<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 26, 2016</td>
<td>Work Session #3: Site by Site Zoning, Transportation, Parks &amp; Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 9, 2016</td>
<td>Work Session #4: Infrastructure (schools emphasis) &amp; Text Edits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 23, 2016</td>
<td>Minor Edits/Planning Board Vote Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda for Planning Board

• Finalize Zoning Recommendations for Woodside/16th Street Station Area District
• Decision on Parks and Open Space Recommendations and related text changes
• Reaffirm major Transportation elements
• Agreement to proceed to Work Session #4 (MCPS briefing) and final edits in June
Site 1 – Spring Center
Existing: CRT-0.75
Proposed: CRT-3.0
Reason: establish mixed use node near transit

Site 3 – 8600 Apartments
Existing: R-10
Proposed: CRT-2.5
Reason: Allow for infill development around existing buildings
Density

**Region 1:**
- CRT-3.0
- C-1.5 R-2.0
- H-70’
- 312 total - 0 existing
- 312 net new

**Region 2a:**
- CRT-2.5
- C-0.25 R-2.5
- H-70’
- 2,343 total - 1,121 existing
- 1,222 net new

**Region 2b:**
- CR-3.0
- C-0.75 R-3.0
- H-145’
- 376 net new

**Region 3:**
- CRT-2.5
- C-0.25 R-2.5
- H-70’
- 346 total - 172 existing
- 174 net new

**Region 4:**
- R-10**
- 228 total - 227 existing
- 1 net new
Comparable Development to Station Areas

Fenwick Station Apartments
Height: 60 ft.
FAR: 109 du/acre approx. 3 FAR
Parking: 2 floors underground
Site 1: Spring Center

- **Residential**
  - 6 floors
  - 300,000 sf
  - 240 units
  - 2 FAR

- **Plaza + Kiss-and-Ride**
  - 23,000sf
  - 15% of site

- **Commercial**
  - Office/Retail
  - 150,000 sf
  - 1 FAR

- **Parking**
  - Underground
  - 2 floors
  - 300 spaces

- **Parking**
  - Structured
  - 3.5 floors
  - 175 spaces

**Sector Plan Proposed Zoning:** CRT-3.0, C-1.5, R-2.0, H-70
Site 3: 8600 Apartments

Existing Zoning: R-10 (approx. 1.25 FAR, H-100 ft)
Site 3: 8600 Apartments

Today
Site 3: 8600 Apartments

Tomorrow
Site 3: 8600 Apartments

Tomorrow
Site 3: 8600 Apartments

Sector Plan
Proposed
Zoning:
CRT-2.5, C-0.25, R-2.5, H-70

Residential
Infill 3-7 fl
130,000 sf
0.75 FAR
115 units

Parking
Underground
2 floors
225 spaces

Residential
Existing
170,000 sf
172 units
1 FAR

Midrise Apartments

Existing Building

Townhouses

16th St

Stream Buffer

100'
Site 3: 8600 Apartments

Sector Plan
Proposed
Zoning:
CRT-2.5, C-0.25, R-2.5, H-70
Site 3: Internal Courtyards

8300 Flats, Bethesda

Courtyard 50-60 ft. wide
Above Harris Teeter and Parking
**Woodside/16th St Station Area**

**Site 2a – Summit Hills**
Existing: R-10, CRT-0.75
Proposed: CRT-2.5
Reason: Leverage proximity to purple line and metro; improve access and connectivity; expand public open space; provide environmental benefits; introduce rent-restricted affordable housing opportunities

**Site 2b – Summit Hills**
Existing: R-10
Proposed: CRT-3.0
Reason: Proximity to Silver Spring CBD, Metro Red Line
Summit Hills Vision

- Greater integration into surrounding community
- Well connected to surrounding streets and transit via new road
  - Spring Street Extended
- Publically accessible parks and open space
- Environmental benefits
- Wider range of affordability
Summit Hills Overview

Strengths
• 30 acre site with one owner (similar in size to The Blairs)
• ½ mi to Silver Spring Metro & MARC rail
• ¼ mi to Woodside/16th St Purple Line
• Market rate affordable housing
• Large unit sizes

Challenges
• No protections for affordable housing
• Disconnected from surrounding streets, large gated super block
• Large areas of impervious surfaces, limited stormwater management
• No publically accessible green space
Planning Board Options:

1) Retain Sector Plan recommended zoning
2) Modify Sector Plan recommended zoning
   • Add Site specific language requiring future rent restricted units be larger units
   • Limit extent of redevelopment
3) Recommend zoning changes only following purple line construction
   • Floating zone
   • Minor master plan amendment
4) Do not rezone (market rate affordable units subject to potential rent increases, amenities as they exist today)
Development Scenarios - Summit Hills

1. NO redevelopment
   NO parks
   NO through connection
   NO rent restricted affordable housing
   NO environmental benefits

2. SOME infill
   Civic Green
   No through connection
   Rent Restricted
   Affordable Housing

3. MORE infill
   SOME redevelopment
   Civic Green
   Daylight Fenwick Branch
   No through connection
   Rent Restricted
   Affordable Housing

4. > REDEVELOPMENT
   Civic Green
   Daylighted Stream Park
   Community Recreational Park
   Through connection
   Rent Restricted
   Affordable Housing
Summary of public testimony, re: parks

• Proposed new density will put pressure on parks that are already heavily programmed/used
  
  **Staff response:** proposed system of parks and trails will greatly increase both quantity and connection to parks and recreation for the Sector Plan Area

• Summit Hills owners concerned about expected public amenities, not enough density to make economics work
  
  **Staff response:** reduced versions of the Fenwick Branch proposed park may be possible with minimal development

• New development adjacent to Rosemary Hills-Lyttonsville Local Park should be compatible with park amenities and features
  
  **Staff response:** proposed additions to the park will help provide compatibility while expanding the park’s land area and amenities
M-NCPPLC parkland, regional context
A Hierarchy (PROS Plan, 2012)
Each area or sector plan should include a system of open spaces based on the roles of each type of open space.

For the Sector Plan Area:
• Active recreation destinations
• A central civic green
• An interconnected system of sidewalks and trails to connect parks and open spaces
• Wooded areas that will provide a sense of contact with nature

For each Neighborhood:
A neighborhood green, buffer park, or community use recreational park

For each Block:
A public square, plaza or green area

For each Building:
An outdoor recreation space

For each Residence:
A private outdoor space
What are the opportunities?

- How can we make Greater Lyttonsville better with connections and spaces?
- Where are the best places to provide focal, civic open spaces?

A Hierarchy

Each area master plan should include a system of open spaces based on the roles of each type of open space. The amount and size of open spaces may vary from plan to plan and should be directly proportional to the projected density, and adjust to the pattern of existing open space and other factors such as community-specific needs.
Stream Daylighting
Summit Hills

Proposed Parks: Urban Greenway Park/Daylighted Stream Park + Community Use Recreational Park + Civic Green Park
Scenarios in Summit Hills

1. NO redevelopment
   - NO parks

2. SOME infill
   - Civic Green

3. MORE infill
   - SOME redevelopment
   - + Daylighted Stream Park

4. MORE redevelopment
   - + Community Recreational Park
Daylighted Stream Park

Parkland Area:
~ 4.83 AC
~15.7% of site vs. 10% POS (Zoning)

MORE infill
SOME redevelopment
+ Daylighted Stream Park

• Preserve existing residential buildings in place
• Proposed trail and some recreational activities to happen along the stream
• Connects to Rock Creek Park (southern end)
• Loss of approximately 430 surface parking spaces
Value of Parks

Increase resiliency of neighborhoods and regions

- LIVING
- PARKS
- ECONOMY
- HEALTH
- ENVIRONMENT
- CONNECTIONS
Montgomery County Rental Market

- Traditionally, older units provide market-affordable housing.
  - However, properties close to transit & amenities filter through the market more slowly.
- Unbalanced supply/demand in rental market
  - 38% of rental supply concentrated in 80%-100% AMI
    - 23% of households in 80%-100% AMI range
- Development/rehabilitation/preservation are all important in meeting the affordability needs of the County.
- Affordable housing development should leverage existing and new connections to transit, employment centers, and amenities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Rental Market</th>
<th>Summit Hills</th>
<th>Lyttonsville (ex Summit Hills)</th>
<th>Downtown Silver Spring</th>
<th>Montgomery County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Asking Rent/Unit</td>
<td>$1,833</td>
<td>$1,541</td>
<td>$1,780</td>
<td>$1,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Effective Rent/Unit</td>
<td>$1,833</td>
<td>$1,445</td>
<td>$1,718</td>
<td>$1,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Asking Rent/SF</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$1.73</td>
<td>$2.16</td>
<td>$1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Effective Rent/SF</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$1.62</td>
<td>$2.08</td>
<td>$1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Unit SF</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Year Built</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CoStar
Effective Rent Per Square Foot

- **Summit Hills** 1.94%
- **Lyttonsville (excluding Summit Hills)** 1.46%
- **Downtown Silver Spring** 2.05%
- **US Inflation Rate** 1.77%

Source: CoStar
### Summit Hills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summit Hills</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Average Rent</th>
<th>AMI</th>
<th>General Income Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>$1,383</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>$55,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-bedroom</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>$1,538</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$61,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-bedroom</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$1,783</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$71,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-bedroom</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>$2,146</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$85,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-bedroom</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$2,403</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>$96,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CoStar/2014 DHCA Survey/HUD

- Units currently affordable to households making 75-85% AMI
- Contains larger units, but no rent restricted units
- Proposed zoning allows Summit Hills to redevelop if units become obsolete but doesn’t incentivize redevelopment in near term
- Redevelopment/infill strategy will provide for preservation of many market-rate affordable units, while adding new rent-restricted units
Planning Board Options:

1) Retain Sector Plan recommended zoning
2) Modify Sector Plan recommended zoning
   • Add Site specific language requiring future rent restricted units be larger units
   • Limit extent of redevelopment
3) Recommend zoning changes only following purple line construction
   • Floating zone
   • Minor master plan amendment
4) Do not rezone (market rate affordable units subject to potential rent increases, amenities as they exist today)
Residential Area

- Industrial/Institutional Area
- Brookville Rd/Lytonsville Station Area
- Woodside/16th St Station Area
**Paddington Square**

**Site 6a**
Existing: R-20  
Proposed: CRT-1.5  
Reason: Allow for increased affordable housing development within close proximity to purple line on lowest topography on site

**Site 6b**
Existing: R-20  
Proposed: THD  
Reason: Requires townhouse development as buffer to single family detached homes
Rosemary Hills – Lyttonsville Local Park
From section 2.7.4 (p.61):

- Coordinate with adjacent property owners to **create a more efficient parcel configuration** for Rosemary Hills-Lyttonsville Local Park to **promote improvements to recreational facilities** at this park.
HOC/
Paddington Square
&
Rollingwood Apartments
P. 79 - Section 3.2.2 – Public Space Improvements – (2nd bullet): Consider a land swap between an access easement across parkland for Paddington Square landowners in exchange for parkland dedication to the Department of Parks to expand Rosemary Hills-Lyttonsville Local Park. The expansion should be large enough public open space dedicated to Parks at the time of regulatory review should be 0.5 acres and configured to accommodate additional recreational facilities to meet the needs of the growing population in the Sector Plan area. Exact location, type and layout of facilities will be determined at the time of regulatory review.

Recommended amount: 0.5 AC.
Rollingwood Apartments & HOC/Paddington Square
Recommendations (5th bullet/ 3rd sub-bullet): “If new buildings and a new access point associated with the redevelopment are placed directly along Lyttonsville Road as part of the negotiated land swap...”

Recommendations (6th bullet): The MNCPPC Parks Department has evaluated a potential land swap and supports such a transition, only if the land swap results in an equal or greater amount of parkland.

Recommended amount: equal or greater amount of parkland
Agenda for Planning Board

- Finalize Zoning Recommendations for Woodside/16th Street Station Area District
- Decision on Parks and Open Space Recommendations and related text changes
- Reaffirm major Transportation elements
- Agreement to proceed to Work Session #4 (MCPS briefing) and final edits in June