As a part of the Montgomery County Zoning Rewrite, the Planning Department is beginning the process of reviewing the potential conversion from existing to proposed zones.

Montgomery County has more zones than almost any other jurisdiction with 123 zones, many of which are similar or no longer used.

The proposed zones have been developed as a part of the ongoing Zoning Rewrite project, and this presentation describes the process of converting existing zones into the proposed new format.

Rationalization

• Lots of zones (123)
• Many are similar
• Some are no longer used
• Others were never used
In some cases, similar zones are being combined.

For example, let’s look at the proposed RMD-6 (Residential Medium Density – 6) zone. Under the draft proposal, it is being created from 3 existing zones:

• R-60
• R-40
• R-MH

As you’ll see in the next slide, these zones have very similar development standards for a detached house.

R-60 is the main zone in this example, making up 98% of the land area proposed to be converted to RMD-6.

The other zones, R-40 and R-MH, each have less than 200 acres.
As you can see, these standards are similar.

For single-family detached houses, R-60 and R-40 have identical standards. Those standards are being carried forward to the RMD-6 zone.

We are proposing the elimination of the “sum of side setbacks” requirement and have proposed changing the way height is measured.

R-MH is a zone designed for mobile homes. We believe that the new RMD-6 zone’s standards will be able to accommodate inclusion of the R-MH zone.
For Agricultural and Rural zones, the conversion is a one-to-one process.

The RDT zone becomes the Agricultural Conservation (AC) zone.

The Rural zone becomes the Rural Residential (RR) zone.

Rural Cluster (RC) and Low Density Rural Cluster (LDRC) would be combined. Our current zoning map indicates that there is no LDRC-zoned land in the county.

Rural Neighborhood Cluster (RNC) would continue to be called Rural Neighborhood Cluster or RNC.
For the single-family residential zones, we’re combining similar zones as was outlined earlier with regard to the RMD-6 zone.

Residential Estate 2 and 2C are being merged into the RE-2 zone.

RE-1 stays RE-1.

R-200, R-150, and RMH-200 are being merged into a new RLD-20 zone.

R-90 becomes RMD-9.

R-60, R-40, and R-MH are becoming RMD-6 as outlined earlier in the presentation.
With the townhouse and multi-unit zones, the same scheme is used.

RT-6 and RT-8 are being combined into Townhouse Low Density (TLD).

RT-10 and RT-12.5 are being merged into Townhouse Medium Density (TMD).

RT-15 becomes Townhouse High Density (THD)

R-30 is becoming RHD-3. (Currently, there is no R-4plex zoned in the county).

R-20 becomes RHD-2.

R-10 and R-H are being merged into RHD-1.
The same type of conversion is being proposed for the county's industrial zones.

The light industrial zones RS, I-1, and I-4 are becoming Industrial, Light (IL).

The heavy industrial zone I-2 is becoming Industrial, Heavy (IH).

I-3 has historically developed as an office park therefore the proposed conversion for I-3 is into an employment zone instead of an industrial zone.
For commercial and mixed-use zones, the process was more involved.

First, consider the 6 zones proposed for commercial and mixed-use areas.

The CR, CRT, and CRN zones already exist in the county. They allow for mixed-use development at varying densities and heights. We’ll discuss how those zones work in a little bit.

The other 3 zones are the employment zones. They were introduced to the Panel at the November 30, 2011 Zoning Advisory Panel meeting.

![Commercial & Mixed Use Zones Diagram](image-url)
Let’s review how the CR zones work.

The CR zone is really a family of zones. Each zone as applied on a parcel has a specific density and height allowance that can be unique.

Each application of the zone has 5 elements:

**The Zone Group** defines the set of uses that are allowed in the zone. In this example, it’s CRT (CR-Town).

**The Overall FAR** is the total amount of density allowed on the site.

**The Commercial FAR** is the total amount of commercial FAR allowed on the site.

**The Residential FAR** is the total amount of residential FAR allowed on the site.

Even though the C and R components may add to more than the Overall FAR, the density cannot exceed the Overall FAR limit.

**The Maximum Height** limits how tall (in feet) buildings can be.
Because of the formula, sites in the CR, CRT, and CRN zones can be fine-grained for the appropriate use of mixes and densities for each particular setting.

There is not one CR density, but many. A CR zone in one part of the county might allow 4.0 FAR, while one elsewhere may only allow 1.0.

The range of densities and heights for the 3 Commercial/Residential zones is shown in the chart on the left. The CR zone, for example, can have an overall FAR anywhere from 0.5 FAR up to 8.0 FAR depending on location and/or Master Plan recommendations.

The employment zones have been structured in a similar fashion. Each employment zone has an overall density and a maximum height, but the employment zones do not have the specific Commercial or Residential density components.
This conversion process is a master plan-driven effort.

We have reviewed all 39 of the active Master Plans in the county.

All Master Plan recommendations regarding commercial or mixed-use properties have been reviewed and used to formulate CR, CRT, CRN, EG, EOF, or ELS zones to exactly reflect those recommendations.

**Master Plan-Driven Process**

- 39 active master plans
- 5 underway
- Focused on commercial & mixed use areas
The process of reviewing each Master Plan entailed several iterative reviews of every commercial and/or mixed-use parcel.

We’re currently entering the proposed recommendations into our GIS system for comparison analyses.

The next step is to distribute/post the maps for public review in an effort to obtain feedback from residents, property owners, and other stakeholders.
This slide shows the generalized decision tree we used for commercial and mixed-use properties. A specific tree exists for each of the current zones.

For each commercial and mixed-use parcel in the county, the first question was:
“Is there a specific Master Plan recommendation for this parcel?”

If the answer is yes, a new zone was formulated to fit those recommendations.

If, on the other hand, the Master Plan did not make any specific recommendations about a parcel, we used a decision tree to determine what zone formula should be used to reflect existing density and height allowances.

The goal for this process is to reflect the density and height currently permitted in each zone and compatible with the Master Plan for each parcel.
Here’s an example of how the decision tree worked.

C-1 is a relatively common commercial zone in the county. It currently has no maximum FAR, but does allow heights up to 45’ in certain cases.

If a parcel is not in a village or town center and is used for auto-centric development not easily accessible on foot, or it is a regional mall, it is converted to **EG-1.0 H-45**.

On parcels within a village or town center that do not abut or confront detached residential housing, the zoning conversion is **CRT-1.0 C-0.75 R-0.75 H-45**.

If the parcel abuts detached residential housing, the C-1 zone is converted to **CRN-0.5 C-0.5 R-0.25 H-35** designation; if it is across a road from detached residential housing, it is converted to **CRN-0.75 C-0.5 R-0.5 H-45**.

These conversions are modeled on the densities and heights that could be achieved under today’s zoning limitations and allowances.
Another example is the C-2 zone. It has a range of development potential in the current code which means that the density allowed today varies depending on particular site conditions, application processes, and proposed uses.

Currently, maximum density for a parcel zoned C-2 is either 1.5 FAR for completely commercial uses, or 2.5 FAR for mixed-use development.

The maximum height for a parcel zoned C-2 is either 3 stories or 45’, unless the new development is an expansion of existing development, then the maximum height is 5 stories or 60’ and requires a site plan. Last, if a currently zoned C-2 parcel is not near property zoned detached residential and it develops as a mixed-use project, the maximum height is 75’.
C-O is a current office zone.

In many instances, the Master Plan recommended “lower density and height” without specifying what that height should be.

In those cases, the proposed recommendation is **EOF-1.5 H-45**. FAR and height were determined by an analysis of C-O development approved under this general Master Plan recommendation.

If there is no Master Plan recommendation (specific or general), the zone conversion recommendation is **EOF-3.0 H-100**, the density and height allowed under the C-O zone.
If there is no specific recommendation, the zone conversion recommendation is **CR-2.5 C-1.0 R-2.0 H-145** for TSR-zoned parcels and **CR-3.0 C-2.5 R-2.5 H-200** for TSM-zoned parcels, the densities and heights allowed under the respective zones.

If the Master Plan does make a *specific* recommendation, it is reflected in the individualized formula.
The CBD zones are easier to convert because the zones themselves spell out the limits on commercial density within mixed-use projects in addition to the maximum allowable density and height.

In many cases, however, the CBD zones have specific recommendations in the Master Plan, which means they won’t have the default conversion shown on this slide, they will reflect the limitations recommended in the Master Plan.
Here’s an example:

To keep things simple, we’re going to focus on the maximum height in this example.

Highlighted in green on this slide is a block in Downtown Silver Spring. It’s surrounded by Eastern Avenue, Newell Street, Kennett Street, and 13th Street.

This whole block is currently zoned CBD-1.

The zoning ordinance allows CBD-1 parcels to achieve a height of 143’.

- This block currently zoned CBD-1
But in the case of this block, the Master Plan has specific recommendations for some parcels in this block.

Any parcel fronting on Eastern Avenue is limited to 90’ in height, and within 60 feet of the street, buildings may not exceed 45’.

The area shown in green on the slide is made up of the parcels that front on Eastern Avenue. Those in light blue do not (so the Master Plan restriction on height does not apply to them).

• MP restricts height on Eastern Ave parcels
If you were to build structures on this block, the Master Plan would limit their heights as shown in the graphic.

The buildings on lots that do not front on Eastern Avenue could reach 143’.

Buildings on the lots fronting on Eastern Avenue could achieve 90’, except within 60 feet of Eastern Avenue, where they would be limited to 45’ in height.

- Current building envelopes as per master plan
Since this block has specific Master Plan recommendations, the zone conversion incorporated the recommended limitations, with one exception.

The green parcels received a CR zone with a Height component of 90’. The further restriction along Eastern Avenue to a height of 45’ was not incorporated in the zone as it would require split zoning the property.

Even though the entire area shown in green has a height limit of 90’, development would still be bound by the Master Plan and development could not exceed 45’ along Eastern Avenue.

The blue parcels got a default conversion to 145’ in height. (CR zones only allow height maximums to be measured in 5-foot increments).

• Proposed CR heights (145’ & 90’)

"Zoning Conversion Process"
We’ve talked a bit about the “non-default” parcels. Those are parcels where the Master Plan made a specific recommendation.

In the CBD areas (Silver Spring, Bethesda, Friendship Heights), those are very common, because the Master Plans are very specific.

In Downtown Silver Spring, 38% of the parcels have some specific recommendation (they’re shown in orange on the slide).
But in the residential area north of Silver Spring’s CBD, every single parcel received a “default” conversion through the decision tree.

This is because the Master Plan did not make specific recommendations that changed the default density or height conversion.
In these four sample Master Plans, you can see that the vast majority of parcels converted using the default method.

### Default Conversions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Default Conversion</th>
<th>Not Default</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%Parcels</td>
<td>%Land Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Spring CBD</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North &amp; West Silver Spring</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olney</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall (these 4)</td>
<td>98.52%</td>
<td>99.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Zoning Conversion Process"
We've categorized the reasons a parcel would not receive default conversion into 9 categories.

It is common for the Master Plan to limit heights or densities. In some cases, the mix of uses is also specified.

Overlay zones also play a role. They often regulate density and height, making it lower than would otherwise be allowed in the zone.

Other reasons a parcel would not be given the default conversion are:
• Restrictions in the site plan
• Conditions of rezoning
• Conditions on the site that preclude the default

### Breaking Down the Non-Defaults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Default Conversions</th>
<th>Silver Spring CBD</th>
<th>Damascus</th>
<th>North &amp; West Silver Spring</th>
<th>Olney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parcels</td>
<td>Parcels</td>
<td>Parcels</td>
<td>Parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP height restriction</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP density restriction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP mix restriction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVR height restriction</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVR density restriction</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVR mix restriction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site plan restriction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning condition</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>214</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We want your feedback about this process and about the proposed zoning ordinance.

If you have questions, concerns, or comments, please let us know.

You can find more information about the Rewrite at http://ZoningMontgomery.org

Correspondence can be sent to: Pamela Dunn
Project Manager
Pamela.Dunn@mncppc-mc.org
301.650.5649