



THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

September 10, 2003

MEMORANDUM

TO: Malcolm Shaneman, Supervisor
Development Review Division

VIA: Ronald C. Welke, Supervisor
Transportation Planning Division

FROM: Cherian Eapen, Planner/Coordinator
Transportation Planning Division

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan No. 1-03102
Site Plan No. 8-03038
Greencastle Towns
Greencastle Road
Fairland/White Oak Policy Area

This memorandum summarizes Transportation Planning staff's Adequate Public Facilities (APF) Ordinance review of the above preliminary plan/site plan for 27 single-family attached housing units (townhouses) in an RT-8 Zone within the Fairland/White Oak Policy Area.

This Policy Area is currently in a moratorium for residential development, and the Policy Area Transportation Review (PATR) component of the APF test for Greencastle Towns is proposed to be satisfied under the FY 03 Annual Growth Policy (AGP) Staging Ceiling Flexibility section (see attached page 22; TP4) with a Full-Cost Developer Participation option (see attached page 22; TP4.1). Montgomery County Planning Board (MCPB) staff and the Montgomery County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPWT) staff have worked with the applicant to prepare a Draft Traffic Mitigation Agreement (TMA) to satisfy the PATR test, which is currently being reviewed. The TMA will enable the development to satisfy the PATR test.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Transportation Planning staff recommends the following conditions as part of the transportation-related requirements to approve this application:

1. Limit the development to up to 27 single-family attached housing units, to be developed in one phase.
2. Satisfy the PATR component of the APF test by entering into a TMA with the Planning Board and the DPWT, to make a one-time lump sum payment to support increased transit use within the policy area.
3. Consistent with the 1997 Approved and Adopted Fairland Master Plan, dedicate additional right-of-way along Greencastle Road to provide 40 feet of right-of-way from its centerline.
4. Coordinate with DPWT's CIP Project No. 500100, Greencastle Road, to provide roadway improvements along the entire property frontage, and to extend the proposed Class I bikeway along the site frontage off-site to north to Wildlife Lane.
5. Coordinate with DPWT on design requirements for the proposed site access driveway.

DISCUSSION

Site Location, Access, Circulation and Transportation Facilities

The site is located on the west side of Greencastle Road between Wildlife Lane to the north and Greencastle Ridge Terrace to the south. The M-NCPPC Fairland Recreational Park is located on the east side of Greencastle Road, and has access to Greencastle Road across from Wildlife Lane. Land use on the west side of Greencastle Road is generally residential.

The site consists of two parcels, P495 and P530, and has access to Greencastle Road. In the vicinity of the site, Greencastle Road is a two-lane roadway, with no paved shoulders and a rolling terrain. To the north of the site, a Class I bikeway exists along both Greencastle Road (to the north of Robey Road) and Robey Road. There are currently no on-road or off-road pedestrian/bicycle provisions along the section of Greencastle Road between Robey Road and the Prince George's County Line. Greencastle Road has a posted speed limit of 30 mph in this area. Several bus routes serve Greencastle Road and Robey Road, to the north of the site.

Master Plan Roadways and Pedestrian/Bikeway Facilities

The 1997 Approved and Adopted Fairland Master Plan describes the nearby master-planned roadways, pedestrian and bikeway facilities as follows:

Greencastle Road, between US 29 to the northwest and Prince George's County Line to the southeast, is recommended as a four-lane Arterial (A-110) with a minimum right-of-way width of 80 feet. The Master Plan also recommends sidewalks and a Class I bikeway (PB-52) along Greencastle Road between Old Columbia Pike (to the west of US 29) and the Prince George's County Line.

Nearby Transportation Improvement Projects

The Montgomery County DPWT's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) includes the following nearby project:

DPWT CIP Project No. 500100; Greencastle Road: This project will provide for the reconstruction of Greencastle Road from 400 feet south of Robey Road to Greencastle Ridge Terrace (a distance of approximately 2,100 feet). The improved roadway will be a two-lane arterial with concrete curb and gutter. The entire improved section of the roadway will have a separate eight-foot Class I bikeway along the west side of Greencastle Road. The section of Greencastle Road from Robey Road to Wildlife Lane (approximately 900 feet in length) will have 50-foot wide pavement and the remaining 1,200-foot section of the roadway from Wildlife Lane to Greencastle Ridge Terrace will have 34-foot wide pavement. The project is fully funded for design and construction and is to be completed in October 2006.

Prior Approvals/Review

The proposed Greencastle Towns development was previously reviewed as Pre-Preliminary Plan No. 7-03037 for 27 townhouse units.

Local Area Transportation Review (LATR)

The proposed Greencastle Towns development consisting of 27 single-family attached housing units would generate less than 50 total peak-hour trips during the weekday morning (6:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.) and evening (4:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.) peak periods (13 and 22 total peak hours trips, respectively). Therefore, a traffic study (to analyze traffic impact at nearby intersections) is not required to satisfy the LATR.

Policy Area Transportation Review (PATR)/Staging Ceiling Conditions

Based on the FY 2003 AGP transportation staging ceilings, there is no capacity available for additional housing units (negative 3,544 housing units as of July 31, 2003) within the Fairland/White Oak Policy Area. However, Greencastle Towns is proposing to mitigate its impact as a Full-Cost Developer Participation development, under the FY 03

AGP Staging Ceiling Flexibility provisions. This would permit the applicant (in a moratorium area) to go forward by entering into a TMA with the Planning Board and DPWT to make a one-time lump sum payment to support increased transit use within the policy area.

CE:kcw
Attachment

cc: Mary Goodman
Calvin Nelson
Jeff Riese
William Kominers, Esq.

mmo to shaneman 8-03038.doc



DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
AND TRANSPORTATION

Douglas M. Duncan
County Executive

Albert J. Genetti, Jr., P.E.
Director

September 8, 2003

Mr. A. Malcolm Shaneman, Supervisor
Development Review Division
The Maryland-National Capital
Park & Planning Commission
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-3760

RE: Preliminary Plan #1-03102
Greencastle Towns

Dear Mr. Shaneman:

We have completed our review of the preliminary plan dated April 2003. A series of meetings has been held between the applicant, their engineer Site Solutions, Inc., this office and the County's Capital Improvements Program (CIP) project manager for Greencastle Road improvements. We recommend approval of the plan subject to the following comments:

All Planning Board Opinions relating to this plan or any subsequent revision, project plans or site plans should be submitted to MCDPS in the package for record plats, storm drain, grading or paving plans, or application for access permit. Include this letter and all other correspondence from this department.

1. Show all existing planimetric and topographic details (paving, storm drainage, driveways adjacent and opposite the site, sidewalks and/or bikeways, bus stops, utilities, etc.) as well as existing rights of way and easements on the preliminary plan.
2. Necessary dedication for future widening of Greencastle Road in accordance with the master plan.
3. The applicant will either construct improvements along Greencastle Road per the directions of Mr. Bary Fuss or Mr. Dan Sheridan of MCDPWT Capital Projects Division, or contribute an agreed upon equivalent dollar amount into the CIP project account. The participation will include all elements of the project including storm drainage, street trees and lights and the class I bikeway.



Division of Operations

101 Orchard Ridge Drive, 2nd Floor • Gaithersburg, Maryland 20878
240/777-6000, TTY 240/777-6013, FAX 240/777-6030

Adopted Fiscal Year 2003
Annual Growth Policy
for Montgomery County, Maryland

Guidelines for the Administration of the
Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance
&
Growth Capacity Ceilings for FY2003

Adopted by the Montgomery County Council
Effective July 15, 2002

- TP3.5** Development approved under **TP3** must be added to the pipeline.
- TP3.6** Each recommended annual growth policy ceiling element must contain a list of all pending or approved development under **TP3**.

TP4 Ceiling Flexibility for Developer Participation Projects

Staging Ceiling Flexibility allows the Planning Board, after considering the recommendation of the County Executive, to approve a preliminary plan application, which exceeds the staging ceiling. In allowing the staging ceiling to be exceeded, caution should be exercised to assure that the average level of service for the relevant policy area is not adversely affected. Except as otherwise expressly stated in **TP4**, the same level of service criteria already established in the Annual Growth Policy must be used in evaluating an application under these ceiling flexibility provisions.

In general, each approval above the staging ceiling must be conditioned upon the planned and scheduled construction by either the applicant and/or the government of some public facility project or other appropriate capacity measure (such as the private operation of a transit program) which, if added to the approved CIP or CTP programmed facilities, will add capacity or its equivalent to the existing facility system and result in no lessening of the area-wide level of service.

In general, the capacity addition must be scheduled for completion at the same time or before the proposed development is to be completed. The application must also be approved under Local Area Transportation Review standards. The nature, design and scale of the additional project or program must receive prior approval from the relevant governmental agencies responsible for constructing or maintaining such facilities or programs. The recommendation of the Executive also must be evaluated carefully.

Both the subdivision plan and the necessary additional facilities must be in accordance with an adopted master plan or other relevant policy statement; the design of the facilities must be subject to mandatory referral to the Planning Board; and the applicant and the relevant public agency must execute an appropriate public works agreement before record plat approval.

The phrase "additional transportation facilities" means transportation facilities other than those on which the policy area staging ceilings of the current Annual Growth Policy are based.

TP4.1 Full-Cost Developer Participation

If an applicant agrees to pay for the full cost of all the additional necessary public facilities, and the relevant administering agency has agreed, the Planning Board may approve subdivision plans whose public facility needs exceed the net remaining capacity under the adopted staging ceiling.

Where the applicant commits to provide the full cost of a transit, para-transit or ridesharing program, such application may be deemed to have passed the staging ceiling test, insofar as transportation is concerned, if the Board finds, after reviewing recommendations of the County Executive, that the program will reduce the number of peak-hour, peak-direction automobile trips by as many trips as would be generated by the proposed development. After a preliminary subdivision plan has been approved on this basis, later applications may be credited for reduced trips generated by the new proposal.

An applicant may meet the requirements of **TP4.1** even if all or part of the funds used to build public facilities or operate programs is provided by a government agency.

10 + 11

RECEIVED
SEP 16 2003

September 16, 2003

Mr. Derick P. Berlage
Chairman of the Planning Board
M-NCPPC
Development Review Division
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20910-3760

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN
THE MARYLAND NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Dear Mr. Berlage:

We, the community members of the Greencastle Woods community in Burtonsville are writing to you regarding the proposed plans to build the Greencastle Towns Subdivision in Burtonsville, plan number 1-03102. We have several serious reservations regarding the current building plans. These include concerns about traffic, overcrowding of schools in the area, and the environment.

TRAFFIC:

As you are aware, the Fairland area is currently in a building moratorium for traffic. Greencastle Road is already very well traveled, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to turn into and out of the Greencastle Woods community from Wildlife Lane and from other streets crossing Greencastle Road. We believe the new townhome community providing 101 new parking spaces (as listed on the plan mailed to the community by Site Solutions, Inc.) and thus the opportunity for 101 additional cars to be on the road will complicate the traffic situation in the area. Although it is doubtful that residents of a \$400,000 townhouse will be riding the bus, we recognize this as a possibility. It is important to note that there are no sidewalks connecting the proposed subdivision with the nearest Park-n-Ride, and it is difficult for pedestrians along the road, even if they do wish to walk to public transportation.

SCHOOLS

The document "Recommendations and Planning Issues," found on the Montgomery County public schools website, lists the current and projected capacity for the Northeast Consortium. According to this document, "projected enrollment at Paint Branch High School will exceed capacity throughout the six-year period," even though an addition is planned for the school. For this past school year, capacity was 1616, and enrollment was at 1725. The school is projected to be over capacity for every single year, topping at 208 over capacity in the 2006-2007 school year. Benjamin Banneker Middle School was also over capacity by 161 this year, and is projected to be 199 over capacity for next year. In fact, it is within capacity for only one of the years listed in the document.

This brings us back to the subject of traffic. It is our understanding that due to the overcrowding in Paint Branch High School, they are currently having difficulty fitting everyone into the cafeteria, even though they have staggered lunch breaks. Because of this, the school has encouraged juniors and seniors to go off campus for lunch. This, in turn, has also increased traffic in the Fairland area. Even if the developers of the Greencastle Towns subdivision are able

to somehow mitigate traffic to and from the housing area itself, traffic in the area will still be negatively affected by the new development.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

It is our understanding that there is no environmental impact study required for this development to be built. We urge the county to conduct this study before the plan is approved. The drainage situation in the proposed area is tenuous at best. During heavy rains and storms there is a great deal of run-off from the proposed property onto the Greencastle Woods property, causing the formation of what is popularly known as the "Greencastle River." During heavy storms such as we experienced this past winter, runoff was considerable and at times built up dangerously on the lower-decks of Greencastle Woods homes. Our concern is that with even less soil to soak into, even more roofs to run off, and less trees to hold the remaining soil in place, the possibilities for water damage to our homes increases exponentially. While this may not be immediately obvious to the builders and planners, it will become apparent with large and continuous storms such as the ones we experienced this past season. Our fear is that by the time this problem becomes obvious to all, the builders will no longer be responsible for correcting it.

Other environmental issues concern the presence of a **buffer zone** between the communities. Many Greencastle Woods home owners purchased their homes when the property proposed for the new subdivision was zoned only for single family homes. We purchased our homes in Greencastle Woods because we loved the woods, and we were assured by the county that the zoning was for single-family homes. Obviously, the preference of the Greencastle Woods Community would be for the county to reject the plans for this subdivision. However, if the plan is ultimately approved, we respectfully request that the builders leave a wide and substantial buffer zone of trees between the two housing areas, including saving as many of the currently growing trees as possible. Current plans show a smattering of trees between the two communities, with all of the current growth disappearing. **If the proposal is approved, would like the final official plan to reflect their statements by showing a greater density of trees in the buffer zone, including saving as much of the current growth as possible.** While the presence of new evergreens the planners have proposed would eventually help in creating a year-round buffer zone, it is important to acknowledge that any new trees will take years—perhaps decades—to achieve the beauty and utility of the current trees already well-established and growing. If the new subdivision is built, leaving a large and substantial buffer zone will be an important quality of life issue for both the existing homes and new homes.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

The residents of Greencastle Woods.

3839 Wildlife Lane	Danny Farah	301-890-0947
3837 Wildlife Lane	Belay Tesfatsion	301-890-9091
3829 Wildlife Lane	Penny Guzman	301-890-3336
3833 Wildlife Lane	Marya Ford	301-890-9041
3831 Wildlife Lane	Bong Yeul Lee	301-890-4149
3821 Wildlife Lane	Willam Fiallos	301-890-1070
3819 Wildlife Lane	Nadeem and Azra Hussain	301-847-0808

3817 Wildlife Lane	Bethlehem Belai	301-890-9656
3815 Wildlife Lane	Jason and Rikki Stenbakken Welch	301-847-6920
3813 Wildlife Lane	Thu Linh	301-890-0660
3811 Wildlife Lane	Henrique Caine	301-847-7907
3807 Wildlife Lane	S. Battachargee and S. Schmoyer	301-847-1598
3805 Wildlife Lane	Evelyn McKinney	301-890-5316
3836 Wildlife Lane	Kristin Owens	301-890-0896
3810 Wildlife Lane	Viha Nguyen	301-847-2081
3824 Wildlife Lane	Kelly Byrne	301-847-0175
3830 Wildlife Lane	Sonia Firpi	301-890-7513
3828 Wildlife Lane	Abby Taiwo	301-890-7818