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**Executive Summary**

The site consists of approximately 24 acres of land under various ownerships which could be assembled to provide an opportunity for a mixed-use development adjacent to the University of Maryland. For a myriad of reasons that we will discuss in this practicum, the governments of Prince George’s County and the State of Maryland are eager to get this development started and it can reasonably be expected that both governments would be willing to participate in the project to ensure its success. The reason for the government participation would be three fold. First, it would serve to create economic development opportunities within Prince George’s County, thereby increasing the commercial tax base. Secondly, it would provide much needed graduate student housing to the University of Maryland. Finally, it would provide an attraction for office and commerce; and a home for the University of Baltimore, School of Law and the University of Maryland Executive MBA program, which potentially could be located in this development.

The concept envisions taking advantage of heavy public investments already made and assuring that those investments produce bountiful returns, both in terms of intellectual capital, financial capital and revenues and forms of taxes and business development. The reason for the State’s involvement in such a plan is to assure that certain public purposes are served. They include the marriage of housing, employment, education and transportation opportunities.

The purpose of this document is to perform a preliminary analysis as to the feasibility of achieving such an objective. The goal would be both to quantify the development that can be
generated in a low scale format, suitable to the community surrounding the property and to
provide for a well organized, well developed opportunity for achieving many public objectives
through public stimulation.

The concept envisions the government acquiring the land and then outlining specifications for
development and putting the property out to bid. The justification for governmental action to
underwrite the development in various ways as follows:

1. The initial cost of the property is expected to be subsidized.

2. The difficulty and time involved in assemblage of the property can be
   substantially reduced through government intervention including utilizing the
   State’s power of Eminent Domain.

3. Guaranteed government leases of properties such as the School of Law and the
   School of Business.

4. The Government subsidizing the cost of the development through the provision of
tax increment financing.

The concept at this point envisions the development of approximately 700 residential units,
approximately 150,000 square feet of office space, and 50,000 square feet of retail space. The
parking requirements are envisioned to total approximately 4,500 parking spaces with the
breakdown being approximately 1,000 for residential activities, 420 for educational parking,
1,200 for office parking, 630 for restaurant parking and 1,300 for retail parking. The effort
would be to maintain a low scale development in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood.
The FAR average across the property would be in the 2.5 range. This practicum will serve as a development proposal conducted by JAC LLC for The Michael Companies (a potential developer of the site) in determining the most profitable mix of uses, given the legal, financial, and political restraints for the “West Campus Village” development in College Park, Maryland. JAC, LLC has been retained to give an analysis of the following areas:

**Site Selection and Market Analysis**- Overview of the site and surrounding areas, demographics, and market supply and demand.

**Land Use and Public Policy**- An overview of the current zoning and a review of recently approved “Text Amendments” that shed light on the possible uses and density of this site. (What is currently allowed, text amendments-EYA)

**Development Strategy**- Recommendations will be given on how to approach the assemblage (since some parcels are more important than others) and the types of uses to incorporate in the development, and the timeline for completion of the investment period.

**Financial Analysis**- A detailed review of the capital structure, land costs, hard costs and soft costs.
SITE SELECTION AND MARKET ANALYSIS

The West Campus Village is an assemblage of 30 properties consisting of 1,041,068 square feet or 23.9 acres directly adjacent to the University of Maryland College Park and the University of Maryland University College.

West Campus Village sits at the intersection of Campus Drive, Adelphi Road, and Greenbelt Road (MD-193). This intersection has a traffic count of more than 33,000 cars a day.

Additionally, the property is located only 3 miles from the Capital Beltway (I-495) providing convenient vehicular access to the site. West Campus Village is only 1.5 miles from College Park Metro Station and 1.3 miles from the Prince George’s Plaza Metro Station, however, West Campus Village also encompasses a planned Purple Line Station at the corner of Campus Drive.
and Adelphi. That will be discussed later in the Site Selection and Market Analysis section. The property is located adjacent to the University of Maryland which is the third largest employer in Prince George’s County with 8,400 jobs. The campus has 25,000 students and is named the 18th Best Public School in the United States by U.S. News and World Report. Over the last decade, the University of Maryland has greatly increased its stature in the academic world and now has 32 undergraduate and graduate programs in the Top 10 in the country and 89 in the Top 25. Additionally, the University of Maryland has seen a large increase in construction on campus. In the last decade, the University of Maryland has built a new physics building, a new engineering building, a new bio-sciences building, a new math building, a new business school building, a new alumni center, a new performing arts hall, a new basketball stadium, and a new student union. After this prodigious building program, there is a shortage of available land to develop. Additionally, the University of Maryland has gained national recognition for its success in winning research grants; passing $500 million in 2008. This, along with the University’s ambitious capital campaign, has led the University of Maryland to look off site to continue its growth. The University of Maryland has typically utilized a public-private development strategy to develop and redevelop projects that are off the University of Maryland’s campus. Under this arrangement, the University purchases the land and then leases space to private developers. This technique has the value of accelerating the approval process, since the property is owned by the state it is not subject to local zoning rules or local property taxes. It should be mentioned though, as a practice the University of Maryland typically voluntarily submits to Prince George’s County’s zoning requirements as a good will gesture and as a matter of political pragmatism. Even then, however, the fact that the University could pull away from the local approval process has the effect of producing what most believe is favorable accommodations from the Park and
Planning Commission relative to other projects that follow the traditional approval process.

Additionally, the University of Maryland typically signs a “PILOT” (Payment In Lieu Of Taxes) agreement with the local jurisdiction that obligates the university to pay to the county an amount of money that approximates what they would have paid had they been subject to paying real estate taxes.

The site has some very important characteristics that make it viable for redevelopment. First, it is located adjacent to the Robert E. Smith Business School which, according to U.S. News & World Report has the #19 ranked business program in the country. This is important because the school is looking to expand its programs. This side of campus is very heavy on classroom and lab space but does not have much in the way of amenities like the center of campus or the proposed East Campus development which will boast restaurants, pubs, and a supermarket. This fact provides us an opportunity to capitalize on an underserved retail market in this corner of campus.
Additionally, this part of campus has become home to the vast majority of new student housing over the last several years. This is valuable since housing is a very likely part of the mixed use plan for this site. In total, West Campus Village benefits significantly from its close proximity to the University of Maryland and that uniqueness will help ensure that West Campus Village thrives as an assemblage redevelopment project.

**Review of the Unique proximity to the Purple Line**

Although the site’s proximity to the University of Maryland is perhaps its greatest physical asset, there is another factor that has the potential of making this redevelopment very marketable. West Campus Village is located directly at a station for the proposed Purple Line which is being supported by Maryland Governor Martin O’Malley and the counties of Prince George’s and Montgomery Counties. The Purple Line is a proposed 16-mile rapid transit light rail line extending from Bethesda in Montgomery County to New Carrollton in Prince George's County. It will provide a direct connection to the Metrorail Red, Green and Orange Lines; at Bethesda, Silver Spring, College Park, and New Carrollton respectively. The Purple Line will also connect to MARC, AMTRAK, and local bus services. 21 initial station locations have been identified with additional stations under consideration. In the Fiscal Year 2008 Budget, the Governor included, and the General Assembly approved $100 million towards the Purple Line. Since then, the Purple Line has been submitted to the Federal Department of Transportation as a priority project for the State of Maryland. The Purple Line will be a light rail line and will operate
largely at street level, although, there may be areas where tunnels or aerial structures are will be used to improve travel times or minimize environmental or community impacts.

It should be of note that two of the stated goals of the Purple Line according to the Maryland Transit Administration’s website are to “increase the potential for transit oriented development at existing and proposed stations in the corridor” and to “make it easier to get to existing and planned shopping and business areas in the corridor”. We believe that the redevelopment of the 23.9 acre site is right in line with the goals of the Purple Line.
Review regional and local demographics

Regional Economy: According to MRIS and Delta Associates, the Washington Metro Area remains one of the strongest in the nation despite the national recession. According to Dr. Stephen Fuller of George Mason University, payroll employment increased by 21,000 jobs in the Washington metro area over the 12 months ending October 2010. This represents the largest increase of jobs, by percentage, in any market in the country according to Fuller. Additionally, the Washington area unemployment rate was 6.2% at August 2010 compared to the national rate of 9.5% in August 2010. There is reason to believe, therefore, that the Washington D.C. market has weathered the recession and is getting back on its feet.

Prince George’s County, Maryland Demographics

To objectively understand the West Campus Village, it is important to understand the local demographics. First, we will look at Prince George’s County as a whole and then focus more precisely on the local trade area. The 2009 American Community Survey showed that Prince George’s County, Maryland continued to grow. As of 2009, the county had a population of 834,986. Families made up 66% of households in Prince George’s County with married couples making up 40%. There were 319,039 housing units in the county, 65.1% were owner occupied, 33.4% were renter occupied, and 6.6% were vacant. With regard to education, 86.2% have a high school degree or higher and 30% has a bachelor’s degree or better. According to the 2006 ACS, Prince George’s County remained a relatively young county. It is younger, on average, than the United States and Maryland. This is important because it means that there will continue
to be a large number of people in the workforce for years to come. 7.19% of residents were under 5 years old, 65.6% were between 18 and 65, and 8.6% were over 65 years old. According to the ACS, the largest types of employment in the county are educational, health care services (20%), public administration (16%) and management and professional occupations (15%). A very important factor is that Federal, state, or local government employed 29% of the workers.

West Campus Village Demographics

Having finished reviewing the demographics for Prince George’s County as a whole, we are now going to look at the demographics for the West Campus Village site. We will review the demographics 1,3, and 5 miles but play particular attention to the 3 mile radius that incorporates most all of the “Northwest Prince George’s” sub-region. This area includes College Park, University Park, Berwyn Heights, Hyattsville, Riverdale Park, and the Route 1 Arts District. This area is a distinct sub-region and trade area and one that will be important to look at from a retail and office viability standpoint. The 3 mile radius for the West Campus Village roughly encompasses an area that is known as “Northwest Prince George’s County”. This area is characterized by being a racially diverse area with a strong influence from the University of Maryland and has a number of younger “urban pioneers” that are moving in. Generally speaking this is an existing community with an older housing stock and although developers have recently begun to see the redevelopment value of this area, most of the projects are currently under construction or in for planning approval. According to Claritas, the 2010 population of this area is 193,807 which is almost identical to the 2000 census number. The median age for this area is 34.2 years old according to the same report. The average age for the county is 35.2 years old and the average age for the United States is 36.7 years old. Northwest Prince George’s County,
where the West Campus Village is located, is racially and ethnically diverse. Of the 193,807 residents that live within a 3 mile radius of this location, 35.2% are White, 34.6% are Black, 6% are Asian, and 5.2% are two or more races. Additionally, the Latino population, regardless of race, is 37.8%. The average household income for this area is $67,603. This is compared to $81,000 for Prince George's County, $70,488 for the state of Maryland and $52,029 for the United States. Anecdotally, this trade area includes the University of Maryland so wage numbers are artificially low. For this trade area, 48.5% of the population is estimated to be employed and over the age of 16. Of these, 19.9% are blue collar jobs, 60.8% are white collar, and 19.2% are service or farm workers. With regard to education levels in Northwest Prince George's, 13.2% of the population over 25 years of age has a Masters, Professional, or Doctorate Degree and 15.9% had earned a Bachelor's Degree. When you look at the housing units, there is an anomaly that can be attributed to the University of Maryland. 54.8% of the dwellings in this area are renter occupied and 45.23% were owner occupied. This is much lower than the national average of 67.1% owner occupied. Also, the median owner occupied housing value is $329,495 and 41.7% of the units were 1 unit detached.

Housing Market

The housing market in the Greater Washington D.C. area has relatively quickly to rebound compared to the rest of the housing market buoyed by the strong federal government presence. According to Delta Associates, Q1 2011 prices in the region rose as compared to Q1 2010 (3.2% increase) although the days on the market increased compared to Q1 2010 (up 12 days). According to Delta Associates First Quarter 2011 Report, this did not reflect a lack of demand but rather "primarily a function of sellers holding out for, and eventually nearly achieving, their
asking price”. As evidence of this the Delta Associates point out that the average sales price is 97.1% of the average listing price. This is the highest percentage since Q4 2005 and clearly much higher than the recent low of 89.9% achieved in Q1 2009. According to the same report, the area’s “inner ring” of suburbs which includes Prince George’s County, Montgomery County, and Fairfax county saw a 1.3% increase in averages sales price (now $56,987) since Q1 2010 and say a modest decrease, 1.5%, in the number of units sold compared to Q1 2010.

In the College Park area there are several residential projects that are currently under construction. These projects; the Mazza Grandmarc, The Varsity, and the Starview, have one important factor in common, they are being marketed to University of Maryland students. In fact, the Varsity and the Starview (pictured below) are within a 5 minute walk to campus.

(Rendering of “The Varsity” located on Baltimore Ave.)  (Rendering of “Starview” located on Baltimore Ave.)
Review existing retail and office in College Park submarket

The expression that college towns are "recession proof" has been put to the test with the latest international downturn in the economy. College Park, while taking its bumps and bruises, has done relatively well both in the residential sector but also in the retail and office sectors as well. With regards to retail, the College Park submarket has remained relatively strong during the recession. According to CoStar, the vacancy rate never topped 12% since 2007. There is approximately 2.4 million square feet of retail space in College Park (although a large portion of this consists of an IKEA located at the Capital Beltway). Currently, 93% (2.28 million square feet) of retail space is leased. Over the last 10 quarters, the vacancy rate ranged between 3.5% and 12% and average rental rates fluctuated from $16-$23.50 in the College Park submarket according to Costar.

![Graph of College Park Retail Vacancy/Rental Rate](image)

(College Park Retail Vacancy/Rental Rate)
As illustrated in the graph, there was a large jump in the vacancy rate during the end of 2008. This was in large measure due to the closing of a 40,000 square foot "Linens and Things" located at the College Park market place due to the company's 2008 bankruptcy. That vacancy has now been filled with a Best Buy. As the nation begins to come out of the recession, it appears that the College Park retail market has begun improving as well. While a 9% vacancy rate is higher than it had been in the past, it was lower than the high water mark of 12%. The College Park office submarket has also been through a very rough patch during the national recession. According to Costar, during 2008, the vacancy rate for the office market hit 18%. Since that time, the office market has leveled out some with the vacancy rate currently at 11%. Additionally, the average rental rate for the College Park office submarket is currently $22.12. It should be noted, however, that there is a significant difference in the range of office rents. According to Costar, newer Class A space is commanding up to $30.19/ square foot while older Class C space only rents for an average of $14.49.

(College Park Office Vacancy/Rental Rate)
Review local development plans that are currently in approval process

Of course the West Campus Village project is not the only project working its way through the approval process. There are two other projects that are currently in the approval process and are relevant both because their size and scope speak to what is feasible politically; and to serve as a guide with regard to competition for tenants.

"The Mosaic at Turtle Creek"

The Mosaic at Turtle Creek is located directly adjacent to the West Campus Village project at the south east corner. The Mosaic at Turtle Creek is marketed as an intergenerational condo project that will offer top of the line concierge service and other amenities to attract a high-end tenant. Additionally, according to the marketing brochures, it will be heavily marketed to University of Maryland Alumni, staff, and others who might have an affinity to the university and may enjoy the amenities that the university has to offer. This may be a useful guide to how to approach the approval process since "The Mosaic" had a relatively easy time getting entitlements. Generally speaking, having the blessing of the University of Maryland is a plus for gaining approvals.
(Rendering of Mosaic at Turtle Creek)

(Illustration of Mosaic at Turtle Creek as Compared to West Campus Site)
East Campus

The East Campus project is singly the largest redevelopment in College Park market and potentially serves as a competitor for some of our tenants. According to the informed local real estate blog “Rethink College Park”, the East Campus Project is a 38 acre project that will bring housing, retail, office, and the “Birchmere Theater” to the corner of Route 1 and Paint Branch Parkway. All told, the project will likely be a $900 million project.

(Renderings of the proposed East Campus Project)

The East Campus is certainly much larger than the West Campus Village project but the fact that there is so much activity in the growing College Park community should be seen as a good thing. Additionally, given that the Executive MBA program and the Law School are going to be anchored at the West Campus Village, there is reason to be optimistic that those anchors will make for a strong project.
Cafritz Property

The Cafritz site is approximately 36 acres of land located inside the beltway in Prince George’s County, Maryland. Specifically, the site is located on US Route 1 in between three (3) forms of mass transportation. The site is walking distance from two (2) existing transit stations, the College Park Metro station and the Riverdale Park Marc station, and within walking distance from the proposed Purple Line Metro station. The Cafritz family envisions a mixed-use pedestrian friendly development for the site which will include commercial, office, and residential components. The proposed development will have approximately 168,000 square feet of commercial space, 22,000 square feet of office space, and 1000 residential units/homes. Most notably, the developer has secured signed leases from Wholefoods Market for 35,000 square feet, LA Fitness, a high end personal fitness gym, for 45,000 square feet including an indoor pool, and an REI for 12,000 square feet. We believe that a new development coming out of the ground with 92,000 square feet of retail already signed bodes well the for the trade area.

It is important to note that the square footage of the commercial and office space along with the number of residential units/homes are estimates and are subject to change as the site proceeds through the development process. Given the active local community, it is reasonable to estimate that the number of residential units will likely be close to 600, which is similar to the very popular EYA Arts District Hyattsville projects’ density (which will be discussed later). Similarly, it is expected that the commercial space will likely equal 150,000 square feet total. This may be very informative since our site is similar, if smaller in size. Additionally, it is almost
identical in political representation and in the neighborhoods that will have a say in the rezoning/planning process.

(Cafritz Site located just south of College Park, MD on US Rt. 1)
LAND USE AND PUBLIC POLICY

Prince George’s County, Maryland uses two types of zoning frameworks, conventional and floating zones. Currently the entire property has a residential zoning, which is a conventional zoning. Much of the property is currently zoned R-55, which is a very common residential zoning in Prince George's County, Maryland. Officially, according to the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, is "one-family detached residential" that permits "small lot residential subdivisions, promotes high density, single family detached dwellings". In particular, the standard lot size in this zoning would be 6,500 square feet with the maximum dwelling units per acre being 6.70 and the average being 4.2 per acre (MNCPPC Citizens Handbook). Additionally, some of the properties are zoned "R-80" which is an even less dense zoning category in Prince George's County. This zoning has a standard lot size for a residential unit of 9,500 square feet. The maximum dwelling units per acre is 4.5 and the average units per acre is 3.4 (MNCPPC Citizens Handbook). Finally, there is no commercial zoning on the property so to develop the property as we have intended, it needs to be rezoned into a mixed use zone. In Prince George’s County, MD, there are 3 ways for this to happen. Zoning can be changed by zoning map amendment (ZMA), Sectional Map Amendment (SMA) or by text amendment. There are very real practical differences in these three approaches that we will discuss.

Zoning Map Amendment

The zoning map amendment (ZMA) may be requested by the property owner. In order to receive a ZMA the District Council must “determine that there has been either a substantial
change to the character of the neighborhood or there was a mistake made in the original zoning” according to the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission. If we, the applicant, believe that we can meet that threshold, an application is made to the Development Review of the MNCPPC Planning Department. The entire process can take approximately 9-12 months. The advantages of this process is that it can be less time than the sectional map amendment process but the negatives are that, traditionally, the District Council views the “mistake or change” as a very burden of proof. There is no guarantee that one couldn’t go through the process and at the end of 12 months, be rejected.

Sectional Map Amendment

Sectional map amendments (SMA) are different from ZMA because they are originated by the government and not an individual property owner. In this process, according to the MNCPPC “all of the zoning within an entire geographic area, such as a subregion, sector, or planning area is examined”. If this were the rezoning route we would take it would start with the local county councilmember or the MNCPPC requesting a sector plan. A sector plan is a public process that has an appointed group of people hearing the opinions of the planning department and the property owners. After this very public process with many public meeting, the recommendations would be put forward in a document and the District Council would then vote on those recommendations which, technically, are called the sectional map amendment. This process is considered the most “legitimate” course for rezoning a property because of the massive amounts of public input. Additionally, a benefit is that by the time the process begins, it is typically clear that most stakeholders are in favor of the rezoning by virtue of the fact that the entire process would not have begun if their wasn’t support from the local councilmember or the MNCPPC.
The downside, however, since the entire process, from the time the sector plan begins until the time the sectional map amendment is approved could be 18 months to 24 months.

Text Amendment

The final avenue that we could consider is called a “text amendment”. It is called this because it actually amends the existing text of the zoning ordinance by legislative vote of the District Council. It is the effect of making large changes to allowed uses in the zoning ordinance. It is a very quick process (sometimes taking only 6 weeks) because it requires no public notice outside of any public notice given for legislation being heard by the District Council. The positives are clearly the quickness with which you can achieve the stated goal of rezoning. The negatives, however, are that the entire process of “text amendments” have become anathema to the civic associations and the environmental community. By merely employing this rezoning technique, we will likely raise the ire of community groups who would have otherwise supported the proposal. If we are to go down this path, having complete buy in from the neighborhoods of University Park and College Heights Estates are critical.

A recent example of a text amendment that worked was the EYA Arts District Project. According to Alonzo Washington, Chief of Staff to County Councilman Will Campos, who represents the area, the developer approached the local Hyattsville Community and went down a dual track of doing the official sectional map amendment that addressed the changing composition of the entire Route 1 corridor but then took the comments and advice of the community and applied for a text amendment for his particular development. I would recommend that we take a similar approach in dealing with the West Campus Village Site.
**Development Strategy**

The development strategy for the West Campus Village is to engage the local community in a Sectional Map Amendment process. After about 6 months of public comment, we will submit for a “text amendment” that will allow the site to be used in a much denser mixed-used development instead of the single family housing that it is currently zoned for. Currently the 24 acres is zoned for between 72-96 single family homes. Our hope is get the property zoned for “Mixed Use-Infill” that will allow for four distinct areas that will could be sold separately. Our goal is to get the property entitled for the development, put in the infrastructure, and then sell the land. The four areas will be:

**Area 1. 150,000 square feet of Class “A” Office/Industrial Space**

The 150,000 square feet of office and institutional space (that will house the University of Maryland Executive MBA Program and the University of Baltimore Law School) will be made up of two buildings 150 feet by 100 feet. The average floor place will be 15,000 square feet with both of the building being 5 stories. This is exactly consistent with the University of Maryland University College and Conference Center which adjacent to the site and Area 1 in particular. The first floor will have a lobby ceiling height of 16 feet (18.5 feet floor to floor) with the remaining ceiling heights being 10 feet (11.5 feet floor to floor). That means each building will stand 62 feet, which we believe will not meet resistance from the local community. Additionally, parking will be offered at a rate of 2 per 1,000 square feet. This rate is lower than the 3 per 1000 square feet called for in the code because of its proximity to the Purple Line and the University of Maryland. We will meet the 300 parking space by providing all 300 spaces in a parking garage. The total area used for Area 1 of the development will be 250,000 square feet or 5.7 acres.
Area 2. 350 Units of Student Housing Suites

The student housing will be in 4 “L” Shaped buildings, 160 feet long with a 60 feet depth. The average floor plate will be 12,000 square feet and will have 14 units per floor. Two of the buildings will be 5 stories, one will be six stories, and one will be seven stories. These will be located at the north east corner of the site, closest to the majority of academic building on the University of Maryland’s campus. The two taller buildings will sit closest to the University, taking advantage of the natural topography that has this site as the lowest point compared to the university. The shorter buildings will be located behind the other two and will serve as a transition to the residential townhomes. There will be general student amenities provided at each building. In total, there will be 350 parking spaces (1 per unit). The total land area required to fulfill this requirement is 300,000 square feet or 6.9 acres.

Area 3. 50,000 Square Foot Retail Facility with 250 Residential Units Above

The concept for this portion of the development is two 1 story 25,000 square foot retail centers. Above the first floor retail there will be 6 additional stories of residential. The average floor plate will be 16,575 square feet and there will be 20 units per floor with an average gross floor area, including common space of 830 square feet. There will be a wide range of options from studio apartments to 2 bedroom units. Each building will be 7 stories tall. The properties in Area 3 will be adjacent to Campus Drive, where there it will be closest to the University of Maryland and furthest away from existing residential neighborhoods. There will be 350 parking spaces provided in this area with 200 parking spaces being provided to the residential tenants and 150 parking spaces provided for the retail customers. As with previous areas, because this property is located so closely to the Purple Line metro station, the parking requirements have been
reduced. The total land area required for Area 3 of the development is 212,000 square feet or 4.9 acres of land.

Area 4. 100 Unit Townhouse Subdivision

The townhouse development employs an over/under concept where the “under” unit is a 1 story 40 feet wide by 32 feet deep unit and each “over” unit is a 2 story 20 feet by 32 feet deep product. Thus, from the street it will appear as a 3 story unit. The reason for this is first, to achieve more density, since a standard 20 foot wide townhouse development would take up approximately 50% more space. Also, we believe there is a market for one story living, given the amenities and proximity to the University of Maryland and the Purple Line. Area 4 will be located in the southern most portion of the site and will serve as a buffer to the existing residential neighborhood. These units will be constructed in groups of 5 or (or 15 units at a time). The lower unit and one of the over units will be oriented to the same side, while the other over unit will have its own driveway in the front of each unit. In total there will be 102 townhouses and they will encumber 288,000 square feet or 6.6 acres of land. Of this approximately 50% of it will be for green space.
Financial Analysis

The first step in seeing the West Campus Village become a reality is the assemblage of the 30 properties. By using CoStar, we looked at all residential and commercial land sold in the College Park trade area since 1/1/2008. We found in total 12 transactions but what we lacked in sheer number of comparable sales, we made up for in quality. In particular, 3 of the comparable sales are adjacent to the site. The comparable sales give us a good idea of what the value of residential land with a similar zoning is worth and also what an entitled mixed use zone value might be. It did not shed much light since there has been very little market demand for office space. Currently, all of the Class A office space in College Park market has been done in partnership with the University of Maryland. Of the properties (CoStar Report added as addendum) that we
are looking at has the average price of residential land being $1.61 million per acre but this includes a number of sales that were already through the approval process and had added density. The best comps are actually adjacent to the site. First, at 7220-7240 Windsor Lane, Hyattsville, MD there was a sale of 1 acre of R55 zoned ground in December of 2009 for $1.1 million. The property was raw land. Additionally, there was a sale of 2.7 acres located immediately adjacent to our site in June of 2008. This site was zoned R55 also and although it did have an old single family dwelling on the site, similar, to our site, it should be viewed through the value of the land. The purchaser, similarly, bought the property to rezone the land, add density, and sell it to a student housing developer. The property sold for $2.750 million or $1.02 million per acre. Using this number as our comp we can predict that our acquisition cost will be $1 million per acre or $24 Million. In addition to acquisition cost, we need to account for the cost of getting the entitlement and building the infrastructure. According to “Mixed Use Development Handbook” published by the Urban Land Institute and Gary Michael, President of the NAI Michael, a local real estate developer, the back of the envelope cost of the entitlements and infrastructure can be estimated at being 10% of the total hard cost of the construction. Of this, according to the same sources, 35% is for the soft cost and 65% is construction of infrastructure. Obviously the cost of the construction varies greatly from product type to product type. Taking a look at the estimated construction cost for each of the areas will allow us to arrive at our infrastructure and entitlement cost. According to a construction cost survey done in June of 2010 by www.realestateinvestor.com the cost of the construction would be as approximately as follows:
Area 1

150,000 square foot office building @ $172 per square foot = $25,800,000

70,000 square foot garage @ $57 per square foot = $3,999,000

Total = $29,799,000

Total Cost of Entitlements and Infrastructure @ 10% = $2,979,700

Total Land acquisition cost @ $1 million per acre

for 5.7 acres of Area 1 + $5,700,000

Total Cost of Area 1 = $8,679,700

Area 2

350 Student Housing Units @ $86,000 per unit = $31,039,050

Total Cost of Entitlements and Infrastructure @ 10% = $3,103,905

Total Land acquisition cost @ $1 million per acre

for 6.9 acres of Area 2 + $6,900,000

Total Cost for Area 2 = $10,003,905

Area 3

50,000 square feet of retail @ $125 per square foot = $6,250,000

Total Cost of Entitlements and Infrastructure @ 10% = $625,000
250 residential units @ $86,000 per unit = $21,500,000
Total Cost of Entitlements and Infrastructure @ 10% = $2,150,000

Total Land acquisition cost @ $1 million per acre
for 4.9 acres of Area 3 + $4,900,000
Total Cost for Area 3 = $7,675,000

Area 4

102 Townhomes (average size 1200sf)

@ $174 per square foot = $21,297,600
Total Cost of Entitlements and Infrastructure @ 10% = $2,129,760
Total Land acquisition cost @ $1 million per acre
for 6.6 acres of Area 4 + $6,600,000
Total Cost for Area 4 = $8,729,760

Selling the Entitled Land

As we look to sell the land that we have taken through the entitlement process, we utilize CoStar once again to show us what properties might sell for. For Area 1, as previously stated, there is little office construction in the College Park area making it extremely hard to find a value for how we might sell the property. For Area 2 and Area 3 we are able to find comparable sales that are extremely informative. For Area 4, the townhouse lot, I interviewed Michael Isen, of NAI Michael Companies to find a finished townhome lot value since there have been no townhome
lot sales in the last 3 years. In this case, we used comps from Bowie, MD and upgraded that value slightly, based on the real estate professional’s opinion, to reflect that College Park, MD is a slightly stronger market.

**Area 1**

In speaking to Gary Michael, President of NAI Michael Companies, he stated that:

"with the University of Maryland, effectively in the real estate business, the risk is too high and the reward is too little for new Class A office construction. The biggest player in the office market prefers to lease its own buildings."

We have included a quick work up for Area 1, showing that the cost of construction for Area 1 does not justify the current average market rent of $23.50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150,000 Square Foot Office Cost</td>
<td>$54,749,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70,000 Square Foot Garage Cost</td>
<td>$4,421,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Building Cost</td>
<td>$59,171,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Building Area in Square Feet</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Area in Square Feet</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area In Square Feet</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Total Cost Per Square Foot</td>
<td>$268.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the reality of Class A office market in College Park, we believe the best option for this site is to sell the property to the University of Maryland. The fact remains that the University of Maryland is an aggressive buyer of real estate and the location of our site, adjacent to the University (particularly the business school) and the Purple Line, and given the fact that it has gone through the approval process leads us to believe that we may be successful in selling the property to the University of Maryland for $8,679,700 or $1,522,754 per acre.
Area 2

The comparable sales have a very unique property that is extremely useful in determining what we believe we can sell our properties for. We first used the sale of 7720 Mowatt Lane in 2008 as a comp to determine a land value when we were purchasing the land. The property, however, was sold again in 2011 after it went through an identical land use strategy for increasing density and making the site mixed use. Therefore, we believe that this comp is uniquely capable of finding what our sales price might be. In 2011, 7720 Mowatt Lane, sold for $7,300,000 or $2,703,704 per acre. For Area 2, at 6.9 acres our sales price would be $18,655,557. Our land, entitlement, and infrastructure cost was $10,003,905 so our potential profit for Area 2 would be $8,651,652.

Area 3

Using the same comp for Area 3 as we did in Area 2, we know that the comparable value is $2,703,704 per acre. For Area 3, at 4.9 acres our sales price would be $13,248,149. Our land, entitlement, and infrastructure cost was $7,675,000 so our potential profit for Area 3 would be $5,573,149.

Area 4

For Area 4, we can’t use the comps that we used for Area 2 and Area 3 since it is a townhouse development and not high density mixed use. As previously stated, we have reached out to real
estate agents with knowledge of the local market to find an appropriate value to sell the entitle
land. Mike Isen, Senior Vice President of NAI Michael Companies suggested that townhouse
lots in nearby areas are trading for $87,000 a lot and that for this site it would be reasonable to
expect $95,000 per lot. Area 4 consists of 102 townhouse lots. At $95,000 per lot that would be a
sales price of $9,690,000. Given that our land, entitlement, and infrastructure cost for Area 4 is
$8,729,760 that would be a profit of $960,240.

Cost Analysis
As previously stated, we are assuming a $24 million purchase price for the land based on
comparables. Additionally we believe the entitlements and Infrastructure would be $10,988,365
(10% of total development costs for the four areas). The total cost of the project would be
$34,988,365. We are assuming that it would take 24 months as an outside date to get the
entitlements to allow the increase in density. As we stated earlier, we believe the total sales price
of all four areas combined will be $50,273,406. Therefore the rate of return will be 43.7% over
the two year period or 21.8% annually.

Conclusion.
After considering all the options and reviewing this site, it is clear that the value of the office
development has minimal direct value and a great deal of risk. The land value for property is the
College Park, MD market is relatively high so it is incredible important that the right amount of
density is granted through the zoning process or the risk of carrying the land will make the
development will be too great. We believe that there is great value and demand for residential and residential next to the University of Maryland. Clearly there is significant potential profit for Areas 2 and 3. There was similarly, but less, potential for profit in Area 4. The major difference between these scenarios is the density. As for Area 1, the University is a natural, and frequent, buyer and user of office space. It is logical that they would be the most likely buyer of Area 1, the office component.
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Zoning

Zoning is the legal power of government to regulate the use of private property for the purpose of protecting public health, safety, and welfare. It is one of the police powers of the State of Maryland. In Prince George's County, this power is delegated to and exercised by the County Council, sitting as the District Council. The link between planning and zoning is critical. Legally defensible zoning controls are based upon sound planning principles as set forth in adopted and approved plans. Zoning based upon arbitrary opinion or the pressures of vested interests is neither legal nor appropriate.

The Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance (Subtitle 27) is part of the County Code. It describes the various zones, lists the uses permitted in each zone, specifies densities, and sets forth the procedures to change the zones. The ordinance establishes standards for the location of structures, building heights, setbacks, and other area requirements. Zoning categories allow residential, commercial, or industrial uses at varying densities or intensities. Some of the more recently adopted zones permit a mix of compatible land uses, subject to certain standards.

This chapter will first explain the various types of zones and then describe the rezoning process: zoning map amendments and sectional map amendments. For a complete zone listing, visit www.pgplanning.org/Resources/Zoning_Information/Guide_to_Zoning_Categories.htm. The listing should be consulted for more details about the various types of zones that are discussed below.
Types of Zones

Two types of zones are in use in Prince George’s County—conventional zones and floating zones. Within these two zones are a variety of individual zoning classifications. Most properties are in conventional zones; however, an increasing number of properties are being placed in floating zones. Each of these types of zones is described below.

Conventional (Euclidean) Zones

Conventional zones fall into three categories: residential, commercial, and industrial. In a conventional zone, permitted land uses and densities are specifically listed. Each land use is permitted subject to strict requirements regarding lot size, lot coverage, street frontage, building setbacks, and height limits.

Floating Zones

The purpose of floating zones is to encourage creativity of design and permit specialized land development. Accordingly, the number of uses allowed is quite broad, but proposals are subject to an in-depth review process. Certain development regulations, such as lot size and coverage, are not specified and are instead established during the review process. Floating zones include comprehensive design, mixed-use/planned community, and overlay zones.

Individual Zoning Classifications

Comprehensive Design Zones

Comprehensive design zones do not have prescribed height, setback, and lot coverage requirements. These zones also allow an increase in residential density or commercial intensity in exchange for the provision of public benefit features, such as a community park or neighborhood bike path that improves the quality of the project.

Development proposals in a comprehensive design zone are approved via a three-phase review process:

Phase I (Basic Plan): Sets forth proposed land uses and general land use relationships, including the approximate number of dwelling units and building intensity. A determination must be made that public facilities are adequate to serve the proposed development.
Phase II (Comprehensive Design Plan): Refines the approved basic plan. Establishes the general location, distribution, and size of proposed structures and includes various standards and guidelines. Proposed public benefit features are described, and a determination must be made that the development will not be an unreasonable burden on public facilities.

Phase III (Specific Design Plan): Includes detailed landscaping plans, tree conservation plans, recreational facilities plans, and exterior building elevations. A determination must also be made that the development will be adequately served by public facilities within a reasonable period of time.

Mixed-Use/Planned Community Zones

There are several mixed-use/planned community zones, each containing its own unique regulations designed to provide for a variety of compatible uses and to create a particular character of development.

The M-X-T Zone is transportation oriented to create a 24-hour environment in the immediate vicinity of major transportation facilities.

The M-X-C Zone encourages a balanced mix of residential, commercial, recreational, and public uses. It also requires the finding that transportation facilities will be adequate to carry anticipated traffic.

The M-U-TC Zone promotes redevelopment, preservation, and adaptive reuse of existing buildings in older commercial areas.

Mixed-Use Infill (M-U-I) promotes smart growth principles by encouraging the efficient use of land, public facilities, and services in areas that are substantially developed. These regulations are intended to create community environments enhanced by a mix of residential, commercial, recreational, open space, employment, and institutional uses in accordance with approved plans. The infill zone may only be approved for property in a transit district overlay zone or a development district overlay zone.

The R-P-C Zone accommodates large-scale community development such as found in Greenbelt and Marlton.

The R-M-H Zone provides for mobile home communities.
**Overlay Zones**

Overlay zones are superimposed over existing zoning classifications in a designated area and are used to modify certain requirements of the underlying zones.

**Transit District Overlay Zone:** The transit district overlay zone (TDOZ) was created to encourage intensive land development in the vicinity of Metro stations in order to maximize transit ridership and reduce automobile use. The TDOZ is superimposed over underlying conventional zones in a designated area around a Metro station. The TDOZ may modify certain requirements of the underlying zones, such as permitted uses, parking regulations, sign requirements, and the location and height of buildings. The requirements may be stricter than in the underlying zone, and development in a TDOZ requires approval of a detailed site plan by the Planning Board.

**Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Overlay Zone:** The Chesapeake Bay Critical Area overlay zone is a mapped overlay area of three zones superimposed over conventional zones. The purpose of these zones is to ensure that future development is environmentally sensitive and in accordance with state and county Chesapeake Bay Critical Area policies and regulations to preserve and enhance the quality of water entering the Chesapeake Bay, to protect wildlife resources, and to enhance recreational opportunities. Prior to approval of permits for development in the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area, a conservation plan and agreement must be approved, unless the proposed work is minor in nature and qualifies for a staff level review. Development is subject to both the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the regulations set forth in the "Prince George's County Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Program Conservation Manual," Chapter 4, Development Review, page 39, contains additional information.

**Development District Overlay (D-D-O):** Intended to ensure that development in a designated district meets the goals established in a master plan, master plan amendment, or sector plan, development districts may be designated for town centers, Metro areas, commercial corridors, employment centers, revitalization areas, historic areas, and other special areas as identified in approved plans.
Revitalization Overlay Districts (R-O-D): Intended to ensure the orderly development or redevelopment of land within designated districts, revitalization districts provide a mechanism for the county to delegate full authority to local municipalities to approve departures from parking, landscaping, and sign standards. In addition, limited authority is also delegated for the approval of variances from building setbacks, lot coverage, yards, and other dimensional requirements of existing zoning.

Architectural Overlay Districts (A-C-O): Intended to ensure that development and redevelopment efforts preserve and protect the architectural or design character of neighborhoods in accordance with an approved architectural conservation plan, conservation districts may be designated in areas where the majority of properties have been developed and exhibit distinct, unifying elements, characteristics, design, or other physical features.

Rezoning

Changes to existing zones occur either through zoning map amendments (ZMA) or sectional map amendments (SMA). Zoning map amendments may be requested by a property owner for a single parcel of land. Sectional map amendments are initiated by the District Council and can cover an entire community. The District Council has full authority and responsibility for all rezoning decisions.

Zoning Map Amendments

Before approving a change to a conventional zone, the District Council must determine that there has either been a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood or that a mistake was made in the original zoning or the most recent sectional map amendment. The change or mistake finding does not apply to floating zones. Approval of a floating zone depends upon demonstrating conformance to required findings for approval of that zone as stipulated in the Zoning Ordinance.

Applications for zoning map amendments are processed as follows:

Filing: Applications are filed with the Development Review Division of the M-NCPPC Planning Department. The offices are located on the fourth floor of the County Administration Building in Upper Marlboro, Maryland. Any person may review and copy an application and supporting documents. Applicants are required
to send informational mailings to registered civic associations, municipalities
within a mile of the property, adjoining property owners, and previous persons of
record at least 30 days before filing applications. Any individual can become a
“person of record” by requesting such in writing or by testifying before the Zoning
Hearing Examiner. Persons of record are notified of all upcoming hearings and
receive copies of the technical staff report and the results of all decisions made with
regard to the application.

**Technical Staff Report:** The Planning Department analyzes the request and
prepares a technical staff report recommending approval, approval with conditions,
or denial. The report is submitted to the Planning Board, Zoning Hearing Examiner,
District Council, all persons of record, and any interested person requesting a copy.
Staff reports are available two weeks prior to the Planning Board hearing.

**Planning Board Review and Action:** Zoning applications are considered
by the Planning Board during its regularly scheduled Thursday meetings.
The Planning Board may vote to hold a public hearing, but a hearing before
the Planning Board is not mandatory. If the Planning Board votes to hear the
case, the applicant and interested persons may testify before the Planning Board
in response to the technical staff report. Testimony may be oral or written. All
testimony becomes part of the official record that will be forwarded to the District
Council. The board may concur with the technical staff report or make a different
recommendation. The Planning Board recommendation is provided in the form of
a resolution and is transmitted to the Zoning Hearing Examiner and District
Council, along with copies of all other official record materials.

**Notice of Public Hearing:** The Zoning Hearing Examiner establishes the hearing
schedule for zoning cases (zoning map amendments and special exceptions). The
examiner sends hearing notices to persons of record and the applicant posts the
property with sign(s) indicating the time and place of the hearing.

**Public Hearing:** The Zoning Hearing Examiner conducts the official county
zoning hearings. All materials and testimony presented before the examiner
constitute the official record in the case. This includes the Planning Board resolution,
the technical staff report, and all other materials forwarded by the Planning Board.
After the hearing, all persons of record receive a written decision, which contains
findings of facts, conclusions of law, and the recommended action. The Zoning
Hearing Examiner’s decision is forwarded to the District Council.
**Oral Argument:** Within 30 days of the filing of the Zoning Hearing Examiner’s decision with the District Council, any person of record or the People’s Zoning Counsel may file exceptions to any portion of the decision and request oral argument before the District Council. Oral argument allows persons of record to speak to the District Council about the case. Only issues contained in the official record may be discussed during oral argument.

**District Council Action:** The council may (1) grant the proposed rezoning; (2) grant a less-intensive zone for all or part of the property; (3) deny the application; (4) return the application to the Zoning Hearing Examiner or Planning Board for further evidence; (5) dismiss the application; or (6) allow it to be withdrawn. Notice of action taken by the District Council is transmitted to persons of record. District Council actions may be appealed to the Circuit Court.

**Conditional Zoning:** In approving any individual zoning map amendment, the District Council may adopt reasonable requirements and safeguards known as conditions that are designed to protect the neighboring area from adverse effects that might result from the rezoning or to enhance the quality of the new development. The applicant must accept or reject the zoning classification as conditionally approved. If the conditions are rejected, the zoning map amendment is voided and the property reverts to the prior zone classification.

**Comprehensive Rezoning (Sectional Map Amendments)**

The preceding section describes the rezoning process, which is followed when an individual property owner makes application to change the zoning on his/her property. However, zoning may also be changed at the initiative of the county government through a process called comprehensive rezoning. Unlike zoning map amendments, comprehensive rezonings are not undertaken for individual properties. Instead, all of the zoning within an entire geographic area, such as a subregion, sector, or planning area is examined. The result of the comprehensive rezoning process is a new zoning map for the subject area that is called a sectional map amendment (SMA).
The purposes of comprehensive rezoning are: (1) to implement the master plan or sector plan recommendations; (2) to provide for a systematic review of zoning and land use and how it conforms to the principles of orderly comprehensive land use planning, staged development, and planned public facilities; (3) to limit piecemeal rezoning; and (4) to limit the zoning map amendment cases heard by the Zoning Hearing Examiner.

 Typically, the comprehensive rezoning process results in a change of zoning for only some of the properties in the subject area. The remaining properties are left in their previous zones either because they are already developed or because a zoning change is not deemed appropriate. The Zoning Ordinance contains some limitations on the ability to rezone and on the zones that may be used.

The Zoning Ordinance stipulates three procedures that may be followed in preparing sectional map amendments. The procedure most commonly used today is the preparation of a sectional map amendment concurrent with preparation of an area master plan. In this instance, a zoning proposal is prepared as one of the area master plan elements and is subject to public hearing along with the area master plan. At the conclusion of the process, the District Council simultaneously approves both the area master plan and the sectional map amendment.

**Special Exceptions**

Applications for special exception uses require a site plan showing all proposed improvements. These applications are reviewed to ensure that the proposed use is compatible with surrounding uses and the general neighborhood. Many special exceptions must also conform to their own unique set of requirements. Once approved, the property must be developed in accordance with the approved site plan. Processing procedures are similar to those described for individual zoning map amendments. However, in the case of a special exception, the Zoning Hearing Examiner is empowered to make the final decision unless a person of record appeals the case to the District Council.
VARIANCES

A variance is a mechanism to obtain relief from the strict application of requirements such as building height, building setback, and yard requirements. Variances are appropriate in situations where strict conformance would result in unusual practical difficulties or undue hardship for the owner of the property. For example, a lot might be so narrow as to make it impossible to observe the side yard setback requirements when building a home. The Board of Zoning Appeals is authorized to grant variances. The Planning Board and District Council are also authorized to grant variances associated with development applications on which they take the final action. State law also permits the District Council to delegate authority to grant variances to municipal governments. As of this writing, this authority has been granted to the Cities of Bowie, College Park, Greenbelt, and New Carrollton.

DEPARTURES

A departure grants relief from the strict application of requirements for: (1) the design of parking and loading facilities; (2) the number of parking and loading spaces; (3) sign regulations; and (4) landscaping, buffering, and screening requirements of the Landscape Manual. The Planning Board is authorized to grant departures. State law also permits the District Council to delegate authority to grant departures to municipal governments. As of this writing, this authority has been granted to the Cities of Bowie, College Park, Greenbelt, and New Carrollton.

NONCONFORMING USES AND STRUCTURES

Some land uses and/or structures in existence do not meet current requirements. These uses or structures are termed nonconforming. This has occurred in a variety of ways. In some cases, a land use was established prior to the initial zoning of the property. In other cases, a use was once permitted in a zone but has subsequently been disallowed or allowed only by a special exception. Also, there are some structures that were originally built according to all of the parking, setback, sign, etc., requirements but no longer meet these requirements because of a subsequent change in the regulations. The nonconforming uses and structures are considered to be grandfathered and allowed to remain as long as the use has never ceased for a period longer than 180 days.
Text Amendments

The Zoning Ordinance is subject to review and amendment solely by the District Council, which may amend the text to create new zones or repeal zones. This process is called a text amendment. Similarly, it may add permitted uses to a zone, eliminate permitted uses from a zone, or require the grant of a special exception. Indeed, any of the regulations may be changed through the text amendment process. A text amendment may be requested by the County Executive, the Planning Board, or any interested individual or organization. In some instances, the council may initiate an amendment itself. Amending the Zoning Ordinance is a legislative process requiring a public hearing and approval by a majority of the council.

The Subdivision Regulations (Subtitle 24 of the Prince George's County Code) are subject to review and amendment by both the District Council and the County Executive. Similar to changes to the Zoning Ordinance, amending the Subdivision Regulations is a legislative process requiring a public hearing and approval by a majority of the District Council and the signature of the County Executive.
Development Review

The final steps in the land development process consist of the review and approval of subdivision plans, site plans, and permits.

Subdivision

The Subdivision Regulations control the subdivision of land for purposes of sale or development. Subdivisions are controlled through a process known as platting. A plat is a map of a parcel of land that shows features such as lot lines, streets, stormwater management facilities, easements, topography, and building restriction lines.

Preliminary Plans of Subdivision

The first step in the subdivision process consists of reviewing a preliminary plan. One of the major purposes of reviewing preliminary plans is to ensure that adequate public facilities are available, or will be available in the foreseeable future, to serve the proposed development. Determination of adequacy is made for fire and rescue facilities, police facilities, public roads, public water, and sewer facilities. The Planning Board determines adequacy based on an analysis of information generated by staff, submitted by the applicant, or submitted by the agencies responsible for building required facilities or supplying the necessary services.
Preliminary plans are also reviewed for environmental issues, such as woodland conservation, sensitive environmental features, and stormwater management; proper legal description of lots; and the general design of the subdivision including access, circulation and lotting pattern. Certain residential subdivisions are required to provide land for public parks and recreational facilities or money to supplement existing facilities. The majority of preliminary plans are heard at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Board. These are known as major subdivisions. However, certain residential subdivisions containing four or fewer residential lots may be approved by the Planning Director. These are known as minor subdivisions.

**Conservation Subdivisions**

The purpose of a conservation subdivision is to protect the character of land through the permanent preservation of farmland, woodland, sensitive natural features, scenic and historic landscapes, vistas, and unique features of the site in keeping with the General Plan and the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan. The purpose of a public benefit conservation subdivision is to prioritize site characteristics that conserve important features such as open space networks and contiguous woodland habitats adjacent to other existing open space tracts. Intermodal trails that provide a link to adjacent properties as an enhancement of recreational opportunities are encouraged.

A conservation subdivision is required in the Rural Tier (R-R, R-E, R-A and O-S Zones) when a subdivision has five or more lots. A conservation subdivision is optional in the Developing and Developed Tiers. Public benefit conservation subdivisions are only permitted in the R-R Zone and are intended for the Developing Tier where more flexibility is necessary on smaller lots.
Final Plats of Subdivision

Final plats include all pertinent engineering data necessary to locate every street, lot, block, and boundary line on the ground. Final plats are reviewed by staff to ensure conformance with the approved preliminary plan. They are approved by the Planning Board at regularly scheduled meetings, but advertised public hearings and preapplication notices are not required.

Record Plats of Subdivision

Once the final plat is approved by the Planning Board, it is forwarded to the Land Records Department of Prince George’s County. A plat book and page number, which are always preceded by the initials of the then-current Clerk of the Circuit Court, are assigned to the final plat. From that time on, it is referred to as a record plat of subdivision. The recordation of a final plat establishes the subdivision of the land and permits the conveyance of individual properties created by that plat.

Procedures for Subdivision Review

The process through which subdivisions are approved consists of the following steps:

1. **Pre-Preliminary Submission:** This step is optional, but is encouraged for all subdivision applications. The applicant meets with staff prior to formal submission of the preliminary plan in order to discuss concerns unique to the site.

2. **Application:** A general scheme of the proposed development is submitted to the Planning Department. The applicant must show the location of the property and access to it; existing topography, utilities and rights-of-way; proposed layout of roads, parkland or utility sites; designated historic sites; open spaces; floodplain areas; and provisions for stormwater management. In many cases, depending upon the magnitude of the proposed impact, a traffic study is required to address the adequacy of the surrounding transportation network.
3. **Technical Review:** Planning Department staff and relevant public agencies review the proposal with the applicant during regularly scheduled Subdivision Review Committee meetings. Staff then prepare a report recommending approval, approval with conditions, or denial. Staff's recommendation is based upon the project's conformity with the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances, required findings for adequate public facilities, and the approved area master plan. The report is submitted to the Planning Board and mailed to all parties of record and any interested person requesting a copy.

4. **Planning Board Action:** Public hearings on preliminary plans are conducted by the Planning Board after the property is posted with a sign advertising the hearing. At these hearings, any interested person may comment. The Board will approve or disapprove the proposal as submitted, or approve it subject to specified conditions. At this stage in the subdivision process, the Planning Board may also require the applicant to set aside land for future public use such as roads, schools, and parks within the subdivision. Under state law, the Board must act within 70 days of plan acceptance. This time period may be extended another 70 days (with the agreement of the applicant) in order to address unresolved issues. The Planning Board's action on the preliminary plan may be appealed to the Circuit Court.

Depending upon the size of the development, an approved preliminary plan is valid for either two or six years from the date the resolution is adopted. Under certain provisions, extensions of the initial validity period may be granted. If a final plat has not been accepted within the validity period of the preliminary plan, the applicant must resubmit a new preliminary plan and repeat the approval procedure.

After preliminary plan approval, the applicant may request engineering studies leading toward a commitment for water and sewer service from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC), which determines what water and sewer extensions are necessary and under what conditions any extension will be constructed. An applicant may obtain a commitment from WSSC for service with an approved preliminary plan, but construction cannot begin until the plat is recorded in the county's land records. If septic tanks and/or wells are to be used, permission must be obtained from the Prince George's County Health Officer based upon the results of ground percolation tests.
Variations

In some instances, extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties may result from strict compliance with the Subdivision Regulations. In such cases, the Planning Board may modify requirements provided that certain findings are made, as stipulated in the Subdivision Regulations. Such waivers are known as variations and should not be confused with zoning variances.

Vacation of Plats

Recorded plats of subdivision may be vacated (abandoned) upon petition by the owner of the property. All owners of abutting properties must be notified in writing of the proposed vacation petition. Notice of a vacation hearing is posted on the property and the Planning Board’s action is sent to the county’s land records and the state’s Department of Assessments and Taxation.

Site Plan Review

Some development applications are subject to a special review process called site plan review. In most cases, site plan review is triggered by a Zoning Ordinance requirement attached to a particular zone or use, such as townhouses, multifamily housing, day care centers, and employment parks in the I-3 Zone. Site plan review may also be required as a condition of the preliminary plan, special exception, or zoning map amendment approval. This process involves an in-depth review of the site plan and is based primarily on design issues, such as buffering, landscaping, grading, and architecture. The plan must conform to the design guidelines stipulated in the Zoning Ordinance. These guidelines are performance standards for the design of parking, loading, and circulation; lighting; views; green area; site and streetscape amenities; grading; service areas; public spaces; and architecture.

A public hearing before the Planning Board is scheduled for site plan review cases. Properties are posted with a sign advertising the hearing and all persons of record are notified by mail. Any interested person may speak on the proposal at the hearing. Staff prepare a report and make a recommendation to the Planning Board, which may approve, approve with conditions, or deny the plan.
The Planning Board’s decision may be appealed to the District Council by any party of record or the District Council may, on its own motion, choose to review the decision. The District Council will then hold a public hearing and affirm, reverse, or modify the Planning Board’s decision.

Several types of plans are subject to the site plan review process:

**Conceptual Site Plans/Comprehensive Design Plans**

Conceptual site plans and comprehensive design plans show basic relationships among the proposed uses and illustrate approximate locations of structures, parking areas, streets, site access, open space, and other major physical features. They may be somewhat detailed, or may be more schematic and depict proposed uses as areas connected with arrows or other graphic symbols. Conceptual site plans and comprehensive design plans must be approved before a preliminary plan of subdivision may be approved. They are valid indefinitely.

**Detailed Site Plans/Specific Design Plans**

Detailed site plans and specific design plans show the exact location and design of all buildings and structures, streets, parking lots, open spaces, landscaping, grading, and other physical features.

These plans contain the same level of site information that is necessary to obtain a permit. They must conform to any preceding conceptual site plan or comprehensive design plan, and to an approved preliminary plan of subdivision. Most detailed site plans are valid for three years; a specific design plan is valid for six years. No building permits can be issued until a required detailed site plan or specific design plan has been approved.

In addition to the plans described above, the Zoning Ordinance provides for detailed site plans and specific design plans for infrastructure that shows grading, stormwater management, tree conservation areas, sediment and erosion control, and utilities such as sewer and water. Approval of a detailed site plan or specific design plan for infrastructure allows an applicant to go forward with grading the property and making infrastructure improvements before all the architectural details are complete.

Questions concerning site plan review should be directed to the M-NCPPC Development Review Division at 301-952-3530.
Permit Review

Building, use and occupancy, grading, and sign permits are issued by the Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources (DER). DER refers such applications to other local agencies, including the Soil Conservation District, Department of Public Works and Transportation, Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, and M-NCPPC. Grading permits are issued by the Department of Public Works and Transportation.

The purpose of the referral to M-NCPPC is to ensure conformance with the Zoning Ordinance, Historic Preservation Ordinance, Subdivision Regulations, and the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance. This referral of the permit to M-NCPPC involves the review of the proposed uses, parking and loading requirements, required setbacks, landscaping, conditions attached to zoning, conditions attached to subdivision approvals, and any other conditions imposed by any other public hearing process. DER and DPW&T must refer all permits to M-NCPPC or the permit will be deemed to have been issued in error. To check the status of a permit, call the M-NCPPC Permit Review Section at 301-952-3530 or www.pgplanning.org/Resources/Tools_Online/Permits.htm.

Historic Area Work Permits

Exterior alterations, demolition, grading, sign or new construction projects affecting a historic site or property within a historic district require a historic area work permit (HAWP). This permit is not required for interior work or certain ordinary maintenance projects that will not alter the exterior features of the historic site or its setting. The Historic Preservation Commission and/or staff review the applications to determine if the proposed work is compatible with the historic character of the property.

Historic site owners and property owners within a historic district are encouraged to contact the staff to informally discuss the proposed project before filing an application.
Other Regulations

Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation

The Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance was adopted in 1990 to conserve woodlands and protect wildlife habitat. The Maryland Forest Conservation Act was passed by the General Assembly in 1991, which adopted woodland conservation as a statewide policy and established minimum local standards to apply during development. All development activities that require a grading permit in Prince George's County must demonstrate compliance with the Woodland Conservation Ordinance, either through submittal of a letter of exemption from woodland conservation or an approved tree conservation plan.

A project is exempt from the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance if the site is less than 40,000 square feet in area or contains less than 10,000 square feet of woodlands; or if the proposed activity will disturb less than 5,000 square feet of woodlands. Letters of exemption are issued for eligible sites by the Environmental Planning Section (EPS) of M-NCPPC after submittal of a signed application form, documentation necessary to identify and evaluate the development site and activity, and payment of a required application fee.

A letter of exemption cannot be issued for a site if these criteria are not met or if there is a previously approved tree conservation plan (TCP) for the site. A TCP is a plan approved by EPS that indicates how the woodland conservation requirements for a site will be met and how woodlands will be protected before, during, and after construction. Development activities on sites subject to the Woodland Conservation Ordinance must be in conformance with an approved TCP, and fines or mitigation may be imposed by the county when unauthorized clearing occurs.

Whether a property has a TCP can be determined by consulting EPS or the environmental features layers in PGAAtlas.com. Copies of approved TCPs can be obtained from EPS, where permanent files are maintained, with the submittal of a copy request form and payment of a copying charge. If a property is subject to a TCP, the seller is required to provide a copy of the TCP to the buyer at the time of the contract signing under the county's Consumer Protection Code.
The enforcement of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance is the responsibility of the county. For further information, consult “A Technical Manual for Woodland Conservation with Development in Prince George’s County,” available at Planning Information Services on the lower level of the County Administration Building; the Planning Department website (www.pgplanning.org/About-Planning/Our_Divisions/Countywide_Planning/Environmental_Planning.htm); or call the environmental planner on duty at 301-952-3650.

Streams and Wetlands

The Prince George’s County Subdivision Ordinance (Subtitle 24) requires that streams and wetlands be preserved during construction, with exceptions being made for necessary site features such as road crossings and utility installations. Impacts to streams and wetlands for a proposed subdivision are subject to approval by the Prince George’s County Planning Board.

Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Program

The Chesapeake Bay Critical Area (CBCA) encompasses the land that is within 1,000 feet of the mean high tide line of the Patuxent, Potomac, and Anacostia Rivers. The program requires the approval of a CBCA conservation plan conforming to special development standards, which focus on limiting total amounts of impervious surfaces, improving water quality, and preserving woodlands, prior to issuance of most permits. Permit applications that are minor in nature may qualify for a staff-level review process and a conservation plan is not required.

For more information, see the current Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Program Conservation Manual. Conservation plans are reviewed by M-NCPPC staff and approved by the Planning Board.

Suspicious or unauthorized woodland clearing can be reported to the DPW&T customer service line at 301-499-8520.

Questions regarding the requirements for a conservation plan can be directed to the Environmental Planning Section at 301-952-3650. Questions regarding the overall program, the staff-level review process, and enforcement can be directed to DPW&T at 301-883-5710.
Landscape Manual and Alternative Compliance

The Landscape Manual establishes mandatory minimum standards for planting on residential lots and for commercial landscape strips, perimeter strips, and internal landscaping in parking lots. Buffering incompatible uses, screening the views of the rears of houses from the road, and screening loading spaces and other undesirable views is also required. The Landscape Manual also includes a list of recommended trees, as well as planting specifications and details.

In cases where circumstances prevent strict compliance, there is a procedure to allow other designs that equal or exceed the requirements. This procedure is called alternative compliance. Staff review these cases and make recommendations to the Planning Director in the case of permits, or the approving authority, such as the Planning Board, in other cases. An alternative compliance application must be accompanied by another application, such as a permit, detailed site plan, or special exception.

Stormwater Management

Development of land generally causes an increase in stormwater runoff that can damage public and private property through increased flooding, accelerated channel erosion, and degraded water quality. To prevent these problems, stormwater runoff resulting from development activities must be managed in accordance with the county’s Stormwater Management Ordinance. All development, with some exceptions, requires a stormwater management plan. A concept plan is required prior to subdivision approval and a technical plan is required prior to issuance of a grading permit. Measures typically used to control runoff include special infiltration practices, stormwater retention structures (wet ponds), engineered detention structures (dry ponds), and environmental site design techniques.
Sediment Control

The Prince George's Soil Conservation District administers the Maryland Sediment Control Act, which was established to prevent soil erosion and sedimentation in developing areas. Any applicant planning to clear, grade, or otherwise disturb the land is required to develop erosion and sediment control plans for review and approval.

The Department of Public Works and Transportation subsequently issues permits for above-ground grading and sediment control and is responsible for inspection and enforcement. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission is responsible for issuing and enforcing sediment control permits for underground utility construction.

Archeological Review

The document, "Guidelines for Archeological Review," was adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board in May 2005. The guidelines were developed to assist applicants in addressing the Planning Board's policy with respect to the documentation and preservation of archeological sites.

Mandatory Referral of Development Proposals on Federal and State Properties

Federal and state governments are not legally obligated to conform to the county's regulations with regard to properties they own. However, federal and state laws require referrals of facility development proposals to the Planning Board for review. The Planning Board's comments are then considered by the government agency as it finalizes plans for the project. Agencies attempt to conform to the county's plans and regulations insofar as possible.
Transportation Analyses

A preliminary plan of subdivision must be accompanied by a traffic study if the development generates 50 trips or more during any peak hour. Traffic studies are prepared by the applicant and reviewed by staff in accordance with the required adequacy finding. In cases where a development generates fewer than 50 trips, the transportation staff must still make the required findings and may request (but not require) a limited traffic study or traffic count to assist in making these findings. Developments generating five or fewer peak-hour trips may be deemed to have a minimal, or de minimus, impact, and if so deemed, are not required to provide traffic-related information.

The Planning Board publishes the "Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals." This document establishes criteria by which staff and applicants with land development proposals can assess traffic impact. Traffic is examined in detail during review of mixed-use and comprehensive design rezoning applications. Certain types of special exceptions require limited traffic analyses. As noted earlier, detailed site plans are intended to review design issues, and as such, generally do not involve the review of transportation adequacy issues.
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6217-6239 Baltimore Ave
Rivertdale, MD 20737 - College Park Submarket
Sale on 11/24/2009 for $4,025,000 ($3,673,115.53/AC) - Research Complete
Commercial Land of 1.10 AC (47,733 SF)

Buyer & Seller Contact Info

Recorded Buyer: Kreitz Corporation
True Buyer: Kreitz Corporation
Don Jacobs
220 N Park Rd
Wyoming, PA 19610
(610) 376-7187

Recorded Seller: Riverdale One Llc
True Seller: Joe Caputo
Sheldon Naras
12208 Lantern Hollow Dr
North Potomac, MD 20878

Buyer Type: Corporate
Buyer Broker: Marcus & Millichap
Derrick Dougherty
(215) 557-0960

Listing Broker: Marcus & Millichap
Mark Taylor
(215) 531-7000
Dean Zang
(215) 531-7094

Transaction Details

Sale Date: 11/24/2009 (155 days on market)
Escrow Length: 68 days
Sale Price: $4,025,000-Confirmed
Asking Price: 4318181
Price/AC Land Gross: $3,673,115.53 ($84.32/SF)

Zoning: MUTC
Actual Cap Rate: 7.08%
Sale Conditions: Ground Lease (Leased Fee)
Transfer Tax: $20,165

Financing: Down payment of $4,025,000.00 (100.0%)
$3,364,025.00 from Wachovia Bank; Assumed loan type

Topography: Level
On-Site Improv: Previously developed lot
Off-Site Improv: Curb/Gutter/Sidewalk, Electricity, Gas, Sewer, Streets, Water
Improvements: Wachovia Bank

Sale Type: Investment
Land Area: 1.10 AC (47,733 SF)
Land Area - Net: 0.00 AC (44 SF)
Proposed Use: Bank

Percent Improved: 41.7%
Total Value Assessed: $1,347,200 in 2009
Improved Value Assessed: $562,000
Land Value Assessed: $785,200
Land Assessed/AC: $716,554

NAMICJACKSONCOMPANYMARKETLISTINGS
This copyrighted report contains research licensed to NAI The Michael Companies, Inc. - 109023.
### Transaction Notes

On November 24, 2009 a 47,734-square-foot land parcel sold. The land sold with a 25-year NNN ground lease to Wells Fargo/Wachovia. The ground lease includes 12% rent increases in year 11 and every 5 years thereafter. There are also five 5-year options.

The building, called Riverdale Financial Center, is located at property ID 6924933 and totals 9,092-square-feet. The building was completed in 2009. Wachovia occupies the ground floor and the buyer in this transaction has rights to the leasing of the second floor, which is currently available for lease (4,546-sf).

The only condition of the sale was that this is a ground lease (leased fee). The cap rate on the property at time of sale was 7.08% based on an NOI of $285,000. The asking price was $4,318,181 and the sale price was $4,025,000. The property was on the market since June 22, 2009 and was under contract from September 16, 2009 until November 24, 2009.

The loan from Wachovia was assumed by the buyer. The buyer stated that at the time of sale he put the entire $4.025 Million down and received the loan camo in lator. The balance on the loan when it was assumed was $3,364,025.

Marcus & Millichap in Philadelphia were the listing brokers and the buyer brokers. The Mark Taylor and Dean Zang Team handled the sale.

### Current Land Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>MUTC</th>
<th>Proposed Use: Bank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density Allowed:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land Area: 1.10 AC (47,733 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lots:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Land Area - Net: 0.00 AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max # of Units:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>On-Site Improv: Previously developed lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units per Acre:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lot Dimensions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements:</td>
<td>Wachovia Bank</td>
<td>Owner Type: Corporate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography:</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Site Improv:</td>
<td>Curb/Gutter/Sidewalk, Electricity, Gas, Sewer, Streets, Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Location Information

- **Metro Market:** Washington DC
- **Submarket:** N Prince George's County/College Park
- **County:** Prince George's
- **CBSA:** Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV
- **CSA:** Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-W
- **DMA:** Washington, DC-VA-MD-WV-PA
# Multi-Property

Multi-Property sale on 01/07/2010 of 2 properties, for $3,165,881 - Research Complete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Type-Class</th>
<th>Property SF</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>Sale Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8320 Baltimore Ave</td>
<td>College Park, MD</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>7,870 SF</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8324-8326 Baltimore Ave</td>
<td>College Park, MD</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Buyer & Seller Contact Info

- **Recorded Buyer:** 8320 Associates Llc
  - True Buyer: Clark Enterprises, Inc
    - Jessica Hendrick
    - 7500 Old Georgetown Rd
    - Bethesda, MD 20814
    - (301) 657-7100
  - Buyer Type: Developer/Owner-RGML

- **Recorded Seller:** Crown Real Properties Llc
  - True Seller: Jim Koons Management Company
    - James O'Connell
    - 2000 Chain Bridge Rd
    - Vienna, VA 22180
    - (703) 355-0400
  - Seller Type: Individual

## Transaction Details

- **Sale Date:** 01/07/2010
- **Sale Type:** Investment
- **Escrow Length:** -
- **Sale Price:** $3,165,881-Full Value
- **Asking Price:** -
- **Price/SAF:** -
- **Pro Forma Cap Rate:** -
- **Percent Improved:** -
- **Total Value Assessed:** $221,500
- **Improved Value Assessed:** -
- **Land Value Assessed:** -
- **Land Assessed/AC:** -

- **Legal Desc:** Lengthy legal refer to deed
- **Parcel No:** 21-2371664, 21-2371649, 21-2371656
- **Document No:** 31318-0408

## Transaction Notes

The parties involved in this transaction were unable to be contacted for comment on the deal.

A plat map is not available for this property.
## Multi-Property

Multi-Property sale on 01/07/2010 of 2 properties, for $3,165,881 - Research Complete (con't)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type:</th>
<th>Retail - Auto Repair</th>
<th>GLA: 7,870 SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center Name:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Total Avail: 0 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg Status:</td>
<td>Built in 1947</td>
<td>% Leased: 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Type:</td>
<td>Developer/Owner-RGNL</td>
<td>Bldg Vacant: 0 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning:</td>
<td>MUI</td>
<td>Land Area: 0.46 AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied:</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lot Dimensions: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent/SF/Yr:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Building FAR: 0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No. of Stores: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Frontage:</td>
<td>94 feet on Baltimore Ave (with 1 curb cut)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Mix:</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses:</td>
<td>2009 Tax @ $2.43/sf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking:</td>
<td>30 free Surface Spaces are available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Location Information

**Metro Market:** Washington DC  
**Submarket:** N Prince George's County/College Park  
**County:** Prince George's  
**CBSA:** Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV  
**CSA:** Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-VA-MD-W  
**DMA:** Washington, DC-VA-MD-WV-PA

| Zoning:        | MUI                  |
| Density Allowed: | -                   |
| Number of Lots: | -                   |
| Max # of Units: | -                   |
| Units per Acre: | -                   |
| Improvements:  | -                   |
| Proposed Use:  | -                   |
| Land Area:     | 0.38 AC (16,553 SF) |
| Lot Dimensions:| -                   |
| Owner Type:    | Developer/Owner-RGNL |

### Current Land Information: 8320-326 Baltimore Ave

**Location Information**

**Metro Market:** Washington DC  
**Submarket:** N Prince George's County/College Park  
**County:** Prince George's  
**CBSA:** Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV  
**CSA:** Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-VA-MD-W  
**DMA:** Washington, DC-VA-MD-WV-PA
3623-3625 Campus Dr
College Park, MD 20740 - College Park Submarket
Land of 3.07 AC is for sale at $3,000,000 ($977,198.70/AC)

3

Sales Contacts

Sales Co: The Hogan Companies, LLC
2661 Riva Rd
Annapolis, MD 21401
(410) 266-5100

Sales Contact 1: Kevin Setzer
(410) 266-5100

For Sale Data

Asking Price: $3,000,000
Price/AC Land Gross: $977,198.70 ($22.43/SF)
Days on Market: 1,285
Sale Status: Under Contract
Parcel No: 21-2424729, 21-2424737

Sale Type: Investment
Land Area: 3.07 AC (133,729 SF)
Proposed Use: Commercial, Apartment Units,
Apartment Units - Dorms

Transaction Notes

- Potential Rezoning Opportunity located near The University of
  Maryland's Robert H. Smith School of Business which is consistently
  ranked in the Top 25 Best Business Schools in the Country.
- 3.07 Acres (ALTA Survey Completed, 2004)
- Currently Zoned R-55
- Access is currently being discussed with neighboring Church
- Adjacent to 300 Unit "Intergenerational" Condo project called Mosaic at
  Turtle Creek recently rezoned from R-55 to R-10. Preliminary Plan
  approved May 31, 2007
- Property located near proposed future Purple Line expansion through
  UMD's Campus
- University of Maryland is experiencing many changes with development
  occurring along Route 1 with UMD's East Campus Redevelopment
  Initiative
### Current Land Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>R-55</th>
<th>Proposed Use:</th>
<th>Commercial/Apartment Units/Apartment Units - Dorms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density Allowed:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land Area:</td>
<td>3.07 AC (133,729 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lots:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Min Div Lot Size:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max # of Units:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>On-Site Improv:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units per Acre:</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>Lot Dimensions:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements:</td>
<td>Two Dwelling Units/ # of sheds</td>
<td>Owner Type:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Site Improv:</td>
<td>Curb/Gutter/Sidewalk, Electricity, Gas, Sewer, Streets, Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Location Information

- **Metro Market:** Washington DC
- **Submarket:** N Prince George's County/College Park
- **County:** Prince George's
- **CBSA:** Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV
- **CSA:** Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-W
- **DMA:** Washington, DC-VA-MD-WV-PA
11301 Edmonston Rd - Redevelopment Site
Beltville, MD 20705 - Beltville/Calverton Submarket
Sale on 06/30/2011 - Research Complete
Non-Arms Length
Industrial Land of 1.67 AC (72,745 SF)

Buyer & Seller Contact Info

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recorded Buyer:</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Seller:</td>
<td>J &amp; M Utilities Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5108 Cypress Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beltville, MD 20705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(301) 937-4640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listing Broker:</td>
<td>Hobbs Associates, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Sheehan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(301) 937-2188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transaction Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale Date:</th>
<th>06/30/2011 (237 days on market)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escrow Length:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Price:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking Price:</td>
<td>1500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Type:</td>
<td>Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Area:</td>
<td>1.67 AC (72,745 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning:</td>
<td>I-2 &amp; RR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Market Reasons:</td>
<td>Inter-Related Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography:</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Improv:</td>
<td>Previously developed lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Site Improv:</td>
<td>Curb/Gutter/Sidewalk, Electricity, Gas, Sewer, Streets, Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements:</td>
<td>1,558 SF Bldg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transaction Notes

This was a non-market comparable. This was a sale between inter-related parties.
**11301 Edmonston Rd - Redevelopment Site**

**Industrial Land of 1.67 AC (72,745 SF) (cont)**

### Current Land Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning:</th>
<th>I-2 &amp; RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density Allowed:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lots:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Improv:</td>
<td>Previously developed lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max # of Units:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Dimensions:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units per Acre:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Type:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements:</td>
<td>1,556 SF Bldg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legal Desc:
Block 53 Lot 28, and 29

### Topography:
Level

### Off-Site Improv:
Curb/Gutter/Sidewalk, Electricity, Gas, Sewer, Streets, Water

### Location Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Market:</th>
<th>Washington DC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submarket:</td>
<td>N Prince George's County/Beltsville/Calverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County:</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBSA:</td>
<td>Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA:</td>
<td>Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA:</td>
<td>Washington, DC-VA-MD-WV-PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ID: 7808085 |

---

This copyrighted report contains research licensed to NAI Michael Companies, Inc. - 100823.
7720 Mowatt Ln

College Park, MD 20740 - College Park Submarket

Sale on 06/10/2011 for $7,300,000 ($2,703,705.70/AC) - Research Complete
Residential Land of 2.70 AC (117,612 SF)

Recorded Buyer: The Of Udr Domain College Park
True Buyer: The Hanover Company
5847 San Felipe St
Houston, TX 77057
(713) 267-2100
UDR, Inc.
1745 Shea Center Dr
Highlands Ranch, CO 80129
(720) 283-6120
Buyer Type: Developer/Owner-NTL REIT
Buyer Broker: No Buyer Broker on Deal

Recorded Seller: Domain College Park LLC
True Seller: UDR, Inc.
1745 Shea Center Dr
Highlands Ranch, CO 80129
(720) 283-6120
Seller Type: REIT Insurance
Listing Broker: No Listing Broker on Deal

Transaction Details

Sale Date: 06/10/2011
Sale Type: Investment

Escrow Length: 10 days

Sale Price: $7,300,000-Confirmed
Proposed Use: Retail, MultiFamily

Price/AC Land Gross: $2,703,705.70 ($62.07/SF)
Zoning: R55

Percent Improved: -
Total Value Assessed: $348,300
Improved Value Assessed: -
Land Value Assessed: -
Land Assessed/AC: -

Street Frontage: 280 feet on Campus Dr
317 feet on Mowatt Ln

Topography: Level

On-Site Improv: Previously developed lot
Off-Site Improv: Curb/Gutter/Sidewalk, Electricity, Gas, Sewer, Streets, Water

Improvements: Small Single Family Home

Parcel No: 21-2425353, 21-2411635, 21-2369718, 21-4001921, 21-4000964

8/15/2011
Page 9
7720 Mowatt Ln
Residential Land of 2.70 AC (117,612 SF) (con’t)

Document No: 32748-0445
Sale History: Sold for $7,300,000 on 06/10/2011
Sold for $2,750,000 on 06/11/2008

Transaction Notes

UDR and Metlife sold 2.7 acres of land in College Park to The Hanover Company and UDR for $7.3 million on June 10, 2011.

The 2.7 acres of land, located at 7720 Mowatt Lane, is approved for 256 units and 9,700 square-feet of retail. Ground breaking is expected to occur in the first quarter 2012 with a completion date two years after.

This was an arms-length transaction. Originally, The Hanover Company had owned the land with Metlife. The Hanover Company exited a number of projects and UDR came in as a new partner. This is new partnership with the Hanover Company and UDR to develop this asset. Metlife is no longer involved.

This was a direct deal between the two parties and was under contract for 10 days.

Current Land Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning:</th>
<th>R55</th>
<th>Proposed Use:</th>
<th>Retail/MultiFamily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density Allowed:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land Area:</td>
<td>2.70 AC (117,612 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lots:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>On-Site Improv:</td>
<td>Previously developed lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max # of Units:</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>Lot Dimensions:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units per Acre:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Owner Type:</td>
<td>REIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements:</td>
<td>Small Single Family Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography:</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Site Improv:</td>
<td>Curb/Gutter/Sidewalk, Electricity, Gas, Sewer, Streets, Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Frontage:</td>
<td>280 feet on Campus Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>317 feet on Mowatt Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Market:</th>
<th>Washington DC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submarket:</td>
<td>N Prince George's County/College Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County:</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBSA:</td>
<td>Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA:</td>
<td>Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA:</td>
<td>Washington, DC-VA-MD-WV-PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7720 Mowatt Ln
College Park, MD 20740 - College Park Submarket
Sale on 06/11/2006 for $2,750,000 ($1,018,518.52/AC) - Research Complete
Residential Land of 2.70 AC (117,612 SF)

Recorded Buyer: Domain College Park, LLC
True Buyer: The Hanover Company
5847 San Felipe St
Houston, TX 77057
(713) 267-2100

Recorded Seller: William P. Poole, Jr.
True Seller: William P. Poole, Jr.
William Poole
9301 Lynmont Dr
Adelphi, MD 20783
(301) 434-7344
Robert E. Poole
Robert Poole

Buyer Type: Developer/Owner-NTL

Transaction Details
ID: 1506504
Sale Date: 06/11/2006
Sale Type: Investment
Escrow Length: -
Land Area: 2.70 AC (117,612 SF)
Sale Price: $2,750,000-Full Value
Proposed Use: Retail, MultiFamily
Price/AC Land Gross: $1,018,518.52 ($23.38/SF)

Zoning: R55
Percent Improved: 34.7%
Transfer Tax: $13,750
Total Value Assessed: $1,172,330 in 2008

Improved Value Assessed: $406,660
Land Value Assessed: $765,670
Land Assessed/AC: $283,581

Street Frontage: 280 feet on Campus Dr
317 feet on Mowatt Ln
Financing: Down payment of $2,750,000.00 (100.0%)

Topography: Level
On-Site Improv: Previously developed lot
Off-Site Improv: Curb/Gutter/Sidewalk, Electricity, Gas, Sewer, Streets, Water
Improvements: Small Single Family Home
Legal Desc: Lengthy legal - refer to deed
Parcel No: 21-2425353, 21-2411635, 21-2369718, 21-2369700

This copyrighted report contains research licensed to NAI Michael Companies, Inc. - 100823.
8/15/2011
11401 Old Baltimore Pike
Beltville, MD 20705 - Beltville/Calverton Submarket
Sale on 05/05/2006 for $1,300,000 ($859.79/SF)
1,512 SF - Sold for Land Value, Class C Industrial Live/Work Unit Building Built in 1956

Recorded Buyer: Industrial Lands LLC
True Buyer: The Duffie Companies
Jonathan Duffie
1701-1727 Elton Rd
Silver Spring, MD 20903
(301) 434-3040

Recorded Seller: MEIER BERNARD & SHIRLEY
True Seller: MEIER BERNARD & SHIRLEY
Bernard Meier
12101 Lanham Severn Rd
Bowie, MD 20720
(301) 262-2499

Sale Date: 05/05/2006
Sale Type: Investment
Escrow Length: 90 days
Bidg Type: Industrial Live/Work Unit
Sale Price: $1,300,000
Year Built/Age: Built in 1956 Age: 52
Asking Price: -
RBA: 1,512 SF
Price/SF: $859.79
Land Area: 1.10 AC (48,003 SF)
Price/AC Land Gross: $1,179,873.32

Percent Leased: 30.2%
Percent Improved: -
Tenancy: Single
Total Value Assessed: $119,000 in 2007
Improved Value Assessed: -
Land Value Assessed: $119,000
Land Assessed/AC: $107,965

Financing: $1,170,000.00 from Private Lender
Legal Desc: LOT 1 & ADJ 3750SF BELTSVILLE 20705 EQ D 3507 NCONF USE-HO USE-DEED06/ 11/06PEND
Parcel No: 01-0042671, 01-0042663, 01-0026576, 01-0042655
Document No: 29655-0467
Sale History: Sold for $1,300,000 ($859.79/SF) on 05/05/2006
Sold for $275,000 ($181.88/SF) on 05/17/2004

Transaction Notes
Confirmed limited sale details with seller.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Building Information</th>
<th>Location Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bldg Type:</strong> Industrial Live/Work Unit</td>
<td><strong>Metro Market:</strong> Washington DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class:</strong> C</td>
<td><strong>Submarket:</strong> N Prince George's County/Beltsville/Calverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Avail:</strong> 0 SF</td>
<td><strong>County:</strong> Prince George's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bldg Vacant:</strong> 0 SF</td>
<td><strong>CBSA:</strong> Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenancy:</strong> Single</td>
<td><strong>CSA:</strong> Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner Type:</strong> -</td>
<td><strong>DMA:</strong> Washington, DC-VA-MD-WV-PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner Occupied:</strong> No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 11210-11220 Somerset Ave - I2-Zoned Acreage

**SOLD**

**Beltville, MD 20705 - Beltville/Calverton Submarket**

Sale on 07/30/2009 for $2,239,350 ($861,288.46/AC) - Research Complete

Industrial Land of 2.60 AC (113,256 SF)

---

### Buyer & Seller Contact Info

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recorded Buyer:</th>
<th>Gary E Shipp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True Buyer:</td>
<td>Cultured Marble, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Shipp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10751 Tucker St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beltville, MD 20705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(301) 937-3000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Buyer Type: | Other - Private |
|            | No Buyer Broker on Deal |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recorded Seller:</th>
<th>HSR Properties, LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True Seller:</td>
<td>Beltville Auto Recyclers, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howard Rosenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11331-11333 Maryland Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beltville, MD 20705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(301) 937-7333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Listing Broker: | Hobbs Associates, Inc. |
|                | Brian Hobbs |
|                | (301) 937-2188 |

---

### Transaction Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale Date:</th>
<th>07/30/2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escrow Length:</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Price:</td>
<td>$2,239,350-Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price/AC Land Gross:</td>
<td>$861,288.46 ($19.77/SF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning:</th>
<th>I2, County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Dimensions:</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Conditions:</td>
<td>Purchase By Tenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Tax:</td>
<td>$42,547.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financing: Down payment of $739,350.00 (33.0%)  
$1,500,000.00 from SunTrust Bank

Topography: Level

On-Site Improv.: Asphalt paved lot
Off-Site Improv.: Curb/Gutter/Sidewalk, Electricity, Gas, Sewer, Streets, Water

Improvements: Asphalt paved lot

Legal Desc.: LOTS 28,29,30
Parcel No.: 01-0052522, 01-0052530, 01-0052506, 01-0052480
Document No.: 30861-0069

---

**ID: 1781100**

---

This copyrighted report contains research licensed to NAI The Michael Companies, Inc. - 130823.
**11210-11220 Somerset Ave - I2-Zoned Acreage**

**SOLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Land of 2.60 AC (113,256 SF) (cont'')</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sale History:</strong> Sold for $2,239,350 on 07/30/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold for $500,000 on 07/17/2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transaction Notes**

The information for this comparable was confirmed by both the seller and the buyer. Gary Shipp assists in running a garbage disposal business and had been leasing the land from Howard Rosenberg of HSR Properties, LLC. Mr. Shipp explained that I2 zoned land is hard to come by in the area which is what caused him to take advantage of the purchasing opportunity. Mr. Shipp represented himself in the transaction while HSR Properties attained representation from Brian Hobbs of Hobbs America, Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Land Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ID:</strong> 4383542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning: I2, County</th>
<th>Proposed Use: Hold for Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density Allowed: -</td>
<td>Land Area: 2.60 AC (113,256 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lots: -</td>
<td>On-Site Improv: Asphalt paved lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max # of Units: -</td>
<td>Lot Dimensions: Irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units per Acre: -</td>
<td>Owner Type: Other - Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements: Asphalt paved lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Legal Desc: lots 14 thru 19, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 blk 56 plat bk A plat 64 |
| Topography: Level |
| Off-Site Improv: Curb/Gutter/Sidewalk, Electricity, Gas, Sewer, Streets, Water |

**Location Information**

| Metro Market: Washington DC |
| Submarket: N Prince George's County/Beltsville/Calverton |
| County: Prince George's |
| CBSA: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV |
| CSA: Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-W |
| DMA: Washington, DC-VA-MD-WV-PA |
| Map(Page): ADC The Map People T-K2 |

---

This copyrighted report contains research licensed to NAI The Michael Companies, Inc. - 100823.
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7220-7240 Windsor Ln
Hyattsville, MD 20782 - College Park Submarket
Sale on 12/18/2009 for $1,100,450 ($1,100,450.00/AC) - Research Complete
Non-Arms Length
Residential Land of 1 AC (43,560 SF)

Recorded Buyer: Buddington Gd, LLC
True Buyer: NAI The Michael Companies, Inc.
Gary Michael
10100 Business Pky
Lanham, MD 20706
(301) 459-4400
Buyer Type: Developer/Owner-RGNL

Recorded Seller: Kenneth & Mary Michael
True Seller: NAI The Michael Companies, Inc.
Kenneth Michael
10100 Business Pky
Lanham, MD 20706
(301) 459-4400
Seller Type: Developer/Owner-RGNL

Transaction Details
ID: 1866020
Sale Date: 12/18/2009
Sale Type: Investment
Escrow Length: -
Land Area: 1 AC (43,560 SF)
Sale Price: $1,100,450-Full Value
Proposed Use: Single Family Development
Price/AC Land Gross: $1,100,450.00 ($25.26/SF)
Total Value Assessed: $45,100
Non-Market Reasons: Inter-Related Parties, Unknown Reason
Zoning: R55

Financing: Down payment of $100,460.00 (9.1%)
$1,000,000.00 from Michael Kenneth H & Mary E

Legal Desc: Lengthy legal refer to deed
Parcel No: 21-3959806, 21-3959798, 21-3959558, 21-3959533, 21-3959525, 21-3959780, 21-3959855, 21-3959541,
21-3959574, 21-3959822, 21-3959830, 21-3959848, 21-3959814, 21-3959582, 21-3959566, 21-3959590
Document No: 31330-0485

Sale History: Sold for $500,000 on 01/19/2011
Sold for $1,100,450 on 12/18/2009
7220-7240 Windsor Ln
Residential Land of 1 AC (43,560 SF) (con't)

Transaction Notes
This was a non-market, inter-family transfer.

Current Land Information
ID: 7410768

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning:</th>
<th>R55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use:</td>
<td>Single Family Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density Allowed:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lots:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max # of Units:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units per Acre:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Area:</td>
<td>1 AC (43,560 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Improv:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Dimensions:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Type:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location Information

| Metro Market: | Washington DC |
| Submarket: | N Prince George's County/College Park |
| County: | Prince George's |
| CBSA: | Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV |
| CSA: | Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-W |
| DMA: | Washington, DC-VA-MD-WV-PA |
### 7220-7240 Windsor Ln

**Hyattsville, MD 20782 - College Park Submarket**

Sale on 01/19/2011 for $500,000 ($500,000/AC) - Research Complete

Residential Land of 1 AC (43,560 SF)

---

**Recorded Buyer:** Evg-college Heights LLC  
**Recorded Seller:** Buddington Gd, LLC  
10100 Business Pky  
Lanham Seabrook, MD 20706

**True Buyer:** Evg-college Heights LLC  
Robert Capellini  
3084 Centerview  
Chantilly, VA 20151

**Buyer Broker:** No Buyer Broker on Deal  
**Lister:** No Listing Broker on Deal

---

**Transaction Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sale Date</td>
<td>01/19/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Type</td>
<td>Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Area</td>
<td>1 AC (43,560 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Single Family Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price/AC Land Gross</td>
<td>$500,000.00 ($11.48/SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>R55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Improvised</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Value Assessed</td>
<td>$43,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Value Assessed</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Value Assessed</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Assessed/AC</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing</td>
<td>$1,800,000.00 from Hopkins Fsb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel No</td>
<td>21-3958655, 21-3959830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document No</td>
<td>32424-0387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale History</td>
<td>Sold for $500,000 on 01/19/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sold for $1,108,450 on 12/18/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Transaction Notes**

New Owner plans to build single family homes on 4 lots so far each lot is .25 acres.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>R55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Single Family Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density Allowed</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lots</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max # of Units</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units per Acre</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Area</td>
<td>1 AC (43,560 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Improv.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Dimensions</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Type</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location Information**

- **Metro Market**: Washington DC
- **Submarket**: N Prince George's County/College Park
- **County**: Prince George's
- **CBSA**: Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV
- **CSA**: Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-W
- **DMA**: Washington, DC-VA-MD-WV-PA
## Quick Stats Report

### Comps Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Price</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale &amp; UC/Pending</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RBA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale &amp; UC/Pending</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td>1,512 SF</td>
<td>1,512 SF</td>
<td>1,512 SF</td>
<td>1,512 SF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Price per SF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale &amp; UC/Pending</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td>$859.79</td>
<td>$859.79</td>
<td>$859.79</td>
<td>$859.79</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual Cap Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale &amp; UC/Pending</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Days on Market</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale &amp; UC/Pending</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sale Price to Asking Price Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Price</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale &amp; UC/Pending</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$2,985,800</td>
<td>$2,484,675</td>
<td>$7,300,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parcel Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale &amp; UC/Pending</td>
<td>3.07 AC</td>
<td>3.07 AC</td>
<td>3.07 AC</td>
<td>3.07 AC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td>1 AC</td>
<td>1.82 AC</td>
<td>1.67 AC</td>
<td>2.70 AC</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Price per Acre</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale &amp; UC/Pending</td>
<td>$977,199</td>
<td>$977,199</td>
<td>$977,199</td>
<td>$977,199</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,613,946</td>
<td>$1,059,484</td>
<td>$3,873,116</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Days on Market</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale &amp; UC/Pending</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sale Price to Asking Price Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td>93.21%</td>
<td>93.21%</td>
<td>93.21%</td>
<td>93.21%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quick Stats Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale &amp; UC/Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale &amp; UC/Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price per SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale &amp; UC/Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Cap Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale &amp; UC/Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days on Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale &amp; UC/Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Price to Asking Price Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Transactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

|                          |       |         |        |      |       |
| For Sale & UC/Pending    |       | $3,000,000 |       |      | 1     |
| Sold Transactions        |       | $22,380,681 |       |      | 9     |
| Total Included in Analysis |       | $25,380,681 |       |      | 10    |

**Survey Criteria**

Location: Location method - Custom Map Boundary

Basic Criteria: Sale Status - Sold, Under Contract; Property Type - Land; Sale Date - from 1/1/2008; - Include Public Record Comps; - Include Non-Arms Length Comps

N/A

8/15/2011
Trend Report

Legend:

Current Survey
Sold Transactions
Number of Transactions | 6 | 1
Total Dollar Volume | $15,164,800 | $3,000,000
Total Bldg Square Feet | 0 | 0
Total Land in Acres | 10.07 | 3.07
Total Land in SF | 436,649 | 135,729
Average Price | $3,032,960 | $3,000,000
Average Number of SF | 0 | 0
Average Price Per Bldg SF | - | -
Median Price Per SF | - | -
Average Number of Acres | 1.66 | 3.07
Average Number of SF(Land) | 73,106 | 133,726
Average Price Per Unit | - | -
Median Price Per Unit | - | -
Average Number of Units | - | -
Average Price Per Acre | $1,605,333 | $977,199
Average Price Per SF(Land) | $41,44 | $22,43
Median Price Per Acre | $1,100,450 | $977,199
Median Price Per SF(Land) | $25,26 | $22,43

Survey Criteria

Location: Location method - Custom Map Boundary

Basic Criteria: Sale Status - Sold, Under Contract; Property Type - Land; Sale Date - from 1/1/2008; - Include Public Record Comps; - Include Non-Arms Length Comps

Report Time Frame: 07/01/2009 - 08/15/2011
Sale Dates: from 1/1/2008
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## Trend Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3Q09 07/01-09/30/09</th>
<th>4Q09 10/01-12/31/09</th>
<th></th>
<th>1Q11 01/01-03/31/11</th>
<th>2Q11 04/01-06/30/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Transactions</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Dollar Volume</strong></td>
<td>$2,239,350</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,125,450</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,440,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Bldg Square Feet</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Land in Acres</strong></td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Land in SF</strong></td>
<td>113,256</td>
<td>91,476</td>
<td>2,652,725</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Price</strong></td>
<td>$2,239,350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$2,652,725</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Number of SF</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Price Per Bldg SF</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Price Per SF</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Number of Acres</strong></td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Number of SF/Land</strong></td>
<td>113,256</td>
<td>45,738</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Price Per Unit</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Price Per Unit</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Number of Units</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Price Per Acre</strong></td>
<td>$861,288</td>
<td>$2,440,580</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Price Per SF/Land</strong></td>
<td>$19.77</td>
<td>$56.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Price Per Acre</strong></td>
<td>$861,288</td>
<td>$2,379,770</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Price Per SF/Land</strong></td>
<td>$15.77</td>
<td>$24.63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Trend Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sold Transaction</th>
<th>For Sale &amp; UC/Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Transactions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dollar Volume</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bldg Square Feet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Land in Acres</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Land in SF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>133,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Price</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Price Per Bldg SF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Price Per SF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Acres</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of SF(Land)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>133,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Price Per Unit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Price Per Unit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Units</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Price Per Acre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$977,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Price Per SF(Land)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$22.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Price Per Acre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$977,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Price Per SF(Land)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$22.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3
This is a construction cost survey for typical income properties in Washington, DC. The cost figures for a suburban area outside a large city are normally less than the city by 14% to 8%. Usually, rural areas have even lower construction costs than either suburbs or cities, but not in all cases. When it's time to get serious, you will want to research specific construction cost figures for your project with help from one of the services or books mentioned below. Consider this survey to be "napkinware," that is, the kind of figures you jot on a napkin at lunch while discussing a new idea for a real estate project.

Contractors, real estate developers, brokers, lenders, investors, and other real estate professionals speak the construction cost language of "dollars per square foot." But how often are the figures you’ve heard second-hand, third-hand, or outdated? This survey for Washington gives you some current construction costs in order to discuss real estate projects and make preliminary analyses.

In doing a survey the problem arises of how to provide generic figures for buildings that vary widely in features, finish, and cost. Of course, there is no easy answer. This dilemma was resolved by providing you with examples. The survey includes many commercial investment properties and several residences. The characteristics for each property were chosen to be typical of its class and quality. The examples are not an average, mean, or norm. They simply represent certain types of property. But to create new ideas and new projects, you have to have something to talk about that.

Keep in mind construction costs can be different for areas on or near a river or even close together sometimes a considerable amount. For instance, in a retail town with high-end homes and retail stores and a limited number of local construction workers, you may find higher construction costs than in an urban area just two hours away. This can be contrary to the notion that rural areas have lower construction costs.

Included in the construction costs indicated for Washington are materials, labor, escorts to infrastructure, normal site preparation, building permits, insurance, architect's fees, general contractor's overhead and profit, basic interior finish (space improvements), and heating and cooling (except where otherwise noted). Space improvements include finished floors, walls, and ceilings as well as normal partitioning and fixtures. For some properties there is the tenant pays for the space improvements.

Not included are land, site development costs, developer's profit, tap fees, special government fees, special district fees, financing expenses, furniture, art, trade fixtures, special fixtures or equipment, interior decoration, landscaping, paved and lighted parking, signage, and other costs which vary widely between communities or between tenancies or which are determined by the extraordinary operating strategies of developers.

To refine your construction cost analysis, use an online service such as Marshall and Swift, books such as those published by Reed Construction Data in the RS Means series, or the Craftsman series of cost manuals. Be sure to use a square foot cost version, not a more detailed version meant to be used by a construction contractor.

When it's time for precision, only a detailed construction cost analysis of your specific project by a construction contractor can provide you with the accuracy you need. Ultimately, only a firm bid by a competent and capable construction contractor is reliable to support a final decision.

The survey shows the estimates for Washington, DC in 2010. Each project described typifies its class of construction and quality. The construction cost estimates in dollars per square foot take into account the stated particulars of the described project. Quality evaluation goes from average to above average and luxurious.

**Small Office** $121
Average quality, two-story, frame, hardboard siding, basic suite improvements, 15,000 SF.

**Medium Office** $148
Above average quality, two-story, lift-up concrete, elevators, basic suite improvements, 30,000 SF.

**Large Office** $144
Above average quality, three-story, steel, glass, elevators, high-end fixtures, basic suite improvements, 60,000 SF.

**Medical Office** $194
Above average quality, two-story, frame, brick, elevators, basic medical suite improvements, 30,000 SF.

**Small Apartment** $106
Average quality, two-story, frame, hardboard siding, appliances, laundry rooms, pool, 34 units, 30,000 SF.

**Neighborhood Shopping Center (strip center)** $112
Above average quality, one-story, concrete block, basic space improvements, 20,000 SF (no anchor space included).

**Community Shopping Center** $105
Above average quality, one-story, concrete block, basic space improvements, 100,000 SF (includes 50% supermarket space).
Bank $339
High quality, one-story, masonry, 4,000 SF.

Convenience Store $136
Average quality, one-story, concrete block, sprinklers, 1,500 SF.

Retail Store $125
Average quality, one-story, concrete block, store front display, 6,000 SF.

Discount Store Building $82
Average quality, one-story, steel, concrete block, open area, sprinklers, 56,000 SF.

Mini Warehouse $70
Average quality, one-story, steel, manager's quarters/offices, 30 units, 30,000 SF. No heating or cooling included.

Storage Warehouse $62
Average quality, one-story, steel, metal panels, office space, loading dock, sprinklers, 30,000 SF. No cooling included.

Industrial Building (manufacturing) $69
Average quality, one-story, tilt-up concrete, office space, loading dock, sprinklers, 30,000 SF. No cooling included.

Hotel $148
Average quality, two-story, frame, concrete block, restaurant, bar, pool, spa, meeting rooms, elevators, sprinklers, 112 rooms, 60,000 SF.

Fast Food Restaurant $221
Above average quality, one-story, concrete block, roof overhang for drive-up window, sprinklers, 3,000 SF.

Restaurant $199
Above average, one-story, frame, wood siding/brick trim, sprinklers, 6,000 SF.

Day Care Center $163
Average quality, one-story, frame, wood siding, kitchen facilities, 3,000 SF.

Residence (average quality tract home) $98
One-story, hardboard siding, composition shingles, 1½ baths, two-car garage, 1,600 SF. Basement, landscaping, fencing, and deck not included.

Residence (above average quality tract home) $116
Two-story, wood siding, composition shingles, 2½ baths, balcony, two-car garage, 2,400 SF. Basement, landscaping, fencing, and deck not included.

Residence (luxurious quality tract home) $181
Split level, wood siding/brick trim, shake shingles, 3½ baths, balconies, three-car garage, 3,200 SF. Basement, landscaping, fencing, and deck not included.

The estimates on these construction costs have been calculated conservatively. If these figures disagree with some of your figures for Washington, DC, you should review the introduction above to see exactly what is included and what is not included in the cost figures presented. And as mentioned before, ultimately the only reliable figures will be the ones you research yourself using one of the construction cost services or the ones you get from a competent construction contractor.

Good luck with your construction projects!

This publication is designed to provide useful information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is published with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, real estate, or other professional service. If expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional person should be sought. This publication is also covered by the Terms of Service (Terms of service) for this website.

Construction Costs for Washington, DC, 2010
Price Per Square Foot Construction Cost for Multi Story Office Buildings

Posted by Dean Dalvit • July 14, 2011 • Printer-friendly

Time again to look at the current construction market activity and analyze construction costs per square foot for various types of office buildings. **How much does it cost to build an office building?** Below is some data from RSMeans construction cost data that we keep a close eye on in order to estimate construction costs for all of our office building projects. This data is sorted by region from the most expensive to the least expensive.

![Chart showing price per square foot for major cities](chart.png)

price per square foot construction cost for two to four story office building

For the most common office building size, two to four stories tall, the range is from just over $130 per square foot in Winston-Salem to over $230 per square foot in New York. The spread here is largely due to the local cost of labor and regulations that allow various construction types that are allowed in low rise construction. For example, in some cases where wood frame construction is still allowed, depending on location and occupancy, this would help to keep costs lower. In areas that are restricted to non-flammable construction, price per square foot will go up.

By taking advantage of savings provided by vertical construction, you will see approximately a 4% savings in cost per square foot by increasing the stories to between five and ten stories. While one might expect a larger savings for that economy of scale, several new requirements come with the mid-rise building that are often not dealt with on the low rise buildings. For example, elevator shafts and service corridors get more complicated as well as HVAC systems.
Price per square foot construction cost for five to ten story office building

The geographic spread in cost per square foot is identical to the low-rise data. This is still principally driven by local factors such as labor costs and local regulatory requirements.

Finally, the high rise buildings see the most economic cost per square foot. For buildings between eleven and twenty stories tall, there is approximately an 11% savings over the mid rise buildings and 15% over low rise. This is largely due to the fact that similar elevator, HVAC and service equipment requirements are required for mid and high rise, resulting in more economy of scale for going up.

Price per square foot construction cost for eleven to twenty story office building

Again, the geographic spread is still the same, telling us that the cost per square foot is very sensitive to geographic location. Note that over twenty stories starts getting into more unique building characteristics that will drive costs in various ways. For more information on estimating the cost of your office building during the early planning stages, contact any of us here at EVstudio and we can help scope the right size project for your pro forma.
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