

Nono Dontask - Rockville, 20850

1

I can't begin to tell you how infuriated I am that County officials feel that the majority of we single family homeowners would ever be "okay" with this Attainable Housing Strategies BS they're spewing. Montgomery County seems to be taking every opportunity to make a tax dollar at the expense of those of us who already live here, whose children are in already overcrowded (and as of FY26 UNDERFUNDED) schools, and who are already stuck driving on overcrowded roadways. Don't think for a second that we're all going to switch to mass transit because your (OVER BUDGET AND OVER DEADLINE) Purple Line project connects a few communities. I drive Connecticut Ave. every day to work and home, and to go just 6-7 miles sometimes takes upwards of 45 -50 minutes. It's ridiculous!! And now there are hundreds of new apartments going up just off Conn. Ave on Veirs Mill Road, in addition to the new apartments and condos ON Conn. Ave in Chevy Chase. My situation is clearly localized, and I get that. If you've driven the neighborhoods in my area, you'll find that there are a LOT of single family homes with upwards of 10-12 people living in them in sublet rooms or illegal apartments, and people are parking their vehicles in their front yards to accommodate their "tenants". How about some enforcement for that? Do you think that making it legal for a SFH owner to now renovate or demo their home to accommodate that same number of people is going to solve the housing crunch in MoCo?? You're delusional, and it makes me wonder where you all actually live, which schools your kids go to (private schools perhaps?), and what roads you drive on to get to and from work because it's clearly NOT what we're dealing with here in the East Rockville, Aspen Hill, Wheaton, Kensington areas.

Marc Brenman - Kensington, 20895

2

Changing single family zoning to multiple family zoning will inevitably upset and make angry many people who live in the County's many single family suburban developments. Why go down that route? Why not show respect for the people who bought houses (many years ago) believing that the integrity of their communities would continue? The County Council has already decreased their quality of life by approving every development request that has come before them, clogging roads, making traffic awful, and overcrowding schools. Owners of single family homes have been supporting the County with their property tax money since time immemorial. The so-called "housing crisis" is mostly an illusion anyway. There's lots of housing being build in many parts of the County. It's good that the County Council wants to pay attention to the needs of low income County residents, but middle class residents deserve attention also. We all know that the rich parts of the County won't be adversely affected by the proposed changes.

Caroline Davenport - Gaithersburg, 20878

3

I support this initiative to increase the diversity of housing types allowed thereby increasing the housing supply and in turn making housing more affordable. This is so needed. While I know this alone won't solve the housing affordability crisis, it is an essential step in the right direction. I grew up in Montgomery County and currently live here as a renter. I would love to one day buy a house and permanently settle down in the County, but currently I'm not sure if that's possible given the prices - and I have a stable, well-paying job as does my partner. All I want is the opportunity to purchase a modest house in the place I've called home for the overwhelming majority of my life.

4

Barron Williams - Chevy Chase, 20815-5326

This is a cynical policy that will not move the needle, and seems to be driven only by ideology and not the goal of making non-apartment housing more affordable. Keep building apartments and the new supply will push those rents down. But the real affordability crisis is in SFH and TH, and that can only be addressed by greenfield development in scale, which the county seems to have no willpower or even desire to do. Meanwhile, you are exasperating the people who elected you by pushing a policy that will accomplish nothing.

5

Nick Silverman - Bethesda, 20816

1 mile from a metro is too far to assume that a neighborhood can handle multiple family buildings. My neighborhood is a dead-end set of small houses where kids play in the street and dogs walk there. We cannot handle any more cars without compromising safety, and that means that we cannot handle multi-family houses.

Please restrict the multi-family house zoning to neighborhoods that have sidewalks. It's not safe to inject more cars into neighborhoods without sidewalks where kids and dogwalkers must use the street.

In our neighborhood, the lots are small, the roads are narrow, and there are no sidewalks. Most houses do not have driveways. Consequently most residents have to use street parking. This can be very challenging, especially when cars are parked on both sides of the street. Rezoning for multifamily housing would have an enormous impact, not only on the many houses affected, but the entire neighborhood. It would ultimately lead to kids being hit by cars and others losing out on the chance to play outdoors.

6

Brooke Wovin - Bethesda, 20816

I am writing to strongly oppose the attainable housing plan that has been submitted to the County Council to rezone segments of single family homes neighborhoods to multiunit dwellings in some areas of the county. The plan that has been introduced was created with no citizen input and no thoughtfulness regarding the neighborhoods that will be affected. The map of rezoning proposed is so haphazard that the 500 foot zones drawn along major corridors even transect some houses.

We live in the Greenacres neighborhood off of River Road with young children. All of the neighborhoods south of Little Falls Parkway are composed of 1940's and 50's houses on small lots with no driveways, narrow streets and no sidewalks. There is already a major parking problem for current residents but more than that, a serious SAFETY issue exists for children who walk to Westbrook and Westland in neighborhoods with no sidewalks. Increasing traffic congestion and parking problems will significantly worsen an already DANGEROUS situation for our kids. Our narrow streets cannot accommodate any more cars.

While I am extremely troubled by the safety and traffic issues that this plan will have on our small community, I want to also emphasize the severe detrimental impact it will have on our schools. The recent boundary study almost doubled the enrollment of our elementary school, Westbrook, which is now overcrowded. Now the attainable housing plan is being introduced on the heels of the county's failure to fully fund the school system for the 2024-2025 school year, which has resulted in increased class size, How can we now further increase density

in our neighborhoods and increase enrollment at Westbrook which is already beyond capacity with multi family housing? Our kids are already in classes that are too large with teachers that are spread too thin. There is no more available capacity at Westbrook.

The Friendship Heights area already has large condo buildings and more are under construction now. Westbard is being turned into a extremely large number of townhomes and condos. So housing is already being accounted for in this area. But if there is a need for more types of housing, continue to focus on old commercial properties such as the Geico complex (near the metro and Somerset elementary school is UNDER capacity) or the gas stations and storage units on River Road. Similar style dwellings can be built together into small neighborhoods and provided with the amenities required. But our small communities between Western Ave and Little Falls parkway should, WITHOUT QUESTION, be removed from the attainable housing plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

7

LYNN GOTTSCHALK - Bethesda, 20816

This is a huge change to our neighborhoods and the planning committee has not done a proper analysis. It is not as simple as adding houses. We need services to support those residents.

An analysis should be done for school enrollment, traffic, the stress on aging utilities and where the county can add facilities like parks. In my area we are already adding hundreds of units. It's not clear the area can handle that.

This is a complex problem and the plan does not reflect that.

8

Elizabeth Jalali - Bethesda, 20816

Please do not hand over our n'hood to developers who do not have our interests protected- this is purely a giveaway to developerrs. There are large unused lots closer to the metro - lord and Taylor, possibly GEICO that would be better suited for dense development- why aren't they being considered? Others have mentioned the loss of mature trees, stress on roads, utilities, schools etc and the council's answers paper over our concerns- "minimal impact" - really??? The council appears to be strong arming this through without a democratic process. Why isn't this offered as a teferendum that citizens can say yes or no?

9

Amanda Tarpey - Bethesda, 20816

We are strongly opposed to the plan proposed by the county for the Westbrook and Green Acres neighborhood and frankly disappointed with the council and our elected representatives for developing this plan without any input or thoughtful consideration for the community. Our small neighborhood cannot accommodate an influx of multi-dwelling units neither in terms of neighborhood services, schools nor parking or support. The proposed plan will materially change the dynamic of our neighborhood, tearing down beautiful homes and deteriorating our home values. Our neighborhoods have no sidewalks and this proposed congestion will create more hazardous conditions for our kids that walk and bike to Westbrook and Westland every day- bus transportation is not provided in our neighborhoods. This is truly a safety concern. In addition, Westbrook is already over capacity from the boundary study a couple of years ago.

If you go forward we are committed to decisive action to show our opposition and concern, and certainly will redirect our support to politicians that truly represent the interest of its constituents.

10 Marina Bowsher - Chevy Chase, 20815

I cannot recall if I already provided feedback, but in case I have not, I think the plan as it stands now is extremely faulty. I would be more supportive of the idea if the following issues were addressed:

1. The goal of "attainable" housing was not based on market rate. Market rate will only benefit developers. Perhaps require an "affordable" unit (something affordable to at least the current median household income in Montgomery County) for any multi-unit dwelling built.
2. Do NOT waiver a parking requirement. On-street parking already clogs the street and threatens the safety of pedestrians, particularly children walking to school.
3. Add sidewalks on each street that is rezoned and on all streets leading from the rezoned streets to the metro. Again - this is a safety issue.
4. Do (or disclose if this has been done) an in-depth study(ies) on the effects this development would have on infrastructure (schools, roads/traffic, water, electricity, sewers, etc.) and the environment.

11 Meredith Hammond - Bethesda, 20816

Attainable housing is a wonderful thing if done properly, and this plan is fraught with problems. There must be a plan to deal with parking, which is in very limited supply in these neighborhoods. With narrow streets, no sidewalks and a school nearby, neighborhoods will become danger zones if multi-family buildings are erected without some plan for where to park the extra cars. The argument that metro is close by and people will rely on that vs. owning cars is absolutely absurd. Figure out a plan that doesn't endanger our neighborhoods or don't move forward.

12 Allie Anindita - Bethesda, 20816

My family is fine with this plan. Please tune out the NIMBYs. Thank you for your work.

13 Nicholas Silverman - Bethesda, 20816

Please do NOT do this.

I live in a small single-family home on a dead-end street in Green Acres, Bethesda. I have a two-year old daughter named Elizabeth. We have small lots, few driveways, and no sidewalks. Children (including Elizabeth) play in the street.

If you add density to our neighborhood, every new unit will mean more cars, more traffic, and more danger to our children. We are NOT close enough to the metro that any residents have no car. Any multi-family housing should be limited to the EAST side of River Road.

Please vote against any attempt to eliminate single-family housing in crammed neighborhoods on the west side of River Road and east side of Massachusetts Ave.

14 Michael Buening - Bethesda, 20816

I'm broadly supportive of the Attainable Housing Strategies being explored. Increasing density of housing is a necessary part of addressing the climate crisis. It will require additional attention to transportation, schools, etc., but those are the right "problems" to have. As a homeowner in a neighborhood that is all single-family units, I would still support sensible "densification" even if it meant the house next door to me would become a duplex.

15 Kevin Guerrero - Bethesda, 20816

I am writing in opposition to the county's attainable housing plan. I would ask the Council to pursue alternatives to the available/affordable housing issue other than rezoning long standing single-family house neighborhoods for multifamily development. Such alternatives exist, instead of destroying well established single family neighborhoods at whim. The general 1-mile-from-metro framework used for this project is not an appropriate one-size-fits-all approach. In our Westbrook neighborhoods (the neighborhoods off of River Road between Little Falls Parkway and Western Ave), the lots are just too small to make this work in any sort of way. The proposal to allow multihousing units to go in and to exempt them from providing on-site parking is so short sighted and will create a truly unsafe environment with both sides of every street jam packed with cars and nowhere for the elementary and middle school children to safely bike or walk to school as we have NO sidewalks and no bus transportation for kids walking to Westbrook and Westland. It is literally unsafe to add more congestion (not to mention construction trucks) to our already hazardous roads. In addition, Westbrook is already over crowded based on the ineffective boundary study a couple of years ago which emptied out Somerset and overwhelmed Westbrook elementary.

There are SO MANY better alternatives to this plan in our area. HUNDREDS of attainable housing units (townhouses and condos) are going in at Westbard and Friendship Heights currently!!! That will already greatly impact our area of Bethesda. If even more is needed, focus on the Geico tract- walkable to the metro and feeds Somerset elementary. Similar style housing can be built with the INFRASTRUCTURE they need- when build together- schools, parking, pedestrian areas, community pools, etc.

Our neighborhoods along River south of Little falls parkway should be EXCLUDED from this plan. At minimum, a referendum should be undertaken to allow the people to vote on this instead of the County making unilateral decisions to rezone single family areas without community input.

I beg you- be more thoughtful about this plan and how it will affect your constituents.

16 Josiane Gabel - Bethesda, 20816

The need to build more housing and more middle options for housing in Montgomery County is understandable. What is not understandable is the broad brushstrokes taken to determine what areas will be within the plan, when a detailed and careful approach should be taken, street by street and neighborhood by neighborhood.

In the neighborhoods of Westbrook and Greenacres in Bethesda, for example, we may be near River Road and Friendship Heights, but proximity to a major road and a 1-mile distance to a Metro station should not be the ONLY factor that is considered when including our area in this Initiative.

What is just as important, if not MORE important, is the fact that our neighborhood school is fully at capacity as a result of MCPS zoning changes; there are NO sidewalks anywhere in these neighborhoods so school children walking to Westbrook Elementary School and Westland Middle School have to walk in the middle of the streets; and we do not have space for more cars either to park on our streets or to further endanger our children as they walk to MCPS public schools.

We chose to buy a home in the Westbrook community for the safety of our streets and the quality of our neighborhood schools. This Initiative would change the character of our community and add more students to an at-capacity school, more cars to park where there are no parking lots, and more cars on roads where children walk without sidewalks.

The Initiative may well be necessary, but there should be a street-by-street and neighborhood-by-neighborhood approach to deciding where the Initiative can best be implemented.

17

Rachel Hunt - Chevy Chase, 20815

I do not support the unprecedented and drastic rezoning plan at all. I live on a small street where many residents park their cars on street because they do not have driveways. If new housing is built, that means more people and more cars. People typically want their own private cars to drive. I don't believe that most will take public transportation. People will fight each other over parking if this plan is approved. It will also mean more noise and more density. It would drastically change the neighborhood that homeowners have scrimped, saved, and sacrificed to live in. The problem I have is with net-new people, cars, noise, and big buildings covering up greenery and destroying trees. I do not want to live among duplexes, triplexes, quads or mini-apartment buildings. Let the county council do that. There are plenty of other places in the county to build new high-density housing. The county should not be doing this on the backs and bank accounts of homeowners. I feel like we as homeowners are in the county's cross-hairs and are powerless to stop this. After decades of paying property taxes, I get the sense that the county does not care what I think and does not care about the investment I have made to live here. Most people do not want this drastic rezoning at all.

18

Devorah Churchill - Bethesda, 20816

This is the stupidest thing ever- a bunch of idiots - you will drive all the high income people out of here- you should all lose your jobs. You are idiots - and no one agrees with this.

19

Evelyn MacKethan - Chevy Chase, 20815

I STRONGLY oppose MULTI family housing in 20815. We pay huge property taxes which will be diminished if multifamily housing is adjacent to single family properties. We also have TERRIBLE traffic on East West Highway given the growth of Bethesda and increased density which just exacerbate this problem. Please vote against.

20	<p>Stephanie Mohandas - Bethesda, 20816</p> <p>I am writing to express concern regarding the planning board's recommendation to change residential zoning throughout the county. I live in Springfield, a subdivision that would be greatly impacted by the proposed changes to the R-60 zones, allowing for duplex, triplex, and small apartment buildings on our already narrow and busy streets. I and many of my neighbors do not want real estate developers to take over the neighborhood to build multi-family units within and across our zone that already lack sufficient parking and road width to accommodate current conditions. It's already difficult for traffic to pass some roads with all the extra cars families have, causing safety concerns for pedestrians and children playing. We chose to live in this neighborhood due in large part to the green space and existing density. While our neighborhood lies along major transit corridors like River Rd, we are not a metro-adjacent neighborhood like nearby AU Park and Friendship Heights, which both have higher density yet offer more commuting options and convenience. Many of us gave up the convenience of being in a metro neighborhood to have this lower density and now that is being threatened, particularly in Zone R-60, where for some reason that is not clarified in the proposal is allowing for the highest degree of density increase. This plan would make our residential streets less safe for children, pedestrians, and bikers, which does not comport with focus on biker and pedestrian access and safety cited by the same planning board when deciding to close lanes of Little Falls Parkway against many residents' wishes.</p>
21	<p>Elizabeth Van Sant - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I am absolutely AGAINST the "upzoning" amendment for multi family housing in rollingwood, montgomery county. It would change the entire neighborhood and be a really bad decision. vote NO on this proposal.</p>
22	<p>Whitney Duffey-Jones - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>Hello - I am writing to express my disappointment with this initiative. It was extremely poorly communicated to the communities that it impacted, and has progressed quite far without sufficient public outreach. While I do not oppose the goals of increasing affordable housing, I do believe that the planning department needs to hit pause and conduct more thorough community outreach.</p>
23	<p>Reuven Uberman - Kensington, 20895</p> <p>?</p>
24	<p>Julian Lord - Kensington, 20895</p> <p>I live in Kensington and I want the "missing middle" houses brought to my community. There have currently been too many 5,000 square foot McMansions built in my community. I know in Kensington one can walk to the Marc station and in one stop make it to Silver Spring to get on the red line or the new purple line. There is no need for McMansions in my community, but duplexes would be great for my community. I also would like to see county or state ordinances saying if a McMansion is to be built in towns (4,000 sq. ft. or more) they can</p>

only be built after a single family home under 2,500 sq. ft. has been renovated, and until a duplex has been built. That will ensure that McMansions do not ruin my community like they have in Bethesda.

25 **Michelle Armstead - Silver Spring, 20904**

I am a long time (over 30 years) MoCo Resident and worked mostly in MoCo. Never had I had the chance to out haw a home in the county because rent was so high. I did not have any savings even after always working two jobs. As I am getting older, I'm am concerned for myself and others what the future will look like. I've lived in the same apartment on [REDACTED] and don't want to die here. It's getting hard for me to walk up door flights of stairs multiple times a day. Crime has increased over the last few years and get home; and walk my dog before dark. I would like to know that I will be able to find an ideal Aging in Place forever home. I worked on helping get the Rent Stabilization bill passed not just for me....bit for my community. I now need help for myself.

26 **lacy rice - chevy chase, 20815**

My company owns ~25,000 workforce apartments across the US. We've owned extensively in MoCo, the DC area and beyond. We work extensively on industry councils and groups to help resolve the affordable housing shortage, including promoting/funding new workforce housing construction. Rent Control and allowing 4-16 unit lots in single family neighborhoods are ill-conceived solutions. I hope you will study areas areas that have tried these steps and, as a result, moderate your plans.

27 **Michael Stroud - Bethesda, 20817**

Hi,

I do not support the rezoning initiative for older established Montgomery County communities like those along River Road in and arrive Bethesda MD. I think the existing infrastructure is inadequate to support the massive building and influx of people should the rezoning changes be implemented. Therefore, I opposed any changes to the existing zone status of Kenwood Park, in Bethesda, and surrounding areas.

Thank you,
Michael

28 **Andrew Lepczyk - Silver Spring, 20901**

As a homeowner in Montgomery County, something like a missing middle legalization is crucial to meeting our housing needs and creating a more vibrant, diverse Montgomery County. I've lived in Maryland for 30 years and have seen how great we can be, but also how unattainable some of the region is from an affordability standpoint. Attainable housing is so important.

29	<p>Tanya Mazin - Bethesda, 20814</p> <p>You really hate homeowners, don't you? We scrapped for the down payment, not buying \$5 lattes from Starbucks to buy our first home in a neighborhood where our children can grow up in a community. We are not trust fund families but often FIRST GENERATION or IMMIGRANTS who worked hard to achieve our American Dream. We left our countries where the governments were dictatorial, corrupt, and did not give a damn about their citizens. And now you want to penalize US for our hard work in favor or what? Well, thank G-d that we live in America and we can move to another county and/or state and deny you the tax base for your social engineering experiments.</p>
30	<p>Eugenia Lambis-McNeal - Bethesda, 20814</p> <p>I absolutely oppose this initiative. This neighborhood and area is already congested enough and plagued by overcrowded schools, no parking, and insufficient infrastructure even just for the existing homes. This is a peaceful residential neighborhood in a surrounding urban environment and it must remain as so to the residents. Period. I'm outraged by thought of this.</p>
31	<p>Maria Kaplan - Bethesda, 20814</p> <p>I am writing in strong opposition to the proposed AHSI, allowing for the construction of multi-family dwelling units in Wildwood Manor. This neighborhood is already overcrowded and already grossly exceeds capacity for public services. The schools in particular are overcrowded, and the county's attempts to address that - while appreciated - are inadequate to meet current neighborhood population growth rate. While there is a need for more affordable housing in Montgomery County, more attention must be paid to the availability of local services and space. There are plenty of areas in Montgomery County with much more space per resident - unlike in Wildwood Manor, which is already overcrowded - and which could better sustain an increased burden on local services. As a homeowner, I strongly oppose the AHSI as proposed.</p>
32	<p>Katie Russell - Bethesda, 20814</p> <p>I would like to voice my objection to the proposed change to zoning to allow higher density housing throughout neighborhoods in Montgomery county. This will only reduce actual neighborhoods by turning our very limited current options into high density areas, having the opposite effect by eliminating the middle and creating a wider gap between income brackets as the upper middle class that live in neighborhoods today will not choose to live amongst multi tenant buildings and the wealthy will just move into wealthier unaffected neighborhoods.</p>
33	<p>John Beckham - Bethesda, 20814</p> <p>PLEASE NO! Our neighborhood cannot sustain multi-family homes from an infrastructure standpoint. Please no!</p>

34

Lori Coleman - Bethesda, 20814

Hard no! I live on [REDACTED] and it's already packed with cars on our small street. Add to that the AirBnB that is - for some reason I can't fathom - allowed in our suburban neighborhood. We already have Ubers, parking issues, and transient people in our neighborhood. Have some foresight: "investors" will buy these condos and rent them via AirBnB (like other cities, who eventually banned AirBnB). We don't even have sidewalks on all but the main street - this is not the right neighborhood to put multi-unit housing.

It will only bring down the value of our houses if we have multi-family units popping up next to us. NO ONE bought a house next to a motel or apartment building - and NO ONE wants to live next to one. This is a small and already overwhelmed neighborhood with small streets (most without sidewalks) - not the place for multi-unit buildings. Please reconsider this zoning change and put a stop to it before it destroys our neighborhood.

35

Bryan Cannon - Chevy Chase, 20815

I live in a neighborhood slated to become a 'growth corridor'. I don't relish the decades of disruption involved in transforming a peaceful community into a precinct of apartments and town homes, and I don't want to live near any of them. I believe the proposal will do more harm than good, destroying a solid community with impressive historic fabric that has survived for over 100 years.

I think overall the proposal is wildly ambitious, and I don't see reason to believe that Montgomery County Planning can successfully manage such a dramatic transformation.

The process is proceeding too quickly; I know few people who really understand what's coming. Information-sharing from the county has been inadequate relative to the impending consequences. Reports of past outreach sessions appear to document contacts with perhaps a few thousand people who already agreed with the project - in a county of 1.053 million residents.

The proposals eliminate too many traditional mechanisms for community input, leaving key decisions to Planners and developers.

The proposals invite developers into neighborhoods. Those developers can't be expected to respect or understand community concerns.

It does not seem likely that this initiative will produce the intended results; more likely, I think you can expect to see more expensive housing crammed into new and different places.

The 'pattern book' is missing.

'Medium scale' housing along growth corridors will emerge piecemeal over time, exposing current residents to decades of disruption. Probably better to take an urban renewal approach, condemn the neighborhoods and prepare redevelopment pad sites.

Like a Russian muzhik after the revolution, I'm not eager to switch over to collective farming. I had a good thing going.

I am a motivated voter and political activist. Never dreamed of voting Republican even once in my life, but this might call for some cross-aisle behavior.

36 Keith Hudolin - Silver Spring, 20910

I have lived in the Park Hills neighborhood in Silver Spring for nearly a decade, and I am writing to express my strong support for the Attainable Housing Strategies initiative. Montgomery County suffers from a severe lack of housing and, as a result, a housing affordability crisis. The solution is simple: allow more housing.

A few of my neighbors recoil at the thought of duplexes replacing single-family homes, but the reality is that we live in an ideal location for new housing--a short walk from downtown Silver Spring and steps away from a future Purple Line station. Personally, I welcome the changes new housing will bring to the area. Our neighborhood used to regularly welcome new families who were drawn by good schools and relatively affordable housing, and whose arrival helped maintain a close-knit, vibrant culture. But that doesn't happen much anymore because there simply aren't houses available for these families to buy. I applaud the Planning Department for endorsing a plan to help remedy this situation, and I urge the Council to do the same.

37 Whydo Youcare - Silver Spring, 20906

I live in a neighborhood between Conn. and Georgia Avenues where we are already PACKED in like sardines, and here you come wanting to allow even MORE people to live here by allowing home/land owners to renovate existing or build new multi-family housing in single family home neighborhoods. Have you driven through any of our overcrowded down-county single family home neighborhoods lately? You'll see cars parked in front yards because there is no more street parking to be had. On trash day, you'll see an egregious amount of trash in front of these SFHs because there are upwards of 10 people living in a house meant for half that number. The schools are already overcrowded and suffering teacher shortages, and the infrastructure is not well-suited to accommodate the number of additional people you want to increase the population by. This is ridiculous! I wonder how many of the County Council are directly affected by this grand idea they have set in motion, as we who ARE now have to figure out how best to protest this insanity while trying to navigate already overcrowded Avenues to our workplaces, homes, and schools. Public transportation is not the answer, as no one lives in a straight line. Not one single person I've spoken with about this initiative is in favor of it because we are all foreseeing the problems it will bring to our daily lives as well as the negative effect it will have on our property values and increases in our taxes.

Instead of packing more and more people into downcounty, try getting the SFH owners in places like Potomac to support this in THEIR area. What? The rich folks out there don't want multi-family riff raff in their neighborhoods? Well, neither do we.

38

Bonnie ENDICK - BETHESDA, 20814

I feel the attainable housing strategy will be a win for investors. Pricing will be market-driven. No impact studies have been completed. I have sat in meetings and the discussion of not using/owning cars is not realistic. Actually, it is anti-worker and anti-family. Families need a car to drop children off at daycare, go to medical appointments, and take care of aging parents and those are just a few examples. I am a teacher for MCPS. I must own a car to do my job. Nurses, Doctors, firefighters etc need cars.

This should not be passed!

39

Emily Harris - Chevy Chase, 20815-6617

(1) This initiative needs to be disclosed more fully to the public (through mailings to the affected areas); (2) the public should be informed of the criteria for a residential floating zone. Changing zoning very close to major transportation arteries makes sense, but floating zones in single family neighbors (especially those without sidewalks and not walkable to large commercial centers) should be subject to stringent and objective criteria.

40

Benjamin Glickstein - Takoma Park, 20912

As a resident of a predominantly single family neighborhood in Takoma Park, I strongly support efforts to increase zoning flexibility. I would love to see an increase in triplexes/quadplexes in my neighborhood, increasing the vibrancy of my community and the affordable range of housing. I would also love to see more "medium" and "large" scale development on the corridors and transit hubs nearby, which would further improve affordability and possibly also come with new businesses and services. Please approve this plan and create further policies to incentivize these positive changes in Montgomery County!

41

Bill Jacobs - Olney, 20832

The increase in density is a welcome change to zoning as well as the accessory unit permitting.

I'd also hope consideration could be given towards a progressive vacancy tax to discourage retention of unused real estate for business purposes that increases fees for larger units and units left vacant for increasing amounts of time. It does no good to build more housing units that will not house anyone.

In 2005 I'd proposed a loan program for home owners to build basement entrances to create apartments currently barred by the county due to concerns about fire. Many apartments were closed due to this regulation and no compensating program was put in place. Re-opening this source of housing could help inexpensively as well as keeping rent money local, in the hands of local homeowners.

42

Catherine Tilford - Silver Spring, 20910

I do not support the proposed zoning changes. The proposal does not provide analysis to show that this change would meaningfully increase housing, and does not support that any resulting housing would be affordable. The proposal ignores the many factors such as building material and labor costs that drive up new housing costs and ignores that the single family homes most likely to be replaced under this proposal are currently more attainable to renters and starter home buyers.

The initiative does not address the infrastructure needs of increased housing because there are no estimated increases in specific neighborhoods. The council should focus on promoting housing in zoning where housing has been approved but not built, and around new purple line stations such as Lyttonsville where existing warehouses could be rezoned to hundreds of townhomes and mixed use spaces, with corresponding consideration of impact on schools and roads. And the council should focus on office to residential conversions. This proposal will result in loss of tree canopy in my neighborhood where there are chestnut trees, pines, and oaks that are several hundred years old. I chose my single family neighborhood because of the trees, small lot sizes and modest homes. The council's proposal will threaten these characteristics with little corresponding benefit for that stated goal of increasing housing.

43

Roberta Steinman - Silver Spring, 20910-4106

I oppose the Attainable Housing Strategy that allows replacement of single family homes with duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes in single family zones. Here's why:

- The plan doesn't address the County's need, which is for affordable housing, not market priced housing.
- Thousands of ready to be built homes are already in the pipeline. This quantity already addresses the need for homes over the next 5 or more years.
- The density and imperviousness that AHS would bring would overwhelm the infrastructure including parking, storm water, sewage, garbage, public school capacity and expense, increased traffic and increased noise.
- The AHS strategy has no guardrails to prevent in-state or out-of-state developers or hedge funds from outbidding local buyers and pricing them out of the market; and the AHS plan affords no prevention from these development companies from buying up small lots and parceling them for sale or rental units - creating an outflow of money to absentee landlords.
- most importantly, this AHS strategy would diminish our green infrastructure - tree canopy and green space - which is vital for the well-being of the human and non-human communities. The environmental consequences of the increased land coverage resulting from the larger building footprints of higher density development would be extreme owing to the increased imperviousness, stormwater runoff, and

loss of tree canopy and green space. This would negatively impact greenhouse gas emissions and climate change goals, air quality, stream quality, quality of life, and so much more. Nature is not an amenity. Green spaces, natural areas, and trees are essential for us all.

44

Curtis Schroeder - Silver Spring, 20901

I have participated in previous Zoom meetings concerning the Attainable Housing Strategies. While I certainly understand the need for additional housing, I am concerned that the current approach shows no concern for maintaining current well established neighborhoods nor do the strategies show any interest in improving an area whether it be a current residential area or other type of property. A concurrent goal should be to maintain the county as a desirable place to live. I am also concerned that I have not seen any other initiatives for Attainable housing. For example the empty Sear complex in White Oak is possible location for housing of various levels. It is located on Route 29 and already has a shopping center access to transportation.

45

FERN HUNT - Silver Spring, 20910

What evidence can be presented that "Attainable Housing Strategies" is a pretext for easing regulations--something desired by developers before attainable or affordable housing became an issue?

46

Lynn Grodzki - SILVER SPRING, 20910

Please stop this terrible plan. There are enough zoned properties in the pipeline. I live in 20910, in the SOECA association, and many of us are going to be affected by this and protest the fact that we did not get to vote to stop this. I resent the council members who pushed this through, like Mr. Jawando, despite written concerns from many of us. This ONLY benefits developers, not residents, and there is not proof that this will lower any housing prices. But it will destroy neighborhoods, add to parking nightmares, and remove the important greenspace we have left. Please veto this and do all that you can to stop it from going forward.

47

Matthew Guttentag - Silver Spring, 20910

This is a much-needed adjustment to create adequate housing. I fully support it.

I expect that in some areas this will necessitate introduction of residential parking permits.

48

Shannon Pryor - Chevy Chase, 20815

As a resident of Chevy Chase Village, I write to oppose this initiative as it applies to the area around Connecticut Avenue above Chevy Chase Circle up to Rosemary. My concerns relate mostly to parking, traffic, and transportation, but also the effect on MCPS enrollment. I live on

an already busy block, and the intersection with Connecticut backs up by 2:30pm every weekday afternoon. We've had four incidents in my household alone of cars being sideswiped by passing traffic. Adding additional commuters would exacerbate the traffic on an artery which is already congested and with lanes that are far too narrow. Additionally, parking can often be difficult on our block due to Brookville residents, Club attendees, and overflow parking there. To allow additional units without requiring commensurate parking will exacerbate the situation further. There is no reasonable metro access in this area- we have to walk approximately 1.5 miles to reach a station, and the purple line will not improve this. Even the public bus stop going North is about a 7 minute walk. Lastly, my daughter attends (and another daughter also attended) BCC high school, and the school is overcrowded, without adequate teaching staff, difficulty getting requested courses, and with unreliable morning bus routes (sometimes they run and sometimes they don't). Adding households means adding students to a school that is not ready to accommodate those students.

49

Sanjida Rangwala - Silver Spring, 20901

I'm a busy working mom of small kids who'd like to drop a quick line in support of the attainable housing strategy. We need more moderate sized homes for singles, couples, and small families to live affordably near shops and parks and good schools.

50

Ariel Bierbaum - Silver Spring, 20910

I am a resident of Montgomery County and a faculty member of urban studies and planning at the University of Maryland.

I am deeply disappointed and dismayed at the county's decision around the land swap with United Therapeutics. It flies in the face of any "attainable housing strategy." It undermines the efforts for zoning changes and the hard work of our planning staff on the Thrive 2050 plan. It compromises climate resilience goals.

The county's own analysis show that downtown has a surplus of parking spaces.

This land swap provides FREE land to the county. Despite the widespread knowledge, understanding, and lament that it's "so hard" to build affordable because of high land costs, the county has negotiated to build a parking garage on a piece of land with ZERO land costs. Why? What were y'all thinking?

Why is the county -- including council members who rallied around this deal and the county executive -- putting a parking garage in a high density corridor 2 blocks from Metro when we have an oversupply of parking and an undersupply of affordable housing?!

Getting land for free is nearly impossible. Getting land for free that is suitable for higher density housing on Georgia Ave, 2 blocks to Metro, is a unicorn, once in a lifetime opportunity.

The planning board weighed in in August, but it seems that they have no power to stop the agreement. I encourage Council to DO something and walk the walk of housing affordability and climate resilience.

Economic development is an important priority - having UT in Silver Spring and our county is important. But we do not need to support UT's growth at the expense of the county's other priorities. In fact, their growth could enable the county's other priorities. The county negotiated a bad, short-sighted deal.

What can be done now to reverse course before it's too late? Can UT just give us the land without the parking lot? Save them money and give the county time to make a good plan that aligns with espoused values and supports all the hard work of some many people over so many years in planning for a more equitable, affordable, and sustainable Montgomery County.

51

GINNA INGRAM - POTOMAC, 20854-3893

Impact on tree canopies is given short shrift, as is addressing infrastructure needs/costs/how to pay for infrastructure changes. Generally, see very little on environmental impact. See almost no concrete planning, cost estimates, or plan to pay for items such as: creating onsite parking to accommodate the increased number of cars (a strategy of requiring little to no parking in order to push people to abandon cars is a bad idea); necessary and prudent changes to roads to accommodate increased traffic; putting in additional bus routes/buses; expanding Metro service and Metro access; figuring out the garbage, gas and electrical needs/costs to accommodate increased density.

Why isn't White Flint front and center for creating affordable housing?

52

JULIA F - BETHESDA, 20814

I would like to voice my enthusiastic support for Montgomery County's Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. As a resident of Montgomery County, I believe the Planning Board's initiatives to allow for greater housing density are essential for ensuring that our community remains a place where people of all income levels can afford to live. The current zoning regulations, which heavily favor single-family homes, have created a situation where many residents, especially those with moderate incomes, are being priced out of the housing market. I've seen firsthand how this lack of housing diversity has impacted our community, leading to longer commute times, increased traffic congestion, and fewer opportunities for people to live close to where they work.

The Planning Board's recommendations to allow for a wider variety of housing types, such as duplexes, townhouses, and small apartment buildings, will provide more options for residents and create more diverse and inclusive neighborhoods. While some may have concerns about these changes, it's important to remember that these are simply options for property owners, not mandates. No one is being forced to change how their property is used. Instead, these initiatives empower property owners with the flexibility to choose what works best for them and their families, while expanding opportunities for those who need and want to live in Montgomery County.

I'd like to express my gratitude to the County Council and their willingness to consider the recommendations put forth by the Planning Board and work diligently to implement solutions that address the housing crisis in our county.

53 **Christopher Burger - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I am incredibly concerned about this initiative. While I agree the county needs to solve the issue of affordable housing, this plan is not it. I live at [REDACTED] (one house back from Connecticut avenue). Our roads are currently over-congested. Every single weekday there is a backup heading north on Connecticut avenue, starting at East/West highway and pushing south at least 0.5 miles to Taylor Street. Cross roads are impassable due to commuters "blocking the box." Buses and the purple line will not alleviate traffic. Noise pollution from traffic is already unbearable. Schools are overcrowded to begin with. These proposed plans will magnify these problems. Additionally, such plans will destroy the community feel of our neighborhood. This is a close-knit community with single family homes and introducing multi-unit housing will kill the feel of the community. Any elected official who votes in favor of this will lose my vote forever and will do everything I can to convince other voters of the same.

54 **Ryan Harrison - Bethesda, 20814**

I am in favour of the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. I've lived in East Bethesda for 4 years. Like many, I would not be able to purchase the house I live in today.

Whenever a small cape code house like mine goes on the market, it's bulldozed in favor of a 5,000 sqft McMansion selling for \$2M+. I would rather see 3x 3BR/2BA 1500 sqft triplex units suitable for families, selling for \$700k per.

I do not understand why my community association (EBCA) is against this measure given that the same height and lot coverage requirements apply to 2-4 unit multiplexes by right, as to the McMansions. I suspect very few multiplexes will actually be built because the McMansions are so lucrative for developers, but if a developer wants to build (still expensive) multiplex units for families, let them.

55 **Ken Hoffman - Silver Spring, 20902**

I am unable to attend the listening sessions due to work commitments, but I'd like to voice strong support for the Attainable Housing initiative. I think the recommendations and zoning modifications are essential to creating more affordable housing options and more livable communities for our residents, especially our younger residents and those in our traditionally underserved communities. Personally, my adult child is looking to move out of the county due because he can't find suitable, affordable housing. I'd hate to see that happen. I strongly urge the council to pass the Attainable Housing Strategies.

56 **Richard Fenati - Kensington, 20895**

I am writing to voice my opposition to the Attainable Housing Strategies initiative. While I recognize the importance of addressing

affordable housing, I believe this proposal will disrupt the character of our established neighborhoods, leading to overdevelopment and altering the unique fabric of our community.

I respectfully urge you to explore alternative solutions that balance affordability with the preservation of our neighborhoods. Should the initiative move forward, I strongly advocate for a provision allowing individual neighborhoods to vote on if these zoning changes will be allowed to apply to their neighborhood, with only owner-occupiers participating in such decisions.

Thank you for your attention to these concerns.

57

Margaret Scott - Silver Spring, 20910

As a resident and homeowner in East Silver Spring and employee at a national nonprofit dedicated to affordable housing, I am in full support of the strategies advanced in the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. Thank you for your leadership in encouraging greater density and affordability in our county.

58

Patrick Mauro - Silver Spring, 20901

I support the attainable housing strategies initiative as a compromise solution. I would encourage the council to allow medium scale development in more places, especially within walking distance of major transit (say a mile). I would also like to encourage considering allowing some commercial usage, for example corner stores or very small businesses (e.g. coffee shops) that would allow greater integration of commercial services with residential areas.

Additionally, as a person who owns a house with no parking, I would encourage you to consider a solution for those lots that have the space for multifamily development but cannot adhere to even a single parking spot requirement.

While I understand this cannot be done quickly, please pursue this as quick as possible to help relieve pressure and take advantage of the market.

Lastly, please consider the many voices you will not hear. I attended a session but was unable to speak, many people are unaware of these meetings or cannot attend, and there's almost no way for my former classmates, who grew up here but who no longer live in the area due to costs, to have their voices heard. This is not a unique problem and you guys clearly understand global and national best practices to relieve these pricing pressures. Those of us speaking, including myself, are the loudest voices at best. You know what will work and I encourage you to pursue that in the best interest of all of us.

59

Jacob Goldberg - Silver Spring, 20901

My fiancée and I just bought our first home in Silver Spring. We love our home, our neighborhood, and are so excited to build our life together. But the reality is for most of our friends, unless they are in dual income households where one or both are a doctor, lawyer, or tech worker, homeownership is literally a dream because of current housing costs. Whether from realtors nor allowing flexibility with fees (the recent NAR settlement) or property managers price gauging renters (future class action suit regarding the use of the RealPage algorithm to set rents above market rates), the system is stacked against renters trying to save enough to buy a home today.

The proposals to ease zoning restrictions and allow dense growth near mass transit is a vital step to chip away at the housing shortage. But steps also need to be taken to prevent projects from being held up by red tape and angry neighbors. Minneapolis took an important step to remove single family zoning restrictions, but according to NPR's Planet Money podcast, most developments have been put on hold by NIMBY activity. While community input is worth hearing, every day a project is delayed the supply shortage gets worse. Recent reports cite the need for anywhere between 4 million to 7 million more housing units just to match current demand, let alone prepare for future household formation. We need housing, and we need it now.

60

Elizabeth Stajka - Silver Spring, 20904

Horrible idea.

Vehemently against re-zoning and re-development of former single family dwellings into multi-unit dwellings.

Not only will this affect property values, it will also increase the already gridlocked traffic on our main streets and neighborhoods.

61

Zachary Weinstein - Silver Spring, 20910

I strongly support expanding housing types available in Montgomery County. Unfortunately, I'm about to move away from this area and part of the reason is because the area I'm moving to has more housing types.

In Silver Spring, there are very few 3 bedroom apartments, which makes them very expensive. There are no 4-bedroom apartments and only a handful of townhomes, so buying a house is the only option available to a family in a 2-bedroom apartment that needs more space. Jersey City, where I plan to move to, has townhomes, 4-bedroom apartments, and houses available to rent.

I urge the council to allow more housing types so that others do not feel forced out.

62

Elizabeth Sullivan - Laytonsville, 20882

The Planning Board's premise that there is a shortage of housing is completely wrong. The Council of Government's predictions (<https://www.mwcog.org/>) for population and jobs from the last round (round 10) have actually gone down. Based on that, the housing needs will be satisfied with what is in the pipeline to be built. Over 30,000 units have already been permitted which is enough to meet the

housing demand, but they are not being built because of the Board's insistence that high rises be the solution. Developers can't charge high enough rents to make building these types of buildings worthwhile financially.

You are going to destroy this county's residential housing if you implement this plan. Housing prices will plummet and a person's home is the main savings people have so their life savings will be eliminated. People purchase a home believing that the zoning of that neighborhood is not going to be changed by the government with no right to appeal that decision. What is going to happen is that outside developers will be buying up properties and converting them to duplexes and multiplexes (3-4 units) and there will be no way to stop them. This is government not of the people but against the people. STOP THE ATTAINABLE HOUSING STRATEGIES PLAN!!

63

Julia White - Chevy Chase, 20815

Very OPPOSED to the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. It ignores the long-standing, well developed Master Plan; it subverts established zoning procedures ignoring community involvement; it ignores infrastructure that would be required; it does nothing to address "affordable" housing; it ignores a robust inventory of housing that is either available or in the pipeline. This an all around undemocratic, bad idea. Our wonderful county deserves better.

64

Marie Dag - Olney, 20832

Please do NOT allow single family homes to be sold for development into multi-family dwellings, including apartments. It will ruin every neighborhood. Even one sale in a neighborhood to a developer will cause other neighbors to move - and they will not be able to sell to other families because no family will buy - and can only sell to a developer, who may muscle the family into an under-market price. Most neighborhoods now have rules for multifamily dwellings, as does ours. It has been a good situation for 30 years. Our neighborhood and every neighborhood will be ruined if this goes forward. YOUR TAX BASE WILL FLEE THE COUNTY. NO ONE WILL WANT TO BUY IN THE COUNTY OR STAY IN THE COUNTY. Only the developers, who will scam customers on rents and services will win on this proposal.

65

Jhoana Carranza - Silver spring, 20902

I don't think this will create affordable housing for anyone. Its just a way for investors to come in and make more money. We do not want more traffic, we do not want over population, over crowdedness and we did not ask for unwanted changes to our neighborhoods.

66

M Steenson - Rockville, 20855

Please STOP(!) this initiative!

Stacking human beings on top of one another in close quarters is dehumanizing!

Rates of depression will rise with the loss of green space and blue skies and privacy.

Native species of animals will be crowded and driven away and change the environment: "In nature, you can't just change one thing."

This is an anti-family initiative, an anti-human initiative.

No one's "American dream" is to reside in an apartment with little privacy owned by someone else - but in a home with property of one's own. To be self-sufficient and autonomous gives a person dignity.

The cause of the housing shortage is the bad economy - which is only temporary! "This too shall pass." But crowded, depressing housing with no green spaces or blue skies is permanent.

Instead, spend money on public service announcements/ads about saving a portion (30 percent if you still live at home) of your paycheck monthly, getting a second job, paying off your debts so you can qualify for a loan.

67

Debra Nichols - Rockville, 20853

Hello,

The Attainable housing strategy is outrageous to say the least!!! We as residents of single family homes in Montgomery County have moved here because we wanted the quaint beauty of the single family house and its neighborhood. We wanted our kids to enjoy attending a school in their neighborhood with other kids in the neighborhood. We had to work hard to save money just to buy our house. We lived with parents to save money. That's what people have to do now...find a way to save money to buy a single family home. With this new zoning strategy, you will destroy the look of our peaceful uniform houses. You will overcrowd the already crowded streets and schools. It will just make it worse! I'm sorry if the property value is out of reach for lower income families but they need to figure it out like we did. The County Executive Elrich thinks it's a bad idea and so do we. Stop this craziness now!!

68

Maya Frey - Silver Spring, 20910

I strongly agree that we should have more attainable housing in Montgomery County. I am a young professional and I want to be able to afford to live here in the future.

69

Eric Fowler - Gaithersburg, 20877

I think more affordable and attainable housing is good. I want way more cheap apartments, condos, and townhomes, and less McMansions and single family homes. People should be able to afford to live in MoCo!!!! Its a great place to live if you can afford to.

70

Esther Curry - Silver Spring, 20902

I fully support building housing types other than single-family homes wherever possible. Personally, I'd like my kids to leave home before they are 30 and when I'm older I'd love to stay in my neighborhood but in somewhere smaller. I'd also appreciate zoning that would allow neighborhood cafes and corner shops rather than just a sea of houses.

My dream would be to turn my ridiculously wide split-level house into a duplex set slightly above ground level with no crawl space/sump pumps to deal with. I could rent out the other side or sell it to pay for in-home care when I'm really doddery. Any way to finance this? Could the County buy a few streets of 1950s split levels and then build a duplex on each lot?

71	<p>David Tokarz - Silver Spring, 20902</p> <p>The Attainable Housing Strategies initiative is a good start to reduce MoCo's high housing prices. My wife and I are both feds, and the only way we were able to buy in this market was due to a stroke of luck. I don't want other members of my community to be forced into bad situations because there isn't enough quality housing. Plus I benefit if I ever want to sell my home to a developer- a win-win.</p> <p>I plan on voting for county council with housing prices as my most important issue, and I encourage the board to swiftly adopt this measure as well as others designed to lower housing prices and give owners more control over their property.</p>
72	<p>Mary Grace Hebert - Silver Spring, 20902</p> <p>I agree with this report. I think it's great to build "missing Middle" housing in single-family zoned areas. We live in a townhome community within a neighborhood of single family homes, townhomes, and apartment complexes. It's great. I love the vibrant neighborhoods that the density of housing in MoCo creates.</p>
73	<p>Nancy Cox - OLNEY, 20832-1117</p> <p>I am vehemently opposed to the proposal to rezone every single family residential neighborhood to allow duplexes & multiplexes to be built. I chose to live in a single family neighborhood that has HOA rules prohibiting multi-units. For the Council to pass a law to override all existing HOA rules is simply unacceptable. It would destroy the quality of life for those of us who choose to live in the suburbs. And, it will negatively affect property values. If this stupid law passes, I will be moving to a neighboring county.</p>
74	<p>Kevin Herbig - Bethesda, 20814</p> <p>I fully heartily support this initiative. As a renter in Montgomery county who would like to buy some day, this initiative would make it more likely I will not have to move far from my current neighborhood to be able to buy. These types of housing allow more affordability while still maintaining benefits of suburban living (backyard for our dogs, lack of noise pollution and danger from living off main roads where so many multifamily housing is situated). This should be adopted immediately to allow for much needed housing to be built for current residents and future.</p>
75	<p>Matthew Curley - Damascus, 20872</p> <p>As a resident and homeowner of Montgomery County, MD, I ask you to please not move forward with the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative plan to re-zone single family homes in a way that would allow for duplexes, triplexes, townhouses, small apartment buildings, etc., to be constructed among them. Thank you.</p>
76	<p>Bryan Huang - Silver Spring, 20910</p> <p>I strongly support the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. It is a step in the right direction into helping making housing more affordable. It may not be a cure-all, but it will help. Increasing the supply of housing will help bring even more dynamism and tax revenue to the county.</p>

The plan legalizes types of homes (like duplexes) that are more likely to be affordable than large McMansions

Housing cost is my number one expense and the most important issue to me when it comes to local politics and I hope the Council adopts this helpful initiative.

77

Will Yetvin - Chevy Chase, 20815

I fully support the initiative and believe Montgomery County should be doing all it can to increase housing density and create more affordable, diverse, housing options near public transit!

78

Linda Noonan - Bethesda, 20817

We oppose the measure to rezone for multiple units. This is too important not to put to a ballot initiate vote what is the rush?

79

Nicholas Blake - Silver Spring, 20910

Good afternoon,

I am writing in support of the draft recommendations for the county's Attainable Housing Strategies project.

The status-quo of housing shortages is unacceptable. It is increasing the cost of living for young people and families in the county and will unnecessarily cause both budgetary and economic hardship if it's allowed to persist. As things stand, the rising cost of housing -- which is being driven by an artificial shortage caused by the county's obsolete approach to residential zoning -- is the leading driver of rising costs for young people and families.

At the same time, as the county population ages, capped increases in real estate tax rates will mean an ever-increasing fiscal hole if that shortfall cannot be addressed by new revenue streams from new housing development and/or new economic development more broadly. Right now, on the contrary, the county is losing jobs and opportunities to surrounding communities in the region where young workers can actually afford to live and work.

I urge you to move quickly to give property owners the freedom to address the housing shortage on property they own, unburdened by antiquated zoning laws. The County Council should likewise be unburdened by the County Executive's stubborn opposition to lowering lower and middle class families' housing costs.

Thank you,

Nicholas Blake

Silver Spring, MD

80

Miriam Schoenbaum - Boyds, 20841

I support the proposal, except that it should only apply to areas in Growth Tier 1 (Areas currently served by Sewers) and Growth Tier 2 (Future Growth Areas planned for Sewers) in Thrive 2050.

81

Jared Hautamaki - Silver Spring, 20902

I write today in opposition to changes to the zoning code that would eliminate single family zoning. While I am strongly in favor of transit oriented development, I am also a homeowner in a working class neighborhood in Wheaton.

Eliminating single family zoning is not the responsible progressive solution to our county's, or our nation's, housing shortage. The responsible solution is transit oriented development combined with investments in rail that would see connections grow to cities like Hagerstown, Cumberland and Salisbury, repopulating existing communities which have infrastructure that can be expanded upon to accommodate growth in Maryland. We need a rail connection to the Eastern shore. Hagerstown, Cumberland and West Virginia can accommodate the housing and population growth that Maryland faces.

Eliminating single family neighborhoods will only benefit developers and increase traffic woes that are already facing our communities. We have invested ourselves in this community because of the single family character of our neighborhood in Wheaton, counting on growth in Wheaton's core and replacing the antiquated strip malls that dominate the urban core. There is plenty of room for growth in Montgomery County without turning your backs on the people that have built these communities and destroying our neighborhoods.

As a recent member of the Racial Equity and Social Justice Advisory Committee I urge you to think about the impact this will have on minority communities in Montgomery County. This is reverse gentrification, stealing from working class neighborhoods to give to transient renters in poorly paid service jobs. The racial and social impact will be disproportionately in Wheaton, Glenmont and east county because property values are lower. You won't see duplexes, quads and apartment buildings spring up in Bethesda or Chevy Chase where the population is majority white and wealthy.

I strongly urge you to preserve our neighborhoods and protect single family zoning in Montgomery County.

82

Holly Leaf - Rockville, 20853

We understand the need for affordable housing. However, the county does not address the areas fairly in the county as it is. In Aspen Hill where we live, the amount of violations that are let go is huge. Cars are up on the sidewalks, in front lawns and many lawns are in need of work. There are work trucks and various vehicles blocking streets. One street going towards a school in Wheaton is almost impassable due to the amount of vehicles on the road. The houses are rented out to multiple families and this creates huge traffic and neighborhood issues that the county does not see to care about. Instead of investing in our area, the county prefers to head to Bethesda or wealthier areas. We have lived her 20 years and watched places like Pike and Rose be built or other developments while the shopping centers in Aspen Hill and on Viers Mill have languished. Under these proposed plans, wealthier investors could buy up homes that are fairly cheap in our neighborhoods and create multi- family units either to sell or rent. This would increase the noise, the traffic, etc... in an area that is already forgotten by the county. Affordable housing will be put on the backs of lower income neighborhoods and never touch the more affluent ones. Our neighborhoods will continue to struggle with limited services, shopping areas and parking places while other areas down county will thrive. When we bought our home , we did not want to live next to a unit with 3 or more families on a lot built for 1. This plan seems to have very little guardrails and oversight and is just lip service for political gain.

83

Caroline Cooper - Chevy Chase, 20815

Dear Councilmember Friedson:

I am one of your constituents on the proposed Priority Growth Zone block of Grafton Street off of Wisconsin Avenue in Chevy Chase. I am writing to raise my objections to this designation.

While I am keeping an open mind about the bigger picture proposal to create attainable housing (I look forward to your presentation on 9/25), I think the PGZ designation is too broad because it fails to take into consideration the fact that many of the streets 500 feet away from a commercial corridor are residential, and unsuitable for small apartment buildings. I am sure there are instances where an apartment building 500 feet off a Growth Corridor may make sense, say if there's already an abandoned commercial building, or an empty parking lot, etc. But in our case, the designation is inappropriate, and I believe your approach needs to be more fine-tuned and sophisticated than just "Apartment buildings are allowed anywhere within 500 feet of a growth corridor."

Even if a small apartment building is never built on our street, the mere designation of being in a "priority growth zone" puts us at a disadvantage from a resale perspective. You are picking "winners" and "losers" and allowing people who live 600 feet away from Wisconsin to get to continue to live without the threat of an apartment building on their block or in their backyard.

I am no lawyer, but to me, this designation is a "taking" as it will undoubtedly put us at a disadvantage against other home sellers who won't have this designation. It is one thing to purchase a SF home that overlooks a commercial lot or even has a multi-story building directly in their yard. That is a buyer's choice and a home is priced accordingly. But it's quite another to purchase a SF home in a SF neighborhood, only to learn years later that "small" buildings of up to 19 units can be in your backyard.

Many of us are rapidly getting concerned about the PGZ designation, and I expect you will have a large crowd at the 9/25 meeting who will want to understand more about this designation, and who - like me -- hope it can be modified. Our block is just as 'residential' as the rest of Grafton, and I don't see any fair reason to be zoned any differently from my neighbors.

84 Erin Kemp - Olney, 20832

I am pro-attainable housing strategies initiative. I dream of having a multifamily property for a multigenerational living situation with my extended family. This increases the chances of making that possible.

85 ANNE KILLEEN - POTOMAC, 20854

As a top realtor with 40 years of experience in Montgomery County, I am strongly opposed to the rezoning proposal encompassed in the Attainable Housing Strategy Initiative. Throughout my career, I have proudly sold homes in Montgomery County based on the stability and foresight of our exceptional Master Plan - a plan developed and refined over decades. To abandon this thoughtful approach in favor of broad, uncertain zoning changes is deeply concerning. While I fully support the goal of addressing housing needs, including the "Missing Middle," there must be other solutions that don't threaten the value of the homes we have worked hard to secure. Where are the comprehensive impact studies on how these changes will affect our schools, transportation infrastructure and community resources? I urge you to vote AGAINST this proposal and to explore more balanced solutions that protect the integrity of our neighborhoods without undermining years of careful planning. If this proposal passes, we can reasonably expect a mass exodus from the County. During the pandemic, we witnessed significant outflow due to Maryland's high tax rates and high cost of living. This zoning change threatens to accelerate that trend, further eroding our tax base and undermining the community's economic stability. I ask you, is this truly the path we want to take for Montgomery County?

86 Rosalie Bright - Rockville, 20850-5148

I live in Montgomery County. My grown children have had to leave the central Maryland area because housing is too expensive for them. After they moved away, rents have increased even more quickly. This isn't sustainable.

I heard that major companies have been buying up properties and colluding to raise rents. This needs to be investigated and if true, it is very unfair. The County should restrict these practices, even if it turns out they aren't happening yet.

87 Robert Passovoy - Germantown, 20876

Thank you for giving us all a new and amazing reason to vote you out of office. Your attempt to blockbust and ruin our neighborhoods in an attempt to increase your tax revenue demonstrates that you do not deserve to be in power.

This may seem novel, but we do not want your population growth initiatives, we want our neighborhoods to stay as they are.

The fact that you have been sending people to call us “selfish” for wanting to keep our property values and safe neighborhoods is enough to make me want to personally run for your positions to replace you.

88

Virginia Leachman - Chevy Chase, 20815

I am a resident for 38 years in Chevy Chase Village. The only people that I see this initiative helping is the real estate developers. There are a handful of large developers with plans for development along Wisconsin Avenue in Chevy Chase. The conditions to achieve "attainable housing" for these developers, on open & available land is severely restricted by the County.

I am co-chair of Western Grove Park in Chevy Chase. We worked very well with the County in creating this beautiful park.

However, to increase density around the Friendship Heights Metro in Chevy Chase Village is not a good idea. We have our park, but very few public amenities, the traffic is terrible and dangerous for pedestrians, and our schools have no physical room to expand. The tree lined streets may seem inviting, but actual life here for new families is not ideal. Chevy Chase is not the neighborhood it was when we moved here. I've done all I can to help remedy our traffic situation, being on the border with the District of Columbia. In some places there are no sidewalks. I truly believe that encouraging higher density housing in our Village is a mistake. We just don't have the infrastructure to support healthy living.

89

Jae Wan Ahn - Silver Spring, 20910

I view this initiative positively. We need more affordable housing in Montgomery County.

90

Suzanne Lizanich-Aro - Silver Spring, 20903-1303

Traffic is outrageous on New Hampshire Ave during rush hour now. One breakdown/accident and you are stuck for an hour. Why do we keep adding more housing/home apartments along this route?

91

Nathalie Patel - Chevy Chase, 20815

Good evening,

My concern with the proposed AHS initiative is that I don't see any analysis as to whether the current utilities infrastructure can handle what could amount to a substantial increase in population in the area. Has improved public bus service been planned for to ensure those without cars have viable methods of transport? The Purple line is still not live and a few years away. What are the environmental impacts on the parks and nature of this zoning change? Impact on public school capacities in these zones? Have these concerns been addressed? If so could we be provided with the analysis?

92	<p>Allyson Nealy - Olney, 20832</p> <p>Rezoning residential areas that are mostly single family homes is a bad idea. It will bring property values down and make people who own homes want to sell and leave the county. If you do this in upper MOCO, why leave out Chevy Chase and other lower county expensive areas? In Olney, there are already neighborhoods with townhomes dispersed. Why not look at the areas that have successful (no increase in crime or drop in property values) outcomes and mimic those?</p>
93	<p>Carolyn Cooper - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I am a property owner of a >15Ksf R60 lot that will qualify for redevelopment under the proposed new codes. I request that your proposed codes provide relief from the existing Build to Line provisions that put unrealistic restrictions on the redevelopment of corner lots within residential zones.</p> <p>I am happy to discuss this and other technicalities that make utilizing the new codes difficult. Feel free to call.</p>
94	<p>Elmer Haapala - Montgomery Village, 20886</p> <p>Housing strategy needs to include yards for people, not just packing people like sardines and patting yourself in the back that you did something.</p> <p>Back to back townhouses aren't the answer either. There's no room for kids to do anything near the house because they have no yard area.</p> <p>Also make sure the builders aren't making these cheap houses super cheap built.</p> <p>Also one thing to think about is maybe put some type of fee, tax, or whatever you want to call it on houses being built that are say, over 3,000 or 4,000 sq feet. Builders need to stop building enormous houses is part of the issue as well.</p> <p>Also packing so many people together is going to greatly increase crime in the area so you need to have a plan to handle that.</p>
95	<p>Darcy King - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I am very concerned about the lack of affordable housing in Montgomery County. I know we are losing middle income residents due to the lack of affordable housing. I cringe at the thought of how so many are forced to commute long distances.</p> <p>I see for-sale McMansions standing vacant for months if not longer. I would much rather see townhomes and duplexes than McMansions.</p>

Someday, I will probably want to downsize, I could not afford to do so in Montgomery County even though I want to remain here. There are few affordable options for empty nesters.

96

Matthew Oberhofer - Chevy Chase, 20815

Strongly opposed to this initiative and what it may do to an already over populated area. Simply put, the infrastructure isn't there and would only introduce more crime and congestion.

97

Malcolm Little - Chevy Chase, 20815

We are sharing the below email which we sent to Town of Chevy Chase Office to provide perspective on the way the sweeping zoning changes under consideration will impact and be perceived by the numerous neighborhoods within Montgomery County. While the below concerns are centered on the impact to our specific neighborhood, many of these issues will be shared across Montgomery County.

After reviewing the information on the Town of Chevy Chase's website related to the proposed zoning changes impacting our neighborhood, we are writing to express our strong opposition to rezoning and to inquire about the best way to join our voices with our neighbors who have similar concerns. The negative impact these changes will have on the way we use our community, the lack of available infrastructure to support it, and the perverse incentives it will invite are all reasons to abandon the proposed changes.

Adding additional density to our neighborhood will fundamentally alter the feel of our streets, adding more car traffic and crowding out bicycles, scooters and pedestrians. Our family, like many of our neighbors, left a densely populated and heavily-trafficked area in our move to the Town to provide a more safe environment for our children to play and move freely between neighboring friends' homes. This dynamic has attracted families to the Town for more than 100 years and is worth protecting.

The additional density will also add considerable traffic to the already over-crowded streets which line our neighborhood and encourage further cut-through traffic by commuters looking to avoid gridlock along Wisconsin Ave, Connecticut Ave, Bradley Ln, and East-West Hwy. Even before completion of the construction in Bethesda and the repurposed 4H Center, traffic around and through our community has increased appreciably. With limited-to-no access to the metro, particularly along Connecticut Ave, additional density can only make this growing problem worse.

We also fear that the ability to add multi-family housing to residential lots will create a prisoner's dilemma amongst our community with significantly negative effect. The demand from multi-family developers will be greatest at the onset - before every suitable lot on a street / in a neighborhood has been redeveloped. As such, early sellers will reap the rewards of selling at high prices at the expense of neighbors that will be left dealing with the construction and traffic consequences and who may not enjoy the same opportunity to profit. More than

	<p>just changing the physical attributes of our neighborhood, the proposed zoning changes could kill the very sense of community we all currently enjoy.</p>
98	<p>Jennifer Cockburn - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I agree that all neighborhoods need to be part of the solution to the current shortage of affordable housing. That includes mine. The devil is in the details. I think it is important to ensure that the character of a neighborhood - architecture, green space, etc. - is retained to the extent possible.</p> <p>Also, there MUST be adequate consideration of the demands that multi-family housing will place on local public services including schools.</p>
99	<p>Edward Hammerman - CHEVY CHASE, 20815</p> <p>My wife and I oppose the proposed attainable housing strategies for the Dunlop Hills and Rollingwood Sections of Chevy Chase. The plan will increase density disproportionately. It will raise housing prices and defeat the goal of making housing more attainable. It will increase congestion, and construction on those small streets will affect traffic detrimentally. The county department of permitting services is already overwhelmed, and adding more housing units' building inspections means the inspectors may allow more issues to be missed that would fail inspection, but are never caught. Safety will be affected negatively. Keep things as they are, please.</p>
100	<p>Chris Bruch - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>Councilmembers,</p> <p>I support by-right duplex structures in single family neighborhoods, so long as the massing and architecture is compatible. I do not support quads or mini apartment buildings in single-family neighborhoods. Suggest starting with baby steps (duplex's). lets see the results before expanding to larger structures.</p> <p>Chris Bruch</p>
101	<p>Laura Gastwirth - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>We would like to state our strong opposition to the proposed zoning amendments. Allowing multi family homes on any lot throughout the Town of Chevy Chase would negatively alter the neighborhood.</p>
102	<p>Harry Savage - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I am absolutely opposed to the pending proposal to allow developers to ruin residential neighborhoods with unlimited construction of multifamily housing by right. I will actively oppose any candidate for county office who supports it.</p>

103	<p>Jean Horan - Garrett Park, 20896</p> <p>Keep zoning as is. There is not enough infrastructure (eg parking) to support multi-unit dwellings in residential neighborhoods.</p>
104	<p>Robert Friedman - Garrett Park, 20896</p> <p>I am in favor of any initiative that will provide additional housing in this county.</p>
105	<p>Kristin Schmidt - Olney, 20832</p> <p>I am glad to see the council working on solutions for increasing affordable and attainable housing in Montgomery County. I am deeply concerned about how unaffordable most housing has become. My spouse and I bought a house in 2020 and if we were to try to purchase a home today in the same neighborhood we couldn't afford it. I want my children to be able to afford to live in the county where they grew up when they become adults, and I strongly support all efforts to make this possible.</p>
106	<p>Karine Jegalian - Garrett Park, 20896</p> <p>I welcome the building of duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes--as well as allowing people to open shops and restaurants--in neighborhoods that are currently restricted to single-family homes, as long as no minimum parking requirements are imposed and parking/paving is not substantially increased in our neighborhoods.</p> <p>My main concern with the proposed change is the potential loss of green space and trees. Unfortunately that is already happening as small houses are replaced with oversized SFHs. So I would urge the Council to go ahead with expanded building rights but please restrict the addition of pavement. If nothing else, I strenuously urge you not to impose expanded parking minima.</p>
107	<p>Phillip Alvarez - Garrett Park, 20896</p> <p>I think this initiative would be transformative for Montgomery county, and would like to point out that a significant percentage of the resistance to this proposal, at least anecdotally, is coming from older residents who typically have owned their home (purchased at a low price many years ago) and do not plan to build new dwellings. These members are mostly concerned with their neighborhood experience at the expense of new county residents who couldn't dream of affording the same experience. As a younger resident in MoCo who is lucky enough to own his own home, and recognize the uniqueness of that, I wholeheartedly support this proposal.</p>
108	<p>Sean Conlan - Garrett Park, 20896</p> <p>Simply put, without some sort of price controls, this will be used as a mechanism for the rent-seeking class of investors and landlords to extract more money from people. I've watched developers replace small, affordable houses in my neighborhood with increasingly expensive houses. Those same developers will see this as a way to increase their profits by putting up buildings that double or triple the</p>

rent they can collect. Unless there is some sort of regulatory framework to keep housing prices reasonable, I do not see this strategy solving the underlying issue of (affordable) housing.

109 Suzie Welker - Garrett Park, 20896

I live in Garrett Park MD. This neighborhood was designed with narrow streets and no driveways where most people park on the street in front of their houses. Most of the streets here have no side walks making it already dangerous for pedestrians and bikers. Building multi family homes I fear would make it increasingly dangerous for our children to be children in this neighborhood that is already congested with cars and lack of pedestrian infrastructure, where no room exists to build it. Allowing mixed zoning of commercial/residential seems to be less disruptive to already existing neighborhoods where the streets are typically wider and more room exists for safe pedestrian/biking infrastructure, and repurposing of unused commercial property would be advantageous.

110 Lee Walsh - Kensington, 20895

I applaud the County's planners for moving forward with the AHSI. Any large change like this will come with complexities that will require current residents to adapt to new circumstances, but this is a necessity in order to allow a greater percentage of the population access to housing in desirable areas close to good jobs. I think that my neighborhood might be ideal for including some of these new housing arrangements as we are blessed with wide streets and plenty of areas for parking.

My hope is that planners are making other changes to infrastructure like schools to accommodate the expected growth in population in this area.

111 Todd Del Priore - Garrett Park, 20896

Our town of Garrett Park, has small roads that are not designed to support multiple families living on one lot. More often than not, existing street parking within our town requires weaving and creates "one lane" passing along most routes. 20896 simply was not designed to support the needs of multiple family structures. Thanks

112 Caitlin Rice - Silver spring, 20901

I do not agree with this proposal. We are in the throws of a catastrophic trajectory for the planet. To ignore that for more tax revenue is short sighted and dangerous. More densification in areas like this will lead to more impervious surfaces, less space for wildlife and continued deterioration of the ecosystems here. There have been a number of discussions with neighbors and the community that is infuriated about the proposal and I absolutely oppose. I won't speak to the detail about how this does not in fact create affordable housing because many others have likely written about this at length. I will just mention that allowing for this without the consent of the community is in direct conflict with the best interests of the community that will have to live with it.

113

Mary Catherine Ruocco - Bethesda, 20816

River Road is already heavily traveled and the congestion is becoming unbearable. More importantly, from the River Road/Westbard Avenue area to Wilson Lane is NOT near public transportation. Additional housing in that area means more traffic and crowded schools. Need more housing? 1. Head North; 2. Build sustainable public transportation; and 3. Once #2 is completed, build housing.

114

Kathleen Charner - Silver Spring, 20910

I do not support the current Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. While I support strategies for affordable housing, I do not support the current initiative because it gives all the rights and power to developers and not to residents.

115

Laura Lederman - Chevy Chase, 20815

I am against the attainable housing strategies and rezoning of SFH to multifamily zones. Concerns: Older neighborhood street design already doesn't meet county safety standards for emergency vehicles and this plan worsens emergency access for residents. Run off and water management are already ineffective and will be worsened. Also, increasing density does not mean housing is attainable, the most recent multifamily development in my neighborhood are condos for 3.6M. This is a windfall for developers at the expense of residents that won't achieve housing goals and will undermine the primary way citizen's accumulate wealth -through SFH. We need aggressive construction of small affordable single family homes throughout the county. Where is the \$500,000 starter home? - nowhere in this plan. Most of what is proposed looks like housing to promote money laundering not residences. Again. I am strongly against this proposal

116

Betty Gentle - Bethesda, 20814

As a newer resident of Montgomery County, I strongly support the Attainable Housing Strategies (AHS) project. The expansion of multi-dwelling units, particularly in areas like downtown Bethesda, has made it possible for me to consider living here, which might not have been an option otherwise. It is crucial that homeownership does not feel out of reach for people like me, especially as I plan for the future. Without initiatives like AHS, which thoughtfully balance the need for more housing with the preservation of neighborhood character, many prospective homeowners may find Montgomery County inaccessible. By embracing zoning modifications that allow for duplexes, triplexes, and other middle housing options, we can create a more inclusive and attainable housing market.

The recommendations under the AHS project do not force changes on neighborhoods but provide property owners with the flexibility to build diverse types of housing, which ultimately expands opportunities for many residents. This approach helps create a more sustainable

community that can accommodate the growing housing needs while ensuring that more residents, like myself, feel confident in their ability to attain homeownership in the near future.

117 **Clara Lovett - CHEVY CHASE, 20815**

Schedule does not allow me to attend listening sessions. But thank you for setting up such sessions.

Under the leadership of Artie Harris, who knows the development industry and the need of MoCo residents for more housing and more affordable (workforce) housing, the Planning staff are moving in the right direction. County Council members should support them as they proceed to identify solutions.

118 **Jennifer Stoloff - Silver Spring, 20910**

I support the proposed Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. We need more housing for middle-income and lower-income people in Montgomery County. In current single family zones should have options to develop duplex, triplex, and quadplex housing. These housing types are already seen throughout Silver Spring and other neighborhoods and they are well-integrated into the community. I support a more inclusive and open community. I own a single family home in East Silver Spring and I would welcome new, denser developments in my area. Now, when a home is torn down, a much larger single family home is usually what replaces it. That's a shame since our lots are certainly large enough to house more than one family. I would also support abolishing parking minimums since they place a large constraint on all types of development.

119 **Kathleen Donodeo - Olney, 20832**

I wholeheartedly support you AHI. My kids grew up here in Olney, and I hope they will be able to afford to settle near us someday. Right now they would be priced out of almost everything. My only concern is that I don't see anything here about the zoning for in-law apts. and similar add-ons. I see these in our neighborhood; they are no problem at all -- most people probably don't even realize they're there -- and I worry that they will get in trouble for doing something with so many benefits. Good luck!

120 **Douglas Petersen - Chevy Chase, 20815**

My family never would have purchased a home in this neighborhood had we known that the government might later change the zoning rules to allow for multi-unit dwellings, drastically changing the character of the neighborhood. Our narrow streets, often without sidewalks, cannot safely accommodate more cars, traffic, etc --- among many other problems with the proposal. We relied on the existing zoning rules when we chose our neighborhood to raise our family. Drastically changing zoning rules in a way that could severely alter a neighborhood, after residents built their lives and communities around the existing rules, is the worst kind of government.

121

Jacob Barker - Takoma Park, 20912

Make it legal to always build the next densest building everywhere, and unleash unlimited mixed use density at all properties along bus lines and metro stops, and especially at bus stops.

Also, permanently close Beach Drive and Sligo Creek parkway, rip out the roadway, and build either a BRT guideway or LRT grassy tram tracks for the length of both to increase access to these linear parks while also reducing vehicle miles traveled and increasing transit connectivity around the county.

122

Jane McClintock - Garrett Park, 20896

I'm a 10-year resident of Garrett Park, Maryland. Speaking with respect to Garrett Park and the single-family house neighborhoods that also feed to Garrett Park Elementary School, I strongly oppose allowing any infill development for multi-family housing, for several reasons.

First, the Town of Garrett Park is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Founded in 1898, the Town retains many of the bucolic characteristics that led to its designation. Building multi-family housing would be inconsistent with this designation.

Second, the Town of Garrett Park is a designated Arboretum. We have one of the highest densities of mature tree canopy in Montgomery County. Mature trees provide vital ecosystem services such as mitigating stormwater runoff, providing shade to houses to reduce power bills, and offsetting climate change. Although the Town has authority to manage trees in the Town parks, public lands, and right-of-way, allowing multi-family infill development will inevitably lead to the loss of mature trees on private property.

Finally, the County is already doing a terrible job of requiring developers to pay adequate fees to ensure our public schools can serve the the ever-growing student body. Garrett Park ES had a complete rev/ex in 2011, but already the school has lost the dedicated music room and computer room to become classrooms and has lost a good chunk of the already-small playground to portables. At Walter Johnson HS, the hallways are overflowing and there are a significant number of portables.

We have a huge new development at Grosvenor-Strathmore that's just been completed. We are getting another huge new development at Holy Cross that will also contribute to further traffic back-ups on Strathmore Avenue. The White Flint site may also see a huge number of housing units if that redevelopment ever gets going. The new Woodmark HS will do nothing to alleviate the existing overcrowding at the elementary schools and middle schools in the Walter Johnson HS cluster that will only be exacerbated by these major development projects in our neighborhood.

The County should not prioritize allowing multi-family housing in single-family neighborhoods like Garrett Park and Garrett Park Estates when it has already refused to build a seventh elementary school at the White Flint site and is not ensuring that investments in the public school system through developer fees keep up with the influx of new residents.

123	<p>Nancy Griscom - Chevy Chasr, 20815</p> <p>I am very concerned about how additional building would impact the green and family nature of our neighborhood. The traffic is already heavy and dangerous for children and there are many old houses and yards that need to be protected for health reasons</p>
124	<p>Salim Furth - Takoma Park, 20912</p> <p>Thank you for initiating the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. I thoroughly agree that our county needs more housing in all types, sizes, and neighborhoods. My own neighborhood has aging apartment buildings and flipped single family homes. Adding some new apartments or condos would diversify and improve the options again. Please upzone the R-60 zone to allow up to four units per lot with reasonable bulk allowances.</p>
125	<p>Kimberly Tilley - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative is a misnomer without adding Sustainable. This proposal is ill conceived if the purpose is to provide affordable housing. Unless safeguards are put into place, ANY multifamily structure will quickly rise beyond the price point of the very population intended to benefit while making an already densely packed area more challenging. Apartment buildings (not in these crowded neighborhoods) with true rent control can provide access to MoCo schools and more. Multifamily dwellings with units for sale will not. This initiative is based on faulty planning and best guesses, which is inexcusable, while leaving the very population it's intended to serve in the cold. Our country has a well documented history of failed housing proposals from which much can be learned. Please conduct further research before proceeding with this.</p>
126	<p>David Fu - Bethesda, 20852</p> <p>Hi, I was born and raised in Montgomery County, and I just wanted to write in support of the new zoning laws allowing many single family lots to be upzoned into duplexes or triplexes or townhomes. I went to UMD, and I can say that firsthand I've seen rent prices drop dramatically as a result of all the new apartment buildings being built. My family moved to a sixplex in middle school and I thought it was every bit as good as a single family home, and the proximity to both parks and public transit was a huge upgrade. I've admired all the progress that's been made so far in housing development and bike lanes, and I hope it continues!</p>
127	<p>Gabriel Hardgrave - Potomac, 20854</p> <p>I'm a long time resident of Montgomery County. My family moved here when I was in middle school. I went to school here and grew up here. And a few years after graduating college I moved back here to be closer to my friends and friendly. I think this is a truly great community, and I'd love to continue living here, and be able build my career and family here.</p> <p>It's for these reasons that I'm extremely enthusiastic about the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. Housing availability in the area is my primary concern. It is the number one local issue that impact my friends and family, and frankly myself. When voting in local elections, housing availability is top of mind.</p>

Rent and housing is currently my biggest expense, and the main barrier to being able to build a life here. I know that the current cost of living crisis is driven by the shortage of housing, and I know the only way to alleviate this crisis is to build more homes. Be they apartment buildings, duplexes, fourplexes, I want it all!

I'm disheartened that many of the opportunities afforded to by parents and grandparents are out of reach for me and folks in my generation, precisely because the new housing construction has been artificially restricted for so long. Allowing more dense housing is crucial, and I'm appreciative and enthusiastic to see real solutions being proposed to combat the cost of living crisis.

128

Fan Fu - North Bethesda, 20852

Support

129

Paul Brown - Chevy Chase, 20815

I live in Chevy Chase. I very much support this Initiative. Montgomery County has an affordable housing crisis. We need affordable housing, but we also need more housing of all types and at all price levels. More housing will stabilize prices for all. We need a housing solution that offers "all of the above" and the Initiative offers that.

Our 25 year old college graduate daughter, who has a minimum wage job because that is all she can find at present, lives at home. Most of her peers do as well. None can afford housing in our area on what they make.

I do understand some of my neighbors do not support the Initiative because they want to preserve the single family nature of our neighborhood. I disagree. Opposing the possible introduction of varied housing, not just single family houses, strikes me as exclusionary, if not in intent, then in effect. No different from redlining: keeping out those who we feel "do not belong."

Chevy Chase was founded by a racist developer who sought to exclude those who were not WASPs of certain income levels. Non-white people of any income level need not apply, Poor people of any color need not apply.

Surely over 100 years later, we can do better and be open to mixed housing.

Do we really want Montgomery County to have a reputation of preserving past exclusionary models?

I urge the Council to approve the Initiative.

130

Paula Gibson - Chevy Chase, 20815

Dear Members of the Montgomery County Council,

As a resident and homeowner in Montgomery County, I respectfully ask the council to reconsider the proposed Attainable Housing Strategies Zoning Changes. The plan as currently drafted is a one-size-fits-all mandate, giving little or no consideration to the unique needs or interests of specific neighborhoods and communities.

As residents of the Chevy Chase Village Historic District, we are concerned that the new zoning rules would significantly undermine generations of successful preservation efforts to maintain the historic character and architectural significance of this neighborhood. Homeowners in the county's historic districts must abide by strict rules and reviews by the Historic Preservation Commission in order to update or modify their homes. However, the new zoning rules would give property owners and real estate developers free rein to significantly modify, or replace, these homes with multifamily housing units. We have spent much personal and financial resources to comply with all of the County, Village and Historic Commission requirements of renovating a home in an historic district. If your plan is adopted as is, all of the work that we and our neighbors undertook to preserve the historic nature of the neighborhood would be obliterated by your proposed strategies and no historic neighborhood would remain.

The new rules would allow any homeowner – even in the historic district – to convert their single-family home to a duplex or triplex “by right.” Additionally, most of the village historic district would fall within a “Priority Housing District” due to its proximity to the Friendship Heights Metro Station, meaning that historic homes could be demolished and replaced with “quadplexes.” Finally, approximately 160 properties within the Village are located within 500 feet of Connecticut or Wisconsin Avenues, which are identified as “major growth corridors,” thereby allowing up to four-story apartment buildings with up to 19 units each on these properties.

This development is not only unwanted by our neighborhood, it is in direct conflict with the stated goals of the county's Historic Preservation Commission and Chapter 24A of the Montgomery County Code. At a minimum, the new zoning rules should make clear that these changes do not apply to historic properties or to neighborhoods designated as historic districts.

As the county seeks to provide more affordable housing to residents, please do not undermine our historic district by opening it up to unwanted development. We cannot fix what ails our community by destroying what makes it great. Sacrificing our history for growth would be an irreversible mistake.

Thank you.

Duane and Paula Gibson

131

Benjamin Glickstein - Takoma Park, 20912

I strongly support the Attainable Housing Initiative. I'm especially excited about the prospect of welcoming duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes into my single family takoma park neighborhood. The increased density will mean more neighbors and friends for my children,

more lively streets, and a critical mass to support more businesses. Larger developments, especially affordable housing and mixed-use transit oriented development would also bring vibrancy, diversity, and ease of living to me and my neighbors. The population - of Montgomery County, of Maryland, indeed of Planet Earth - is growing. And the idea that we need more housing to match should be common sense. Thank you for advancing a plan to help combat the housing crisis.

132

Stephanie Miller - Chevy Chase, 20815

Dear Members of the Montgomery County Council,

As a resident and homeowner in Montgomery County, I respectfully ask the council to reconsider the proposed Attainable Housing Strategies Zoning Changes. While well-intentioned, the plan as currently drafted is a one-size-fits-all mandate, giving little or no consideration to the unique needs or interests of specific neighborhoods and communities.

As a resident of the Chevy Chase Village Historic District, I am particularly concerned that the new zoning rules would significantly undermine generations of successful preservation efforts to maintain the historic character and architectural significance of this neighborhood. Homeowners in the county's historic districts must abide by strict rules and reviews by the Historic Preservation Commission in order to update or modify their homes. However, the new zoning rules would give property owners and real estate developers free reign to significantly modify, or replace, these homes with multifamily housing units.

The new rules would allow any homeowner – even in the historic district – to convert their single-family home to a duplex or triplex “by right.” Additionally, most of the village historic district would fall within a “Priority Housing District” due to its proximity to the Friendship Heights Metro Station, meaning that historic homes could be demolished and replaced with “quadplexes.” Finally, approximately 160 properties within the Village are located within 500 feet of Connecticut or Wisconsin Avenues, which are identified as “major growth corridors,” thereby allowing up to four-story apartment buildings with up to 19 units each on these properties.

This development is not only unwanted by our neighborhood, it is in direct conflict with the stated goals of the county's Historic Preservation Commission and Chapter 24A of the Montgomery County Code. At a minimum, the new zoning rules should make clear that these changes do not apply to historic properties or to neighborhoods designated as historic districts.

As the county seeks to provide more affordable housing to residents, please do not undermine our historic district by opening it up to unwanted development. We cannot fix what ails our community by destroying what makes it great. Sacrificing our history for growth would be an irreversible mistake.

Thank you for your consideration

Matthew Kurgan - Chevy Chase, 20815

133

Dear Members of the Montgomery County Council,

As a resident and homeowner in Montgomery County, I respectfully ask the council to reconsider the proposed Attainable Housing Strategies Zoning Changes. While well-intentioned, the plan as currently drafted is a one-size-fits-all mandate, giving little or no consideration to the unique needs or interests of specific neighborhoods and communities.

As a resident of the Chevy Chase Village Historic District, I am particularly concerned that the new zoning rules would significantly undermine generations of successful preservation efforts to maintain the historic character and architectural significance of this neighborhood. Homeowners in the county's historic districts must abide by strict rules and reviews by the Historic Preservation Commission in order to update or modify their homes. However, the new zoning rules would give property owners and real estate developers free reign to significantly modify, or replace, these homes with multifamily housing units.

The new rules would allow any homeowner – even in the historic district – to convert their single-family home to a duplex or triplex “by right.” Additionally, most of the village historic district would fall within a “Priority Housing District” due to its proximity to the Friendship Heights Metro Station, meaning that historic homes could be demolished and replaced with “quadplexes.” Finally, approximately 160 properties within the Village are located within 500 feet of Connecticut or Wisconsin Avenues, which are identified as “major growth corridors,” thereby allowing up to four-story apartment buildings with up to 19 units each on these properties.

This development is not only unwanted by our neighborhood, it is in direct conflict with the stated goals of the county's Historic Preservation Commission and Chapter 24A of the Montgomery County Code. At a minimum, the new zoning rules should make clear that these changes do not apply to historic properties or to neighborhoods designated as historic districts.

As the county seeks to provide more affordable housing to residents, please do not undermine our historic district by opening it up to unwanted development. We cannot fix what ails our community by destroying what makes it great. Sacrificing our history for growth would be an irreversible mistake.

Thank you for your consideration

134

Nina Merlin - Bethesda, 20817

I'd like to submit my concern with Attainable Housing. In my neighborhood, Kenwood Park, many smaller, more affordable homes have been bought by developers and redeveloped into expensive homes. Attainable Housing should restrict the new home development / tear downs instead of focusing on multi family homes. If you did that, people would not be priced out of single family homes as they are now. If you allow developers to build multi family units in our neighborhood it's only going to push up the price of the single family homes more because there will be limited stock. It's a desirable school district and location.

135

Margit Nahra - Chevy Chase, 20815

Dear Members of the Montgomery County Council,

As a longtime resident and homeowner in Chevy Chase, I am writing in support of efforts to change local zoning to permit the implementation of Attainable Housing Strategies in Montgomery County. I acknowledge the dire need to expand our housing stock to support our growing population and welcome the opportunities to do so in our area in a measured and thoughtful manner.

Living in the Chevy Chase Village Historic District, I would prefer that zoning changes limit the options for replacing single family homes to duplexes or triplexes rather than quadplexes and apartment buildings, and I wish the changes would permit ADUs where feasible without greatly diminishing a lot's green space. While my preferred options would not go far in addressing the looming housing crisis, I think such modifications to the current zoning rules could be absorbed by the community without significantly changing the character of the neighborhood and hopefully could lessen the alarm and opposition the currently proposed changes are engendering.

I am more concerned that there will not be sufficient housing stock in our area for our children to raise their own families here, or for empty nesters like me to downsize and stay in the community we now call home, than I am that significant numbers of my neighbors will sell their homes not to other families, but to developers seeking to replace single family homes with multifamily units.

I am also concerned that some may confuse attainable housing with affordable housing. While the intentionally exclusive origins of our community bear acknowledgement and remediation, efforts to address the shortage of housing stock, such as are contemplated by the currently proposed strategies, do not address the shortage of affordable housing, which is a distinct and complex issue arguably better addressed through other means.

	<p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Margit Nahra</p>
136	<p>Helen Heinrich - Silver Spring, 20902</p> <p>Montgomery County is in dire need of attainable housing for people with disabilities, especially near transit options as many disabled people also cannot drive, whether due to their disabilities or due to not being able to afford to. I fully support having more housing, just make sure that it is attainable for everyone, and not just abled people.</p>
137	<p>Douglas Ratay - Rockville, 20852</p> <p>I support building more housing so that more people/families can live in our county.</p>
138	<p>Luke Holian - Chevy Chase Village, 20815</p> <p>Do not push this forward. We do not support this effort.</p>
139	<p>Mary Ellen OBrien - Bethesda, 20817</p> <p>Does the county now have occupancy limits on detached homes. As a realtor i saw many many communities deteriorate in value due to the county's lack of invoking capacity limits to living in one home. I would find on house tours many homes with drywall making makeshift closet size "rooms" to rent in basements . You would start seeing cars parked on yards, etc. It was the initial signs of a community losing its commitment, cohesion and care. Then long time residents complained of classroom size growing reducing their children's quality of education, the list of implications and unintended effects goes on. I fear again the county's lack of commitment to invoking ordinances and preserving the integrity of neighvorhoods causing their decline. Completely unfair to existng residents.</p>
140	<p>David Cunniff - Silver Spring, 20905</p> <p>The biggest concern I hear from my neighborhood is that owner-occupied homes might start flipping to owner-rental homes...and those owners might seek to leverage the Attainable Housing Initiative to create high density residential units in our historically residential neighborhood. Even with the HOA, we may not be able to prevent a determined property owner from forging ahead, creating churn, cost, and controversy in the neighborhood. MoCo needs to establish clear guidelines for what can and cannot be done, when and where.</p>

141	<p>Ben Gielow - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I strongly oppose the Planning Board's "Attainable Housing Strategies" initiative. Stop your work and scrap it.</p>
142	<p>Jonathan Lyons-Raeder - Silver Spring, 20910</p> <p>I strongly support the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative! The housing crisis is one of the foremost issues of our time, and its knock-on effects are contributing to and part of many other problems, such as the affordability/cost-of-living crisis, political polarization, segregation, the climate crisis, and more. I love living in a city - it's better for the environment, it increases my daily interaction with people different than me, and it's filled with fun and interesting things to do and see. But if I want to stay in an urban area, it's likely that I'll never be able to afford a home, despite having a college degree and working for a notable nonprofit. If even I cannot own a home, then those richer than me will take up the limited supply, furthering gentrification and pricing people lower on the socio-economic ladder out of their neighborhoods. I strongly support any initiatives to build more housing, increase mixed-use zoning, increase housing density, end single-family-exclusive-zoning, and provide a wealth of different housing types. Thank you!</p>
143	<p>Allison Giles - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I am very concerned about the housing initiative that will have a detrimental impact on the Chevy Chase Village (CCV) and other communities. CCV has strong historical ties to the county and the spirit of the community runs deep. Allowing significant zoning changes that would include duplexes, investor-owned developing will damage the CCV community bringing traffic, disruption, and weaken community ties. Affordable housing and additional tax revenue important but this is not the right proposal and there is too short a turnaround to think through the many issue. I urge you to abandon or allow more time for input. Thank you. Best, Allison and Tom Giles</p>
144	<p>shanti stanton - Chevy Chase, MD, 20815</p> <p>Dear Members of the Montgomery County Council,</p> <p>As a resident and homeowner in Montgomery County, I respectfully ask the council to reconsider the proposed Attainable Housing Strategies Zoning Changes. While well-intentioned, the plan as currently drafted is a one-size-fits-all mandate, giving little or no consideration to the unique needs or interests of specific neighborhoods and communities.</p> <p>As a resident of the Chevy Chase Village Historic District, I am particularly concerned that the new zoning rules would significantly undermine generations of successful preservation efforts to maintain the historic character and architectural significance of this neighborhood. Homeowners in the county's historic districts must abide by strict rules and reviews by the Historic Preservation Commission in order to update or modify their homes. However, the new zoning rules would give property owners and real estate developers free reign to significantly modify, or replace, these homes with multifamily housing units.</p>

The new rules would allow any homeowner – even in the historic district – to convert their single-family home to a duplex or triplex “by right.” Additionally, most of the village historic district would fall within a “Priority Housing District” due to its proximity to the Friendship Heights Metro Station, meaning that historic homes could be demolished and replaced with “quadplexes.” Finally, approximately 160 properties within the Village are located within 500 feet of Connecticut or Wisconsin Avenues, which are identified as “major growth corridors,” thereby allowing up to four-story apartment buildings with up to 19 units each on these properties.

This development is not only unwanted by our neighborhood, it is in direct conflict with the stated goals of the county’s Historic Preservation Commission and Chapter 24A of the Montgomery County Code. At a minimum, the new zoning rules should make clear that these changes do not apply to historic properties or to neighborhoods designated as historic districts.

As the county seeks to provide more affordable housing to residents, please do not undermine our historic district by opening it up to unwanted development. We cannot fix what ails our community by destroying what makes it great. Sacrificing our history for growth would be an irreversible mistake.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Shanti Stanton

145

Scott Robinson - Kensington, 20895

I am opposed to the AHS initiative as it is currently structured. I can’t imagine how this will be a good thing in long standing established neighborhoods. If a developer drops a duplex or triplex in the middle of our street what will happen to the value of the other homes. I suspect a house or two will get a good price and the rest will drop sharply. What does that do to the tax base? In addition who is doing traffic studies? This will be an unmitigated disaster. This could not be more poorly thought out.

146

L Yoder - Chevy Chase, 20815

Before any vote is taken by the County Council on this initiative, it is essential to carry out impact studies of increasing residential density as a result of up zoning. What will be the impact on parking, rainwater runoff, utility demands, tree canopies, school enrolment, urban temperatures, road congestion, air pollution? If more affordable housing is the goal, increase the number of units developers have to provide and establish a moratorium on the attainable houses that currently exist in our residential neighbourhoods. There are better ways to approach this issue than AHS!!!

147	<p>Tino Calabia - Chevy Chase, 20815-4601</p> <p>Compared to other counties throughout the U.S., our Montgomery County, Maryland does very well in terms of people of color and low-income families. But we can still do better. Let's do it! --Tino Calabia, Friendship Heights, MD</p>
148	<p>Liz Overstreet - Garrett Park, 20896</p> <p>I think converting unused office space to housing will provide more affordable units in both the short and long term. Garrett Park in particular would be negatively impacted by allowing other than single family houses because there is no way our streets can accommodate the additional parking congestion created by additional residents no matter how much you say there will be limited impact. It is a bad idea. I think it will not provide a benefit to the neighborhood but will likely only benefit builders and developers. The more crowded our area becomes the less green space we will have and the liveability and reasons we like to be here will be diminished.</p>
149	<p>M Hale - Gaithersburg, 20877</p> <p>There are townhouses being built adjacent to asking Farm Why aren't these allocated to the "affordable housing"? If the situation is so dire for affordable housing, why not build affordable housing instead of the outrageously expensive townhomes and condos being built?</p>
150	<p>Robert Fares - Silver Spring, 20902</p> <p>I strongly support the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. I think it makes no sense that a property owner's options for redeveloping their lot are unreasonably constrained to one option: a single family home. I live on a large lot near the Metro, and if zoning reform were enacted I would certainly be interested in replacing my home with a duplex/multiplex, so that I could potentially live in one unit and rent the others. This would also provide a huge benefit to the county in terms of increasing housing supply near Metro - a win-win!</p>
151	<p>Avantika Fraser - Kensington, 20895</p> <p>I worry about how crowded and congested things will be. The area is not equipped otherwise to handle so many more people.</p> <p>What else is being done to accommodate parks, commuting, school classroom sizes, traffic, etc.?</p>
152	<p>Cindy Finn - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I'm with the architects of this initiative in spirit. There's no question affordable housing is a meaningful problem in MoCo (and beyond!). I don't have a perfect answer to it. BUT as a mother, a 26-yr. MoCo resident/observer (all of those years in Chevy Chase), I will regrettably predict that adding such development w/in the BCC lines, will unequivocally result in other -- arguably much worse problems. I used to be a tax lawyer -- so it's hard to get more nerdy than that. I've read about the conundrum and also via common sense and again, observation -- very bad idea. Not only will prices rise for things like food and gas etc. (think supply/demand) -- but much more serious ramifications such as assured spikes in car accidents, cars hitting pedestrians, and more. The list is lengthy. Longer times spent in traffic, increased emissions,</p>

decreased quality of life/family time/productivity due to time sitting in traffic and on and on. We're at a beyond-saturated point population wise and if you add AH projects here, you will create disaster frankly. Eventually, people will move, decreasing tax revenue to service roads which will need more repair, etc. VERY BAD IDEA but I know, good intentions.

153 **Deborah Vergara - Bethesda, 20817**

"The goal of the Planning Board's Attainable Housing Strategies recommendations is to increase options for property owners to build more housing types in Montgomery County to help address the housing crisis"

Please quit referring to the reason your zoning changes mentioned above is so home owners of single family homes are going to benefit from this attempted rezoning. Do you really think that it is economically feasible for a home owner in a single family neighborhood to tear their house, down that they have bought/mortgaged, and build one of these multifamily structures? Of course not. The only entities making out are developers/builders and only if they can make a bigger buck than building another single family house. You are just sugar-coating your plan to tear down the single family home culture. I believe you and the Counsel/MPB will try to pass this ZTA which states these changes will be made "by right" i.e. home owners will have no say, no recourse, no transparency as to what structure is built next door - probably using a ZTA rather than a code change to avoid any veto. I believe you will pass this no matter what your constituency wants. I believe you will expand the changes deeper and deeper into single family area until there are none. Why do I believe these things? Because you are lying and masking the truth from the get go.

Your residents really do see through this glossing of the words

154 **MARK KRAMER - BETHESDA, 20814**

I hope that this zoning change is NEVER adopted.

As a resident and an Architect within the County for 40 years, the concept of changing the single family zone is unfair to existing home owners and would destroy the fabric of the architecture within communities.

I have seen other communities within the Country adopt such legislation and it destroys the street scape, creates parking issues, overloads the schools and creates community social problems.

155 **Margaret Eastman - Chevy Chase, 20815**

As a longtime Montgomery County resident, I oppose plans to rezone land to create space in which to crowd more houses. My neighborhood is dense enough as it is, and we have major storm runoff problems. The infrastructure of these built neighborhoods cannot take more building. We also have parking problems now, which would become untenable under such crowding. I support affordable

	<p>housing, but rezoning is NOT the way to do it. We have enough problems as it is with builders knocking down existing houses to build huge mansions. Please don't ruin our built communities.</p>
156	<p>Julian Lord - Kensington, 20895</p> <p>I am in full support of the AHS Initiative! My son is seven and I find it immoral to continue to allow McMansions to be built which turn our communities into exclusive country clubs. I am on a local list serve in Kensington and there are many NIMBY's in my community who are signing petitions and organizing to stop the initiative. Is there any organizing force to push back against the NIMBY movement in the county?</p>
157	<p>Matt Bormet - Takoma Park, 20912</p> <p>I strongly support the county advancing the Attainable Housing Strategy Initiative. As a small business owner, I am dependent on a community that can afford to live nearby. The more people that live near me, the more I can sell great books to! I also rely on attainable housing for my employees to be able to work near where they live. I encourage the council to find ways to expand housing in the county.</p> <p>Matt Bormet People's Book Takoma Park MD</p>
158	<p>Alan Davis - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>This initiative is the most ill conceived and nonsensical planning proposal possible. There is ample land in the core commercial areas of Chevy Chase and Bethesda to create additional "attainable" (which is nothing more than a euphemism for some sort of special housing that can't be called housing because the Planning Department needs a cover to eradicate due process and constituent input) housing. There is over 30,000 lots currently zoned and permitted for housing that sits undeveloped because demand can't support additional supply. The Planning Department AHSI proposal is rogue, radical and without justification. This initiative is fundamentally flawed and without merit and those in the government that support this radical action to deny due process and democracy need to be relieved from their duties.</p>
159	<p>Sherry Thomare - Gaithersburg, 20877</p> <p>This is unacceptable. People have worked hard their entire lives for what they own. This is criminal and will not be accountable or tolerated by the mass majority. The State and/or County government is overstepping their boundaries.</p>
160	<p>Sallie Lowenstine - Kensington, 20895</p> <p>I think this is a specious solution--it seems misguided. Does it occur to the county that if they want median priced housing that they should not let developers come in and buy up affordable housing in good shape, tear the house down and put up a poorly built replacement that costs 2-3 times what the previous house cost. In addition, many of us bought our homes as single family dwellings.</p>

161

Robert Burns - Gaithersburg, 20882

As a long-time resident of Montgomery County and the father of 5, several of which live in Montgomery County with their families, I understand the need for additional, affordable housing. This rezoning effort does not support that need nor is it based on valid data points.

As noted by County Executive Elrich and others, this plan is based on incorrect data and does a disservice to county (your constituents) residents. The plan is not focused on affordable housing but what is considered "attainable" housing which can start at \$800,000 and exceed several million (which it already has) per unit. It does not satisfactorily take into account the impact of increased density on neighborhoods, the already limited parking in areas of the county, schools, traffic or stormwater runoff (reduction of open space) nor the impact to the tax base based on tax breaks given to developers and the multi-unit owners. It basically allows someone to tear down an existing single-family home and build multiple units on the same footprint. This will permanently change the baseline of housing and quality of life in Montgomery County and not for the better.

One final point – the biggest beneficiaries of this effort to me seem to be the developers, not the homeowners here in the county. It is my understanding that the Planning Board has proposed property tax breaks for up to 10 years for redevelopers and homebuyers of single-family homes that are converted to multiplexes. Specifically a 50% reduction in property taxes for a duplex, 66% for a triplex, and 75% for a quad. Almost certainly this will mean that the redevelopers will pay less property taxes over 10 years than the individual remaining homes that are adjacent to the multiplexes. It will also mean that those single-family homeowners will be subsidizing the redevelopers.

This plan should not be passed by the council.

162

Gearld Smith - Chevy Chase, 20815

Sirs:

The pending zoning change, as recommended by the Planning Commission, is a disaster, a disgrace, and an insult to the communities of Bethesda-Chevy Chase who, overwhelmingly, oppose such a drastic and arbitrary attempt to obliterate what Bethesda-Chevy Chase has come to be known for, it's SURBURBAN flavor of single family homes in a community that is healthy for both senior citizens and children alike. Curiously, while the Planning Commission is ram-rodging this measure thru for a vote, it has been PROVEN to be both unnecessary and counterproductive. It is unnecessary because the projections for housing needs have actually gone DOWN thru 2035+, as has job growth in the area. Second, our existing infrastructure is struggling badly to keep-up with the current single family home zoning, much less the potential for tripling the number of single family structures. Parking is a joke and has not been planned for in the current re-zoning plans, streets are narrow, schools are already overcrowded, and our electrical grid goes out with the mere whisper of an incoming storm. The list goes on and on. Curously, when asked in the Section 5 session last Tuesday what the impact would be on our infrastructure, the County representative responded, however truthfully, "we haven't gotten to that yet". Can we say, "putting the cart before the horse"?

Moreover, what has become of the democratic norm of the WILL OF THE PEOPLE? Why is this measure not on the ballot, allowing the people it affects most to have a say. Why is so much power now in the hands of so UNELECTED few minds who are bowing to money and political expediency instead of to the people they serve? Indeed ,if MOCO wants be FAIR and talk about EFFECTIVE solutions to what they

	<p>falsley deem to be a housing crisis, why not look at White Flint and Pike& Rose where there are already projects on the boards, approved and permitted, but not built. Why? because the numbers don't make sense for the developers. So, as a solution, let's placate the developers by decimating a 130 year old neighborhood where they can make a quick buck?</p> <p>We all know and understand that if passed, this all will end up in the Courts. So, why not take a step back and take a more reasonable, educated, and informed approach that will address the current and projected REALITIES at hand, and do so WITHIN a notion of respect for the past. Why not invest the funds that will go to lawyers in a more in-depth study of the negative impact the current proposal will have on our communities, as well as looking at other options for land use. For sure, MOCO is a very large county.</p> <p>The current PLAN is wrong in so many other ways, too many to list here. PLEASE SLOW DOWN and properly and effectively represent the PEOPLE who have put you in the County seat you sit. LISTEN TO US, PLEASE!!!</p>
163	<p>Margaret Conze - Garrett Park, 20896</p> <p>I think this is the worst idea. If my neighbor becomes a multi family unit my housing value will decrease. That is basically changing the rules in the middle of the game. People and families are struggling for sure and by making a possible opportunity for some families you undermine other family's main investment. It's not fair!! We don't need more people there's no place for their kids to go to school anyway.</p>
164	<p>Naomi Yount - North Potomac, 20878</p> <p>This is by far the worst idea the council has had in my entire voting life in Montgomery County. This will change the zoning but does nothing for infrastructure, schools, and overall aesthetics for the community. What this does seem like is a way to charge more in property tax. Please DO NOT enact this</p>
165	<p>Marisa Kish - Gaithersburg, 20878</p> <p>Please vote for the proposed changes. We need more housing (and types of housing).</p>
166	<p>peggy lucero - bethesda, 20814</p> <p>Bad irrational plan. Elrich is Rightfully OPPOSED & I Agree. Infrastructure cannot support this at all</p>
167	<p>Guillaume de Decker - CHEVY CHASE, 20815</p> <p>As a resident of Dunlop Hills for the past 20 years I am absolutely not interested in the AHS initiative as proposed by the county. Wanting to overpopulate an already overcrowded area is completely idiotic and there is more to life than money.</p> <p>If this proposal see the light, I will strongly show my disappointment by voting against any member of the council that support the measure.</p> <p>regards,</p> <p>Guillaume de Decker</p>

168

Melissa Bronez - Garrett Park, 20896-1508

I am very much in favor of opening up our beautiful neighborhood to more affordable housing....provided the Town retains the ability to control setbacks, historic preservation, height limits and parking regulations.

169

Janis Alcorn - Chevy Chase, 20816

I oppose the rezoning proposed in AHS as it stands.

It needs to have a full independent social and environmental Assessment that is shared with voters and Council before it is voted upon , as well as a financial analysis of how taxes will go up to meet the rising costs required for expansion of schools, police , streets, utilities and rainwater drainage necessary while this dense housing is created.

170

Ann Joseph - Chevy Chase, 20815

I am an elderly resident of Rollingwood.. I have lived in my house for over 60 years. I don't plan to move. I have watched the traffic on Connecticut Ave get worse over the years. Now it is rush hour all day. This idea is faulty on many ways. It will increase the already congested area. The residences will bring profits only to the developers. People who need low cost housing won't be able to afford these homes, so the current housing problem won't be solved but made worse. People like me will suffer so that developers can make more money. This is a very bad idea.

171

Carol Leventhal - Silver Spring, 20901

We are vehemently opposed to the Montgomery County's planning board Attainable Housing plan, which rather than being a sensible plan to create more affordable housing in the county, is a gift to developers, hedge fund operators and real estate companies. Addressing this need should not come by despoiling the character of our residential neighborhoods. Downtown Silver Spring's sites for the Discovery Building and its many two-story buildings along Colesville Road, adjacent to the Metro offer a far better solution that doesn't sacrifice the ambience of life in Montgomery County's residential neighborhoods.

Should this plan be enacted by the County Council, there will be intended and unintended consequences. A tree canopy will be lost. Our property has hundreds of young and mature trees on it. Their loss will result in greater pollution for Silver Spring residents. Streets will have to be widened to accommodate increased traffic. Where will the cars for the new residents end up?

This isn't an example of enlightened planning. It is a scheme to line the pockets of the aforementioned real estate community. Affordable housing won't be the result. Is this the best we can do?

Carol and Allan Leventhal

[REDACTED]
Silver Spring 20901
[REDACTED]

172

Logan MacKethan - Chevy Chase, 20815

Please do not implement. The traffic problems on East West Highway and Connecticut Ave. leading into Bethesda and DC are already VERY VERY BAD as Bethesda is expanding. The streets are not able to handle additional capacity.

In addition, developers are making duplexes and even small apartment complexes that are luxury and selling for \$1 million and above in Chevy Chase so that does not solve the "affordable" housing problem. These are not affordable!

In addition, the value of homes (I am a real estate agent) that are adjacent to multifamily house will decrease property values and therefore your tax base.

Please vote no.

173

Andrew Malone - Silver Spring, 20910

I believe strongly that the strategies the Planning Board has proposed to ensure that attainable housing can be constructed in all Montgomery County neighborhoods should be enacted.

I grew up in Montgomery County, in the Park Hills area of Silver Spring. When it came time to move out of my parents' house, I was able to move into apartments in downtown Silver Spring.

I met my wife and we wanted to buy a house. We didn't have a huge amount of savings or income, but thanks to the diversity of housing options available in East Silver Spring, we were able to purchase a relatively spacious townhome that had been built about 30 years earlier and modestly updated. We did some updates ourselves, saved our money, and were able to purchase a single-family home as our next step.

The key is that we had a way to begin building equity without having to purchase a small, outdated, or dilapidated single-family home, which was pretty much the menu available when we bought our townhouse.

Living in East Silver Spring also showed me that neighborhoods are enhanced when there are a multiplicity of housing types available. Many homes in the area had been cut up into three- or four-unit rentals, which you could only tell when delivering mail or (in my case) the ESSCA newsletter. The neighborhood also contains some townhouses (like mine), some duplexes, and, along bus routes or larger roads, some condo buildings and apartment buildings. These allowed people at different income levels or stages of life to live in the neighborhood. The neighborhood is thriving and a desirable place to live, as evidenced by continually increasing property values.

The use of the pattern book for the small-scale development seems a thoughtful concession to traditional notions of neighborhood "character." I don't personally think it's necessary, but recognize its political value.

As we face a future where we will need to curb carbon emissions, it makes more sense to allow denser building anywhere we have adequate public transit infrastructure, regardless of the current zoning. We need people living in places where they don't have to drive as much. The Attainable Housing Strategies will help with that goal too. And more people riding public transit will create a positive spiral for the transit system, allowing better and more frequent service.

I have seen the value of attainable housing in my own life and in communities in which I have lived. I strongly support these strategies to foster the construction of more attainable housing throughout Montgomery County.

174 **Thomas Wilson - Silver Spring, 20910**
I just want to say that as an owner of a single family home in the Forest Glen neighborhood of Silver Spring, I am **enthusiastically** in favor of this change. More zoning flexibility please!!

175 **Scott Shuchart - Chevy Chase, 20815**
I am strongly in favor of the initiative and find it unfortunate that my town, Chevy Chase Section 3, and others in the area seem to be providing such negative feedback. We need to limit sprawl and make sure our communities remain vibrant with young families, and controlled density is the right path for transit-focused development.

176 **Jordan Ying - Silver Spring, 20910**
I support this initiative (and think it doesn't go far enough).

I own my own home in MoCo, but I think that others should be able to do so too. But it's impossible given how much demand outstrips supply.

I live next to a home filled to the brim with recent immigrants, it would make much more sense for them to be able to live in this neighborhood but be able to live in apartments.

I'd love to be able to see my neighborhood have more people and fewer cars (because we live right on a bus line and in walking distance of the Metro and soon purple line).

Stop outlawing apartments!

177 **Geoffrey Irving - Silver Spring, 20902**
I support relaxing zoning requirements in proximity to metro stations and other mass-transit stations to promote reasonable residential development. This should be done with community involvement and input. Over-restrictive zoning and regulation is the primary culprit of the county's housing shortage. Make it easier to develop and build. Make government smaller.

178	<p>Eric Saul - Takoma Park, 20912</p> <p>Height limits are subjective and useless. Land is finite and the sky is not. Allowing developers the ability to build more units on their property will obviously lower the cost of housing. It's why buying in bulk is cheaper per unit at places like Costco. As long as we allow our population to grow, we should allow the creation of more houses near desirable areas that have a near monopoly on resources and good paying jobs. Montgomery must adapt and lead on housing if we really believe we have a housing crisis.</p>
179	<p>Jessica Begue - North Bethesda, 20852</p> <p>I am writing in strong support of the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative set forth by the Planning Department.</p> <p>I was raised in Ohio and my fiance was raised in Silver Spring. When it came time to move in together and decide where we were going to put down our roots, there was no question about where we would be. We have lived, worked, and played in Montgomery County for the last 4 years, and we can't imagine our lives any other way. Our family is here, our friends are here, and our jobs are here. We want to raise a family here.</p> <p>But as the county grows, the opportunity to own a home and experience the stability it brings shrinks. Despite both having good jobs, the American Dream feels out of reach to us.</p> <p>The attainable housing strategies set forth by the planning department would put our goal (and the goal of many young families!) firmly within reach. If the county increases both housing volume AND housing types, more young people will be able to purchase homes in Montgomery County and spend their lives here. Montgomery County belongs to everyone, not just those fortunate enough to have bought a home 30 years ago.</p>
180	<p>Kelly Simonson - Derwood, 20855</p> <p>Good evening, my name is Kelly and I was born here in Montgomery County, I have loved it my whole life. Reconsidering the county's archaic zoning restrictions is long overdue and absolutely the right decision! As a young professional working for MCPS, I have felt squeezed and stagnated at the housing options available. Landowners should be able to invest in their property and provide more housing for us all. Thank you for taking the time to read this message, and please do not bow to the loud and angry minority! People who understand the basic physics of population growth are with you!</p>
181	<p>Lauren Ashburn - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>This is a RIDICULOUS idea that will cause property values to plunge and major traffic issues. There is hardly any on-street parking as it is. I am violently opposed to this idea. It's true government too-down management designed to give more dollars to builders who won't care about the style and feel of our community. And it will price out the elderly on fixed incomes who will not be able to property taxes. Shame on you for railroading this proposal down our throats. You are all what is wrong with government doing what you want when you want. Do not pass this plan.</p>

182

Michael McMinn - Silver Spring, 20904

I don't believe this plan will work. I'm strongly opposed to any development that leads to more condominium-style homes and apartments. Instead, we need better access to housing, with a focus on improving transportation access and repurposing underused commercial and residential properties. While these solutions are easier said than done, simply building more units isn't the answer.

Take Baltimore as an example. They built a large number of overpriced "luxury" apartments and condos that failed to provide the affordable housing the city needed. Instead, these developments widened the gap in already-disparaged areas. Owners would rather sit on empty units than lower rents due to adverse incentives tied to commercial loans. Plus, let's not forget—builders are driven by profit. They're not building to help families; they're building to make money, prioritizing luxury units to maximize margins.

In pursuit of profit, builders often disregard the character of neighborhoods, community needs, traffic concerns, safety, sustainability, and school capacity. They will push for maximum development, often at the expense of these important considerations, and that will continue unless there's real accountability. You can have all the pattern books you want; they'll still find a way around them.

If we want to truly address housing affordability and availability, I propose a 6% property tax on any short-term or unoccupied single-family or multi-family unit. The property value for these empty units could be calculated based on 16 years of rent. For example, if someone is charging \$3,200 a month for a 1.5-bedroom loft, that translates to a property value of \$614,400. At 6%, the owner would owe \$36,864 annually to keep it empty. Alternatively, they could lower the rent, reduce the assessed value, and fill the unit. This approach would encourage more affordable pricing and incentivize the construction of lower-cost units to meet demand at reasonable rates. The council can implement this today—no zoning changes required.

183

Janice Williams - Olney, 20832

We are OPPOSED to the AHSI plan for Montgomery County.

We are long time residents of Olney and do not believe this is the answer to housing challenges in Montgomery County.

Go back to the planning phase and find a solution that does not destroy current communities and our investment in our property and chosen community culture.

Thank you

184

matt leakan - brookeville, 20833

this concept should include many other corridors. start with major numbered state roads. include confronting or abutting (edges) properties that have larger lot areas such as re-1, re-2, rc, etc.

this is necessary to achieve stick built middle housing and yes, even some limited compact-form sfd. outcome will be a more efficient and refined character esp in areas that developed in the past without a master plan or regulating plan.
increase lot coverage % which has always been the problem with sfd zones in the county.
develop corridor plans if necessary to ensure appropriate form and function. start with an easy corridor to develop an archetype then continue to learn and improve.

185 **Carolyn Bauer - Silver Spring, 20904**

I am disappointed that the planning board decided on a solution without defining the problem using reliable data; now we understand that, in fact, more housing has been built than thought, and drastic and dire measures do NOT need to be taken to fulfill what someone has assumed will be the housing demand a decade or more out. If you look at our population growth, those projections and assumptions are way off; 11,000 in growth since 2017??? That is because we have no business base, too much regulation, no investment in roads, and a neighbor in Virginia that is a huge business attracter. I have very little faith in the planning dept's housing "crisis" and am very upset that the council is seriously considering destroying one of the few remaining pieces of the county that is still beautiful and functioning and providing stability to the county - our older single family neighborhoods. Additionally, if you look at housing -rental or ownership - along the rt 29 corridor, a LOT of it is affordable to middle income people. However, it has been a dumping ground by the planning department for low income housing, and also a concentration in crime, so few people want to set roots there. Otherwise, you would promote that area as a great area to buy homes/townhomes or rent that is affordable. On the other hand, the county went hard on the Purple line when we really need a Metro spoke to go out the 29 corridor....but that is not where the political money sits so that was not considered. I am 100% not supportive of the approach, because I do not think it is backed by data and I think the planning department is politically biased and has not made many positive decisions that benefit the residents of this county

186 **Andrew Malay - Bethesda, 20816**

I am against this specific policy. All this will do is line developers pockets and increase home values. Middle class people will not be able to afford these multi family properties, close in. I am all for increasing density where density already is; along major corridors eg Georgia Ave, Rockville Pike/Wisconsin Ave, etc. 355 is the largest opportunity as it hugs a red line and is fairly urban all the way to Gaithersburg. residential neighborhoods should remain protected unless you want homeowners selling out and moving to VA for better tax policy, schools and zoning.

187 **David Putnam - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Why is the Listening Session from Tuesday, Sept. 17, from 7 to 9 p.m. | White Oak Community Recreation Center not yet posted. You did the earlier ones promptly...why not White Oak?????

188 **Ava Morgenstern - Silver Spring, 20910**

Hello! I am a first-time homeowner in downtown Silver Spring. I moved here from DC and bought my condo here because prices were more affordable, access to public transit is solid, and Silver Spring is one of the country's most diverse cities.

I want us to keep being a dynamic and excellent place to live. That's why I support affordable and attainable housing to make our county as accessible as possible to new residents like me. Specifically, I support zoning for and constructing more multi-unit buildings like mine, improving public transit options, reducing single-family zoning and environmentally unsustainable sprawl, and emphasizing racial and economic diversity.

I hope we can make these changes and I hope to welcome many new neighbors to our community!

189

Henrietta Keller - GARRETT PARK, 20896

There is a great deal of lower cost housing in the vicinity of Garrett Park: Parkside, Randolph Hills, Garrett Park Estates, new apartments and condos at Pike and Rose, etc. I believe that multi-plex housing IN Garrett Park would destroy the character of our historic community. Anything more than a duplex would be completely out of character. Even a duplex is non-standard in a single-family home community. I would rather the County investigate aid to first-time home buyers in Parkside or Randolph Hills. And perhaps put limits on mansionization. Mansionization puts many formerly affordable houses out of reach for many.

190

Jill Barr - BETHESDA, 20817-3131

I feel strongly that duplexes, triplexes etc. do not fit well into established single family home neighborhoods. In my case, the stone houses on Woodhaven Blvd, Thoreau and other nearby streets were built by the same builder (Dein) in the 1930s and '40s; they form a unique, harmonious and planned whole. Dropping multi-family buildings and large homes into neighborhoods like this destroys the character of the neighborhood.

Although the "attainable housing strategies" plan argues that this is not a mandate for duplexes etc., "...it allows property owners the flexibility to build different types of housing if they choose to." In fact the county allows too much latitude to developers to build big and ugly and to overwhelm the communities now existing.

191

Robert Oshel - Silver Spring, 20910-1520

I urge the Council to defer action on the Attainable Housing Initiative until critical questions are adequately answered. If the Council does decide to rush adoption, the upzoning should be applied only to select pilot test neighborhoods and new subdivisions until both its positive impact and unintended negative consequences can be assessed in those area designated for study.

The Attainable Housing Initiative is likely to have unintended consequences and potential negative impacts on residents throughout the County. While it may be found to be desirable in whole or part, the Attainable Housing Initiative should not be adopted until it is not only shown to be needed but also shown to be effective in solving the affordable housing problem without creating problems that are worse than the problem the initiative is designed to solve. The real problem facing the County is a lack of affordable housing for lower income persons, not a lack of housing at "attainable" price levels. Newly constructed "attainable housing" under this proposal is said by the Planning Board to be more expensive than the current median price of housing sold in the County, so clearly adequate "attainable" housing

is already available. Otherwise the current median price would meet or exceed the price of the proposed “attainable housing” to be constructed.

There are a number of questions that need to be answered before major changes affecting quality of life throughout the County are made:

How much new affordable housing is needed? Current projections from the Planning Board are inadequate and questionable.

– Apparently there is a lack of data about approvals and construction of approved housing before 2019. We don’t know the full extent of the current supply and already approved additions to the supply. How can we know the additional need if we don’t know the available supply?

– Population estimates serving as the basis for future need are questionable. Despite estimates that the County will grow by 200,000 (20%) over the next few years, the County’s population actually decreased between 2020 and 2023. Will long term trends possibly resulting from the pandemic and work-at-home continue, and to what degree? Will the County resume growing and, if so, at what rate?

Will the proposed zoning changes for “attainable housing” bring about a solution for whatever amount of additional affordable housing is needed?

– The planners say there will be a “trickle down” effect and that an increase in the supply of “attainable housing” will lead to greater availability of affordable housing. Has Republican style “trickle down” economics ever worked? Will more higher priced “attainable” housing lead to more lower priced affordable housing?

– Will developers seeking to maximize profits purchase naturally occurring affordable housing and replace it with new “attainable” units? If so, as seems likely, the supply of affordable housing would be reduced rather than increased, thus making the affordable housing problem worse.

– Can the County require that no redevelopment of existing naturally occurring affordable housing be undertaken unless the replacement units are no more expensive than the housing to be replaced, i.e., that these units also be affordable? No policy should be adopted which will result in a net reduction of affordable housing in the County.

– How will the County prevent gentrification of neighborhoods by replacing naturally occurring affordable housing with “attainable” housing? Can the County ensure that displaced owners or renters have an opportunity to continue to live in their neighborhoods after “attainable” housing is built there?

– The goal is that 75% of new housing should be “affordable.” How will the Attainable Housing Initiative achieve this goal when the planners estimate that new units will cost more than the naturally occurring housing they will replace? Can this goal be met without subsidies that it appears the County is not in a position to provide?

Will the proposed “attainable housing” increase societal equity?

– Proposals to build duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, and especially “small” apartment buildings will likely result in construction of rental units. Adding rental units rather than owner-occupied housing will prevent accumulation of generational wealth, thus worsening equity. Can the County ensure that new “attainable housing” duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, and units in the proposed 19-unit apartment buildings are owned by residents rather than investors or speculators? A perpetually applicable requirement in deeds may be required to ensure these units will be occupied only by owners. Otherwise there will be no generational wealth created and societal equity may be worsened rather than improved.

Can the County meet the infrastructure costs resulting from the “Attainable Housing Initiative?”

– These infrastructure costs have been estimated at \$6 Billion. How will the County government address the need to pay these costs? How will these costs affect the County’s AAA bond rating?

– New housing other than senior facilities and high-rise apartment/condominium buildings cost the County more in services than they generate in tax revenues. How will the County pay for the additional services needed and demanded by residents of new more dense “attainable” housing?

– Is there adequate school capacity for additional students living in areas with increased density resulting from new “attainable” duplexes, triplexes, and “small” apartment buildings? Especially in the down county areas to be densified, there is generally no land available for new schools or additions to schools unless parkland or playgrounds are taken. Yet increased density requires more park and play area, not less.

– Is stormwater infrastructure adequate to handle increased runoff from larger structures on lots? My neighborhood in recent years has had flooding (including manhole covers being popped up from storm sewers) as one street floods after heavy rain because of additional development in the area. Can the County afford the “millions of dollars” estimated cost of increasing the size of the storm sewer just in my neighborhood, let alone the increased runoff in other neighborhoods to be densified?

– Can the County afford to pay for the street and traffic improvement needed as a result of densification? Despite wishful thinking, residents of densified neighborhoods will almost invariably have cars. Unless there are requirements for adequate parking (i.e., well more than ½ parking space per unit) on lots with duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes, let alone “small” apartment buildings, street parking will

necessarily be inadequate. In addition many streets in older neighborhoods affected by the proposal are too narrow to allow parking on both sides, making the problem worse.

– How will the need for additional on-site parking impact our current tree canopy retention and stormwater runoff problem? More impervious surface areas will make both these problems worse.

Should the quality of life in neighborhoods throughout the County be impacted by densification until there is evidence that the upzoning will result in an increase in affordable housing?

– Should we affect the entire County before we know the impact of what we are doing? While the Attainable Housing Initiative will increase options for some residents, it will eliminate an option for all residents. Residents will no longer have the option to buy or rent a single family home in a neighborhood guaranteed by the County to remain a relatively quiet low density area where they will not have more density including even an apartment building built next to their home. Making this change amounts to a betrayal of trust by the County to all residents who relied on the County's promise that their neighborhood would remain low density when they bought or rented their home. The County should not betray the trust of residents unless it is proven that the Attainable Housing Initiative will create more benefits than negative impacts.

Can the Planning Board provide unbiased data concerning the Attainable Housing Initiative?

– The Planning Board and staff seem to be advocates for the Attainable Housing Initiative rather than neutral analysts who provide facts for the decision makers on the Council. For example, the Chair of the Planning Board was quoted as saying the average price of a home in Montgomery County is more than \$1,000,000. As a descriptor of the housing market in the County, this statement could be an example from the book *How to Lie With Statistics*. As the Chair should know, the "average" or "mean" is the sum of the sales divided by the number of sales. The "average" home sale price in Montgomery County is highly skewed by a few extremely high sales prices in Potomac and elsewhere. The "average" or "mean" is not representative of the actual housing market. When price distributions are skewed as they are in Montgomery County, the median – half above and half below – is a much better indicator of the market. The median single family home price in Montgomery County is around \$600,000, which is lower than the goal set for "attainable" housing. The lowest recent sale price in the County was slightly over \$300,000. I can only conclude that the Planning Board Chair's statement that the average sale price in the County is over \$1,000,000 was meant to deceive and persuade rather than to provide objective information for residents and the Council. The Council should direct the Planning Board to provide objective factual information, not arguments why the Council should take one position over another, before the Council acts on the Attainable Housing Initiative.

Should the County adopt the Attainable Housing Initiative before it knows if the upzoning will result in people who want a guaranteed single family neighborhood deciding to live in Prince Georges County, Frederick County or Fairfax County instead of Montgomery?

– Had the upzoning been in effect when I was deciding where to purchase a house, I would have chosen to live in Fairfax County rather than Montgomery where my housing investment and quality of live would not be at risk of being impacted by someone building a duplex, triplex, quadplex, or even an apartment building next to my home. I wanted to live in a guaranteed relatively non-dense environment, not one with a potential of much higher density. I suspect others may make the same decision in the future.

The Council should not adopt the Attainable Housing Initiative throughout the County until these questions are answered and is clear that the initiative would have a net positive impact for the residents of Montgomery County.

192

Leslie Zimberg Martin - Chevy Chase, 20815-4216

My husband, Keith, and I oppose the imposition of the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative zoning changes on the homes in Chevy Chase Village. The Village maintains strict standards for how houses and properties must be maintained to preserve the historic nature of the neighborhood and safe living of residents.

There are a considerable number of new multi-family residential buildings being built along Wisconsin Avenue and planned for Connecticut Avenue in the same area as the Village. These are major thoroughfares that can more easily accommodate the additional traffic and density that multi family buildings bring. They are closer to bus and subway access on those streets. We do not see why the neighborhood streets with single family homes need to be disrupted given how many new residents will be housed in these buildings.

Thank you for your consideration of our views.
Sincerely,

Leslie and Keith Martin

██████████
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

193

Rebecca Mann - Silver Spring, 20903

Hello,

I recently moved away from Montgomery County (temporarily). Currently, I rent out my former home.

Although an increase in housing supply in Montgomery County could reduce my own rental income, I think it is a worth goal for policy-makers to pursue. I support zoning that would allow for more attainable housing/missing middle. Additionally, I encourage policymakers to

consider loosening requirements around setbacks, lot coverage, and height restrictions, in order to allow for additional missing middle housing. Montgomery County needs more homes to grow and thrive.

Best,
Rebecca

194

Louis Wilen - Olney, 20832

Please add my name to the list of people who OPPOSE the plan to allow multi-unit housing in areas zoned for single family homes. The infrastructure cannot support any more density. Our roads, our schools and our hospital emergency departments are already at maximum capacity. Our land cannot support more building in many areas; basement flooding is rampant. Sewers are also at maximum capacity in many areas. We cannot tolerate sewer backups.

Stop the madness!

195

Amanda Hungerford - Takoma Park, 20912

I appreciate your attention to this matter. Montgomery County needs more attainable housing, for reasons including: (1) to offer more affordable housing options, (2) addressing inequity by offering access to high-opportunity neighborhoods for more people, and (3) encouraging more environmentally sustainable land use that supports convenient access to transit.

Thank you for taking these matters seriously!

196

Steven Kraft - Gaithersburg, 20877

I agree with everything stated in the presentation! My wife and I are raising our daughter in Montgomery County and we find it very hard to find affordable housing, and we worry our children will not be able to live here. We need more housing, more flexibility in housing types, and more housing near mass transit. I think the Attainable Housing Strategies is a great first step to achieving those goals!

197

Zhu Ying - Silver Spring, 20910

As a resident of Montgomery County who would like to both see more affordable housing and more ways to accommodate households that need more space (e.g. convert ADUs to allow extended family and elderly parents to live with family) I am strongly in favor of this initiative.

	I also believe that this initiative will help keep housing costs down and, I hope, also reduce traffic (i.e. those who work locally can live locally).
198	<p>Margaret Fogarty - Chevy Chase, MD, 20815</p> <p>My husband and I are extremely concerned about the Attainable Housing Strategy Initiative. It makes no sense to suddenly allow developers to build many large housing units within single family home neighborhoods like ours. I would have never moved here in the first place if this was on the table. It will take away the charm entirely of this whole area. Please consider putting this re-zoning plan on pause!! Thank you. Margaret & Gibbs Fogarty</p>
199	<p>Susanna Drayne - Silver Spring, 20910</p> <p>I support the AHSI and want the Council to draft a Zoning Text Amendment! The County desperately needs more housing, and I would love to see this process move forward.</p>
200	<p>Joan Barron - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I am not totally against this but I am against the TOTALITY of it and the fact that these buildings are being allowed by right. Clearly you are trying to streamline the permitting process but at the cost of due process for the folks most affected. It is naive to think that attainable housing will be built in many neighborhoods. In my opinion it will only lead to now attainable neighborhoods becoming unattainable. Different kinds of housing would make sense in some spots, even in high density areas but filling up a small lot which would have with less green space and not taking into account environmental factors and old infrastructure, well that is not a well thought out plan. Is it? More to come....</p>
201	<p>Ivan Galic - Bethesda, 20814</p> <p>I am opposed to the County's recommended zoning modifications and other policy changes that would allow duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, and quadplexes in certain residential areas of the County, including in my neighborhood of Bethesda (20814). While proponents argue that increasing housing density can help address housing shortages and affordability, several negative impacts will unquestionably emerge that would negatively impact the established character of single-family neighborhoods, infrastructure capacity (ex: schools, parking, public services etc.), social cohesion, and long-term urban planning. Additional details are provided below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact on Neighborhood Character and Property Values

Single-family neighborhoods are often prized for their low density, quiet environment, and uniformity in housing types. The introduction of multi-family housing units like duplexes or quadplexes will disrupt this aesthetic and change the character of the area. Larger buildings may contrast starkly with smaller single-family homes, creating a visual inconsistency that many residents may perceive as a loss in the charm or desirability of the neighborhood.

This shift can lead to decreased property values for existing homeowners, who may have invested in their homes specifically because of the low-density residential setting. Lower property values can affect individual wealth, as home equity is often a primary asset for middle-class families. A drop in home values can also reduce local tax revenue, which could have broader fiscal implications for local government services, such as schools and public safety.

2. Strain on Infrastructure and Services

Introducing higher-density housing to areas zoned for single-family homes could place significant strain on existing infrastructure, including schools, roads, sewer systems, and utilities. Single-family neighborhoods are often designed with infrastructure capacity intended for a certain population density, and a sudden increase in the number of residents could overwhelm these systems.

For example, the added number of cars associated with duplexes or quadplexes can lead to traffic congestion on streets that were not designed for higher volumes of vehicles. Additionally, parking can become a significant issue, as multi-family units typically require more parking spaces than a single-family home, leading to overcrowded streets and diminished quality of life for all residents. Similarly, local schools, public transport systems, and emergency services might struggle to meet the increased demand, resulting in lower service levels across the board.

3. Undermining Community Cohesion

Many single-family neighborhoods are built around a sense of community cohesion, where residents share similar lifestyles, expectations for neighborhood maintenance, and long-term investment in the area. Introducing multi-family housing could lead to a higher rate of rental properties, which tend to have shorter-term tenants. A transient population may be less invested in the neighborhood's long-term success and maintenance, leading to a decline in social cohesion and local engagement. This could erode the fabric of community organizations, local events, and mutual support networks that are critical for neighborhood vitality.

Further, the differences in housing types may create tension among long-time homeowners and newer residents, particularly if the changes are viewed as being imposed by external developers or urban planners without sufficient community input.

4. Potential for Increased Gentrification

While advocates of increased density often cite affordable housing as a key benefit, the actual outcome could be the opposite, particularly in neighborhoods that are attractive due to their proximity to urban centers or other desirable amenities. Developers may view duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes as an opportunity to construct higher-end units that attract wealthier residents. This could lead to gentrification, pushing out lower-income residents who may have previously been able to afford single-family homes in the neighborhood.

The increase in housing density could, therefore, exacerbate affordability issues rather than resolve them. Furthermore, as property values rise due to new development, long-time residents may find themselves priced out of their own community through rising property taxes or rent increases. Public policy should carefully weigh whether density-driven development will truly achieve the goal of affordable housing or whether it will further the economic divide.

5. Zoning Laws and Long-Term Urban Planning

Zoning laws exist to ensure that land is used in a way that balances the needs of residents, businesses, and public infrastructure. These laws are based on long-term planning that considers factors like population growth, environmental sustainability, and resource allocation. Sudden changes to zoning that allow for increased density in traditionally single-family neighborhoods can disrupt this balance, leading to unforeseen consequences over time.

For example, higher-density developments may not align with broader regional plans for transportation, environmental sustainability, or economic development. If density increases in a piecemeal or unplanned manner, it could lead to urban sprawl, inefficient land use, and increased carbon emissions due to a greater reliance on cars. Public policy should ensure that any changes to zoning laws are part of a comprehensive plan that takes into account long-term urban development goals, rather than responding to short-term housing demands without considering the full impact on the urban landscape.

Building duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes in single-family neighborhoods presents several risks. These include altering the character of established neighborhoods, straining infrastructure, reducing property values, undermining community cohesion, exacerbating gentrification, and conflicting with long-term urban planning goals. While increasing housing density can offer some benefits, such as more housing options, policymakers must carefully consider the negative consequences and work to ensure that changes in zoning laws are both sustainable and aligned with the long-term interests of the community. Public input, thoughtful planning, and attention to the capacity of existing infrastructure are essential in managing the transition toward more diverse housing types without compromising neighborhood integrity.

202

Dan Stern - Rockville, 20850

I am writing to express my strong support for the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. This plan represents a significant step forward in addressing the critical need for housing affordability and accessibility in our county. By focusing on increasing the availability of missing middle-income housing, this initiative will provide much-needed options for individuals and families who are often left out of the current housing market.

I am particularly encouraged by how this plan complements other major development efforts in the county, such as the White Flint and Lake Forest mall site redevelopments. Together, these projects have the potential to reshape our housing landscape in a positive and inclusive way, ensuring that residents across all income levels have greater access to homes in thriving communities.

	<p>Moreover, I appreciate how this plan empowers homeowners by expanding their options for what they can do with their properties. This level of flexibility is crucial for fostering innovation and adaptability within our neighborhoods, allowing them to grow and evolve to meet changing needs.</p>
203	<p>Arthur Bennett - Garrett Park, 20896</p> <p>Our neighborhood will be adversely affected by the planning department's AHS initiative. The local infrastructure - narrow streets designed for 1930's traffic, currently overcrowded schools - cannot support high density housing. I would hope that the Council will modify or reject this initiative and pursue other options - there is an abundance of underused commercial space that could be modified into housing developments. While the initiative seeks to provide for future residents, it does not recognize the negative impacts for current residents. As a taxpayer, I'm very offended that quality of life for current residents is not considered a priority under this initiative.</p> <p>I am additionally concerned that "attainable" is undefined in this initiative and given the price of new construction in our area, I am dubious that truly affordable housing will result from this initiative.</p>
204	<p>Bob Kenney - Kensington, 20895</p> <p>I oppose the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. Many of us bought our homes in MoCo based on the understanding that we were buying into a neighborhood of single-family homes. The Initiative would destroy this tacit covenant by allowing multi-family housing in our neighborhood. What bothers me even more is the County's approval of developers buying small houses and then tearing them down and building mega-mansions for single-family households (as has happened repeatedly on my street). This is a subject that cries for regulation, not single-family zoning.</p>
205	<p>Thomas Howard - CHEVY CHASE, 20815</p> <p>I am absolutely opposed to both the proposed zoning changes as well as the rapid timetable which the county is using to ram this unwanted zoning change down the throats of the residents.</p> <p>I am separately emailing a letter to the Council members with more detailed comments.</p>
206	<p>Aaron Kramer - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>Obviously a rushed and poorly designed proposal that will only benefit developers, not the current or future residents of Montgomery County. Please postpone the vote and develop a plan that will actually enable attainable housing down county without ruining the character that makes Montgomery County an attractive community compared to Washington, DC and Virginia.</p>
207	<p>Christina Jacobs - CHEVY CHASE, 20815</p> <p>This is not a well thought through plan. It would be a far better idea to subsidize housing than to build more (there is already building in the</p>

pipeline which is not acknowledged in this plan). This plan will increase traffic density and impervious surfaces, and strain services and infrastructure.

Please refer to the following study which finds reforms that loosen restrictions are associated with a statistically significant 0.8 percent increase in housing supply within three to nine years of reform passage, accounting for new and existing stock. This increase occurs predominantly for units at the higher end of the rent price distribution; we find no statistically significant evidence that additional lower-cost units became available or became less expensive in the years following reforms.

<https://www.urban.org/research/publication/land-use-reforms-and-housing-costs>

208

Judy Horowitz - Chevy Chase, 20815

The attainable housing initiative is extremely unwelcome. There is no infrastructure to support new residents. Not enough schools, already congested roads, pollution, streets already too crowded to have more cars on them. The data does not show large increases of residents. Many businesses, especially small business, have shut down, not to be replaced. These are the people who might seek attainable housing. Communities do not need to be burdened with unexpected disruption. No one moved with the thought of having to move shortly after buying a house, saved for most of the owner's life. Stop the invasion .

209

Karin Bolte - Bethesda, 20814

September 24, 2024

Andrew Friedson, President
Montgomery County Council
100 Maryland Avenue, 6th Floor
Rockville, MD 20850

Kate Stewart, Vice President
Montgomery County Council
100 Maryland Avenue, Floor 6
Rockville, MD 20850

Dear Council President Friedson, Council Vice President Stewart, and Councilmembers Albornoz, Balcombe, Fani-González, Glass, Jawando, Katz, Luedtke, Mink, and Sayles:

On behalf of the Wildwood Manor Citizens Association (WMCA), I am writing to express our strong opposition to the Planning Board's Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHSI), which would eliminate single-family zoning throughout Montgomery County. WMCA represents more than 500 Bethesda homes located just east of MD 187 (Old Georgetown Road) and bordered by I-270 on the North, Snow Point Drive on the East, and Grosvenor Lane and Southport Drive on the South.

WMCA is very concerned that the AHSI will adversely impact our quality of life by increasing population density that will harm the environment, place severe strains on critical infrastructure, further overcrowd our schools, and exacerbate traffic congestion, among other negative impacts. County Executive Marc Elrich agrees that the AHSI is a bad idea for Montgomery County.

The most glaring problem with the AHSI is the failure of the Planning Department to conduct impact studies on the likely effects of the Initiative on the environment, infrastructure, schools, transportation, and adequate public facilities. Instead, the Planning Board simply states that “impacts on infrastructure. . . are likely to be minimal” and “impacts [on] schools. . . will be de minimis.” The County Council would be derelict in its duties if it were to enact the AHSI’s sweeping zoning changes without conducting, analyzing, and considering evidence-based studies of the Initiative’s expected impacts on the County and its residents’ quality of life.

Montgomery County needs more affordable housing, not more market rate housing that will be generated under the AHSI. Despite the AHSI’s stated intention to “create more opportunities for homeownership,” research has shown that similar upzoning proposals have not resulted in any statistically significant reduction in the cost of housing.

Instead of inappropriately bypassing the Master and Sector Planning processes by implementing the AHSI proposal, WMCA urges the County Council to consider implementing more effective ways to address the need for Missing Middle and affordable housing units.

Our specific concerns and recommendations are detailed below:

The AHSI Inappropriately Bypasses the Master and Sector Planning Processes for Modifying Zoning

In its Priorities and Approaches for Housing Policy and Legislation policy statement, the Montgomery County Civic Federation notes that “[the Master and Sector planning] processes allow for consideration of important factors unique to a neighborhood, including existing density, transportation, infrastructure and adequate public facilities, and environmental concerns. These processes also allow for meaningful engagement with the specific community.” Wildwood Manor has certain features and factors that are unique to our neighborhood. Instead of taking these unique factors into account, the AHSI will impose an inappropriate one-size-fits-all upzoning policy across the County. The Planning Board and County Council should not bypass the Master and Sector Planning processes by implementing the AHSI.

The AHSI Will Place a Disproportionate Burden on Wildwood Manor by Utilizing an Inappropriate Definition of Priority Housing District

Under the Planning Board’s proposed one mile straight-line buffer from Metrorail definition of Priority Housing District, the AHSI’s impact on Wildwood Manor will be particularly severe. Two-thirds of Wildwood Manor will fall within the Priority Housing District, allowing the construction of duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes in most of our neighborhood. Additionally, 17 homes in the Northwest corner of our neighborhood on Aubinoe Farm Drive and Berkshire Drive will fall within a Growth Corridor and will be subject to the Medium and potentially Large Scale allowed densities.

If any form of AHSI is allowed to move forward over our objections, a pedestrian network walkshed of 0.5 miles walk to rail stations should be utilized to define the Priority Housing District, since 0.5 miles “represents the distance most people are willing to travel to reach a Metrorail station.”

Similarly, the Northwest corner of our neighborhood should not be included within the “Growth Corridor,” since there is no direct access to MD 187 (Old Georgetown Road) or I-270 within 500 feet of those 17 homes (see map).

While the Planning Board seeks to justify its definition of Priority Housing District by stating its belief that “it was consistent to align the buffer distances with previous guidance from the Accessory Dwelling Unit parking requirements, which included 1-mile straightline buffers,” we note that the approval of Accessory Dwelling Units did not envision the huge neighborhood impacts that will result from the increases in population density that will be generated under the AHSI. The pedestrian network walkshed of 0.5 miles walk to rail stations is the more appropriate definition for purposes of AHSI.

The AHSI Will Exacerbate School Overcrowding in the Walter Johnson Cluster

Dramatically increasing the population of Wildwood Manor and nearby Bethesda neighborhoods will place a severe burden on our already overcrowded Walter Johnson cluster schools. While North Bethesda Middle School is currently at capacity, Ashburton Elementary School and Walter Johnson High School are severely overcrowded.

Ashburton has a capacity of 789 students. However, current enrollment for the 2024-2025 school year is 869 students, which is 110% of capacity. The enrollment projection for the 2028-2029 school year is 956 students, representing 121% of school capacity. We note that this is the current enrollment projection, without taking into consideration any increases in population density in our single-family neighborhoods that will occur if the AHSI were to be implemented.

North Bethesda Middle School has a capacity of 1,233 students, and is just shy of 100% capacity with a current enrollment of 1,228. This is 102 students higher than the projected enrollment of 1,126 for the 2024-2025 school year. If MCPS can't get projected enrollment right now, how is it going to be able to make accurate projections when single-family homes can turn into duplexes, multiplexes, and small apartment buildings?

Similarly, Walter Johnson High School has a capacity of 2,290 students. However, current enrollment for the 2024-2025 school year is 3,056 students, which is 133% of capacity. There are 19 portables, with barely any space to add more. The enrollment projection for the 2028-2029 school year is 3,143 students, representing 137% of school capacity. Again, these are current enrollment projections, without any increases in population density due to implementation of the AHSI. There simply is not enough space in the Walter Johnson cluster schools to accommodate significantly more students.

To make matters worse, Montgomery County has proven its inability to build adequate schools, as evidenced by the fact that Woodward High School opened for the 2024-2025 school year without a stadium, track, and athletic fields or an auditorium. In fact, the NORTHWOOD @ WOODWARD FAQ Hub notes that the “[d]ate of completion [of the auditorium] is pending funding and planning.”

While the Planning Board states that “attainable housing options are subject to existing transportation and school impact tax payments and any applicable Utilization Premium Payments to mitigate impacts on crowded schools,” it has proposed replacing the current development impact tax exemptions and discounts for multi-family units with three or more bedrooms with “full countywide exemption for schools and transportation.” Rather than addressing school capacity concerns, the Planning Board’s AHSI and Growth & Infrastructure Policy proposals will only exacerbate overcrowding in the WJ cluster.

The AHSI Will Overtax the Sewer and Water Supply System

WMCA has significant concerns about the negative impact of increased population density on Wildwood Manor’s sewer and water supply systems. Our aging infrastructure was designed to handle the density of our single-family neighborhood, not a significantly increased population.

Ramapo, New York is a case in point of the inability of sewage infrastructure to accommodate new multi-family residential development. As reported in Cityscape, “New Jersey residents living downstream of Ramapo filed a multimillion-dollar lawsuit against the sewer district that serves the town, successfully proving in court that the local sewer plant had overflowed into the Upper Saddle River multiple times between 2006 and 2010. . . Despite subsequent investments in capacity, emergency sewage discharge occurred again in 2022, which environmental activists also connected with ‘extensive development in the area.’” Ramapo also experienced inadequate water pressure to fight a nursing home fire, resulting in two deaths.

These are the kinds of adverse consequences of overdevelopment that WMCA is concerned about and for which the Planning Board has given short shrift.

The AHSI Will Exacerbate the Inadequacy of the County’s Stormwater Management System

As with the sewer and water supply system, WMCA has significant concerns about the negative impact of increased density and loss of pervious surfaces under the AHSI on Wildwood Manor’s stormwater management system. WMCA’s concerns are heightened by the fact that the County’s current stormwater management code does not even address lot-to-lot drainage for three- and four-unit multiplex buildings.

Ineffective stormwater management can have many negative consequences, including flooding of homes and businesses. As County Executive Elrich noted, “the County stormwater system will have to be upgraded because the outdated system is not equipped for the impacts of climate change. . . Our sewers are often not large enough for the volume of water and ultimately fail to move the water fast

enough which causes flooding.” The inadequacy of the County’s stormwater management system will only be exacerbated by increases in population density that will be generated by the AHSI.

The AHSI Will Harm the Environment by Leading to a Loss of Tree Canopy

Wildwood Manor benefits from mature trees throughout our neighborhood that not only provide beauty, shade, and animal habitat, but also improve air quality and decrease stormwater runoff. As the County’s Climate Change Officer Sarah Kogel-Smucker noted: “Tree canopy is incredibly important to Montgomery County. Trees are climate superheroes that remove carbon pollution from our atmosphere while providing the shade needed to withstand hotter temperatures.”

Unfortunately, between 2014 and 2018 (the latest years for which data is available), Montgomery County lost 5,784 acres of tree canopy, reducing the percentage of tree canopy cover from 48.6% to 46.7%. The AHSI will only exacerbate this troubling trend.

Michael Knapp, Chair of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments’ Regional Tree Canopy Subcommittee, explains why infill development threatens tree canopy: “Once a tree has grown and matured in these older neighborhoods, its root system [doesn’t] pay attention to property lines. . . One large tree can have a root system that extends into, maybe four different lots. So, if you go in and build on a lot, it is very easy to not only remove the trees that are on the lot but also impact the health of trees on adjacent lots.”

The development envisioned under the AHSI will necessitate the removal of trees and directly conflict with the goals of the County’s Climate Action Plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 80% by 2027, and by 100% by 2035 compared to 2005 levels. While the Planning Department recommends exploring ways to lessen the canopy loss resulting from new development, younger trees cannot replace the benefits of older mature trees in our neighborhoods.

The AHSI Will Inundate our Neighborhoods with Cars and Worsen Traffic Congestion

Parking Concerns

WMCA has significant concerns about the number of cars that will be generated under the AHSI and available on-street parking in our neighborhood. Under the AHSI as currently proposed, there will be a 50% reduction in the parking requirement for duplexes and multiplexes in a portion of our community, and a 75% reduction in the parking requirement for duplexes and multiplexes in the majority of our community that falls within the Priority Housing District. Many more cars will be associated with any 10-unit buildings that would be allowed to be constructed in the Northwest corner of our neighborhood under the AHSI’s Medium Scale development. While the Planning Board likes to believe that people moving into duplexes, multiplexes, and small apartment buildings will not have cars, that is not reality. Even if people are frequent users of public transit, they will have cars in order to get to other areas in Maryland, Virginia, and DC.

Wildwood’s single-family homes typically have between 2-3 cars each. A quadplex housing 4 families could easily have 8 cars, depending upon the number of residents. Without onsite parking, those cars will be utilizing limited street parking spaces. Wildwood Manor has

narrow streets, most without sidewalks. If cars are parked up and down both sides of the street, pedestrians and children riding their bicycles will need to walk and ride in the middle of the street, with the attendant risks to their safety posed by more cars driving through our neighborhood.

Concerns about Ingress and Egress to Our Neighborhood

As noted above, WMCA is concerned about the number of cars that will be generated under the AHSI and the resulting traffic congestion that will make it even more difficult to get into and out of our neighborhood. Wildwood Manor is uniquely situated between MD 187 (Old Georgetown Road) and MD 355 (Rockville Pike), with the only means of ingress and egress via Cheshire Drive and Grosvenor Lane, which intersect. The traffic pattern is further complicated by the fact that there is what we call the “loading zone” between Old Georgetown Road and the 4-way stop sign that marks the intersection of Cheshire Drive with Grosvenor Lane and the entrance to the Wildwood Shopping Center (see map). This “loading zone” is only long enough to accommodate 5 cars in each of the lanes.

In 2015, the Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) commissioned an improvement study of the Old Georgetown Road at Cheshire Drive intersection. The report found the following:

AM Peak Hour

- The queuing on the westbound approach of the intersection of Old Georgetown Road at Cheshire Drive continuously exceeded the storage capacity. Maximum queues extended onto northbound Grosvenor Lane to Hatherleigh Drive/Hurst Street, a distance of approximately ¼ mile.
- An average of two to three signal cycles were required for westbound vehicles in the queue to clear the intersection of Old Georgetown Road at Cheshire Drive.

PM Peak Hour

- The queuing on the westbound approach of the intersection of Old Georgetown Road at Cheshire Drive continuously exceeded the storage capacity. Maximum queues extended onto northbound Grosvenor Lane to Southport Drive, a distance of approximately 300 feet.
 - An average of two signal cycles were required for queued westbound vehicles to clear the intersection of Old Georgetown Road at Cheshire Drive.
 - The queuing on the southbound approach of the intersection of Old Georgetown Road at Cheshire Drive occasionally exceeded the storage capacity.
-

To address excessive queuing at this problematic intersection, WMCA worked with MCDOT to advocate for the construction of a dedicated right-turn lane to accommodate westbound cars turning right from Cheshire Drive onto northbound Old Georgetown Road. This right lane was ultimately built and, along with signal timing changes, has helped to alleviate traffic congestion at this intersection. However, WMCA fears that increased population density in our neighborhood will result in excessive queuing again at the Cheshire Drive-Old Georgetown Road intersection, as well as at the Grosvenor Lane-Rockville Pike intersection.

Concerns about Traffic Congestion on Old Georgetown Road

In addition to traffic congestion on Cheshire Drive and Grosvenor Lane, WMCA is very concerned that the AHSI will worsen traffic congestion on Old Georgetown Road, as well as on Rockville Pike and other State and County roads. The AHSI will significantly increase population density and associated cars in the neighborhoods all along Old Georgetown Road, as well as elsewhere in the County, at a time when the State and County have reduced the capacity of Old Georgetown Road between Ryland Drive and Nicholson Lane by one-third with installation of the barely used bike lanes.

The Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration's (MDOT SHA) MD 187 Final Corridor Assessment found that travel impacts are most severe in the northbound PM peak direction. Specifically, the Final Assessment found "on average, [a] 2.1 minute" increase in travel time, which translates to about a 34% increase in travel time in the northbound PM peak direction post-bike lane installation. In addition, northbound travel times increased starting at 2:00 PM through about 6:30 PM – impacting traffic far more than just at peak hour. While not as high as during the afternoon hours, northbound travel times also increased between 7:00 AM and about 9:30 AM compared to pre-installation travel times.

Similarly, the Final Assessment found an increase in post-installation travel times in the southbound direction beginning at 7:00 AM through about 9:30 AM, and then again from 1:00 PM to about 5:00 PM -- impacts far beyond just peak hour. As daily users of Old Georgetown Road, we continue to experience significant vehicular travel delays and back-ups that will only be exacerbated by the AHSI.

Concerns about Delays in Emergency Medical, Fire, and Police Services

Increased traffic congestion on Old Georgetown Road, Rockville Pike, Cheshire Drive, Grosvenor Lane, and neighborhood streets will also negatively impact the ability of emergency medical, fire, and police vehicles to serve Wildwood Manor and other neighborhoods in a timely manner, threatening public health and safety.

In addition to delays in emergency response times, WMCA is concerned about whether the County's emergency medical, fire, and police departments have the necessary resources to serve the population increases envisioned under the AHSI. This is already a concern, as the Montgomery County Police Department is "fac[ing] unprecedented staffing shortfalls."

The AHSI Will Increase Property Taxes

WMCA also opposes the AHSI because it will likely result in increased property taxes due to higher assessed property values. Research examining the 2013 and 2015 upzonings in Chicago found “statistically significant, robust evidence that a byproduct of upzoning is growth in property values on affected parcels ... within two years of the zoning changes....” County Executive Elrich also notes that upzoning increases land values and raises property taxes.

Despite its Intentions, the AHSI Will Not Reduce Housing Costs

Despite its intent to increase attainable housing, evidence does not support the contention that the AHSI will reduce housing costs. Urban Institute researchers who studied upzoning reforms throughout the country between 2000 and 2019 found “no statistically significant evidence that additional lower-cost units became available or moderated in cost in the years following reforms.” In New York, “up-zoning did increase supply, but it did not drive down prices.” Similarly, a study of upzoning in Chicago over a 5 year period found “that the short-term, local-level impacts of upzoning are higher property prices but no additional new housing construction.”

Instead of the AHSI, the County Council Should Consider and Pursue More Effective Ways to Increase Affordable Housing

Instead of inappropriately bypassing the Master and Sector Planning processes by implementing this AHSI proposal, WMCA urges the County Council to consider implementing more effective ways to address the need for Missing Middle and affordable housing units, such as the following:

- converting unused and underutilized office and commercial space into affordable housing;
 - co-locating affordable housing on county-owned properties;
 - increasing financial support for the Affordable Housing Opportunity Fund (AHOF), which provides short-term loans (matched at least 3:1 with private lending) to developers to acquire and preserve affordable housing.
 - consider increasing the percentage of required Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) units, adjusting the MPDU income requirements, requiring that MPDU units reflect the mixture of unit sizes available in the project, and ensuring that projects replacing projects meeting MPDU requirements at least maintain the percentage of affordable units.
 - establishing a No Net Loss of Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing (NOAH) policy. Where NOAH exists in older multifamily developments slated for redevelopment, policymakers should seek to ensure that replacement projects will include affordable units at least equivalent in number, size, and rental cost to those currently available. The county should pursue anti-displacement initiatives in vulnerable communities.
-

-
- adopting policies to promote more home ownership opportunities in new developments;
 - identifying projects on county-owned or faith-based properties that might designate a specific number of units for the county workforce (i.e., teachers, police, first responders, and public servants) housing program lottery.
 - establishing down payment assistance programs for first-time home buyers, similar to The Home Stretch program Councilmember Kate Stewart created when she was Mayor of Takoma Park; and
 - other innovative affordable housing strategies.

Conclusion

We, your constituents, did not elect you to eliminate single family zoning throughout the County. Do not risk harming the environment, overwhelming the County's infrastructure, overcrowding schools, and flooding our roads with additional cars by implementing the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative, especially since it won't accomplish the County's goal of increasing affordable housing.

If you have any questions or would like to follow-up with us about our comments, please contact Karin Bolte, WMCA Development Committee Chair, at [REDACTED]

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns and recommendations.

Sincerely,

Leana Derbarghamian, President
Wildwood Manor Citizens Association

Karin Bolte, Chair, Development Committee
Wildwood Manor Citizens Association

Cc: Arlet Koseian-Beckham, Acting Vice President, WMCA
Marie Wierzbic, Secretary, WMCA
County Executive Marc Elrich
Jason Sartori, Planning Director, Montgomery Planning
Lisa Govoni, Housing Planner, Montgomery Planning

210	<p>Daniel Rosenbloom - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I am in favor of the AHS strategies as outlined.</p>
211	<p>Alexander Laios - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I am writing to express my opposition to the Planning Board's recommendation to upzone areas along Connecticut Ave particularly those in Chevy Chase. We purchased our home at 3818 Williams Ln (1 house in from Connecticut Ave) last year. Part of the reason that we decided to move to Chevy Chase was because of the charm and suburban neighborhood feel of the area. We felt that this would be a great area to raise our daughter and for her to grow up and play in.</p> <p>The proposal to allow multi-family development including 3-4 story apartment buildings within 500 feet of Connecticut Ave would drastically change the neighborhood. In addition, it would bring more density and traffic to streets in Chevy Chase that are already very narrow and difficult to navigate via car. We are constantly playing car tetris on Williams Ln because of how narrow it is. Adding additional density/car traffic would only make this worse.</p> <p>I also believe that the increased "growth" and density on Connecticut Avenue in the Chevy Chase area would be a negative. The road is already very busy with lanes not wide enough to accommodate the traffic it already sees from the Circle up to East West Highway. Increasing density and the number of people traversing this section of the road everyday would only make this problem worse.</p> <p>I believe the county would be better served helping real estate developers repurpose the massive amount of suburban office space in Rockville and near Montgomery mall into multi family housing. We have too much office space in the US generally and in metro DC area. The suburban office market will never recover post pandemic and over time these buildings will become under maintained/and to the extent they have debt secured by the property will end up in the hands of banks. The county should offer incentives to allow these buildings to be demolished and the sites repurposed for housing.</p> <p>I believe this would solve two problems in one and repurpose lots of underutilized land often along metro train/bus lines into housing. I appreciate your consideration of our views and I am happy to discuss the issue further.</p>
212	<p>James Anderson - Bethesda, 20817</p> <p>I am a Montgomery County resident and I strongly support this initiative. The artificial prohibition on housing leads to the absurdity of downtown areas across the street from neighborhoods of only single-family homes. This is what is causing the housing shortage and such high cost of housing in the county. The proposal would not hurt property values, but would rather increase property values as properties</p>

could be put to better use. (I own a single family house, but I only own the house and the land it is on, not the whole neighborhood. I support expanded housing and am very disappointed in politicians that oppose this.)

213 **April McGuigan - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Dear Sir or Madam:

Our family in Chevy Chase has been in this neighborhood for decades, and we urge you to PAUSE the initiative re attainable housing. It would only degrade the traditional American values of community, safe family neighborhoods, friendly neighbors, and quiet residential areas. To pander to developers, only for profit, is not the American way. Please, please do not do this initiative. Thank you for listening. Kind regards, April

214 **Craig Pernick - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I am writing in opposition to the current initiative. I urge the Council to pause and review the impacts of this proposal. The current plan, while admirable in addressing the missing middle housing market, has failed to sufficiently address the impact on schools, tree cover, water runoff, sewer, traffic, parking and more.

Please consider other options that do not damage our communities with overly ambitious and flawed plans.

215 **Jennifer Klang - Kensington, 20895**

I am opposed to the upzoning of neighborhoods like mine with small lots, excessive through-traffic, parking issues and water run-off problems. The county is already not dealing with issues in these older neighborhoods, and now the addition of high-density construction will only make things worse. In addition, the majority of homes in upzoned areas nationwide are being purchased as rental properties - in many cases by large investment firms who don't maintain the properties and are impossible to reach. Montgomery county has a HUGE amount of unused and unoccupied commercial space that could be re-zoned for mixed use. In addition, opening even a small area of the ag zone would provide opportunities for additional construction - especially farther out - which could be less expensive than properties near metro. I am over a mile from metro, but my neighborhood would be particularly impacted by this zoning change because we are within a mile of the Marc - which almost no one can use because it only stops in one location in downtown DC, and we have no neighborhood buses that take you either to metro or marc. As a result, people who live here have at least 2-3 vehicles per household and many people don't have off-street parking - in part because many of the lots are so hilly. This upzoning initiative is only going to drive more people to move to Howard and Frederick county. Several of my neighbors have already left the county. Some of them said that the potential upzoning of our neighborhood was the final straw for them - after the high taxes, bad elementary school, vehicle and pedestrian accidents on our busy streets and having 900+ people cutting through the neighborhood on many weekdays (and some weekends). The county is already giving people variances to build things that shouldn't be here to begin with, and to rent parts of their home that don't meet parking or other guidelines. I am aware that the county sees this as an opportunity to increase its property tax revenue, but they could provide additional construction in areas with underutilized commercial construction. In addition, it seems that the numbers being cited to demonstrate a supposed huge housing demand don't include large sections of the county with A LOT of construction going up including everything in the

city of Rockville and Gaithersburg. The actual housing in the pipeline - that which has been permitted and is in process - demonstrates that there actually isn't much of a shortfall at all.

Also, the average home in MoCo is around 620K, not 950K. I don't know why I keep seeing articles where people on the county council and in development are using that number, but a realtor could show you the county average. Maybe where they live, most of the houses are 950K, but they aren't in my neighborhood or the area immediately around me.

216

Amanda Stieglitz - Chevy Chase, 20815

I am strongly opposed to the change in zoning proposed by the Planning Board. Much like keeping students remote for well too long during the pandemic with unintended detrimental long term consequences, this plan is well-intentioned but will NOT produce attainable or affordable housing for more residents. It will simply destroy neighborhood character and benefit developers alone.

217

Brad Wilner - Chevy Chase, 20815

Good morning. I wanted to express my strong opposition to the Attainable Housing Strategies initiative. As a result of Section 5 in Chevy Chase for the last 10+ years, I struggle to see how changing the community design and culture from single family homes to duplex/triplexes would alleviate "attainable housing" in the area when comparable examples have yielded sale prices for \$3+ million. This would notably degrade the community experience for homeowners with crowding on the already narrow streets, as well as continue to crowd the local schools, which are beyond capacity.

Again, I strongly oppose the proposed initiative.

Thanks,
Brad

218

Claire Livingston - Chevy Chase, 20815

Press Pause.

219

Darcy Marshall - Chevy Chase, 20815

This is the worst idea yet to achieve affordable housing! Spend tax payers money better! You cannot take away single family neighborhoods and use this concept!

220

Richard Chavez - Silver Spring, 20901

September 25, 2024

To Whom It May Concern:

Good morning. My name is Richard J. Chavez. My wife and I currently reside in a single family house located at [REDACTED] in Silver Spring, Maryland. My wife and I are both senior citizens. We purchased the house in 2003.

I am writing to ask that you not support any zoning modifications in the neighborhood where my wife and I currently live at least until the county addresses a number issues that we face on a daily basis.

Already there are a number of households in the neighborhood that are overcrowded. In turn, this leads to parking challenges often in front of one's own home. Also, leaving and returning from one's home is a challenge as both sides of the streets are lined with cars making it impossible for "two" cars to pass on the street. Frankly, this can present a dangerous situation particularly if both drivers are unwilling to yield to the other. I cannot help but believe that overcrowding of households has a detrimental impact on our schools, particularly if not prepared with sufficient resources i.e. physical space, staff, etc.

Additionally, there are a number of households in the neighborhood operating businesses out of the home. This again leads to parking challenges and may lead to confrontations between neighbors due to noise, parking, property upkeep, sanitation, etc. Loud music and marijuana odor are also issues that we currently face in our neighborhood.

Zoning modifications could also lead to unintended consequences such as a decrease to a home's value. My wife and I both worked hard all I our lives to have the home we have today. To have our home's value decrease or the potential to decrease with zoning modifications is a reality that would be hard to swallow particularly at our age. Frankly, it would be devastating!

Currently, our neighborhood is such that I feel safe/secure at home and while being outdoors, especially on my daily walk with the dog. Both my wife and I would like to see it stay this way. Zoning modifications could impact this feeling with a potential for an increase in crime.

I could go on however I believe that you've already heard what i noted above and much more. Again, please do not support any zoning modifications at least until we can resolve our current neighborhood issues. Thank you.

Richard J. Chavez
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Joan Hirn - Chevy Chase, 20815

221

Please pause the "housing initiative".

Dear Council,

Our family in Chevy Chase has been in this neighborhood for decades, and we urge you to PAUSE the initiative re attainable housing. It would only degrade the traditional American values of community, safe family neighborhoods, friendly neighbors, and quiet residential areas. To pander to developers does not seem the American way. It would not serve the implied purpose of "affordable" housing at but would ruin many lives. Please vote against this initiative, and help preserve some charm, some sanctity, some tradition, some safe supportive communities for our children. Thank you for considering my plea.

Kind regards,
Joan
Chevy Chase

222

Michael Lieberman - Chevy Chase, 20815

To Whom It May Concern,

I want to put forward my endorsement of the county's attainable housing initiative. Though imperfect in many ways, the county is attempting to confront the housing shortage in a proactive manner, which is commendable. In turn, while my neighbors in Chevy Chase are levying complaints regarding the initiative's environmental impact and school-crowding (legitimate) as well as potentially increased home prices/property taxes (less so), I want to offer a different framing within which I hope the decision-makers will view this issue. To that end, I ask the council to remind itself that in the midst of becoming caught up in wealthy residents' frustrations, there is a missing element in the conversation-- the voices of the people who don't live in new housing because it hasn't been built yet. I urge the county council to keep these future residents in mind when being bombarded by the complaints of wealthy homeowners who feign concern about "missing middle" or "attainable" housing as a front for a genuine fear of what may happen to their property values.

Sincerely,

Michael Lieberman

223

Alex Campbell - Bethesda, 20817

I am currently a college student at UMD, and I fear that I will not be able to afford a home in the neighborhood I grew up in in Bethesda. The proven way to make homes of all types more affordable is legalizing higher density to increase supply and thus lower costs. Please take this common sense action.

224

Nina Rubenstein - Bethesda, 20816

I am in favor of the initiatives. My neighborhood needs more small scale attainable housing instead of more new 7k-8k sq ft single family homes that cost \$2+ million. We also need more mixed-use buildings in growth corridors with increased options for shopping/dining/working. It is critical that these changes are accompanied by more frequent RideOn bus routes, more sidewalks and bike lanes, and other infrastructure improvements to support the increased density.

225	<p>Kristi Gunster - Bethesda, 20817</p> <p>PLEASE do not pass the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative without collecting more resident feedback and conducting AND SHARING impact studies revealing how current residents, schools, traffic and environment would be effected by re-zoning single family housing into multi-unit housing!</p> <p>PRESS PAUSE ON MOCO REZONING!!!!</p>
226	<p>Eduardo Wisbrun - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>Please press pause to (stop) the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative and keep the single-family zoning in the Hamlet (Chevy Chase, MoCo).</p>
227	<p>Gerald Gunster - Bethesda, 20817</p> <p>I do NOT want MOCO re-zoned from single family housing to multi-unit housing! DO NOT pass the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative!</p>
228	<p>Susan Murray - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>When we must apply to numerous entities to seek approval for basic house improvements such as replacing fences or removing dead trees, it is truly shocking to learn that our entire neighborhood and beloved community could be upended by a zoning initiative that we only learned about this month. We implore you to listen to us - the people who elected you and will be adversely impacted by this effort.</p> <p>Our neighborhood, which we sought for its sidewalks, tree canopies and warm neighborliness, has already undergone unsustainable growth in the two decades that we have lived here. The streets were not built to accommodate the constant flow of traffic and every home addition and rebuild has brought with it increased water as more permeable surfaces are lost. Every year Connecticut Avenue backs up earlier and becomes a parking lot between the circle and the beltway making running errands time consuming and dangerous.</p> <p>Again, I am imploring you to study more carefully local neighborhood impacts of what you are proposing. I am a bike riding mother who has devoted her life to conservation and human services organizations and I applaud efforts to create multifamily housing, but I beg you to build these dwelling in the county neighborhoods that have the infrastructure to handle them. That's not Chevy Chase MD.</p>
229	<p>Melissa Dutcher - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>To: Montgomery County Council Subject: Concerns Regarding the Attainable Housing Strategies – Small-Scale Housing Recommendations</p> <p>Dear Council Members,</p>

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Planning Department's 2024 Attainable Housing Strategies (AHS) initiative. While I understand the intention behind increasing small-scale housing options such as duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes, I would like to express my concern that these strategies may actually exacerbate affordability challenges and other critical issues for many town of Chevy Chase residents. I would like to use a concrete example to illustrate this, along with several broader concerns.

1. Case Study: Walsh Street, Chevy Chase, MD

In the case of 4500 Walsh Street in Chevy Chase, MD, a single-family home was demolished and replaced with three townhomes. The original home had a list price around \$1.4 million, which, while still high, reflects the general market for the area. The three newly constructed townhomes, however, were listed at approximately \$3.65 million each, more than 2.5 times the price of the original home.

This example demonstrates a trend where developers take advantage of zoning changes to replace relatively more affordable housing with expensive, luxury units, rather than the attainable housing that these strategies are meant to encourage.

2. Market-Driven Development: Pushing Affordability Out of Reach

Rather than creating more affordable housing, this type of development leads to speculative, market-driven outcomes. Developers are incentivized to build high-end units because there is a greater profit margin, particularly in desirable areas such as Chevy Chase. This trend raises housing prices across the board, pushing the concept of "attainable" housing further out of reach for middle- and lower-income families.

3. Increased Density and Infrastructure Strain

While small-scale housing may seem like a solution for increasing housing stock, the reality is that adding more units in already dense areas risks overwhelming critical infrastructure. Schools in many neighborhoods, including Chevy Chase, are already bursting at the seams, with overcrowded classrooms and inadequate staffing levels. Increasing density without proper planning and investment in education infrastructure will strain local schools even further, potentially reducing the quality of education for all students.

Additionally, neighborhoods are often not equipped to handle the pedestrian safety concerns that come with increased density. More housing means more cars on residential streets, posing risks for pedestrians, cyclists, and children walking to school. Without improvements to sidewalks, crosswalks, and traffic management, we risk making these neighborhoods less safe, especially for vulnerable populations like children and seniors.

4. The Need to Preserve Neighborhood Character

Many areas targeted for small-scale housing reforms, such as Chevy Chase, serve as important buffers between the bustling downtown areas and quieter, family-oriented neighborhoods. These residential enclaves provide a unique quality of life that should be preserved, not sacrificed for development at all costs. Allowing the construction of townhomes, triplexes, and other multi-family units in these areas will fundamentally alter the character of these neighborhoods, leading to increased noise, traffic, and congestion.

The push to increase density should be carefully balanced with the need to protect these residential zones, which serve as a vital counterpoint to the more commercial and densely populated areas of Montgomery County. If we don't respect these neighborhood boundaries, we risk losing the very qualities that make Montgomery County attractive to families in the first place.

5. **Potential for Gentrification**

This type of zoning reform risks accelerating gentrification, and losing history, particularly in areas transitioning from more affordable housing to high-end development. Gentrification often leads to the displacement of long-standing residents, particularly minority, the elderly who are intending to age in place in our specific neighborhood, as housing prices rise and the character of neighborhoods changes. Instead of creating more inclusive, affordable housing options, we risk amplifying housing inequality within the county.

6. **Lack of Affordable Housing Safeguards**

The AHS recommendations should incorporate stronger safeguards to ensure that these zoning reforms genuinely benefit those seeking affordable housing. Without clear affordability thresholds or developer incentives tied to price ceilings, we will continue to see examples like Walsh Street, where housing becomes increasingly unattainable for most residents.

Conclusion

While I support the idea of expanding housing options, the current zoning recommendations under the AHS initiative appear to serve the interests of developers more than those of residents who need affordable housing. The Walsh Street example is a case in point where increasing housing density did not lead to more affordable homes, but rather to expensive luxury properties that are out of reach for the vast majority of county residents. Moreover, these density increases risk straining public infrastructure, particularly schools, while reducing neighborhood safety and quality of life. We are already in a hard position with our schools so much that I feel forced to put my children in private school while also paying taxes to cover the costs of other children going to the public school for those who cannot afford private. I grew up in this neighborhood and went to our now very different public school system that I, at this time, feel is unable to handle the increased enrollment compared to the 90s before we began changing our zoning in Bethesda and is now under terrible strain. I urge the Council to reconsider these recommendations and introduce stronger affordability requirements, as well as equally strong infrastructure planning, to ensure that new developments meet the needs of the broader community, not just those who can afford premium real estate.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Melissa

Jennifer Lavorel - Bethesda, 20816

230

1. The report lays out a number of issues, then offers a recommendation that will solve none of them.
 - a. Issues include

- i. Creating a more diverse housing supply and, thus, more diverse communities
- ii. Unraveling “exclusionary” aspects of single-family residential zones (what those “aspects” are is not explained, nor is it explained why we are simply doing away with single-family zoning rather than modifying those “aspects”)
- iii. Creating more opportunities for homeownership for more households.
- b. The report recommends allowing by-right duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes in neighborhoods currently zoned for single-family housing.
 - c. The report fails to state how the recommendation relates to the identified issues.
 - 2. What outcomes should we expect if this recommendation is adopted?
 - a. A new vested zoning right for developers. How will they respond?
 - i. Will they continue to build large single-family homes known as “McMansions”?
 - 1. A Congressional Budget Office report released on September 19 found that, in the wake of COVID lockdowns, people continue to seek larger homes with more space and that this is what’s driving new starts for single-family housing.
 - 2. County data from 2021 show that, relative to the homes being torn down, newly built homes are:
 - a. 155 percent larger; and
 - b. Sell on average for 114 percent more.
 - ii. Will they build duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes?
 - 1. Only if the profits from doing so exceed profits from building single-family homes.
 - b. The loss of relatively affordable single-family homes for purchase.
 - i. In a 2021 report, the Montgomery County Planning Department acknowledged that newly constructed “missing middle” housing would actually cost more than the single-family home that was demolished to make way for it.
 - 1. The report compared a single-family home in the 20910 Zip code, where the average sales price was \$600,000, with the average sales price of a newly constructed townhome: \$800,000.
 - 2. In a recent blog post, Montgomery County planners stated that the proposal to “relax” single-family zoning is not about providing affordable housing – even though elsewhere we are told that “attainable” means precisely that households of various incomes will be able to afford housing that is suitable for their needs.
 - ii. Developers will sell these newly developed units to homeowners only if the net transactional costs of individual sales transactions don’t result in lower net profits.
 - 1. Alternatively, developers will minimize their transactional costs by selling entire properties to absentee owners, who will become absentee landlords.
 - 2. No matter what type of housing is newly built as a result of this proposed change, a modest, relatively affordable single-family home will have been demolished to make way for a home that is less “attainable” to households of various incomes.
- c. Increased density in neighborhoods that were platted and designed for single-family residences and are characterized by:
 - i. Narrow streets
 - ii. An absence of sidewalks
 - iii. In some cases, on-street parking – the recommendations include loosening up parking requirements for neighborhoods where on-street parking is available.

d. Lastly, the recommendation will make Montgomery County less desirable for people seeking single-family homes, in single-family neighborhoods. Depending on where these people work and where they choose to live, increased could result in commuting times and increased congestion on public transit. This outcome is contrary to the desire, as stated by the planning department, to ensure that more people have the opportunity to enjoy the quality of life in Montgomery County.

3. Are there any benefits for current taxpayers?

a. The Attainable Housing Strategies initiative Web site states that the primary goal of the initiative is to “develop recommendations to increase options for property owners to build more housing types in the county.”

b. While the report does mention enacting policies to “assist existing homeowners who wish to convert their homes to a duplex, triplex, or fourplex,” it recommends only that such ideas be “studied,” and then “only after zoning changes have been enacted.”

4. Does housing demand justify proceeding with this recommendation?

a. The CBO report from last week estimates that housing starts will slow considerably beginning in 2030 and through the 2040s “as population growth wanes.” This will occur due to the number of new households declining “as the population ages and the number of deaths rises.”

b. This is consistent with estimated population and job trends in Montgomery County.

5. Montgomery County is blessed to have one of the best housing agencies in the country – the Housing Opportunities Commission – under the leadership of Chelsea Andrews. The development team there is top-notch – creative, smart people who know how to build truly affordable housing. I urge the Council to focus its efforts and attention on building workforce and deeply affordable housing and to explore methods of helping workforce and low-income families to build assets, including through homeownership in the marvelous single-family neighborhoods throughout Montgomery County.

231

Jordan Howard - Silver Spring, 20910

The County should adopt the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. For too long, Montgomery County has allowed fear of change to govern itself, it has proven to be its detriment. Instead of families and tax revenue pouring into the county we're seeing new residents go to other parts of the DC region and housing costs increase for those who remain. Investing in different types of housing will ensure that the County will continually grow and welcome new residents at all stages of life, as well as allow those who have raised families and built a life in the County to remain and move into a different housing type within their neighborhood or community. Fear of "declining home values" or "unsafe" neighborhoods are red herring arguments designed to exclude minority populations. It's dated and bigoted thinking and as a progressive County, Montgomery County should be at the national forefront of housing strategies to ensure a prosperous future.

232

Holly Worthington - Chevy Chase, 20815

I am not a fan of this initiative. The impact has not been studied enough. Please do not pass this.

233

garland miller - Chevy Chase, 20815

For many reasons I am against the Attainable Housing Strategies proposal.

If adopted, the mis-named “attainable housing” plan is likely to do irreparable harm to existing communities and produce little or no low-cost housing. The zoning change could generate billion-dollar revenues for developers and investors, while bankrupting small municipalities and imposing immense congestion costs, environmental losses, and infrastructure burdens on County residents. The plan is not supported by relevant data or by a credible economic analysis. It may reduce, not increase, the supply of “missing middle” housing. The “attainable housing” proposal would maximize attainable profits, not affordable housing. The proposed re-zoning is economically damaging and contrary to the public interest.

Please work on other strategies to focus development where available and most needed, such as the conversion of 20% vacant office space.

I look forward to your thoughtful consideration.

234

Kathleen Troy - Bethesda, 20817

To Montgomery County Council members: The proposed re-zoning initiative to allow significantly denser home building on lots currently zoned for single family homes is a massive change from existing zoning regulation that has been in place for decades, or longer. I (and our household members) oppose the proposed change in the manner being pursued. Council action to significantly increase housing density is authoritarian and undemocratic, as a small group decides how large numbers of home owners will be affected without their consent. Any proposal to make such significant zoning changes should be done prospectively, with at least a 10 year time line, so current owners won't be fully cheated out of the market value of their homes that they have relied on for years.

235

Matt Pacinelli - Chevy Chase, 20815

Why not first evaluate the performance of hundreds of new “missing middle” / “attainable” housing coming to Shady Grove Innovation District, Viva White Flint, and other similar projects forthcoming before making a massive change to zoning in long-established communities? It seems a that proof of concept is warranted when considering the outcome of similar approaches in places like Minneapolis. Thank you

236

Dan Keen - Bethesda, 20817

No, no, a thousand times no! Please do not support the AHSI. It will fundamentally change the character of our neighborhoods for the worse. There are other ways to address the "missing middle" that will be more effective and far less divisive.

237

Taryn Rosenkranz - Bethesda, 20816

The Montgomery County Council has solicited public input on a set of recommendations prepared by the Montgomery County Planning Department. Those recommendations are summarized in a report titled Attainable Housing Strategies. Among the recommendations is a proposal to allow by-right duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes in neighborhoods currently zoned for single-family housing. We the below-signed petitioners oppose this proposal. Our comments follow.

Developers as Beneficiaries

The elimination of by-right, single-family zoning is intended (according to the Web site) to "increase options for property owners to build more housing types in the county."

The likely path forward to implement the strategy is that a single-family owner will list their home for sale, it will be purchased by a developer, and the developer will construct multifamily housing. The neighbors on either side of the home will have no recourse. Perhaps the Web site, in speaking of "property owners," means "developers." It cannot mean owner-occupants, who will derive no benefit from the implementation of this strategy. By contrast, the proposal has a clear benefit for developers.

Neighborhood Character

As likewise stated on the Web site, the elimination of by-right, single-family zoning is intended to "increase the number of units that [can] be built while maintaining neighborhood character." This statement is indefensible. Allowing by-right multifamily housing in neighborhoods currently zoned for single-family housing is a strategy for changing neighborhood character, not maintaining it. In addition to undermining neighborhood character, increased density has negative implications for schools and government services.

Increased density also has implications for parking. We note that the report proposes to reduce parking requirements for developers building in single-family neighborhoods where on-street parking is available. Several of the neighborhoods targeted by this proposal are characterized by homes that lack off-street parking and whose owners will now face greater competition for already-scarce on-street spaces.

Lastly, many of the streets in the proposed area were not designed to handle bi-directional traffic when cars are parked on the road and require one direction of traffic to pull over allowing the other to pass. Any increase in traffic or parking density would create additional unsafe conditions, contrary to the county's Mission Zero initiative to reduce traffic fatalities. Increased on-street parking will also impede emergency vehicles.

Attainability

Attainable Housing Strategies defines "attainability" as "the ability of households of various incomes and sizes to obtain housing that is suitable for their needs and affordable to them" (pg. 3). The report cites housing affordability as a problem to be solved. For example, the report states that "housing has become less affordable in all parts of Montgomery County" (pg. 12) and "Montgomery County's single-family neighborhoods are becoming less and less attainable to households without high incomes or the privilege of generational wealth" (pg. 15).

Despite these references to affordability, the report does not assert or include data showing that eliminating by-right, single-family zoning is an effective strategy for improving affordability. It states, for example, that “it is impossible to estimate or model in advance the precise size of the attainable housing market because no builder in the region has redeveloped existing single-family homes into duplexes, triplexes, or quadplexes in many decades” (pg. 77). In fact, some studies have found that “upzoning” increases property values, particularly when the primary beneficiaries of upzoning are speculative developers [“Zoning Change: Upzonings, Downzonings, and Their Impacts on Residential Construction, Housing Costs, and Neighborhood Demographics,” Jonah Freemark, Journal of Planning Literature].

Existing Owner-Occupants

The report speaks pejoratively of existing owner-occupants, decrying the fact that trends in home price values “provide tremendous benefits to current landowners who increase their wealth as home values surge” (pg. 15). It perhaps bears stating that existing owner-occupants are Montgomery County taxpayers who cover the salaries of those who prepared this report, as well as those who are in a position to implement its recommendations.

Existing owner-occupants may experience an increase in home values as a result of upzoning, as some reports suggest. Alternatively, owner-occupants may experience a loss in value commensurate with the negative effects of increased density. Given that the elimination of by-right, single-family zoning cannot be shown or estimated to serve a legitimate public purpose, it is reasonable to question why the Montgomery County Council would pursue such a policy. As the only certain beneficiaries are speculative developers, it is likewise reasonable to question whether their influence over the process, for example as participants on the Housing Equity Advisory Team, was determinative.

We request that the Council reject the proposal to eliminate by-right, single-family zoning in neighborhoods currently zoned for single-family housing.

238

Chui Fong - Bethesda, 20817

I think the pause is long enough since this is not in legislation. I admire those speak for the current attainable strategies.

239

Philip Webre - Chevy chase, 20815

I support the planning Board’s Attainable Housing Strategies. We have to increase the supply of housing to meet the demand or our children will be priced out of our neighborhoods. Providing diverse types of housing might also mean more options for empty nesters seeking to downsize.

Some argue that the new units will be too expensive. But by increasing the supply of housing, the new units—even if these new units are expensive—will put more housing on the market overall. Added units will drive down asking prices on other houses in the neighborhood, with the most pressure being on older units.

240

Paul Grove - Bethesda, 20816

I oppose the initiative. I live in Brookdale on [REDACTED] in R40, with no sidewalks and narrow streets. You cannot add additional cars on [REDACTED]— there is no space. You will create conditions whereby emergency vehicles will not be able to navigate parked cars to

reach me when I need them most, in addition to creating hazards for pedestrians who have no choice but to share the streets with vehicles. Check it out yourself. One size does not fit all.

241 Dennis Dufour - Chevy chase, 20815

Post 9/25 Bethesda Chevy Chase "listening" session this proposed plan is horrible. Worse yet Andrew Friedson was not facilitating discussion he was advocating and supporting so maybe this stupid idea is fait d complet. Hope not because it won't work.

242 Michael Dutka - Rockville, 20851

I support the recommendations in the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative

Add +1 to the pro column!

243 Maria Pekala - Chevy Chase, 20815

Thank you for holding this session. I hope it was clear just how many of us who attended object to this AHSI plan. Please know that I am a supporter of affordable housing -- we need more of that in MoCo. This plan will not yield attainable housing, let alone affordable housing. The market forces in the BCC area are such that no duplex or triplex or quadruplex will cost \$400K. We have examples of this just adjacent to the Town of Chevy Chase now, with \$3M townhouses replacing one modest single family home. MoCo needs to develop plans that will make MORE neighborhoods desirable and walkable, not build more densely in the few that already are. For that we need to address public transportation, schools, and housing for middle class people all around MoCo. This AHSI plan focusing so heavily in the BCC area will only benefit investors and developers. For the rest of us it will drive up housing prices, increase traffic and school crowding, and create adverse effects on our environment by straining sewage system and storm water management. Judging from discussions I have had with neighbors who did not attend tonight's meeting, my views are very widely shared and I'm sorry to report there are deep suspicions about the motivation of this plan. I hope the Council takes the comments that were made tonight seriously.

244 Jonathan Weinberg - Chevy Chase, 20815

This plan is absolutely sickening.

Supporters seem to think that if you knock down all the houses in a nice neighborhood and fill it up with condos, then you will have more people living in a nice neighborhood. You won't. You'll just have everyone living in a crap neighborhood.

Four story condos in Chevy Chase?!? Dear god, has anyone considering this plan ever even been here? Please stop this.

245

Seth Shich - Chevy Chase, 20815

Dear Sirs/Madams:

I am a resident of the Town of Chevy Chase. I am strongly opposed to the introduction of multi-family housing in my neighborhood. I have spoken with numerous other individuals living in neighborhoods currently zoned as single family, including those within the Town but also located elsewhere in MontCo, who are similarly opposed to this development.

My questions are as follows:

1. What steps will the county take to ensure that homes of historical note and value are preserved? Many of the homes in our area are of historical significant and would need to be razed in order to allow for the construction of multi-family residences and thus a piece of history would be lost. For example, the home we are currently living in was previously owned by a preacher who was in the cabinet of President Eisenhower. One day, a man knocked on our door, mentioned that he used to live in the house as a kid, and wanted to look around. My wife allowed him in, and it turned out that he was the son of this preacher and was in town to do research at the National Archives for a book he was writing on his father. There are many other homes like this in our neighborhood. See here. Do I think these homes could be demolished to accommodate more people and more families? Probably. Do I think this should happen? I think it would be a travesty to do this. In Europe, they actually care about their history and try to preserve the character of historical neighborhoods. Why does the county not care about this? Also, it is probable that areas affected by your attainable housing policy are located on the burial plots of former slaves. What steps will the county take to ensure that these burial sites are not disturbed?
2. Will the County take into account the local sentiments of the residents who live in the communities that would be affected by the conversion from multi-family to single-family? Part of the problem with this County is that it is so large that the voices of local communities affected by your policies get drowned out and the opposition never becomes sufficiently widespread to make an impact. As a result, everyone is trampled over by the County government for differing reasons, and there is zero accountability. I truly hope that this situation will be different. What steps will you to take to ensure that this process is different given the size of this county?
3. What is the basis for this attainable housing policy? Many of duplexes and triplexes would still be out of reach for most families to afford in my neighborhood. Furthermore, there are plenty of areas in this county with undeveloped land that can be used to construct more affordable multi-family housing. With connection to a metro, commuting to/from these could be done with ease. Why is the County seeking to change existing communities whose residents may be happy with the communities in which they live when there are plenty of alternative areas with undeveloped land that can be used to promote the policy of "attainable housing"?

4. What steps does the county intend to take to address crime? With more urban development, crime rates rise. Bethesda used to be a sleepy town with very little crime until you began to allow unrestrained construction of skyscrapers and apartment buildings. Now, crime in Bethesda is out of control, with constant car jackings, thefts, and drug and other violent crime occurring on a near daily basis. There is police presence around the clock in downtown Bethesda; this was never the case before. A few weeks ago, I went for a bike ride with my children on the Capitol Crescent trail. On our way back through Bethesda, we stopped to get a bagel and watched with horror as not one but two separate individuals were tackled by police ostensibly for drug dealing. Will the County pay for the Town and other affected municipalities and areas to have round-the-clock police patrol if crime rates rise? Or will the Town of Chevy Chase and other such communities have to foot the bill for this in order to ensure that its residents home values don't plummet as a result of your policies?

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Seth

246	<p>Sean Alcorn - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>As currently described, this plan fails to consider impacts to the surrounding areas, infrastructure needs, and could easily work counter to its goal of more affordable housing. More studies and planning should be undertaken before making such a wide-ranging, drastic, and consequential decision.</p>
247	<p>Chuncong Du - North Bethesda, 20852</p> <p>I support increased zoning density. Please require increased transit and active transport into any development plans</p> <p>I do not think wealthy and influential individuals should be able keep out a trend that is occurring in the rest of the county.</p>
248	<p>Taylor Price - Bethesda, 20817</p> <p>Consider the need to control rent prices ahead of adding more, likely new and expensive, homes. There are plenty of apartment buildings with available space that are too costly for many. Additionally, there needs to be something introduced to protect trees during construction. For some reason, Montgomery county allows clear cutting of lots for new homes. It's completely changing the character of neighborhoods particularly in a time of climate crisis. Please, please don't make this an urban jungle that is no longer a desirable place to live and instead a developers paradise.</p>
249	<p>Jill Scharff - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>Please do not increase density with multi-family affordable housing in single family neighborhoods. I am in favor of increasing affordable housing in Maryland, including parts of Montgomery County, because it is necessary to accommodate population growth, but you should</p>

not destroy the character of old, established neighborhoods for which we pay high taxes to enjoy space, privacy and convenience. If you do rezone, residents will move to other counties or states or move into neighborhoods in the DC. Please map out areas where the plan makes sense, such as near Metro, and does not erase existing quiet neighborhoods or cause traffic congestion. Thank you, Jill Scharff

250 Barton Goldenberg - Chevy Chase, 20815

I am totally opposed to the proposed Attainable Housing Strategies initiative. It is not what my family signed up for when we purchased our home in 1984.

251 David Thomas - Chevy Chase, 20815

I attended the BCC listening session last night (9/25) and I was disappointed that I was unable to speak during the meeting.

Had there been time, I would have shared the following. I do not believe last night's meeting did anything to change the minds of the people in attendance. In fact, I believe people's opinions on the plan are more firmly opposed than they were at the start of the meeting. Some of concerns raised were environmental, school over-crowding, traffic, strained county services and the unreleased planning book. I share all of these concerns.

Questions of residents exist because of the lack of information in the plan itself. The plan is confusing and lacks concrete data. Very few of these questions were answered at the session.

Hundreds of people spent over two hours late into the evening participating in this meeting because they care about their neighborhood. The Council needs to do more to explain and sell this plan if they want support. There is great fear that the Council listening sessions are a check the box exercise and that it will soon move forward on this plan without taking the concerns of the residents into consideration.

The Council should press pause. It should slow down and actually have conversations with the various neighborhoods that would be changed at a result of this plan. If they do not, residents will be more strident in their opposition and explore more ways to express their disapproval of the Council itself.

252 Mark M - Town of Chevy Chase, 20815

I strongly support the recommendations made by the Planning Board. I anticipate that if implemented, they will result in a modest increase in the overall stock of housing and increase more modestly priced houses.

253 Joseph Kaufman - Bethesda, 20816

The Council should vote NO to the initiative. I live in a Bethesda community that regularly meets to discuss local politics and in particular the Initiative. The uniform belief is that the Initiative is a terrible idea and we will vote against any Council member who supports it. While

I greatly respect and appreciate the Council's civic service, I cannot in good conscience support any councilmember who supports the Initiative because so many voters dislike it.

In particular, the Initiative will overcrowd our schools. Bethesda is way too cramped already. Alternative housing is amply available in areas further from the DC metro area, such as Poolesville.

Also the Initiative will not actually create affordable housing in Bethesda. The duplexes/quadplexes etc will still be very expensive and only accessible to wealthy people who could buy a single family house anyway. So you will not be creating more affordable options for less wealthy people in areas like Bethesda, Potomac, and Chevy Chase.

The solution instead is (1) more housing in areas farther away; and (2) apartment buildings right next to the metro stations. It makes absolutely no sense to add quadplexes in areas of Bethesda over 2 miles away from the closest metro.

I must express in the strongest possible terms that I, and everyone in my community, oppose the Initiative and will work tirelessly to oppose any member who supports it. Thank you for your consideration.

254

Isaac Dworkin - Rockville, 20850

I have lived in Rockville for 18 years and I am starting college and voting for the first time this year. I am concerned about high housing prices making it difficult for me to become financially independent in the future, and I support this effort to legalize more types of housing to increase supply and make living in Montgomery County more accessible to everyone.

255

Rose Ray - Kensington, 20895

I am opposed to this proposal. It would result in the ruin of single family neighborhoods in down county. I am also alarmed by the concentration of low income housing in Wheaton. After 36 years of service as a Special Education teacher/administrator and college professor at John's Hopkins and Boston U, this results in further segregation of schools and lower achievement results in Title One schools. It is time to integrate the schools in MC. Re-districting needs to be done. Does the school board and County Council have the "guts" to do what is right for all students?

256

Matthew Murawski - Silver Spring, 20910

I am writing in support of the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. When my wife and I moved to Silver Spring in 2021 there were few options for us between prohibitively expensive large single family homes and small condo units. We were lucky to find one of the smaller homes in the neighborhood at a price we could afford. This is a great area with incredible access to transit, parks, and other amenities that can accommodate more diverse housing forms.

257	<p>Jayaraman Vijayakumar - Montgomery Village, 20886</p> <p>This is one of the worst proposals that I have seen. This goes to completely undermining an individual's right to privacy, to leading their way of life in peace, and in ensuring a sense of safety. The proposal will lead to complete reduction of the quality of living in the county and a drastic exodus out of the county. This also will lead to destruction of property values and a reduction in tax revenues long term. The proposal reeks of politics fueled by greedy developers whose only objective is build and build more without any concern for the environment, a citizen's green space needs and health. It will only destroy the quality of life for everyone and benefit no one except the builders and politicians.</p>
258	<p>Lauren DeSarno - Kensington, 20895</p> <p>This initiative, if implemented, would tank home values and local schools (the latter of which is already in decline). I believe it would also negatively affect the character of our neighborhoods, and make traffic worse.</p>
259	<p>Carol Leventhal - Silver Spring, 20901</p> <p>We are vehemently opposed to the Montgomery County's planning board Attainable Housing plan, which rather than being a sensible plan to create more affordable housing in the county, is a gift to developers, hedge fund operators and real estate companies. Addressing this need should not come by despoiling the character of our residential neighborhoods. Downtown Silver Spring's sites for the Discovery Building and its many two-story buildings along Colesville Road, adjacent to the Metro offer a far better solution that doesn't sacrifice the ambience of life in Montgomery County's residential neighborhoods.</p> <p>Should this plan be enacted by the County Council, there will be intended and unintended consequences. A tree canopy will be lost. Our property has hundreds of young and mature trees on it. Their loss will result in greater pollution for Silver Spring residents. Streets will have to be widened to accommodate increased traffic. Where will the cars for the new residents end up?</p> <p>This isn't an example of enlightened planning. It is a scheme to line the pockets of the aforementioned real estate community. Affordable housing won't be the result. Is this the best we can do?</p> <p>Carol and Allan Leventhal ████████████████████ Silver Spring 20901 ████████████████████</p>
260	<p>Jason Davis - Bethesda, 20814</p> <p>Attainable housing targeted to middle income earners is important. Equally important is for the County to fully prepare for the impacts of increased densification, particularly on the schools. Bethesda cluster schools, particularly, are over-capacity even after recent boundary adjustments, and unless new schools in the Bethesda area are constructed, there simply are not enough available seats in which to house</p>

additional students without sacrificing educational quality (which sadly appears to already be compromised due to lack of funding and bloated administration). Additionally, there will be further strain on infrastructure that needs to be proactively addressed to ensure quality of life is not further reduced. Proactively addressing these issues will take funding and so the County must identify solutions and funding sources in advance of approving any new density. Any Attainable Housing Strategy MUST account for these externalities or the impact of this noble goal will be poor.

261 **Michael Dorment - Kensington, 20895**

I don't understand how you think this is going to solve housing shortages, or even the price of housing. Attached housing will still be expensive in the right areas. Park Potomac is a prime example. The townhomes are selling for 1.3-1.9 mil. If you want affordable housing, build vertically. This is where you will have the biggest impact.

The current proposal is more predatory than anything else.

262 **GRACE PALLADINO - Bethesda, 20814**

How making more multi-million structures available will result in housing "attainable" by middle - and working classes is beyond me. Unless you subscribe to trickle down economics I guess. Putting a social justice face on this urbanist density dream is insulting.

263 **Jonathan Massaquoi - Rockville, 20852**

Do it. Only weirdo NIMBYS oppose. Single-family home zoning is not helpful and the county will suffer even more if takes too long to upzone. As someone who doesn't only care about the value of my property and knows about housing across multiple nations, I find arguments against upzoning to be ridiculous. The school focused arguments also fall flat.

264 **Robert Love - CHEVY CHASE, 20815**

The Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative is ridiculous. It will destroy neighborhoods even more than the McMansion phenomenon. I own a house in Section 3 where lots are only 50 feet wide. What kind of multi-apartment building can you build on a 50 foot lot? You would just end up with expensive tiny 1 bedroom units. Our street is 17 feet wide. Where are cars going to park? This is not a strategy, but a gift to real estate developers. Apparently the planning staff plan to work for the developers after they leave county employment. Abandon this "strategy" now.

265 **Donald HOROWITZ - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I am extremely worried about the effect on Chevy Chase communities--more traffic, which is already gridlocked on major streets, pollution, in-adequate infrastructure, stress on service people like those already over-worked in providing crime protection, firemen who will have crowded streets to contend with, trash people who will have many more residents to serve. Schools, already overcrowded, will need to be

	enlarged (no land available for new schools), need for more teachers (shortage of teachers now), increased utility usage, and much, much more.
266	margaret dimarzio - Damascus, 20872 Please leave the small city nature of Bethesda. Do NOT take on this new housing strategie. For all the people in the county especially us in upper county that will not go to dc but, will go to Bethesda. Adding this amount of affordable housing will decrease ALL of our taxes.
267	rob nichols - chevy chase village, 20815 I strongly oppose the proposal.
268	Linda Morelli - Derwood, 20855 Absolutely opposed to the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. It will destroy neighborhoods in every area of the county. Increasing density is not the solution to achieving affordable housing. It will diminish our community. It will compromise our ability to provide an exemplary education to every student. Most roads throughout the subdivisions do not meet the requirements for a safe road as they are narrow. On street parking which will be the result of higher density would render the streets unsafe and unsightly. The beauty of our county would be lessened. It is probable that developers who already infill neighborhoods by buying small homes and replacing them with large homes that are definitely not affordable would do the same but instead of building single family homes will increase their profits by constructing multi family homes. This plan will impact the already middle class neighborhoods more than more expensive areas of the county. This initiative will affect our environment. It will increase crowding and result in less green space and more non-permeable surfaces. This is where most of the increased density will occur. The middle class will lose property value and most likely feel tax increase. This initiative hinders all residents of the county not only property owners from enjoying the given right to peaceful and secure enjoyment of their homes. This initiative does not serve the residents of Montgomery County, instead it will cause harm.
269	Farnaz Edwards - Brookeville, 20833 I would like to state that I am completely against the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative and the rezoning of single family homes to include multi-unit housing. This will NOT in any way make housing more affordable to anyone. It will just have more density of expensive housing. There should be more rules put in place regarding the realty companies that buy many houses in cash to drive up costs to everyone. You can't say you want to make housing more affordable and at the same time increase fees associated with buying a house (recordation fees, taxes). How about just stopping waste to free up some money that can subsidize housing for those who can't afford it? We cannot build endlessly. We will get to a point where the number of housing units will just be what it is, and we will all have to live in those parameters.

270	<p>Joseph Mendonca - Silver Spring, 20910</p> <p>I support all the recommendations outlined in the Attainable Housing Strategies Report. R-40, R-60, R-90, & R-200 zones currently occupy near 80,000 acres in the county, compared to under 16,000 acres for all other residential zones (multi-family, townhouse, commercial). This means that more affordable housing types are banned from being built in most of the county's residential land, exacerbating the local housing crisis and forcing the county to waste taxpayer dollars on providing services across low-density areas that contribute comparatively little to the county revenues. This initiative will allow established residents and newcomers to afford housing, boost the economy, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. I support these recommendations because it is the county government's purpose and responsibility to support healthy, resilient, and livable communities, NOT to cater to the interests of misinformed landowners seeking to reduce the county's economic competitiveness to temporarily protect their own property values.</p>
271	<p>Ann Bittman - CHEVY CHASE, 20815</p> <p>I think the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative that would change zoning for single family homes to multi-family housing is a terrible idea! It will ruin our neighborhoods and not have the desired effect of providing more affordable housing as it will result in expensive units shoved together on smaller parcels of land. Additionally, it will result in overwhelming our already congested roads, schools and otehr services.</p>
272	<p>Mary OBrien - Bethesda, 20817</p> <p>I might have submitted this already. As a realtor, I witnessed what poor county policies and the impact of not implementing ordinances by citing violations can do to bring down the social and economic fabric of a suburban community. I started my real estate career in Wheaton, MD.around 2005 once i put fliers out i was amazed at the amount of calls i received. After interviewing various owners about their intention to move, i realized their concerns were common: over-crowded classrooms causing their children a lower level of quality of education, concern for a neighborhood becoming more rentals, cars parked on lawns tolerated, increased density of residents, and slowing crime rising. When i went on rental calls there with people looking for homes to rent, everyone wanted basements. I did not understand why a couple without children were so keen on basements. As i toured many homes in Wheaton i realized that both owners and renters were putting up drywall making multiple little closets to rent out to the public. The renters never told the owners since they planned to take the drywall down when they moved. Crime kept going up, lawns were unmowed and cars were parked everywhere on lawns and the curb. Over the years market values were going down and a one-time wonderful neighborhood marked by little crime, pride of home ownership, a cohesive community and good schools degraded. The county sadly never enforced the ordinance for maximum no of occupancy of rentals and principle home owners' residences. People were not cited for cars parked on lawns. People were just pushed out of their homes that they loved because they were losing market value and quality of life. I gave up selling in Wheaton because it became too dangerous and depressing. I simply do not trust Montgomery County and Park and Planning in ensuring policies that do not over-crowd a neighhborhood so that cars are everywhere not just on the street, the density of people brings overcrowding in schools , on the street, and in the homes and values subsequently decline. Crime ultimately will surface under these . conditions. Save the integrity of our neighborhoods and do not introduce new configurations that will cause so many unintended consequences. Think up better and more</p>

logical locations to place the middle tier. It is so unfair to the owners who have worked a lifetime to create their space and environment and then move them out because of your failed policies.

273 **Brad Hansen - Potomac, 20854**

Terrible idea. This will not only decimate residents' investments, but create multi million dollar eye sores (increasing crime) while not addressing one issue allegedly existing today. Keep government planning the hell out of single family neighborhoods - the last vestiges of peace in this county.

274 **Lauren Bopp - Rockville, 20852**

I was hoping to make it to one of the listening sessions, but I haven't been able to. I just want to say I'm in favor of changing the zoning to allow duplexes, triplexes, or quadraplexes on lots that were previously restricted to single family homes.

In general, I think when people hear "affordable housing" they imagine a revolving door of transient low-income renters showing up in neighborhoods that are used to longer-term residents with a sense of stability and community. But when I hear duplexes, triplexes, etc., I envision things like being able to move my aging parents into their own adjacent dwelling instead of having to build an in-law suite in my basement and install a stair-lift. Or as a young family being able to buy a building together with friends or siblings so we can have our own spaces but be right there to babysit, share a meal, look in on each other, etc.

I think the biggest thing is just making sure a) you limit how many stories/how tall they can be, b) you account for how to handle street parking so you don't end up with 8 cars for a lot that previously brought 2 making it so that adjacent neighbors can't even park in front of their own houses, and c) ensure that individuals or co-ops who actually live in the community can build and own these, instead of outsider or big business developers or private investors who just charge and arm and a leg from afar.

We 100% do not have enough housing options in many parts of the county for people who want affordable, smaller, single-level dwellings that are walkable to retail, doctor's offices, and transit. So much of the new housing being built are expensive townhouses that are really only suitable for one demographic: affluent families with cars and no mobility issues.

And why are we failing to preserve green space? I love the semi-urban vibe, but so many apartment and condo buildings in the Rockville/North Bethesda areas have very little access to grass or trees for walking a dog, or just strolling through some nature instead of along Metro tracks or six-lane roads.

I lived in Los Angeles for many years and I *loved* the neighborhoods there that were a blocks and blocks of a mix of small apartment buildings and single family homes sandwiched between large commercial corridors. You got a huge diversity of people living in proximity to each other in the community - young twenty-somethings sharing apartments with roommates, empty nesters, young families, etc. Each

building had its own architectural character. I could feel like I was living in the suburbs, but still walk to grocery stores, shops, cafes, parks, catch a city bus to work, etc.

If I could wave a magic wand I'd also rebuild all the shopping centers along Rockville Pike so that the storefronts were right up against the sidewalks (which were also wider), and the parking lots were all in the back, behind the stores. The area is never going to feel pedestrian friendly when you have to dodge cars crossing giant parking lots on foot just to get to the store entrances.

Anyway, I'm a current homeowner in Rockville and I chose my neighborhood precisely because I could walk to the grocery store, some restaurants, my child's school, etc., and I am absolutely not worried about greater density affecting my property values or my neighborhood's character, so long as it is done thoughtfully.

275

Bill Carey - Kensington, 20895

Concerning AHSI, I have read the preliminary information. Once the County Council receives the Planning Board's studies, reports, recommendations, I want the County Council to suspend and not introduce any further discussion on this issue.

276

Amy Sommer - Kensington, 20895

I think the proposal is very fair, although I'm unsure how much true impact this will have on improving affordability and availability. Many in my single family neighborhood association (Parkwood) are very upset by this plan complete with all the racist undertones on the listserve that you'd expect. There are tons of replacement homes going up in my neighborhood, now asking over \$2 million, so I am wondering how developers would be incentivized to build replacement homes with multi-units at affordable prices and still make a sizable profit when they are buying the lots for \$850,000 to tear down? Requiring on-site two-spaces per unit will also help with neighbors' street parking concerns.

277

Jennie Willson - Chevy Chase, 20815

The planning recommendations completely dismiss any potential impact to infrastructure (schools, traffic, water/sewer, green space) and suggest implementing a broad approach without taking into account the specific needs/nuances of the communities affected. I'm concerned in particular that the plan is based on some assumptions that are wildly inaccurate including the assumptions that most people are willing to walk a mile to public transport and that most people only have 1 car or no cars. Regarding the former, my potential 1 mile walk to the metro currently lacks sidewalks, includes crossing a busy, 6 lane road, and is incredibly hilly - this trek is unrealistic for most, but impossible for kids or those with limited mobility. Our schools are overcrowded, but there's no mention of how to deal with any potential influx of students and in fact, the MCPS is in the process of rezoning, without any input from potential impact from this plan. How is that good governance? Is the council planning to account for the varied and disparate needs of each community to make our communities not just more dense, but more livable and walkable? What guardrails are you putting in place to make sure this isn't just a free for all for developers? And will you commit to making our communities a great place to live for existing and new residents by providing clear plans to shore up infrastructure and schools?

278

Caroline Cooper - Chevy Chase, 20815

I attended last night's listening session at BCC, and I agree with the majority sentiment that the proposals by the Planning Board don't provide a solution to the need for 'Missing Middle' housing. I think the Walsh Street development is a devastating example of how you can't force developers to price things at an attainable level. I have written in to President Friedson before, and I want to re-iterate here that I was disappointed with the proposal to simply call everything within 500 feet of a Growth Corridor a Priority Growth Zone. That label is not appropriate for my block, and the mere designation is unfair as it puts us at a disadvantage from our neighbors. Take the time to identify areas that might be appropriate for small apartment buildings, this approach is too broad and unsophisticated. Also, please explain how more market rate rental apartments achieve the Missing Middle you seek. We currently have 200+ open apartments in the 20815 zipcode, why are more market-rate rentals a fix for this problem?

279

Sarah Efir - Chevy Chase, 20815

President Friedson and Director Sartori, thank you for the opportunity to comment. I'm Sarah Efir Stephens, longtime taxpayer and constituent, at [REDACTED], Chevy Chase Section 3. Here is the statement I didn't get the opportunity to make at the September 25 Listening Session.

With due respect, the Planning Board's Final Report is downright dystopian:

It says that market rate housing is affordable.

It says there has been extensive outreach when we all were overwhelmed with pandemic health and mental health issues during early 2021 when listening sessions were held.

Finally, the Report brushes off in a few pages, with no specific solutions, extremely relevant local concerns such as flooding, parking, lot coverage, fire and police, traffic and schools.

These recommendations are a bonanza for developers and for MoCo's opaque and unelected bureaucracy. Local conditions such as drainage, parking, tree cover, and building height and frontage are central to quality of life. The Planning Board recommendations take control of all of those things from volunteer local councils who know the local challenges because they live there, and transfer all regulation to the already-vast County government, where developers can easily lobby, but the individual homeowner is nearly powerless.

Some recommendations from your constituent:

Leave local building restrictions in place. Otherwise developers will run amuck to the extreme detriment of adjoining homeowners. For example, the builders who constantly are digging beneath the water table, causing flooding of houses in my neighborhood, now face

immediate consequences. They will not under the Planning Board's scheme. You stated that state law on this needs to be clarified, but that does not diminish the power grab the Planning Board is suggesting.

Re-think the Priority Housing District within 1 mile — as the crow flies — of Metro. Even if Metro could get you everywhere you need to go in the DMV, it is ridiculous to suggest all people young and old can walk over a mile to Metro for all their needs. It is also crazy to encourage density within 500 feet of major roads before putting more extensive transportation networks in place. Most everyone in these areas sit in traffic just to get out the impacted neighborhoods no matter the time of day. By the way, Director Sartori, you omitted from your presentation last night the planned streamlined method for getting a permit to build a 19 unit apartment building on MY STREET near Connecticut Avenue. It is hard not to feel you were lying when you said that small apartment buildings along Connecticut Avenue (and my tiny Delaware Street) haven't been proposed!

Let's work together to find solutions. Please don't summarily preempt local regulations on developers in this quixotic and misguided quest to turn market rate housing into affordable housing!

280

Eva Smart-Campbell - MONTGOMERY VILLAGE, 20886

I am against this initiative

281

Elizabeth Waters - Chevy Chase, 20815

I am against the Attainable Housing Initiative. I am all for increasing the stock of affordable housing in Montgomery County, including in the neighborhoods that are closest to the metro stops and major arteries. I do not believe that this proposal will increase affordable housing though. It will increase density and the stock of expensive housing, and the environmental costs could be enormous. It would also lead to the destruction of many historic neighborhoods, which would have a widespread social and cultural impact for present and future generations.

282

Brooke Wolvin - Bethesda, 20816

I am writing to strongly oppose the attainable housing plan. The plan that has been introduced was created with no citizen input and no thoughtfulness regarding the neighborhoods that will be affected. The map of rezoning proposed is so haphazard that the 500 foot zones drawn along major corridors even transect some houses.

We live in the Greenacres neighborhood off of River Road with young children. All of the neighborhoods south of Little Falls Parkway are composed of 1940's and 50's houses on small lots with no driveways, narrow streets and no sidewalks. There is already a major parking problem for current residents but more than that, a serious SAFETY issue exists for children who walk to Westbrook and Westland in neighborhoods with no sidewalks. Increasing traffic congestion and parking problems will significantly worsen an already DANGEROUS situation for our kids.

While I am extremely troubled by the safety and traffic issues that this plan will have on our small community, I want to also emphasize the severe detrimental impact it will have on our schools. The recent boundary study almost doubled the enrollment of our elementary school, Westbrook, which is now overcrowded. Now the attainable housing plan is being introduced on the heels of the county's failure to fully fund the school system for the 2024-2025 school year, which has resulted in increased class size. How can we now further increase density in our neighborhoods and increase enrollment at Westbrook which is already beyond capacity with multi family housing? Our kids are already in classes that are too large with teachers that are spread too thin.

The Friendship Heights area already has large condo buildings and more are under construction now. Westbard is being turned into hundreds of townhomes and condos. So this type of "missing middle" housing is already being accounted for in this area. But if there is a need for more types of housing, continue to focus on old commercial properties such as the Geico complex or the gas stations and storage units on River Road. Similar style dwellings can be built together into small neighborhoods and provided with the amenities required. But our small communities between Western Ave and Little Falls parkway should, WITHOUT QUESTION, be removed from the attainable housing plan.

283

George Smith - Bethesda, 20817

I favor the Planning Board's recommendation to permit rebuilds to be duplexes and triplexes in my neighborhood. There is no question that opportunities for more affordable housing should be available in my and many other neighborhoods. Even with all the rebuilding in my Bethesda neighborhood, the transformation of the neighborhood to include duplexes and triplexes would be very gradual (allowing for easy school and infrastructure accommodation) and I doubt most people would even notice. The argument that real estate values would decline from this recommendation is thoughtless and nonsense.

284

Jana Anderson - Bethesda, 20817

Hello,

I strongly disagree with the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. I chose to purchase a single-family home on purpose, in a single-family neighborhood, in Bethesda. This was the #1 requirement for my family. I wanted a neighborhood that was not overcrowded with parked cars, overcrowded parks/ walking paths, and overcrowded schools for my children. I desired this type of community and feel that this initiative would deter future home-buyers like me, from purchasing homes in this area. It may actually make my family move. Montgomery County is very diverse and has very diverse types of homes and neighborhoods. This is the beauty of it. This initiative would take this diversity away and drive home-owners like my family to choose another area to live in.

Protect the beauty and diversity of our neighborhoods! There are plenty of mixed use neighborhoods within MoCo that have affordable apartments, townhomes, and single-family homes for those that desire those types of neighborhoods. I know, because I have lived in them. I moved to MoCo and rented my first apartment in Rockville. I purchased my first townhome in North Potomac, my second home in Germantown, Gaithersburg, and finally our current home in Bethesda. I love this county and loved having the ability to find housing that suited my personal and financial situation.

	<p>MoCo residents and home buyers should be free to choose the sorts of neighborhoods we want to live in. Thank you.</p>
285	<p>John Farrell - Kensington, 20895</p> <p>The AHSI is ridiculous overkill. Go back to the drawing board and design a pilot program that scatters a hundred or so zoning exemptions per year around the county. (And this time include Potomac.) Run it by lottery, or even better, make developers compete for the privilege, so we can see what their best efforts look like. After two or three years we all will know what is working (or if it is working at all) and what is destructive.</p>
286	<p>Mike Mccarthy - Gaithersburg, 20879</p> <p>Noooo!!!!</p>
287	<p>Karen McCarthy - Gaithersburg, 20879</p> <p>no no no to this!!!</p>
288	<p>Pete Tantisunthorn - Silver Spring, 20910</p> <p>I support the initiative and most efforts to increase housing density around transit. Thanks.</p>
289	<p>Rachel Mulcahy - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>Please maintain single-family neighborhoods without the addition of multi-family dwellings. We support adding attainable housing but encourage the council to look into leveraging the current multi-unit buildings (many of which are vastly under capacity) in the surrounding neighborhoods of Bethesda, Chevy Chase and Rockville; or to explore conversion of commercial/office properties in nearby neighborhoods which are also under capacity and in close proximity to transit and other amenities. There are many such lots that could be revitalized with this measure.</p>
290	<p>Michael Williams - Kensington, 20895</p> <p>All,</p> <p>Please know that we strongly oppose this plan. Part of what makes the county a desirable place to live is the beautiful single family home neighborhoods. We worked hard, saved, and sacrificed for years to be able to live in one of these neighborhoods and have the space for</p>

our family. Allowing multi unit housing would diminish desirability of the neighborhood (and home value) and lead to congestion. Please do not allow this to go through.

291 **Carisa Ebert - Olney, 20832**

What exactly are you planning to do about the rest of the county infrastructure to support the anticipated large influx of residents over the next several years? Our schools cannot handle double the students, our roads cannot handle double the cars, and our retail/grocery/gas suppliers will not be able to fully handle the new demand. What happens when medical offices can no longer accept new patients? If you want to be a big city, you need to first upgrade your infrastructure before you cram loads more people in. It's basic economics and city planning.

We moved to Olney because it wasn't the overpopulated mess that is Rockville and Bethesda. But if Olney becomes like them, we will leave MOCO first chance we get.

292 **Stephen Bokat - Chevy Chase, 20815**

My Wife and I are senior citizens, residents of the Rollingwood section of Chevy Chase. We have lived in our modest—by current standards—home for more than 50 years. The approximately 1900 square foot house has not been substantially enlarged since it was built more than 70 years ago. I am a life-long member of the BCC neighborhood, and a product of Montgomery County Schools.

The Planning Board's "Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative" will substantially change the nature of the single-family home neighborhoods that many of us have chosen, without increasing the availability of affordable housing. We are strongly opposed to the Planning Board proposal to rezone single family lots to permit construction of duplex, triplex and quadraplex residences for the following reasons:

Attainable Housing Needs: The stated purpose of the Planning Board proposal, as we understand it, is to increase the availability of "attainable housing." We are not sure what this means, versus "affordable housing." One thing that seems sure is that the proposal will not increase the availability of affordable housing, the lack of which is a nation-wide problem. There is no requirement in the proposal that in any way limits the cost of any multi-unit housing that is built. I am sure you have heard about the Triplex built one block east of Wisconsin Avenue in Bethesda under an apparent exception to current zoning rules, where a modest home (4500 Walsh Street) was turned down and turned into new triplexes which are being offered at multi-million dollars per unit.

In the 50 years since we moved into the Rollingwood neighborhood, there have been an increasing number of either total teardowns and very large houses built on the lots or the removal of the roof and additional stories added. Increasingly, we find ourselves staring up at our neighbors that tower over our house. This trend in Montgomery County was highlighted by the gentleman from the Planning Board that spoke at the September 25 listening session at BCC High School, who spoke of the many homes that have been built that greatly exceed 3,000 square feet, and cost over \$2 million. But the Planning Board's "solution" of allowing duplexes and triplexes will only exacerbate this situation, encouraging developers to take houses like ours which are modestly priced by comparison and turn them into towering monstrosities where each unit exceeds \$2 million. How this increases "attainable housing" is beyond me.

At the same time, we are discussing this proposal, the County has approved the tearing down of a number of relatively modest multi-unit housing on Manor Road, immediately adjacent to the very-high end developments around the Purple Line station. This development will

have 220 dwelling units, of which 28 are MPDU's, plus 19,000 square feet of retail space. While we are not sure how the 28 units compares to what was torn down, I suspect it is a substantially smaller number. In any event, why weren't more MPDU's required in this space? In any event, County Executive Ehrlich's office has projections showing that current, planned increased dwelling units when added to the current stock, is more than sufficient to accommodate the expected growth in population.

Environmental – the proposal will increase hardscape and eliminate trees, producing more storm runoff and eliminating the trees that store carbon.

Traffic – the narrow streets in Chevy Chase cannot handle more on-street parking or additional traffic. As older citizens, it is more difficult for us to utilize public transportation, rather than driving. The building of multi-unit housing in the Rollingwood neighborhood will make it difficult for us to drive and park. This is a neighborhood with few if any sidewalks requiring that all of us get our exercise walking in the streets. And, of course, kids are reduced to riding their bikes and other vehicles in the streets. The Planning Board supposedly has considered the need for increased parking, requiring that each house have parking for a total of 4 vehicles. That might work for a duplex, but assuming two cars per family (some have more), each triplex would need space for 6 vehicles.

Infrastructure – there is little space for the additional schools that would be required to educate the additional children. Has the Montgomery County Board of Education weighed in on this proposal on how they plan to accommodate the additional students, and pay for the presumably larger schools that will be needed down county? Similarly, there is not adequate land for parks or recreation centers for the increased population. In addition, the electric grid, communications infrastructure, storm sewers and water and gas lines are not designed to serve such a dense population.

The zoning modifications will not create affordable or attainable housing as it can be sold at market rates. On the contrary, those modifications could lead to existing moderate cost housing being demolished to build the multiplexes to be sold at higher prices. There is no problem of enough housing as there are sufficient projects permitted to satisfy the need for growth for the next 20 years.

We and our wonderfully diverse neighbors love where we live. We do not want to see the essential nature of this neighborhood changed, even though it may mean a substantial increase in the value of our property. When the proposal comes to the County Council, I hope you will oppose it.

Sincerely,
Stephen A. Bokat

Janet Carafelli - Silver spring, 20903

293

Please do not do this proposal. It will destroy our already declining neighborhood. We have people already who have 15 or more people living in there house. So many cars and commercial vehicles that clog the streets.. They park in front of fire hydrants make the streets impassable. Our neighborhood is forgotten by the country as these commercial vehicles are allowed even though it's breaking the law. Build in your back yard ONLY but not ours. Plus the traffic is horrific. Please listen to the people of this once great county. If I was able to move away I would.

294

Paul Colacicco - Olney, 20832

I bought a home in a single family neighborhood. It cost me quite a lot and I'll be dealing with that for 25 more years. I made this decision because my wife and I want to raise our kids in the type of neighborhood we grew up in, with quiet streets to play on and a small amount of friendly neighbors. I do not want my neighborhood split into multiple occupant dwellings. Where will the additional people park? How will a neighborhood road designed for a given volume look when there are four to five fold cars driving and parking on it? The streets are congested enough with the families who live here parking on them. I would sell my home and head to Frederick the moment I realized my neighbors homes were being redeveloped to multi occupant units. It's not the type of neighborhood I want to live in, so it's not the type of neighborhood I bought a house in.

I agree housing should be affordable but this solution is asinine and will drive out your current residents. Drop this solution and look elsewhere.

295

Sheila Timbers - Chevy Chase, 20815

I understand the need for affordable housing, but I don't think your current plan is an equitable solution. Builders will have a field day, and neighborhoods will be broken apart with large buildings in neighborhoods with little parking and lot more traffic. My street is already overwhelmed with people cutting through the neighborhood and driving at unsafe speeds. Please consider all of us while formulating your plan for the county.

296

Jonna Stoycos - Bethesda, 20817

Good afternoon! Thanks for having the portal to share ideas! While I do appreciate the initiative to find more housing, a few thoughts-as the areas of Bethesda, Chevy Chase and 'close-in' neighborhoods have grown, property values have greatly increased. Those homeowners who can afford to live in those neighborhoods have worked extremely hard and worked many years to afford to live there-in other words, have worked long and hard to be able to afford the conveniences of living close to downtown areas. Their children know that right out of college they will not be able to afford to live in the same neighborhoods, that eventually they will be able to, but not until they have had careers for much longer. Disrupting single family neighborhoods with development that doesn't fit, will only disrupt property values that homeowners have worked long and hard for. In addition, developers who purchase vacant lots or 'tear down' lots, are certainly NOT going to build 'low cost' townhomes! For example, one of your photos shows a row of EYA townhomes, which are beautiful, and I am quite a fan of....but they sell for \$1.8M. That's not affordable housing. Now, I do believe you might find a few small commercial zoned lots around the county. Those could be turned into townhomes, but I would highly suggest that you engage, even pay, a group of highly valued architects, perhaps even award-winning architects, to design townhomes that will fit into the nearby neighborhoods and compliment the adjoining neighborhoods. HOWEVER-instead of focusing on not having enough low income housing in Bethesda and Chevy Chase, why don't you focus on the traffic issues? The county needs to address the terrible traffic that residents must face when they need to drive a simple ten miles to work. For example.....because the county didnt keep the shrubs cleared from a sidewalk on Old Georgetown Road, a cyclist lost his life. Instead of adding one bike lane, the county took a knee jerk reaction and added two bikes lanes that are rarely ever used. So traffic backs up on Old Georgetown Rd. Downtown Bethesda has no 'one way' streets like other cities. It's a mess.....you have added so much

development yet no traffic control. Workers who live in Rockville or Gaithersburg can afford homes there, and it's not that far to drive to Bethesda to work, but the traffic is an absolute nightmare. AND perhaps you could LOWER taxes all around. Do teachers need insurance for life? Why so many administrators in the department of education? This is getting off topic, but perhaps the bigger solution is less taxes, better traffic solutions for the commuters and a much better approach to general planning. Think about the overall plan for the county, not attacking the beautiful single family homes that we have all worked so hard to purchase and live in. Thanks so very much!!!!

297

Anne Schenof - Chevy Chase, 20815

I have read the AHS proposal and found it woefully deficient of details necessary to assure that attainable housing will result. Rather it seems to offer developers the opportunity to tear down an older home in a desirable location and replace it with at least two homes, each of which would cost more than the home it replaced. We have seen this happen all over Chevy Chase. The future existence of a pattern book will not prevent this result unless it includes specific limitations. In fact, the decision to change the zoning should not be made without prior review of such a pattern book. Given that the County needs more housing at a greater range of pricing, I am at a loss to understand why a developer was allowed to tear down a group of affordable apartment buildings on Manor Road to replace them with luxury townhomes. I certainly would like an explanation for that.

298

Rita Grotsky - Olney, 20832

Montgomery County already does not have the resources such as schools and teachers, water supply, police force and many other services particularly for our lower income residents. Parking in single family neighborhoods is also limited. If this policy is implemented, the residents who pay the majority of property taxes that fund these services will rapidly abandon the County

299

Katharine Kosin - Bethesda, 20814

As a lifelong MoCo resident currently raising a family here, I am strongly in favor of the proposed Attainable Housing strategies initiative. I have seen how the neighborhood I grew up in has dramatically changed due to rising land prices and single family zoning, and do not consider the growing unaffordability (and the narrowing of the types of people and careers who can afford to live here) to be a positive development. I have seen many examples of duplexes and quadplexes that look more like traditional housing and fit in a less hulking footprint than the McMansions that regularly go up in my area, demonstrating how invalid the concerns about these buildings fitting into neighborhoods are. I am all for allowing a greater number of people to live in this great county, and especially near public transportation so we can make progress on climate goals. (Being able to build smaller housing units in place of McMansions would reduce carbon output). Please do not let the loud voices of a wealthy minority dissuade you from showing leadership and doing the right thing.

300

Kate Stein - Chevy Chase, 20815

I attempted to provide input as a spoken public comment last night, but was not given an opportunity to speak. This is what I had hoped to say:

Good evening. My name is Kate Stein. I have been a resident of Montgomery County for more than 15 years--first as a renter and since 2012 as a homeowner. I am here tonight to register my strong support for the Attainable Housing draft plan. The draft of the attainable

housing strategy is well thought out and I am sure was the result of a lot of effort. It seems like a good start. I encourage the council to speed drafting and passage of the laws and zoning ordinances required to implement it.

I encourage the planning commission to increase its speed and ambition in addressing the housing affordability crisis. We need to mobilize and move quickly.

We know that there is not enough housing in the county. Scarcity is contributing to rising prices and unaffordability both for those looking to rent and those hoping to buy.

In my case, the lack of affordable housing in the county meant that my parents could not afford to move here, to live here, as they aged. They moved, instead, to the exurbs of Atlanta and were 800 miles away when my mother grew ill during the pandemic, and they needed my support. Most of us have families or parents or children or friends or neighbors who we hope will be able to live near us, who we hope will care for us and who we want to be able to care for or continue to care for in our community. So, yes, please, in my back yard. Yes, please, to more housing, greater density, and the increased affordability that I know will come with that.

Three more specific recommendations:

- ONE. Attainable, affordable housing should also be sustainable and accessible. Lower the barriers to green architecture and universal design and incentivize. The pattern book could be the perfect vehicle for this. The pattern book could include green features like solar and electric charging—good ancestor features that increase current affordability of utilities—and universal design features and adaptations for live in / multigenerational care-giving—features that enable people to more easily age in their communities. Don't forget housing that is already built. Invest more in subsidies to green retrofit existing housing. Make it easier to add ADUs for caregivers and to take advantage of current incentives to add accessibility features
- TWO. Combine attainable housing initiatives with sustainable community initiatives—pair zoning changes that increase housing and population density with neighborhood level investments in parks, public transit, public infrastructure, public pre-k, daycare and elder care. If you do this, I believe more residents will say yes, please, in my back yard.
- THREE. Be bold on behalf of our public servants. We must do more to make housing attainable--we must invest--in making housing attainable and affordable for for teachers, civil servants, fire and police, sanitation engineers, etc. Use direct subsidies, if necessary. Build homes and apartments if necessary. The people who we trust to teach our children, who pick up our recycling, who police our community, and who, literally, put out our fires should be able to afford to live here, in the community they serve.

I say Yes, please, in my back yard. (Ye-pimby).

Thank you.

Anna Toubiana - Chevy Chase, 20815

301

While we applaud the county's initiatives, this is a poorly thought-through project. In order to implement a rezoning project of this magnitude, the county needs to be bulletproof in its showing of the impact on roads, water, parking, environment, and communities as a whole of the project. To this day, the initiative has not been able to show any concrete studies. A serious initiative would have all the consequences mapped out. This is not it.

Please consider pausing the project, taking a few steps back and think it through, paired with the adequate studies.
Thank you.

302 Kate Sheckells - Chevy Chase, 20815

This is a horrible idea! Why don't you focus on building in friendship Heights, Chevy Chase Lake, downtown Bethesda, and White Flint, before you destroy our neighborhoods. I'm a lifelong Montgomery County resident. It is shocking to me that you are not paying attention to your constituents. This is not affordable housing! This is luxury housing that only benefits developers. Why don't you focus on affordable housing.

303 Jacqueline Coolidge - Chevy Chase, 20815

Thank you for the Listening Sessions and providing the opportunity to share feedback on the Planning Board proposal for "Attainable Housing" in Montgomery County.

While I came around to support for the overall masterplan "Thrive Montgomery," I feel I was led to believe that it would prioritize affordable housing and balanced growth for the county, including an appropriate sequencing of upgrades and capacity for infrastructure, transportation, and environmental concerns.

On the one hand, I can appreciate the need for increased density in the county. But I don't see how this particular "new tool" of "attainable" (not "affordable") housing fits in with the vision and priorities of Thrive Montgomery when we have not yet seen detailed legislative proposals for affordability, infrastructure, transportation and our environment. It seems more like a lucrative opportunity for corporate developers, which should be extremely low on our list of priorities.

I agree with the critique of County Executive Marc Elrich:

WHAT AHS DOESN'T DO:

- It does not address housing affordability. In fact, the AHS report is clear that the additional housing households will be market-rate units – ...
- It does not address the need for additional opportunities for home ownership for low-income households.
- It does not address concerns that its recommendations may create incentives for outside real estate speculators to purchase single-family homes for redevelopment.
- It does not address how COG's latest forecast affects housing targets for 2030. ...

- It does not address the environmental consequences of increased land coverage from the larger building footprints of higher density development, resulting in increased imperviousness, stormwater runoff, and loss of tree cover.
- It does not consider its effect on “sprawl,” one of the basic tenets of Smart Growth. ... “

Please put “Attainable Housing” on the back burner. After we have addressed these more pressing concerns, maybe it could be considered as an “additional tool” to increase needed density but it should definitely NOT be among the first items for proposed legislation. Let us see some tangible progress on affordability, infrastructure, school capacity, transportation/transit and the environment first, and then it might be appropriate to add consideration of this approach into the mix.

304	<p>Elizabeth Brody - Bethesda, 20814</p> <p>Many of us have worked hard for many years to afford our single-family homes in bethesda. Please do not do anything to decrease the value of our homes and the equity in our homes that we have worked so hard for. Please do not allow multiple dwelling units in single-family homes. We do not want to turn, downtown bethesda and other parts of bethesda from lovely neighborhoods into multi family dwellings areas.</p>
305	<p>Ellen Gadbois - Bethesda, 20817</p> <p>I fully support multi family housing, including in areas zoned for single family housing (such as where I live in Bethesda). We need affordable housing and a mix of housing types in all parts of MOCO. Otherwise we have socioeconomic segregation. We also need more sidewalks, bike lanes, and safe pedestrian crossings so people aren't required to own cars to live in certain neighborhoods.</p>
306	<p>Eric Eisner - Bethesda, 20814</p> <p>I am writing in support of the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. Montgomery County has a serious housing shortage, and the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative will help working people afford a place to live in the county.</p>
307	<p>Jane Boynton - Bethesda, 20814-2423</p> <p>I am very opposed to having multiple family dwelling units in single family neighborhoods. This will affect property value, the quality of the neighborhood, the schools, traffic and is not fair to those of us who bought homes in single family home zoned areas. I feel certain that there must be a more fair way to provide lower cost housing without changing single family home zoning.</p>
308	<p>Jen D - Bethesda, 20817</p> <p>I oppose the new zoning structure. If you are going to propose these new laws, it should be allowed for the public who it affects to be able to vote. I opposed thrive. I want to keep the coming the way it is. Why don't you focus on how to get. Business back from NOVA. That will</p>

	<p>help. The schools are all over crowded. This will not help. Parking is already terrible. MC is already overcrowded, I don't need a mini apartment in my backyard.</p>
309	<p>Laura Moulton - Bethesda, 20817</p> <p>I am against this and feel it is corrupt. I do not believe it will provide affordable housing but will provide more money to developers which seems to be the main concern of the planning commission and county council</p>
310	<p>Nathan Eisner - Bethesda, 20814</p> <p>I strongly support the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. I believe that single family zoning is exclusionary and every action that leads to more affordable housing and a more diverse community should be a priority. Density is good for the environment, good for making Bethesda more walkable and livable, and good for residents.</p>
311	<p>Melissa Bronez - Garrett Park, 20896-1508</p> <p>I am in FAVOR of this initiative and disappointed in my neighbors who seem overwhelmingly opposed. Perhaps more thought is needed to ensuring each neighborhood can retain some control and introduce some "guard rails" to combat the fear that a single family neighborhood would become overrun by duplexes...perhaps a limit on the number permitted such at no more than 10% of the total in the town limits?</p>
312	<p>Amy Rump - Bethesda, 20814</p> <p>Totally against this! You will ruin neighborhoods, property value, and the infrastructure cannot handle this. Do NOT proceed. Many tax paying citizens will flee the county if you proceed.</p>
313	<p>Leslie Jarvis - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I support the Planning Board's initiative to provide more housing in single family housing zoned areas. If not for our generational wealth, my children would not be able to afford to live in the neighborhood where they grew up because the price of housing in the county has skyrocketed in the last thirty years. I fully support the idea of duplexes and triplexes being built in my neighborhood, which is within walking distance of a Purple Line station (once that project is finally completed). I have concerns about overcrowding in the local schools, but believe that solutions can be found. We cannot be content to do nothing and leave so many without safe, affordable housing. I would welcome more diversity and vibrancy that multifamily housing can bring to communities.</p>
314	<p>Megan Hall - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I write today to strongly oppose the proposed zoning changes to Rollingwood. We have lived in Rollingwood for 10 years and have a 10 year old child so we are intimately familiar with all aspects of the neighborhood as we raised our child here.</p>

The County Council has not considered their one-size fits all of Montgomery County proposal is not appropriate for certain areas of the County. This new zoning law will further exacerbate Rollingwood's existing infrastructure problems by adding buildings, cars and people to incompletely designed neighborhood that already has an excess of unused and mismanaged vacant real estate that can be used for housing. The Council should invest its time and money on thoughtfully planning and correcting Rollingwood's existing issues so that any new increase of housing, cars, people can be integrated well without collateral impacts.

Recall that Rollingwood:

1. Has no drainage - Many hills cause roads to flood any time it rains;
2. Has no sidewalks - You cannot safely walk around the neighborhood. Kids cannot play outside. Walking with a stroller is difficult and not safe. More parked cars will make it impossible to safely walk. Practically, we can hardly put our trash cans out in the space there is now. The roads cannot accommodate trash cans, recycling, etc. of four families. See above regarding flooding: you will have four times the amount of garbage cans washing away in the floods.
3. Underground springs percolate and cause the roads to freeze around school bus stops. Adding more kids to unsafe conditions that haven't been remedied for 10 years?
4. MCPS wasn't aware that the Rollingwood school was vacant and vandalized. That resource continues to be grossly misused by the county. MCPS and the County do not even have the resources to make it usable for the existing community. Current young families and elderly would love a community center. My 10 year old drew her dream plans for the space. It continues to be sad that those that live here can't use such a wonderful space that she had such hopes for.
5. Connecticut Ave between DC and the Beltway has many vacant buildings and plans for other communities. The corridor is underutilized and none of which is/will be affordable housing. Current new housing is luxury. I would love to have my elderly parents move there. But, there is no remotely affordable option.
6. Rollingwood should be preserved as part of the Rock Creek park watershed. Continual building causes extreme amounts of runoff that exacerbates the existing drainage problems. Developers take down trees without any plan to plant more. Neighbor's poorly managed construction of a new home killed eight 100 year old trees in the back of our house. It was a waste and destroyed habitats. The County did not have sufficient capability to monitor this construction even though it had the rules.

With the age of work-from-home there isn't a need for additional housing close to DC. People want more space, not less. DC housing market just reported a softening. No one is living and working downtown. I commute there three times a week. It's dead. Housing costs were for the first time higher in Montgomery County than DC. This is not due to those neighborhoods close to the DC line, like Rollingwood. It's related to those areas farther out that are closer to places where kids go to school and have fields to play soccer. The schools here are at capacity and old.

The plan to develop Rollingwood should be thoughtful and excluded from any current planning. Adding any more strain to Rollingwood will have more knock-on effects that the County does not have the money or people to manage. It would be more prudent to spend the County's resources (planning time and money) more wisely in the areas where planned growth makes sense. We can look at other communities like those around Pike & Rose. Have you been to Bark Social? People are at Pike & Rose. That is a huge success, which would

be made even more fun, vibrant and lovely if the County encouraged planned town homes and green spaces to surround it, rather than a wasteland of cement and highway.

There are also many successful high-density housing areas that the county can use as an example. One is the Penderview Community in Fairfax. It has condos and town homes. A planned community with two pools, a golf course, playgrounds, basketball courts, walking trails, the condos are one bedroom and two bedroom. It is affordable! People start their families there. Older people retire there. All have dedicated parking spaces, planned green spaces, community centers with gyms. They have communal garbage receptacles close to the condos so that there is one trash pickup per street. The county needs to encourage more of this kind of development and not rezoning existing communities. Put a Community like this on the Saks and Lord & Taylor parking lots in connection with DC. This is what is needed, not adding 3 houses on random lots dotted around Rollingwood. The cost to the Rollingwood community (people and the environment) is too high for so little return on the county's investment.

I am happy to speak to the council more and lay out more fully my issues with further burdening Rollingwood with construction. We all know that developers will buy the land in Rollingwood and put up the largest construction they can so that they can make the most money that they can. I have a .25 acre lot and who knows -- I could knock down my modest 1950s mid-century modern house and put up 4 - 1.5 million+ dollar town homes. Now that the council's proposal has made me think of it...maybe that is what I should do, so that I can make an insane amount of money off my land so that 3 more families can live on my street. That is not what the County council wants, but that is exactly what this progressive council's agenda will incentivize people to do. This is not Rollingwood. This is not what the County council can want? What Rollingwood and the Council should want is to make a community center out of a vacant school and refresh our library. Encourage the replanting of trees where developers take them down. Encourage nice places to live in our community. Protect our environment and watershed.

A one-size fits all approach to zoning has no place in Montgomery County. The proposal makes me think that the Council does not understand the land, the issues with the infrastructure or the unique environment of the Rock Creek watershed. The preservation of environment should easily be the number one priority for the Rollingwood neighborhood from the County's perspective. It should be a gem for the County to preserve to highlight as a draw to the County. It is clear if the Council encourages more development in Rollingwood, it will cause a severe impact to the community and the environment. Has an environmental study been conducted? Does the council even care? Do they know to care?

I am happy for any one of the other council members to speak with me directly. I will take them on a tour of Rollingwood so they can see that Rollingwood is compact, has almost no infrastructure and is woven into the woods. It is a very delicate balance and often is out of balance due to too much construction and in attention by the county. More needs to be done here to protect the neighborhood and, the more, should not be development. Ask Rollingwood residents if they would vote for strict no construction and no tree removal rules, and I think you would find the response to be staggering. Do not touch Rollingwood would be the resounding answer. I think through your listening sessions you have heard this loud and cohesive response already.

It would be wonderful if the Council showed some acknowledgment and respect for our community.

In that vein, if the Council wants to make change to our county to encourage housing, I would ask that they speak to their constituents. I still do not understand the why for this plan that includes Rollingwood? Is it to get more tax revenue from these hypothetical 1.5 million town homes that will be built in Rollingwood? Is it because the planning is lazy in the drafting of the rules? To me it's an inelegant one-size approach that does not fit the whole of the county. It smacks of an ill-conceived slapped together plan that certain of the council are trying to push through to meet an agenda that doesn't serve constituents.

We need to shine more of a light on what is being proposed by our council members. There seems to be a need for speed, for pressing an easy button and not for wisely and strategically improving our whole county. It still pains me that Amazon chose Pentagon City to develop and not White Flint. Our Council should spend its time working to attract businesses to the waste lands of White Flint and cement blocks around Pike & Rose or to making more housing and affordable housing around the new purple line stop on Connecticut Avenue. Perhaps if those community's fought harder or there was more of a plan to develop those communities, we would now have thriving residential areas there. Try driving through pike and rose on a weekend. It's turned around in 10 years. I never would have expected to be in such a traffic jam. Now I want to go there more than Bethesda. It has a community feel. A place you want to stay awhile.

There is still time to invest there and attract more families and businesses. It would be excellent to see progress there and in Bethesda! But there are more areas in Kenwood, North Bethesda and Kensington that if they had the county's attention would really flourish — affordable housing and revitalization of business and community.

On the other hand, Rollingwood needs the attention that should be afforded to an old and established neighborhood -- sensible infrastructure improvements and care for our forest and fields for soccer. Nothing more. A wish would be for MCPS to donate the old school to the Rollingwood community to care for and manage as a nature / community center.

Please except Rollingwood from any zoning plans unless they are to restrict development. If there is a need for Rollingwood to formally request exemption, I would like to be contacted about starting the process. I would also like the council to formally start the process to designate Rollingwood with special protection from development due to its proximity to and integration into Rock Creek Forest.

Gregory Lewis - Silver Spring, 20910

315

I am opposed to the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. Montgomery County is a desirable and therefore expensive place to live. Allowing indiscriminate, at will construction of apartment buildings anywhere and everywhere represents a complete abdication of the County Council's responsibilities to its constituents. I also agree with the County Executive's data-supported position that sufficient housing stock already exists to make housing in the county "attainable." Just 2 years ago, the County's "Silver Spring Downtown and Adjacent Communities Master Plan" addressed residential zoning in the "adjacent communities." Now please leave us alone.

316	<p>Dominique Rychlik - Bethesda, 20817</p> <p>I live near Friendship Heights and grew up there. I am also a real estate agent. The proposed zoning changes are "one size fits all" and do NOT create more affordable housing. When that became abundantly clear, the goal became "attainable". No provisions for parking and street safety in single family neighborhoods with no sidewalks but planned increased density. In friendship heights we have a "condo canyon" where prices are stable and affordable and the condos do not sell quickly. But we have a terrible shortage of single family homes. The new zoning changes are a giveaway to developers and do not meet the goal of more affordable or attainable housing as the costs will rival those of single family homes, providing profit to developers but no more affordable housing for families or teachers or firefighters who still won't be able to afford the area. We bought our houses with the understanding of the zoning of those houses, you should not be able to change it without a long term planning process.</p>
317	<p>Louise Howe - Bethesda, 20817</p> <p>This is a misguided effort that will not help the people it is intended to help and will hurt others.</p>
318	<p>Yazmin Rowe - Bethesda, 20814</p> <p>I have worked for decades to first obtain and later maintain a life living in a single family home in a single family home neighborhood near the metro. These proposed initiatives take away what I've worked for decades to achieve. It is an assault on the American dream that I as an immigrant Latina sacrificed so much for.</p> <p>Decididamente y especialmente desde el punto de inmigrante latina, me opongo a esta propuesta que me roba de mi logros despues de una vida de trabajo y sacrificio.</p>
319	<p>Drew Miller - Bethesda, 20814</p> <p>I live in Bethesda and I like it - maybe it will be bad for home values, maybe not, but it would be nice to have some more young people in the neighborhood who aren't multi-millionaires.</p>
320	<p>Laurie Halverson - Potomac, 20854</p> <p>I have been paying attention ever since Thrive & I am still against elimination of single family zoning. Homeowners enter into a contract when they obtain a loan for their home, and risk is involved. When you change the zoning after these loans are contracted, it is like cutting someone at the knees. It increases the risk that the value of the home could go down. How is this fair to middle class citizens who currently own homes? In addition, the infrastructure was not planned for multiple homes which need more plumbing , more electricity and more parking. It is an insane thing to do. There are other things you can do, such as change the Metro Center office space which is half occupied, into affordable housing. The planning board is insane to unanimously vote for this....appoint Republicans on the board!</p>

321	<p>David Lewis - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>The entire proposal is based upon the premise that there is a “housing crisis”. In fact there isn’t any such thing. The COG estimates that there will be an 8,000 unit housing shortage in MOCO by 2030. In a county of 1 mill people that’s like a 1% short fall. Hardly a situation justifying zoning changes not favored by residents. Given the changing work patterns, where many more people are working from home and commuting less, it makes better sense to let the free market develop and not mess with the zoning of the single family neighborhoods. This only benefits developers. Thank you.</p>
322	<p>Christopher Cameron - Kensington, MD USA, 20895</p> <p>It sounds like a solution in search of a problem. It also appears to rest on flawed premises. In the description it is stated that MoCo 'is expected to add 200,000 more people over the next 25 years' but also implied that there is not enough housing to do so. At least one of these things must not be true. It is also stated that 'more than a third of the county is still zoned exclusively for single-family housing'. By my math this should mean that almost two-thirds is not. Why not start there?</p> <p>Exactly where are we being told there is this problem? 'The County'? MoCo is a very large county by land area that stretches northward into regions that appear quite rural and sparse. Meanwhile, much (granted not all - but of course this is more true closer to DC) of MoCo's SFH neighborhoods are very old builds/layouts with smallish footprints and <1930s-era road layouts that are already extremely narrow compared to most of the country. It isn't obvious where or why many of the places I'm familiar with would be good candidates to even try to build duplexes, flag lots, nanny flats, let alone 4-over-1s or whatever someone's aspiration (for more property-tax revenue?) here is.</p> <p>In the grand scheme building the occasional duplex here or there is of course not a big deal. But if (and I do not grant this) 'Montgomery County' has a 'housing shortage', whatever that means & however it's defined - this term is thrown around far too sloppily and fuzzily by many - it's far from obvious why the lower-hanging fruit, and larger bang-for-the-buck, wouldn't involve approving and building out in the (apparently many) places that currently do not have built-spaces, rather than this attempt to reach into the 'more than one-third' of places that are SFH. It isn't obvious unless it's driven mostly by ideology, that is.</p>
323	<p>Sheri Cooper - Rockville, 20852</p> <p>What is the percentage of unfilled condos in the area? How many more units are planned? There is already significant building of housing opportunities in the price range you are trying to accommodate. Why are you disturbing established neighborhoods when you could instead be developing multi-family housing neighborhoods instead?</p> <p>Where else has this been done in the country? What were the results as far as property values?</p>
324	<p>Mike Rogers - Silverspring, 20910</p> <p>Thank you all for addressing one of the biggest concerns of the county (affordable housing).</p>

We all aware there is a big supply problem here. Unfortunately much of the crowd attending these meetings was older, retired, existing homeowners, and few younger people who need housing. Please don't let this deter you from doing what the subject matter experts know is right.

The planning board clearly was well prepared and has done a phenomenal job. I just wanted to thank you all for doing a commendable job in the face of some of your harshest critics. Keep up the good work!

325

Ann Joseph - Chevy Chase, 20815

This doesn't solve the problem of the need for low cost housing close to public transportation.. There are areas in the Eastern part of the county that would welcome more multi-family dwellings.. The Connecticut Ave corridor has terrible traffic congestion all day and night...To add more housing is a poor idea.. There are multi -family units close to Purple line...and we still don't know when the line will be completed... This plan is anything but good planning.

326

Catharina Farrell - Kensington, 20895

Hello.

Our names are Catharina and John Farrell, and we live in Kensington. Catharina is a retired Social Studies teacher with the Montgomery County public schools and John is an historian, with a Ph.D. in history. John attended high school in Montgomery County, and together we have lived here since 1990. We bought a single-family 1950s-era home in Kensington by borrowing from relatives and renting with an option to buy for a year. It is our single most important investment, as we now enter our 70s. We have two children, who have confronted the problem of housing affordability. From personal experience, we know the issues of availability and affordability.

We live within the Town of Kensington, which has an historic district and a unique feel, and are opposed to the plan to rezone 82% of the single family neighborhoods in the county, ending a long practice and tradition of single-family zoning, under which tens of thousands of Montgomery County residents bought houses as homes and investments.

We question if the county needs this radical proposal, given the adjusted recent housing targets and the huge amount of already planned-for housing. We are concerned about the impact multi-family housing will have on our existing neighborhoods.

- Despite the scare headlines of the county council press releases, according to the data provided by Marc Elrich's office, there is no current housing "crisis." There may well be an affordable housing crisis, but this proposal does not address affordability.

- Housing targets need to reflect projected job growth, and job growth projections have recently been revised downward. The county currently is projected to house all the people that will move here to fill those jobs.

-There are already 30,000 units in the pipeline – approved but not yet built.

-The sector plan, that was agreed to in 2012, allows for high density, town center type projects to be built close to mass transit. There was a long, open process in which communities were consulted, and had input into the plan, solicited by candid, responsive planning representatives. Much of this commercial and residential space has yet to be built. Why is the Master Plan ignored? Why not build what has already been approved?

We know that the character of our town of Kensington will be significantly altered if the planned town center is built near our Marc train station. But our downtown, where we have channeled denser housing development with great success, is surrounded by streets in the town of Kensington and neighboring communities like Rock Creek Hills, with single family houses that we thought were protected. Now you propose to open those residential streets to -plexes and apartment buildings. This is a double gift to developers. And it is bait and switch, unworthy of the Montgomery County tradition of honest, open, liberal government. At the time the master plan was presented to us for our input, there was no mention of ending single family zoning in the surrounding neighborhoods.

As far as we can tell, there are no requirements for a developer to provide community benefits – green space, parkland, school land, impact taxes or other compensating amenities – just a “by right” authority to build, build and build and give nothing back to the community. There is no local review. The “by right” authority goes straight to the building permit process.

And, as the county executive has warned, there are no protections – and in fact this proposal may provide incentives – for out of state real estate speculators to buy up blocs of housing for redevelopment. Nor is there any requirement that these new plexes be owner occupied, meaning rents and maintenance may be decided by absentee out of state landlords.

- The Marc Train station has been grouped with Metro when identifying areas to build high density housing. As the county executive has noted, it may make sense to build more dense housing close to Metro stops, but the Marc does not carry anywhere close to the same number of passengers that Metro does. Metro stops every 15 minutes at Strathmore and Forest Glen while the Marc stops some 10 times a day in Kensington.
- Since only one parking space is allowed per unit in the new zoning plan, on-street parking will pack the residential streets. Many of our streets are already not wide enough to accommodate both traffic and cars parked on each side.
- Little thought, as far as we can see, has been given to the loss of tree canopy, storm water runoff, and additional traffic. Ours is a community where Silver Creek and Rock Creek are prone to massive flooding.
- The planners cannot tell us how many multi-family units will be built and where and at what cost. Some areas of the county may see little impact, others like Potomac are exempted, and still other areas many see their neighborhood completely changed and filled with - plexes. With this new zoning, it is left up the individual property owner and the developers to decide the neighborhood’s density – not our town council or our county government.

There will be no government requirements to stop developers from building McMansions wherever they find a property worth a teardown – if they find that they can’t make more money squeezing an apartment building into a neighborhood.

As for affordability, the nearby townhome complexes, at Strathmore and Chevy Chase Lake cost from \$1.4 million and up. Yet two single-family houses on our street in Kensington just sold for \$700,000 and \$800,000. You tell me which house a young teacher or fireman and his or her family will be better able to afford.

There are many houses, on both sides of Connecticut Avenue, protected by the strictures of Kensington’s historic preservation district. We are realists in Kensington: faced with the problem of the Circle Manor mansion/nursing home, we worked hard for years to reach a satisfactory condition in which a developer came up with a plan we all could endorse. We acquiesced to the train station town center. We are not NIMBY-ists. We are proud that we have affordable housing in our small town. But this meat-ax, trigger-happy zoning change throws all those careful considerations out the door to meet a non-existent “crisis.”

Given that there is not an immediate housing crisis, and given the enormous impact multi-family housing could have on neighborhoods, we believe we should slow down.

This new zoning plan should be broken down into steps, with local review of development plans – not “by right” authority. It is important to get input from all the stakeholders and that includes the people living in the neighborhoods. And, just as important as gaining neighborhood support: start small. Instead of building triplexes and fourplexes, allow a restricted number of duplexes with local review. Over time, evaluate how denser housing has impacted affordability and availability and affected neighborhoods. With flexibility built into the zoning plan, adjustments can be made as it rolls out.

Do not pass this drastic, radical plan.

Thank you.

Catharina Farrell and John A. Farrell, Ph.D.

327

Rose Sather - Bethesda, 20817

I believe the Attainable Housing Strategy Montgomery County council members are supporting would put the community at risk. There are already overcrowded schools and MCPS (I am a 1991 graduate of MCPS) and MCPS has seen a decline in performance due to the strain of overcrowding. Additionally, home values, traffic, and the environment should factor in to this decision. There are areas within Montgomery County where affordable housing exists close to public transportation, so there are always other options.

328

Susanna Parker - Silver Spring, 20906

I wholly support the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. Many neighborhoods, especially those close to our urban centers, should have varying types of housing instead of only single family homes. As long as there are reasonable restrictions on building size and height so as to not stick out like a sore thumb, duplexes, triplexes, townhouses, and small garden apartments should be allowed in neighborhoods currently zoned for SFH.

Two anecdotes: in my 20s I lived in a two-story building divided into four apartments, and it was the most affordable housing I've ever lived in. Considering how prices have soared over the last decade and a half, increasing this type of housing is imperative. I want other young professionals to have the same opportunity that I did, to live independently without breaking the bank. Second anecdote: I currently live in a neighborhood north of Kensington, and while the majority of homes are single family, there are two sections of townhomes on either end of the neighborhood. They do not impact our home value or our quality of life whatsoever, and I think more neighborhoods should incorporate that type of housing. Especially those close to public transit.

329

Elizabeth Kellar - Bethesda, 20817

While I support increased density close to transit, land values in Bethesda will lead to expensive duplexes on single family lots. We already have upper middle class homes getting torn down so a developer can replace an \$800,000+ home with a multi-million house. Whether clear cutting properties for a quadplex or for a mansion, there are environmental concerns that must be addressed.

In my view, we will need government subsidies or different loan terms to create and sustain our shrinking middle class housing.

Ian Swank - Silver Spring, 20901

Dear Council Members,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Montgomery County Planning Board's Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHS). While the initiative aims to increase housing diversity and affordability, several critical issues need to be addressed before moving forward.

I live in the Sligo Woods neighborhood of Silver Spring. This small neighborhood is sandwiched between University Boulevard and Sligo Creek Park, about a mile from Four Corners. We are a diverse neighborhood filled with middle class families who have worked hard to own a house with a small back yard to spend our non-working hours enjoying. We are the people Montgomery County has recently raised property taxes on to finance ever-increasing expenditures. We enjoy our neighborhood as is. If we wanted to live in an urban environment, we would have chosen to live several miles away in Washington, DC.

Key Concerns:

Lack of Data and Analysis: The AHS fails to present comprehensive data on housing needs and existing zoning laws. This oversight raises questions about the necessity and effectiveness of the proposed upzoning.

Impact on Property Rights: The proposed upzoning of 82% of single-family lots in Montgomery County represents a significant alteration of property rights. Such drastic changes should be carefully reviewed and justified with thorough analysis and public input.

Environmental and Infrastructure Concerns: The AHS does not adequately consider the environmental impact, increased demand on municipal services, or the potential for increased congestion and parking issues.

In addition to the above infrastructure concerns, this misguided proposal will have an enormous detrimental impact on our already overcrowded schools. I urge the council to gather unbiased, accurate data on how many additional students this proposal will bring into the county, and to publish the data to the public.

Public Input and Transparency: The public input sessions were poorly publicized and timed during vacation months, resulting in minimal attendance and limited opportunity for residents to voice their concerns.

Personally, I will always choose to live in a single family zoning area. If the county chooses to do away with this, I, and many tax-paying families like mine, will be choosing to seek the sort of neighborhood we desire elsewhere.

I urge the council to reconsider the AHS and ensure that any changes to zoning laws are based on accurate data, comprehensive analysis, and meaningful public engagement. The potential consequences of this initiative are too significant to proceed without addressing these fundamental issues.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Ian Swank

331

David Schopfer - Chevy Chase, 20815

Appreciate the listening sessions to share the concept. As a board member of my local community group, I know that many individuals are supportive of more housing options and more density, but the devil is always in the details. Communities want to know that zoning changes for each neighborhood need to be considered uniquely. It would be helpful to include communities and incorporate their needs into plans. Using a one size fits all approach is not going to be well received and could create additional problems without providing more middle income housing.

332

Benjamin Wolff - SILVER SPRING, 20910-2712

I support the initiative. Don't let the vocal minority outweigh the needs of the greater community.

333

Kathy Kirvan - Kensington, 20895

We are whole heartedly against this Initiative. We specifically chose our neighborhood because of the single family character. The County has no right to change the historic nature of our properties.

334

Ronni Jolles - Chevy Chase, 20815

I'm not sure if my voice will make any difference with this council, but I hope you don't approve the new housing initiative. Our neighborhood is filled with older single family homes. Many, like ours, were built in the 1930's & it feels like a bait & switch with your new plan to bring multi family housing. For once - please - stop changing things - . I know that on our street, there are 2 elderly people & 3 families like ours who are not rich by any means, & I don't see a lot of wealth here EXCEPT for one issue - perhaps you can protect the old homes & stop the constant knock-downs of the old charming homes for new fancy ones. THAT could truly accomplish your goal of keeping the charm of the old & probably dissuade the very wealthy from moving in , knocking down the old & building huge new homes. That would be a win win and although I don't think you listen to this, I hope you might see the value I not allowing knock - downs for new big fancy homes. Thanks.

335	<p>Stephen Hathaway - Bethesda, 20817</p> <p>This is a terrible idea which seems to only benefit the developers. On a small scale it will destroy neighborhoods and make the dream of owning a home even more difficult. Not sure if you have seen the prices of townhouses in Bethesda but if you drop one in a neighborhood its not going to solve a "crisis" its going to create a free for all for developers to over pay for older homes, tear them down, build townhouses, and sell for 2x what that 1 house was sold for. This is a Bad idea.</p>
336	<p>Jacob Bardin - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I strongly support the initiative to increase housing density in Montgomery county, especially in areas with access to Metro. The values that many of us share: equality of opportunity, sustainability and diversity are all driven, to varying degrees, by housing density. That said, for pragmatic reasons I suggest a gradual approach. Allowing multi-family homes (or at least duplexes) in the current single family home footprint seems like a great first step, and where I suggest we start. Thanks!</p>
337	<p>Frank Kauffman - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>While I support efforts to help provide more housing opportunities in the country, the proposed initiative will not accomplish the goal. My understanding is that the new homes would be sold at market rates that would keep the housing out of the reach of the people the initiative ostensibly is designed to serve. It would also threaten the character of neighborhoods like mine - "new" Rollingwood, which is comprised of single-family homes mostly built in the 1960s. You need to go back to the drawing board on this.</p>
338	<p>Tyler Morgan-Wall - Silver Spring, 20910</p> <p>Hello,</p> <p>As a concerned Montgomery County resident and father of a young child, I wish to express my reservations regarding the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHSI). While I support responsible growth and development, I am deeply troubled by the lack of detailed analysis and planning concerning the infrastructure impacts of this proposal, particularly on local schools.</p> <p>My primary concern is the potential strain on Woodlin Elementary and other schools in the area. Woodlin has already faced overcrowding issues this year. The county's current approach to addressing school capacity relies on a one-time fee for additional housing units—the school impact tax—which charges developers approximately \$1,000 per unit for multifamily low-rise and \$600 per unit for multifamily high-rise housing.</p> <p>The school impact tax calculation is based on the following formula:</p> <p>Average # of Students per Unit × School Construction Cost per Student = Impact Tax per Unit</p>

However, this approach appears inadequate given current circumstances. A new elementary school was recently built in our area due to capacity concerns, yet it is already nearly at capacity. That project took five years and cost \$48 million. To fund a similar school with impact tax revenue, 40,000–50,000 new housing units would need to be built. Even under the most optimistic Student Generation Rate assumptions for our neighborhood (0.07–0.1 students per unit), we could see an influx of up to 4,000 additional students before another school could be constructed. Where will these children go in the meantime? Even assuming only a fraction of these 4,000 students attend Woodlin (with the rest distributed across growth corridors), our elementary school has limited capacity for further growth. The recent expansion only increased capacity from 450 to 650 students, and many classrooms are already at capacity.

It's also important to note that School Impact Taxes do not account for the cost of land, which is at a premium inside the beltway. We are simply not in a position to build another school in our neighborhood in the foreseeable future. Will we resort to trailers? Further overcrowding? Redistricting? Increased taxes to fund new schools? These critical questions demand clear answers—not the vague responses we've received so far.

Additionally, the Planning Board's reliance on existing school impact taxes is problematic because these taxes are based on outdated area classifications:

- * Infill Impact Areas – High housing growth, predominantly in multifamily units, which generate relatively fewer students per unit.
- * Turnover Impact Areas – Low housing growth where enrollment trends depend largely on the turnover of existing single-family units.
- * Greenfield Impact Areas – High housing growth predominantly in the form of single-family units, consequently experiencing high enrollment growth. (The 2020–2024 Growth and Infrastructure Policy currently classifies no areas as Greenfield.)

However, the AHSI effectively turns all growth corridors where rezoning is proposed into de facto Greenfield Impact Areas, resulting in much higher enrollment growth than the current impact tax structure anticipates. This will likely lead to significant underfunding for capital costs associated with new schools. Since these tax rates are only adjusted after enrollment data is collected and problems are observed, neighborhoods that experience early development will suffer from overcrowding long before any adjustments are made. Indeed, in FY24, we saw significant (60%) growth in student generation rates for multifamily housing compared to FY22-23. These fees are not retroactive, and the current tax system is not designed for the rapid and unprecedented rate of growth that the AHSI will allow. Given the overcrowding we already face, this misalignment between projected growth and financial planning could exacerbate infrastructure challenges, particularly in established, developed areas like ours.

The Planning Board has "addressed" these concerns with the following statement:

"Increased Demands on Infrastructure While impacts on infrastructure (schools, transportation, water and sewer) are likely to be minimal, these can be addressed through existing policies including those contained in the Growth and Infrastructure Policy. For example, attainable

housing options are subject to existing transportation and school impact tax payments and any applicable Utilization Premium Payments to mitigate impacts on crowded schools."

This response is dismissive and fails to address how a county-wide rezoning policy will disproportionately affect already-dense, mature neighborhoods. What assumptions or analyses support the claim that infrastructure impacts will be "minimal"? If this analysis is based on countywide averages, it could obscure the fact that certain neighborhoods will be disproportionately impacted. This is vital information that should be thoroughly examined before moving forward with such a sweeping proposal. While some less-developed areas of Montgomery County may have room for new schools and infrastructure expansions, this is not feasible inside the beltway. Neighborhoods are not interchangeable, and the lack of specific planning for inevitable infrastructure impacts is deeply troubling.

Our children deserve a more thoughtful response regarding how their education will be affected than "it's probably going to be okay."

Additionally, I am concerned about the environmental impact of this proposal, specifically the increase in impermeable surfaces and the resulting pollution in Sligo Creek, which is already heavily burdened by the current population density.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Council to reconsider the AHSI in its current form and conduct a more thorough analysis of its potential impacts. The existing analysis does not adequately support the vast changes being proposed, and our community deserves careful consideration.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

339

Jade Wexler - Chevy Chase, Chevy Chase

I am shocked that this is happening. This does not even achieve anything to do with affordable housing. All this does is help greedy developers. This is a real problem with implications for parking, traffic, environment issues, and school issues too. Please preserve our neighborhood!

340

Tyler Morgan-Wall - Silver Spring, 20910

Hello,

As a concerned Montgomery County resident and father of a young child, I wish to express my reservations regarding the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHSI). While I support responsible growth and development, I am deeply troubled by the lack of detailed analysis and planning concerning the infrastructure impacts of this proposal, particularly on local schools.

My primary concern is the potential strain on Woodlin Elementary and other schools in the area. Woodlin has already faced overcrowding issues this year. The county's current approach to addressing school capacity relies on a one-time fee for additional housing units—the

school impact tax—which charges developers approximately \$1,000 per unit for multifamily low-rise and \$600 per unit for multifamily high-rise housing.

The school impact tax calculation is based on the following formula:

Average # of Students per Unit × School Construction Cost per Student = Impact Tax per Unit

However, this approach appears inadequate given current circumstances. A new elementary school was recently built in our area due to capacity concerns, yet it is already nearly at capacity. That project took five years and cost \$48 million. To fund a similar school with impact tax revenue, 40,000–50,000 new housing units would need to be built. Even under the most optimistic Student Generation Rate assumptions for our neighborhood (0.07–0.1 students per unit), we could see an influx of up to 4,000 additional students before another school could be constructed. Where will these children go in the meantime? Even assuming only a fraction of these 4,000 students attend Woodlin (with the rest distributed across growth corridors), our elementary school has limited capacity for further growth. The recent expansion only increased capacity from 450 to 650 students, and many classrooms are already at capacity.

It's also important to note that School Impact Taxes do not account for the cost of land, which is at a premium inside the beltway. We are simply not in a position to build another school in our neighborhood in the foreseeable future. Will we resort to trailers? Further overcrowding? Redistricting? Increased taxes to fund new schools? These critical questions demand clear answers—not the vague responses we've received so far.

Additionally, the Planning Board's reliance on existing school impact taxes is problematic because these taxes are based on outdated area classifications:

- * Infill Impact Areas – High housing growth, predominantly in multifamily units, which generate relatively fewer students per unit.
- * Turnover Impact Areas – Low housing growth where enrollment trends depend largely on the turnover of existing single-family units.
- * Greenfield Impact Areas – High housing growth predominantly in the form of single-family units, consequently experiencing high enrollment growth. (The 2020–2024 Growth and Infrastructure Policy currently classifies no areas as Greenfield.)

However, the AHSI effectively turns all growth corridors where rezoning is proposed into de facto Greenfield Impact Areas, resulting in much higher enrollment growth than the current impact tax structure anticipates. This will likely lead to significant underfunding for capital costs associated with new schools. Since these tax rates are only adjusted after enrollment data is collected and problems are observed, neighborhoods that experience early development will suffer from overcrowding long before any adjustments are made. Indeed, in FY24, we saw significant (60%) growth in student generation rates for multifamily housing compared to FY22-23. These fees are not retroactive, and the current tax system is not designed for the rapid and unprecedented rate of growth that the AHSI will allow. Given the overcrowding

we already face, this misalignment between projected growth and financial planning could exacerbate infrastructure challenges, particularly in established, developed areas like ours.

The Planning Board has "addressed" these concerns with the following statement:

"Increased Demands on Infrastructure While impacts on infrastructure (schools, transportation, water and sewer) are likely to be minimal, these can be addressed through existing policies including those contained in the Growth and Infrastructure Policy. For example, attainable housing options are subject to existing transportation and school impact tax payments and any applicable Utilization Premium Payments to mitigate impacts on crowded schools."

This response is dismissive and fails to address how a county-wide rezoning policy will disproportionately affect already-dense, mature neighborhoods. What assumptions or analyses support the claim that infrastructure impacts will be "minimal"? If this analysis is based on countywide averages, it could obscure the fact that certain neighborhoods will be disproportionately impacted. This is vital information that should be thoroughly examined before moving forward with such a sweeping proposal. While some less-developed areas of Montgomery County may have room for new schools and infrastructure expansions, this is not feasible inside the beltway. Neighborhoods are not interchangeable, and the lack of specific planning for inevitable infrastructure impacts is deeply troubling.

Our children deserve a more thoughtful response regarding how their education will be affected than "it's probably going to be okay."

Additionally, I am concerned about the environmental impact of this proposal, specifically the increase in impermeable surfaces and the resulting pollution in Sligo Creek, which is already heavily burdened by the current population density.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Council to reconsider the AHSI in its current form and conduct a more thorough analysis of its potential impacts. The existing analysis does not adequately support the vast changes being proposed, and our community deserves careful consideration.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Marlene Kaplan - Chevy Chase, 20815

341

We've lived in Rollingwood for 26 years. In that time, we've seen almost all the ramblers around the corner on Winnett replaced with \$2-3M houses shoe-horned into the property. It looks like a completely different place. If you wanted affordable housing, why let them bulldoze the affordable ramblers? Now you want to allow multi-unit dwellings which would dramatically change our neighborhood and impact our environment, our schools, traffic and parking. We don't believe they would sell at affordable prices. We imagine developers will continue to buy up any relatively affordable homes and replace them with 4 units at \$1-2M each. Please kill this terribly misguided proposal and save our single family homes, our trees, our walkable streets, our schools and the general character of our lovely neighborhood.