ASPEN HILL
Minor Master Plan Amendment

Project Briefing
Planning Board Agenda Item #7

Andrea Gilles, Area 2
June 5, 2014
Briefing Purpose

1. Follow-up evaluation on Mixed-Use land use in the Minor Amendment area

2. Update on Traffic Impact Analysis

3. Review Preliminary Minor Amendment Recommendations
   - Land Use and Zoning
   - Design
   - Transportation and Circulation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 3, 2013</td>
<td>Kick-off Community Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 23, 2014</td>
<td>Scope of Work to Planning Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Market Analysis Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2014</td>
<td>Community Meeting #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 2014</td>
<td>Aspen Hill Civic Association Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 23, 2014</td>
<td>Meeting with Northgate Plaza Business Owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24, 2014</td>
<td>Staff Briefing to Planning Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aspen Hill Homeowners Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 13, 2014</td>
<td>Community Meeting #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 5, 2014</td>
<td>Staff Briefing to Planning Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minor Amendment Area

- Approximately 14 acres
- Vacant office; gas stations; professional offices; parking; Dunkin Donuts
Amendment Goals

• Encourage quality redevelopment and design within the suburban context
• Address traffic impacts on Aspen Hill Rd & Connecticut Ave
• Address pedestrian/bicycle circulation & safety
• Encourage interconnectivity (vehicle & pedestrian) between properties
• Recommend appropriate transitions to residential neighborhoods
• Recommend land use and flexible zoning that allows a mix of compatible uses responsive to market changes
• Provide momentum for the large-area Aspen Hill Master Plan update
Aspen Hill and the General Plan

Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Location
Follow-up Analysis: Mixed-Use

• **Purpose**
  - At the April 24 meeting, Planning Board requested that Staff evaluate the potential for mixed-use development in the Subject area

• **Approach**
  - Reviewed characteristics of successful mixed-use developments
  - Analyzed current feasibility of mixed-use/vertical development for the subject area
  - Lessons learned: Glenmont
What does Mixed-Use mean?
Definition of Mixed-Use

“A mixed-use development is a real estate project with planned integration of some combination of retail, office, residential, hotel, recreation or other functions. It is pedestrian oriented and contains elements of a live-work-play environment. It maximizes space usage, has amenities and architectural expression and tends to mitigate traffic and sprawl.”

- 2006 Conference on Mixed-Use Development (Industry wide definition created by the International Council of Shopping Centers (ICSC), the National Association of Industrial and Office Properties (NAIOP), the Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA), and the National Multi Housing Council)
Mixed-Use Development Characteristics

1. Developed as integrated projects
2. Located in existing mixed-use environments
3. Strong pedestrian orientation
4. Good access to transportation systems
5. Sufficient property size
6. Near major attractions
7. Located in jurisdictions supportive of mixed-use

Mixed-Use Development Characteristics

Feature 1: Developed as integrated projects

- Physically and functionally integrated
- Synergy and demand between uses
- Interconnected sidewalks and public streets
- Conforms to a coherent plan (i.e. “placemaking”)

Mixed-use: Reston Town Center, Reston, VA
Multi-use: Edgewood Retail District, Atlanta, GA
Mixed-Use Development Characteristics

Feature 2: Located in existing mixed-use environments

- Extension of urban fabric and context
- Can leverage existing consumer market
- Vertical development easier in urban context

*Urban mixed-use: CityVista, DC*

*Suburban mixed-use: Mall at Prince George’s*
Mixed-Use Development Characteristics

Feature 3: Strong pedestrian orientation

- Pedestrian activity is key to success
  - Well designed pedestrian infrastructure
  - Connections to external surroundings
  - Destinations and activities to encourage walking

Existing: Connecticut Ave/Aspen Hill Road

Shared-use path, landscape separates street & sidewalk
Mixed-Use Development Characteristics

Feature 4: Good access to transportation systems

- Served by various forms of transit
- Easy access to freeways and existing travel patterns
- Numerous ways to get in/out
- Good visibility and exposure

- Minor Amendment Area
- BRT (proposed): 0.25 Miles
- Glenmont Metro: 2.0 Miles
- City of Rockville: 2.0 Miles
- ICC: 2.5 miles
- Twinbrook Metro: 2.5 Miles
- Wheaton Metro: 3.5 Miles
Mixed-Use Development Characteristics

Feature 5: Sufficient property size

- Urban: Allow for higher-density development
- Suburban: Large enough to create context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rockville Town Square</th>
<th>Bethesda Row</th>
<th>Village at Shirlington</th>
<th>Merrifield Town Square</th>
<th>Reston Town Square</th>
<th>Washingtonian Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Acres</td>
<td>14 Acres</td>
<td>24 Acres</td>
<td>31 Acres</td>
<td>85 Acres</td>
<td>120 Acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Build on Context | Create Context
Mixed-Use Development Characteristics

Feature 6: Near major attractions

- High volume of foot traffic
- Examples include:
  - Waterfronts
  - Convention centers
  - Sports venues

Images:
- Rio Washingtonian - Lake
- DC Chinatown – Sports Arena
- Inner Harbor - Waterfront
Mixed-Use Development Characteristics

Feature 7: Located in jurisdictions supportive of mixed-use

- Flexible or mixed-use zoning
- Development approvals/rezoning possible within a reasonable amount of time/effort
- Availability of economic incentives or public/private partnerships for mixed-use development
### How does Subject Area Compare?

**Subject area conditions – Today**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Developed as integrated projects</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Located in existing mixed-use environments</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strong pedestrian orientation</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Good access to transportation systems</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sufficient property size</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Near major attractions</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Located in jurisdictions supportive of mixed-use</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ratings Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fostering Mixed-Use Conditions

• Subject area currently suitable for multi-use development

• Mixed-use development may be feasible as surrounding environment and market evolves

• Important to assess the feasibility/vision of mixed-use corridor development in the forthcoming Aspen Hill Sector Plan
  • Establish pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure
  • New catalysts that can help encourage revitalization
  • May require public sector investments/partnerships to realize mixed-use development
Lessons Learned: Glenmont Town Center

- W-ZHA (an economic advisory firm) was engaged to evaluate feasibility of redeveloping the Glenmont Shopping Center into a Town Center

- **Key Findings**
  - Investor “gap” – subsidies required
    - Market rents insufficient (principally residential)
    - High cost of structured parking
  - Public-Private venture (PPV) was preferred approach
    - Easier land assembly
    - Ensure community vision
Connectivity and Traffic Impact
## Trip Generation

### Existing Vacant Office (Vitro/BAE) Redevelopment Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>Office *</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Retail ***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-O Reuse Exist. Bldg.</td>
<td>Max EOF Build-out</td>
<td>Max CRT Multi-Fam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>268k SF</td>
<td>320k SF</td>
<td>349 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.26 FAR</td>
<td>1.5 FAR **</td>
<td>1.0 FAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Intersection Congestion

## Critical Lane Volume (CLV) Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing Peak Hour</th>
<th>Currently Vacant</th>
<th>No Build * Remains Vacant</th>
<th>Office ** EOF Reuse Exist. Bldg. 268k SF 1.26 FAR</th>
<th>Max EOF Build-out 320k SF 1.5 FAR ***</th>
<th>Max CRT M-F Build-out 349 Units 1.0 FAR</th>
<th>Max CRT Build-out 218k SF 0.50 FAR</th>
<th>Proposed Big Box 120k SF 0.27 FAR</th>
<th>Max SF w/ Accept. CLVs 170k SF 0.39 FAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Ave &amp; Connecticut Ave</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Ave &amp; Aspen Hill Rd</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Ave &amp; Aspen Hill Rd</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 13 Community Meeting

• The area is challenging for pedestrians;

• Traffic in the area, particularly along Aspen Hill Road, is already excessive and impacts will be greater than what is reflected by Staff’s trip generation analysis;

• This area should not be rezoned ahead of the large area master plan update;

• Could a CRN Zone be considered for the amendment properties on which Staff is preliminarily recommending a CRT Zone?
Preliminary Recommendations

- Land Use and Zoning
- Design
- Transportation and Circulation
Current Conditions

Existing Land Use

Conversion Zones
Preliminary Zoning Recommendations
Land Uses and CRT

Example Menu of Uses Permitted in CRT

Retail
Combination Retail*
Office
Townhomes
Senior Living*
Restaurant
Apartments
Mixed Use

*Special Exception/Conditional Use or Limited Use which requires additional review
Land Uses and EOF

Example Menu of Uses Permitted in EOF

- Medical or dental clinics
- Medical or dental laboratory
- Office
- Retail* (limited percentage of development)
- Restaurant
- Residential* (limited percentage of development)
- Family and group daycare centers
- Health club
## Land Use and Zoning Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>CRN</th>
<th>CRT</th>
<th>EOF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse Living</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Unit Living</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Living Facility – Seniors or Persons with Disabilities</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic (More than 4 Medical Practitioners)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical, Dental Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Service Establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Up to 5,000 SF)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,001 - 15,000 SF)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15,001 - 50,000 SF)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50,001 - 85,000 SF)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(85,001 - 120,000 SF)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(120,001 SF and Over)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
P = Permitted Use  
L = Limited Use  
C = Conditional Use  
Blank = Not Allowed
Preliminary Zoning Recommendations
Design Criteria
Traffic Impact and Circulation

- Direct traffic onto Connecticut Ave (subject to SHA approval) rather than neighborhood streets
- Reduce impacts from queuing on Aspen Hill Road
- Affirm recommendations from the MCDOT/SHA Pedestrian Road Safety Audit, 2011
- Affirm the proposed Shared Use Path on Connecticut Ave
- Recommend Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis
Intermediate:
Consider installing street lights on the west side of Connecticut Avenue near Home Depot delivery driveway

Consider trimming tree canopies

Consider constructing a barrier at back of sidewalk to protect pedestrians from drainage structure

Consider installing pedestrian warning signs

Consider constructing curb extensions and eliminating channelizing islands

Consider installing pedestrian crossing signs

Consider installing pedestrian warning signs

Evaluate signal control including pedestrian signals

Consider relocating bus stop to the south

Consider installing pedestrian warning signs

Consider closing pedestrian access to the shopping center breezeway
Pedestrian Circulation and Safety

Bus Stop Suggestions:
- Consider relocating existing bus shelter further from roadway
- Consider relocating bus stop closer to the intersection

Consider consolidating driveways and constructing sidewalks

Consider constructing a barrier along back of sidewalk to protect pedestrians from ditch

Intersection corner suggestions:
- Consider reconstructing the corner with reduced turning radii
- Consider constructing expanded pedestrians landings
- Consider installing APS/CPS signal equipment and detectable warning surfaces at corners and medians
- Consider implementing LPI phasing

Consider implementing exclusive westbound and eastbound left-turn phasing

Median modification suggestions:
- Consider constructing level and accessible median improvements
- Consider installing APS/CPS signal equipment and detectable warning surfaces at corners and medians

Consider relocating bus stop closer to the intersection
## Project Timeline and Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Community Meeting #1</td>
<td>Dec 3, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Scope of Work to Planning Board</td>
<td>Jan 23, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Initial Staff Recommendations</td>
<td>Feb - Mar 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Community Meeting #2</td>
<td>April 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Staff Briefing to Planning Board</td>
<td>April 24, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Community Meeting #3</td>
<td>May 13, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Briefing to Planning Board</td>
<td>June 5, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Draft Plan to Planning Board</td>
<td>July 10, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board Public Hearing</td>
<td>Sept 11, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board Work Sessions</td>
<td>Sept - Oct 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board Draft Plan</td>
<td>Oct - Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Executive Plan Review</td>
<td>Nov - Dec 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Council Public Hearing</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Plan</td>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>