Planning Board Worksession No.4: Parklawn South District and Randolph Hills District
Prior Worksessions

- **January 27:** Focused on transportation analysis and staging recommendations in the Draft Plan.

- **February 9:** Reviewed the Executive Boulevard District and associated economic feasibility analysis for some properties.

- **February 16:** A joint meeting with the Rock Spring Master Plan on school issues within the Walter Johnson Cluster.

- **February 23:** Reviewed the Rockville-Pike Montrose North District and revisited five properties in the Executive Boulevard district.
Today’s worksession is focused on the Parklawn District and the Randolph Hills District.

- Industrial uses and market rate residential development.
- Staff memorandum has additional analysis on industrial uses and market rate residential development (multifamily).
Parklawn and Randolph Hills Districts
Key Draft Plan Recommendations

- Parklawn Drive and Randolph Road realignment
- New bikeways
- Use of Rocking Horse Road Center as a public school
- New parks and open spaces
Twinbrook and White Flint 2 Context

2009 Twinbrook Sector Plan
Draft Plan Recommendations

Recommendations:

- Redevelopment should incorporate the character of the adjacent industrial area, to create neighborhood serving centers that are unique to this cluster.
- Define and activate open spaces for community use.
- Promote the enhancement of bike and pedestrian connections related to potential redevelopment sites.
Industrial Analysis

Purpose

- Understand suitability of current zoning for industrial properties in White Flint II

- Considerations
  - Value to local businesses and residents
  - Market conditions
  - Competitiveness of facilities
  - Balance land use changes while maintaining industrial viability
Industrial Analysis

2013 Industrial Land Use Trends: Montgomery County

Key Findings

- **Residential encroachment one of the most serious threats** to an industrial district….
- Light industrial districts provide **valuable services for residents and businesses**…
- …losses (of industrial land) are greatest in the county’s urban areas…
- Industrial land often provides **opportunities for entry-level and vocational jobs**…
- Industrial land **serves the County’s needs for municipal facilities**…
- Industrial buildings **typically offer lower rents** than most office or retail buildings, and often **light industrial properties are better suited to the needs of non-industrial businesses**, entrepreneurs, and even artisans….
- **Public commitment to retaining industrial districts** can reassure businesses to long term stability and investment…
Industrial Analysis

Business/Industry Composition

- Over half are either retail goods/services, or offices

- Characteristics
  - Synergy with industrial uses
  - Doesn’t require storefront with lots of auto or foot traffic
  - Cost sensitive
  - Serves downcounty

- Most are small businesses
  - ~50% employ 5 people or less

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Business Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Light Industrial Uses (~39%)</td>
<td>Auto Repair</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dry Cleaners</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General contracting or construction services (including design)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Supply and Wholesale</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storage Facility, Rental Car Companies, Moving Companies</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Goods and Services (~32%)</td>
<td>Furniture Store</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apparel, Home Goods Supply and Wholesale</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurants and Grocery Stores</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convenience Retail Services</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fitness Centers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices and Professional Organizations (~24%)</td>
<td>Professional associations and advocacy organizations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Offices and Education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consulting Firms</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Office for Retail Businesses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown (~5%)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Quarterly Census of Earnings and Wages, 2014
## Market Analysis

### White Flint II Industrial District: Market Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WFII Industrial District</th>
<th>County (Industrial)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupancy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>90.50%</td>
<td>89.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Occupancy Rate Change</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent per SF</td>
<td>$13.12</td>
<td>$12.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Rent PSF Change</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absorption</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Net Absorption Rate</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Underutilized Land</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CoStar Group, Inc.

1 Industrial space measured in the County include only buildings classified as industrial and flex space.

2 Planning professionals often consider properties with an improvement-to-land ratio below one to be underutilized and more likely to redeveloped or improved over time.
Industrial Analysis

Competitiveness of Facilities

- Building Size
  - Diverse
    - Half are 20,000 SF or less
    - 14 percent are 50,000 SF or more

- Building Age
  - 90 percent were built between 1960-1979
  - Most are in original condition, with some maintenance and minor upgrades

- Density
  - 65 percent have an FAR of 0.6 or less (1.0 is maximum)
    - Enough for most to expand, although not fully redevelop
Industrial Analysis

Conclusions
- Strong market; vacant space accommodates future demand
- Diverse businesses; many provide valuable down-county services
- Facilities match the needs of industrial tenants
- Older facilities keep rents low, although could benefit from reinvestment

Land Use Recommendations
- Maintain IL zoning for majority of industrial district
- Providing additional density (within existing uses) could encourage reinvestment for some properties
- Retail zoning classifications possible for properties with established retail presence
- Limit new residential uses in the district
Draft Plan Recommendations
District: Parklawn South

Nicholson Court

Parklawn Drive

Randolph Hills Shopping Center
Draft Plan Recommendations

District: Parklawn South

Existing Zoning

Draft Plan Zoning Recommendations
Draft Plan Recommendations

District: Parklawn South

Public Testimony

Nicholson Court

- Nicholson Plaza is supportive of the Neighborhood Retail (NR) zone.
- Other property owners at Nicholson Court requested retaining the existing light industrial (IL) zone with a floating Commercial Residential (CR)-2.0 zone.

Parklawn Drive and Randolph Square

- No submitted testimony.

Randolph Hills Shopping Center

- Requested rezoning of the shopping center to permit development at 1.75 FAR.
- Pickford Enterprises, Parklawn Center 11711-11777 Parklawn Drive and 5040 Boiling Brook Parkway, recommended different alternatives for the property, including the CRT 2.0 C2.0 R2.0 H-75; IL 2.0; IL or IM zone that permits residential development, similar to the Twinbrook overlay; or the CRT floating zone.
Draft Plan Recommendations
District: Parklawn South

Public Testimony

Randolph Hills Civic Association (RCA) supports:
- Loehmann’s Plaza recommendation and Randolph Hills Shopping Center redevelopment; the reconfiguration of Parklawn Drive and Randolph Road; and a MARC station at Nicholson Court.
- Pedestrian and bicycle connection across the CSX tracks.
- Converting the right-of-way at the intersection of Putnam Road and Macon Road should be developed as park and formalizing the MCDOT parcel, which is adjacent to the Walnut Grove condominium into a formal pathway as part of the bikeway network.

Friends of White Flint
- Supportive of bikeway recommendations and reconfiguration of Parklawn Drive and Randolph Road.
- A pedestrian-bike connection across the CSX tracks to the Metro is needed.
- Endorses retaining of light industrial properties, but supports mixed use development at Randolph Hills Shopping Center and Nicholson Court.
Draft Plan Recommendations

District: Parklawn South

Property: Pickford Enterprises

Land Area: 4.88 acres
Existing FAR: 0.65

Revised proposal

- IL zone at 1.5 FAR
- Height: 75 feet
- Zoning text amendment for residential uses

Issues

- IL zone height is limited to 50 feet
- Twinbrook Overlay Zone: All residential uses must be located above the first floor and must be less than 40% of the total floor area of the building—Section 4.9.17 (B)
Draft Plan Recommendations

Area: Montrose Baptist

Key Properties

Existing Zoning

Draft Plan Zoning Recommendation
Draft Plan Recommendations
Area: Rocking Horse Road Center

Key Properties

Existing Zoning

Draft Plan Zoning Recommendation

JDS-Uptown School

Rocking Horse
Road Center

R-90 Single-Family Residential

R-60 Single-Family Residential

Not to Scale
Multifamily Residential Properties

Key Multifamily Zoned Properties

1. The Morgan
2. Miramont Apartments and Condominium
3. Randolph Square
4. Walnut Grove Condominium
5. Oxford Square
Affordable Housing Definitions

- **Income Restricted Affordable Housing:** A Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) or a dwelling unit built under government regulation (Chapter 25A) or binding agreement requiring the unit be affordable to households at or below the income eligibility for the MPDU program.

- **Income Restricted Workforce Housing:** Defined in Chapter 25B as housing that is affordable to households at or below 120% area wide median income (AMI). When a master plan refers to Workforce Housing as a part of its affordable housing goals or requirements, incomes are limited to 100% of AMI.

- **Market Rate Affordable Housing.** There is no definition in County Code, Zoning Ordinance or elsewhere. The term is used to describe rents that occur in the market place and not subject to government rules or requirements (and therefore not income-restricted). Market rate affordable dwelling units are affordable to households earning no more than 80% of area median income, adjusted as MPDUs for household and unit size, and must not exceed the median rent for the planning area.

- **Rent Restricted Affordable Housing:** This term is not currently defined in County Code or commonly used, but appears to be the best term to describe housing where rent increases will be limited and there is no income test for the tenant. The preservation of market rate affordable housing may require an agreement that both establishes the baseline rent (priced to be affordable at 80% of AMI) and rent restrictions (such as requiring that rents increase by only the Voluntary Rent Guideline.)
Multi-Family Existing Conditions

1. The Morgan
- 120 units – all 2 bedroom units
- 19 years old – youngest facility in Plan Area
- Only facility in the planning area with MPDUs (20)
- MPDUs expired in Feb 2017 but were extended for 5 years
- 6% vacancy
- Highest AMI in Planning Area – Affordable to households earning around 109% AMI

2. Miramont Apartments & Condominium
- 300 Units (Apartments); 120 (Condos)
- 28 years old
- 1.3% vacancy
- Predominantly 1-bedroom units (53% of units), 77 2-bedroom units (26%), 60 efficiencies (20%)
- Affordability ranges from 80% - 96% of AMI – 80% for efficiency, 85% for 1-bedroom unit, and 96% of AMI for a 2-bedroom

3. Randolph Square
- 120 Units
- 47 years old
- 0.8% vacancy – lowest vacancy in Plan Area
- 33 1-bedroom units (28%), 72 2-bedroom units (30%), and 15 3-bedroom units (13%)
- Most affordable facility in Plan Area
- Affordability ranges from 61%-65% of AMI

4. Walnut Grove Condominium
- 167 units
- Units between 700 and 1200 square feet
- 42 years old

5. Oxford Square
- 167 units
- 49 years old, oldest facility in Plan Area
- 7.2% vacancy
- 44 1-bedroom units (26%), 101 2-bedroom units (60%), and 22 3-bedroom units (13%)
- Affordability ranges from 60%-71% of AMI

6. The Monterey
- 432 units – largest facility in Plan Area
- 48 years old
- 5.6% vacancy
- 174 1-bedroom units (40%), 210 2-bedroom units (49%), 48 3-bedroom units (11%)
- Affordability ranges from 75% (1-bedroom units, 84% (2-bedroom units), and 89% (3-bedroom units)
Multi-Family Existing Conditions

- Five multi-family rental dwelling buildings
  - 1,133 units
    - 5% efficiencies, 36% 1-bedrooms, 51% 2-bedrooms, 8% 3-bedrooms
    - 2% MPDUs (20 units)
  - Average age of 38 years
- Of the 5 buildings in White Flint 2, 2 are wholly market-rate affordable, 2 are partially
- Rent levels for White Flint 2’s multi-family dwelling units are affordable to households who earn between 60% - 109% AMI
  - Average affordability of 83% of AMI

White Flint 1 Comparison

- Apartments in White Flint 2 have lower rents and are more affordable than apartments in White Flint 1
- Average building age in White Flint 1 is only 8 years old
  - 16% of units in White Flint 1 are MPDU units
- Typical with newer construction, multifamily in White Flint 1 skews to smaller units
  - 8% efficiencies, 60% 1-bedrooms, 36% 2-bedrooms, only 5% 3-bedrooms
  - Contrast in affordability in greatest in larger units
Effective Rent Per SQ FT in White Flint 1 and White Flint 2 (2000-Current)

2006 - 2016 Average Effective Rent Growth/Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Average Growth/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Flint 2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Flint 1</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Inflation Rate</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CoStar
Multifamily Residential Properties

draft plan recommendations

Retention of existing multifamily residential zone properties (R-30 and R-20) to support existing market rate affordable units.
Multifamily Residential Properties

Public Testimony (non-property owners)

City of Rockville
- Supports increased percentage of MPDUs and preservation of some of the existing “market affordable” housing.
- Strengthen the Plan’s approach on the provision of a broader range of housing options and types.
  - Incomes that are lower than MPDU levels and individuals with disabilities and special needs
  - Incorporate alternative housing types, such as duplexes and small apartments.

Friends of White Flint
- Supportive of Oxford Square request.
- Market rate affordable will become obsolete; no ADA access etc.
- Innovative residential concepts: micro-units, shared housing, office/residential (Elofts)
Multifamily Residential Properties
Property: The Morgan

The Morgan
- Built in 1996
- Existing Zone: R-20
- Land Area: 4.97 acres
- Existing Units: 132 dwelling units (all are 2 bedroom units)
- Units per acre: 26.5 dus/acre
Multifamily Residential Properties
Property: The Morgan

Public Testimony
- Request for Commercial Residential (CR) 1.25 C0.25 R1.25 H120

Draft Plan zoning recommendations
Multifamily Residential Properties
Property: Miramont Apartments and Condominiums

Public testimony
- No comments submitted

Key properties

Existing zoning

Draft Plan zoning recommendations
Multifamily Residential Properties
Property: Randolph Square

Public Testimony
- No comments submitted
Multifamily Residential Properties
Properties: Walnut Grove and Oxford Square

Key Properties

Existing Zoning

Draft Plan Zoning Recommendation

Walnut Grove
Parklawn Drive
11821
Loehmann’s Plaza
Commercial Residential
CR 1.5, C-1.0, R-1.0, H-75’

11821 Parklawn Drive
Loehmann’s Plaza
Walnut Grove
Oxford Square
Loehmann’s Plaza
- Supportive of the Draft Plan recommendations.

Walnut Grove
- Requesting the CR 1.25 C0.25 R1.25 H-120 to add incremental development to preserve and improve the existing community.

Oxford Square
- Requesting the CRT or CR 1.0 C0.25 R1.0 H65 to permit complete redevelopment of the property with MPDUs.
Multifamily Residential Properties
Zoning Alternatives

Multifamily Zones: (R-30 and R-20)

- Multifamily, low density residential (R-30)
  - Base: 14.50 dwelling units per acre
  - Optional: 17.69 dwelling units per acre
  - TDR: 40 dwelling units per acre

- Multifamily, medium density residential (R-20)
  - Base: 21.70 dwelling units per acre
  - Optional: 26.47 dwelling units per acre
  - TDR: 50 dwelling units per acre

Floating Zones

- Commercial Residential (CR)
- Commercial Residential Town (CRT)
  - With or without a Master Plan recommendation

Euclidean Zones

- Commercial Residential (CR)
- Commercial Residential Town (CRT)
- Commercial Residential Neighborhood (CRN)
Multifamily Residential Properties
Properties: Walnut Grove and Oxford Square

**Walnut Grove**
Existing Dwelling Units: 135 (Condominium)
Land Area: 6.20 acres
Existing Zone: R-20
Dwelling units per acre: 21.7

**Zoning Alternatives**
1. R-20 (TDR-50)
   - Provides TDR
   - Building heights that are compatible with residential community
   - Does not permit retail sales and service

**Potential Dwelling Units**
- Walnut Grove: 310 dwelling units
- Oxford Square: 565 dwelling units

**Oxford Square**
Existing Dwelling Units: 167 (Rental)
Land Area: 11.3 acres
Existing Zone: R-30
Dwelling units per acre: 14.7

**Zoning Alternatives**
2. Commercial Residential (CR) or Commercial Residential Town (CRT)
   - CR/CRT 1.0
   - CR: optional method (0.5 FAR and higher); CRT (1.0 FAR)
   - Height: 65-70 feet
   - Permits retail sales and service

**Potential Dwelling Units**
- Oxford Square: 400 + dwelling units @ 1 FAR
- Walnut Grove: +175 dwelling units @ 1.25 FAR
Multifamily Residential Properties

Walter Johnson School Impact

1. The Morgan
2. Miramont
3. Randolph Square
4. Walnut Grove
5. Oxford Square
## School Impacts and Residential Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White Flint 2 Sector Plan in the Walter Johnson Cluster*</th>
<th>329</th>
<th>139</th>
<th>189</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Executive Boulevard</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Multifamily Residential</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Walter Johnson Total</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Flint 2 Sector Plan in the Downcounty Consortium*</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total White Flint 2 Sector Plan Schools</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Development</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Plan Recommendation</td>
<td>5,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New multifamily residential</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Executive Boulevard</td>
<td>1,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Total</td>
<td>8,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Properties</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumption: 90% of the residential development are multifamily; 10% are townhouses and latest generation rates for the Southwest area (June 2016)
Upcoming Worksessions

March 23, 2017  Finance
March 30, 2017  Transportation