Chevy Chase Lake Sector Plan
Public Hearing Draft

Additional Information Presented to the Planning Board on September 6, 2012
Introduction: Transparency, Engagement, and Compatibility

When staff presented the Scope of Work for the Chevy Chase Lake Sector Plan to the Planning Board in July 2010, some community members challenged the openness and transparency of the process. They asserted that developers had an unfair advantage and access to staff, and that the community would not be legitimately involved in the decision-making process. To address this perception, with the support of the Planning Director and the Chair, staff enlisted professional facilitators from the Conflict Resolution Center of Montgomery County to help.

Staff worked with the facilitators to develop a community outreach process that emphasized transparency, and resulted in a number of well-attended and successful public meetings. These engaged the larger Chevy Chase Lake community, including major land owners and developers, in a two-year dialogue about what kind of change the Sector Plan could bring to the neighborhood.

Staff heard and considered many ideas and viewpoints to determine the right “fit” for Chevy Chase Lake. Did 4.5 million square feet of development, with numerous 20-story buildings and elevated parks, fit in Chevy Chase Lake? The community, and ultimately the property owner, decided it did not. Did an underpass at Connecticut Avenue and East-West Highway, to accommodate more traffic, fit? The community and planners past and present decided it did not.

Chevy Chase Lake has a definite character: established residential neighborhoods surrounding a small retail center. Ultimately, the sector plan must balance developers’ interest with the community’s desire to preserve character, so that Chevy Chase Lake does not lose the sense of place it has developed over the last century.

Note: Measurements in the following illustrations are approximate, based on available GIS data.
Preserving the area’s character while allowing compatible new development is the underpinning philosophy of the Staff Draft, and is manifested in its recommendations:

- Building heights should reinforce and enhance the Town Center, but not overwhelm the surrounding residential neighborhoods;
- Limit density to minimize traffic impacts on Connecticut Avenue without disruptive and incompatible road improvements (e.g., enlarging intersections out of proportion to the adjoining neighborhoods);
- Phase development with the Purple Line to allow only already-approved projects to move forward before transit is in place to support additional density;
- Implement rezoning by phasing two sectional map amendments to give the community greater certainty that the plan will work as envisioned;
- Allow compatible development at the shopping center that would provide additional housing and other benefits, even should the Purple Line be significantly delayed.

**What the Board Asked For**

On July 16, 2012, after presentation of the Staff Draft recommendations, the Planning Board requested additional information and analyses prior to setting a Public Hearing. That information is now provided and may well be supplemented during Board work sessions following the Public Hearing. The following addresses the questions raised by the Board.

**What would additional building height look like in Chevy Chase Lake?**

The following studies examine the character of the Town Center in Chevy Chase Lake as it exists today, as envisioned under the Staff Draft recommendation, and with the maximum building heights requested by property owners.
The Town Center, viewed along the east side of Connecticut Avenue below Manor Road, existing conditions
The Town Center, viewed along the east side of Connecticut Avenue below Manor Road, Staff Draft recommended building heights
The Town Center, viewed along the east side of Connecticut Avenue below Manor Road, with building heights requested by property owners
The Town Center, viewed along the east side of Connecticut Avenue above Chevy Chase Lake Drive, existing conditions
The Town Center, viewed along the east side of Connecticut Avenue above Chevy Chase Lake Drive, Staff Draft recommended building heights.
The Town Center, viewed along the east side of Connecticut Avenue above Chevy Chase Lake Drive, with building heights requested by property owners.
What are the potential impacts of additional building height at Newdale Mews?

Staff has looked at the slope and height differential between the Newdale Mews property on Newdale Road and the single-family homes immediately to the north on Lynwood Place. The following diagrams illustrate this relationship at three points along Newdale Road.

The Newdale Mews site and immediate context
How might the level of density recommended in the Staff Draft fit on the ground? How would additional density fit?
An aerial view of the Town Center, looking north, showing distribution of density recommended in the Staff Draft Sector Plan.
An aerial view of the Town Center, looking north, showing distribution of additional height and density requested by property owners.
By modifying the land use mix of the Chevy Chase Land Company’s approved preliminary plan for the Chevy Chase Lake Shopping Center, could the approved traffic impact accommodate more development on that site before the Purple Line?

The Staff Draft Sector Plan recommends limiting development before the Purple Line to the Chevy Chase Lake Shopping Center. The Chevy Chase Land Company received preliminary plan approval in 2005 for approximately 250,000 sf. of development at the Chevy Chase Shopping Center, with 74,356 sf. of office uses and 174,016 sf. of retail uses. This approval, which remains valid, also includes the traffic that would be generated by the redevelopment.

Different land uses generate traffic at different rates, with residential uses generating less traffic than office uses. Using trip generation rates from our Local Area Transportation Review (LATR) guidelines, the Land Company produced two alternative land use scenarios for the redevelopment of the Chevy Chase Lake Shopping Center site that resulted in traffic that would be at or below the traffic generated by the existing approved development. (See Attachment 1 for the Land Company worksheets.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use scenario</th>
<th>Total AM Peak Hour trips</th>
<th>Total PM Peak Hour trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing approval</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74,356 sf office</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174,016 sf retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708 apartments</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120,000 sf retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-room hotel</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~598 apartments*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120,000 sf retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*to be reduced as necessary to achieve the trip cap
What is the traffic impact of increasing density beyond the staff draft recommendation?

Property owners have requested additional density beyond the Staff Draft recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Staff Draft recommended density</th>
<th>Requested density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howard Hughes Medical Institute</td>
<td>remain special exception use in R-90 zone</td>
<td>approximately 775,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevy Chase Lake Apartments (Housing Opportunities Commission)</td>
<td>approximately 230 apartments</td>
<td>approximately 400 apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8401 Connecticut Avenue (Chevy Chase Land Company)</td>
<td>260,000 sf office/retail/residential</td>
<td>approximately 512,000 sf, incl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300,000 sf office, 44,000 sf retail,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>168 apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevy Chase Lake West Shopping Center Parking Lot (Chevy Chase Land Company)</td>
<td>15 townhouses</td>
<td>Approximately 65 apartments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff has prepared an updated analysis (included as attachment 2), which compares the traffic impacts of the staff draft recommended densities, the “maximum build-out” scenario (which incorporates the requested density increases listed above), and a number of increments in between.

Are we able to perform economic analyses to determine the appropriate level of density in Chevy Chase Lake?

There was not sufficient time to engage our economic consultant in advance of the September 6, 2012, work session. We requested economic analyses from the Chevy Chase Land Company, the Housing Opportunities Commission, and the owner of Newdale Mews, but were not provided with any.

Why should the new public parks be publicly owned?

Parks Department staff will address this question in a broader context in an upcoming presentation to the Planning Board, currently scheduled for September 20, 2012. Parks staff will be available for questions at the September 6th worksession.
What would be required to provide a pedestrian connection from the Hamlet neighborhood across Coquelin Run to Chevy Chase Lake Drive?

East to west the Sector Plan area is bisected by the Coquelin Run stream valley, which has forested, steep slopes, springs, and rare, threatened and endangered species. The undeveloped condition of the valley is primarily due to the topographic constraints. These make access to the stream challenging for the residents living on either side of the valley.

Three potential access points and stream crossings opportunities have been evaluated at rights-of-way from three cul-de-sacs along the southern side of Coquelin Run: Cardiff Court (Option A), Cardiff Road (Option B), and Kerry Court (Option C).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slope, top of bank to stream</td>
<td>21% / ~5:1</td>
<td>36% / ~3:1</td>
<td>19% / ~5:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>8101 Connecticut Avenue</td>
<td>Chevy Chase Land Company</td>
<td>Chevy Chase Land Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erodible Soils</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Quality Forest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coquelin Run Access Options from the Hamlet Community
Option A
Option B
Given the steep slopes at each of the potential locations, an accessible route would require significant switch-back pathways. An accessible route would be further complicated by the narrow width of the right-of-way extensions (about 20 feet).

Community Correspondence

Since the July 16, 2012, Planning Board meeting, staff and the Planning Board have received correspondence from interested parties. We have attached the correspondence received (attachment 3). The correspondence is grouped by property owner, civic/neighborhood organization, and individual.

Attachments

1. Chevy Chase Land Company Trip Distribution Calculations for Chevy Chase Lake Shopping Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chevy Chase Lake</th>
<th>Trip Generation Table for Existing Approved Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>74,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Approved Additional + Existing</td>
<td>174,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-By Reduction</td>
<td>0% / 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Future

| 303 | 200 | 503 | 503 | 548 | 1,051 |

Formulas Used*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Total = 1.7 (GFA/1000) - 8</td>
<td>1.44 (GFA/1000) + 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Total = 0.25 [ 7.43 (GLA/1000) + 247]</td>
<td>7.43 (GLA/1000) + 247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All formulas from LATR
Chevy Chase Lake
Trip Generation Table for Scenario 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Approved Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high rise</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail + Grocery</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-By Reduction</td>
<td>0% / 40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (Retail + Residential)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Capture Rate</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed New Trips</strong></td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved Plan</strong></td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formulas Used*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Total =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1.7 (GFA/1000) - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>0.25 (GLA/1000) + 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (high rise)</td>
<td>0.29 (# of units) + 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.44 (GFA/1000) + 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.43 (GLA/1000) + 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.34 (# of units) + 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All formulas from LATR
Chevy Chase Lake
Trip Generation Table for Scenario 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - high rise</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Rooms</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail + Grocery</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-By Reduction</td>
<td>0% / 40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (Retail + Residential + Hotel)</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Capture Rate</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Proposed New Trips*     | 232    | 293   | 525 | 451 | 383  | 834 |
| Approved Plan           | 303    | 200   | 503 | 503 | 548  | 1,051 |

Formulas Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Total = 1.7 (GFA/1000) - 8</td>
<td>1.44 (GFA/1000) + 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Total = 0.25 [ 7.43 (GLA/1000) +247]</td>
<td>7.43 (GLA/1000) +247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (high rise)</td>
<td>Total = 0.29 (# of units) +11</td>
<td>0.34 (# of units) +12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel**</td>
<td>Total = 0.56 (# of rooms)</td>
<td>0.59 (# of rooms)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The proposed development with Hotel option results in AM peak hour trips to exceed approved plan trip cap

**Hotel formulas come from ITE, Land Use 310. Everything else is from LATR.
## 2. Staff CLV analysis

### Chevy Chase Lake Sector Plan

Additional analysis requested by the Planning Board

**PRE-2011 COUNTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing (AM)</th>
<th>Existing (PM)</th>
<th>Future (AM)</th>
<th>Future (PM)</th>
<th>Staff Draft</th>
<th>Create (post-Purple Line)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Ave &amp; Jones Bridge Rd / Kens Pkwy</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Ave &amp; Manor Rd</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>1332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Ave &amp; Chevy Chase Lake Dr</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>1219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Ave &amp; East-West Hwy</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Ave &amp; Bradley Ln</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>1481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Rd &amp; Jones Bridge Rd</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Bridge Rd &amp; Jones Mill Rd</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-West Hwy &amp; Beach Dr / Jones Mill Rd</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Bridge Rd / Platt Ridge Rd</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Ave &amp; Dunlop St</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>1107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Ave &amp; Beach Dr</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Bridge Rd &amp; Spring Valley Rd</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2011 COUNTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing (AM)</th>
<th>Existing (PM)</th>
<th>Future (AM)</th>
<th>Future (PM)</th>
<th>Staff Draft</th>
<th>Create (post-Purple Line)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Ave &amp; Jones Bridge Rd / Kens Pkwy</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>1474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Ave &amp; Manor Rd</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>1508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Ave &amp; Chevy Chase Lake Dr</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>1201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Ave &amp; East-West Hwy</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Ave &amp; Bradley Ln</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>1398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Rd &amp; Jones Bridge Rd</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>1114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Bridge Rd &amp; Jones Mill Rd</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>1053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-West Hwy &amp; Beach Dr / Jones Mill Rd</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>1607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Bridge Rd / Platt Ridge Rd</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Ave &amp; Dunlop St</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>1181</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Ave &amp; Beach Dr</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Bridge Rd &amp; Spring Valley Rd</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Purple Line and BRAC improvements at the intersection of Connecticut Ave / Jones Bridge Rd

= Exceeds CLV standard of 1600
### Additional Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enhance 1</th>
<th>Create 1</th>
<th>Create Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Shopping Ctr)</td>
<td>(Shopping Ctr + West Side)</td>
<td>(Shopping Ctr + West Side + HHMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>AM PM</td>
<td>AM PM</td>
<td>AM PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 million sf., incl. ~1,044 du.</td>
<td>1693 1534</td>
<td>1802 1675</td>
<td>1809 1673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515,000 sf.</td>
<td>1534 1702</td>
<td>1675 100</td>
<td>1673 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 million sf., incl. ~1,450 du.</td>
<td>1625 1512</td>
<td>1636 1538</td>
<td>1638 1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 sf., incl. ~406 du.</td>
<td>1101 1435</td>
<td>7 64</td>
<td>1140 1584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 million sf., incl. ~1,600 du.</td>
<td>2005 1936</td>
<td>12 2</td>
<td>2035 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enhance 1</th>
<th>Create 1</th>
<th>Create Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Shopping Ctr)</td>
<td>(Shopping Center + West Side)</td>
<td>(Shopping Center + West Side + Howard Hughes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>AM PM</td>
<td>AM PM</td>
<td>AM PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 million sf., incl. ~1,044 du.</td>
<td>1614 1510</td>
<td>1722 1635</td>
<td>1727 1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515,000 sf.</td>
<td>1510 1620</td>
<td>1635 102</td>
<td>1642 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 million sf., incl. ~1,450 du.</td>
<td>1417 1660</td>
<td>1437 1678</td>
<td>1478 1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 sf., incl. ~406 du.</td>
<td>-29 81</td>
<td>20 18</td>
<td>1083 1457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 million sf., incl. ~1,600 du.</td>
<td>1045 1340</td>
<td>1066 1376</td>
<td>1913 1826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enhance 1</th>
<th>Create 1</th>
<th>Create Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Shopping Ctr)</td>
<td>(Shopping Ctr + West Side)</td>
<td>(Shopping Ctr + West Side + HHMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>AM PM</td>
<td>AM PM</td>
<td>AM PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 million sf., incl. ~1,044 du.</td>
<td>1611 1408</td>
<td>1632 1430</td>
<td>1639 1436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515,000 sf.</td>
<td>1408 1618</td>
<td>1430 14 21</td>
<td>7 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 million sf., incl. ~1,450 du.</td>
<td>1363 1670</td>
<td>1367 1673</td>
<td>1393 1683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 sf., incl. ~406 du.</td>
<td>71 55</td>
<td>4 3</td>
<td>783 1095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 million sf., incl. ~1,600 du.</td>
<td>770 1059</td>
<td>777 1060</td>
<td>1067 1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 sf., incl. ~406 du.</td>
<td>1040 1211</td>
<td>1056 1216</td>
<td>1067 1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 million sf., incl. ~1,600 du.</td>
<td>1029 1210</td>
<td>1056 1216</td>
<td>1067 1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 sf., incl. ~406 du.</td>
<td>1029 1210</td>
<td>1056 1216</td>
<td>1067 1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 million sf., incl. ~1,600 du.</td>
<td>875 1007</td>
<td>1051 1154</td>
<td>1052 1155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>