

Park Hills Civic Association General Meeting – Summary

The Park Hills Civic Association (PHCA) held a General Meeting on **Wednesday, May 25, 2011** at the Silver Spring International Middle School in a classroom across from the Media Center beginning at 7:15 pm.

Attendees:

Jim Anderson; Deanne Anderson; Alan Bowser; Leslie Downey; Phil Downey; Robert Fair; Sandra Fair; Paul Guinnessy; Christine Keck; Gary Klauber; Ben Lourie; Christine Lourie; Chris Richardson; Bruce Segal; Don Slater; Tina Slater; Dean Steinman; Stephanie Subramanian;

Guests:

Rollin Stanley, Director of the Montgomery County Planning Department;
Pamela Dunn, Project Manager – Zoning Code Rewrite, Montgomery County Planning Department;
Richard Romer, Policy Analyst – Office of Councilmember Valerie Ervin;
Anne Kaiser – SOECA Neighborhood Watch volunteer.

Secretary's Report.

Chris Richardson reported that on February 23, 2011 the Park Hills Civic Association held a General Meeting at Sligo Creek Elementary School cafeteria:

- Sgt. Mark Yaniga of the Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD) made a presentation about crime and safety in the PHCA/SOECA communities, as well as answered residents' questions from the floor.
- Aakash Thakkar of EYA Developers and Anne Spielberg of the SOECA Chelsea School Task Force both made presentations with respect to EYA's request to the county for a Local Map Amendment to change the existing zoning from R-60, which allows for approximately 25 single family homes to be built on the site, to RT-15, highest density townhouse zoning, to allow for 76 townhouses to be built on the site.
- Pat Baptiste, a former member of the Montgomery County Planning Board (1991-1998) and current member of the Planning Board's Zoning Advisory Panel, gave residents an introductory overview of the county's Zoning Code Rewrite Process.

The Civic Association's Executive Committee previously met on March 18, 2011 to finalize preparations for the May meeting taking place tonight.

Richardson also completed and posted the final report of the October 2010 Special Community Meeting devoted exclusively to MTA's proposed Purple Line station at Dale Drive. This meeting was a panel discussion composed of public officials and experts, who addressed some of the potential impacts of greatest concern to area residents - such as zoning & land use; crime & community safety - as a result of the proposed station for Wayne and Dale.

Treasurer's Report.

Alan Bowser, PHCA Treasurer, reported a balance of \$1,159.96, as of March 14, 2011, in the Association's checking account.

Neighborhood Watch.

Anne Kaiser, SOECA Neighborhood Watch volunteer, made a brief presentation on the establishment of a Neighborhood Watch program in the Park Hills area. Block captains or point of contact people are needed, especially for the Fleetwood area.

Special Presentation on the Montgomery County Zoning Code Rewrite Process – Guest Speakers, Rollin Stanley, Director of the Montgomery County Planning Board and Pamela Dunn, Project Manager of the Zoning Code Rewrite.

Rollin Stanley, Director of the Montgomery County Planning Board, and Pamela Dunn, Project Manager of the Zoning Code Rewrite, delivered a slide show presentation entitled, “Zoning | Process | Involvement.”

Overview:

- Planning Department Structure
- Background
- Zoning Code Rewrite
- CR Zones
- Smart Growth
- Community Involvement
- Financial Pressure – Impact on Development

Part One: Planning Department Structure

[see accompanying graphical representation of Planning Department structure]

Development Process:

- Staff report to planning:
 - project plans
 - prelim plans
 - concept plans
 - sketch plans
 - site plans
- Comment on ZTA’s | Rezoning
- Many other applications:
 - forest conservation
 - platts
- No involvement in most c1 | c2 zones
- Current challenges to development process:
 - lengthy
 - repetitive
 - high staff cost
 - looking to consolidate

Part Two: Background

- We have grown as planned
[accompanied by county map showing Population Distribution 2010]
- Montgomery county development
[accompanied by county maps showing decade-by-decade comparisons with respect to (1) water lines and (2) units between the years 1930-2000, as well as 2009]

- Zoning has consequences
 - Is our land use a healthy mix?
 - Do we have sufficiently zoned land for different uses?
[accompanied by map showing Montgomery County Zoning color-coded with respect to the following zones:
Agricultural;
Commercial;
Industrial;
Mixed Use;
Planned Unit Development;
Residential;
Transfer of Development Rights;
Overlay]
[followed by maps showing the following uses:
Agricultural zones (138,330 acres or 48.8% of zoned land in County)
Commercial zones (1,880 acres or 0.7% of zoned land in County)
Industrial zones (4,993 acres or 1.8% of zoned land in County)
Mixed use zones (1,024 acres or 0.4% of zoned land in County)
Residential zones (119,636 acres or 42.2% of zoned land in County)
Single-Family Residential zones (116,667 or 97.5% of Residential land)
Multi-Family Residential zones (2,969 or 2.5% of Residential land)
- Implications
 - 48% preserved
 - 20% developed pre 1
 - 27% developed post
 - 4% undeveloped
- Few places where zoning will have an impact
 - 1.1% of the county zoned for commercial & mixed use
- Very little of the landscape will change
 - Where growth should be directed:
 - o Surface parking (8,000 acres)
 - o Vacant land (14,000 acres)
 - o Growth areas (10,500 acres)
- We have a lot of strip malls:
 - They can only develop as strip malls
 - No site plan required
[accompanied by map showing Distribution of Shopping Centers by Planning Area]
- Arterials are a challenge
[accompanied by map showing Freeways; Major Roads; Primary Roads; Secondary Roads]

Part Three: The Zoning Code Rewrite

- The Goals
 - predictability
 - clear & faster process
 - suitable / sustainable infill
 - consider future infill development
- The Process

- started two years ago
- zoning discovery – Jan. 2009
- consultant retained – Aug. 2009
- mapping – underway & already paying off
- text drafting – residential & agricultural
- Zoning Growth
[accompanied by bar graph comparison:

| Year | # zones | # zoning code pages |
|--------|-----------|---------------------|
| - 1928 | 5 zones | 15 pages |
| - 1958 | 29 zones | 135 pages |
| - 1977 | 41 zones | 274 pages |
| - 2011 | 120 zones | 1200 pages] |
- Zones we don't use
 - 33 commercial & mixed use zones
 - mobile home zones?
- Zoning District Conversion Table [graphic]
- We propose fewer zones [accompanied by byzantine chart of land use categories]
- Fewer uses
- Emerging Ideas
 - Building types
 - Detached house
 - Attached house
 - Townhouse building
 - Apartment building
 - Mixed use building
 - General building
 - Community building
 - Building types = setbacks, coverage, lot size
 - Building types = building form
 - Smarter parking rules
- What does this mean for you?
 - Park Hills serving area: all zoned R60
[aerial map showing Park Hills Civic Association – Existing Zoning]
- 60 renamed RMD-6 – uses removed
- 60 uses changed = attached accessory apartment / detached accessory apartments
- Comparison R-60 & RMD 6 development standards – additions: addition & tear down
- Comparison R-60 & RMD 6 development standards – additions: [see accompanying chart]
- Next steps:
 - prepare modules
 - residential & agricultural uses and standards released
 - process due in June
 - other zones fall
 - complete draft late winter 2012
 - ongoing public engagement
 - 65+ meetings thus far

Part Four: CR Zones

- Example: Kensington [graph comparing C2 vs. CR zones]
- Example: Kensington [graph showing pitfall of C2 zoning vs. advantage of CR zoning]
- Example: Kensington
 - Less surface parking
 - Lower height
 - Incentives for green building, etc.
 - More public review – site plan requirement
- CR zoning
 - No bonus density as per CBD zones
 - Zoning sets height & floor area and then takes it away
 - To get it back, certain amenities have to be provided
 - Angular plane requirement
- Example: Kensington [with accompanying graphics that illustrate the following aspects]
 - = amenity requirements
 - = permitted density - 2.0; base density - .5 far
 - = transit proximity
 - = affordable housing
 - = unit mix
 - = parking
 - = community garden
- Kensington, as a result:
 - Site plan review
 - Limits on the ix – lower vmt
 - Requirements

Part Five: Financial Pressure | Development

- To improve our land use balance
[chart showing Total Assessed Value per Acre by Land Type]
- Strategic change: Wheaton
[accompanying series of aerial views showing infill development]
- Strategic change: jobs | housing balance
 - Reduction in vmt for the new residents
- Greater utilization of existing infrastructure
 - Cul de sac with 100 houses vs. condo with 214 units
- New resident will help pay for existing services | infrastructure
- Strategic change: comparison = Silver Spring condo vs. Woodside house
- What's happening: change in assessed value per acre
[Bethesda vs. Silver Spring vs. Rest of the country]
- Where are the future residents in strategic growth areas?
 - 85,000+ new seniors by 2040 = 73% increase
 - 63% own their own home
 - o no children for two generations
 - o family moves in
 - o pressure on schools is from existing house turnover

- Where are the future residents in strategic growth areas?
 - Your kids = Gen X & Y
 - They cannot afford to live here
 - We need them to replace the working age adult population
 - Big drop by 2030 = 5.2 to 3.4 working age to seniors
- Impact on attracting new people
 - Providing places where people want to live [see accompanying chart]

Part Six: Smart Growth

- We will grow whether we plan for it or not
 - 11.3% growth -- 2000 to 2010 = 98,777
 - 1 million by 2013 or 2014
- Purple Line change?
 - Nodal – and this will happen slowly
 - Long Branch – 15 years out
 - R-60 areas – little land use change
- Strategic change to meet the needs of a changing population – diverse with respect to
 - Ethnicity
 - Income
 - Needs

Questions & Answers

Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 pm.

Respectively submitted.

Chris Richardson, PHCA Secretary.