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Issue 5: The proposed CR Zone may be a disincentive to redevelop properties in Wheaton.
CBD-2
Standard Method: 2.0 FAR maximum (178,800 square feet)

Required: 10% Public Use Space

CR 5: C 4.5 R4.5 150’
Optional Method project at 2.0 FAR (178,800 square feet)

Required: 10% Public Use Space
5% BLTs
Sketch Plan
Site Plan

5% BLT purchase (.075 FAR)

Tower setback + structured parking .45 FAR 30%

Neighborhood services + Minimum parking .45 FAR 30%

Transit proximity ¼ mile .6 FAR 40%

Optional Method

Standard Method .5 FAR

Example

Wheaton Crossing (Univ. Blvd Block) 89,400 square foot lot area
Example

CBD-2
Standard Method: 2.0 FAR maximum (178,400 square feet)

Required: 10 % Public Use Space

CR 5: C 4.5 R4.5 150’
Optional Method project at 2.0 FAR (178,400 square feet)

Required: 10 % Public Use Space
5 % BLTs
Sketch Plan
Site Plan

2.0 FAR
Green wall/energy conservation
0.075 FAR
0.75 FAR

5 % BLT purchase
0.075 FAR
5 %

Tower setback + structured parking
0.45 FAR
30 %

Neighborhood services + required parking
0.45 FAR
30 %

Transit proximity ½ mile
0.45 FAR
30 %

Optional Method

Standard Method
0.5 FAR

Wheaton Crossing (Univ. Blvd Block) 89,400 square foot lot area
Issue 9: Testimony – location of the major civic space and its ownership
The ownership of the major civic open space by the Department of Parks may be one of the options, and that the final status of ownership, management, and operation will be determined as part of the development review process.
Issue 10: Testimony – Ennalls Realignment with Price Avenue

Realignment increases connectivity resulting in:

• Improved pedestrian safety
• Opportunity to enhance redevelopment of the Core district
• Establishes Ennalls Avenue as a viable alternative to University Boulevard
• Improved circulation within the CBD for pedestrians as well as vehicles.

Recommendation: Retain Ennalls Avenue realignment in the Plan
Staff has met with one property owner adjacent to the proposed realignment – the owner does not favor the realignment.

Use of County lot #34 could enable alignment to avoid demolition of existing buildings.
Issue 10: Testimony – Ennalls Realignment with Price Avenue

Adopted plan recommendations

Conditions prior to plan adoption/redevelopment
Issue 10: Testimony – Ennalls Realignment with Price Avenue

Improved Pedestrian Safety  Better defined east-west pedestrian pathways
Provide for a better crossing of Georgia Avenue

2008 and 2009 Pedestrian Collision Comparison
In and Around the Reedie Drive HIA

Source: MCDOT
Issue 10: Testimony – **Ennalls Realignment with Price Avenue**

**Improved Pedestrian Safety** Shorter block length along Georgia Ave.
Opportunity to enhance redevelopment of the Core district

Recommended by local developers to improve redevelopment options

Supported by Wheaton redevelopment partner B.F. Saul, Montgomery County General Services and the Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee (WUDAC)
Issue 10: Testimony – **Ennalls Realignment with Price Avenue**

Alternative to University Boulevard = Better CBD Circulation

September 2009 ULI Technical Advisory Panel
Issue 10: Testimony – Ennalls Realignment with Price Avenue

Alternative to University Boulevard = Better CBD Circulation

2004 SHA/Kittelson Wheaton Pedestrian Safety Evaluation
Issue 11: Testimony – Price Ave. Extension to Amherst Ave.

The extension provides opportunity to:

- Increase pedestrian and bicycle connectivity within Wheaton
- Create two smaller blocks from one of the longest blocks in the CBD

Road extension would only be considered as part of a public/private partnership that incorporates a redesign and removal of Garage 45.
Considerations for Price Avenue Extension

Need for parking during the short term as Wheaton/public lots redevelop

Parking garage #45 has one of the lowest utilization rates (65%) but its proximity to Metro is important

Other businesses would need to be relocated for roadway to be built

Project could leverage County property at Garage #45 which is one of the current County redevelopment sites

Increased connectivity is a goal of the Plan
**Increase connectivity within Wheaton**

**Montgomery County Planning Area Street Connectivity Comparisons**
Fall/Winter 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wheaton</th>
<th>Silver Spring</th>
<th>White Flint</th>
<th>Bethesda</th>
<th>Friendship Heights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Plan/</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing Plan/</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGBC Intersections</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (Sq. Miles)</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections/Sq. Mile</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGBC LEED ND Standard (Minimum)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Area Above/Below Std.</td>
<td>-83</td>
<td>-71</td>
<td>-78</td>
<td>-166</td>
<td>-81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issue 11: Testimony – Price Ave. Extension to Amherst Ave.

Create two smaller blocks from one of the longest blocks in the CBD
Issue 12: Testimony – **Priority Retail Streets**

Veirs Mill Road
Issue 12: Testimony – **Priority Retail Streets**

**Recommendation**
Do not designate Veirs Mill Road and University Boulevard (west of Veirs Mill Road) as Priority Retail Streets
major mixed-use transit-oriented market center

Price District
Issue 13: Testimony – Retain Veterans Park at its Current Location

Recommendation
No change to the Plan

Retain options to:
- Improve the park at this location *(community testimony)*
- Relocated the park as part of a future public private development project
- Move the memorializing of war veterans to a more central open space

RFQ Sites
- Safeway Site
Issue 14: Testimony – Standard Properties Parcel Density

Maximum FAR
- 6.0
- 5.0
- 4.0
- 3.0
- 2.0
- 1.5

Wheaton Metro Station
Wheaton Sector Plan Boundary

Standard Properties Parcel
Issue 14: Testimony – Standard Properties Parcel Height

Standard Properties Parcel
Proposed Zoning - Standard Properties

- Archstone at Wheaton Station
- Standard Property Site – Existing Use
Issue 14: Testimony – Increased Density and Height on Standard Properties Parcel

40 feet

150 feet
Issue 14: Testimony – Increased Density and Height on Standard Properties Parcel
Proposed Zoning - Standard Properties

Zoning Changes

CR 5: C 4.5: R 4.5: H 150'
Issue 15: Testimony – Rezone the WTOP Site

Recommendation
No change to the sites existing zoning R-90
Recommendation

Support the proposed amendments to the CR Zone, and retain the current recommendation of the CR Zone.
Issue 16: Testimony – Is the CR Zone Appropriate for Transition to Single-Family Residential Uses

C-T The community request that the current C-T Zone be retained
Restrictions on building, drive, and parking locations to 100’ from res/ag property line

Land uses restricted
- Ambulance/rescue squad
- Automobile repair and services
- Automobile sales, outdoors
- Entertainment/performance venue [new use]
- Manufacturing ... of cosmetics, drugs, perfumes, etc.
- Manufacturing ... of medical, scientific, etc. ... equipment.

Restrictions on drive-through to 100’ from res/ag property line
- Eating and drinking establishments
- Retail trades, business, and services of a general commercial nature
Issue 17: Testimony – Consider preserving the four-acre Montgomery County Art and Design college (MCADC) property on Georgia Avenue and Evans Drive South of the Sector Plan Area.
Next Steps

Worksession 3  November 18, 2010
Worksession 4  December 9, 2010
Council        Spring 2011
Extra Slides
Vision

Current development proposals develop:

Washington Properties
Safeway
Avalon Bay

Proposed Open Space
Vision

Proposed develop + expressed interest in redevelopment:
WMATA public/private partnership, WMATA North, Lindsay Ford property

Owners expressed interest in redeveloping
Vision

Possible development if assemblage occurs

Proposed Open Space
Issue 9: Testimony – *Parcels considered for public/private*
Density

Maximum FAR
- 6.0
- 5.0
- 4.0
- 3.0
- 2.0
- 1.5

Wheaton Metro Station
Wheaton Sector Plan Boundary
Height
Existing Zoning Core and Price Districts
Wheaton Overlay Zone

2006

Overlay zone amended in 2006

Allows optional method development

Exempts buildings less than 20,000 square feet from site plan review

Allowed increased building height

Requires set aside floor area for small businesses

There has been no development using the optional method since these changes were made
Wheaton Overlay Zone

Office development never occurred

Site plan review for standard method projects became a point of controversy

Viewed as a complicated zoning regulation and a disincentive to redevelop

Recommendation

Remove the existing Retail Preservation Overlay Zone and use other mechanisms to protect small business including provisions of the CR zone
Proposed Zoning Core and Price Districts

CR Zones

CBD Zoning

Maximum FAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Legend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Dark Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Light Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Beige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Light Beige</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>CR Zone</th>
<th>C Zone</th>
<th>R Zone</th>
<th>H Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CR 6:</td>
<td>C 6:</td>
<td>R 3:</td>
<td>H 250'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CR 6:</td>
<td>C 5.5:</td>
<td>R 5.5:</td>
<td>H 200'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CR 6:</td>
<td>C 5.5:</td>
<td>R 5.5:</td>
<td>H 150'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CR 5:</td>
<td>C 4.5:</td>
<td>R 4.5:</td>
<td>H 150'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CR 5:</td>
<td>C 4.5:</td>
<td>R 4.5:</td>
<td>H 130'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CR 5:</td>
<td>C 4.5:</td>
<td>R 4.5:</td>
<td>H 100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CR 4:</td>
<td>C 3.5:</td>
<td>R 3.5:</td>
<td>H 100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CR 4:</td>
<td>C 3.5:</td>
<td>R 3.5:</td>
<td>H 130'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CR 3:</td>
<td>C 2.5:</td>
<td>R 2.5:</td>
<td>H 100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CR 3:</td>
<td>C 1.5:</td>
<td>R 2.5:</td>
<td>H 75'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CR 2:</td>
<td>C 1.5:</td>
<td>R 1.5:</td>
<td>H 75'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CR 2:</td>
<td>C 1.5:</td>
<td>R 1.5:</td>
<td>H 60'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CR 1.5:</td>
<td>C 1:</td>
<td>R 1:</td>
<td>H 75'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CR 1.5:</td>
<td>C 0.5:</td>
<td>R 1.5:</td>
<td>H 45'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
major mixed-use transit-oriented market center
Core District
Core District  COMMUNITY VISIONING
Map 16 Existing and Proposed Street Network

Street Classifications:
- Major Highway Existing
- Residential Primary Existing
- Residential Primary Proposed
- Business Existing
- Business Proposed (New Designation)
- Business Proposed
- Abandon

Local Streets:
- Existing
- Proposed

Pedestrian Connections:
- Existing
- Proposed

* Local street connections are not designated in the Master Plan of Highways. Proposed local street and pedestrian rights-of-way and alignment to be determined during the development review process.
Issue 14: Testimony – Increased Density and Height on Standard Properties Parcel

Standard Properties Parcel

Archstone at Wheaton Station building
Issue 16: Testimony – Is the CR Zone Appropriate for Transition to Single-Family Residential Uses

Proposed BB&T Bank – University Boulevard and Valley View Avenue
Issue 16: Testimony – Is the CR Zone Appropriate for Transition to Single-Family Residential Uses
Within Sector Plan - .99 acres
Wheaton Veteran’s Park

Within ¼ mile outside – 32.03 Acres
Arcola LP
Glen Haven LP
Pleasant View LP
Portion of Sligo Creek SVU 5
Wheaton Community Center
Wheaton Forest LP

Within 1 mile outside – 658.57 acres
Parks

Everyone

Wheaton Regional Park
Brookside Gardens, athletic fields, tennis, ice skating, fitness trails, picnicking

Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park
Trail connectors and natural areas

Rock Creek Regional Park
Trail connectors to Washington DC and Shady Grove

Local and Neighborhood Parks
Fields, playgrounds, picnic areas

Plan Area

Central Civic Urban Park
Gatherings, ceremonies, celebrations in the core

Wheaton Veteran’s Park
Veteran ceremonies and celebrations
## Wheaton Open Space System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Public use space plazas and parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting offices, residents, and retail uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blueridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kensington View/Wheaton Hills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Green Streets / Pedestrian Promenade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connects each district</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Buildings and Households | Private recreation and outdoor balcony space |
**Examples of the Range of the CR Zone**

The CR Zone is really a family of zones. Each zone has specific limits on density – Floor Area Ratio (FAR) – and height. A formula regulates the density (0.5 - 8.0 FAR) and height (40 - 300 ft) of each instance of the zone.

**How the formula works**

**CR-3:**
- Total FAR allowed
- C-2.0 | R-2.0 | H-60

**CR-1.0:**
- C-0.75 | R-0.75 | H-40

**CR-2.0:**
- C-0.75 | R-1.50 | H-50

**CR-4.0:**
- C-2.50 | R-3.50 | H-90

**Range of Floor Area Ratio (FAR):**
- 0.5
- 1.0
- 2.0
- 3.0
- 4.0
- 5.0
- 6.0
- 7.0
- 8.0

Let's consider an example: This parcel is zoned CR-4.0 | C-3.0 | R-3.5 | H-50.

That means this parcel could develop several ways:

- Under the “standard method” the maximum density is only 0.5 FAR.
- If developed 100% residential, only 3.5 FAR can be reached.
- If developed 100% non-residential, only 3.0 FAR can be reached.
- If developed as mixed-use density can reach 4.0 FAR.

This gives developers an incentive to mix uses.

**major mixed-use transit-oriented market center**

Georgia Avenue corridor and eastern County