

**MEMORANDUM**

July 24, 2014

TO: County Council

FROM: Marlene Michaelson, Senior Legislative Analyst *MM*  
Glenn Orlin, Deputy Council Administrator *GO*

SUBJECT: **Action** – Resolution to Approve the White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan

Attached on © 1 to 16 is a resolution to approve the White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan. The resolution is consistent with the Council straw votes on July 22, 2014. There are two matters to highlight before the Council adopts the resolution.

**White Oak and Hillandale Shopping Centers**

At the Council meeting there were various suggestions for language that would ensure that any redevelopment of the White Oak and Hillandale Shopping Centers would include significant commercial development (including retail businesses that serve the existing communities). The Planning Board Chair recommended the following language:

This Plan anticipates that redevelopment of the White Oak Shopping Center may occur in phases; however, each phase of redevelopment should be consistent with the long term vision in this Plan for a mixed-use center. An exclusively residential redevelopment of this Center is not desirable and would not be consistent with the vision in this Plan.

Councilmembers indicated that the word “exclusively” could result in redevelopment that has only the smallest amount of commercial use. The Chair proposed changing it to replace “exclusively” with “not primarily”, but that could eliminate any project with more than 50% residential. The Council asked Staff to continue to work on this language. Staff recommends adding the following language to the description of each shopping center (see lines 123 to 128 and 183 to 189). This language focuses on the importance of including commercial development, rather than limiting residential development, since this appeared to be the Council’s goal during its discussion at the worksession. It is silent on whether this needs to be achieved in each phase or at build-out, which would enable the Planning Board to determine timing. (Staff believes it may be difficult to accomplish in every phase, but it should not be associated with ultimate build out since this may never occur, particularly in light of the significant increases in density allowed by the Master Plan.)

Significant residential FAR has been included to allow for mixed-use development and to create the greatest incentive for redevelopment, but redevelopment that does not include a significant commercial component would not be consistent with the Plan. At a minimum, any redevelopment should continue to provide the same amount or greater retail than currently exists, and additional commercial development is strongly encouraged.

A representative of the Hillandale Shopping Center asked that the retail/commercial requirement be associated with build out, and Staff believes it is preferable to be silent on timing for reasons described above. Representatives of the White Oak Shopping Center suggested deleting the last sentence and replacing it with the following sentence:

At a minimum, any redevelopment should at full build-out continue to provide a significant amount of retail, restaurant, and neighborhood services at street level, and additional commercial development is strongly encouraged.

Planning Staff estimates that there is currently 477,155 square feet (0.4 floor area ratio or FAR) of commercial uses at the White Oak Shopping Center. If only that amount is retained, the site could still develop with 1.5 FAR of residential development (over 2,000 units). Options for Council consideration:

- Continue to support the language last discussed at the worksession which would require that **each phase** of development not be **primarily** residential (or that each phase be primarily commercial). Since this implies that each phase would be at least 51% residential, it would significantly limit the property owners' flexibility.
- Use the Staff language in the draft resolution distributed on July 24 that would require that the property provide at least as much retail as exists now. This would still enable them to build a development that is approximately 75% residential. (Staff recommends changing the term "retail" to "retail or other commercial" to allow slightly more flexibility to change the commercial use.)
- Support the property owner's language, which would provide them flexibility to develop the full amount of residential development and an uncertain amount of commercial space. Without the reference to a minimum amount of retail, it is possible that it will be less exists today.

## **Funding BRT**

The Implementation chapter of the Final Draft includes the following paragraph:

In order to achieve BRT service needed to support the development recommended in this Plan, all transportation impact taxes, TPAR transportation mitigation payments, and Transportation Management District (TMD) fees collected in this area should be utilized to implement BRT in the Fairland/White Oak and White Oak policy areas until the BRT routes are operational. [Page 95]

Although the subject of BRT funding was raised several times during Committee and Council worksessions, whether to keep, revise, or discard this particular paragraph was never explicitly discussed or voted upon. In the attached resolution, Council staff has eliminated it, primarily because the Council approved Councilmember Leventhal's language directing that a BRT funding plan be developed in the next 24 months. The BRT funding plan may include some of the suggestions in the paragraph, but not others. As has been pointed out on several occasions, identifying sources of revenue for infrastructure in

a 20-year master plan has only been done once before—in the 1994 Clarksburg Plan that recommended development districts—and the result was not a happy one.

### **Requests from Councilmembers**

Councilmember Navarro is recommending language that would create a redevelopment office or similar entity for White Oak (see © 17).

Councilmember Leventhal is recommending that the New Hampshire Avenue BRT route be highlighted as a need to implement this Plan (see © 18).

g:\misc\marlene\wosg resolution\resolution cover memo-2.doc

Resolution No.: \_\_\_\_\_  
Introduced: \_\_\_\_\_  
Adopted: \_\_\_\_\_

**COUNTY COUNCIL FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND  
SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PORTION  
OF THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTON REGIONAL DISTRICT  
WITHIN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND**

---

By: District Council

---

**SUBJECT:** Approval of December 2013 Updated Version Planning Board Draft White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan

1. On September 20, 2013, the Montgomery County Planning Board transmitted to the County Executive and the County Council the September 2013 Planning Board Draft White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan, and on December 20, 2013, the Montgomery County Planning Board transmitted to the County Executive and the County Council revisions to the September 2013 Plan (the December 2013 Updated Version).
2. The December 2013 Planning Board Draft White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan amends portions of the Approved and Adopted 1997 Fairland Master Plan and portions of the Approved and Adopted 1997 White Oak Master Plan. It also amends The General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties, as amended; the Master Plan for Historic Preservation, as amended; the Master Plan of Highways within Montgomery County, as amended; the Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan, as amended; and the Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan.
3. On February 24, 2014, the County Executive transmitted to the County Council the Economic Impact Analysis and on February 25, 2014, the County Executive transmitted to the County Council the Fiscal Impact Statement for the December 2013 Planning Board Draft White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan.
4. On February 4, 2014, the County Council held a public hearing on the December 2013 Updated Version Planning Board Draft White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan. The Master Plan was referred to the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee for review and recommendation.
5. On July 1, July 7, and July 16, 2014, the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee held worksessions to review the issues raised in connection with the December 2013 Planning Board Draft White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan.

43 6. On July 22, 2014, the County Council reviewed the Planning Board Draft White Oak Science  
44 Gateway Master Plan and the recommendations of the Planning, Housing, and Economic  
45 Development Committee.  
46

47  
48 **Action**  
49

50 The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland, sitting as the District Council for that  
51 portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery County, Maryland, approves  
52 the following resolution:  
53

54 The Planning Board Draft White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan, dated December 2013  
55 Updated Version, is approved with revisions. County Council revisions to the Planning Board Draft  
56 White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan are identified below. Deletions to the text of the Plan are  
57 indicated by [brackets], additions by underscoring. All page references are to the December 2013  
58 Updated Version of the Planning Board Draft Plan.  
59

60 Page 1: Revise the first sentence of the Abstract as follows:  
61

62 This Plan contains the text and supporting maps for a comprehensive amendment to portions of the  
63 approved and adopted 1997 *White Oak Master Plan* and portions of the approved and adopted  
64 1997 *Fairland Master Plan*, as amended. It also amends *The General Plan (On Wedges and*  
65 *Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in*  
66 *Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties*, as amended; *Master Plan of Highways within*  
67 *Montgomery County*, as amended; the *Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan*, as amended;  
68 *the Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan*, as amended; and the 1979 *Master Plan*  
69 *for Historic Preservation in Montgomery County, Maryland*, as amended.  
70

71 Page 23: Add a new paragraph before the last paragraph and revise the last paragraph as follows:  
72

73 The Plan contemplates having the Life Sciences/FDA Village Center provide a focal point or Town  
74 Center for the broader community. Mixed-use zoning at this location will encourage a  
75 combination of commercial, residential, and retail uses within a compact walkable center. The  
76 recommended civic green and other elements described in this Plan should draw residents from the  
77 entire White Oak community.  
78

79 Reshaping and redeveloping [these] the two older shopping centers into sustainable, complete  
80 communities is both challenging and necessary. The Plan seeks to change and transform these  
81 areas over time, with the support of a future BRT system. Mixed-use developments [encourage the  
82 combination of commercial, residential, and retail within compact,] with walkable centers that  
83 bring employment, housing, and shopping opportunities together are desirable for these centers as  
84 well. It is especially important that the redevelopment of these sites not result in the long term loss  
85 of retail uses that serve the community, and new commercial office uses would also be particularly  
86 desirable. This Plan’s zoning and infrastructure recommendations strive to encourage the private  
87 sector to redesign, redevelop, and reinvest in older centers.  
88

89 Page 26: Add the following sentence at the end of the second paragraph:  
90

91 The Plan recommends removing narrow bands of “buffer strips” that are in the RE-2, I-4, and R-90  
92 zones and applying the CR zoning that is recommended for the adjacent properties to these buffer  
93 strip areas.

94  
95 Page 26: Amend the last paragraph as follows:  
96

97 All properties zoned R-H and R-20 (with the exception of the National Labor College site) are  
98 recommended to retain these zones. [Some properties that are currently in the medium-density  
99 multi-family zone (R-20) are recommended to be rezoned to a CR Zone that increases potential  
100 density but continues to emphasize housing as the primary use. For properties currently zoned R-  
101 H, all of which are developed, the Plan recommends retaining this zone.]  
102

103 Page 26: Revise the first footnote for Table 1 as follows:  
104

105 \*Reflects densities from February 2012 traffic modeling; does not reflect the maximum potential  
106 densities allowed by the Plan’s full recommended zoning except for the Percontee/Site 2  
107 properties, where maximum densities are assumed.  
108

109 Page 26: Revise the heading on the fourth column of the table and add a related footnote as  
110 follows:  
111

112 [2040 COG adjusted] 1997 Master Plan Scenario\*\*

113 \*\* Estimated build out of the 1997 Master Plans, based on an adjusted 2040 COG forecast;  
114 assumes existing centers will not redevelop with existing zoning.  
115

116 Page 27: Revise the table to reflect Council changes.  
117

118 Page 29: Revise the map to reflect Council changes.  
119

120 Page 32: Add the following to the last paragraph on the page (describing the White Oak  
121 Shopping Center):  
122

123 The Plan’s long term vision is for a mixed-use walkable center at this important location.  
124 Significant residential FAR has been included to allow for mixed-use development and to create  
125 the greatest incentive for redevelopment, but redevelopment that does not include a significant  
126 commercial component would not be consistent with the Plan. At a minimum, any redevelopment  
127 should continue to provide the same amount or greater retail than currently exists, and additional  
128 commercial development is strongly encouraged.  
129

130 Page 34: Revise the fourth paragraph on the page as follows:  
131

132 [One of the critical issues in this area is whether i] Increasing density and/or changing the zoning  
133 from R-20 (a single-use, medium density, multi-family zone) to a mixed-use/CR zone poses a risk  
134 that potential redevelopment will result in rent increases that reduce or eliminate the number of  
135 units that are currently market affordable and will result in displacement. Therefore, the Plan  
136 recommends deferring any change in zoning until the Planning Department has completed a

137 comprehensive Countywide study of how to best preserve existing affordable housing in older  
 138 multi-family housing. [The Plan’s challenge for this area is to protect its affordability while also  
 139 providing incentives for property owners to reinvest in these older buildings. To achieve this, the  
 140 Plan recommends higher density than what is there today while encouraging more MPDUs than the  
 141 required minimum. If there is redevelopment, owners of the existing garden apartments should,  
 142 where possible, utilize strategies that achieve an orderly, phased replacement of older buildings  
 143 with upgraded multi-family communities while minimizing, if not eliminating, dislocation of  
 144 current residents. This Plan strongly encourages owners and developers to create opportunities and  
 145 incentives that allow existing tenants to remain and reside in new units, once constructed.]  
 146

147 Page 35: Revise the first sentence of the first bullet as follows:  
 148

- Rezone approximately 7 acres of commercial properties west of New Hampshire Avenue and south of Lockwood Drive from C-2, C-O, and R-90 to CRT-1.5, C-1.5, [R-0.75] R-0.25, H-60 (see number 2 on Map 7).

153 Page 35: Revise the first sentence of the second bullet as follows:  
 154

- Rezone approximately 12 acres of commercial property, including the Dow Jones and Bank of America sites, from I-3 and C-O to CR-1.0, C-1.0, [R-0.75] R-0.25, H-65 (see number 3 on Map 7).

159 Page 35: Delete the third bullet and replace it as follows:  
 160

- [Rezone properties in the R-20 Zone to CR-1.5, C-0.25, R-1.5, H-75 (see number 4 on Map 7) to emphasize residential as the primary use, with the possibility of some supportive retail within the area.]
- Retain the R-20 zone for the residential communities along Lockwood Drive, Stewart Lane, and April Lane.

168 Page 35: Add the following bullet after the last bullet:  
 169

- Retain the existing RE-2 zone for the 622-acre Federal Research Center, home of the FDA and other federal government activities.

173 Page 35: Add the following sentence after the last full sentence of the last paragraph on the page  
 174 as follows:  
 175

176 The property is currently for sale. To ensure that future development is compatible with the  
 177 existing single-family neighborhood along the western and northern edges of the property, the  
 178 existing tree buffer should be preserved to the extent feasible and attention should be paid to  
 179 appropriate housing types and related land planning efforts.  
 180

181 Page 36: Add the following to the last paragraph on the page:  
 182

183 It is particularly important that redevelopment of the Shopping Center not result in a loss of  
 184 commercial uses that serve the surrounding community. Significant residential FAR has been

185 included to allow for mixed-use development and to create the greatest incentive for  
 186 redevelopment, but redevelopment that does not include a significant commercial component  
 187 would not be consistent with the Plan. At a minimum, any redevelopment should continue to  
 188 provide the same amount or greater retail than currently exists, and additional commercial  
 189 development is strongly encouraged.

190

191 Page 37: Revise the second bullet as follows:

192

- 193 • Rezone the I-1, C-O, and C-T properties (on Elton Road on the east side of New Hampshire  
 194 Avenue) to CRT-1.0, C-0.75, [R-0.75] R-0.25, H-45 (see number 8 on Map 7). These  
 195 properties, which include a Coca-Cola plant and two office buildings, are not likely to  
 196 redevelop in the near-term; therefore, the proposed CR Zone is comparable to the existing  
 197 zoning. Redevelopment should provide an appropriate transition to the adjacent residential  
 198 neighborhood.

199

200 Page 37: Revise the first sentence of the third bullet as follows:

201

- 202 • Rezone the eastern portion of the National Labor College site from R-90 to CRT-1.5, C-1.0,  
 203 [R-1.0] R-0.75, H-75 (see number 5 on Map 7) to allow for a potential mixed-use  
 204 redevelopment.

205

206 Page 38: Revise the first bullet as follows:

207

- 208 • Rezone the R-20 Holly Hall property [from R-20] and the adjacent O-M property to CRT-1.75,  
 209 C-0.5, R-1.5, H-85 (see number 5a on Map 7) to increase future redevelopment opportunities,  
 210 which would include replacement of the 96-units of senior housing.

211

212 Page 38: Revise the second bullet as follows:

213

- 214 • Rezone the C-T property (on the west side of New Hampshire Avenue) to CRN-1.0, [C-0.75]  
 215 C-1.0, [R-0.75] R-0, H-45 (see number 7 on Map 7). If the existing commercial use  
 216 redevelops, it should continue to be a commercial use.

217

218 Page 38: Revise the fourth bullet as follows:

219

- 220 • Rezone the C-1 properties (on the east side of New Hampshire Avenue, north of Powder Mill  
 221 Road) to [CRT-1.0, C-0.75, R-0.75, H-45] Neighborhood Retail (NR)-0.75, H-45 (see number  
 222 8 on Map 7). Ensure compatibility with adjacent single-family lots through building setback  
 223 and articulation. [Redevelopment of the properties currently zoned C-1 is unlikely because  
 224 they consist of separately owned small lots, including three gas stations.]

225

226 Page 38: Revise the last bullet on the page as follows:

227

- 228 • [Retain the C-O Zone for] Rezone the M-NCPPC Hillandale Park Office Building at 10611  
 229 New Hampshire Avenue from C-O to Employment Office at an FAR of 0.75 with a height of  
 230 45 feet (EOF-0.75, H-45).

231

232 Page 43: Add the following text before the "Mobility" section:

233

234

**Town Center on Percontee/Site 2**

235

236

This Plan recommends that the Site II/Percontee properties (Area 9, Map 7) include a prominent civic promenade that can serve as a community focal point or Town Center, not just for the Life Sciences/FDA Village Center, but also for the broader Eastern Montgomery County area as well. The Town Center should include community-gathering attractions and features such as (but not necessarily specifically prescribed) entertainment venues, shops, restaurants, wide sidewalks for outdoor dining and merchandising, a civic green and streetscape that could accommodate community festivals and/or holiday celebrations, and other urban features that would encourage outdoor community activities (especially serving children and families). The street layout and signage should help attract visitors from other neighborhoods surrounding the property.

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

This Plan further recommends that the County consider locating a prominent County resource center or agency (such as a library and/or one or more County offices or County agency facilities) that would further activate this civic promenade. Because this civic promenade would be in such close proximity to the gates of the U.S. FDA Headquarters and Federal Research Center, this Plan further recommends the County seek potential collaborations with State, Federal, and/or International agencies or institutions to locate one or more prominent State, Federal, and/or International biomedical or bioscience facilities or programs proximate to this proposed civic promenade, which would further activate this East County community-gathering place.

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

Given the size of the property and the vision for this new community, the developer of the 300-acre Percontee/Site 2 properties should prepare one overall sketch plan for approval by the Planning Board through the CR zone regulatory process that demonstrates how the new community will achieve the vision of the Master Plan and reflect the themes described below.

255

256

257

258

259

Development in the Town Center shall include:

260

- Uses likely to create an active town center, including a complementary mix of uses.
- A central public space in the town center for community gatherings, supplemented by smaller public spaces or public squares in the various neighborhoods to encourage social interaction and recreation.
- Connections to the surrounding communities.
- Development scale that concentrates the tallest buildings near the existing water tower or at the center of the community along the main streets (Industrial Parkway extended and FDA Boulevard) to lower scale buildings at the edges of the community.

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

Throughout the entire 300 acre property, the design should encourage a pedestrian-oriented development with appropriate open space:

270

271

- A mix of uses, such as academic, research and clinical facilities, office, hotel, retail, and residential uses.
- Integrated active and passive recreational uses through the creation of formal and informal open spaces and parks, pedestrian trails linked to the street network and bicycle paths and lanes. See pages 89-90 for a complete list of open space and park recommendations for these properties.
- Integration with the surrounding community and uses, specifically by extending Industrial Parkway into the site and connecting it with FDA Boulevard.

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

- 280 • A hierarchical street grid network that focuses activities, defines circulation, and is integral  
 281 with a series of public use spaces.  
 282 • Structured parking that is located at the back of lots or lined with residential or office uses to  
 283 enhance the pedestrian quality of the entire community.  
 284 • Tree-lined streets and open spaces that form green links to the various uses and open spaces.  
 285 • Integrated multi-modal transportation featuring elements that may include shuttles, buses, cars  
 286 and car sharing, bicycles, and extensive pedestrian sidewalks and trails so that visitors can park  
 287 once and then use other forms of transportation.  
 288

289 Pages 44-45: Revise the fourth bullet as follows:  
 290

- 291 • Rezone the five parcels owned by AHC and proposed for Washington Adventist Hospital from  
 292 I-1 and I-3 to the Life Sciences Center Zone, to promote research, academic and clinical  
 293 facilities that advance the life sciences, health care services and applied technologies. The LSC  
 294 Zone allows hospitals by right and has been successfully used by Shady Grove Adventist  
 295 Hospital in the *Great Seneca Science Corridor Master Plan* area. [This zoning  
 296 recommendation may be revisited if the hospital does not receive a Certificate of Need from the  
 297 State.] If development of the Hospital does not occur, it would be appropriate to retain the LSC  
 298 zone to encourage life science and medical service uses. Alternatively, rezoning to the CR or  
 299 CR floating (CRF) zone (at a density of 1.0 FAR) would also be appropriate to permit  
 300 development comparable to the adjacent CR-zoned properties.  
 301

302 Pages 48-50: Delete text from the start of Page 48 through the third bullet on Page 50.  
 303

304 Page 50: After the third bullet on Page 50, revise as follows:  
 305

### Transportation Standards

306  
 307  
 308 This Plan recommends that the roadway and transit adequacy standards for the Plan area be those  
 309 applied to other Urban policy areas, as described in the Subdivision Staging Policy. Currently the  
 310 Urban roadway standard is a minimum 40 percent ratio of forecast speed to uncongested speed (the  
 311 borderline between Levels of Service “D” and “E”) averaged over all arterials and roads of higher  
 312 classifications.  
 313

314 This Plan recommends the Local Area Transportation Review (LATR) standard be raised from  
 315 1475 critical lane volume (CLV) to 1600 CLV (1.00 volume/capacity) within the Plan area. [This  
 316 recommendation is in recognition of the potential for significantly enhanced transit service in the  
 317 area which will likely be encouraged by the proposed new TPAR transit adequacy test  
 318 recommended by this Plan.] The rationale for a 1600 CLV (1.00 volume/capacity) standard stems  
 319 from the Plan-recommended BRT network that would serve the area and offer a viable alternative  
 320 to automobile travel. This is consistent with the County’s policy of accepting greater levels of  
 321 roadway congestion in areas where high quality transit options are available.  
 322

323 Pages 50-51: Replace the last two paragraphs on Page 50 and all of Page 51 with the following:  
 324

325 This Plan includes the following intersection improvements:

- 326 • Cherry Hill Road at Broadburch Drive/Calverton Boulevard: on Broadburch Drive, add an  
 327 eastbound left-turn lane and an eastbound through lane; on Calverton Boulevard, change the

328 westbound right-turn lane to a westbound right-turn and through lane; and on Cherry Hill Road,  
 329 add a northbound left-turn lane and a southbound right-turn lane.  
 330 • MD 650 at Powder Mill Road: from Holly Hall, add an eastbound left-turn lane; on Powder  
 331 Mill Road, add a westbound right-turn lane; and on MD 650, add a southbound left-turn lane.  
 332 • MD 650 at Lockwood Drive: on Lockwood Drive, add an eastbound left-turn lane.  
 333 • Powder Mill Road at Riggs Road: on Powder Mill Road, add a second eastbound left-turn lane.  
 334 • Old Columbia Pike at Musgrove Road: on Old Columbia Pike, add a southbound left-turn lane;  
 335 and on Musgrove Road, add a westbound right-turn lane.  
 336 These specific improvements are a guide to right-of-way reservations at these intersections. The  
 337 need for each intersection improvement will be revisited as part of specific development plan  
 338 LATR reviews.

340 Pages 53-55: Delete.

342 Page 56: Delete the first paragraph as follows:

343  
 344 [Horizontal dotted orange lines are shown to depict the adequacy standards (LOS) for the Rural,  
 345 Suburban and Urban (with Metrorail) Policy Areas, from left to right, which graphically  
 346 corresponds to the Standards of Adequacy depicted in the table above. These standards are  
 347 established in the Subdivision Staging Policy.]  
 348

349 Page 56: Revise the second sentence in the third paragraph as follows:

350  
 351 This Plan recommends that the Old Columbia Pike bridge over the Paint Branch stream valley be  
 352 rebuilt and reopened to vehicular traffic, and that Old Columbia Pike be reconstructed as a four-  
 353 lane arterial between Industrial Parkway and Stewart Lane, which would improve connectivity in  
 354 the area and provide an option to US 29 for local travel. Should widening Old Columbia Pike and  
 355 reopening the bridge over Paint Branch precede the US 29/Stewart Lane interchange, then the  
 356 intersection of Stewart Lane with Old Columbia Pike, US 29, and Milestone Drive likely will need  
 357 to be reconstructed.  
 358

359 Page 56: After the third paragraph, add the following:

360  
 361 To further improve circulation between the White Oak Center and Life Sciences/FDA Village, the  
 362 County should work with the General Services Administration to identify a route and funding for  
 363 public access on a four-lane roadway between New Hampshire Avenue and FDA Boulevard that  
 364 would also maintain the security of FDA’s campus.  
 365

366 The Plan recommends extending Old Columbia Pike as a four-lane arterial from Stewart Lane near  
 367 the northwest and southwest edges of the White Oak Shopping Center property, terminating at  
 368 Lockwood Drive near New Hampshire Avenue. This extension will relieve some of the traffic that  
 369 would otherwise be on Lockwood Drive and Stewart Lane through the multi-family residential area  
 370 east of the shopping center.  
 371

372 Page 56: Revise the first two sentences of the fourth paragraph as follows:

373  
 374 In the Life Sciences/FDA Village Center, the Plan recommends that Industrial Parkway, Tech  
 375 Road (between US 29 and Industrial Parkway), FDA Boulevard, and Prosperity Drive be classified

376 as four-lane arterials. The Plan also recommends that Broadbirch Drive[,] and Plum Orchard Drive  
 377 be reclassified from Industrial Roads to Business District Streets.

378

379 Page 57: Add as a fourth bullet to the first paragraph as follows:

380

- 381 • Reconstructed interchange at US 29 and New Hampshire Avenue to provide three continuous  
 382 southbound lanes through the interchange

383

384 Page 57: Revise the first bullet in the fourth paragraph as follows:

385

- 386 • Extend Industrial Parkway through Site 2/Percontee to connect with FDA Boulevard and  
 387 designate as [a Business District Street] four-lane arterials.

388

389 Pages 57-58: Revise Table 4 as follows:

390

- 391 • For the Columbia Pike segment between Paint Branch Stream Valley and New Hampshire  
 392 Avenue, add this footnote: Reclassified as a freeway when the grade separated interchanges at  
 393 Stewart Lane, Industrial Parkway/Tech Road, and Fairland Road/Musgrove Road are  
 394 completed.
- 395 • Replace the two segments of Old Columbia Pike with one segment, from Lockwood Drive to  
 396 Industrial Parkway, as arterial A-105 with a minimum right-of-way of 80 feet, 4 through travel  
 397 lanes, and 2004.08 as the design standard.
- 398 • Move Industrial Parkway and Industrial Parkway Extended to the Arterial category, with  
 399 Master Plan of Highways number A-106, a minimum right-of-way of 100 feet, 4 through travel  
 400 lanes, and 2004.08 modified as the design standard.
- 401 • Move Tech Road between Columbia Pike (US 29) and Industrial Parkway to the Arterial  
 402 category, with Master Plan of Highways number A-107, a minimum right-of-way of 100 feet, 4  
 403 through travel lanes, and 2004.08 modified as the design standard.
- 404 • Add in the Business District Streets category Tech Road from Industrial Parkway to 1,600 feet  
 405 southwest of Industrial Parkway with Master Plan of Highways number B-11, a minimum  
 406 right-of-way of 100 feet, 4 through travel lanes, and 2005.03 modified as the design standard.
- 407 • Move Prosperity Drive from the Business District Streets category to the Arterial category,  
 408 with Master Plan of Highways number A-108, a minimum right-of-way of 80 feet, 4 through  
 409 travel lanes, and 2004.08 as the design standard.
- 410 • Move Broadbirch Drive and Plum Orchard Drive from the Industrial Roads category to the  
 411 Business District Streets category.
- 412 • Delete the Industrial Roads category.
- 413 • Add to Footnote 4 that the private street would have a cross-section of 60 feet.

414

415 Page 59: Revise Map 12 to reflect Council changes.

416

417 Page 60: Delete all text after the first paragraph as follows:

418

419 [A grant from the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG) and the  
 420 Transportation Planning Board's Transportation Land Use Connection (TLC) technical assistance  
 421 program provided a broad, sketch level analysis that examined the potential development required

422 to support various forms of fixed guideway transit service in the Plan area (see the Appendix). The  
 423 study found that:

- 424
- 425 • Metrorail was cost prohibitive and would require a significant amount of additional  
 426 development that would likely overwhelm the remaining infrastructure.
  - 427 • Bus Rapid Transit and Light Rail Transit offered the most compatible match between  
 428 transit and land use with BRT being preferable from a cost and timing standpoint.
  - 429 • Current land use (reflecting current zoning) suggests the New Hampshire Avenue corridor  
 430 would initially have higher ridership than US 29.
  - 431 • Extensions to serve Konterra and the Muirkirk MARC station in Prince George's County  
 432 would be as cost effective as the other corridors and should be considered.
- 433

434 Based on the results of this study, this Plan focuses on the BRT option as a potentially feasible  
 435 transit solution to address the traffic congestion in this area.

436

437 The Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) conducted a feasibility study of  
 438 BRT corridors that included US 29 and New Hampshire Avenue. This study also included a route  
 439 on Randolph Road from the White Flint Metrorail to the Glenmont Metrorail station. (The study  
 440 initially examined a route on Randolph Road/Cherry Hill Road that extended east of the Glenmont  
 441 Metrorail to the Prince George's County line, but the segment east of Glenmont was not carried  
 442 forward to the final set of routes because the future estimates of population and employment  
 443 densities were lower in eastern County than other areas).

444

445 The July 2013 Planning Board Draft Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan  
 446 identifies the minimum master plan right-of-way necessary to implement a Countywide BRT in  
 447 selected corridors.

448

449 North of New Hampshire Avenue, US 29 is classified as a controlled major highway, with  
 450 interchanges possibly replacing all existing at-grade intersections. This northern segment of US 29  
 451 has a wide median and four existing interchanges (at Randolph Road/Cherry Hill Road, Briggs  
 452 Chaney Road, the ICC, and Spencerville Road/MD 198) that can accommodate a median busway.  
 453 South of New Hampshire Avenue, US 29 is classified as a major highway and has a very different  
 454 character, passing through congested areas such as Four Corners, with limited opportunities to  
 455 expand the right-of-way.]

456

457 Page 61: Revise the first paragraph as follows:

458

459 The [recommendations for the] overall BRT network to serve the Plan area (see map 13) generally  
 460 is described in the Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan. That network consists of  
 461 the following corridors:

- 462 • US 29
- 463 • New Hampshire Avenue
- 464 • Randolph Road[/Cherry Hill Road]

465 This Plan includes an extension of the Randolph Road BRT from its current planned terminus at  
 466 US 29/Randolph Road east along Cherry Hill Road to FDA Boulevard, with the potential to extend  
 467 further into Prince George's County. It also includes a spur off of the mainline US 29 BRT route  
 468 into Life Sciences/FDA Village via Tech Road/Industrial Parkway. In both cases, BRT would run  
 469 in mixed traffic with no dedicated lanes, no added transit lanes, and no widening beyond the

470 otherwise planned right-of-way. One or more stations should be planned for Life Sciences/FDA  
 471 Village.

472

473 Page 61: Delete all text after the first paragraph as follows:

474

475 [The July 2013 Planning Board Draft Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan  
 476 recommends the following for the proposed US 29 BRT:

477

- 478 • Along US 29 from MD 198 to Stewart Lane, a two-lane busway in the median.
- 479 • Along Stewart Lane and Lockwood Drive, a mixed traffic operation. (A mixed traffic  
 480 operation is recommended along Stewart Lane and Lockwood Drive, but this  
 481 recommendation is not intended to inhibit the continuation of express bus service along US  
 482 29 through the New Hampshire Avenue interchange.)
- 483 • Along US 29 from Lockwood Drive to Southwood Avenue, curb lanes via lane-  
 484 repurposing.
- 485 • Along US 29 from Southwood Avenue to Sligo Creek Parkway, a mixed traffic operation.  
 486 (A mixed traffic operation is recommended in this segment because of potential operational  
 487 problems with curb bus lanes in the vicinity of the I-495 interchange, however, the  
 488 extension of dedicated lanes through this segment should be considered during facility  
 489 planning.)
- 490 • Along US 29 from Sligo Creek Parkway to Georgia Avenue, managed lanes via lane-  
 491 repurposing in the peak-hour peak-direction.
- 492 • Along US 29 from Georgia Avenue to Sixteenth Street, curb lanes via lane-repurposing.

493 The July 2013 Planning Board Draft Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan  
 494 recommends the following for the proposed New Hampshire Avenue BRT:

495

- 496 • From Colesville Park and Ride Station to Lockwood Drive, a mixed traffic transitway.
- 497 • From Lockwood Drive to University Boulevard, a reversible one-lane median transitway.

498

499 Two other possible BRT corridors within Prince George's County are:

- 500 • Life Sciences/FDA Village Center to Konterra/Muirkirk MARC Station via Powder Mill  
 501 Road/Ammendale Road
- 502 • Hillandale Center to Greenbelt Metro via I-495]

503 Page 71: Map 16 Watersheds and Streams: Remove the stream notation on the Labor College  
 504 site and replace it with a dashed line to indicate that the stream is currently piped.

505

506 Page 72: Delete the fourth bullet under "Recommendations" in the "Air Quality/Climate  
 507 Protection" section as follows:

- 508 • [Maximize use of renewable energy systems to supply a portion or all of a building's energy  
 509 demand. Alternative energy systems may include:
  - 510 ○ Solar power
  - 511 ○ Wind power
  - 512 ○ Geothermal]

513

514 Page 72: Add the following new section after “Water and Sewer Service” and before “Specific  
515 Property Recommendations” as follows:

516  
517 Carbon Footprint

518  
519 Montgomery County Bill number 32-07 establishes a goal to stop increasing greenhouse gas  
520 emissions by the year 2010 and to reduce emissions to 20 percent of 2005 levels by the year 2050.  
521 There are three main components to greenhouse gas emissions: embodied emissions, building  
522 energy emissions, and transportation emissions. Embodied emissions are emissions that are  
523 created through the extraction, processing, transportation, construction, and disposal of building  
524 materials, as well as emissions created through landscape disturbance (by both soil disturbance and  
525 changes in above ground biomass). Building energy emissions are created in the normal operation  
526 of a building, including lighting, heating, cooling, and ventilation, and operation of computers and  
527 appliances. Transportation emissions are released by the operation of motorized vehicles such as  
528 cars, trucks, buses, and motorcycles.

529  
530 The embodied emissions contribution to total greenhouse gas emissions will increase, due to the  
531 demolition of existing structures and construction of new structures. However, both the building  
532 energy emissions and transportation emissions will decrease on a per capita basis. Newly  
533 developed buildings have decreased energy emissions due to substantial advances in energy  
534 efficiency. Total transportation emissions will decrease with increases in fuel efficiency and  
535 reductions of vehicle miles traveled. The proposed mixed-use development will have a lower  
536 carbon footprint than the redevelopment of the existing development under current zoning due to  
537 the reduction of single-function automobile trips.

538  
539 Page 74: Revise the two bullets under “National Labor College” as follows:

- 540
- 541 • Future development of the site should investigate options for possibly daylighting the piped  
542 stream, which may be compromised by existing utilities and natural conditions. [Investigate  
543 options for daylighting and restoring the stream running through the center of the property.]
  - 544 • Retain existing trees that serve [Maximize and enhance forest retention] as a buffer to  
545 surrounding single-family communities to the extent feasible.

546  
547 Page 88: Modify the last two sentences of the “Hillandale Community” paragraph as follows:

548 While removal of the Park Activity Building provides opportunities to redesign the park, the site  
549 has little or no room for [new fields] reconfigured parking and additional needed facilities. This  
550 Plan recommends exploring opportunities with the FRC and the adjacent Hillandale Volunteer Fire  
551 Station for possible expansion of Hillandale Local Park’s land area to allow for additional facilities  
552 to meet community needs.

553  
554 Page 88: Modify the second and third bullets under “Recommendations” for the “Hillandale  
555 Community” section and add two new bullets as follows:

- 556
- 557 • Remove the Park Activity Building in Hillandale Local Park and repurpose parkland with  
558 facilities that are in demand, such as community open space and reconfigured play areas. The  
559 final program and park design will be determined through the currently funded Facility Plan.

- 560 • The paper street adjacent to Hillandale Local Park, Edgewater Parkway, should become part of
- 561 the Park via abandonment, easement, or other agreement between M-NCPPC and the County.
- 562 • Pursue acquisition of the Hillandale Volunteer Fire Station site for purposes of expanding the
- 563 area of Hillandale Local Park if the Fire Station relocates to a larger site and there is a willing
- 564 seller.
- 565 • Consider acquiring land or an easement from the FRC property adjacent to Hillandale Local
- 566 Park to allow for needed facilities such as an adult rectangular field.
- 567

568 Page 91: Add a new sentence at the end of the paragraph under the heading “Recommendation”  
 569 as follows:

571 Explore co-locating a child care center with the new elementary school.

573 Page 91: Modify the fourth sentence of the first paragraph under the heading “Libraries” as  
 574 follows:

576 [There are currently no plans for expansion or renovation of] The County Council encourages  
 577 exploration of options to renovate or refurbish the White Oak Library.

579 Page 93: Add the following to the end of the page:

581 **Cyber-infrastructure**

583 An important component of the infrastructure and community facilities for the White Oak Science  
 584 Gateway will be a high speed, highly reliable, highly secure communications fiber network  
 585 connecting buildings inside the district and then connecting the district itself to major research  
 586 centers in the region, across the country, and internationally.

588 Page 95: Delete the last paragraph in the Overview section as follows:

590 [In order to achieve the BRT service needed to support the development recommended in this Plan,  
 591 all transportation impact taxes, TPAR transportation mitigation payments, and Transportation  
 592 Management District (TMD) fees collected in this area should be utilized to implement BRT in the  
 593 Fairland/White Oak and White Oak policy areas until the BRT routes are operational.]

595 Pages 95-96: Replace the section on “Public Benefits in the CR Zone” as follows:

597 [Public Benefits in the CR Zone  
 598 The CR Zone has two development methods: standard and optional. The standard method allows  
 599 up to 0.5 FAR in the CR Zone and up to 1.0 FAR in the CRT Zone and requires compliance with  
 600 a specific set of development standards. The optional method allows for greater density and  
 601 height but requires projects to provide public benefits to achieve the incentive density above the  
 602 standard method density. The additional optional method density may be achieved through a  
 603 series of incentive increases that can be combined to achieve the maximum allowable density.  
 604 Public benefits provided under the optional method are drawn from among seven categories  
 605 outlined in the Zoning Ordinance.

607 The following list of public benefits should be considered priorities during project development  
 608 and review of optional method projects in the CR Zone within the boundaries of this Plan. This  
 609 list is not mandatory nor does it preclude consideration of other benefits listed in the CR Zone to  
 610 achieve the maximum permitted FAR. The requested benefits should be analyzed to make sure  
 611 that they are the most suitable for a particular location, are consistent with the Plan's vision, and  
 612 that they will satisfy the changing needs of the area over time. When selecting these benefits, the  
 613 Planning Board should consider community needs as a determining factor.

- 614 • Major public facilities
  - 615 ○ Bus Rapid Transit
  - 616 ○ Bus circulator to connect centers to BRT stations
  - 617 ○ Elementary school
  - 618 ○ Parks and Trails
- 619 • Transit proximity
- 620 • Connectivity between uses, activities, and mobility options
  - 621 ○ Trip mitigation
  - 622 ○ Neighborhood Services
  - 623 ○ Streetscape
  - 624 ○ Way-finding
- 625 • Diversity of uses and activities
  - 626 ○ Affordable Housing
  - 627 ○ Dwelling Unit Mix
  - 628 ○ Care Centers
- 629 • Quality building and site design
  - 630 ○ Structured Parking
  - 631 ○ Public Open Space
- 632 • Protection and Enhancement of the Natural Environment
  - 633 ○ Energy Conservation and Generation
  - 634 ○ Tree Canopy]

#### 635 Public Benefits in the CR Zone

636  
 637  
 638 The CR and CRT Zones have two development methods: standard and optional. The standard  
 639 method allows a total density of up to 0.5 FAR in the CR zone and a total density of up to 1.0 FAR  
 640 in the CRT zone and requires compliance with a specific set of development standards. The  
 641 optional method allows for greater density and height, but requires projects to provide public  
 642 benefits to achieve the incentive density above the standard method density. The additional  
 643 optional method density may be achieved through a series of incentive increases that can be  
 644 combined to achieve the maximum allowable density, subject to Planning Board approval.

645  
 646 Public benefits provided under the optional method must be drawn from among seven categories  
 647 outlined in the Zoning Ordinance. Depending upon the zone and the proposed FAR, applicants  
 648 must provide public benefits in a minimum number of the seven categories. While applicants for  
 649 the optional method of development may propose any of the thirty-six (36) public benefits listed in  
 650 Section 4.7.2 of the Zoning Ordinance, there are certain benefits that should be prioritized for this  
 651 Plan area. These include the following:

- 652
- 653 • Provision of major public facilities, including but not limited to: Bus Rapid Transit; a bus  
 654 circulator to connect centers and/or transit; conveyance of an acceptable site for (or

- 655 construction of) a new public elementary school, fire station or library; and dedication of land
- 656 for parks and trails.
- 657 • Connectivity and mobility, including but not limited to: transit access improvement and trip
- 658 mitigation.
- 659 • Diversity of Uses and Activities, particularly care centers.
- 660 • Quality building and site design, including but not limited to: structured parking, exceptional
- 661 design, and the amenities listed on pages 89-90 to the extent they exceed the requirements of
- 662 the zone.

663

664 This list of priorities does not preclude consideration of other public benefits, as listed in the

665 Zoning Ordinance, to achieve the maximum permitted FAR. All public benefits requested by the

666 developer will be analyzed to make sure they are the most suitable for the Plan area, that they are

667 consistent with the Plan’s vision, and that they satisfy the changing needs of the area over time.

668

669 Page 96: Add the following language before the “County Capital Improvements Program”

670 section:

671

672 Trip Reduction Agreements

673

674 Through the 1990 Trip Reduction Amendment to the 1981 Eastern Montgomery County Master

675 Plan, trip reduction restrictions were placed on certain properties in the Cherry Hill Road

676 Employment Area. This Plan supports the removal of those restrictions so these property owners

677 are not at a disadvantage relative to other developers in the area. Property owners who executed

678 voluntary trip reduction agreements with the Planning Board may take action to have these

679 restrictions removed from the land records.

680

681 Transportation Management District

682

683 A Transportation Management District (TMD) that matches the boundaries of this Plan should be

684 created and funded as soon as practicable after the adoption of this Plan. A TMD would be the

685 focus of programs and marketing to reduce the demand for roads and to promote pedestrian and

686 bicycle access and safety. By so doing, this will help to reduce vehicular emissions, energy

687 consumption, and noise levels. The TMD would also monitor transportation trends in White Oak,

688 including the level of congestion on road links and intersections, transit ridership, and the progress

689 in achieving the Plan’s non-auto-driver mode share goals.

690

691 A White Oak TMD Advisory Committee comprised of residents and businesspersons—and staff as

692 non-voting members—would meet regularly to provide input and feedback on programs addressing

693 these goals. It would report its findings to the Executive and Council biennially.

694

695 Page 96: Add the following text after the first paragraph under the “County Capital

696 Improvements Program” section:

697

698 This Plan anticipates the development of a Bus Rapid Transit system to facilitate movement of

699 people and provide alternatives to the automobile. The BRT system is expected to become

700 operational on a time frame concurrent with the development in the Plan, facilitating a reduction in

701 automobile traffic that would otherwise result from the new jobs and housing.

702

703 This Plan recommends that County and State agencies explore the full range of tools that might be  
 704 available to fund the transportation infrastructure--especially the proposed BRT route for US 29--  
 705 needed to implement this Plan. Possible funding mechanisms that should be explored include  
 706 Federal and State aid, a development district, a higher transportation impact tax, a special benefit  
 707 assessment, or other innovative financing mechanisms, along with general obligation bond  
 708 financing. This Plan anticipates that the Executive Branch will make recommendations to the  
 709 County Council within 24 months following the adoption of this Plan, proposing one or more  
 710 options in a comprehensive capital financing plan that could fund the full buildout of the Plan's  
 711 transportation infrastructure.

712  
 713 Pages 96-97: Amend the paragraph that starts at the bottom as follows:

714  
 715 In the Plan area, priority should be given to [the following] these other CIP projects as well:

- 716  
 717 • [bus rapid transit]  
 718 • reconstructing the Old Columbia Pike bridge over the Paint Branch  
 719 • a new elementary school, if needed  
 720 • routes and facilities in the proposed bike and trail network, particularly the shared use loops  
 721 in the Life Sciences/FDA Village Center and in the White Oak Center, including the  
 722 proposed connection to FDA.

723  
 724  
 725 **General**

726  
 727 All illustrations and tables included in the Plan will be revised to reflect the District Council  
 728 changes to the Planning Board Draft White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan (December 2013  
 729 Updated Version). The text and graphics will be revised as necessary to achieve and improve clarity  
 730 and consistency, to update factual information, and to convey the actions of the District Council.  
 731 Graphics and tables will be revised to be consistent with the text.

732  
 733  
 734 This is a correct copy of Council action.

735  
 736  
 737  
 738 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Linda M. Lauer, Clerk of the Council



**MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND**

**COUNCILMEMBER NANCY NAVARRO**  
**DISTRICT 4**

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Colleagues  
**FROM:** Councilmember Nancy Navarro  
**DATE:** July 24, 2014  
**RE:** Proposed Language for White Oak Implementation

Even after the Council has adopted the White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan, I believe that Montgomery County must continue to take an active role to ensure that the Plan is successful and East County finally sees the economic opportunities and high quality amenities that it deserves. Our planning can create the conditions that make this success possible, but ultimately it will be up to the private sector to make our vision a reality.

I propose that we add the following language to the White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan, based on similar language that was included in the White Flint Sector Plan:

This Plan recommends the creation of a redevelopment office or similar entity, which will work in coordination with the East County Regional Services Center.

The redevelopment office or similar entity would be tasked with branding, marketing, and recruitment for the new, unique opportunities this Plan is creating in White Oak to public and private sector entities across the country and around the world.



MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL  
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

GEORGE LEVENTHAL  
COUNCILMEMBER  
AT-LARGE

## MEMORANDUM

July 25, 2014

TO: Councilmembers

FROM: George L. Leventhal *GLL*

SUBJECT: White Oak Master Plan language on BRT financing

Dear Colleagues,

On July 22 I introduced language for the White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan clearly stating the importance of building the bus rapid transit (BRT) system serving White Oak as the area builds out. To that end I recommended that the Executive Branch create a financing plan for the entire transportation infrastructure in the plan—especially the proposed US 29 BRT route—within the next 24 months. The council unanimously supported my motion.

I had highlighted US 29 because it is the most advanced among the three BRT routes that will ultimately serve White Oak, in that the Maryland Department of Transportation has set aside several millions of dollars to conduct a conceptual design study that is just getting underway. However, the proposed New Hampshire Avenue BRT, while not quite as high a priority, will also be needed. It is the only route that will serve FDA and Hillandale directly. It is also the route that—other than US 29 and MD 355—the Council and Executive included in the State transportation priorities letter this past winter.

Therefore, I suggest that page 16, lines 702-704 of the draft resolution before be amended as follows:

This Plan recommends that County and State agencies explore the full range of tools that might be available to fund the transportation infrastructure—especially the proposed BRT routes for US 29 and New Hampshire Avenue—needed to implement this Plan.

I urge you to support this revision.