as community gardens and a dog park."

Park Planning Policy Background

We are in a new age of park planning that differs from how we planned urban parks in the past. Staff believes the Commission should continue to be evolutionary in its thinking about park ownership to fit the times. Since 1927, the Commission has re-invented the types of parks it owns to accommodate changing demographics and recreational preferences and needs. Examples of the changing character of the park portfolio include Stream-Valley Parks in the 1920s, Recreation Centers and Neighborhood Parks in the 1930s and 1940s, and Regional Parks in the 1960s, just to name a few.

Today we are committed to creating parks in the core of communities (rather than at the edges or outside the high density areas) so that residents do not have to travel to parks outside their area for recreation. *Vision 2030* recommends that we deliver new park and recreation facilities and services in the areas of highest density in our county. To support the development of walkable and livable communities, the Planning Board approved the Urban Park Guidelines in *PROS 2012* with six new urban park types, and guidance for meeting needs through urban parks. According to *PROS*, master plans should:

- Contribute to a system with specific attributes to meet needs of urban residents
- Create a hierarchy of parks and open spaces with relative service areas to avoid gaps in service
- Help create a walkable open space system, using a standard maximum walking distance from residences and transit stops to parks
- Help meet needs identified in the PROS Plan for urban park facilities such as civic greens, community open space, urban woodlands, community gardens, dog parks, and skate park

Ownership

Parks staff believes that it is important and necessary to state when an open space should be a public park at the time of the master plan. This is consistent with past master plans. Deferring the decisions on ownership will jeopardize the Board's, and ultimately the Council's ability to plan the "right parks in the right places". Over the last four years, Parks staff has been researching the pros and cons of public ownership versus private ownership of the public realm. Staff has learned that the most successful models for public open space are in public ownership. How the open space is funded for development, management and programming varies depending on the location, the type of park and the interest of private partners. Public ownership guarantees the following:

- Open to all public
- All legal uses allowed – no restrictions on activities such as photography, demonstrations, etc
- No fences or barriers to people walking in or through
- ADA accessible
- Any changes in design, management or programming has public review
- Clear, standard signage conveying who to contact for safety or maintenance concerns

Without the guarantee of ownership, the Board may lose its ability to meet the needs of the residents in each area. In order to insure that residents of the high-density, walkable, livable areas have access to needed public open space, the master plan documents should be as clear and certain as possible. At the time of regulatory review, many aspects of a plan are negotiated including transportation, streetscaping, schools, etc. It is quite likely that parks will be short-changed in these negotiations.

Location

This property could generate significant needs for open space within the White Oak Center node/neighborhood if it redevelops as a mixed-use project that includes new residential units. It is therefore appropriate that the park be located on the shopping center property. Other parks and open spaces in the area are over a half-mile away, which is not considered walkable for all who may live in this high density area. If this property redevelops under the proposed CR Zone, the location of the open space will be decided during the Sketch Plan Review, which will determine the placement of open space on the property.

Size

The recommendation in the Public Hearing Draft for a two-acre park is based on the park and recreation needs for urban areas as recommended in *Vision 2030* and *PROS 2012*. The facilities that have been identified to meet the park and recreations needs for this community will not fit on a site smaller than two acres. Approximate sizes of the needed facilities are as follows:

- Community open space (1/2 acre)
- Playground (1/8 acre)
- Dog park (3/8 acre)
- Community Garden (1/4 acre)
- Seating and Walkways (1/4 acre)
- Stormwater management (1/4 acre)
- Setbacks (1/4 acre)
- TOTAL: (2 acres)