



Montgomery  
County Council

**Committee:** PHED

**Committee Review:** Completed

**Staff:** Pamela Dunn, Senior Legislative Analyst

Glenn Orlin, Senior Analyst

**Purpose:** To make preliminary decisions – straw vote expected

**Keywords:** #Forest Glen, Montgomery Hills, Sector Plan

AGENDA ITEM #8A

January 28, 2020

Worksession

## SUBJECT

Council worksession to discuss the recommendations of the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee regarding the Planning Board Draft of the Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan.

## EXPECTED ATTENDEES

Casey Anderson, Chair, Montgomery County Planning Board

Gwen Wright, Director, Montgomery Planning Department

Mike Riley, Director, Montgomery Parks

Leslye Howerton, Master Plan Supervisor, Montgomery Planning Department

Melissa Williams, Senior Planner, Montgomery Planning Department

Katie Mencarini, Senior Transportation Planner, Montgomery Planning Department

Lisa Govoni, Housing Planner, Montgomery Planning Department

Stephen Aldrich, Functional Planning & Policy, Planning Department

Christopher Conklin, Director, Montgomery County Department of Transportation

Andrew Bossi, Director's Office, Montgomery County Department of Transportation

## COUNCIL DECISION POINTS & COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

- Council will take straw votes on the recommendations of the PHED Committee regarding the Planning Board Draft of the Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan.
- The recommendations (too numerous to list here) are covered in two separate staff reports. The staff report labeled Part 1 addresses the land use, zoning, historic preservation, urban design, environment, and parks and open space recommendations in the Plan. The staff report labeled Part 2 addresses recommendations related to transportation infrastructure and adequacy as well as school facility adequacy and includes an evaluation of the fiscal impact statement.

## DESCRIPTION/ISSUE

On July 25, 2019, the Montgomery County Planning Board approved the Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan. The Plan makes recommendations for land use and zoning within the Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan area, as well as recommendations intended to improve overall circulation, pedestrian connections, and the network of bikeways for approximately 230 acres.

## SUMMARY OF KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

- The PHED Committee held three worksessions on the Plan.
- The staff reports for the first worksession, held on November 25, can be viewed at:  
<https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/council/Resources/Files/agenda/cm/2019/20191125/>

20191125\_PHED1.pdf and

[https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/council/Resources/Files/agenda/cm/2019/20191125/20191125\\_PHED2.pdf](https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/council/Resources/Files/agenda/cm/2019/20191125/20191125_PHED2.pdf)

- The staff report for the second worksession, held on December 2, can be viewed at:  
[https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/council/Resources/Files/agenda/cm/2019/20191202/20191202\\_PHED1AM.pdf](https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/council/Resources/Files/agenda/cm/2019/20191202/20191202_PHED1AM.pdf)
- The staff report for the third worksession, held on January 16, can be viewed at:  
[https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/council/Resources/Files/agenda/cm/2020/20200116/20200116\\_PHED1.pdf](https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/council/Resources/Files/agenda/cm/2020/20200116/20200116_PHED1.pdf)
- The Planning Board Draft of the Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan can be viewed at:  
[https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Forest-Glen-Mont-Hills-Sector-Plan-Planning-Board-Draft\\_FINALhires.pdf](https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Forest-Glen-Mont-Hills-Sector-Plan-Planning-Board-Draft_FINALhires.pdf)

**This report contains:**

Staff Report Part 1: Memorandum on zoning, historic preservation and other land use-related recommendations

Staff Report Part 2: Memorandum on transportation infrastructure and adequacy, school facility adequacy, and the fiscal impact statement for the Plan.

**Alternative format requests for people with disabilities.** If you need assistance accessing this report you may submit alternative format requests to the ADA Compliance Manager. The ADA Compliance Manager can also be reached at 240-777-6197 (TTY 240-777-6196) or at [adacompliance@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:adacompliance@montgomerycountymd.gov)

**M E M O R A N D U M**

January 23, 2020

TO: County Council

FROM: Pamela Dunn, Senior Legislative Analyst

SUBJECT: Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan – evaluation of land use, zoning, historic preservation, urban design, environment, and parks and open space recommendations

PURPOSE: Worksession – Review PHED Committee recommendations

**Participants:**

Casey Anderson, Chair, Montgomery County Planning Board  
Gwen Wright, Director, Montgomery Planning Department  
Mike Riley, Director, Montgomery Parks  
Leslye Howerton, Master Plan Supervisor, Montgomery Planning Department  
Melissa Williams, Senior Planner, Montgomery Planning Department  
Tina Schneider, Senior Environmental Planner, Montgomery Planning Department  
Rachel Newhouse, Planner Coordinator, Montgomery Parks  
Hyojung Garland, Park Planning Supervisor, Montgomery Parks

This memorandum presents the recommendations of the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee regarding the Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan. A separate memorandum from Glenn Orlin addresses the transportation and school facility recommendations. This memorandum covers recommendations on land use, zoning, historic preservation, urban design, environment, and parks and open space, both property specific recommendations and broader recommendations for the Plan area in general. The PHED Committee's recommendations are highlighted in **bold**.

**Councilmembers may wish to bring their copy of the Plan to the meeting.**

## **BACKGROUND**

The Plan area is composed predominantly of commercial development along Georgia Avenue, intermixed with garden apartments, townhouses, religious institutions, and single-family detached homes. The area is bifurcated by two heavily-traveled major thoroughfares: Georgia Avenue (MD 97) and Interstate 495 (the Capital Beltway).

Just over half of the residents within the study area are Non-Hispanic Whites (52 percent), with African Americans representing 20 percent of area residents, and Hispanics and Asians representing 16 and 7 percent, respectively. The median household income is \$125,148, which is slightly lower than the Countywide average (\$133,543); however, the study area population is economically diverse.<sup>1</sup> In addition, the study area is marked by a high degree of education, with 40 percent of the population over 25 years old holding a graduate or professional degree as compared to 31 percent across the County.

## **GENERAL PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following are general recommendations not specific to a particular property. Unless noted otherwise, the Committee recommendations were unanimous.

### **Urban Design (pages 49-50)**

To support the unique identity of the Plan area, the Sector Plan establishes two principle goals related to urban design. The first is to encourage quality design that incorporates neighborhood compatibility and sustainable development practices. The second is to enhance the public realm by providing green infrastructure (safe, accessible parks, stormwater systems, and usable open space) that meets the needs of all users. Several recommendations, described on pages 49 and 50 of the Plan, are proposed to achieve these goals.

**Committee Recommendation: Support the Sector Plan recommendations for urban design. Chair Riemer suggested, and the Committee agreed, that the Plan should emphasize the importance of undergrounding utilities during redevelopment.**

### **Historic Preservation (page 50)**

The Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan area currently does not contain any sites or districts listed in the Master Plan for Historic Preservation; however, the Woodside District is listed in the Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites. The Plan lists several broad goals and two areawide recommendations on page 50 of the Plan. The goals principally encourage the future identification and potential designation of historic resources and sites within the Plan area and support the preservation of all historic resources, designated or not.

The second goal, related to the historic preservation tax credit program, may be better suited as a recommendation, recognizing that its implementation will be contingent upon future designations. In addition, the fourth goal, "Safeguard the historical and cultural heritage of the County", seems to go beyond the scope of this sector plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> 15.3 percent of households earn below \$35,000 per year, 26.1 percent earn between \$50,000 and \$100,000, 35.3 percent earn between \$100,000 and \$200,000, and 16.5 percent earn above \$200,000.

**Committee Recommendation: Move the second goal to the recommendation section, and change the scope of the fourth goal from “County” to “Plan area”.**

### **Environment (pages 50-53)**

The Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan proposes three environmental goals. To achieve these goals, the Plan provides numerous environmental recommendations separated into three categories: Green Cover, Water Quality, and Air Quality and Carbon Emissions.

#### **A. Green Cover**

Vegetation or green cover is any surface with soil and vegetation. In Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills, the commercial areas have a green cover of between 6 and 20 percent. The Plan recommends improving green cover through planted roofs, trees, bioretention systems, planting beds, and lawns.

More specifically, for properties greater than 2.5 acres (108,900 sf) in size (with potential for redevelopment under the CRT zone), the Plan requires a minimum 35 percent green cover. This would be the first sector plan to require a 35 percent green cover. The Bethesda Downtown Plan contains a similar recommendation regarding green cover; however, it explicitly states that it is a recommendation, not a requirement.

**Committee Recommendation: Modify the language in the Plan to clarify that the green cover proposal is a recommendation only.**

The Plan contains additional recommendations related to green cover; one specifies that the soil volumes required for canopy tree plantings be no less than 800 to 1,000 cubic feet. By comparison, the Bethesda Downtown Plan requires that soil volumes for canopy tree plantings be no less than 600 cubic feet. The Committee discussed the challenges of redevelopment in this area and precedent set by other recently-adopted plans.

**Committee Recommendation (2-1): Reduce the soil volume requirement to a minimum of 600 cubic feet, in line with the Lyttonsville and Bethesda Downtown sector plans. Councilmember Jawando supports the Planning Board recommendation of 800-1,000 cubic feet.**

#### **B. Water Quality**

Within the Plan area, the overall impervious cover averages 65-70 percent. In the commercial zones, the impervious cover reaches 95 percent on some properties. The Plan makes several recommendations related to Environmental Site Design and stormwater management, to promote improved treatment of water runoff from impervious surfaces.

**Committee Recommendation: Support the Sector Plan recommendations regarding water quality.**

#### **C. Air Quality and Carbon Emissions**

Improving air quality and reducing carbon emissions involves making reductions in all greenhouse gas source areas (those that impact embodied energy, building energy, and transportation emissions). The Plan provides numerous recommendations that will result in reduced vehicle miles traveled and delays, reduced building energy demand and consumption,

increased clean energy generation, improved carbon sequestration, and reduced heat island effects, all of which will improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions.

**Committee Recommendation: Support the Sector Plan recommendations with respect to air quality and carbon emissions.**

### **Parks, Trails and Open Space (pages 54-55)**

The *2017 Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan*, developed by the Department of Parks, serves as the planning policy for parks and recreation in Montgomery County. The PROS Plan suggests that each master plan include an open space system that addresses a variety of needs, including active recreation destinations; a central “civic green” urban park; an interconnected system of sidewalks and trails to connect parks and open spaces; and wooded areas to provide a sense of contact with nature.

Specific park and open space recommendations for the Plan area are shown on Map 17 (page 54) and described in Table 5 (page 55). The property-specific recommendations are covered with the land use and zoning recommendations presented later in this report.

In addition to location-specific recommendations, the Plan also provides areawide recommendations aimed at promoting enhanced trail connections, safe and improved park access, and inclusion of art and sensory-integrated installations into parks and open spaces.

**Committee Recommendation: Support the areawide recommendations for parks and open space.**

## **PROPERTY-SPECIFIC PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Land Use and Zoning**

To support the Plan’s vision, broad land use goals and recommendations are described on page 49 of the Plan. With this as a guide, the following recommendations on land use, zoning, and parks are presented for specific properties in the Forest Glen, Montgomery Hills, and Woodside districts.

#### **A. Forest Glen District**

The Forest Glen District is generally defined by Dennis Avenue to the north, Forest Glen Road to the south, Woodland Drive to the east, and Darcy Forest Drive to the west. According to the Plan, it is the most diverse and densely populated district within the Plan area. It is home to General Getty Park, the Forest Glen Metro Station, medical office buildings, religious institutions, and several multi-unit residential buildings as well as single-family homes.

##### **1. Dennis Avenue Medical Cluster**

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Text in Sector Plan: page 70

###### **a. Burkland Medical Center (10313 Georgia Avenue)**

Existing Zoning: R-60

Proposed Zoning: CRT-1.25 C-1.25 R-0.5 H-75

The Burkland Medical Center, which houses medical condominiums, was allowed by special exception under the Residential-60 (R-60) zone. The Plan recommends rezoning to the Commercial Residential Town (CRT) zone to accommodate the medical and office uses on the property and to allow for limited

retail activity, such as a coffee shop (which under the special exception is not currently allowed). The CRT zone would also allow for potential residential development should the property redevelop in the future.

During the tour of the Plan area and the first worksession, Committee members expressed their desire to evaluate the maximum potential for residential development within the Plan area. For most of the properties recommended for CRT zoning, the proposed commercial density (expressed as Floor Area Ratio (FAR)) has been set equal to total density. For about half of these properties, the residential density or FAR has been set equal to total FAR as well (to provide for maximum flexibility in redevelopment).

One option to ensure the maximum potential for future residential growth would be to set residential FAR equal to the total FAR for all properties being recommended for CRT zoning. This would allow a property owner to add residential units to an existing commercially-developed property, up to the maximum density allowed in the zone. It would also allow the site to be completely reconstructed with any mix of commercial and residential FAR, up to the total density allowed.<sup>2</sup>

Below is a table showing the current zoning for the Burkland Medical Center, the zoning proposed in the Planning Board Draft, an alternative zoning recommendation that sets residential FAR equal to total FAR, and the number of potential dwelling units under each.

Burkland Medical Center - Zoning Map Portion of Site #8				
	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning	Alternative Residential Density
<b>Size (square feet)</b>	92,855			
<b>Size (acres)</b>	2.13			
<b>Zoning</b>	R-60 (7.26 DU per Acre)	CRT-1.25 C-1.25 R-0.5 H-75	CRT 1.25 C-1.25 R-1.25 H-75	
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	35,955	43,332	116,069	116,069
Residential Square Footage	0	0	46,428	116,069
Commercial Square Footage	35,955	0	116,069	116,069
<b>Single-Unit Detached Square Footage * 2800 SF</b>	0	43,332	0	0
<b>Number of Single-Unit Detached DU's (7.26 DU)</b>	0	15	0	0
<b>Multi-Unit Square Footage</b>	0	0	46,428	116,069
<b>Number of Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	0	0	37	93

**Committee Recommendation:** Support the alternative residential density option for this property, CRT-1.25 C-1.25 R-1.25 H-75, to provide maximum flexibility for redevelopment and strengthen the potential for additional housing.

b. **Doctor's Medical Park East (10301 Georgia Avenue)**

Existing Zoning: R-60

Proposed Zoning: CRT-1.25 C-1.25 R-0.5 H-75

Doctor's Medical Park East, like the Burkland Medical Center, was allowed by special exception under the Residential-60 (R-60) zone. The Plan recommends rezoning to the CRT zone to accommodate the medical and office uses on the property and, like the Burkland Medical Center, to allow for limited retail activity. Below is a table showing the current zoning for the property, the zoning proposed in the

<sup>2</sup> The potential increase in residential units could affect the directionality of vehicle trips and resulting mode share; however, the percentage of trips from new development within the Plan area is a relatively minor addition to the transportation network, and thus a shift in potential use from commercial to residential will have correspondingly minor impact.

Planning Board Draft, the alternative zoning recommendation that sets residential FAR equal to total FAR, and the number of potential dwelling units under each.

Doctors Medical Park - Zoning Map Portion of Site #8				
	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning	Alternative Residential Density
<b>Size (square feet)</b>	201,247			
<b>Size (acres)</b>	4.62			
<b>Zoning</b>	R-60 (7.26 DU per Acre)	CRT-1.25 C-1.25 R-0.5 H-75	CRT 1.25 C-1.25 R-1.25 H-75	
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	97,527	93,915	251,559	251,559
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	1	93,915	100,624	251,559
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	97,527	0	251,559	251,559
<b>Single-Unit Detached Square Footage * 2800 SF</b>	0	93,915	0	0
<b>Number of Single-Unit Detached DU's (7.26 DU)</b>	0	34	0	0
<b>Multi-Unit Square Footage</b>	0	0	100,624	251,559
<b>Number of Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	0	0	80	201

**Committee Recommendation:** Support the alternative residential density option for this property, CRT-1.25 C-1.25 R-1.25 H-75.

c. **Montgomery County Dennis Avenue Health Center (2000 Dennis Avenue)**

Existing Zoning: R-60

Proposed Zoning: CRT-1.25 C-1.25 R-0.5 H-75

The Dennis Avenue Health Center was rebuilt by the County in 2016. As a County project, it was not required to meet the standards of the R-60 zone. The Plan recommends rezoning to the CRT zone to provide the opportunity for potential comprehensive redevelopment with the neighboring medical center properties, should they choose to redevelop in the future.

However, development of housing on this site is not dependent on redevelopment of the adjacent properties. Under the Plan's proposed residential zoning of 0.5 residential FAR, approximately 118 multi-family units could be constructed. In a memo to the Committee dated December 2, 2019 (see © 1), Councilmember Jawando, recognizing the potential for affordable housing on this site, proposed increasing the density for this site equal to CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-1.5 H-80. Councilmember Jawando also requested that the Plan recommend 30 percent of the units be provided as regulated affordable units: 15 percent affordable to households earning at the standard Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) level of 65 percent or less of Area Median Income (AMI) and 15 percent affordable to households earning less than 50 percent of AMI.

The table below shows current zoning, the zoning proposed in the Planning Board Draft, Councilmember Jawando's alternative zoning recommendation, and the number of potential dwelling units associated with each.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The potential number of residential units under the alternative zoning has been reduced by the commercial density of the Health Center since it is unlikely to redevelop.

Dennis Avenue Health Center - Zoning Map - Portion of Site #8

	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning	Alternative Residential Density
<b>Size (square feet)</b>	295,554			
<b>Size (acres)</b>	6.78			
<b>Zoning</b>	R-60 (7.26 DU per Acre)	CRT-1.25 C-1.25 R-0.5 H-75	CRT 1.5 C-1.5 R-1.5 H-75	
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	74,758	137,925	369,443	443,331
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	0	137,925	147,777	443,331
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	74,758	0	369,443	443,331
<b>Single-Unit Detached Square Footage * 2800 SF</b>	0	137,925	0	0
<b>Number of Single-Unit Detached DU's (7.26 DU)</b>	0	49	0	0
<b>Multi-Unit Square Footage (*minus existing FAR)</b>	0	0	147,777	368,573
<b>Number of Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	0	0	118	295

**Committee Recommendation:** Support Councilmember Jawando's alternative density recommendation for this property of CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-1.5 H-80, adding a Committee recommendation to increase height by five feet to ensure the ability of the site to accommodate the increase in density.

## 2. Fields of Silver Spring (10111 McKenney Avenue)

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Text in Sector Plan: page 71

Existing Zoning: R-10

Proposed Zoning: R-10

Fields of Silver Spring was built in 1947 on approximately 8.4 acres. It contains 221 apartments. The property is currently managed under a low-income housing tax credit program that is set to remain in place until 2043. The Plan recommends reconfirming the existing R-10 zoning for this property.

Given the low-income tax credit program currently underway, this property is unlikely to redevelop during the life of this plan; however, the tax credit program does not prevent redevelopment. If the property requires significant renovation and redevelopment within the next 20-30 years, without a change in zoning the property would be faced with redeveloping under the R-10 zone.

This is likely to create challenges to redevelopment. A perfect example is the recently-approved local rezoning of the Forest Glen Apartments. Currently under redevelopment by Montgomery Housing Partnership (MHP), the Forest Glen Apartments needed and received a local rezoning from R-10 to the CRT zone. The Plan increases this slightly.

The table below shows current zoning, the zoning proposed in the Planning Board Draft, the alternative proposed zoning, similar to the MHP property, and the number of potential dwelling units associated with each.

Fields of Silver Spring Apartments - Zoning Map No Site Number				
	Existing on the Ground Today	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under PB Draft Zoning - no change	Proposed Alternative Zoning
<b>Size (square feet)</b>			365,940	
<b>Size (acres)</b>			8.40	
<b>Zoning</b>		R-10 (43.5 DU per Acre)		CRTF 2.0 C-0.25 R-2.0 H-75
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	276,250	456,795	456,795	731,880
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	276,250	456,795	456,250	731,880
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	0	0	0	91,485
<b>Multi-Unit Square Footage</b>	276,250	456,795	456,250	731,880
<b>Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	221	365	365	586

**Committee Recommendation:** Given the length of the tax-credit program and the financial characteristics on which it is based, the Committee supports reconfirmation of the R-10 zone with a recommendation to support a future application for a CRT floating zone, roughly equivalent to CRT-2.0 C-0.25 R-2.0 H-75, should the property seek redevelopment in the future.

In addition, the Committee supports a requirement that any optional method project that includes residential dwelling units provide a minimum of 15 percent Moderately Priced Dwelling Units (MPDUs) and five percent market-affordable units<sup>4</sup> for up to 30 years.

Councilmember Jawando further suggested, and the Committee agreed, that with redevelopment a minimum of 25 percent of the units should be provided as two-bedroom units.

### 3. Belvedere Apartments (2107 Belvedere Blvd)

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Text in Sector Plan: page 71

Existing Zoning: R-10

Proposed Zoning: R-10

Like the “Fields”, the Belvedere Apartments were built in 1947. The complex occupies 3.4 acres and contains 93 units. The Plan recommends reconfirming the existing R-10 zoning for this property to preserve the existing market-rate affordable housing.

Like the aging multi-family properties discussed during the Veirs Mill Sector Plan, this property will, within the life of the Plan, most likely require significant renovation, rehabilitation or redevelopment. Under the R-10 zone, up to 145 units at a height of up to 100 feet would be allowed under the standard method of development.

Testimony provided by the County Executive supports the preservation of existing affordable housing. However, this is not necessarily achieved by retaining current zoning. No change in zoning might ensure market affordable rents and no displacement of residents in the near term, but as systemic infrastructure and utility issues worsen over time, the Belvedere will most likely need to be renovated or rebuilt. Given current zoning, additional residential units could be built and would require the standard 12.5 percent regulated affordable units (MPDUs). However, the challenges with redevelopment for properties in this

---

<sup>4</sup> Market-affordable units are market-rate affordable dwelling units that rent at prices affordable to households earning no more than 80 percent of area median income, based on unit and household sizes. They are not income-restricted by government regulation.

area under similar circumstances and zoning indicate that a better option would be to rezone this property from R-10 to CRT.

The table below shows current zoning, the zoning proposed in the Planning Board Draft, the alternative proposed zoning, similar to the MHP property, and the number of potential dwelling units associated with each.

Belvedere Apartments- Zoning Map No Site Number				
	Existing on the Ground Today	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under PB Draft Zoning - no change	Proposed Alternative Zoning
<b>Size (square feet)</b>			145,668	
<b>Size (acres)</b>			3.34	
<b>Zoning</b>		R-10 (43.5 DU per Acre)		CRT 2.0 C-0.25 R-2.0 H-75
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	116,250	181,834	181,834	291,336
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	116,250	181,834	181,834	291,336
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	0	0	0	36,417
<b>Multi-Unit Square Footage</b>	116,250	181,834	181,834	291,336
<b>Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	93	145	145	233

**Committee Recommendation:** Given the lack of regulated affordable units today and the high probability of redevelopment in the next 20-30 years, the Committee supports a change in zoning from R-10 to CRT-2.0 C-0.25 R-2.0 H-75. In addition, the Committee supports a requirement that any optional method project that includes residential dwelling units provide a minimum of 15 percent MPDUs. And, like Fields of Silver Spring, the Committee agreed that, if redeveloped, a minimum of 25 percent of the units should be provided as two-bedroom units.

#### 4. Forest Glen Apartments (2106 Belvedere Blvd)

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Text in Sector Plan: page 72

Existing Zoning: CRT-1.75 C-0.25 R-1.5 H-70<sup>5</sup>

Proposed Zoning: CRT-2.0 C-0.25 R-2.0 H-75

The Forest Glen Apartments are almost 70 years old. There are currently 74 apartments on this site. The Montgomery Housing Partnership (MHP) recently received Council approval for a local rezoning of this property. The Plan recommends a slight modification to the recently-approved Local Map Amendment (LMA). Under the LMA, the site was approved for CRT-1.75 C-0.25 R-1.5 H-70; the Plan recommends increasing total FAR from 1.75 to 2.0 and increasing residential FAR from 1.5 to 2.0, primarily to ensure sufficient density for MHP to succeed in achieving their redevelopment plan.

**Committee Recommendation:** Support the Sector Plan recommendation with respect to zoning.<sup>6</sup>

#### Environment

Just prior to the third worksession, the Committee received correspondence from MHP regarding two environmental recommendations in the Plan. MHP noted concern with the wording of the

<sup>5</sup> The Plan lists existing zoning as R-10; however, the Council approved a Local Map Amendment that changed the zoning on this property to CRT 1.75 C-0.25 R-1.5 H-70.

<sup>6</sup> Commercial density was proposed at 2.0 FAR; however, this is in error and should be C-0.25.

recommendations. As stated, they appear more stringent than the recently-approved preliminary Forest Conservation Plan for this site and could affect future regulatory approvals and the number of potential units on the site. MHP and Planning Staff have agreed on the following changes to the text, noted in *italics*:

- Protect or enhance the existing tree buffer along Belvedere Boulevard *to the maximum extent possible*.
- *To the maximum extent possible*, incorporate the oldest healthiest trees into the design of the redevelopment project.

**Committee Recommendation:** Council staff polled the Committee members, who support the proposed revisions.

##### **5. Forest Glen Metro Station Parking Lot and Entrance (Forest Glen Road and Kimball Place)**

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Text in Sector Plan: page 73

Existing Zoning: R-60

Proposed Zoning: CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-2.5 H-120

The Forest Glen Metro Station Parking Lot and Entrance is approximately 8.7 acres in size. It is one of the few remaining Metro station surface parking lots to remain undeveloped. The Plan recommends rezoning this site from its current R-60 zoning to CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-2.5 H-120 to accommodate mixed-use pedestrian-oriented development.

Several residents of the Plan area testified about the potential redevelopment of this site, including residents from the abutting Americana Finnmark community. They expressed concern with the potential number of new residential units as well as the proposed height, requesting height be limited to 75 feet. Other Plan area residents lauded the potential for development at the Metro Station site and the possible redevelopment of other properties within the Plan area.

**Committee Recommendation:** Support the Planning Board recommended zoning of CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-2.5 H-120. Under redevelopment, support a requirement to provide 15 percent MPDUs and a minimum of 25 percent of the units as two-bedroom units. The Committee requested language be added to the Plan regarding the consideration of convenient access to the Metro Station site from neighboring properties should the site redevelop.

##### **6. Forest Glen Medical Center (9818 and 9816 Woodland Drive, and 9907 Georgia Avenue)**

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Text in Sector Plan: page 74

Existing Zoning: R-60

Proposed Zoning: CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-2.5 H-120

Constructed in 1967, the existing medical building and associated parking lot are situated on approximately 3.9 acres across multiple lots. The Medical Center was approved as a special exception in the R-60 zone. Also on this site is a roughly 1.25-acre vegetated/wooded area that serves as a buffer

between the parking area and the adjacent single-family homes. The Plan recommends rezoning the Forest Glen Medical Center from R-60 to CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-2.5 H-120 to accommodate a mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented development adjacent to the Forest Glen Metro station. Like the Forest Glen Metro Station site, the Plan recommends that 15 percent MPDUs be provided under redevelopment.

Given the substantial investment by the County in the Metro access tunnel construction, the Committee discussed requiring that 10 percent of the units be provided as workforce housing. This does not address access to lower affordability units; however, this property, less than half the size of the Metro site, is privately owned.

**Committee Recommendation: Support the Planning Board recommended zoning of CRT-2.5 C 2.5 R-2.5 H-120. Under redevelopment, support a requirement to provide 15 percent of the units as MPDUs, 10 percent of the units as Workforce Housing, and a minimum of 25 percent of the units be provided as two-bedroom units.**

**Following the discussion on zoning, the Committee had a lengthy discussion regarding environmental recommendations for the forested area of the Medical Center site. Councilmember Friedson proposed modifying the Plan recommendation regarding this portion of the property, stating that with respect to the 1.24 acres of existing remnant forest, maximum flexibility on the site should be given for providing an area of equal environmental benefit that also provides improved community benefit and access. The Committee agreed.**

## **7. 9909 Georgia Avenue and 9820 Woodland Drive**

Existing zoning: R-60

Requested zoning: CRN 1.5 C-0.0 R-1.5 H-55

During the public hearing on the Sector Plan, the Council received a request to rezone two abutting residential properties owned by the same individual. The properties in question abut single-family homes to the north (including a property owner who testified in opposition) and the wooded section of the Forest Glen Medical Center site to the south. As discussed above, the Medical Center site is recommended for CRT zoning.

The owner of 9909 Georgia Avenue and 9820 Woodland Drive is seeking CRN zoning for her properties in hopes of converting the small, older single-family rentals to “missing middle” housing.

**Committee Recommendation: Due to the lateness of the request (post Planning Board approval) and testimony in opposition to this change, rather than recommending a change in zoning, the Committee agreed (2-1) to include in the Plan a recommendation to support a future application for a CRN floating zone, roughly equivalent to CRN 1.5 C-0.0 R-1.5 H-55. Councilmember Riemer supports rezoning 9909 Georgia Avenue and 9820 Woodland Drive as part of the Plan.**

The Committee had a lengthy discussion regarding the potential for the remaining block of homes bound by Georgia Avenue, Tilton Drive and Woodland Drive to be redeveloped as “missing middle” housing.

**Committee Recommendation: Include in the Plan a recommendation to support a future application for a CRN floating zone, roughly equivalent to CRN 1.5 C-0.0 R-1.5 H-55 for the remaining properties in the block bound by Georgia Avenue, Tilton Drive, and Woodland Drive.**

**The Plan should also include language to encourage consolidation of any required open space with that of adjacent properties should these properties assemble and redevelop under the floating zone option.**

## **B. Montgomery Hills District**

Montgomery Hills is generally defined by Forest Glen Road to the north and 16<sup>th</sup> Street to the south. The district is home to several older, low-density, strip shopping centers with retail and auto-centric commercial service uses for residents and commuters.

### **1. Seminary Place Shopping Center, Shell Gas Station, and Montgomery Hills Car Wash (9440 and 9520 Georgia Avenue, 9510 Georgia Avenue, and 9500 Georgia Avenue)**

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Text in Sector Plan: pages 75-76

#### **Seminary Place Shopping Center (both lots)**

Existing Zoning: CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-0.5 H-45

Proposed Zoning: CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-2.5 H-75

#### **Shell Gas Station**

Existing Zoning: CRT-2.25 C-1.5 R-0.75 H-45

Proposed Zoning: CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-2.5 H-75

#### **Montgomery Hills Car Wash**

Existing Zoning: CRT-2.25 C-1.5 R-0.75 H-45

Proposed Zoning: CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-2.5 H-75

This site is comprised of four lots under varying ownership. The Seminary Place Shopping Center, which comprises two of the four lots, is a major activity center within the Plan area. The Shell Gas Station and the Montgomery Hills Car Wash make up the other two lots. All four properties are being recommended for the same zoning to encourage joint redevelopment. The zoning allows the site to be completely reconstructed with any mix of commercial and residential FAR, up to the total density allowed in the zone, thus providing ultimate flexibility.

**Committee Recommendation: Support the Sector Plan recommended zoning for these properties. However, Councilmember Friedson suggested adding language to the Plan regarding the importance of retaining small business/community-serving retail that would apply to all commercial properties in the Plan. To address this, the Committee recommends the Plan include language that encourages optional method development that provides Small Business Opportunities as a public benefit for any redevelopment of commercial property within the Plan boundary.**

**Seminary Place Shopping Center - Zoning Map Portion of Site #5**

	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning
<b>Size (square feet)</b>		136,858	
<b>Size (acres)</b>		3.14	
<b>Zoning</b>	CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-0.5 H-45	CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-2.5 H-75	
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	42,503	205,287	342,145
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	0	68,429	342,145
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	42,503	205,287	342,145
<b>Single-Unit Detached DU's (7.26 DU)</b>	0	0	0
<b>Multi-Unit Square Footage</b>	0	68,429	342,145
<b>Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	0	55	274

**Shell Gas Station - Zoning Map Portion of Site #5**

	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning
<b>Size (square feet)</b>	19,211		
<b>Size (acres)</b>	0.44		
<b>Zoning</b>	CRT-2.25 C-1.5 R-0.75 H-45	CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-2.5 H-75	
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	1,838	43,225	48,028
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	0	14,408	48,028
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	1,838	28,817	48,028
<b>Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	0	12	38

**Car Wash - Zoning Map Portion of Site #5**

	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning
<b>Size (square feet)</b>		11,685	
<b>Size (acres)</b>		0.27	
<b>Zoning</b>	CRT-2.25 C-1.5 R-0.75 H-45	CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-2.5 H-75	
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	2,625	26,291	29,213
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	0	8,764	29,213
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	2,625	17,528	29,213
<b>Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	0	7	23

## Parks and Open Space

The Plan recommends the establishment of a civic green urban park of  $\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 acre with the redevelopment of the Seminary Place Shopping Center. It also suggests that a memorial would be appropriate for the historic resources cited in the historic preservation section of the Plan (page 76). The Plan suggests ownership of the park facility be considered at the time of redevelopment.

For properties larger than 10,000 square feet, the CRT zone requires that 10 percent of the site be provided as open space. A one-acre park requirement would comprise approximately 26 percent of the shopping center site (if all four properties redevelop together). A  $\frac{1}{2}$ -acre park would occupy about 13 percent of the combined site.

**Committee Recommendation: Modify the civic green urban park site recommendation to “no less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  acre”.**

## 2. Montgomery Hills Shopping Center

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Text in Sector Plan: page 77

Existing Zoning: CRT-2.25 C-1.5 R-0.75 H-45

Proposed Zoning: CRT-2.25 C-1.5 R-0.75 H-45

Constructed 90 years ago, the Montgomery Hills Shopping Center is the oldest commercial assemblage in the Plan area. The Plan recommends reconfirmation of the existing zoning for this site. The Plan also provides a history of historic designation efforts related to the Shopping Center.

Several residents testified in support of redevelopment of this site. A few individuals testified in opposition to possible historic designation efforts, believing such designation would only further suppress interest in redevelopment. The Plan recommends future evaluation of designation; it does not recommend designation at this time.

This site is one of the few places not recommended for rezoning in the Plan. Other commercial properties in the Plan area received slight increases in density but, more useful, they also received zoning that allowed for ultimate flexibility in redevelopment, meaning the maximum commercial and residential FARs have been set equal to the total FAR (or density).

**Committee Recommendation: Change the zoning recommendation for properties that make up the Montgomery Hills Shopping Center from CRT-2.25 C-1.5 R-0.75 H-45 to CRT-2.25 C-2.25 R-2.25 H-60.**

Montgomery Hills Shopping Center - Zoning Map Site #4				
	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning	Proposed Alternative Zoning
<b>Size (square feet)</b>			43,084	
<b>Size (acres)</b>			0.99	
<b>Zoning</b>	CRT-2.25 C-1.5 R-0.75 H-45		CRT-2.25 C-1.5 R-0.75 H-45	CRT 2.25 C-2.25 R-2.25 H-60
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	26,866	96,939	96,939	96,939
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	0	32,313	32,313	96,939
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	26,866	64,626	64,626	96,939
<b>Multi-Unit Square Footage</b>	0	32,313	32,313	96,939
<b>Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	0	26	26	78

### 3. Sniders Super Foods, Silver Spring Volunteer Fire Station, and Parking Lot #12

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Text in Sector Plan: pages 78-79

#### a. Sniders Super Foods

Existing Zoning: CRT-0.75 C-0.75 R-0.25 H-45

Proposed Zoning: CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-1.5 H-60

The Plan recommends an increase in density for these properties to incentivize redevelopment and implement the Main Street grid detailed in the transportation section of the Plan.

The Council received testimony from the owner of Sniders Super Foods, requesting additional density and height equal to CRT-2.25 C-2.25, R-2.25, H-75. The owner explained the possible challenges of redeveloping this property, including proximity to the Fire Station and a significant WMATA easement running along the eastern edge of the site. Additional density and height would allow more options for siting new development.

That said, a common refrain when discussing this sector plan with almost anyone is “Whatever you do, don’t get rid of Sniders!”. Unfortunately, the Sector Plan cannot require a business to remain in

operation. It can, though, include language that recognizes the significant public benefit provided by this family-run store, should an application for redevelopment materialize.

**Committee Recommendation:** Support changing the zoning recommended for Sniders Super Foods to CRT-2.25 C-2.25 R-2.25 H-60. After a lengthy discussion regarding potentially increasing the height from 60 feet to 75 feet, the Committee agreed to retain the Sector Plan proposed height of 60 feet. The Committee agreed that language regarding the significant public benefit to the community of retaining a local grocery store at this site be added to the Plan.

Sniders Grocery - Zoning Map Portion of Site #2				
	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning	Proposed Alternative Zoning
<b>Size (square feet)</b>		39,846		
<b>Size (acres)</b>		0.91		
<b>Zoning</b>	CRT-0.75 C-0.75 R-0.25 H-45		CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-1.5 H-60	CRT 2.25 C-2.25 R-2.25 H-60
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	12,000	29,885	59,769	89,654
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	0	9,962	59,769	89,654
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	12,000	29,885	59,769	89,654
<b>Multi-Unit Square Footage</b>	0	9,962	59,769	89,654
<b>Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	0	8	48	72

#### b. Silver Spring Volunteer Fire Station

Existing Zoning: R-60

Proposed Zoning: CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-1.5 H-60

The Plan recommends rezoning the Fire Station from R-60 to the CRT zone. The Fire Station does not currently envision moving from this site or redeveloping their property. Should that change over the life of the Plan, the recommended zoning seems an appropriate transition to the abutting and confronting single-family homes.

**Committee Recommendation:** Support the Sector Plan recommended zoning for this property.

Fire Station -Zoning Map Portion of Site #2			
	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning
<b>Size (square feet)</b>	27,203		
<b>Size (acres)</b>	0.62		
<b>Zoning</b>	R-60 (7.26 DU per Acre)		CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-1.5 H-60
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	6,200	12,695	40,805
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	0	12,695	40,805
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	6,200	0	40,805
<b>Single-Unit Detached DU's (7.26 DU)</b>	0	5	0
<b>Multi-Unit Square Footage</b>	0	0	40,805
<b>Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	0	0	33

#### Parks and Open Space

Under redevelopment, the Plan recommends a ¼-acre pocket green urban park for the Sniders Super Foods and Fire Station properties. If redeveloped together, a ¼ acre park would be about 16 percent of the combined site – a requirement that is more than 50 percent above the open space requirement for the zone.

**Committee Recommendation:** Eliminate the ¼-acre park recommendation given the limited size and physical constraints of these properties.

c. **Parking Lot #12**

Existing Zoning: R-60

Proposed Zoning: CRT-1.0 C-1.0 R-1.0 H-60

The Plan recommends changing the zoning on Parking Lot #12 to accommodate potential redevelopment with open green space. In a memo to the Committee dated December 2, 2019 (see © 1), Councilmember Jawando proposed increasing the density on this public property to CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R 1.5 H-60. This change would increase the potential number of multi-family units from 24 to 35 for this site. Councilmember Jawando's memo also requests that the Plan recommend 30 percent of the units be provided as regulated affordable units: 15 percent affordable to households earning at the standard Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) level of 65 percent or less of Area Median Income (AMI) and 15 percent affordable to households earning less than 50 percent of AMI.

**Committee Recommendation:** Support Councilmember Jawando's alternative zoning recommendation and other related affordable housing requirements for this site.

PLD Parking Lot 12 - Zoning Map Site #1				
	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning	Proposed Alternative Zoning
Size (square feet)			29,438	
Size (acres)			0.68	
Zoning	R-60 (7.26 DU per Acre)		CRT-1.0 C-1.0 R-1.0 H-60	CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-1.5 H-60
Gross Floor Area	0	13,738	29,438	44,157
Residential Square Footage	0	13,738	29,438	44,157
Commercial Square Footage	0	0	29,438	44,157
Single-Unit Detached DU's (7.26 DU)	0	5	0	0
Multi-Unit Square Footage	0	0	29,438	44,157
Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf	0	0	24	35

## Parks and Open Space

If this property is developed, the Plan recommends an urban recreational parklet of no less than 1/10-acre in size. For this small parking lot, a 1/10-acre parklet would comprise about 15 percent of the site.

**Committee Recommendation:** Given the proximity of Parking Lot #12 to the 16<sup>th</sup> Street SHA right-of-way, where an urban gateway recreational park is being recommended, and the Committee's desire to maximize affordable housing opportunities on all publicly-owned properties in the Plan area, the Committee recommends removing the park recommendation for this site.

## 4. Georgia Avenue East

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Text in Sector Plan: page 78

### 9517 Georgia Avenue

Existing Zoning: CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-0.5 H-45

Proposed Zoning: CRT-2.25 C-2.25 R-0.5<sup>7</sup> H-45

**9439 Georgia Avenue**

Existing Zoning: CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-0.5 H-45

Proposed Zoning: CRT-2.75 C-2.75 R-0.5 H-45

**9431 Georgia Avenue**

Existing Zoning: CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-0.5 H-45

Proposed Zoning: CRT-2.25 C-2.25 R-0.5 H-45

**9427 Georgia Avenue**

Existing Zoning: CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-0.5 H-45

Proposed Zoning: CRT-1.75 C-1.75 R-0.5 H-45

**9421 Georgia Avenue**

Existing Zoning: CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-0.5 H-45

Proposed Zoning: CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-0.5 H-45

The four commercial blocks between Flora Lane and Columbia Blvd along the east side of Georgia Ave include a mix of gas stations, restaurants, and retail establishments. The development pattern consists of one- to three-story buildings on lots of varying widths and shallow depths.

The properties listed above are recommended for zoning that conforms to existing development. These properties are currently legal, non-conforming structures that were most likely built before C-2 zoning (and thus the translated current zoning) was applied to the property.

For properties within these blocks not noted above by address, the Plan recommends reconfirming the existing zoning of CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-0.5 H-45. This creates a variety of densities along the same block for buildings attached to one another.

**Committee Recommendation:** Zone properties within the same block consistently and increase the residential FAR to equal the total FAR, for flexibility in redevelopment. This would result in 9517, 9513 and 9501 Georgia Avenue being rezoned to CRT-2.25 C-2.25 R-2.25 H-45 and 9475, 9443, 9441, 9439<sup>8</sup>, 9431, 9427, 9423, and 9421 Georgia Avenue being rezoned to CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-2.5 H 45.

**There is no recommended change in zoning for Parking Lot #48; however, Chair Riemer suggested language be added to the Plan emphasizing the important parking resource being provided to the small businesses in this location by Parking Lot #48. The Committee agreed.**

---

<sup>7</sup> For this property, the recommended zoning on the map on page 69 is CRT-2.25 C-2.25 R-2.25 H-45; however, under the zoning recommendations on page 78, the recommended zoning is CRT-2.25 C-2.25 R-0.5 H-45. Staff believes that the R-2.25 on the map is noted in error.

<sup>8</sup> 9439 Georgia Ave is proposed for CRT 2.75 C-2.75 R-0.5 H-45 to accommodate the existing building currently constructed at 2.51 FAR. Staff believes FAR of 2.5 is an appropriate approximation of the existing development, which is currently legal, non-conforming.

**9517 Georgia - Zoning Map Site #7a**

	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning	Proposed Alternative Zoning
<b>Size (square feet)</b>			10,726	
<b>Size (acres)</b>			0.25	
<b>Zoning</b>	CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-0.5 H-45	CRT-2.25 C-2.25 R-0.5 H-45	CRT-2.25 C-2.25 R-2.25 H-45	
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	22,990	16,089	24,134	24,134
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	0	5,363	5,363	24,134
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	22,990	16,089	24,134	24,134
<b>Multi-Unit Square Footage</b>	0	5,363	5,363	24,134
<b>Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	0	4	4	19

**9439 Georgia - Zoning Map Site #7b**

	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning	Proposed Alternative Zoning
<b>Size (square feet)</b>			2,978	
<b>Size (acres)</b>			0.07	
<b>Zoning</b>	CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-0.5 H-45	CRT-2.75 C-2.75 R-0.5 H-45	CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-2.5 H-45	
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	7,500	4,467	8,190	7,445
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	0	1,489	1,489	7,445
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	7,500	4,467	8,190	7,445
<b>Multi-Unit Square Footage</b>	0	1,489	1,489	7,445
<b>Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	0	1	1	6

**9431 Georgia - Zoning Map Site #7c**

	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning	Proposed Alternative Zoning
<b>Size (square feet)</b>		2,489		
<b>Size (acres)</b>		0.06		
<b>Zoning</b>	CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-0.5 H-45	CRT-2.25 C-2.25 R-0.5 H-45	CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-2.5 H-45	
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	5,000	3,734	5,600	6,223
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	0	1,245	1,245	6,223
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	5000	3734	5,600	6,223
<b>Multi-Unit Square Footage</b>	0	1,245	1,245	6,223
<b>Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	0	1	1	5

**9427 Georgia - Zoning Map Site #7d**

	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning	Proposed Alternative Zoning
<b>Size (square feet)</b>		2,859		
<b>Size (acres)</b>		0.07		
<b>Zoning</b>	CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-0.5 H-45	CRT-1.75 C-1.75 R-0.5 H-45	CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-2.5 H-45	
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	5,000	4,289	5,003	7,148
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	0	1,430	1,430	7,148
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	5,000	4289	5,003	7,148
<b>Multi-Unit Square Footage</b>	0	1,430	1,430	7,148
<b>Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	0	1	1	6

**9421 Georgia - Zoning Map Site #7e**

	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning	Proposed Alternative Zoning
<b>Size (square feet)</b>		3,038		
<b>Size (acres)</b>		0.07		
<b>Zoning</b>	CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-0.5 H-45	CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-0.5 H-45	CRT-2.5 C-2.5 R-2.5 H-45	
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	4,736	4,557	7,595	7,595
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	0	1,519	1,519	7,595
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	4,736	4557	7,595	7,595
<b>Multi-Unit Square Footage</b>	0	1,519	1,519	7,595
<b>Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	0	1	1	6

There are three more retail areas<sup>9</sup> within Montgomery Hills, south of Columbia Blvd, that are not mentioned for rezoning in the Plan. The current zoning for these properties is CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-0.5 H-45 (see map below).



**Committee Recommendation: Change the reconfirmation of CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-0.5 H-45 to CRT 1.5 C-1.5 R-1.5 H-45 to provide flexibility for redevelopment.**

### **III. Woodside District**

Woodside is the southernmost community within the Plan. It lies from the edge of Montgomery Hills at the northern end to Spring Street at the south. The district has an established low-density residential character but is also home to several religious and community facilities.

#### **1. Georgia Avenue at Luzerne Avenue and Cedar View Court**

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Text in Sector Plan: page 80

Existing Zoning: R-60

Proposed Zoning: CRN-1.25 C-0.0 R-1.25 H-50

The Plan recommends rezoning five lots located at the intersection of Georgia Avenue with Luzerne Avenue and Cedar View Court to encourage potential assemblage for the construction of missing middle-type housing.

---

<sup>9</sup> The three areas are south of Columbia Blvd on both the west and east side of Georgia Ave and contain several contiguous properties, all zoned CRT-1.5 C-1.5 R-0.5 H-45.

Parking Lot @ Luzerne/Vacant Lot - Zoning Map Site #2 (CRN Zoning)

	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning
<b>Size (square feet)</b>	54,406		
<b>Size (acres)</b>	1.25		
<b>Zoning</b>	R-60 (7.26 DU per Acre)		CRN 1.25 C-0.0 R 1.25 H-50
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	0	25,389	68,008
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	0	25,389	68,008
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	0	0	0
<b>Single-Unit Detached DU's (7.26 DU)</b>	0	9	0
<b>Missing Middle (approx lot size)</b>	0	0	3,000
<b>MM @ 18 units/acre</b>	0	0	22

## Parks and Open Space

In conjunction with the development of missing middle-type housing, the Plan recommends a pocket green urban park of  $\frac{1}{4}$ -acre in size.

**Committee Recommendation:** Support the Sector Plan recommendations with respect to zoning and parks for these properties.

### 2. Right-of-Way at 16<sup>th</sup> Street and Georgia Avenue

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Text in Sector Plan: page 81

Existing Zoning: R-60

Proposed Zoning: R-60

The approximately 3-acre wooded site is situated between 16<sup>th</sup> Street and Georgia Avenue and is the right-of-way owned by the Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA). The Plan recommends reconfirming the property's R-60 zoning to accommodate future development as a park or some other compatible public use that incorporates usable open space. The Plan's ideal future use of the site would be as an urban recreational park, providing a distinctive gateway to the community that could include a recreational field, public garden, playground, pavilion, and/or bike share facility. Should the site remain under SHA ownership, the Plan recommends that SHA collaborate with Montgomery Parks to ensure that any portion available after the realignment of 16<sup>th</sup> Street be accessible and useful as public open space, to the maximum extent possible.

During the tour of the Plan area and the first worksession, Committee members expressed their desire to evaluate the maximum potential for residential development within the Plan area, including any publicly-owned property. In a memo to the Committee dated December 2, 2019 (see © 1), Councilmember Jawando proposed increasing the residential density on this public property to 1.5 FAR.

Below is a table showing the current zoning for the property, the zoning proposed in the Planning Board Draft, Councilmember Jawando's proposed zoning recommendation, and the number of potential dwelling units under each.

SHA Right-Of-Way - Not numbered on zoning map				
	Existing on the Ground Today	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under PB Draft Zoning - no change	Proposed Alternative Zoning
<b>Size (square feet)</b>	130,680			
<b>Size (acres)</b>	3.00			
<b>Zoning</b>	R-60 (7.26 DU per Acre)		R-60	CRT-1.5 C-0.25 R-1.5 H-60
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	0	60,984	60,984	196,020
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	0	60,984	60,984	196,020
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	0	0	0	32,670
<b>Single-Unit Detached DU's (7.26 DU)</b>	0	22	22	0
<b>Multi-Unit Square Footage</b>	0	0	0	196,020
<b>Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	0	0	0	157

This property generated a lengthy discussion regarding the Planning Board's proposal for an urban gateway recreational park in this location versus the potential to create more affordable housing. Councilmember Jawando's proposed zoning would allow for the construction of more than 150 multi-family units; however, Councilmember Friedson argued for the importance of providing more ballfields in urban areas, especially in the eastern part of the County, supporting the Planning Board's recommendation.

**Committee Recommendation:** Ultimately, the Committee agreed to the Planning Board's recommendation for an urban gateway recreational park containing an athletic field at this site; however, the Committee also agreed that the Council should be aware of the discussion. In addition, given the current state of the SHA ROW as a place where those who are homeless find refuge, Chair Riemer suggested the Plan should include language that recognizes the need for permanent supportive housing for the homeless.

### 3. Silver Spring Health and Human Services (HHS)

Map in Sector Plan: page 69

Text in Sector Plan: page 82

Existing Zoning: R-60

Proposed Zoning: CRN-1.0 C-0.5<sup>10</sup> R-1.0 H-60

The Plan recommends rezoning the 2.6-acre facility from R-60 to the CRN zone to provide flexibility for future development of medium-density housing or to continue as a public facility.

Like the other publicly-owned properties, the Committee's interest in maximizing the provision of housing where possible is relevant to the zoning for this site. Councilmember Jawando's memo recommends a residential FAR of 1.5 for this site. Below is a table showing the current zoning for the property, the zoning proposed in the Planning Board Draft, Councilmember Jawando's proposed zoning, and the number of potential dwelling units under each.

<sup>10</sup> For this property, the recommended zoning on the map on page 69 is CRN 1.0 C-0.5 R-1.0 H-60; however, under the zoning recommendations on page 82 the recommended zoning is CRN-1.0 C-0.0 R-1.0 H-60. Staff believes the C-0.0 on page 82 is a typo.

**SS Health and Human Services (DGS) - Zoning Map Site #1 (CRN Zoning)**

	Existing	Allowable under Current Zoning	Allowable under Proposed Zoning	Proposed Alternative Zoning
<b>Size (square feet)</b>			114,386	
<b>Size (acres)</b>			2.63	
<b>Zoning</b>	R-60 (7.26 DU per Acre)		CRN 1.0 C-0.5 R-1.0 H-45	CRN-1.5 C-0.5 R-1.5 H-45
<b>Gross Floor Area</b>	42,680	53,380	114,386	171,579
<b>Residential Square Footage</b>	0	53,380	114,386	171,579
<b>Commercial Square Footage</b>	42,680	0	57,193	57,193
<b>Single-Unit Detached DU's (7.26 DU)</b>	0	19	0	0
<b>Multi-Unit Square Footage</b>	0	0	114,386	171,579
<b>Multi-Unit @ 1250 sf</b>	0	0	92	137

Councilmember Jawando's memo also requests that the Plan recommend 30 percent of the units be provided as regulated affordable units: 15 percent affordable to households earning at the standard Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) level of 65 percent or less of Area Median Income (AMI) and 15 percent affordable to households earning less than 50 percent of AMI.

**Committee Recommendation:** The Committee tentatively agreed to Councilmember Jawando's proposal; however, they discussed further increasing the density on this site. The Committee requested that Planning Staff evaluate the implications of increasing the zoning to CRT-2.0 C-0.5 R-2.0 H-75 and be prepared with this information at the Council worksession.

**This report contains:**

Memo from Councilmember Jawando dated December 2, 2019  
Correspondence submitted to the County Council

**Pages**

© 1-3  
© 4-39



**MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL  
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND**

WILL JAWANDO  
COUNCILMEMBER  
AT-LARGE

To: Councilmember Hans Riemer, Chair  
Councilmember Andrew Friedson  
PHED Committee Staff  
From: Councilmember Will Jawando  
Date: December 2, 2019  
Re: Increasing density and affordable housing for the Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan

The lack of affordable housing in Montgomery County is a crisis for many residents, with 74 percent of renters earning less than 100 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI), and the demand for affordable housing outpacing supply. This places land-use and planning at the heart of our county's equity issues and creates pressure on our ability to house many parts of our workforce. I believe it is imperative that the County Council take every opportunity to encourage higher-density housing near mass transit and make more of those units affordable through the county's Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) program.

Our review of the Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan offers us an early opportunity to make one change, for county-owned properties, that could address both density and affordability. First, I propose increasing the residential Floor Area Ratio (FAR) on publicly-owned properties in the plan, including the Dennis Avenue Health Center, the Silver Spring HHS Center, Parking Lot No. 12, and the parcel at the 16th Street and Georgia Avenue intersection currently owned by the State Highway Administration. Increasing FAR to this higher level would increase the number of potential units on these properties. For instance, current zoning for the Dennis Avenue Health Center permits construction of 49 units, and the Planning Board's draft zoning proposal would permit 118. Increasing the FAR to 1.5 would permit the construction of 295 units.

Secondly, to deal with affordability, I encourage my committee members to join me in adding language to the Forest Glen Montgomery Hills Plan that emphasizes our efforts to provide affordable housing on these sites, and in particular, units for households that earn below 50 percent AMI. Specifically, adding language to the Plan to recommend that on these public sites, 30% of the units would be MPDU's, with half of these units at the standard MPDU level of 65% below AMI, and half of the units be for residents at 50% of AMI or below.

This is one plan of many that will be reviewed by the Council and the Planning Board. By establishing the use of public property as a vehicle for driving an increase in the availability of housing for low and very-low income households, we can make a case for including housing for low and very-low income households for all new residential projects. Recently, we affirmed the goals outlined by the Council of

Governments as it relates to our housing shortage. While we need all kinds of housing to meet this goal, it is imperative that we create opportunities that prioritizes affordable housing in planning.

The lack of affordable housing in Montgomery County is a symptom of growing income inequality. There are areas of our county where there are simply no affordable housing units at all, in part because of the ways that zoning rules have been used to zero out new housing development, particularly housing for middle- and working-class families. Maximizing the use of publicly owned land to produce more affordable housing, particularly in areas near transit and commercial and retail, would serve to add considerable numbers of affordable housing units to the market.

<b>Property</b>	<b>Existing Development</b>		<b>Allowable under Existing Zoning</b>	<b>Allowable under PB Draft Zoning</b>	<b>Allowable under Council Staff Zoning</b>	<b>Proposed Alternative Density</b>
Dennis Avenue Health Center (site 295,554 sf)	74,758 0	Commercial FAR Residential FAR	R-60 (7.26 units/acre) 0 137,824	CRT-1.25 C-1.25 R-0.5 H-75 369,443 147,777	CRT-1.25 C-1.25 R-1.25 H-75 369,443 294,685	CRT 1.5 C-1.5 R-1.5 H-75 443,331 368,573
	0	Residential Units	49	118	236	295
Parking Lot #12 (site 29,438 sf)	0 0	Commercial FAR Residential FAR	R-60 (7.26 units/acre) 0 13,823	CRT-1.0 C-1.0 R-1.0 H-60 29,438 29,438	CRT-1.0 C-1.0 R-1.0 H-60 29,438 29,438	CRT-1.5 C1.5 R-1.5 H-60 44,157 44,157
		Residential Units	5	24	24	35
SHA 16th and Georgia Avenue (site 130,680 sf)	0 0	Commercial FAR Residential FAR	R-60 (7.26 units/acre) 0 60,984	R-60 (7.26 units/acre) 0 60,984	CRT-1.0 C-0.25 R-1.0 H-60 130,680 130,680	CRT 1.25 C-1.25 R-1.25 H-60 163,350 196,020
		Residential Units	22	22	105	157
Silver Spring HHS Center (site 114,386 sf)	42,680 0	Commercial FAR Residential FAR	R-60 (7.26 units/acre) 0 53,463	CRN-1.0 C-0.5 R-1.0 H-45 57,193 114,386	CRN-1.0 C-0.5 R-1.0 H-45 57,193 114,386	CRN-1.5 C-1.5 R-1.5 H-45 171,579 171,579
	0	Residential Units	19	92	92	137



11-29-19

Dear Council Member Hucker,

It has come to our attention that Montgomery County plans to open Woodland Drive through Medical Park Drive and continue to Dennis Avenue (in Silver Spring). As a parent of children who currently attend St. John the Evangelist School on Woodland Drive and a resident of the Forest Estates neighborhood, I am wholeheartedly against this cut through.

This expansion would create a through street between Saint John the Evangelist Parish and School. The school, which serves approximately 200 students per year, has been in its location on Woodland Avenue for almost 70 years. Students and/or parishioners cross the street regularly during the school day for activities and events. Their playground is located directly adjacent to the street. The drop-off and pick-up procedures, which take approximately 10 minutes, aim to reduce traffic and, most importantly, keep students safe. The proposed expansion would increase traffic in front of the school. The children's safety would be compromised if the street is opened and the cut through would essentially cleave our parish campus in two halves with the church on one side of the busy street and the school on the other.

Respectfully, Kate and Phil Droege

Dear Councilmembers,

9-27-19

I'm writing to you today to express my support of the Forest Glen Sector Plan. I'm so excited to see changes at this metro stop, and eagerly await the positive outcomes.

I have lived with my family in the neighborhood of Forest Estates since August, 2000 (19 years!). We first rented a townhouse and now we own a single-family home. We moved to the area and settled on this neighborhood because of its proximity to Metro and to Sligo Creek Trail; its parks (we especially liked getting to choose between two playgrounds at Getty Park and Forest Grove park when our son was young) and to the beltway. Between the members of our family, we run/bike/walk along Sligo Creek Trail, walk to the school bus stop, walk to Metro, or drive to work on the beltway every day. We love the plethora of Little Libraries in the neighborhood, the farmer's market, and the various activities organized by the Forest Estates Community Association. We plan to grow old here--hopefully still walking to Metro to get downtown, and also hopefully having some amenities around that Metro stop, as well.

I am impressed with this plan for many reasons, including some personal (I can't wait to use the Metro entrance on the east side of Georgia Ave. and maybe stop at a convenience store, other retail, or a coffee shop!) and some more broad, including its climate-friendly, pollution-prevention, transit-oriented features. I was delighted to see the green spaces, trees, and roofs in the plan.

I take metro to work every day, walking through the neighborhood and crossing Georgia at the infamous light (hopefully someday using a tunnel!). My family and I often walk across the bridge (which itself was a wonderful addition to the neighborhood since we've been here) and shop at Snider's or grab a bagel at Goldberg's on the weekend, and it's amazing to imagine what the plan could offer to increased pedestrian safety, aesthetics, and even protected bike lanes--as it is now, I'd never ride my bike along Georgia, unfortunately.

The other day, we walked from our house to the Montgomery Hills Fest and received several comments when we ran into neighbors at the event that they'd seen us walking and were incredulous. Wouldn't it be nice to live in a neighborhood where walking was the norm, because the streets were built with pedestrians in mind!

Because of my job (I'm a curator at the National Building Museum in DC) I have read a lot about various built environment and sustainability issues, including the desperate need for more affordable housing to help curb the eviction crisis and promote housing stability--affordable housing in abundance is good for everyone, including tenants, neighbors, tax payers, and the greater community.

For an upcoming project at work, I've been reading about the protests against the Forest Glen metro station in the early 70s, which sound eerily similar to what we're hearing now. A lot of the animosity toward Metro coming to Forest Glen had to do with preserving the "character" of the neighborhood, not wanting traffic, etc. (not unlike the protests against metro in pretty

much every neighborhood Metro went to). It is frustrating to see how similar the arguments are, decades later, given all we've learned about the benefits of density near public transit, environmental benefits, walkable retail, economic & racial diversity in neighborhoods, etc.

The argument that Forest Glen was "never meant" to carry more people, or to be mixed-use (which I heard at our local farmer's market table earlier this summer) makes little sense to me, since the area was developed 50 years ago when MoCo was a different place. The folks protesting the coming of the metro with their "NO BUILD" slogan in 1971 couldn't have imagined the community we have today, and they didn't want the kind of change. They demanded that Metro have "no impact" on development in the suburbs. Luckily, we are not bound by their short-sightedness, but we can use the network and infrastructure they imagined and built 50 years ago to make a better county for us today.

Thank you for your consideration and I hope I can count on your support for the Forest Glen Sector Plan.

All best,

Sarah Leavitt

(1602 Sanford Rd./Silver Spring, MD 20902)

11-26-19

Dear Montgomery County Council Members,

I am writing you to protest the plan to open Woodland Drive in order to allow traffic from Georgia Avenue to have more access to Medical Park Drive with the thought that it will ease some of the flow on Georgia. That span is not even a mile long and you are considering making it a mini-Georgia Avenue speedway to a road that already has two openings on it.

I am sure many of you are parents with children and should be able to see how ludicrous such a plan would be if implemented. In the past, a school location was protected from such a death trap for children, where is that consideration now!

As a former principal, I can only imagine the fears the parents of this school, who are Montgomery County tax payers, will experience if this is put in to action.

In the name of our children, please reconsider this preposterous idea.  
Sincerely,

Sister Anne Mary Smith, IHM  
St. John the Evangelist Parishioner and  
Graduate of St. John the Evangelist School

*Peter A. Frandsen  
9900 Georgia Avenue #302  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20902-5242*

November 15, 2019

Montgomery County Council  
Council Office Building  
100 Maryland Avenue  
Rockville, Maryland 20850-2322

Re: Forest Glen Sector Plan  
November 12 hearing

Dear Sirs,

This letter is a supplement to my letter to the County Council dated November 5, 2019, and to my testimony before the Council on the evening of November 12. I am opposed to heavy development because of the additional ensuing traffic congestion in the immediate area of the intersection of state roads Georgia Avenue and Forest Glen Road.,

It is apparent from the witnesses who testified Tuesday night that the farther one lives from the center of the proposed massive development, the more one is okay with, or even heartedly endorses heavy development at the intersection. Most of the supporters who testified live in the Forest Estates community which is east of Georgia Avenue. Those who live closest to undisputedly dubbed "ground zero" in the testimony, were naturally more opposed to two 12 story buildings and increased congestion next to their homes and apartments.

Americana Finnmark Condominium, at the northwest quadrant, is at ground zero and will suffer most with the attendant consequences of major development. However, it was highly instructive to note the once possible development, especially the opening of Woodland Drive was proposed nearer to those residents in favor of development, there were howls of protest from the same neighborhood about cut-through traffic and danger to life and limb should such a terrible thing as extending a residential road one additional block. However, it is acceptable for them to have ground zero developed - at someone else's expense.

In a nod to the supposed effort to increase greenspace in the neighborhood, the County could purchase the existing two-story medical building lot and convert it and the vacant lot next to it into a park. Otherwise, proposed development will only reduce the greenspace. Americana Finnmark is one of the larger greenspaces in that area, but other than free saplings, it receives no help from the County to maintain that greenspace. Finnmark has already lost property and greenery due to the earlier widening of southbound Georgia Avenue. It should not lose more.

There is little space now for all the parked cars and the moving cars in the area. There is no space for additional traffic.

Forest Glen metro station was designed and approved and built from the very start as a unique residential station. It should stay that way.

Very truly yours,

/s/

Peter A. Frandsen

Email to: [county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:county.council@montgomerycountymd.gov)

11-15-19

Council Members:

It is my understanding that the proposed re-zoning of the Forest Glen Metro Station parking lot would allow for the construction of one-bedroom luxury apartments in a mixed-use (residential/commercial) building with a height up to 120 feet.

I feel that it would reflect the character of the existing Forest Glen community to develop the Forest Glen Metro Station parking lot with mixed-use buildings of heights no greater than 75 feet with living units ranging in size from that of studio apartment to three-bedroom apartment, townhome, or condominium. This would attract a *mixture of residents* including seniors, singles and families.

I implore the Council to limit the height of the buildings on the Forest Glen Metro Station parking lot to heights no greater than 75 feet rather than re-zoning that parking lot to allow for building heights of up to 120 feet.

Thank you,  
Wanda West  
Americana Finnmark Resident/Owner  
Silver Spring, MD.  
202 230 7232

**PH 11-12-19**  
**Forest Glen/Mont Hills SP**  
cc

PD  
CC

## SNIDER'S SUPER FOODS

1936 Seminary Road  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

NOV 12 2019

RECEIVED  
MONTGOMERY COUNTY  
PLANNING BOARD

November 12, 2019

By E-mail and Hand Delivery

Ms. Nancy Navarro, President,  
and County Councilmembers  
Montgomery County Council  
Stella B. Werner Council Office Building  
100 Maryland Avenue  
Rockville, MD 20850

Re: Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan  
Snider's Super Foods  
1936 Seminary Road  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Dear Ms. Navarro and Councilmembers:

In September, the Planning Board Staff transmitted the Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan (the "Plan"). In this regard, I am writing to request your consideration of a zoning change relating to Snider's Super Foods, located at 1936 Seminary Road, Silver Spring, Maryland. Please note that I am not a zoning lawyer, and I write to you as an owner of the land on which Snider's operates.

My family has operated Snider's Super Foods at the corner of Georgia Avenue and Seminary Road since 1946. Through 1960, we operated a store located in the Montgomery Hills Shopping Center. See enclosed Exhibit 1. In 1960, we purchased the land and built the building where Snider's currently operates and have continuously operated at that location for almost 60 years. During that time, we have witnessed significant land use changes and development in downtown Silver Spring but fewer changes in Montgomery Hills and Forest Glen, notwithstanding their proximity to the Beltway, Forest Glen Metro and lovely residential neighborhoods. Therefore, we are excited by the Plan and hope it will enable our submarket to develop in a responsible manner and thrive for years to come.

Our locally-owned business faces competition from many quarters, including Safeway stores in downtown Silver Spring, Wheaton and Kensington; Whole Foods in downtown Silver Spring; Giant stores in Silver Spring and Wheaton; Amazon and other home delivery services; and Aldi's, which has now moved into the Seminary Place Shopping Center across the street from Snider's. Finally, and most important relative to the impact on Snider's, was the opening of Costco in Wheaton. Costco has provided access to very low prices, which we applaud, but the \$6m provided to Westfield to build a garage at Wheaton Plaza plus the additional \$4m given to Westfield (which in turn was used to bring Costco, a company with \$100 billion in gross revenue in 2011, the year of the grant) had a significant negative impact on Snider's and other local businesses.

(ft)

The Plan currently proposes a rezoning of the Snider's parcel from CRT-0.75, C-0.75, R-0.25, H-45 to CRT-1.5, C-1.5, R-1.5, H-60. See enclosed Exhibit 2, which illustrates the existing zoning and proposed zoning changes for Forest Glen and Montgomery Hills. The stated purpose of the Plan is to incentivize redevelopment and provide a through street. The Plan proposes a similar rezoning for Silver Spring Fire Station 19 (the "SS Fire Station" or "Station 19")—in the case of the SS Fire Station, from R-60 to CRT-1.5, C-1.5, R-1.5 and H-60. While we appreciate the proposed FAR increase for Snider's, given the competitive industry in which we operate and other reasons noted below, we request that the Council consider increasing the overall FAR for the Snider's parcel from the proposed CRT-1.5 to CRT-2.25. In this regard, I note:

1. The proposed change to CRT-2.25 would be consistent with the commercial properties adjacent to Snider's, namely, (a) to the north, Seminary Place Shopping Center (proposed for CRT-2.5), and (b) to the east, Montgomery Hills Shopping Center and Prestige Exceptional Fabricare (currently and with no proposed change, CRT-2.25). Moreover, this change would have no impact on the water tower parcel located west of Seminary Place Shopping Center, the SS Fire Station located immediately to the west of Snider's or Parking Lot 12 (which, according to the Plan, the Department of Transportation intends to preserve to accommodate future parking needs or as open space). Stated differently, assuming the Plan is adopted, the commercial properties adjacent to Snider's would be zoned CRT-2.25 or CRT-2.50. The other adjacent properties—a water tower, parking lot and fire station—would not be impacted adversely by the requested increase in FAR. Finally, although a handful of homes are located up Seminary Road from Snider's, the Snider's parcel does not abut any of the nearby residential neighborhoods and, therefore, should not adversely impact them. Enclosed as Exhibit 3 please find an aerial photo that shows the location of the Snider's parcel and surrounding properties.
2. Based upon discussions with officers of the SS Fire Station, it appears that Station 19 will operate at its present location for many years to come due to its proximity to Holy Cross Hospital and the high-rise buildings in downtown Silver Spring. The SS Fire Station is one of only a few fire houses that can accommodate a hook-and-ladder fire engine of the size currently located at Station 19. My understanding is that the SS Fire Station would need at least 3 acres to relocate and build a new fire station, and the land would need to be relatively close to its present location on Seminary Road. This would be difficult, if not impossible, without assembling land, which would probably take many years to accomplish. Over the years, Station 19 has been a wonderful neighbor. However, if any type of residential use is contemplated for the Snider's parcel, having an adjacent fire house is not ideal and the only way to "make the numbers work" will be to have greater density.
3. The Plan recommends construction of a vehicular connection between Seminary Place and Seminary Road, including "generous, tree-planted panels with ample sidewalks. . ." It also recommends a design that maximizes storm water management and "prioritize[s] passive and active building orientation and design techniques to maximize energy efficiency and energy conservation." These recommendations will increase development costs, thereby increasing the need for greater density to make a redevelopment financially viable.
4. The Seminary Place Shopping Center parcel, where the CRT will be increased to 2.5, is several times the size of the Snider's parcel. Development of Snider's less than one acre parcel will be more costly per square foot than a larger parcel, particularly when one considers the

recommended off-site improvements, e.g., vehicular connection, thereby reflecting a need for greater density.

5. WMATA has an easement near the eastern boundary of the Snider's parcel. The easement, which was granted in connection with the Metro extension from Silver Spring to Forest Glen, exists below grade with an upper-most elevation that is 156' from the surface. Construction over the easement is prohibited. In addition, on property adjacent to the easement--which is referred to by WMATA as its Zone of Influence and, in the case of Snider's, includes virtually the entire parcel--development is subject to review and approval by WMATA to ensure there are no negative impacts to WMATA's below grade structure. Enclosed as Exhibit 4 is the WMATA Zone of Influence applicable to the Snider's parcel. To obtain WMATA's approval, there will likely be additional requirements and costs relating to earth pressure, structural loading, shoring, dewatering and other construction techniques. Given these additional costs, greater density may be the only way to make a redevelopment feasible.

While I have discussed this request briefly with Melissa Williams of the Planning Board Staff, I became engaged in the Plan process too late for my request to formally be considered at the Planning Board Staff level. However, based upon my conversations with Ms. Williams, she believes that the Planning Board Staff will not object to the foregoing request.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,



Steven S. Snider

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Gabe Albornoz, Montgomery County Councilmember-At-Large  
Joy Nurmi, Chief of Staff, Joy.nurmi@montgomerycountymd.gov

Andrew Friedson, Montgomery County Councilmember-At-Large  
Cindy Gibson, Chief of Staff, Cindy.gibson@montgomerycountymd.gov

Mr. Evan Glass, Montgomery County Councilmember-At-Large  
Valeria Carranza, Chief of Staff, Valeria.carranza@montgomerycountymd.gov

Mr. Thomas Hucker, Montgomery County Councilmember-At-Large (District 5)  
David Kunes, Chief of Staff, David.kunes@montgomerycountymd.gov

Mr. Will Jawando, Montgomery County Councilmember-At-Large  
Cecily Thorne, Chief of Staff, Cecily.Thorne@montgomerycountymd.gov

(13)

**Mr. Sydney Katz, Council Vice President**  
**Lisa Mandel-Trupp, Chief of Staff, [lisa.mandel-trupp@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:lisa.mandel-trupp@montgomerycountymd.gov)**

**Nancy Navarro, Council President**  
**Ikhide Roland Ikheloa, Chief of Staff, [Roland.Ikheloa2@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:Roland.Ikheloa2@montgomerycountymd.gov)**

**Mr. Craig Rice, Montgomery County Councilmember-At-Large**  
**Sharon Ledner, Chief of Staff, [sharon.ledner@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:sharon.ledner@montgomerycountymd.gov)**

**Mr. Hans Riemer, Montgomery County Councilmember-At-Large**  
**Ken Silverman, Chief of Staff, [Ken.Silverman@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:Ken.Silverman@montgomerycountymd.gov)**


**Pamela.dunn@montgomeryplanning.org**

**Mark Pfefferle, [Mark.pfefferle@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Mark.pfefferle@montgomeryplanning.org)**


**Ms. Melissa Williams, [Melissa.williams@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Melissa.williams@montgomeryplanning.org)**

**EXHIBIT 1**

(b)




**EXHIBIT 2**




**EXHIBIT 3**

### Recommended Land Use




### Existing Zoning



**EXHIBIT 4**

**PLAT NO. 27**





**LerchEarlyBrewer**

7600 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 700 • Bethesda, MD 20814 • [lerchearly.com](http://lerchearly.com)

**Susan M. Reutershan**  
(301) 841-3830  
[smreutershan@lerchearly.com](mailto:smreutershan@lerchearly.com)

November 11, 2019

Via Electronic Mail

The Honorable Nancy Navarro, Council President  
Montgomery County Council  
Stella B. Werner Office Building  
100 Maryland Avenue  
Rockville, MD 20850

**Re:** Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan; (Planning Board Draft, September 2019)  
("Sector Plan") – Public Hearing: November 12, 2019

Dear President Navarro and Members of the Council:

This office represents the Medical Park Associates LLP, the owners ("Owners") of the Doctors Medical West Building (also known as the "Wolf Medical Center"), Doctors Medical Center East, and Doctors Medical Center (collectively, "Medical Center") located at the intersection of Georgia Avenue and Medical Park Drive in Silver Spring. The property on which the Medical Center is located consists of approximately 4.6 acres and is currently classified in the R-60 (Residential) Zone (the "Property"). The purpose of this letter is to present the Owners' comments on the recommendation for the Property in the Sector Plan.

The Medical Center consists of three office buildings and associated parking. The office buildings are: (1) Doctors Medical West, located at 10301 Georgia Avenue; (2) Doctors Medical East, located at 2101 Medical Park Drive; and (3) Doctors Medical Center, located at 2121 Medical Park Drive. The current use of the Property for medical offices is allowed by special exception under the existing R-60 Zone.

The existing land use in the area around the Medical Center consists of a mix of office, single-family, multi-family, institutional, and community uses. In addition to the Medical Center owned by our client, other medical office buildings and health care facilities, including the Burkland Medical Center, and the Montgomery County Dennis Avenue Health Center, are clustered in the block located on the east side of Georgia Avenue between Medical Park Drive and Dennis Avenue. Most of the property to the south, across Medical Park Drive, is surface parking for a church and its related facilities. Townhouses and other attached residential is to the east and southeast. The portion of Medical Park Drive along the southern boundary of the Property was originally dedicated as a part of this development.

The Sector Plan recommends that the Property be rezoned to the CRT Zone (Commercial/Residential Town) in the form: CRT-1.25, C-1.25, R-0.5, H-75, as part of the eventual comprehensive rezoning of the area encompassed by the Sector Plan. The Owners support this zoning recommendation. The CRT Zone would allow the Medical Center to continue to operate, now as a permitted use, and as part of a healthcare complex in conjunction with its neighboring uses, and thereby continue to serve its existing clientele and be available to the broader community. In addition, under the CRT Zone, the zoning will be more reflective of the actual use of the Property.

Planning for the future of the Property and the Medical Center over the life of the Sector Plan (approximately 15-20 years) requires a zoning recommendation that is flexible and can allow the Owners to maintain and upgrade the Medical Center and/or the uses on the Property to meet changing market needs. As a mixed-use zone, the CRT allows for a variety of uses. As such, the CRT Zone is appropriate in the vicinity of the Georgia Avenue/Medical Park Drive/Dennis Avenue area in order to not only take advantage of the public transportation options along heavily traveled Georgia Avenue (*i.e.* buses, Metro, planned BRT), but also to retain the compatible relationships between the existing medical uses and the single-family, attached residential, commercial, and other uses nearby. The CRT Zone provides the framework to ensure that the area retains the ability to serve the community with various uses and that the Owners will be able to respond in a timely fashion to changing times and the needs of the community in the future.

Please place this letter into the Record of the November 12, 2019 public hearing on the Sector Plan.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

LERCH, EARLY & BREWER, CHTD.



William Kominers



Susan M. Reutershan

cc: Ms. Roberta Bernstein  
Mr. Thomas Fauquier  
Ms. Pam Dunn  
Ms. Melissa Williams

**Montgomery County Council  
Council Office Building  
100 Maryland Avenue, 4th Floor  
Rockville, MD 20850**

**Re: Forest Glen Sector Plan Re-Zoning**

**Dear Madam or Sir:**

**11-11-19**

I have lived in the Americana Finnmark complex since 1978 when my parents had bought their condo in the mid-rise till 1992. I was 9 years old at the time, and I remember when there was no Metro and no townhouses nearby. It was a quiet neighborhood and an oasis from the hustle and bustle of downtown DC. In 1995, I moved to New York City, where I lived in 4 of the 5 boroughs until 2009. Afterwards, I returned to live in Americana Finnmark again while our economy slowly improved, and I have seen drastic changes over the years. I have also traveled to Los Angeles and driven on their freeway during rush hour and during their off-peak hours.

Based on my personal experience in New York City and Los Angeles, I believe the current plan to build a 12-story building near the Beltway and a 12-story medical building will not only create more congestion on the local roads, it will also cause the Beltway to be even more congested than it already is. Our traffic has been cited on the news to be even worse than the traffic in Los Angeles, and people will not use the Metro on a regular basis when they can use a car to get around much faster, especially with the high cost of riding Metro. Most people in this area use the Metro to go to work, not to run errands or go to a doctor. Even in New York City, people still drive cars, especially to get around in their own community.

A few years ago, when I stayed in the Los Angeles area at my friend's place in Pasadena, it took me 2 hours to drive to the heart of the city, double the time of off-peak hours. Most of the time, I wasn't even moving. I just sat in traffic. It was considered to be a normal commute for Los Angeles residents. This will be the new reality in the Washington, DC, area if we keep creating buildings near the Beltway. In addition, widening the roads will not work. The freeways in Los Angeles have at least 2 to 3 more lanes than our Beltway, and they are severely congested.

I strongly urge the City Council to take in consideration the mistakes and assumptions that other major cities such as Los Angeles and New York City have made and realize that people still prefer to use their cars, even when there's a subway as in New York City that transport its residents everywhere. I have seen the concrete jungle of Brooklyn, and it has caused people to flee to Staten Island and New Jersey to live in a more natural environment. I know because I lived my last 8 years in New York on Staten Island, and I was well aware of the flight to the suburbs.

If the City Council insists on constructing a building on the Forest Glen Metro parking lot, I strongly urge the Council ensure that there is enough parking space created to prevent cars trying to park in the neighborhood. In addition, I recommend the City Council reconsider the 12-story medical building across Americana Finnmark. It will exacerbate the traffic on Georgia Avenue to the Beltway that is already backed up to Wheaton Plaza. Please make sure to drive during our morning rush hour on Georgia Avenue to the Beltway to experience this daily nightmare.

I have noticed that the question of widening our roads comes up on the ballot box on a regular basis. If more buildings are created near the Beltway, the traffic problem will multiply in more ways than anybody could foresee, and then, it will be too late to go back.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Lisa Tuvalo

Hi there.

11-12-19

My name is Britt Gordon-McKeon, and my husband and I have owned a single-family home in Forest Glen for 5.5 years (part of the Forest Estates Community Association.) We are happily raising our daughter here with another baby on the way this fall, and plan to live in our current house and neighborhood for at least the next 20 years or so, until our children are grown. We love the neighborhood the way it is, especially the parks and the ability to walk to the Metro, but we are also very excited about the changes envisioned in the proposed sector plan for our family and neighborhood, including the possibility of increased retail, improved pedestrian and bike safety, and another entrance to the Metro station.

Even if we didn't believe these changes would benefit us, however, we would still support them. We believe that Montgomery County needs more housing in general and more affordable housing in particular, and we are strong supporters of transit-oriented development. There is no excuse or justification for having so little housing density near the Forest Glen Metro currently, and it is the right thing to do for the environment and for county residents of all incomes to increase the density here as much as possible. We would (and do!) support this kind of development near any other Metro stop in the county, and we are equally supportive of it at our own.

Please support the sector plan as written. It is the right thing to do, and many of us here in the neighborhood welcome these changes and strongly support them.

Thanks,  
Britt Gordon-McKeon  
(9902 Forest Grove Drive, Silver Spring)

November 11, 2019

Dear County Council:

I think the proposed Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan is a very positive step forward for walkability, bikeability, and driveability.

It was well thought out, and it will be very important in making our neighborhood and this important population corridor more liveable.

Currently, walking and biking in Montgomery Hills are very unsafe, and this plan will help address that, which will also help local businesses.

It will also improve property values and the quality of life throughout the Montgomery Hills area.

Please support the proposed Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan.

Thank you also for your support of the East Entrance for the Forest Glen Metro Station.

Sincerely,

Michael Ravnitzky  
1905 August Drive  
Silver Spring, MD 20902  
[mikerav@verizon.net](mailto:mikerav@verizon.net)  
301-592-8808

11-8-19

Dear County Council:

I am emailing to register my support for the proposed Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan. I live in Forest Glen with my spouse and two young children. I believe the Sector Plan balances the needs of the community and attempts to address important issues affecting the quality of life: traffic, pedestrian-friendly access, and improved retail and commercial opportunities. It is forward thinking and matches a vision of Montgomery County that includes greater access to transit, affordable housing, and environmental stewardship.

I live just two blocks north of the Forest Glen metro station and am a firm believer that the Metro Station parking lot should be developed with high-density residential and retail housing. I strongly disagree with people seeking lower density development on the parking lot. The Forest Glen metro station is an essential resource not just for the neighborhood but for all of the County. What makes this development critical is that it remains one of the only potentially developable properties near the Forest Glen metro station. Higher density development fully utilizes this resource by providing community retail amenities, housing, and ultimately more affordable housing set-asides. Ultimately, a higher density development will increase metro ridership for an underutilized station, reduce the number of cars on county roads, and provide more people affordable transit-accessible housing. Such transit-oriented high density development is the right direction for my neighborhood and ultimately the County.

As somebody who lives next to the proposed parking lot development, I feel strongly that we should not waste this rare opportunity by choosing a half-way plan that misses the mark. I urge you to vote to approve the sector plan as proposed, with higher-density transit oriented development.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Joey Hipolito  
10103 Gates Ave  
Silver Spring, MD 20902

11-1-19

Dear County Council Members,

My husband and I moved to the Forest Estate Community Association neighborhood 20 years ago, when our son was only 6 months old. I'm an artist and educator, and we moved to this neighborhood for primarily three reasons: the Metro is walking distance, we were able to afford a house in a safe and diverse neighborhood that was still close to DC where I could set up my studio and we could raise our son, and the neighborhood was in a good school district. We have enjoyed living in this neighborhood very much, yet the one thing that we have always longed for is a small, walking-distance area that had more of an urban feel and where we could feel connected to our community, with unique shops, art galleries/studios, cafés, restaurants, etc. In fact, for me personally, I have always seen the site of the Medical Building at the corner of Georgia and Forest Glen as a prime area for such a space for our community.

The Forest Glen Sector Plan is a welcome direction and we're completely behind such a plan. We would love to see a really good design in place that promotes sustainability, green spaces, a coming together area for the community, walking and bike safe access, a place that feels like an extension of our neighborhood without it being just a strip mall or a building with a storefront. My husband and I see it as a wonderful opportunity for good, innovative, urban design, especially in place of the medical building at the intersection of Georgia and Forest Glen. The projected area for where the Metro parking lot is seems good, allowing for shops and open space for community gathering.

I look forward to learning more about the project!

With all my best,

Muriel Hasbun and David Fosnocht  
1812 August Drive, Silver Spring, MD 20902

To Council Members:

I was born and raised in Silver Spring and I have lived in Silver Spring for 35 years. For the past twelve years, my wife and I have been raising our three kids in a single-family home that was built in the 1940's and that is part of the Forest Estates Community Association. We love our neighborhood because we can walk to Sligo Creek Park, access the Metro, and because our neighbors make this an awesome place to live.

However, our neighborhood has some challenges. Georgia Avenue acts as a big barrier between different residential neighborhoods in the Forest Glen area. Our kids all attended Flora Singer Elementary School. While the school is less than a mile from our house, most of the kids in our neighborhood took a bus to get there or got a car ride because it's so dangerous to cross Georgia Avenue.

Likewise, walking or biking to the Montgomery Hills commercial area south of the Beltway is not feasible for kids (or many adults) because there are so many pedestrian hazards along the way. Again, it's a shame because the area is only a mile from our house. Adding dedicated bike lanes and increasing pedestrian safety on Georgia Avenue will help connect our neighborhood to Montgomery Hills.

I fully welcome more mixed-use development north of the Beltway and near the Metro station. Having walkable and bikable access to a retail area in our neighborhood will keep more cars off the road and make the area safer for pedestrians. Without the outlined improvements, I don't see how our area will ever achieve the County's goal of Vision Zero.

Increasing the housing zoning options will help expand the amount of affordable housing in our area. While I live in a single-family home now, I would love to have more options for housing to choose from in the future. Updating the zoning in the Forest Glen sector to allow different housing types is a critical first step in the right direction.

As a longtime resident of Silver Spring, I've witnessed many positive changes in the county from when I grew up here. The Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills sector plan has outlined a positive vision for our neighborhood that will help create a more livable future for us all. I encourage you to support the plan and help make it a reality.

Sincerely,  
Tom Jelen  
1905 Brisbane St, Silver Spring, MD 20902

9-26-19

Our Beloved Council Persons,

My wife Eileen and I have lived in Forrest Estates for over 20 years now. We live at 1709 Belvedere Blvd. We have reviewed the new sector plan for Forrest Estates and are excited by its climate-friendly, transit oriented nature. We strongly urge the council to move forward with it.

thank you,

Eileen Kraus-Jakobsberg

Phillip Jakobsberg

9-23-19

Dear Members of the Montgomery County Council:

I have owned my house in Forest Estates for 47 years, so I remember the fight to build the Forest Glen Metro and the push to establish the Colonel Getty neighborhood park. Overcoming some neighborhood naysayers, both the Metro and the park went on to become invaluable assets maintaining our high home resale values and enhancing the quality of living we all enjoy.

Now I strongly support proceeding with the Montgomery Hills/Forest Glen 40 year sector plan. Like the push to build the Metro stop and to create Getty Park, the sector plan lays out ways to offer an even better and safer quality of life to our neighborhood.

As a senior citizen, I want to drive less and walk more, so I especially value

- \* the new east entrance to the Forest Glen Metro station
- \* the enhanced street scape, safer sidewalks, and improved traffic lights on Georgia Avenue
- \*the promise of green built affordable housing next to the Metro
- \*the better use of green space and traffic direction along Georgia Avenue from Montgomery Hills to Dennis Avenue

Thank you for your years of work coordinating this sector plan. Please move forward in approving the plan.

Carole Tomayko  
1631 Belvedere Blvd.  
Silver Spring, MD. 20902

9-23-19

To the Montgomery County Council,

I strongly support the Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills sector plan coming before you soon. Simply put, it will help us make the place we live even better: safer and easier to get around, with more affordable homes, and more welcoming to new businesses. I ask you all to support it.

I've been participating in development of the plan through the public hearing process, and I have been consistently impressed with the planning staff. They have made thorough outreach to the community, brought smart and innovative planning expertise to the effort, and created a plan we should all support.

Among the features I like in the plan:

- \* East side of Georgia Ave entrance to the Forest Glen Metro Station (I take my life in my hands crossing Forest Glen and Georgia Avenue every morning. Come see some morning.)
- \* Affordable housing options to add density in a range of options to make our community welcoming to all
- \* Walkability and safety improvements, so that there's more to walk to and more people will want to walk to it
- \* Bike accessibility and safety improvements
- \* Attention to greenery and public spaces throughout

Plans like this are a long-term effort. The County can lay out what's desired and pursue some portion itself, but the private development community will need to see value and commit resources to bring it all together. I am hopeful that this vision will work to create the livable future we can all enjoy.

Please support the Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills sector plan.

Sincerely,

Ethan Handelman  
1703 Tilton Dr, Silver Spring  
Member of the Forest Estates Community Association  
Resident since 2011

Dear council members,

9-23-19

I am writing to add my voice in favor of the new Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills sector plan.

My husband Tim Watkins and I have lived in the Forest Glen neighborhood for 13 years, with our now grown/teen kids and our dog. We love it so much here that when we felt our family had finally outgrown the space in our little 1100-sq ft split-level house on Julep Ave, about five years ago, we moved just around the corner to a bigger home on Woodman, backing up against the Sligo Creek trail which is a gem of the county and where we walk our dog Maggie almost every day. We are still part of the Forest Estates Community Association even though apparently there is some silly controversy over whether we are technically part of Forest Glen. We say we are, and we love being able to walk to the metro, but we have always felt it was dangerous and unpleasant to get across the intersection at Georgia/Forest Glen and navigate even by car through the Beltway and Georgia strip.

Now that there are plans to improve and develop the area of Montgomery Hills extending from the metro to below the Beltway, this will make this an even better place to live. The aspects of it that we think are especially important are the inclusion of green spaces, green cover and trees, and environmentally building requirements, small-scale retail near the metro, and improvements to the shopping areas already in place.

Making this neighborhood even more walkable and pedestrian/bike friendly would go a long way to reducing our little car trips to CVS and Sniders. Even better would be to have walk-to retail within a mile so we can make stops on the way home from the metro or quick bike trips to pick up a quart of milk or whatever we are short on, without having to get in our cars and drive through the current obstacle course. And ANYTHING that can be done to reduce the hazards and improve the looks of Georgia Ave will be an investment in this neighborhood and this part of the county. Please support the sector plan! I am happy to endorse it, and I'm really happy about the prospect of these positive changes in Forest Glen so we can be sure of keeping the neighborhood livable for the future.

Caitlin McLaughlin  
Tim Watkins  
(for Ben, Lydia, and Maggie)  
1402 Woodman Ave  
Silver Spring MD 20902

Dear Members of the Montgomery County Council,

9-23-19

As the Council considers the Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills sector plan, I encourage you to support the plan. It effectively addresses the long-term needs of Montgomery County and specifically our Forest Estates neighborhood.

My husband and I purchased our Forest Estates house in 1998. Looking back I feel fortunate that as a young couple we were able to afford a home where I could walk to Metro. One thing missing from our new neighborhood was easy access to restaurants and retail that our downtown Silver Spring apartment provided. The new sector plan lays the groundwork that could bring such amenities to our community in a purposeful way. It also sets a framework that would allow future residents affordable housing options.

We've seen a lot of change in our community. High on the list is the volume of traffic along Georgia Avenue. For more than 18 years, I've commuted daily by Metro and encountered a number of near misses as a pedestrian crossing Georgia Avenue. After many years of community action, I delight in the possibility of an eastern metro entrance in the plan. I hope I won't have to wait too much longer for this to become a reality.

Nearly 30 years ago Montgomery County leaders considered approving a Metro station at Forest Glen. I imagine there was pressure at the time from some residents to by-pass this neighborhood. What a loss it would have been. As we look to the future, I encourage you to join us in thinking boldly for our community and support the sector plan.

Yours sincerely,

Eileen Goldspiel  
Alcan Dr.  
Silver Spring

County Council Members:

9-18-19

I write to urge you to approve the Forest Glen/ Montgomery Hills Sector Plan. As a resident of Forest Estates, and a member of the Forest Estates Community Association, I attended many of the Planning Board's public meetings and submitted several comments.

I love Forest Glen but I believe it could be even better. I think the sector plan addresses the shortcomings of our area in a positive way that will help us grow and thrive in the coming years. I moved to Forest Estates because of its network of sidewalks, walkable access to Metro and bus routes, and walkable access to Sligo Creek greenway. The quality of life within our neighborhood is quite high but changes immediately whenever we encounter Georgia Avenue, either on foot or by car. It is a road with high car volume; poor signage; dangerous conditions for cyclists, transit users, and pedestrians; and limited enforcement. I appreciate the thought and care of the sector plan in addressing many of these pain points. My hope is that the entire area can become a safe, pleasant, and vibrant multi use gateway to Montgomery County through the implementation of the sector plan's recommendations.

I also appreciate the sector plan's inclusion of higher density housing near the Forest Glen metro. The county must support housing density near transit and as well as basic retail to encourage walkability. The majority of car trips are three miles or less. To decrease our reliance on cars and their greenhouse gas emissions we need comprehensive public policy to make it safe and efficient to go about our daily routines without using a car. This is a climate emergency, and we need to start acting accordingly.

Thank you,

Anna Priddy  
1714 Belvedere Blvd  
Silver Spring, MD 20902  
[Anna.o.priddy@gmail.com](mailto:Anna.o.priddy@gmail.com)

Resident of Forest Estates for four years  
Previous resident of downtown Silver Spring for ten years

Dear Council Members,

9-18-19

I am writing today to urge you to support the recently revised sector plan for Forest Glen and Montgomery Hills. I have been a resident of Forest Estates since 2002. Like many of my neighbors I have made numerous improvements to my home over the years and believe now is the time for the county and the state of Maryland to make similar improvements to our community.

I am very excited by the prospect of pedestrian and bike friendly improvements to the area. In addition, I am looking forward to new retail options (i.e. coffee shop, bank, pharmacy, etc.) within walking distance to my home. In my mind these improvements are LONG overdue.

Two issues critical to any improvements to our neighborhood are (1) traffic mitigation and (2) environmental protection. I STRONGLY support a new metro entrance on the east side of Georgia Avenue. This will encourage more people to use metro rail. In addition, it will more efficiently facilitate traffic vehicular flow by removing the pedestrian lights from this intersection.

It is also vital to include additional green space in the final plan. These spaces are the heart and soul of any community.

Thank you for your consideration,

Matthew von Kerczek  
10101 Forest Grove Drive