

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that to address the aforementioned priorities, the City Council requires that the Montgomery County Planning Board holds work sessions that critically examine the following topics during development of the Planning Board Draft Plan of the MMPA:

**Topic: Potential Redevelopment of the Washington Adventist Site and the Flower Avenue District**

<p>How do the development requirements, including set-backs, building heights and step downs, lot coverage and density of the newly proposed zoning for the Washington Adventist site impact neighboring single-family housing?</p>	<p><i>The Plan’s recommended CR zones alongside single-family residential properties are typically scaled to be only one or two stories taller than what is allowed for a single-family home. Further, Section 4.1.8 of the zoning ordinance has specific controls for building height and setbacks to achieve compatible relationships with adjacent single-family homes.</i></p>
<p>The MMPA should reduce the scale, height, and apply appropriate set-backs of parcels adjoining Maplewood and Greenwood Avenues in order to preserve the character of adjacent single-family housing.</p>	
<p>What specific public space and public benefits recommendations can be made for the Washington Adventist site?</p>	<p><i>The Zoning Ordinance requires that 10 percent of the overall site be provided as public space when redeveloped. The Plan recommends a central space open to Flower Avenue, a pedestrian path along the top of the hill above Sligo Creek Park, and the extension of the Green Promenade through the campus. The Plan also recommends co-location of community-serving public uses for the site.</i></p>
<p>Specifically, how can recommendations on the site address the six key community priorities in the Public Hearing Draft?</p>	<p><i>The Key Takeaways (community priorities) were addressed in the following ways: flexible zoning recommendation allows for the development of new retail options and new institutional uses such as a healthcare and other co-located public facilities. Additionally, the plan recommends a variety of approaches for affordable housing production, the protection of Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park and a centrally located public open space that would allow for community gathering.</i></p>
<p>The Plan should explore recommending inclusion of dedicated public spaces on the site.</p>	<p><i>The Zoning Ordinance requires that 10 percent of the overall site be provided as public space when redeveloped. The Plan recommends a central space open to Flower Avenue, a pedestrian path along the top of the hill above Sligo Creek Park, and the extension of the Green Promenade through the campus.</i></p>

<p>Additionally, the plan's 35 percent green cover requirement should not mitigate the need for dedicated public space to the benefit of green roofs.</p>	<p><i>The Zoning Ordinance requirement for public open space is independent of the MMPA recommendation for 35% Green Cover. Public Open Space is defined by Section 59.6.3.6.A.2 as “space devoted to public use or enjoyment that attracts public appreciation due to its location and amenities.” Typically, a private green roof would not meet the definition of Public Open Space. However, ground-level open space that includes significant tree cover may meet both the Public Open Space and Green Cover definitions.</i></p>
<p>Within the green space requirements of the Washington Adventist site development, the MMPA should (1) retain the greenspace at Hospital Hill (i.e., Maplewood Ave and Maple Ave) and (2) increase the recommended ½-acre primary central public open space with a recommended unobstructed opening on Flower Avenue to better preserve the existing central commons on the Washington Adventist site, promote its continuing accessibility to the public, and respect the historical legacy of the commons for public health and recreation.</p>	<p><i>The Plan language has been revised to include the following text to address these concerns (Section 4.3.2.1):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Recommends to retain, to the maximum extent practicable, the existing open space along Maplewood Avenue, known as “Hospital Hill.”</i></li> <li>• <i>Include a primary central public open space of least ½-acre and that is open to Flower Avenue.</i></li> </ul>
<p>What is the appropriate zoning for the Erie Center retail node to meet the MMPA vision of the neighborhood that serves retail without adversely impacting existing single-family homes?</p>	<p><i>The Erie Center which consists of sites 27-33 were all given zoning that is compatible with the surrounding uses. This allows for the continuation of existing uses and flexibility for future development.</i></p> <p><i>The zoning Ordinance (Section 59.4.1.8) will control compatibility requirements beyond height and density which are expressed in the plan’s zoning recommendations.</i></p>

<p>MMPA roadway and transit recommendations within the Flower Avenue District should allow for local usability of the Center and well-functioning traffic conditions.</p>	<p><i>The Plan recommendations for connectivity enhance multi-modal access throughout the plan districts. Redevelopment of the campus and district sites will allow for and improve local usability of the center.</i></p> <p><i>Traffic function at the operational level is managed on an on-going basis by the City, the State Highway Administration, and the County Department of Transportation. Potential impacts of any proposed development on that function will be reviewed at the time of development by the Planning Department, the City, and other agencies to determine any necessary mitigation, which is typically provided by the developer.</i></p> <p><i>The Transportation Policy Area Review conducted by Planning Department staff for the Silver Spring Downtown and Adjacent Communities Plan also covers the Plan Area for the TPMMA. That review found transportation infrastructure at the Policy Area to be adequate for the density recommended in the Silver Spring Plan. The relatively small geography and recommended additional density of the TPMMA does not change that finding.</i></p> <p><i>As mentioned above, Local Area Transportation Review (LATR) will be conducted as part of each application for development to review, and if necessary, mitigate the project's local transportation impact.</i></p>
<p>The MMPA should clearly map the planned dedication and demarcate the allowable line of development on Site 23 abutting Sligo Creek. Any dedication and additional development requirements should preserve the existing native forested area and provide appropriate development setbacks and stormwater requirements to protect the environmental health of the Creek.</p>	<p><i>The TPMMA is a long-range planning document that sets priorities for land development and addresses related transportation, environmental, historic preservation, and other impacts.</i></p> <p><i>The TPMMA undergoes a lengthy public approval process, including the Takoma Park City Council, the Planning Board, and ultimately the County Council.</i></p> <p><i>The area recommended for dedication will need to be defined by a land survey. The survey document is a legal and technical property delineation that is too detailed to be specifically included in the TPMMA. A land survey will be part of any dedication. The intent of the dedication is consistent with the comment. A graphic that generally outlines the land that would be dedicated to the Parks Department was presented to the Board and may be added to the Plan or Appendix.</i></p>

**Topic: Promoting a Diversity of Housing in the Plan Area**

<p>What are the potential impacts of newly proposed zoning on the diversity of housing stock and affordability? The MMPA should recommend that any new units constructed within the Plan area help meet the City's objectives of increasing the number of units and variety of housing types across the affordability spectrum that result in economically diverse communities.</p>	<p><i>Page 68 of the Public Hearing Draft recommends: "Support a creative diversity of housing options including personal living quarters and/or micro units; "missing middle" housing types such as tiny houses, cottages, duplexes, townhomes, multiplexes, and small apartment buildings; shared housing, cooperative housing, co-housing, live-work units, and accessory dwelling units (ADUs), to help meet housing needs and diversify housing options."</i></p>
<p>What funding and regulatory recommendations can the MMPA make to ensure stakeholders (City, County, etc.) incentivize and finance the creation and preservation of quality, safe, diverse, and energy efficient housing within the Maple Avenue District?</p>	<p><i>Per the direction of the Planning Board, the TPMMA will now include a housing resources list that will highlight existing county and city tools that can help incentivize and finance the creation and preservation of housing within the Maple District.</i></p> <p><i>Some tools listed will include the Housing Initiative Fund (HIF), the Affordable Housing Opportunity Fund (AHOF), Payment-in-lieu-of-taxes (PILOTs), Moderately Priced Dwelling Units and Rental Agreements.</i></p>
<p>What are the best comparable jurisdictions to Takoma Park with regard to housing density, transit access, geographic location, etc. to the MMPA and how do their zoning densities compare to the proposed MMPA land use?</p>	<p><i>The recommendations for each master plan are tailored to the unique characteristics of each plan area when the plans are created. The study recommended by this comment is not within the scope of the MMPA.</i></p>
<p>Where appropriate, in the Maple Avenue District, the MMPA should encourage innovative in-fill development opportunities on underutilized portions of parcels that do not adversely impact existing affordable housing units.</p>	<p><i>Several sites in the Maple Avenue District have significant underutilized portions of parcels that under the plan zoning recommendations could accommodate separate and compatible free-standing infill development in addition to the existing affordable housing onsite.</i></p>

<p>Given the trade-offs between commercial and housing development, consider alternatives to the proposed 100 percent commercial FAR to promote increased housing creation.</p>	<p><i>Given the long-term horizon for the MMPA, and the recognition that valuable community-serving non-residential uses could be an asset for Maple Avenue and the surrounding community, the Board did not change the allowable commercial density on sites in the district.</i></p> <p><i>However, based on discussion related to this comment, the Board added to the Land Use and Zoning recommendations for the Maple Avenue District (Section 4.2.2.1) the following language:</i></p> <p><i>“While the plan recommends a diversity of residential and non-residential land uses in the Maple Avenue District, the overall development pattern should remain primarily residential.”</i></p>
---	---

**Topic: Public Space, Infrastructure, and Amenities within the MMPA**

<p>What is the impact of the density proposed in the Plan on access to and provision of public space, infrastructure, recreational facilities, school capacity, roads, public utilities, and healthcare?</p>	<p><i>The TPMMA is a long-range planning document that sets priorities for land development and addresses related transportation, environmental, historic preservation, and other impacts.</i></p> <p><i>Some impacts are initially assessed during the master plan process, to be more fully assessed during the development review process, or through a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) or other process.</i></p> <p><i>Public space needs are assessed and met through recommendations for “Public Open Space” – privately owned land to which the public has access – achieved through new private development or through acquisition or improvement of public parkland, owned and/or operated by the City of Takoma Park or Montgomery Parks. The CR zoning recommended by the TPMMA includes a requirement for Public Open Space as a percentage of a development project site, up to 10% based on the size of the site and the number of street frontages. See Section 59.4.5.4 of the Zoning Ordinance. The Plan Area includes numerous public parks and the TPMMA does not recommend new park space but does recommend exploring new ways to activate existing parks.</i></p>
--	---

*For transportation infrastructure, the master plan process includes Policy Area Review of potential transportation impacts of recommended density on the transportation network. The Transportation Policy Area Review conducted by Planning Department staff for the Silver Spring Downtown and Adjacent Communities Plan also covers the Plan Area for the TPMMA. That review found transportation infrastructure at the Policy Area to be adequate for the density recommended in the Silver Spring Plan. The relatively small geography and recommended additional density of the TPMMA does not change that finding. Local Area Transportation Review (LATR) will be conducted as part of each application for development to review, and if necessary, mitigate the project's local transportation impact.*

*For public recreation, the TPMMA recommends colocation of new facilities as part of redevelopment on the Adventist campus as well as potential reuse of the Piney Branch Elementary School building in the event that the school moves from the Maple Avenue site. Additionally, each private residential development will also need to provide recreational elements to serve its new residents. Many of these elements could also be publicly accessible. Recreation requirements for private development are addressed during the development review process. Montgomery Planning's recreation guidelines are online at:  
<https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/countywide/recreation-guidelines/>*

*Planning for adequate public-school facilities is a joint effort between Montgomery Planning and the Division of Capital Planning and Real Estate at Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS). MCPS planners project student enrollment for the near future at the countywide and individual school levels, and develop strategies and long-range facility plans to meet capacity needs. They also coordinate relevant county and state budgets for the six-year Capital Improvements Program (CIP), and publish the [Educational Facilities Master Plan](#) annually.*

	<p><i>Montgomery Planning administers the Annual School Test based on MCPS' projections and scheduled CIP projects and conducts School Adequacy Analysis for development applications accordingly. Planning staff also produces student generation rates and relevant housing data, which is shared with MCPS to inform their forecasting and facility planning efforts as well. For more information, visit: <a href="https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/countywide/growth-and-infrastructure-policy/schools/">https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/countywide/growth-and-infrastructure-policy/schools/</a></i></p> <p><i>The TPMMA process determined that there is currently sufficient capacity in the schools serving the Plan Area to accommodate the recommended density.</i></p> <p><i>The adequacy of public utilities is determined during the development review process for each application. PEPCO, Washington Gas, and WSSC review each application and determine if the utility impacts of the proposed development require specific upgrades, which generally the developer would implement at their expense.</i></p> <p><i>Health care is an essential element of a thriving community, but it is not a “public facility” – like roads, schools, police, fire, libraries, etc. – that is assessed during the master plan process, or during development review.</i></p>
<p>How does the MMPA ensure adequate services will be available with the proposed increased population growth, and what mitigating strategies can be considered?</p>	<p><i>As discussed above, master plans assess certain impacts at a general level, while more specific impacts are assessed during the development review process. At development review, the Planning Board must find that public facilities are adequate to accommodate the impacts of the proposed development. Sometimes the developer is required to improve particular facilities, or make a financial contribution to that end, to meet the finding. Other impacts may be addressed through public capital expenditure from the County or City. The TPMMA includes a CIP table (Table 6, beginning on page 100 of the Public Hearing Draft) identifying capital improvements recommended in the plan and which public agency/government would have the lead role. These are not requirements, but recommendations.</i></p>

<p>Are there specific parcels outside the Municipal District that would be appropriate locations to incentivize the expansion or creation of specific public benefit facilities?</p>	<p><i>The plan looked at opportunities for co-location throughout the plan area including Site 23 which is a part of the Washington Adventist campus. Here is the specific recommendation for Site 23: “Consider feasibility of location/co-location of public or community-serving uses.”</i></p>
<p>The MMPA should include more specific recommendations around the activation and creation of usable greenspace including the activation of the greenspace neighboring Essex House and identification of additional opportunities for ballfields and structured play areas.</p>	<p><i>The TPMMA plan area already includes numerous parks, including Takoma-Piney Branch Local Park, which includes several ballfields, two structured play areas, a multi-hoop basketball court, a skate park, and picnic pavilions, as well as an adjacent City dog park.</i></p> <p><i>To address the City’s concerns, the Board provided the following language revisions to Section 4.2.2.2, Parks and Open Space as part of the Maple Avenue District:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Conduct feasibility studies to add a food forest, orchard project, in addition to the unprogrammed open space of Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park at the southeastern corner of Maple Avenue and Sligo Creek Parkway. Approximately three-quarters of the 0.5 +/- acre turf area of Sligo Creek Stream Valley Park is undevelopable (for anything other than food forest, orchard, afforestation, etc.) due to the floodplain and stream buffer constraints. The parkland outside of these environmentally sensitive areas could accommodate picnic tables and benches.</i></li> <li><i>• Conduct a feasibility study to add a neighborhood-serving community garden to Opal A. Daniels Neighborhood Park.</i></li> <li><i>• Encourage activation of the unprogrammed parkland at the intersection of Maple Avenue and Sligo Creek Parkway.</i></li> </ul>
<p>The plan should clearly support improvements in multi-modal transportation, help meet City and County climate goals, and address the current and future challenges of local vehicle traffic in the plan area.</p>	<p><i>The TPMMA Draft Plan recommended connectivity improvements and environmentally sensitive development throughout the plan area. Local traffic is addressed as part of the development review process.</i></p>



**Topic: Protecting Existing Housing Affordability in the MMPA**

<p>How can the MMPA stakeholders retain existing housing affordability while improving the quality of existing stock of housing?</p>	<p>Many of the multifamily properties in the Maple Avenue corridor may soon reach the end of their useful life, given their age and condition.</p> <p>The TPMMA offers a guide for redevelopment that allows properties to redevelop as mixed-income communities that preserve and expand existing affordability with no net loss of affordability while minimizing displacement, ensuring residents receive support and assistance to mitigate the impacts of temporary relocation and prioritizing existing residents the right to return.</p>
<p>What protection mechanisms are in place to prevent displacement of current renters in the Maple Avenue District and are additional protections needed in the MMPA?</p>	<p>Per the recommendation of the Planning Board, on page 70 of the Public Hearing Draft, Section 3.3.2.3, Preservation of Housing and Affordability, the recommendation regarding displacement was strengthened to read “In the event of redevelopment, priority should be given to existing eligible residents for the right to return. Property owners should work with DHCA, the City, and tenants to minimize displacement and ensure eligible residents receive support and assistance to mitigate the impacts of temporary relocation.”</p>
<p>How do federal, state, and local policies such as low-income housing tax credits, Moderately-Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) requirements, rent stabilization, and others advance affordable housing goals in the MMPA, including no-net loss of affordable housing?</p>	<p>The Planning Board has no purview over the allocation of federal and state affordable resources like LIHTC, nor does the Board have purview over the implementation of county or city rent stabilization policies.</p> <p>The TPMMA advances affordable housing largely through three mechanisms:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The MPDU program, given that the requirements for MPDUs are nested in the zoning code. The plan recommends 12.5% MPDUs, consistent with the county code.</li><li>2. Implementation recommendations that call on our partners like DHCA, the city, HOC, and development partners to assist with expansion and retention of affordability.</li></ol>

	<p>3. Substantial conformance with Master Plans in the development review process. This requires development applications to substantially conform to Master Plan recommendations, including the no net loss of affordable housing recommendation.</p>
<p>The MMPA should be more explicit about how its goal of no net loss of affordable housing, and City housing goals, will be met in this plan.</p>	<p>The Planning Board added the following information on the mechanics of no net loss of affordable housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No net loss of affordable housing requires that all affordable housing units (both naturally occurring and income-restricted units) lost through demolition be replaced or rebuilt.</li> <li>• No net loss of affordable housing is enforced primarily through the requirement that the Planning Board find that new development applications are consistent with the recommendations of the Plan.</li> <li>• Planning Staff would work with potential applicants for development on sites with affordable housing with the goal of ensuring the amount of affordable housing on the site did not decrease.</li> <li>• More broadly, realizing this goal requires increased density to ensure feasibility, flexibility for land use, coordination with implementation partners (including the Department of Housing and Community Affairs and both affordable and market-rate housing providers), and assistance from other housing policies and programs.</li> </ul>

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council wants the Montgomery County Planning Board to address the following in the Planning Board Draft Plan of the MMPA directly or prior to the advancement of the revised MMPA to the City Council and the Montgomery County Council:

<p>Include language in the MMPA that explicitly explains how the plan's recommendations address the Community Priorities identified</p>	<p><i>The Planning Board added the following language to TPMMA Section 1.4, Community Priorities, to address this comment:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The TPMMA strives to preserve the city's unique character, enhance the quality of life, and create new opportunities for residents to live, work and play within the Plan area.</i></li> </ul>
---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The plan envisions a new mixed-use future for the Washington Adventist Campus that allows for medical, educational, commercial and residential uses.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Plan provides for recommendations that address environmentally sensitive development adjacent to the park and increases the protection of the park and improves public access.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Plan's recommendations allow for a flexible mixed-use zone that can accommodate MPDU's or other affordable housing.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Plan recommends a flexible mixed-use zone that allows for the development of neighborhood retail and other commercial uses.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Plan's recommendations allow for co-location of public facilities such as a recreation center, encourages improved access to existing open space and a flexible mixed-use zone that has an open space requirement for development.</i></li> </ul>
<p>Provide additional documentation and background information on the Climate Assessment as well as assess the potential impacts of the MMPA on the environment and consider possible mitigating strategies</p>	<p><i>As required, by the legislation, the Climate Assessment will be transmitted to the County Council no later than one week prior to the Council's Public Hearing. Additionally, the Plan made recommendations that encourage environmentally sensitive design, address climate change and encouraged improvements to major environmental features such as Brashear's Run and Sligo Creek Stream and Stream Valley Park.</i></p>
<p>Provide additional information on the race equity impacts and how they were developed</p>	<p><i>The County Racial Equity and Social Justice Act requires the Planning Board to consider the impact of a master plan on racial equity and social justice. The TPMMA contains new language that summarizes the ways in which the plan recommendations support racial equity and social justice.</i></p> <p><i>The Office of Legislative Oversight will conduct a formal impact assessment of the Planning Board Draft that is sent to the County Council.</i></p>
<p>Provide additional details on resident engagement during the development of the MMPA's vision, including outreach to residents along Maple Avenue</p>	<p><i>A Community Engagement Report is available on the TPMMA website: <a href="https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/TPMMA-Appendix-A-Community-Engagement-and-Outreach.pdf">https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/TPMMA-Appendix-A-Community-Engagement-and-Outreach.pdf</a></i></p>

<p>Provide additional information on how existing tree coverage in the MMPA along with future development requirements will help meet the goal of 60% tree canopy coverage throughout the entire City</p>	<p><i>The Plan takes the following into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Individual tree protection is reliant on the City Tree Ordinance and the Forest Conservation Law.</i></li> <li>• <i>Impervious cover will be reduced due to green cover requirements.</i></li> <li>• <i>Requirements for new development may increase open space &amp; tree planting outside of the campus.</i></li> <li>• <i>Existing park and green open space will be retained.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>To further align with the City’s approved plan and policies, the Board made the following revision in Section 3.3.1.1 Extreme Heat &amp; Tree Canopy:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Consistent with the City’s goals of 60% tree canopy throughout the entire city, the plan proposes achieving 60 percent tree canopy coverage for the overall plan area on both public and private property.</i></li> </ul>
<p>Work with City staff to demonstrate alignment of the MMPA with City of Takoma Park adopted plans and policies, including: the Housing and Economic Development Strategic Plan, the 2019 Sustainability and Climate Action Plan, the 2019 declaration of climate emergency, the 2020 Climate Action Framework, the City's Rent Stabilization ordinances, the City's Racial Equity Initiative, and City policies and ordinances related to stormwater, tree canopy, safe streets, and City right-of-way</p>	<p><i>The Plan was a joint effort between the City of Takoma Park and the Montgomery County Planning Department. Regular meetings were held to ensure that the plan incorporated stated City goals and policies. As a result, the Takoma Park Minor Master Plan Amendment (TPMMA) aligns with the City's adopted plans and policies by incorporating provisions that promote mixed-income housing, sustainable and environmentally sensitive development practices, racial equity, and climate action.</i></p>
<p>Address forthcoming additional list of City edits and corrections to the text of the MMPA</p>	<p><i>Minor edits and text corrections will be incorporated into the red-line version of the Public Hearing Draft of the TPMMA for the Planning Board’s review and approval on December 14<sup>th</sup>.</i></p>