

MEMORANDUM

July 13, 2017

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

FROM: Marlene Michaelson, ^{MM} Senior Legislative Analyst
Nicole Rodriguez-Hernandez, Summer Associate ^{NSA}

SUBJECT: Rock Spring Master Plan

This is the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee's second worksession on the Rock Spring Master Plan. This memorandum addresses property-specific recommendations and follow-up from the previous meeting.

Councilmembers should bring their copy of the Plan to the meeting.

PROPERTY-SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 2 of the Master Plan presents property-specific recommendations for 3 clusters: the Rock Spring East/Village Center, Rock Spring Central/Mixed-Use Business Campus, and Rock Spring West/Mixed-Use Regional Marketplace. A chart attached at © 1 presents an explanation of each of the zones recommended in the Master Plan. A chart on © 2-3 summarizes the Plan's zoning recommendations and testimony.

Rock Spring East/Village Center Area

The Master Plan identifies 6 properties for rezoning in the Rock Spring East/Village Center Area. The eastern portion of the planning area includes two shopping centers, some offices, the Walter Johnson High School, and a large vacant property.

1. Wildwood Shopping Center & Gas Station

Text in Master Plan: page 26

Map in Master Plan: page 25 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: Wildwood Shopping Center: NR .75, H-45 & R-90; Gas Station: CRT .75, C-.75, R-.25, H-35

Proposed Zoning: Wildwood Shopping Center: CRT 1.25, C-.5, R-.75, H-50; Gas Station: CRT 1.25, C-.75, R-.75, H-50

Plan Recommendations: The Wildwood Shopping Center is a traditional strip mall surrounded by surface lot parking and R-90 (residential) zoning. The nearby gas station is under the same ownership as the shopping center. The Plan recommends increasing the overall floor area ratio (FAR)¹ and height of the gas station to allow for a consistent redevelopment strategy if the owners choose to redevelop. The Plan also recommends new zoning for the Wildwood Shopping Center to encourage mixed-use development in addition to meeting the overall area vision for a more connected, pedestrian-friendly area.

Testimony: Ann Bowker, a resident of the Wildwood Manor neighborhood, testified regarding the zoning changes for the Wildwood Shopping Center and its possible effect of too much potential development, which would exacerbate traffic congestion (even with Bus Rapid Transit) and the school capacity problem, as well as create an inappropriate transition between the commercial property and the lower scale density R-90 neighborhood.

Staff Comments: The Plan addresses the transition from the Wildwood Shopping Center to the adjacent residential neighborhood on page 28, requiring a 30-foot green buffer and limiting height to 35 feet within 50 feet of the Berkshire Drive right-of-way. This is similar to the transitions recommended in other master plans where higher density development abuts single family homes. Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

2. Aubinoe Properties

Text in Master Plan: page 24

Map in Master Plan: page 25 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: CRT 1.25, C-.5, R-.75, H-50

Proposed Zoning: CRT 1.25, C-.5, R-.75, H-50 (status quo)

Plan Recommendations: An office building and bank are developed on this site and there is an approved plan for the development of 58 multi-family units on the surface parking lot south of the existing development. The Plan recommends confirming the existing zoning.

Testimony: The Council received testimony from three Wildwood Manor residents—Ann Bowker, Linda Lizzio, and Mary Miller—regarding the zoning changes in the Aubinoe Properties and Wildwood Shopping Center sites. Their overall main concerns are for an appropriate “transition”

¹ The FAR expresses the relationship between the amount of useable floor area permitted in a building (or buildings) and the area of the lot on which the building stands.

between the potentially higher density commercial properties and the lower scale density R-90 neighborhood and the abidance to the previously established binding elements created as part of an earlier Schematic Development Plan. Lizzio's specific concern is about the supposed 68 foot height request and only 30 foot setback from the Aubinoe Properties for their proposed new development. Bowker's specific concern, as mentioned under the Wildwood Shopping Center property testimony, regards the possibility for too much potential development impacting the appropriateness of the transition between the commercial property and neighborhood (height, setback, and buffering). Miller highlighted the need to maintain the binding elements to ensure an appropriate transition that reflects the characteristics of the neighborhood.

Representatives for Mr. Alvin "Tripp" Aubinoe, owner of the Wildwood Medical Center, testified in support of confirming the current zoning (CRT-1.25, C-.5, R-.75, H-50); the green space buffer of at least 30 feet in width from the neighborhood's single-family homes; and the limited building massing of a height of 35 feet within 50 feet of the Berkshire Drive right-of-way (per all properties of CRT recommended zoning adjacent to Berkshire Drive). He attests that he will follow the aforementioned recommendations in any future development on the property and is aware of the testimonies by the Wildwood Manor Association members and residents. He now hopes to incorporate a multi-family residential project (underground parking, ground level retail, and residential) on the existing surface parking lot to promote a mixed-use live/work community.

Staff Comments: Some of the concerns raised in testimony are based on previous proposals presented by the property owner and not included in the Planning Board Draft, which the property owner now supports. The Plan limits the height to 50 feet (not the 68 feet cited in testimony), requires a 30-foot setback/green buffer and an additional 20 foot area where the height will be limited to 35 feet (comparable to single-family development). The property cannot reach 50 feet in height within 50 feet of the Berkshire Drive right-of-way, making the protections similar to those used along the Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan Greenway. The Planning Board considered the issues presented by the Wildwood Manor residents. On page 28 of the Plan, they specifically reference some of the binding elements between Aubinoe and the adjacent neighborhood (an R-90 zone). In addition to the height and setback requirements mentioned above, there will be no thru-way into the neighborhood buffer between Berkshire Drive and the beginning of the Aubinoe property.

Staff supports the Plan recommendations.

3. Walter Johnson High School

Text in Master Plan: page 26

Map in Master Plan: page 25 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: R-90

Proposed Zoning: R-90

Plan Recommendations: The Plan recognizes the potential for expansion on-site and also comments on pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly advancement in this area. The Plan recommends confirming the existing zoning.

Testimony: None specific to the zoning.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

4. Bells Mills Road Offices

Text in Master Plan: page 27

Map in Master Plan: page 25 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: EOF 0.5, H-60

Proposed Zoning: EOF 0.5, H-60 (status quo)

Plan Recommendations: MCPS may consider this campus as an additional school site. The Plan recommends confirming the existing zoning.

Testimony: None specific to this property.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

5. Georgetown Square Shopping Center

Text in Master Plan: page 26

Map in Master Plan: page 25 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: NR .75, H-45

Proposed Zoning: CRT 1.5, C-1.0, R-.75, H-75

Plan Recommendations: The Plan aims to adapt this shopping center from a single-use retail area to a more mixed-use, connected, sustainable, and pedestrian-friendly area. Density transfers may be appropriate in this area. The Plan recommends rezoning the property from Neighborhood Retail (NR) to a CRT zone.

Testimony: John Davis of Georgetown Square LP testified that while the CRT zone is the appropriate designation, they requested an additional increase in density to incentivize redevelopment to match the Plan's overall vision of a more connected, mixed-use, 24/7 lifestyle. The requested zoning is CRT-1.75, C-1.0, R-1.25, H-75. Specifically, they want to allow for greater residential development in addition to some retail and open space areas. They believe a residential cap will address the school capacity issue.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted. This is a successful shopping center and it is hard to imagine that the property owner would choose to redevelop it before developing a nearby 50-acre primarily vacant property. Should the property owner want to redevelop and believes that additional residential development is necessary on this site, it could be accomplished via a transfer of FAR from one of the other properties in the planning area.

6. Rock Spring Centre

Text in Master Plan: page 26

Map in Master Plan: page 25 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: CR 1.5, C-.75, R-.75, H-275

Proposed Zoning: CR 1.5, C-.75, R-.75, H-275 (status quo)

Plan Recommendations: This 50+ acre mostly vacant parcel of land has undergone several approved plans (and various zoning designations) without action from its property owners. The last approval was under the former Mixed-Use Planned Development (MXPDP) zone. The Plan recommends that the owners work with Planning staff to develop a new project that matches the overall Plan's vision, as well as meets the current needs of the community, prior to the expiration of the Adequate Public Facilities validity period. The Plan recommends confirming the existing zoning.

Testimony: Chris Camalier of Camalier LP testified that the Rock Spring Centre is vital to the success for the Rock Spring area. He highlighted the development of the Berkshire apartments as well as the funded and constructed off-site infrastructure and public improvement projects. Now, they plan to work with a development partner and are requesting increased residential development due to the limited residential areas available for development. The requested zoning increase the residential component by 0.25 to CR-1.5, C-.75, R-1.0, H-275. He suggested a residential cap to address school capacity issues.

Staff Comments: Of all the properties owned by the Camalier and Davis Families, this property with significant undeveloped land is likely to be the first to be developed. The existing approvals are in the MXPDP zone. Staff **supports the property owner request** for increased residential density on this property as a means of encouraging them to resubmit their plans for regulatory approval under the CR zone and obtain the public benefits associated with this zone. If the Council increases other residential densities, Staff would support a residential cap suggested to address school capacity limitations in advance of the normal subdivision staging review.

Rock Spring Central/Mixed-Use Business Campus

The Master Plan identifies 10 properties for rezoning in the Rock Spring Central/Mixed-Use Business Campus. This area includes most of the office space in Rock Spring. The Plan recommends a consistent zoning strategy for properties in this area, setting the FAR at 1.5 and heights ranging from 100 to 150 feet (except for the stormwater management facility, which retains its existing height of 275 feet). For most properties, this represents a measurable increase in FAR. The Plan also provides the opportunity for these properties to apply for a local map amendment to allow a further increase in height and/or FAR. The Plan language on page 30 is as follows:

Property owners also have the option of applying for a CR Floating (CRF) Zone through a local map amendment. For the Rock Spring area, densities for a CRF Zone could range from between 1.5 and 2.5 with heights between 150 to 200 feet. Any application for a CRF Zone

must include major public benefits such as a school site, a park, a significant recreational amenity, funding for public transit, a library, or a recreation center. Major public benefits help provide conveniently located public amenities, where increased densities create greater needs for civic uses and more demands on public services.

Representatives of the Camalier and Davis Families and the owner of Democracy Center asked for increased residential FARs on their properties and, in some cases, increased total FAR and height. The Camalier and Davis Families have recommended a cap on the total number of residential units of 4,113 units (excluding senior housing, which would not generate students) to ensure that the increased residential FAR will not exceed school capacity.

There are three different options for increasing density on one or more specific sites:

- The first would be to provide the zoning increases the property owners have requested. If the Council does that, Staff would suggest it be done with the cap on units as they recommended.
- The second alternative is the floating zone option included in the Plan. The cost and uncertainty associated with a local map amendment makes this a less appealing option from the property owner's perspective.
- The final option is to use the transfer of density options allowed by the Zoning Ordinance. Since it is highly unlikely that multiple properties will redevelop simultaneously, or in the life of this Master Plan (particularly since the 50-acre Rock Spring Center is still mostly vacant), Staff believes this is a viable option. It would not increase the overall potential density in the planning area, but provides flexibility for property owners.

Staff believes that development in the near term is likely to focus on the undeveloped Rock Spring Centre, before the property owners undertake more costly redevelopment options. During the life of this Plan, Staff believes transfers of densities should provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate the property owner needs. To provide additional flexibility for such transfers, Staff recommends that this Plan allow for transfers beyond the ¼ acre limit in the Zoning Ordinance, but limited to areas within the planning area west of Old Georgetown Road.

1. Stormwater Facility

Text in Master Plan: page 32

Map in Master Plan: page 31 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: CR 1.5, C-.75, R-.75, H-275

Proposed Zoning: CR 1.5, C-.75, R-.75, H-275 (status quo)

Plan Recommendations: This facility is associated with the Rock Spring Centre. The Plan recommends confirming the existing zoning.

Testimony: None specific to this property.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

2. Montgomery Row Townhouses

Text in Master Plan: page 32

Map in Master Plan: page 31 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: EOF 1.0, H-100

Proposed Zoning: Townhouse High Density (THD) Zone

Plan Recommendations: The Plan recommends rezoning the site from EOF to a Townhouse High Density Zone.

Testimony: None specific to this property.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

3. Lockheed Martin/Rockledge Center (Office Park)

Text in Master Plan: page 30

Map in Master Plan: page 31 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: EOF 1.25, H-150

Proposed Zoning: EOF 1.25, H-150 (status quo)

Plan Recommendations: The Plan recommends confirming the existing zoning.

Testimony: None specific to this property.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

4. Capital Gateway (Office Park)

Text in Master Plan: page 30

Map in Master Plan: page 31 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: EOF 1.0, H-100

Proposed Zoning: EOF 1.0, H-100 (status quo)

Plan Recommendations: The Plan recommends confirming the existing zoning.

Testimony: None specific to this property.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

5. Democracy Center

Text in Master Plan: page 32

Map in Master Plan: page 31 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: EOF 1.25, H-150

Proposed Zoning: CR 1.5, C-1.25, R-.75, H-150

Plan Recommendations: The Plan is built around the idea of a central spine. For properties on the spine, such as this one, they recommend a consistent zoning approach (CR), with all having an FAR of 1.5, the previous C amount under the EOF, an R of .75, and varying heights, depending on their proximity to I-270. The Plan recommends a change on this property to a CR zone with an increased total FAR and new potential for residential development.

Testimony: Françoise M. Carrier testified on behalf of Democracy Associates, from Democracy Center, to oppose the language in the Draft that would prohibit the property owners from infilling their open space with townhouses (or for any other permitted use). They believe that other property owners do not have that same restriction, placing Democracy Associates at an economic disadvantage for having created an underground parking garage with open space on top. Carrier also testified against the required rezoning process, since it will halt redevelopment (additional economic and time expense). Democracy Associates also recommended additional heights and densities of CR-2.00, C-1.5, R-1.0, H-200. If that is not possible, she asked that Democracy Center be rezoned as CRT rather than CR, so that the “public benefits required will be commensurate with the development capacity granted.”

Staff Comments: The issue of the open space was addressed at the previous meeting and is addressed further below. Staff supports the Plan-recommended zoning as submitted, noting that this property could also take advantage of density transfers if they require additional density.

6. Rockledge Executive Plaza (Rockledge Executive Plaza One and Two)

Text in Master Plan: page 30

Map in Master Plan: page 31 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: EOF 1.0, H-100

Proposed Zoning: CR 1.5, C-1.0, R-.75, H-100

Plan Recommendations: The Plan is built around the idea of a central spine. For properties on the spine, such as this one, they recommend a consistent zoning approach (CR) with all having an FAR of 1.5, the previous C amount under the EOF, an R of .75, and varying heights, depending on their proximity to I-270. The Plan recommends a change to a CR zone with an increased FAR.

Testimony: Representatives from the Camalier family testified to request increased densities and heights of CR-2.5, C-2.5, R-2.5, H-200 for this property to incentivize redevelopment. They came to this conclusion after discussions with the Planning board and separate evaluations.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

7. Rock Spring Plaza

Text in Master Plan: page 32

Map in Master Plan: page 31 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: EOF 1.5, H-100; EOF 1.0, H-100; EOF 1.25, H-100

Proposed Zoning: (top left cluster of buildings) CR 1.5, C-1.5, R-.75, H-100

Plan Recommendations: The Plan is built around the idea of a central spine. For properties on the spine, such as this one, they recommend a consistent zoning approach (CR), with all having an FAR of 1.5, the previous C amount under the EOF, an R of .75, and varying heights, depending on their proximity to I-270. The Plan recommends a change to a CR zone with an increased FAR.

Testimony: The Camalier Family representatives identified different buildings than the Planning board while recommending rezoning. The Camalier Family identifies a majority of the Rock Spring Plaza as Rock Spring North, with the specific buildings including the Bedford Building, Westmoreland Building, and Rock Spring Plaza 1 & 2. For these properties, they requested CR-2.5, C-2.5, R-2.5, H-175. They believe this will incentivize redevelopment.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

8. Rock Spring Court

Text in Master Plan: page 32

Map in Master Plan: page 31 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: EOF 1.0, H-100

Proposed Zoning: (top right building & bottom cluster) CR 1.5, C-1.0, R-.75, H-100; (middle right building) CR 1.5, C-1.25, R-.75, H-100

Plan Recommendations: The Plan is built around the idea of a central spine. For properties on the spine, such as this one, they recommend a consistent zoning approach (CR), with all having an FAR of 1.5, the previous C amount under the EOF, an R of .75, and varying heights, depending on their proximity to I-270. The Plan recommends a change to a CR zone with an increased FAR.

Testimony: The Camalier Family representatives identified different buildings than the Planning board while recommending rezoning. The Camalier Family identifies a majority of Rock Spring Court as Rock Spring South, with the specific buildings including the Johns Hopkins Medical Building, the approved Lincoln Building, and the Camalier and Champlain buildings. For these properties, they requested CRT-1.5, C-1.5, R-1.0 H-150. They believe this will incentivize redevelopment.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

9. Democracy Plaza (and Marriot Suites Hotel)

Text in Master Plan: page 32

Map in Master Plan: page 31 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: EOF 1.0, H-110

Proposed Zoning: CR 1.5, C-1.0, R-.75, H-150

Plan Recommendations: The Plan is built around the idea of a central spine. For properties on the spine, such as this one, they recommend a consistent zoning approach (CR), with all having an FAR of 1.5, the previous C amount under the EOF, an R of .75, and varying heights, depending on their proximity to I-270. The Plan recommends a change to a CR zone with an increased FAR.

Testimony: Representatives for the Camalier family also testified on behalf of Democracy Plaza, which specifically includes One Democracy Plaza and Two Democracy Plaza, along with the Marriot Suites Hotel. They have requested a change in zoning to CRT-1.5, C-1.5, R-.75, H-150.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

10. Marriot International Headquarters

Text in Master Plan: page 32

Map in Master Plan: page 31 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: EOF .75, H-100

Proposed Zoning: CR 1.5, C-.75, R-.75, H-150

Plan Recommendations: The Plan is built around the idea of a central spine. For properties on the spine, such as this one, they recommend a consistent zoning approach (CR), with all having an FAR of 1.5, the previous C amount under the EOF, an R of .75, and varying heights, depending on their proximity to I-270. The Plan recommends a change to a CR zone with an increased FAR.

Testimony: Testimony was provided on behalf of the Marbeth Partnership, which owns the site where the Marriot International headquarters is currently located. Due to their future move, Marbeth supports the Planning board's recommendation to change from an EOF to a CR zone. They further request an increase in commercial and residential densities to CR 1.5, C-1.5, R-1.0, H-150 (to allow for effective mixed-use redevelopment); the floating zone up to CR 2.5 and H-200 (for properties that provide major public benefits/public amenities); and to no longer be considered a potential school site (so they can utilize the space for redevelopment and to activate the central spine). They believe reuse is not possible for this office space due to its structure and surrounding infrastructure, thus they request the new zoning as they explore potential options.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

Rock Spring West/Mixed-Use Regional Marketplace

The Master plan identifies 4 properties for rezoning in the Rock Spring Central/Mixed-Use Business Campus. This area is dominated by Montgomery Mall and surrounding retail uses, but also includes an office building.

1. Westfield Montgomery Mall

Text in Master Plan: page 35

Map in Master Plan: page 34 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: General Retail GR 1.5, H-45

Proposed Zoning: GR 1.5, H-45; amend RSC to include residential uses and any associated development standards

Plan Recommendations: The Plan recommends that Westfield Montgomery Mall remains a General Retail zone, however they would like to amend the Regional Shopping Center (RSC) Overlay zone to be applied to the site to include residential uses and any associated development standards.

Testimony: Patricia Harris from Lerch, Early and Brewer testified on behalf of the mall in support of the zoning text amendment (ZTA), which would allow for increased residential heights (150 feet) and would accommodate the Plan's desire for mixed-use development, including some new residential development.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

2. Ourisman Ford Site

Text in Master Plan: page 35

Map in Master Plan: page 34 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: CRT 2.5, C-1.5, R-2.0, H-.75

Proposed Zoning: CRT 2.5, C-1.5, R-2.0, H-150

Plan Recommendations: A 340-unit multifamily high-rise residential building with ground floor commercial space has been approved for the property.

Testimony: None specific to this property.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

3. Office Building - Motor City Drive, LLC

Text in Master Plan: page 33

Map in Master Plan: page 34 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: EOF 1.5, H-75

Proposed Zoning: CRT 2.25, C-1.5, R-.75, H-150

Plan Recommendations: This zoning has been updated to create a consistent zoning strategy during redevelopment.

Testimony: None specific to this property.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

4. Home Depot, Car Dealerships, Small Shopping Center, U.S. Post Office

Text in Master Plan: page 33

Map in Master Plan: page 34 (proposed zoning)

Existing Zoning: CRT 2.25, C-1.5, R-.75, H-75

Proposed Zoning: CRT 2.25, C-1.5, R-.75, H-150

Plan Recommendations: The height has been increased to remain consistent with the surrounding properties.

Testimony: None specific to this property.

Staff Comments: Staff supports the Plan as submitted.

Follow-up from Previous PHED Meeting

At the July 10 worksession, the Committee discussed the Plan's recommendations for open space on the Democracy Center property and asked Staff to prepare revisions to the Plan language. Staff recommends the following changes:

The description of open space specific to the Democracy Center on page 52 should be revised as follows:

- Should the existing structures on the site be razed and the property redeveloped, [or if infill is contemplated under the optional method of development, removal of] the existing open space on the northern portion of the site should be [discouraged. This existing open space should be] considered for parkland, [as a public benefit,] either through dedication, or acquisition by the Department of Parks. [Multi-family residential development should be encouraged over townhouses.] Any such dedication should qualify either as a public benefit or as fulfillment of the public open space requirement under optional method development.

- If infill is contemplated under optional method development, complete removal of the existing open space on the northern portion of the site should be discouraged. The portion of the northern open space to be preserved should be considered for conversion to parkland, either through dedication as part of the public open space requirement or a public benefit, or through acquisition by the Department of Parks.

Rather than limit the ability of the property owner of the Democracy Center to build townhomes, the Plan should have a general comment on page 51, under “Recommendations”, that would apply to all properties:

Multi-family residential development should be encouraged over townhouses, where appropriate, to maximize the opportunities for open space.

Zoning Code Definitions

| Term | Definition |
|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| CR= Commercial Residential | The CR zone is intended for larger downtown, mixed-use, and pedestrian-oriented areas in close proximity to transit options such as Metro, light rail, and bus. Retail tenant gross floor area is not restricted. |
| CRT= Commercial Residential Town | The CRT zone is intended for small downtown, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented centers and edges of larger, more intense downtowns. Retail tenant ground floor footprints are limited to preserve the town center scale. Transit options may include light rail, Metro, and bus. |
| EOF=Employment Office | The EOF zone is intended for office and employment activity combined with limited residential and neighborhood commercial uses. The EOF allows flexibility in building, circulation, and parking lot layout. Combines Commercial, Office Park (C-P), Office Building, Moderate Intensity (O-M), Technology and Business Park (I-3) |
| GR=General Retail | The GR zone is intended for commercial areas of a general nature, including regional shipping centers and clusters of commercial development. The GR zone provides development opportunities adjacent to the County's most auto-dominated corridors and those areas with few alternative mobility options. The GR zone allows flexibility in building, circulation, and parking lot layout. Retail/Service Establishment gross floor area is not restricted. |
| NR=Neighborhood Retail | The NR zone is intended for commercial areas that have a neighborhood orientation and which supply necessities usually requiring frequent purchasing and convenient automobile access. The NR zone addresses development opportunities within primarily residential areas with a few alternative mobility options and without a critical mass of density needed for pedestrian-oriented commercial uses. The NR zone allows flexibility in building, circulation, and parking lot layout. |
| R-90= One-Family Detached Residential | The intent of the R-90 zone is to provide designated areas of the County for moderate density residential uses. The predominant use is residential in a detached house. A limited number of other building types may be allowed under the optional method of development. |
| THD=Townhouse High Density Zone | The intent of the THD zone is to provide designated areas of the County for residential purposes at slightly higher densities than the R-90, R-60, and R-40 zones. It is also the intent of the THD zone to provide a buffer or transition between nonresidential or high-density residential uses and the medium or low-density Residential Zones. |
| CRF= Commercial Residential Floating Zone | Allow development of mixed-use centers and communities at a range of densities and heights flexible enough to respond to various settings; allow flexibility in uses for a site; and provide mixed development that is compatible with adjacent development. |
| RSC= Regional Shopping Center Overlay Zone | Provide flexibility of development standards to facilitate certain uses compatible with a regional shopping center. Provide parking design standards and requirements compatible with the function and circulation needs of regional shopping centers. |

Current & Proposed Zoning for Rock Spring

| Property | Current Zoning | Proposed Zoning | Testimony |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Rock Spring West/Mixed Use Regional Marketplace | | | |
| Westfield Montgomery Mall (Westlake Crossing & Gas station included) * | General Retail- GR 1.5, H-45' | GR 1.5, H-45'; amend RSC to include residential uses and any associated development standards | Patricia Harris, a legal representative for the mall supported the ZTA. |
| Ourisman Ford Site | CRT 2.5, C-1.5, R-2.0, H-75' | CRT 2.5, C-1.5, R-2.0, H-150' | None |
| Office Building | EOF 1.5, H-75' | CRT 2.25, C-1.5, R-.75, H-150' | None |
| Home Depot, Car Dealerships, Small Shopping Center, U.S. Post Office | CRT 2.25, C-1.5, R-.75, H-75' | CRT 2.25, C-1.5, R-.75, H-150' | None |
| Rock Spring Central/Mixed Use Business Campus** | Current Zoning | Proposed Zoning | Testimony |
| Stormwater Facility <i>(considered part of the Rock Spring Centre in the East Village Center)</i> | CR 1.5, C-.75, R-.75, H-275' | CR 1.5, C-.75, R-.75, H-275' | None |
| Montgomery Row Townhouses | Nonexistent but in a EOF-1.0, H-100 | Townhouse High Density Zone | None |
| Lockheed Martin/Rockledge Center | EOF 1.25, H-150' | EOF 1.25, H-150' | None |
| Democracy Center | EOF- 1.25, H-150' | CR-1.5, C-1.25, R-.75, H-150' | A Democracy Associates representative requested CR-2.00 C-1.5, R-1.0 H-200' or CRT rezoning, removal of infill restrictions on their property, and reduction of the open space requirement. |
| Capital Gateway | EOF 1.0, H-100' | EOF 1.0, H-100' | None |
| Rockledge Executive Plaza/Center | EOF 1.0, H-100' | CR 1.5, C-1.0, R-.75, H-100' | CR-2.5, C-2.5, R-2.5, H-200' (Camalier/Davis request) |
| Rock Spring Plaza | EOF 1.5, H-100'; EOF 1.0, H-100'; EOF 1.25, H-100' | (top left cluster of buildings) CR 1.5, C-1.5, R-.75, H-100' | CR-2.5, C-2.5, R-2.5, H-175' Camalier/Davis representatives presented a different zoning area than the Plan. Their requested zone includes the Plan's Rock Spring Plaza designation plus the top right (Plan recommended zoning: CR 1.5, C-1.0, R-.75, H-100') and |

*=Regional Shopping Center Overlay Zone (RSC)

**= The Plan notes that Rock Spring Central properties are appropriate for a CR Floating Zone (CRF)

| | | | |
|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | the middle right building (Plan recommended zoning: CR 1.5, C-1.25, R-.75, H-100') that are included in the Plan's Rock Spring Court area designation. |
| Rock Spring Court | EOF 1.0, H-100' | (top right building & bottom cluster) CR 1.5, C-1.0, R-.75, H-100'; (middle right building) CR 1.5, C-1.25, R-.75, H-100' | CRT 1.5, C-1.5, R-1.0, H-150' Camalier/Davis representatives presented a different zoning area than the Plan. Their requested zone includes the bottom 3 buildings of the Plan's Rock Spring Court designation. |
| Democracy Plaza | EOF 1.0, H-110' | CR 1.5, C-1.0, R-.75, H-150' | CRT-1.5, C-1.5, R-1.0, H-150' (Camalier/Davis request) |
| Marriot International Headquarters | EOF .75, H-100' | CR 1.5, C-.75, R-.75, H-150' | None |
| Rock Spring East/Village Center | Current Zoning | Proposed Zoning | Testimony |
| Wildwood Shopping Center & Gas Station | WSC: NR .75, H-45' & R-90 Gas Station: CRT .75, C-.75, R-.25, H-35' | WSC: CRT 1.25 C-.5, R-.75, H-50' Gas Station: CRT 1.25, C-.75, R-.75, H-50' | Wildwood Manor residents are concerned about the impact of redevelopment (height and setback) on their neighborhood. |
| Aubinoe Properties | CRT 1.25, C-.5, R-.75, H-50' | CRT 1.25, C-.5, R-.75, H-50' | Wildwood Manor residents are concerned about the impact of redevelopment (height and setback) on their neighborhood. |
| Walter Johnson High School | R-90 | R-90 | None |
| Bells Mills Road Offices | EOF .5, H-60' | EOF .5, H-60' | None |
| Georgetown Square Shopping Center | NR .75, H-45' | CRT 1.5, C-1.0, R-.75, H-75' | CRT 1.75, C-1.0, R-1.25, H-75' (Camalier/Davis request) |
| Rock Spring Centre | CR 1.5, C-.75, R-.75, H-275' | CR 1.5, C-.75, R-.75, H-275' | CR 1.5, C-.75, R-1.0, H-275' (Camalier/Davis request) |

*=Regional Shopping Center Overlay Zone (RSC)

**= The Plan notes that Rock Spring Central properties are appropriate for a CR Floating Zone (CRF)