

PHED Committee #2
November 28, 2016

MEMORANDUM

November 23, 2016

TO: Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee

FROM: Marlene Michaelson, Senior Legislative Analyst *MM*

SUBJECT: Greater Lyttonsville Sector Plan

This is the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee's second worksession on the Greater Lyttonsville Sector Plan. This memorandum discusses site specific zoning and the Plan's recommendations for the Environment, Community Facilities, Parks and Open Space and Community Design. At the first worksession, the Committee discussed adding staging to the Sector Plan and affordable housing. The Committee may want to return to these issues after considering the property specific recommendations.

DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 3 of the Plan presents property specific recommendations for 4 districts: the Woodside/16th Street Station Area, the Residential Area, the Brookville Road/Lyttonsville Station Area, and the Industrial/Institutional Area.

Woodside/16th Street Station Area

The Sector Plan identifies 4 properties for rezoning in the Woodside/16th Street Station Area. A fifth property, the Barrington Apartments, is not mentioned in the Sector Plan because it is not recommended for rezoning, but Staff recommends adding at least a couple of sentences that describe this development and the fact that it provides over 400 rent-restricted affordable housing units.

The Spring Center

Text in Sector Plan: page 68

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Site number: 1

Existing Zoning: CRT 0.75, C 0.75, R 0.5, H 40

Proposed Zoning: CRT 3.0, C 1.5, R 2.0, H 70

Plan Recommendations: This is the site of one of the 2 Purple Line stations planned for Lyttonsville. The Plan recommends encouraging new mixed-use development, while maintaining compatibility with the adjacent residential neighborhood. The Sector Plan recommends retaining the existing CRT, but increasing the density and height.

Testimony: None specific to this property.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

Summit Hills Apartments

Text in Sector Plan: page 68

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Site number: 2

Existing Zoning: R-10

Proposed Zoning: CR 2.5, C 0.25, R 2.5, H 145

Plan Recommendations: This 30 plus acre site has approximately 1,100 residential units in 9 buildings. Many of the units are larger units suitable for families. The Plan recommends rezoning this property to the CR zone to permit a transitional, mixed-use development between Downtown Silver Spring and Greater Lyttonsville. The increase in allowable density is meant to encourage future infill development or redevelopment. The Plan recommends that heights step down from the maximum 145 feet to 70 along East West Highway and toward other housing with lower heights. It also recommends the creation of new parks when redevelopment occurs, including a new civic green near the highest concentration of commercial and civic uses and the daylighting of the Fenwick Branch of Rock Creek, providing a new Urban Greenway Park along the property's western edge. The Plan also includes the following:

“Prior to sketch plan approval, the applicant or applicants must coordinate with the Department of Housing and Community Affairs (DHCA) to determine affordable housing preservation needs on the site. A rental agreement with DHCA should be required at the time of regulatory approval if preservation is deemed necessary by DHCA.”

Testimony: The property owner, Summit Hills LLC, has requested zoning of CR 5.0, C 1.0, R 4.0, H 200. They believe that this property's proximity to the Purple Line Station justifies higher density, transit-oriented development. They indicated that since the “rental apartments are thriving with high occupancy rates and very low debt”, they would be unlikely to redevelop the property without greater incentives (density and height) than provided by the Planning Board Draft Plan, especially in light of the Plan requirements for parkland, the loss of parking with the creation of the Greenway, and the requirement for a rental agreement with DHCA.

Staff Comments: The decision before the Committee is whether the benefits of redevelopment of this site justifies heights and densities significantly greater than recommended in the Sector Plan. While this may be true at some future point, Staff believes the existing housing serves an important role, providing market rate affordable housing with larger units close to transit. Since the units are not approaching obsolescence, Staff believes the benefits of retaining the existing units at this time outweigh potential negative impacts of the increased density at this location.

Staff asked Department of Parks staff to consider whether any of the Plan's recommendations for new parks could be implemented without redevelopment or whether there was an alternative recommendation for new parks that would work in a scenario where redevelopment does not occur. This issue is addressed under the section on Parks and Open Space that follows below.

8600 16th Street

Text in Sector Plan: page 69

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Site number: 3

Existing Zoning: R-10

Proposed Zoning: CRT 2.5, C 0.25, R 2.5, H 70

Plan Recommendations: The Plan recommends rezoning this property to the CRT zone to allow for potential redevelopment on the site or redevelopment in the long term to better relate to 16th Street. The height was limited to 70 feet to limit height of new development along 16th Street.

Testimony: The property owner, Bradford Place LLC, supports the CRT zoning and recommended density, but objects to the recommended height since the existing building is 100 feet and the property is not adjacent to any single-family homes, but rather is adjacent to the CSX/MARC and Metro tracks, 16th Street, and other multi-family housing. They request that the height be increased to 100 feet.

Staff Comments: Staff does not support a zone that would make the existing building non-conforming and therefore does not support the Sector Plan recommendation. Instead, Staff recommends setting the height at 100 feet so that the existing building would not become non-conforming and then using Sector Plan text to limit the height on new infill development (or redevelopment) in specific locations, as intended by the Sector Plan.

Park Sutton Condominium

Text in Sector Plan: page 69

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Site number: 4

Existing Zoning: R-H

Proposed Zoning: R-10

Plan Recommendations: Since the R-H zone is being phased out, the Plan recommends rezoning the Park Sutton Condominium to R-10, the most comparable high-density residential zone.

Testimony: None

Staff Comments: While Staff supports the Sector Plan’s intent to remove the R-H zoning and replace it with a similar high-density residential zone, the PHED Committee has previously discussed the problems with the R-10 zone and the need to either amend it or replace it with a zone that provides many of the benefits associated with the CR zone, but with a completely residential focus.¹ Staff does not believe that can occur in the timeframe of this Sector Plan, but if the Committee remains interested in pursuing this, it may want to add language to the Plan indicating that a rezoning to a new high density residential zone may be appropriate at a future time.

Residential Area

The Sector Plan identifies 5 properties for rezoning in the Residential Area.

The Rollingwood Apartments

Text in Sector Plan: page 75

Map in Sector Plan: page 76

Site numbers: 5a and 5b

Existing Zoning: R-20

Proposed Zoning: CRT 1.5, C 0.25, R 1.5, H 85

Plan Recommendations: The Plan recommends rezoning the Rollingwood Apartments (Site 5a) and the M-NCPPC Park site (Site 5b) from R-20 to the CRT 1.5 zone to allow redevelopment of the portion closest to the Purple Line Station. It encourages redevelopment to only occur on the northern portion and suggests the retention of “an affordable housing stock and unit mix (a minimum of 176 existing units) for up to 20 years” and operation of those units “in a manner consistent with current operations in terms of quality maintenance, relatively moderate rents and provision of larger than typical units.” It further notes that “this commitment should be incorporated into the Sketch Plan approval at the time of Planning Board approval.” The Plan encourages a land swap of 5b, which is a small area of unusable parkland owned by M-NCPPC adjacent to Lyttonsville Road, for property Federal Realty owns adjacent to Rosemary Hills – Lyttonsville Local Park.

Testimony: The Council received testimony from the property owner, Federal Realty, supporting the Sector Plan recommendations and the option of swapping Site 5b for property they own adjacent to Rosemary Hills – Lyttonsville Local Park. It also received testimony objecting to the height allowed on the property close to Lyttonsville Road (85 feet).

Staff Comments: Staff agrees that the CRT zone is the appropriate zone for this property but questions whether the Sector Plan can prevent redevelopment on the south portion of this site. To accomplish this objective, Staff recommends split zoning Site 5A. On the southern portion, the zoning should reflect what is currently on the ground so that it does not provide an incentive for redevelopment. A higher density on the northern portion will enable them to concentrate density here, as intended by the Sector

¹ The R-10 zone does not include any requirements for the provision of public benefits or purchase of Building Lot Termination rights, as required by the mixed-use Commercial/Residential (CR) zone. Historically, its lack of height limits and open space requirements led to the development of tall towers isolated from other buildings.

Plan. Staff notes that the Plan allows up to 85 feet on this site along Lyttonsville Road due to the topography of the site, which would make the additional height less noticeable. Staff recommends adding language to the Sector Plan clarifying in more detail the limited portions of the site which are appropriate for the additional height.

As noted at the previous worksession, Staff is concerned about the ability to implement and enforce the affordable housing recommendations for this property.

Paddington Square

Text in Sector Plan: page 77

Map in Sector Plan: page 76

Site number: 6

Existing Zoning: R-20

Proposed Zoning: CRT 1.5, C 0.25, R 1.5, H 65

Plan Recommendations: The Plan recommends rezoning this site from R-20 to the CRT zone to allow increased density for mixed-income housing near the Purple Line station, while also ensuring compatibility with the surrounding single-family residential development. (Paddington Square is owned and operated by the Housing Opportunities Commission (HOC)). On the portions closest to single-family detached units, it limits unit types and height to townhomes. Staff understands that HOC is considering a partnership with the developer EYA, which could result in the redevelopment of this site as well as the WSSC property, Friendly Gardens, and the County-owned property on 11b.

Testimony: EYA testified in support of the Sector Plan recommendations for this property. The Council received significant testimony in support of EYA's proposals for redevelopment on multiple sites in the planning area.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Sector Plan recommendations for this property, but believes that the Sector Plan should describe the affordable housing on this site and indicate what is anticipated when the site redevelops.

MTA Supply Yard

Text in Sector Plan: page 78

Map in Sector Plan: page 76

Site number: 8b

Existing Zoning: IM-2.5

Proposed Zoning: CRN 0.25, C 0, R 0.25, H 35

Plan Recommendations: This site is currently zoned industrial and is used as a supply yard. The Plan notes that this is the proposed location for a future MTA stormwater management facility and recommends rezoning the site to CRN with very limited height and density. On page 81, the Sector Plan expresses concern regarding MTA's plans for this pond, including that it is likely to be fenced from the community and designed without Environmental Site Design techniques or other progressive stormwater engineering methods.

Testimony: None

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Sector Plan recommendations. The Committee may want to discuss with the Planning Department whether it would be appropriate for the Council to send a letter to MTA regarding the stormwater management pond.

Assorted Commercial and Industrial Buildings

Text in Sector Plan: page 78

Map in Sector Plan: page 76

Site number: 9

Existing Zoning: IM-2.5

Proposed Zoning: CRN 0.75, C 0.5, R 0.75, H 45

Plan Recommendations: This site contains light industrial buildings that house commercial and industrial businesses. Heavy truck access to this site will be compromised by a future railroad crossing on Stewart Avenue and therefore businesses that rely on truck deliveries will likely relocate as a result. The Plan's recommendation to convert this property from industrial to mixed-use zoning is also consistent with its strategy for other properties south and east of the Purple Line. Since this property has single-family residential development adjacent on the sides not confronting the Purple Line, the Sector Plan recommends the lower density CRN zone with a height and density that would support townhouse residential development.

Testimony: The property owners support the change to mixed-use zoning but have requested CRN 1.5, C 0.25, R 1.5, H 65 consistent with the recommendation in the Planning Board's Public Hearing Draft (December 2015). They objected to the Planning Board decision to cut the density by half and believe they should have a higher density like other properties near the Purple Line Station. Without sufficient density, they indicate that they are most likely to maintain industrial uses, rather than redevelop as residential.

Staff Comments: Staff believes that the townhouse form of development with a height limit of 45 feet is appropriate for this site, since there are single-family detached units on two sides of the property. To encourage the redevelopment of this existing industrial site, Staff recommends raising the FAR to 1.0, but maintaining the height limit to ensure compatibility.

Vacant Residential Lot

Text in Sector Plan: page 78

Map in Sector Plan: page 76

Site number: 13

Existing Zoning: RT-15

Proposed Zoning: R-60

Plan Recommendations: This vacant lot is zoned RT-15 but is surrounded by R-60 zoned homes. The Plan recommends rezoning the lot to R-60 to be consistent with the surrounding zoning.

Testimony: None

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Sector Plan recommendations.

Brookville Road/Lyttonsville Station Area

The Sector Plan identifies 6 properties for rezoning in the Brookville Road/Lyttonsville Station.

Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) Property

Text in Sector Plan: page 82

Map in Sector Plan: page 83

Site number: 7

Existing Zoning: R-60 and IM

Proposed Zoning: CRT 1.5, C 0.25, R 1.25, H 65

Plan Recommendations: This property is owned by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) and is currently split-zoned R-60 and IM. The Plan recommends rezoning it to the CRT 1.5 zone to allow mixed-use development with multi-unit residential and commercial uses to be located closest to the Purple Line Station. The text on page 82 and the map on page 25 limits the residential density to 1.25, whereas the map on page 83 allows a residential density of 1.5. The Sector Plan recommends 12.5% to 25% affordability on the site and a one-acre civic green.

Testimony: EYA generally supports the Plan recommendations but asked that the map on page 25 and text on page 82 be revised to reflect the zoning shown on page 83 (i.e., a 1.5 residential FAR) or, alternatively, that the property be split zoned to allow the 1.5 residential on the western portion furthest from the Purple Line Station. The Council received significant testimony in support of EYA's proposals for redevelopment on multiple sites in the planning area.

Staff Comments: Staff agrees with the Sector Plan vision of allowing the WSSC site to redevelop as a mixed-use development close to the Purple Line. Staff has asked Planning Department Staff to be prepared to comment on the discrepancy in the residential FAR at the Committee meeting.

Claridge House and Friendly Gardens

Text in Sector Plan: page 84

Map in Sector Plan: page 83

Site number: 8a (i-iv)

Existing Zoning: R-H, IM, RT, and R-20

Proposed Zoning: 8ai and 8aii – CRT 2.5, C 0.25, R 2.5, H 70

8aiii – CRT 1.5, C 0.25, R 1.5, H 70

8aiv – CRT 2.0, C 0.25, R 2.0, H 70

Plan Recommendations: There are four different properties that compose area 8A. These properties contain existing, multi-unit buildings known as Claridge House and Friendly Gardens, as well as

landscape contractor storage yards. The properties lack cohesive zoning and are currently zoned R-H, IM, RT and R-20. The Plan recommends rezoning all 4 properties to the CRT zone, with greatest densities (CRT 2.5) closest to the Purple Line Station.

Testimony: EYA, who hopes to redevelop sites 8aii and 8aiii with the non-profit that owns and operates Friendly Gardens, supports the Sector Plan recommendations for these sites. The owner of Site 8ai (Companaro Properties LLC) also testified in favor of the Sector Plan recommendations and indicated that the proposed zoning is likely to lead them to sell the project for redevelopment instead of maintaining the existing landscape storage yard. The Council received significant testimony in support of EYA's proposals for redevelopment on multiple sites in the planning area. The Council also received testimony suggesting that the density should not exceed 1.5 in the planning area, without specifically commenting on the densities recommended for this site. The Council received testimony from one individual who suggested that the County acquire portions of 8ai and 8aii to create a park that would extend from the Purple Line Station to Stewart Avenue.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the zoning recommended for sites 8ai, 8aii and 8aiii, where property owners and potential purchasers have expressed an interest in redevelopment that would be appropriate for these locations and would maintain the affordable housing currently provided by Friendly Gardens. The Sector Plan does not describe the existing housing at Friendly Gardens or any assumptions regarding what is assumed for affordable housing in the future. Staff believes this is important, especially since ownership can change over time. Staff believes that an FAR of 2.5 is appropriate for the properties closest to the Purple Line.

The owners of Claridge House (site 8aiv) have not expressed an interest in redevelopment at this time. Redevelopment of this site might be appropriate in the long term (most likely beyond the life of this Sector Plan), but Staff sees no reason to increase densities at this time given the concern expressed by some regarding the total number of additional housing units allowed by this Sector Plan. Staff recommends rezoning the property to a CRT zone (which would ensure the provision of public benefits if redevelopment does occur), but recommends that the densities reflect what is existing today. Should the Committee want to allow for longer-term redevelopment, it could indicate that this property may be appropriate for a higher density zone at a later time through a local map amendment rezoning.

Site 10

The map on page 83 of the Sector Plan identifies Site 10, but there is no text regarding this Site, nor is there a recommended change in zoning. Staff learned that Planning staff had proposed a rezoning for this property that was not supported by the Planning Board; the Plan confirms the existing IM zone. It was identified in the Planning Board Draft to document this decision. Since there is no change or text to explain why it is identified on the map, Staff recommends the map in the Approved Plan delete this identification.

Industrial/Institutional Area

The Sector Plan identifies 3 sites for rezoning in the Industrial/Institutional Area and confirms the existing industrial zoning or residential zoning for institutional uses. The goal of the Sector Plan is to preserve existing businesses and resources valuable to the down-county and regional economies.

Ride-On Bus Depot

Text in Sector Plan: page 88

Map in Sector Plan: page 88

Site number: 11a

Existing Zoning: R-60

Proposed Zoning: IM 2.5, H 50

Plan Recommendations: The Plan recommends changing the R-60 zoning to industrial zoning to better reflect the existing and planned use for the site as a Ride-On Bus Depot.² Should the depot ever relocate, this would be an appropriate location for industrial uses.

Testimony: At least one individual suggested allowing mixed-use development here instead of east of the Purple Line.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Sector Plan recommendations. This site is needed for the Bus Depot in the short and long term and Staff does not support the suggestions to zone it to allow for mixed-use redevelopment.

County-Owned Land

Text in Sector Plan: page 88

Map in Sector Plan: page 88

Site number: 11b

Existing Zoning:

Proposed Zoning: CRT 2.0, C 0.5, R 2.0, H 75

Plan Recommendations: This land is owned by the County and is the proposed location for the Lyttonsville Station Maintenance Facility and a parking garage for County employees. The Sector Plan recommends CRT zoning on this site to allow a potential mixed-use development that would include the needed government facilities, as well as new development with a residential focus. This could occur if the County parking proposed for the site could be accommodated in an underground garage or elsewhere.

Testimony: EYA supported the proposed zoning for this property and hopes to create a mixed-use development here with a focus on housing. EYA believes it can accommodate necessary employee parking in an underground garage. The Council received testimony suggesting that this property be swapped with other properties east of the Purple Line to allow development here and a park on the properties southeast of the rail tracks.

Staff Comments: Questions have been raised as to whether this site can accommodate both the necessary government uses with new mixed-use development and whether this is the appropriate location for residential development. On the former issue, Staff has asked the government entities who will use this

² The County used to zone all public uses R-60, regardless of the nature of the use. The Council now places the appropriate zone on the property to enable the correct use if the government facility relocates.

site to comment and hopes to have a response in time for the worksession. This site is clearly needed for ongoing public needs, so could not be swapped with other developable land (and used for parkland), as suggested in testimony.

The Sector Plan recommends focusing industrial zoning to the west and north of the Purple Line and residential zoning to the east and south, so the residential zoning proposed at this location in the Planning Board Draft is an anomaly. This property is not only north/west of the Purple Line, but will also be between the light rail tracks and industrial zoning that accommodates the Ride-On Bus Depot and other industrial uses, leading Staff to question whether this is an appropriate location for residential zoning. Staff recommends that the zoning for this property either be changed to a CRT zone with a focus on commercial development or to an industrial zone. If the Council believes that residential use of this property might be appropriate in the longer term, it could indicate that it may be an appropriate location for a future local map amendment to allow residential development.

Miscellaneous Industrial Businesses

Text in Sector Plan: page 89

Map in Sector Plan: page 88

Site number: 12

Existing Zoning: R-60 (parking)

Proposed Zoning: IM 2.5, H 50

Plan Recommendations: The Plan recommends rezoning these parking lots that serve industrial business operations from R-60 to IM.³ This will provide consistent zoning and eliminate confusion on these sites.

Testimony: None.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Sector Plan recommendations.

ENVIRONMENT

Pages 32-35 present the environmental recommendations in the Plan. Appendix D provides supporting back-up detail. This section of the Plan focuses on Water Quality, Ecology and Energy. The section on Water Quality (page 33) includes recommendations to integrate visible environmental site design strategies, use permeable pavers where feasible, utilize environmental site design for parks and open space, provide stream buffers, and have redevelopment projects meet or exceed all stormwater management requirements.

The section on Ecology (page 34) includes recommendations related to tree planting, green roofs, and tree canopy. The section on Energy (page 35) includes recommendations to provide and improve alternatives to automobile travel, utilize whole building design, facilitate reuse and/or recycling of

³ At one time, the County zoned all parking lots R-60, but has changed its zoning strategy and now zones parking the same as the property the parking serves.

existing building material and consider recycled materials, locally sourced and produced materials, and/or local construction labor for new and renovated buildings.

Testimony: EYA submitted testimony to the Council asking that the Plan be revised to indicate that green roofs are only required on concrete structures that can support them. **Staff recommends revising the Sector Plan language to clarify requirements for green roofs.** They also expressed concern regarding the last bullet on page 33, which appears to state that developers in Lyttonsville would not be eligible for stormwater management waivers and that “redevelopment projects must meet or exceed all County stormwater management requirements.” Instead, they suggest the Sector Plan state, “Encourage multitude of stormwater management measures in effort to maximize treatment of stormwater management.” The Plan does not identify why there should be different standards for Lyttonsville than elsewhere in the County and **Staff agrees that the wording should be modified and will work on appropriate revisions.**

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Pages 36-39 present the Community Facility recommendations in the Plan. The Committee considered the recommendations related to schools at its first worksession. Other facilities are discussed on pages 38-39. The Plan notes that the new Silver Spring Library serves the planning area. Montgomery County Public Libraries submitted comments suggesting a far more detailed description of the library facilities and collections, but this is not typical for master plans and Staff does not recommend it be added. Page 38 discusses the Gwendolyn E. Coffield Community Center. Several residents testified that they believe the new development would require the expansion of this center, which is acknowledged in the Plan:

At present, neither renovations nor expansions are recommended for the Gwendolyn E. Coffield Community Center; however, the ongoing needs of the center are assessed by the Montgomery County Department of Recreation on an annual basis and there may be a need for additional programming and/or a larger facility as redevelopment occurs within the Plan area.

As the Council has frequently confirmed, it is the operating department’s ongoing assessments and not master plans that determine the need for facility expansion.

The Fire Chief has proposed some technical corrections to the section on Public Safety on page 38 which staff will include in the resolution. Page 39 of the Plan describes the Military facilities in the planning area and the National Museum of Health and Medicine.

PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

Pages 59-61 present the Parks and Open Space recommendations in the Plan. This section describes the existing parks and open spaces and makes recommendations for a new urban greenway park, 2 new civic greens, a civic plaza and a neighborhood green. The Plan also presents recommendations that result in increasing the size of Rosemary Hills-Lyttonsville Local Park. All of these improvements are associated with redevelopment.

Two parks are proposed in conjunction with the redevelopment of **Summit Hills**, but since the property owner has indicated that he is unlikely to redevelop with the Sector Plan recommended zoning, Staff asked Department of Parks staff whether there was any potential to create new parkland on this property without redevelopment. Their response appears on © 1-2. The first option would create a civic green on the property directly across 16th street from the Purple Line Station and would provide internal paths to connect to the civic green. In their analysis, they indicated that it was not clear whether the loss of parking spaces at this location would be a problem. Staff believes this option justifies further consideration. Option 2 would have the County purchase parkland to create a stream valley park or linear park and also build a parking garage along East West Highway to replace the lost parking spaces. This would be a far more expensive option and would result in a new garage in a location that is less than ideal in the short term and would limit redevelopment options if Summit Hills redevelops at some future point. Staff does not support this option and recommends that the language regarding the Greenway in the Sector Plan be revised to present a more realistic outlook on the timeframe for a Greenway park. It should indicate that its implementation will not occur until Summit Hills redevelops, which may not happen during the life of this Sector Plan.

The Council received testimony from EYA objecting to the language on page 60 of the Plan that indicates that the civic green should be ½ to 2 acres, since the Planning Department had agreed that the civic green could be 1 acre. The language on page 60 is generic language not specific to Lyttonsville and the Sector Plan should be amended to indicate this.

COMMUNITY DESIGN

Pages 62 – 65 present recommendations related to the Public Space Network, Building Form and Compatibility, and Placemaking. These community design goals and recommendations will be further detailed in the Community Design Guidelines and Streetscape Standards for the Greater Lyttonsville Sector Plan area. The Plan’s recommendations for placemaking appear to address the comments the Council heard in testimony regarding Lyttonsville’s “rich identity and strong community ties” and the importance of design in evoking a sense of place and “making the area’s character recognizable to those who live, work, and visit this unique community.”

IMPLEMENTATION

Pages 93-105 present the Implementation recommendations in the Plan. This chapter addresses zoning (including public benefits in the CR and CRT zones), the Capital Improvements Program, Partnerships, Retention of Industrial Businesses, and Sustainability. As noted in the memorandum for the first Committee meeting, the section on public benefits does not mention the provision of affordable housing, which is a critical tool to enable the Planning Board to implement the Plan’s recommendations. The Plan lists priority benefits for major public facilities; connectivity; protection and enhancement of the natural environment; and wayfinding and public art. The Section on Partnerships does not identify the affordable housing partners that currently serve the area, and they should be included here. On pages 101-103, the Plan presents an economic profile of the Brookville Road industrial district and various strategies to support the district and continue to make it affordable, accessible and practical for both traditional industrial enterprises and entrepreneurs establishing new businesses, including retail-industrial hybrid uses.

Summit Hills Parks Options without Redevelopment

Option 1 – Civic Green

- Parks acquires parkland (~0.5 acres) negotiation details TBD.
- Parks develops a Civic Green + pedestrian connection to 16th Street (switchback/ADA)
- Parks and County provide internal path connecting Rosemary Hills through Spencer Road to the Purple Line and Civic Green
- Parks and County provide internal path going south connecting Spencer Road with East-West Hwy/ Rock Creek Park
- Consider interim bioretention along the trail and in parking islands to reduce stormwater runoff to the stream

Challenges

- The proposed parkland for both parks options would not require demolition of any structure. However, surface parking lots will be lost/relocated in the process. According to the proposed zoning for Summit Hills, the number of excess parking spaces, if removed, would yield the amount of land needed to the stream valley park. The Civic Green would require a much smaller parking spaces loss/replacement. That said, it is not clear, at this stage, how the loss/replacement of parking spaces would affect the day-to-day operations of this development.
- Summit Hills is currently fenced at its perimeter. Implementing the recommended internal connections/easements to the Purple Line + Public Roads + Rock Creek Park, would require relocation of the perimeter fence.



0 100 200 400 Feet

Summit Hills Parks Options without Redevelopment

Option 2 – Stream Valley Park or Linear Park

- Parks acquires parkland (~4.83 acres), negotiation details TBD.
- Parks develops a Stream Valley Park, including park trail connecting Spencer Road and Rock Creek Park
- County builds pedestrian connection to 16th Street (switchback/ADA)

Challenges

- The proposed parkland for both parks options would not require demolition of any structure. However, surface parking lots will be lost/relocated in the process. According to the proposed zoning for Summit Hills, the number of excess parking spaces, if removed, would yield the amount of land needed to the stream valley park. The Civic Green would require a much smaller parking spaces loss/replacement. That said, it is not clear, at this stage, how the loss/replacement of parking spaces would affect the day-to-day operations of this development.
- Summit Hills is currently fenced at its perimeter. Implementing the recommended internal connections/easements to the Purple Line + Public Roads + Rock Creek Park, would require relocation of the perimeter fence.

