



MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

April 10, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Montgomery County Planning Board

FROM: Roselle George, Research Manager
Piera Weiss, Planner Coordinator (Community-Based Planning)
Jacob Sesker, Planner Coordinator (Research)

SUBJECT: Housing Policy Element of the General Plan: Review of Housing in Master Plans

In February, the Planning Board approved an approach for the *Housing Policy Element of the General Plan* whereby the Board engages in regular discussions of housing policy issues throughout the spring. These discussions occur as either public work sessions where the conversation is sparked by a staff memorandum or as discussions that begin with presentations by invited speakers. Additional discussion will be occurring through the Department's housing blog, *The Home Stretch*, which debuted recently. Through these discussions, we will identify housing policy issues that we may decide to address through changes to the *Housing Policy Element of the General Plan*, through changes to other housing-related policies, or changes to planning processes.

This memorandum is intended to spark conversation about the relationship between the master plans and housing. This memorandum first includes a summary of the observations and recommendations related to housing in master plans. That summary is followed by a review of the housing components and housing-related strategies and recommendations of all master plans approved and adopted since 1993. Finally, this memorandum includes brief summaries of focus groups held with staff from the Community-Based Planning Division and the Development Review Division.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Master plans should include a survey of existing housing stock

It has been the practice not to include detailed quantitative data regarding housing stock and projections in master plans. The information is collected during the master plan process and is used in the transportation modeling to test different development scenarios with road capacity.

The GIS system makes compiling information regarding housing stock much easier than in the past. Future master plans should contain a survey of the existing housing stock including housing unit types and number of affordable and senior units. That data represents a base line on which a master plan can generate recommendations to create the desired variety of living environments tailored to local conditions.

2. Housing targets and housing projections present challenges; new technologies and capabilities can help meet those challenges

Quantitative targets can be counter-productive. Quantitative analysis, on the other hand, can play an important role in master plan concept development and implementation oversight. New technologies and changing staff capabilities provide opportunities for enhanced quantitative analysis. However, even recent master plans have been inconsistent in their approach to quantitative analysis, projections, and targets.

If master plans are too specific, there can be unintended consequences. For example, if a master plan caps development to a specific mix of units including TDRs and MPDUs, and market conditions do not favor TDRs, the TDR receiving potential in the master plan may be lost. TDRs are not yet required and property owners can elect not to use TDRs. For example, a property in eastern county at the county line was zoned RE-2. The 1997 Master Plan recommended higher density through TDRs to match the surrounding community. The property owners sold the tract to Riderwood Village. The site, which straddles the county line, now supports a thriving senior community approved through special exception process. Eastern County, however, lost a TDR receiving area.

The GIS system can be used to refine the projections by accurately measuring each property. Spreadsheets can be used to accurately calculate the different zoning densities and the unit counts, including potential TDRs and MPDUs from each property, can be aggregated. However, during the development process, the physical characteristics of each site and other regulations, not to mention market forces, may not yield the desired results. In addition, more mixed-use and other flexible zones mean that projections of dwelling units will be more difficult. It is rare for a development to reach the maximum allowed by the zone, and it is difficult to determine what the maximum is in the zone when multiple uses are allowed.

Staff continues to develop capabilities and analytical models for assessing the feasibility of development. In master plans where feasibility is a question, these improvements will enable staff to better evaluate the feasibility of master plan recommendations and incentives to achieve desired development goals. While many quantitative analyses and projections are specific to an individual master plan, quantitative analysis should be consistently incorporated in plans.

3. GIS and Hansen can aid in monitoring development activity, master plan goals, objectives and recommendations

Both Staff and the Planning Board could benefit from periodic development summaries of each master plan area to chart the implementation of the master plan recommendations. The GIS system and Hansen will make these summaries geographically accurate and can pinpoint instances where there were unforeseen problems or unintended consequences.

4. Some affordable housing goals and objectives may be better met through tools other than master plans

It is generally accepted that future development will not generate affordable housing at the same rate as in the past. The total amount of affordable housing units as a percentage of new housing will be smaller than in the past. The county has taken measures to ensure that the existing and future affordable housing stock will be controlled for longer periods of time. Opportunities for affordable housing may lie in the conversion of existing market rate housing stock into controlled affordable housing. Members of the County Council recently suggested publicly that the current foreclosure crises could be an opportunity for such an effort. However, the role that the master plan process might play in these efforts is limited. Opportunities for conversion of housing stock follows generally follows market cycles, but on a micro level follows timelines specific to the parties engaged in the process. A master plan process is set in motion through an approved Work Program, which may be out of phase with both the general market cycle and the specific timeline of a potential sale. Also, the public nature of the master plan process may make it difficult to respond quickly enough to take advantage of land-sale opportunities.

Master plans, however, are the appropriate tool to recommend acquisition of land for public purposes, such as affordable housing. In fact, both the Olney and Rock Creek Master Plans recommend affordable housing if specific county owned sites are not used for schools. GIS technology can be an aid to identifying appropriate sites for acquisition and development of affordable housing.

5. Each plan should take a more strategic approach

Housing policies that are clearer and better defined can improve the ability of master plans to develop strategies to implement those policies. Each master plan can not address housing needs in the same way. Opportunities may arise in some areas and not others. Older uncontrolled rental communities are a resource in certain parts of the county and the pros and cons of preservation or redevelopment should be carefully considered.

Density bonuses are appropriate in some areas and not others. Some parts of the county, even in built-up areas, are not well served by transit. Environmentally sensitive areas are not

good locations for high densities; on the other hand environmental sensitivity is relative. If higher density can be achieved through underground or structured parking and taller buildings, then perhaps environmentally sensitivity issues can be minimized through the application of low-impact development techniques.

OVERVIEW OF HOUSING IN MASTER PLANS

The General Plan: “A Variety of Living Environments”

The Regional District Act gives The M-NCPPC the authority to prepare a general land use plan. The plan, *A General Plan for the Maryland- Washington Regional District in Montgomery and Prince George’s County, 1964, as amended*, “encourages a greater variety of living environments in anticipation of the transformation of the two counties from undeveloped to urban use.” The 1993 General Plan Refinement, which updated the 1964 Plan, sets one goal, six objectives and a number of strategies to achieve the “variety of living environments.” The General Plan Refinement explicitly refers to affordable housing in Objective 4, “Encourage an adequate supply of affordable housing throughout the county...” The Plan proposes eleven strategies to accomplish that objective:

- Encourage the provision of low-moderate and median income housing to meet existing and anticipate future needs.
- Distribute government –assisted housing equitably throughout the County.
- Plan affordable housing so that it is reasonably accessible...
- Encourage well-designed subsidized housing that is compatible with surrounding housing.
- Assure the provision of low and moderate income housing as part of large scale development through a variety of approaches including the Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit program.
- Preserve existing affordable housing where possible.
- Encourage development of affordable housing by the private market.
- Designate government owned land, other than parkland, that meets appropriate housing site selection criteria for future housing development.
- Identify County housing policies that have a burdensome effect on the cost of housing; find alternatives if possible.

- Encourage the provision of innovative housing types and approaches such as single-room occupancy housing and accessory apartments to meet the needs of lower income single persons and small households.
- Develop zoning policies that encourage the provision of affordable housing while protecting the Wedges and Corridors concept.

Master Plans approved since 1993 have to some degree included these strategies. It should be noted that the County Executive released the report of the Affordable Housing Task Force on April 4, 2008. The recommendations of the Task Force echo many of the eleven strategies listed above.

Area Master/Sector Plans

The 1964 General Plan anticipated transformation from undeveloped to urban use has occurred; the county has reached the end of that transition. The county is entering a second phase of growth that will proceed at a slower rate and will be directed more to redevelopment in key locations.

A historical survey of the master plans underscores that transition. In the 1970s and 80s, master plans, such as Germantown, Eastern County and Olney, addressed development of large tracts of vacant land. Clarksburg (1994) was the last master plan that dealt primarily with large tracts of vacant land. While there were some sizable tracts of developable land in the Damascus (2006), Olney (2005) and Rock Creek (2004) master plans, much of the developable land was constrained by environmental conditions or was located at the edge of agricultural reserve.

1993 General Plan Refinement

Housing Goal

Encourage and maintain a wide choice of housing types and neighborhoods for people of all incomes, ages, lifestyles and physical capabilities at appropriate densities and locations.

Objectives

- *Promote variety and choice in housing of quality design and durable construction in various types of neighborhoods.*
- *Promote a sufficient supply of housing to serve existing and planned employment and the changing needs of residents at various stages of life.*
- *Encourage housing near employment centers with adequate access to a wide variety of facilities and services. Support mixed use communities to further this objective.*
- *Encourage an adequate supply of affordable housing throughout the county for those living and working in Montgomery County especially for households at the median income and below.*

The transition to redevelopment and revitalization, accompanied by the corollary theme of neighborhood preservation, has become more prevalent, although those planning issues were certainly evident in the Bethesda, Silver Spring and Wheaton Sector Plans done in the 1980s. The master/sector plans in the lower part of the county and outside the Central Business Districts have well-established neighborhoods and little unused land. The master plans for these areas have focused on themes of sustainability, compatibility, connectivity, and neighborhood preservation.

Housing Component of Master Plans

As master plans have become more detailed, the recommendations have become more complex. Consistency in master plan content and presentation of housing data tends to be uneven from plan to plan. This inconsistency relates to the issues in each master plan, the length of the particular master plan process and a shift in focus of county policies while master plans are in process. Plans have become more detailed since 1993. Plans prepared since the late 1990s contain projections of future housing units and details regarding TDRs and MPDUs. Master plans consistently address the potential effects of future development on surrounding neighborhoods and focus on site-specific design and environmental issues that affect potential development.

Where development potential exists, master plans typically discuss the type and mix of units as a function of compatibility and context. Some master plans identify sites as suitable for affordable housing; most mention MPDUs as a regulatory requirement. Some recommend text amendments to expand the application of the MPDU ordinance to zones not requiring such at the time. Senior housing appears in some of the plans as a possible “special exception” use where appropriate, or as a use that should be added to mixed-use zones. Many plans recommend new zones or amendments to existing to achieve county housing goals and objectives.

Most plans contain a brief description of the type and mix of existing housing, population statistics and demographic analysis, and COG forecasts. Some plans also contain tables of housing units and job capacity as a function of a desired jobs/housing balance.

Summary of Master Plans Approved Since 1993

As would be expected, master plans follow the directive of the General Plan with less or more specificity. Before the 1993 Refinement, housing goals in master plans were general, more detailed recommendations has been added over the years as county policies have evolved. The 1993 Refinement, as noted, contains more details and options for achieving housing goals. The

County Council has approved twenty-two area master/sector plans since 1993 and many contain extensive discussion of housing-related issues and local housing needs. In addition, there are three official county policies enacted since 1993 that have directed master plans to address housing in greater detail.

- In 1995, the county census update survey indicated that the population was aging and that senior housing was needed. In response, subsequent master plans contained recommendations for senior housing.
- In 2001, the County Council adopted a Housing Policy. Master plans approved after 2001 contain a housing component; included in that housing component are recommendations for senior and affordable housing.
- In 2006, the County Council added workforce housing to the county code as a regulatory requirement in CBD/transit areas. The Woodmont Triangle Amendment to the 1994 Bethesda CBD Sector Plan includes workforce housing, as will all future master plans in designated workforce housing areas.

County Policy has become more directed since 1993. Staff reviewed all the master plans approved since 1993. A summary of the housing component in each of the master plans is included at the end of this report (see Appendix 1); a table summarizing the content of that appendix is included below (see Table 1, following page).

Master plans reflect county policies, although to a lesser or greater degree in each plan. As Table 1 indicates, there is inconsistency with the degree to which plans have included housing inventories and housing projections/targets. Even plans completed during the same time period may not address the issue in the same manner.

TABLE 1: Master Plan and Housing Components Since 1993

<i>Master Plan</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Housing Inventory</i>	<i>Housing Projections</i>	<i>Senior Housing</i>	<i>TDR</i>	<i>Work Force</i>	<i>MPDU</i>	<i>Text Amendment Housing</i>
<i>Bethesda CBD</i>	<i>1994</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Aspen Hill</i>	<i>1994</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Clarksburg</i>	<i>1994</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Four Corners</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Forest Glen</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Glenmont</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Cloverly</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Fairland</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>White Oak</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Friendship Heights Sector</i>	<i>1998</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Sandy Spring/Ashton</i>	<i>1998</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Takoma Park</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>East Silver Spring</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>North / West Silver Spring</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Silver Spring CBD</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Kemp Mill</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Potomac Sub-region</i>	<i>2002</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Upper Rock Creek</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Olney</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Woodmont Triangle</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Damascus</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Shady Grove</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>

FOCUS GROUPS: COMMUNITY-BASED PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

Two focus groups were held in March 2008 to collect feedback from staff in the Community Based-Planning Division and Development Review Division. The focus of these sessions was on possible changes to the housing components of future master plans. Summaries of the findings from these focus groups are provided below.

Community-Based Planning Focus Group

On March 13, 2008, a Community-Based Planning focus group was held to assess staff concerns regarding how affordable housing is addressed in master plans and to generate ideas for how master plans could better incorporate County housing policy. The primary issue raised was the inclusion of effective affordable housing goals in County master plans. Early in that discussion Staff raised many questions, which can be broadly categorized as follows:

- Changing economics of housing affordability: Redevelopment economics, construction costs of verticality, the high cost of land, and federal disinvestment in housing have made it increasingly difficult to meet demand for housing affordability.
- Competition and prioritization: Housing policy objectives compete with other policy objectives in each plan (e.g. agricultural preservation, environmental concerns, etc.), and sometimes multiple housing policies compete with each other.
- Clarity and latitude: Planners want clearly enunciated priorities, but planners also must have the latitude to capitalize on opportunities as they arise.

When specific housing solutions were discussed, staff suggested that there were some specific strategies that could be used to get more affordable housing in master plans, though staff felt that the total impact of these strategies would be limited. The specific suggestions included:

- Productivity housing: increased density is needed to make the productivity housing economically viable.
- Workforce housing: Wherever possible, co-locate workforce housing with other public uses or on public lands. Higher workforce housing yields will be achieved if the land cost barrier is removed or minimized.
- Senior and special needs housing: Staff discussed the need to more consistently address housing needs of the County's growing senior population and for individuals with special needs.

- Accessory Dwelling Units: Staff suggested that the plan provide more support for ADUs and for less regulation of ADUs.

Towards the end of the discussion, staff discussed the role of research and analysis in improving the housing component of future master plans. Issues discussed at that time include the following:

- Identification of sites for affordable housing, especially sites that are publicly owned.
- Quantitative analysis of housing affordability for the County and comparison to the master plan area.
- Identification of areas eligible for housing subsidies.
- Analysis of TDR and MPDU bonus density programs to better understand how to improve the yield at certain locations.

Development Review Focus Group

A Development Review Focus Group was convened on March 17, 2008 to provide additional feedback about staff experiences with housing in Master Plans.

One major discussion point in this focus group related to conflicts between Master Plans and the Zoning Ordinance. Four specific instances of these conflicts were identified.

- Master Plans cap development or set height limits that are lower than the zoning standard and then recommend more development if MPDUs are provided. The result is that applicants request taller buildings than the Master Plan recommends. Examples of this conflict that were cited were Woodmont, Bethesda Sector Plan, and Rugby Road Development.
- The second conflict was that Master Plans recommend a proportion of unit types overall, but as development occurs, some properties develop with a higher proportion of one type of unit, leaving the remaining properties to develop with only the other unit type. These recommendations relate to the use of the PD zone, which has a requirement for a percentage of the three basic housing types. Once a few properties develop, the amount of one housing type may have to be compensated for on another property. This may result in conflicts between the zoning standard and other regulations. Examples of this conflict that were cited by the group were Clarksburg, particularly the Garnkirk Property.

- Third, the group identified conflicts regarding workforce housing. Workforce housing is required in the zoning ordinance and in CBD zones near transit, but the group felt workforce plus MPDUs may be a disincentive. . Developers have pre-application meeting to discuss these requirements and choose not to submit plans.
- In the fourth conflict, seen in more recent Master Plans, caps and percentages of unit types and specified TDRs or MPDUs are included in the Master Plans. At Site Plan Review/Preliminary Plan review, issues arise regarding environmental or other site constraints, which make achieving densities or TDR yields impossible. These Master Plans do not take into consideration the 2/3 TDR requirement. Examples that the group cited of this conflict were Clarksburg and Shady Grove.

Another point of discussion was location of MPDUs. Staff recommended dispersing MPDUs, but Department of Housing and Community Affairs (DHCA) prefers MPDUs clustered to keep purchase costs lower and future management easier.

This group also raised the issue of the Zoning Ordinance lacking clarity. An example cited was that in PD zones, staff was unclear as to whether MPDUs are calculated on the base only, or over the entire yield. Staff has interpreted this differently. Currently, MPDUs are calculated on total yield; however, there is disagreement on this interpretation from the development community because of earlier interpretations.

Several more general suggestions were also solicited from staff. Among those suggestions were:

- Staff experience suggests that MPDU bonus densities rarely achieve more than 12.5% to 13.0% and are not used between 13.0% and 15.0%.
- Staff also stated that there are too many market rate units achieved in the bonus densities relative to the MPDU gain.
- Staff agreed with some OLO zoning text amendment changes.
- Staff felt that Master Plans should be more general, and that specific density or cap recommendations are hard to achieve.
- Staff suggested that the county subsidize 100% of the cost of the land on sites suitable for affordable housing.

Appendix 1: Summary of Housing Component in Master Plans Approved since 1993

The master plan summaries of the housing component in master plans approved since 1993 are organized by Team.

Silver Spring/Takoma Park Team

Takoma Park (2000)

This plan covered an almost entirely built-out urban area, part of which was annexed into Montgomery County from Prince George's County. The thrust of the plan was neighborhood preservation and neighborhood reinvestment. The zoning of the annexed area was changed to conform to Montgomery County zoning categories. Extensive grandfathering was necessary to address small lot sizes and other existing uses permitted by the previous jurisdiction. The Plan proposed a Commercial Revitalization Overlay Zone (CROC) that provided height bonuses for commercial projects that incorporate housing.

East Silver Spring (2000)

This master plan addressed a built-out area and focused on maintaining stable residential neighborhoods and revitalization of commercial centers. RT (townhouse) zoning was recommended for the police station site to increase the range of housing choices. The plan did not summarize the existing housing stock. This plan used the CROC zone and height bonuses to encourage housing in commercial revitalization projects.

North and West Silver Spring (2000)

The master plan focused on community preservation, stability and character. The plan recommended townhouse redevelopment (RT zoning) and R-60 cluster option on redevelopable sites. The plan recommended that the County's Department of Housing and Community Affairs assess the single-family housing stock in certain areas and provide improvement loans where necessary. The Nation Park Seminary District had the most redevelopment potential; in 2005, The District Council rezoned the property to the PD 18 Zone in conformance with the master

plan. The project contains 280 dwelling units including detached, attached, condominium and senior housing. Fifty-six of those units are MPDUs. The project involves extensive rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of historic structures for housing and community use.

Four Corners (1996)

Four Corners is a built-out community with very little vacant or developable land. The Plan confirmed all the existing residential zoning (R-60). A six-acre property available for redevelopment was recommended for parkland acquisition or residential redevelopment under the base zone (R-60); alternatively, the site was deemed suitable for PD 7, a floating zone, if not used for a park facility. The Parks Department has since acquired the land.

Silver Spring CBD (2000)

The goal of this master plan is to enhance established downtown residential community and create housing options through new development; the plan includes a housing section. The recommendations include rezoning CBD properties to encourage residential and mixed-use development and providing height incentives in an overlay zone to encourage mixed-use projects. The plan proposed converting publicly owned surface parking lots to housing and identified three potential sites. There are no detailed demographic or housing projections in the plan.

Bethesda/Chevy Chase/ North Bethesda Team

Woodmont Triangle Amendment to the Bethesda CBD Sector Plan (2006)

This limited sector plan amendment recommends a range of housing opportunities for low and high-rise units. The plan designated publicly-owned surface parking lots for optional method housing and/or permanent affordable housing, as had been recommended on Lot 31 in Bethesda. The plan encourages the use of the CBD Optional Method that allows taller buildings in projects qualifying for the 22 percent MPDU bonus density. The plan limits commercial potential in favor of residential uses.

Friendship Heights Sector Plan (1998)

This sector plan area covers 92 acres and contains exclusively multi-family housing. There were 3,435 dwelling units at the time of the master plan adoption. The plan recommended an additional 635 apartment and townhouse units and recommended that surface parking lots be redeveloped for residential use at appropriately higher densities in order to achieve the proposed additional units.

Bethesda Central Business District Sector Plan (1994)

This sector plan covers about 405 acres. The plan stated that there were 5,200 existing residential units. About 87 percent of the residents at that time lived in multi-family structures. The primary housing goals were to maintain a wide range of housing types, to reinforce neighborhoods, and to provide an adequate supply of new housing, including affordable units. The plan proposed adding about 2,700 units by the year 2010. The plan recommended a new CBD residential (CBD-R) zone as well as amendments to the existing CBD zones targeted to encourage more residential development.

Georgia Avenue and Rural East Team

Damascus (2006)

The Damascus Master Plan covers rural and suburban areas in the northern part of the county. The master plan area has a town center and is surrounded by the agricultural reserve. The Plan recommends densities of 15 to 20 units per acre in the town center as part of a mixed-use core. The plan recommends a range of housing types. Two parcels were targeted as suitable locations for age-restricted housing. The plan used the RNC/TDR zone (including MPDUs) to transition between the rural and suburban densities. The plan recommends as many as 1,374 new units in approximately 450 acres and includes MPDUs and TDRs in that total.

Olney Master Plan (2005)

The Olney Master Plan contains a housing plan that includes an overall discussion of affordable and senior housing issues. The goal is to provide a mix of units and opportunities for affordable and elderly housing. The plan recommended an additional 2,000 units in the southern part of the master plan area. The plan recommended rezoning RE-2 areas to the RNC Zone, which had previously been amended to include MPDUs. The plan recommended the R-200/TDR 7, RT 10, PD 3 and PD 7 zones for other redevelopable sites. The plan recommended that the Town Center absorb the bulk of new housing units through a mixed-use zone at a density of up to 20 residential units per acre. The Plan noted that the existing conditions in 2003 included 500 affordable units (99 of which were elderly housing units). The plan recommended use of the site of unused Oakdale Jr. High for affordable housing, if not needed for a school. The plan noted that there was potential to increase the number of units for the elderly from 417 to as many as 814 units.

Upper Rock Creek Master Plan (2004)

The plan focused on open space, heritage and environmental resources. It recommended the use of the low-density RNC Zone to achieve the goals of preserving the resources. The plan also recommended an amendment to the RNC zone to include MPDUs. On certain sites, the plan recommended RT zoning to achieve a density that would generate MPDUs. The plan recommended the Sherwood Elementary School Site No. 6 as a site for affordable housing if not used for a school.

Glenmont Transit Impact Area and Vicinity Sector Plan (1997)

This sector plan covered 568 acres and was primarily concerned with transit-oriented redevelopment. The plan recommended mixed uses and residential densities of up to 51 units per acre including MPDUs. Recommended zoning included TSR, RMX, PD and RT zoning at the major intersection (Georgia Avenue and Randolph Road) and for areas within walking distance of Metro. The plan recommended a new townhouse zone, RT-15 that would require assemblage of single-family detached housing.

Forest Glen Sector Plan (1996)

This sector plan area covered about 400 acres. The plan recommended two redevelopable properties (18 acres) west of Georgia Avenue for higher densities due to their proximity to Metro. The plan recommended RT-12.5 zoning on the WMATA Tract with an option to apply for PD zoning for up to 18 units per acre. The County Council approved a PD 15 for the site. Planning Board approved preliminary and site plans for 280 units including 56 MPDUs.

Aspen Hill Master Plan (1994)

This plan contains a general statement regarding housing goals and notes that the planning area contains large concentrations of affordable multi-family dwelling units. The plan recommended TDR zoning where the intent is to increase residential densities. The plan added 260 units including 122 TDRs to the zoning envelope of the previous plan. The plan recommended a WSSC site for affordable elderly housing that might yield 210 units under the PRC zone (planned retirement community). The plan recommended a text amendment to allow the site to be rezoned PRC if 20 % of the new units were MPDUs.

Potomac and Rural Area West Team

Potomac Sub-region Master Plan (2002)

The plan contains sections on elderly housing and affordable housing and an inventory of affordable housing. The plan recommended sites suitable for senior housing and recommended a zoning text amendment adding senior housing as a use in the RMX zone. According to the master plan, the planning area contained 800 subsidized and affordable housing including 260 MPDUs. The plan noted that only approximately 3 percent of the existing housing stock in the Potomac Sub-region was affordable in 2002.

Eastern County Team

Kemp Mill Master Plan (2001)

This master plan area had very little redevelopable land. The Plan recommended R-60 and RT-6 zoning for two properties that together might yield 40 new units.

Sandy Spring/Ashton Master Plan (1998)

This master plan focused on rural character and preservation of rural open space with a goal of providing a diverse array of housing choices. The plan recommended a new zone, the Rural Neighborhood Cluster Zone, to achieve that goal. The proposed zone did not require MPDU. The zone did provide for very small lots in order to preserve larger areas for farming and open space. The plan envisioned that approximately 374 new units would be generated from the RNC zone. The plan did not contain a housing section, demographics or census information, or recommendations for senior or elderly housing. The Council amended the RNC zone to include MPDUs in 2004. The Planning Board approved a subdivision in the master plan area that included MPDUs.

Cloverly Master Plan (1997)

This master plan area covers both the residential wedge and the suburban communities. The master plan area contained the headwaters for the Upper Paint Branch stream system and environmentally sensitive resources in the Patuxent and Northwest Branch watersheds. The plan confirmed the low-density zoning in these watersheds for environmental protection and compatibility with surrounding development.

Fairland Master Plan (1997)

The plan stated that there were approximately 14,000 housing units in this master plan area. According to the plan, the housing stock is evenly divided between detached, attached and multifamily units. The plan goal was to provide more detached units; consequently, the plan recommended lower densities on specific properties to achieve that goal. The plan projected 1,180 new detached units and 674 townhouses/attached units. The master plan calculated that

there would be 16,000 units at build out (including market rate units and MPDU). The plan recommended locations near the existing commercial centers as suitable for elderly housing.

White Oak Master Plan (1997)

The White Oak master plan area was close to build-out, but there were two key redevelopable parcels: the Dow Jones property and the Milestone tract. The plan recommended TDRs for a portion of the Milestone tract and townhouse zoning for Dow Jones. The Dow Jones site has developed with 155 townhouse units (35 MPDUs). The Milestone site now contains 47 detached units and the County is contemplating purchasing the remainder of the site, the portion designated as a TDR receiving area, for a police station.

The master plan projected that there would be a significant increase in persons over the age of 70 by the year 2017 and that services be provided through the special exception process, but did not identify specific sites.

I-270 Team

Shady Grove Sector Plan (2006)

This master plan contains a housing and households section. The proximity to Metro warranted an emphasis on housing. The master plan recommended as many as 6,340 new housing units including workforce housing, TDRs and MPDUs. The plan recommended a text amendment to add housing as an optional development method in the I-3 zone and a new zone, the TOMX zone, a transit zone that would include TDRs and MPDUs. Since the master plan area did not have a great diversity of housing stock--58 percent of the existing stock was detached housing--the plan recommended a range of housing types and affordability levels near the Metro. The plan further recommended that MPDUs be staged and distributed in new developments. Three sites were identified as suitable for senior housing. The plan recommended that accessory apartments be allowed in the existing neighborhood through the "special exception" process.

Clarksburg Master Plan and Hyattstown Special Study Area (1994)

The master plan states: "...at end state ... may have as many as 14,000 housing units. The Plan takes great care to assure a wide choice of housing types, including recommended housing mix guidelines by neighborhood."

The master plan proposed an overall mix of 15-25 % multi-family, 30-40% attached and 40-50% detached with densities ranging from 2 to 11 units per acre. Zones recommended to implement this mix were MXP, PD and RMX I and RMX 2, TDRs (up to seven units per acre) and the I-3 Zone, which was amended to allow for housing as part of a mixed-use development.