

342

### **Joseph Wheatley - Chevy Chase, 20815**

The new “attainable housing” proposal is a sham. It would not provide low-cost housing. If approved, the proposal would impose a sweeping zoning change that would have damaging economic effects in many areas of the County.

The “attainable housing” proposal is not about affordability. It appears to be part of a much wider, national effort to eliminate single-family zoning, to open up large new profit and revenue streams for real estate builders and investors. Other regions across the country are also being pushed to adopt the same kinds of proposals.

The plan would cancel much of Montgomery County’s single-family zoning and provide a wide-open field for developers to put multiplex condos on the small lots in many of the existing communities.

- Every available lot could be used as a tear-down to maximize much higher profit. Why build a single-family home, or even a duplex, when you can put a 4-unit quad on the lot and sell each unit for \$1 million or more?
- The way the economic incentives are designed, it’s doubtful that much of the older housing stock would survive in some areas. The neighborhood lots could fall like dominos, as developers outbid families to buy up nearly every house on the market and replace it with a high-price / high-rent quad.
- There is no economic basis to assume that only a handful of multiplexes would be built.

The proposal sets no limit on how many neighborhood properties could be torn down for multiplexes. Century-old communities could see intense demolition and condo construction, with quads stacked on block after block.

Under the proposed plan, the new units would sell or rent at market rates. None of the new housing would have to be even remotely affordable.

- The existing requirements for lower-priced affordable units apply only when a residential development site includes 20 housing units or more. The pending County plan allows up to 19 units on a site. That certainly does seem to signal that affordable housing is not the intent of the proposal.

- Since there is no mandate for affordability, the zoning change is likely to do little or nothing to improve integration, produce “missing middle” housing, or provide financially "attainable" housing options for the thousands of County residents who earn less than \$50,000 a year.
- At present, the small older houses that still remain in many single-family neighborhoods are an important supply of “missing middle” housing. Re-zoning would make it highly lucrative for developers to bulldoze them.

The potential profits for private developers are so large that the new zoning could produce a tidal wave of neighborhood multiplexes and environmental destruction – with enormous costs for the communities that would have to deal with the congestion and infrastructure effects.

Putting quads on just 25% of the lots would double the local population. A full block of quads would put 80 households on streets that now have 20.

Here’s what that kind of increased density would mean in the existing single-family neighborhoods:

- dangerous traffic overloads on the narrow suburban streets, with hundreds of additional cars, service vans, and delivery trucks.
- a significant decrease in pedestrian safety.
- massive neighborhood parking problems. One version of the proposed plan would make that even worse by reducing the requirement for developers to build off-street parking.
- more transportation gridlock on the down-county arteries.
- more school overcrowding.
- lower air quality as a result of the congestion. That has a public health impact.
- extensive flooding and storm-water damage in the communities where the old infrastructure is already overwhelmed every time it rains.
- widespread environmental damage: significant loss of the tree canopy, permeable surfaces, yards, gardens, and green space. We have already experienced some of this loss when developers clear-cut the old lots and stretch the existing building code to the limit.
- It takes decades to produce suburbs with mature tree canopies. They are immensely valuable; they reduce air pollution for the region, help control water run-off, and reduce heat islands. The multiplex buildings in the County plan would leave no room for canopy trees on a typical lot.
- It’s not yet clear whether towns would be able to maintain the setbacks, height, and other regulations in their building codes. Zoning changes can override local municipal ordinances.

Small towns like Somerset could potentially be bankrupted by the infrastructure costs. Many of the older municipalities were not built with the infrastructure capacity to handle denser housing loads. Adding a few small accessory units may be manageable. Doubling or tripling the current housing density is not.

- The "attainable housing" proposal omits any fiscal impact analysis. Who pays to rebuild the streets for heavier traffic? Who pays to double the town's sewer-line capacity?
- Who pays to upgrade the old community gas lines, electric grid, and storm drains?
- How much would it cost each town just to handle double the volume of trash collection?
- How many new fire hydrants would it take to meet the fire code? What if the old community water lines don't supply enough pressure to make the additional hydrants work? Is the town liable? Would it have to install new water mains?

To put 50 quads in a new housing development, the builder would have to provide the infrastructure. But if you put the same 50 quads on the old lots in a neighborhood, none of the individual builders would have to face responsibility for the community capacity. The proposed zoning change could inflict crushing costs on the local municipalities. Retrofitting the infrastructure in older communities can be far more expensive and difficult than installing the infrastructure for a new housing development. There is no data to show that "impact fees" and town tax revenues could come even close to covering the costs.

What a bonanza for developers, to be able to construct, sell and rent high-profit multiplexes "by right" on lot after lot, with no obligation to build the necessary community infrastructure or provide a single unit of affordable housing. It is inexcusable to do that anywhere – and even more indefensible to do it under the guise of "attainable housing."

- Who would benefit from this zoning change? The developers, real estate investors, and the giant private capital firms that are buying up the housing in neighborhoods all over the country.
- Who would be harmed? The people of Montgomery County. Replacing existing neighborhoods with expensive multiplexes would have a profound societal cost. We and our neighbors are part of a warm, complex, inclusive multicultural community that people have been building for generations. That community provides the essential support network for young families and elders; it has been life-saving at times. When a neighborhood is re-zoned, it's not just the trees and houses that are lost.
- The first round of new multiplex development is likely to inflate property values as developers bid up the price of the lots. The second stage could see a glut of high-price multiplexes, with depressed property values for the remaining single-family homes that are surrounded by quads and congestion.

There is no objective basis to give developers a free pass to build multiplexes at the expense of the residential neighborhoods. County Executive Marc Elrich opposes the zoning plan, noting that there is no data to show that this drastic zoning change is required to meet the need for affordable housing. Elrich is right to take a practical approach: Instead of setting off an uproar about zoning, the County should compile the relevant data, identify where additional low-cost housing is needed, and then focus on providing it. Some projects are already being built; more are in the pipeline with construction permits already approved. Elrich and others point out that the proposed zoning initiative has no sound factual basis – the premise is not based on accurate data – and the proposed plan is no solution – it would produce high-price condos and substantial neighborhood damage, not affordable housing.

Reasonable Alternatives: It would make economic sense to add low-cost and “missing middle” housing in the County job centers where (1) the future job growth will occur, (2) the infrastructure capacity is already in place, and (3) the transportation impact would be much lower. There are many ways to do that.

- One obvious suggestion: Instead of tearing up the neighborhoods, give the developers incentives to convert the 20% vacant office space in downtown Silver Spring, Bethesda, White Oak, Wheaton and White Flint into accessible, affordable housing. Do this right: Put new housing where the jobs are, and require at least 30% of those new housing units to actually be affordable.
- It is also entirely possible to keep the current single-family zoning intact in the interior of each neighborhood, and limit the denser multiplex development to a zone within 500 feet along the “growth corridors” like Connecticut Avenue. Any approval of higher density in any area should include explicit requirements for affordability, adequate infrastructure, sufficient off-street parking, tree canopy, etc.

Proposed Planning Review: In response to the strong immediate public objections to the “attainable housing” strategy, the County Planning officials have now proposed to review the impact 2-4 years after the plan is adopted. That is not an acceptable response.

- In 2-4 years, the damage will already be done. Hundreds of homes may already be demolished by that point, because the zoning change would create a profit premium for fast action (the first builders to construct the new multiplexes are likely to reap the highest profits).
- The pledge to review the effects is so vague that it is meaningless: There is no available documentation that identifies the review’s proposed methodology, the criteria, or the factors that might be assessed.
- And there is certainly no need to “wait to see how this plays out,” as one County Planning staff member recently suggested. The economics are basic. The outcome is well known, readily apparent in countless examples of neighborhoods that now have a few surviving single-family homes in a sea of multiplexes and townhouses.

Questionable Government Procedure: Ending 100 years of single-family zoning is such an enormous change that it should be evaluated within the County Master Plan process, with full public analysis, notice, and hearings, not treated as just a zoning text amendment (ZTA). The Montgomery County Council used to care about good government process. Citizens, local municipalities, County and state government officials, and community organizations should insist on a Master Plan review process here.

There is an additional cost factor for the County Council to consider: Zoning changes of this magnitude can trigger expensive, protracted lawsuits. Several jurisdictions in Virginia are now being sued for canceling single-family zoning. Montgomery County can prevent such litigation by leaving the current zoning in place. The legal costs of the re-zoning plan could be significant; the “attainable housing” proposal is so problematic that it may be difficult to defend. Fiscal prudence applies here: Use our tax dollars for housing, not for zoning litigation.

Summary: 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

	<p>“attainable housing” proposal would maximize attainable profits, not affordable housing. The proposed re-zoning is economically damaging and contrary to the public interest.</p>
343	<p><b>Susan Geolot - Bethesda, 20817</b></p> <p>This proposal would ruin the character of our neighborhoods and drive taxpayers like me away from the area.</p>
344	<p><b>Meredith Barry - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>I am against the proposed attainable housing strategies initiative. I understand and agree that affordable housing needs to be addressed in this county, but this initiative is not that. It would add additional multi-million dollar condos/duplexes to single-family neighborhoods. Pushing people out of those neighborhoods, and doing the opposite of the initiative's original goals. In addition, no studies on density, parking, infrastructure, traffic, etc. have been conducted. This initiative will only increase the gap that is occurring (and add more issues), not help fix the affordable housing crisis in Montgomery County.</p>
345	<p><b>Matthew Oberhofer - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>This is a horrible idea that only benefits developers. I'm urging you to not allow this to get passed and help to preserve the charm and beauty that is Chevy Chase. Infrastructure alone can't handle this as the roads are already crowded that have many children and bikers occupying them.</p>
346	<p><b>Paula Whyman - Bethesda, 20817</b></p> <p>This is a terrible idea. You are destroying the soul of this county by this amendment. Single family homes and neighborhoods are the heart of American culture. This zoning amendment uses false and misleading language to pretend that it helps poorer, lower income people. Why are you trying to exploit lower income people to push an amendment that benefits wealthy developers and builders. There is plenty of housing in moco in the form of town homes and apartments and condos, of lower prices and great style. This initiative is terrible.</p>
347	<p><b>Dee Clarkin - Silver Spring, 20910</b></p> <p>I write in opposition and strong concern about the proposal from the context of a resident of Woodside Forest in Silver Spring -- a neighborhood with already compact housing, majority sidewalk-less streets, and proximity to heavily travelled corridors (Georgia Ave and Colesville Rd). Adding double the cars, based on the proposal of replacing single family homes with duplexes (never mind triplexes) would be a disaster in our tightly congested streets, which are already hazardous to pedestrians.</p> <p>My other concern with this proposal is that there seems to be no connection with environmental planning -- especially storm water management. Larger roofs and additional driveways/sidewalks with impermeable surfaces poses a significant problem in our compact, hilly neighborhood. My own house on Russell is a case in point. We receive the storm water run off from the homes above us. If those houses were replaced with larger structures and larger roofs -- it would be a disaster. Rainfall is only increasing (see:</p>

<https://cnsmaryland.org/2021/10/13/maryland-is-seeing-an-increase-in-precipitation-sea-level-and-flooding/#:~:text=Over%20the%20past%2020%20years,per%20decade%2C%20according%20to%20NOAA>) and will continue to increase as we continue to warm the atmosphere. There is literally no where for the water to go -- my neighbor and I have spent significant amounts on water management for our yards and I don't know what else we can do to address the water. Would the newly built duplexes have green roofs? Doubtful.

My last objection is the fact that this proposal is supposed to provide "attainable" housing for more folks -- a worthy goal. However, what would prevent developers and investors from buying these new duplexes and turn our stable, predominantly owner-occupied neighborhood into a priority renter neighborhood? How would this increase home ownership in the county?

I oppose this proposal in its current form.

348

**Angelica Freeman - Kensington, 20895**

Agree with Mr. Ehrlich.

349

**Chester Stein - Bethesda, 20814**

I live in an area near Old Georgetown Road. We have already faced the unpopular decision of narrowing this corridor by placing poorly designed and rarely utilized bike lanes. I realize we have the State Highway Administration to blame for that. This "touted" plan has simply caused traffic congestion and dangerous turning patterns. There are already major housing projects underway adjacent to Old Georgetown Road as well as a new high school which will all complicate this corridor further.

Now you want to add multiplex units into the single family neighborhoods which will only cause more traffic and parking issues. What about the economic ramifications to the individual homeowners? If you own a private home, do you want a multiplex built next door to you?

This is absolutely the wrong approach to the problem and will only prove detrimental to the County in the long run.

350

**Edmund Rice - Bethesda, 20816**

I am opposed to the zoning changes contemplated in the Attainable Housing Strategies. The Council should preserve single family zoning, which is essential to the character and attractiveness of Bethesda and other county communities. I will vote against any Council member who supports the AHS.

351	<b>Sherwin Freeman - Kensington, 20895</b>  I agree with Mr. Erlich
352	<b>Susan Kulp - Bethesda, 20817</b>  While the goal of attainable housing is a good one, the implementation of this proposal falls extremely short. First, there is no attention paid to the infrastructure. Many schools are already over-crowded. How will bringing in multi-family housing affect the quality of the education and other infrastructure support? Additionally, current homeowners bought into a neighborhood and a way of life. Multi-family units add more cars, more traffic, and more people to an otherwise quiet street. This is not what people selected. Finally, and perhaps most important, adding multi-family units to an expensive neighborhood will result in expensive multi-family units. These units are not going to sell for pennies on the dollar. Rather, they will be luxurious condos. Look at any of the "centers" as examples. The apartments/condos in Pike and Rose and Downtown Bethesda are not any cheaper or more attainable.
353	<b>Margaret Savage-Johnson - Bethesda, 20816-1843</b>  Thoughts on the concept of Up Zoning in Montgomery county. I am against it. The proposal noted that the housing would be market rate. This will not give us affordable middle income housing. Right now the law requires 15% of new build to be affordable. That is NOT ENOUGH. It should be 30% at a minimum with a percentage for low income and then middle income. Simple change can have a positive affect. I agree the Up zoning will also present infrastructure issues and congestion. What I have seen of the Council is they do not think about the effects of their proposal, do no due diligence, surveys or reviews of the issues. Other areas have tried this and it is not successful. You also have to think about what and how people want from their home. Many do not want a small apartment with no back yard. Much more research and thought needs to go into helping to create more housing but up zoning is not it.
354	<b>Diana Mysliwec - Chevy Chase, 20815</b>  This plan appears to be a fraudulent land grab on the part of developers in cahoots with the Count Council and the committee on Parks and Planning, designed to line their own pockets. It is NOT a plan to provide attainable housing. I would like to see an investigation into the connections between housing developers and our elected officials. The people of Montgomery County are not being well served here.
355	<b>grant davies - CHEVY CHASE, 20815</b>  I attended the listening session held at BCC. I have grouped my comments: Data: I was surprised by how little data was available to support the Planning Board recommendation -- particularly given the PLanning Board worked on this issue for 3 years. The Planning Board President said one of the drivers of the change was that 26,000 residents had left the County since 2006 because of housing cost. We are a very large county and 26,000 does not strike me as a reason for such fundamental change. I also do not believe that one can attribute one cuase to why 26,000 left the County -- for example many fire fighters

live outside the County -- from my 20 years as a MCFRS volunteer suggests there are many other reasons. I strongly believe we need data on the implications on traffic, schooling, health care, etc of these changes are required.

Duplexes VS Tri and Quadplexes: I was brought up in Montreal West, Canada -- a town of single family houses and attached duplexes. This model worked well and there was a strong sense of community -- so I can see how this model could work in Chevy Chase but there is no way a sense of community can be maintained if we start building quad plexes and triplexes.

Attainable VS Affordable: Based on what I have seen in the down-county I believe Attainable housing is an oxymoron -- just one example from 47th St and West in Chevy Chase makes the point -- one small house replaced by 4 \$3.5 million plexes -- these do nothing to address affordable housing and do not provide attainable housing for the vast majority of Montgomery County residents. I think the Council has to recognize Attainable housing is a laudable goal it is highly unlikely to be achievable.

Conclusion: On balance I see an opportunity for duplexes/semi detached in Chevy Chase and something to be pursued -- assuming there is data to support this recommendation but I do not see nor can I support triplexes and quadplexes within single family housing areas in the County.

356

**OPHELIA YEUNG - Bethesda, 20817**

Although our voices seem to be drown out by those of our neighbors, some of us are supportive of the attainable housing strategies initiative including proposed zoning changes in the single-family neighborhoods. It's very disappointing to hear that so many people put their own interests ahead of collective interest, NIMBY at its worst. Please know that the opposition is far from universal but just like our recent sidewalk plans that also got shot down, the complaining voices are the loudest.

Their strongest argument (when they are pretending that they are not selfish or afraid of change) is that the new housing is not "affordable" and therefore will not solve the housing crisis. I hope safeguards and plans can be proposed so that people feel that their "sacrifice" in allowing change, tolerating more density and "overcrowding" and parking problems will clearly benefit middle class people and not only the developers.

357

**Chuck Apfelbeck - Silver Spring, 20901**

Absolutely not, This will not result in affordable housing. It will only result in more housing but at the same or higher pricing, it has happened before. We are not being told the truth about this, we are being misled! The most unfortunate parts of this proposal is that it will result in too much undue stress on the current infrastructure, parking, sewer, power grid, etc., and traffic that is already beyond maximum capacity, and actually will make people's life more uncomfortable for an unobtainable (and dishonestly presented) end product for their own disingenuous reasons.

It is not acceptable for Government to dictate any individuals' quality of life under any circumstances.

358

**Dale Barnhard - Silver Spring, 20906**

attended Wednesday night's listening session at BCC high school and was not called upon to state my views as follows:



First and foremost, I resent being called "EXCLUSIONARY" by owning a home. I worked as a house painter for almost 30 years with an average income never exceeding \$21,000 in any given year. I saved, I was frugal, I invested so I could buy a small condo. And eventually working up to being able to purchase a small home in downtown Silver Spring. My neighbors there are a wonderful mix of people, everything from a janitor to FBI agents, Black, Brown, White, Gay, ALL with the same goals and sense of values. Nobody "excluded" anyone. Your name calling will not solve the housing problem.

I also question the claimed need for this zoning change because there are already THOUSANDS of housing units in the pipeline, ie: Whiteflint and Whiteoak being only two of many proposed projects yet to be built, at the same time, county officials have LOST the opportunity to build much needed affordable housing by giving away COUNTY OWNED surface parking lots #31, 31A, 24, 10, 44, and 25, ALL in downtown BETHESDA, ALL turned over to HIGH END developers with a few token MPDUs. My suspicion is that these developers PAID into an affordable housing fund for that housing fund to build affordable housing ELSEWHERE!!!

This zoning change is a great advantage for speculators and developers who have the CASH to buy up the more modest/older homes and make fat profits (particularly with the added benefits of your proposed "impact tax credits") inevitably increasing property values and pricing out even more perspective buyers looking for a home.

You claim a need to "diversify" neighborhoods with "different style housing" means everyone should live packed in sardine can social housing as in socialistic countries. This is NOT the answer!!!

I'm counting on county officials to come up with a better plan for the sake of retaining quality of life for everyone!

Ms. Dale Barnhard [REDACTED]

359

**Brian Christaldi - Chevy Chase, 20815**

The initiative says it is not about affordable housing but it appears that developers and private equity will be able cash in on this program to access subsidized loans and tax credits from Federal, State and County agencies among others for construction of multi family affordable/ low income housing projects in formerly single family home neighborhoods.

360

**Lawrence Bruser - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I strongly oppose the pending proposal to re-zone single-family neighborhoods for multi-unit buildings. This plan would destroy the character of my neighborhood and others like it. My family chose to live in Montgomery County for the quality of life it provides and would greatly prefer that its character be maintained.

361

**Jody Krieger - Kensington, 20895**

I am in favor of the AHS Initiative if current municipality setbacks are retained.

I'm hoping there can be guidelines in the initiative as to making duplexes and triplexes look as close to single family homes as possible.

In order for the outcry against this initiative to quiet down, the county council needs to address some of their issues.

**362 Jennifer Flitton - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I am a Rollingwood (Chevy Chase) resident and just now hearing from neighbors ab this zoning proposal, which I find highly disconcerting. I tried to sign up for the Oct 2nd zoom call and to my surprise it is no longer accepting submissions. Ridiculous. Looking forward to the next opportunity I have to vote against Andrew Friedson.

**363 Teddy Springer - Kensington, 20895**

I do believe that we should have more affordable housing in the county. But my concern is how the homes will be built.

If the zoning changes, I worry that builders will start buying homes when they go up for sale (I'm guessing that big builders have the resources to out-bid other buyers), tearing them down and squeezing multi-family homes onto a lot not sized for multi-family homes.

I don't trust that builders will do the right thing. A builder bought the lot at the end of our block, tore down the 1930's house that was there and squeezed a 6,000-square-foot home (three times the size of the houses around it) onto the lot. The result is a house that takes up almost the entire lot, looms over the other homes and isn't at all in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.

The zoning changes should certainly take schools, infrastructure, the environment and traffic into account. And builders must be strictly required to build appropriately-sized multi-family homes that respect the existing community.

**364 David Rosenberg - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I support the plan. There would be high-sensory, mixed use neighborhoods within 1 mile of all rail-bases transit stops, and within 1 mile of all bus stops with frequencies of 12 min or less.

**365 Flora Tsui - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I would like to see the full analysis on how the changes could generate more affordable housing, including assumptions, the predictions and all that; as I don't believe it will be defensible.

I also want to see an impact analysis on schools, environment, and neighborhood characters.

**366 Remy Bosselut - BETHESDA, 20814**

I do not believe the neighborhood I leave in (Wildwood Manor, next to Old Georgetown Road, Bethesda) can accommodate the 2- to 4-fold increase in housing density that would result from the construction of duplex to quadriplex homes.

Among other problems, such increased density would:

- exacerbate current school overcrowding in the Walter Johnson cluster, including the Ashburton Elementary and North Bethesda Middle schools.
- increase traffic and generate major parking issues in the neighborhood. It is unrealistic to believe that the neighborhood is truly walkable, even though part of it is within the 1-mile radius from the Grosvenor metro station: actual walking times to the station or stores serving the area generally are close to or higher than 30 minutes. A fourfold increase in car numbers (with necessarily little space for off-street parking given the construction density) will result in major street congestion and risks for pedestrians.
- The planning board documents that were made publicly available do not mention site-specific studies of the impacts on the sewer and water supply system (the latter already underperforming) and stormwater management system.

In addition, from comments made by the County Executive, it appears that the AHSI will not reduce housing costs, and it has been argued that its current presentation is misleading.

There may be a need for cheaper housing in the County, whether classified as "affordable" or "attainable". However, I do not believe building quadriplex structures in what was designed for a single-family housing is the solution. In our area, conversion of empty office parks, or using land left empty (e.g. after the demolition of the White Flint Mall, seem better opportunities, or between Walter Johnson high school and highway 270) seem better solutions. I urge the County Council not to approve the current ASHI.

367

### **Dale Barnhard - Silver Spring, 20906**

ADDITION TO MY TESTIMONY☆☆☆

I attended Wednesday's listening session at BCC high school and was not called upon to state my views as follows:

First and foremost, I resent being called "EXCLUSIONARY" by owning a home. I worked as a house painter for almost 30 years with an average income never exceeding \$21,000 in any given year. I saved, I was frugal, I invested so I could buy a small condo. And eventually working up to being able to purchase a small home in downtown Silver Spring. My neighbors there are a wonderful mix of people, everything from a janitor to FBI agents, Black, Brown, White, Gay, ALL with the same goals and sense of values. Nobody "excluded" anyone. Your name calling will not solve the housing problem.

I also question the claimed need for this zoning change because there are already THOUSANDS of housing units in the pipeline, ie: Whiteflint and Whiteoak being only two of many proposed projects yet to be built, at the same time, county officials have LOST the opportunity to build much needed affordable housing by giving away COUNTY OWNED surface parking lots #31, 31A, 24, 10, 44, and 25, ALL in downtown BETHESDA, ALL turned over to HIGH END developers with a few token MPDUs. My suspicion is that these developers PAID into an affordable housing fund for that housing fund to build affordable housing ELSEWHERE ☆☆☆such as in Silver Spring. That's a clear example of EXCLUSIONARY as well as being in VIOLATION OF COUNCIL'S OWN RACIAL EQUALITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE BILL!

This zoning change is a great advantage for speculators and developers who have the CASH to buy up the more modest/older homes and make fat profits (particularly with the added benefits of your proposed "impact tax credits") inevitably increasing property values and pricing out even more perspective buyers looking for a home.

You claim a need to "diversify" neighborhoods with "different style housing" means everyone should live packed in sardine can social housing as in socialistic countries. This is NOT the answer!!!

I'm counting on county officials to come up with a better plan for the sake of retaining quality of life for everyone!

Ms. Dale Barnhard [REDACTED]

368

**Ashley Iddings - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I am supportive of the initiative.

369

**Keith Campbell - BETHESDA, 20817**

I write in support of the Attainable Housing initiative as a Bethesda single family homeowner.

The reason is simple: I have 2 college-age kids who will have trouble getting housing nearby if that is what they want. This is important for our family.

Although our kids are likely to have good STEM jobs, the housing is just too expensive around here.

The Attainable Housing Initiative will help with housing costs--this is simple Econ 101, regardless of what opponents say. And a quick look at Zillow shows that townhouses and apartments in Bethesda are usually substantially cheaper than nearby single family homes.

370

**John Whitty - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Dear County Council,

I am very supportive of the proposed Attainable Housing Initiative. Finding ways to increase the supply of housing near already-developed areas and especially areas near public transportation is brilliant! Please make this a priority.

John Whitty

Town of Chevy Chase

371

**Michael Endrias - Bethesda, 20817**

Montgomery County's Attainable Housing Strategies initiative represents a crucial step toward addressing the ongoing housing crisis by creating more affordable and accessible housing options for residents. As someone who lives in one of the few Section 8 project housing

---

complexes in Bethesda (Magruder's Discovery), I can speak from firsthand experience on the impact that affordable housing—or the lack thereof—has on families and individuals. I believe this initiative is a fantastic plan that stands to benefit not only those currently in affordable housing but also the broader community.

One of the key benefits of the initiative is that it provides more housing options for people like me who are on Section 8 or living in designated affordable housing complexes. Currently, options for affordable housing in wealthier areas like Bethesda are incredibly limited. The introduction of attainable housing strategies, particularly through expanding the Moderately Priced Dwelling Units (MPDU) program, would allow current residents of Section 8 housing more opportunities to move into mixed-income communities, freeing up space for others who are in urgent need of affordable units.

This increase in housing stock would allow for a more dynamic and flexible housing market. With more MPDU units available, residents could move out of dense, project-style complexes and into neighborhoods with more diverse income levels, better schools, and greater access to resources. For those of us trying to transition to a new neighborhood, these initiatives could represent the key to upward mobility, while also allowing new residents to take advantage of the affordable housing opportunities we leave behind.

Moreover, by increasing the supply of affordable and attainable housing, Montgomery County can prevent the housing bottleneck that currently forces so many people into long waiting lists for Section 8 or MPDU housing. Those of us in complexes like Magruder's Discovery often feel stuck because there aren't enough affordable options elsewhere. This plan would open up more pathways for movement within the county, improving quality of life and reducing overcrowding in certain developments.

In the long run, the Attainable Housing Strategies initiative would foster greater economic diversity in all parts of Montgomery County. When affordable housing is scattered across different neighborhoods instead of being concentrated in certain areas, it promotes more inclusive communities and reduces socio-economic segregation. People from different backgrounds and income levels could live side by side, enriching the community and fostering social cohesion.

Additionally, this plan aligns with the broader goals of smart growth and sustainable development. Montgomery County is rapidly growing, and if we don't act now to ensure that housing is accessible to people across a range of income levels, we risk exacerbating inequality and pushing lower-income families out of the area entirely. By pursuing these attainable housing strategies, the county is taking a proactive approach that balances growth with inclusivity.

In conclusion, Montgomery County's Attainable Housing Strategies initiative offers real, tangible benefits for residents like myself. By expanding the availability of affordable housing options, particularly through programs like MPDUs, the county can provide more opportunities for residents to live in diverse, inclusive communities. This is not just a housing plan; it's a pathway to better neighborhoods, greater upward mobility, and a stronger, more integrated Montgomery County.

---

372

**Shaheda Sultan - Bethesda, 20816**

On Sept. 25, 2024, at the BCC High School, there was a large crowd against ( 90%) the proposal. Speakers provided excellent reasons for withdrawing the proposal. The most important was that the proposal will not result in attainable/affordable housing because developers cannot turn a profit on duplexes, triplexes, etc unless they sell each unit of such buildings at well over a million dollars. That price does not equal affordable/attainable housing.

373

**John Thomas - Kensington, 20895**

I live In Kensington and we are subject to the many projects the Council and planning Board have already approved and are underway. The many new housing developments (townhouses, condos, apartments and single family homes are bringing an intolerable amount of traffic, demand on services and high congestion to our area. The county has already targeted the down-county area for additional development. Please don't further degrade our neighborhoods. Do not implement this "affordable housing" proposal Mr Friedson.

374

**Raleigh Martin - Bethesda, 20814**

I am writing to strongly endorse the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative in Montgomery County.

Right now, our county is in a housing crisis, with far too few housing units available for our existing residents, let alone those who want to move here to contribute to our vibrant culture and economy. Adding new housing units will benefit everyone.

I appreciate that the county is taking an "all of the above" approach to increasing housing supply - developing vacant lands, incentivizing new construction that includes affordable units, and pursuing rezoning (including gentle removal of single family requirements in neighborhoods along transit corridors). We need every new housing unit we can get.

Opponents of the Initiative note that new homes resulting from upzoning single family neighborhoods will not directly lead to new affordable units in these neighborhoods, and I'm not disputing this point. However, we need to look at system-wide impacts. Right now in my neighborhood (East Bethesda), whenever a modest home is torn down by a developer, it is rebuilt as a \$2-2.5M McMansion. No new supply is added, and the existing supply becomes less affordable. If instead that unit could be developed into a triplex of 3 units for \$1M each, the developer would make more money and the housing supply would be increased by a net of 2 units. Win-win. Though \$1M homes are admittedly not "affordable," they are significantly more attainable for middle class families, who may otherwise be living in rental apartments. Those rental units then become available for lower-income families, and so on. \$1M homes would also help to attract diverse new residents into our lower-density neighborhoods (beyond those with the law or finance salaries needed to afford living in a \$2M+ home).

I want to note that I myself live in East Bethesda in a single-family house. Single-family houses have many nice qualities, and I support people's right to stay in or buy these homes (if they can afford to). I understand that no existing single-family homeowner would be forcibly

removed from their home on account of this Initiative. Furthermore, I understand that the plan retains existing setback requirements, so the “character” of neighborhoods wouldn’t change. Yes, there may be a few more people around, a bit more traffic, more demand on services, etc. But these changes will occur gradually and be compensated by the increasing tax base to support the needed services. Parking may become slightly harder, but there is plenty of spare capacity now. Besides, we have many good transit options in Bethesda, and these will only get better with the Purple Line (though I urge further investments in pedestrian safety, bike lanes, dedicated bus lanes for BRT, and Metro). If done right, the net outcome of this Initiative would be more people living in transit-friendly neighborhoods with fewer cars, thus benefiting our endangered climate.

I wanted to note one more thing. Your office is probably mostly hearing from county residents who are opposed to this plan. They have the right to speak their mind, but please remember there is a deep bias built into who is able to provide public comment. People who are working multiple jobs (to barely hang onto their existing housing), people who want to move to the County but can’t afford to, youth who have moved away for school but would like to return - they are unlikely to have the time to provide comment or even be aware of this plan. Instead, a lot of the public comment comes from long-time residents of single family homes (many retired) who have plenty of time but may not fully realize how much housing affordability has degraded over time. (My mom, who had lived here for 30 years, is one of these people.)

Finally, I wanted to express my frustration with our County Executive. He may disagree with the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative, but it is appalling that he recently described this plan, developed by his own Planning Department, as “a fraud.” By making such inflammatory statements, our County Executive is demonstrating that he serves only special interests and is unwilling to hear the perspectives of those with whom he disagrees.

Thank you for considering my opinion.

375 **Joanne Guth - Bethesda, 20816**

This is the developers’ dream. They will be able to ask obscene prices on two dwellings on a single lot, instead of just one. What about owners who will now choose to build extra dwellings on their land for airbnbs, family, etc? These possibilities will not help the middle class. And our local school is already bursting at the seams with temporary classrooms.

376 **Joan Ebzery - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I am vehemently opposed to the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. It will not fulfill its stated purpose. It is a giveaway to two developers. Please vote against this and work to halt this initiative. Thank you very much Joan Ebzery.

377 **Joan Schaffer - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I generally support the Initiative. In nearby DC, single family, duplexes and row houses co-exist and property values remain high.

Perhaps, the Council could find away to allow, but limit increases in density, and use height and total mass limitations to maintain neighborhood scale and character.

I think that our tear-down craze has done a lot to eliminate affordable housing in the community. Every time, we replace a 2,000 Sq foot home with a 7,500 sq foot home, we price people out of the market and change the character of the neighborhood.

**378 Janine Weidow - Bethesda, 20814**

I fully support finding a way to make housing more affordable. The county and country wide we need it! I do NOT however support the Attainable Housing Strategy Initiative. It is a way for developers to make more money by taking a home (for example in East Bethesda where I live) and instead of selling a single family home on the lot, they can build a triplex or small apartment building with no additional parking needed (we are within a mile of the Metro) and realizing more profit while also driving UP the values of real estate (not making it more affordable!!) parking is already an issue in East Bethesda, for example. If a small apartment building is built within our neighborhood where will the tenants park their cars? On our already packed streets? We were assured that SF home neighborhoods would be PROTECTED in the Bethesda Downtown Plan. Now we will be squeezed out by this Initiative that will not lower the costs of real estate. Vote NO for this initiative!

**379 Carlyne Worsham - Rockville, 20851**

It's my impression that Montgomery County (MC) government is over-focused on helping rich developers and their families get richer and supporting the needs of the newest members of our community, like illegal immigrants. Are you all just so out of touch that you think we're all fine and dandy sittin' in the middle of the donut? I'm here to wake you up and let you know that we're not ok, really bro.

I'm 53 years old, and I have never owned a home. My family moved to Rockville, MD, in 2015 for my job. We settled in the Twinbrook Area, renting a small house with the goal of purchasing our own home in 3-5 years. My husband is a public high school teacher, and I'm a mid-level federal civil servant here in Montgomery County; we've worked hard our entire lives serving the public interest in various capacities. I have ancestors who fled religious persecution in Scotland and who were early settlers in Washington County, Maryland.

Sadly our dream of home ownership has still not been achieved in late 2024. In fact, we are much worse off now than we were a decade ago on several quality of life measures, but now we don't even have the economic mobility to leave. And we just keep paying off our landlord's mortgage (if we haven't already) on her second home because we can't afford to purchase our own home and we can't afford to move. Our only car is 12 years old.

That's why I believe MC Executive Marc Elrich and his elected and appointed team members are way out of touch with the stark economic truth families like mine face in realizing that we will probably never own a home. The reason is simple math, Mr. Elrich. We currently pay about \$2,500/month excluding utilities to rent a house in Twinbrook, which I'm told is a "good deal." We recently investigated getting a home loan for the second time since moving here. We were even eligible for a Montgomery Employee \$25,000 loan for down payment



---

assistance. Our monthly mortgage rate even with that “generous” MC employee loan assistance would have been \$6,000/month for a \$500,000 home. Nope – no thanks, Mr. Elrich!

To add insult to injury, my 14 year old daughter and I were deeply traumatized and injured by MC police officers on 08/09/2023, when they responded to my daughter, who was experiencing a mental health episode. When I saw the police abusing her as she was lying exhausted on the grass on the side of a road and heard her crying, “Mommy, Help!” I went to her aid. The police responded to my efforts to calm my daughter down with the use of severe force on her and me to separate us while the EMT officers witnessing the scene pleaded with the officers to “let Mom help!” Instead, I was arrested for assault and carted off to jail, costing me one miserable night of terror in a MC jail, \$5,000 for legal representation, a deep sense of distrust in police, and lifelong dose of trauma.

My attorney got the assault charges dismissed thankfully as I would have lost my job too. My criminal attorney expressed his deep concern for how my daughter and I were treated by MC police officers, and he encouraged me to look into a civil suit against the MCPD. Over the next year, I used my free time to investigate the possibility of getting legal representation for a civil suit against the MCPD for excessive use of force. However, because the legal threshold for bodily damage is so high, no law firm agreed to represent me. A possible settlement of 50k-100k isn’t worth the effort, they said. Then I learned that, in order to preserve any claims under state law, I must submit a notice under the Local Government Tort Claims Act to the County Executive for Montgomery County within one year from the date of my arrest, 8/9/23. Too late! Congratulations, Mr. Elrich! You’ve thought of everything to help and protect your buddies. Now my family is traumatized by MC police officers, and we’re out 5K!

Unfortunately, this tragic story of my family’s experiences of living in MC is only the tip of the iceberg. I haven't yet told you yet about how my now 15 year old daughter was sexually assaulted, offered drugs, and then struck by a hit and run vehicle in downtown Silver Spring on 03/01/2024. She was hospitalized for 4 months with severe injuries and jumps at the slightest noise. The MC Police told me "they don't investigate non-fatality hit and runs." So, I went to the accident location and got street camera video of the incident and sent it to the police. And because MC police refused to investigate these crimes, I witnesses my daughter being hit and dragged for 20 feet on the street cam video. I also put 10 hours of work (\$1500) for a private investigator on my credit card but I couldn't afford to pay him more. I checked the police report and noticed the diagram shows the car coming from the wrong street and wrong direction. The MC Police don't care; they never call me back.

And I know Marc Elrich nor my local or state elected officials sure as hell don't care about me or any of my family's experiences in MC because none of them ever replied to my multiple calls and emails to request an opportunity to discuss my family’s grievances.

---

hardships people like me have faced living in this county that will impact our entire lives. and my family have faced every day living here. place and feeling trapped here. He only cares about constructing affordable housing for illegal immigrants and rich people. When my family moved to Rockville in 2015, we had about 50K in savings; now we have 5K. This loss off funds was not due to a loss of employment or the down payment of a house. Rather, this loss was due to

However, since moving here my family has suffered significant financial loss, inadequate mental health servicesand experienced deeply traumatizing events sometimes at the hrough engagement with various government officials in all levels of and agencies.

Before moving to MC, we heard the quality of life here was good and that it had some of the best schools in the country; we were excited about living in such an ethnically diverse environment. However witnessed any effort on the part of MC officials since living here for ten years demonstrating they care about or have the time to listen to people like us

380

**Margaret Barnett - Bethesda, 20814**

I live in East Bethesda. We own our home. I am in favor of changing the rules to allow more affordable housing to be built in the county, especially near mass transit, including allowing small multi-unit dwellings where only single-family is currently allowed. This is how we address the critical lack of housing for people just starting out or downsizing.

381

**Eddie Gerow - Washington, 20007**

Attainable housing is something that is extremely important to me. There is a housing shortage in the DC metro area, and I am unable to afford a home in the area. Large scale housing to be built and centered around the major town centers and transportation hubs with medium and small scale sprawling out from those areas. We need all of it.

382

**Bea Cummins - Pittsburgh, 15233**

I support the changes to housing policy. As a graduate from Walter Johnson High school, I have moved away from Montgomery county in part due to the high cost of housing. A fixed housing supply but increasing demand necessarily lead to price increases. I am concerned as someone in gen z that I will be forever excluded from living in an amenity rich place because of concerns over neighborhood character. Although I am not currently a resident it is not purely because I chose to leave, I was forced to leave. I hope fairly minor increases in density can pass. Otherwise I will forever be kept from where I am from. I hope my perspective is taken into consideration and that I may be able to return home one day. Increased density will help me and many of

383

**Mark Hoffenberg - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I am strongly opposed to the proposal. It would be one thing if it were aimed at housing low income residents, but as crafted, it seems only to cater to developers at the expense of neighborhood quality, congestion, environmental issues and the like. Please defeat this highly ill advised proposal.

384

**James Mich - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I am opposed to the Attainable Housing Initiative. I've been a resident of the DMV for 65 of my 67 years, and have lived in Montgomery County for the last 31 years. I've followed and lived through many of the County Planning / Housing Initiatives, and in summary I have little faith in the County's ability to plan for the long term especially with current residents in mind. There's a mindset in the county that they have to attract potential new young residents at all costs, with no thought to long term/senior residents. The Council and Planning Board show no consideration for seniors. Also many of the prior planning initiatives have backfired in that they created an over the top demand to live in the hub areas. Bethesda is the classic example. Our home value tripled when Bethesda Row opened, especially with all the fancy condos that were allowed to be developed. And now you want to punish the "wealthy". Defacto you are throwing the long-term residents aside, you want us to move somewhere else. Many of us are middle class who bought decades ago what was then affordable. All of the development drove our values and property taxes up and now you ostracize us as "wealth & elite". So now we are disposable. Thank you very much.

Also, why isn't that no one is looking at the golf courses in the Bethesda area as a source for new property? If the problem of housing is that dire, you should have the stomach to tackle the golf courses, surely some of their land could be rezoned. But they remain unscathed, which is the ultimate hypocrisy.

Lastly, history shows that every new planning/housing initiative that focuses on the central hubs of Montgomery only brings in a bunch of development that drives prices further up. This new initiative will be no different. The concept that this initiative will help provide attainable housing is a false narrative.

BTW - I've sent in several comments on planning issues of the years, and have never received a response other than a "thank you for your comment". I suspect that no one has ever read my comments.

**Louis Evangelista - Chevy Chase, 20815**

After attending the listening session on Sept. 25 at BCC High School, I came away with a better understanding of AHS and the concerns expressed by the citizens. The Council President, Council and MC Planning Board/Staff are commended for affording us, myself included, the democratic right to ask questions and express our opinions to our elected officials. I hope these officials will take note of the jam-packed auditorium and the vast majority of negative opinions expressed about the AHS. My following comments mirror the AHS handout given at the Sept 25 listening session:

I fully appreciate that with housing prices skyrocketing in recent years, that the County Council would task the MC Planning Department to develop the ASH initiative to recommend ways to increase opportunities for more diverse housing options in order to create more opportunities for home ownership and rentals with the expectation that a mix of housing types would result in more stable home values than areas with only single-family houses. The concern expressed by the Council is that if no action is taken, over time currently attainable properties in the existing housing stock will be slowly transformed by-right under the existing code and development standards into large custom homes that are less affordable because they are more expensive. The wishful thinking of the Council is for for the AHS effort to result in more people of varying income levels having the chance to buy or rent more types off homes and thus making those communities better reflections of the county's diversity. However, the Planning staff modeled the feasibility of replacing existing single-family detached homes in the county with attainable housing typologies and found that while it varies by neighborhood, there generally is a limited supply of homes for which replacement is feasible. This conclusion strongly implies that AHS initiative is self-defeating in achieving the Council's expectation. Further, the Planning staff found that only 10 % of homes out of 20,000 were within a price range that would support redevelopment of any type. The portion that would potentially result in attainable housing typologies is even smaller. Lacking statistics from the Planning staff on supply and demand in the county housing, or surveys/input of builders, sellers and buyers, I ask:

1. What number of new units would bring down skyrocketing prices?
2. What optimum mix of new units would bring down skyrocketing prices?
3. What is the number of current and prospective county residents looking elsewhere? What is demographic data and number coming into the county?
4. Why is R-200 zone treated preferentially relative to R-40, 60, 90 zones since it would only be allowed duplexes except within a Priority Housing District? Zone R-200 having the largest lots it would seem logical that it would have the larger multiplexes by right.
5. Why are 10 units/acre permitted for R-90 zone lots and larger 13 units/are for smaller R-60 zone lots?
6. Other AHS initiatives (called EHO in Arlington or missing middle ) are in litigation or on hold by judges across the country (Minneapolis, Montana, Charlottesville, California) and in our metro area (Arlington, Alexandria). Therefore, is the AHS initiative the right policy and action to give residents the opportunities to not be priced out of the county? i.e tax abatements, downpayment subsidies.
7. What are the tax consequences of AHS? One should not just look at the decrease in transfer taxes. Higher home prices will lead to higher assessments and increase real estate taxes (which will incentivize current residents to leave the county and make housing available).
8. Have you assessed how the ASH initiative links to the real world of housing economics and consumer/buyer/seller preferences? Buying a home is a highly individualized process that is greatly influenced by psychological factors, such as the perception of the quality of life of a neighborhood, along with the quantitative considerations of that form and fit and price of the property. Left to their own devices, builders

will develop to the maximum that the market can bear. The one-size-fits-all approach of AHS may thus change neighborhoods and result in unintended consequences of higher prices and less appealing housing options and neighborhoods.

I conclude my comments by requesting that you look at the example of the triplex which replaced a small cottage at 4500 Walsh Street, Chevy Chase MD 20815 as a case-in-point of the failure of one AHS initiative.

386

### **Judy Rein - Silver Spring, 20903**

Dear Montgomery County Council Members, Please know that I've spent time to understand key issues related to the Attainable Housing Initiative: attended the community meeting in White Oak, read more about Montgomery County's Attainable Housing Initiative online as well as searching for other successful programs. Plus the last two Saturdays I spent planned outings in Rockville and Silver Spring to observe the effects of zoning for high density housing where there are known transportation hubs. Overall I support the work that's been done thus far because it appears to be in alignment evidence based ways for easing the housing shortage here. However, I expect there will be many problems with the current plans. First, it's hard for me to believe there will be little impact on roads, transportation services, sewer and other utility systems as a result of this attainable housing plan. As a Hillandale resident, traffic seems to have increased in the last couple years during rush hour so that it takes about 30 instead of 20 minutes to drive 1.5 miles south on New Hampshire Ave. to get on I 495. This is before completion of the new Hillandale 0 energy development that will add almost 500 additional apartments and town homes that will decimate the tree canopy around the stream running through the former Labor Union College to the Northwest Branch south of the Oakview community. Concerns about that lack of sufficient data about data was discussed in the Wash. Post article of 9/28/24 about a judge's decision in Arlington county to stop the Affordable Housing program there given its lack of clear data about impact on the community. So my recommendation is to collect some preliminary data and plan to continue collect data once the project is implemented, reporting more frequently than usual. The data needs to include not just information about homes but also changes to infrastructure, zoning codes, and other factors necessary to support the initiative. My opinion is that these details are highly relevant to maintaining the quality of life most citizens want to have in this county, especially if our taxes are higher than other neighboring counties.

Another issue that I think may be important is giving more consideration to the differences in socioeconomic levels present in Montgomery county communities. For example, both Rockville and Silver Spring have experienced more high rise development in the last couple years. I understand that one difference is because the Purple Line will run through Silver Spring not Rockville. Based on my personal observations Rockville appears to be more open for business around new high rises that seem to convey some luxury features. In comparison, the quality of high rises in Silver Spring appeared to be more basic. This seems to reflect past development plans that favored low density, luxury housing in the western county and more affordable high density development in the eastern part of the county. However, I believe the standards for developing middle income housing need to convey equal access to new housing the same quality without discriminatory practices. This means attainable housing needs to convey high standards for quality of life living such as attractive features for those in the middle income range regardless of race, skin color, disabilities, age, or political party.

387	<p><b>Leslie Kefauve - Bethesda, 20816</b></p> <p>This proposal is anathema and should be VOTED DOWN! This will not provide affordable housing, but will simply enrich greedy builders. It will overcrowd neighborhoods with no sidewalks, narrow streets and it will strain the local school. Why are people trying to ram this proposal through over the objections of the homeowners?</p>
388	<p><b>emiline ott - chevy chase, 20815</b></p> <p>We attempted to register for the zoom session on Oct 2 but it is closed. This is both disappointing and inexcusable.</p> <p>Emiline and Marvin Ott [REDACTED]</p>
389	<p><b>Laura Foggan - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>Dear Councilmembers: Altering the entire county's zoning is a huge change with many implications for existing residents and homeowners. Adding density creates challenges for parking, infrastructure and otherwise. And the proposed changes won't necessarily create "attainable" housing at all but rather just give more profit to developers. I urge you to pause this initiative. We should see what happens in other areas that are experimenting with these ideas rather than jump in and make irreversible mistakes, costing the County and its current residents dearly. Speaking of cost, as you know, advancing a change of this magnitude now will virtually certainly draw a lawsuit against the County, costing taxpayers and the County more. Please wait and pause this proposal so everyone can be heard and the County can make the best plans for all, not rush to be in the forefront of untested changes that will have a lasting impact on our neighborhoods and quality of life with more congestion, more density and more burdens on aging infrastructure. Thank you.</p>
390	<p><b>Britta Thomas - Rockville, 20852-4435</b></p> <p>At this time, I am OPPOSED to this idea of re-zoning single family home sites. The Montgomery County Planning Board has failed to conduct impact studies on the likely effects of the AHSI on the environment, infrastructure, schools, transportation, and adequate public facilities and services. The County has allowed building of "luxury" townhomes and apt buildings in every nook and cranny down county and have already failed to require developers to get creative e with their space. Now the County has run out of room and you're coming for our long established neighborhood? With little thought to parking, sewer, traffic, etc. Focus your attention on areas like White Flint, Lake Forest, or existing business office buildings that have low occupancy and renovate for housing. There are ideas out there. The developers don't run this county, our elected officials do.</p>
391	<p><b>Mary Hunter-Apfelbeck - Silver Spring, 20901</b></p> <p>This is such a bad idea! The infrastructure will not support additional traffic and parking on our already overcrowded streets, especially in older neighborhoods built in a time when families usually only had 1 family car. Let alone concerns about electrical, sewer, trash and recycling. Thanks to Montgomery County's push for multi family living in single family dwellings, parking is already at a premium in our neighborhood. If I wanted to live in a townhome or apartment, I would. We chose a single family detached home in a single family</p>

community for a reason. We worked very hard and made sacrifices to be able to achieve this dream. The county government should not take away the quality of life for ANY of it's residents. Montgomery County's Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative is a bad idea!

392

**Alex Kinnier - Bethesda, 20814**

County Council and Planning Department, I am outraged that my tax dollars are going towards efforts to fundamentally undermine my quality of life. I am very supportive of actual affordable housing located in well thought out areas that are maximally beneficial to those living there. This "Attainable" plan does none of that. Without a publicly stated change of direction, I will not vote for any of you again -- and I will donate to ensure you never hold office again.

393

**Matt Felts - Bethesda, 20814**

To the members of the Montgomery County Council and County Executive Marc Elrich:

In no way, shape, or form should proposals such as the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHSI), as set forth by the unelected Planning Board, be allowed to proceed without the vote of every individual and homeowner in Montgomery County that would be impacted by the potential implementation of such proposals. Six "listening sessions" held over the course of four weeks are not sufficient to allow county residents – property owners and taxpayers – to engage in comprehensive discussions about such proposals that would impact the vast majority of residents and end by-right, single family zoning for over 80% of the dwellings in Montgomery County.

- The Planning Board has not shared any impact or feasibility studies with data as to the potential effects of the proposed changes, which would include, but not be limited to:
  - o Already-strained infrastructure (water, sanitation, electricity distribution, poorly maintained roads, etc.)
  - o Environmental impact (water runoff, tree canopies, significantly more impervious surfaces, etc.)
  - o Increase in existing homeowner property taxes
  - o Traffic impact (capacity of roads, parking, transportation systems, etc.)
  - o Pedestrian and cyclist safety
  - o Significant influx to school systems
  - o Capacity of hospital and EMS systems, including police and fire departments
- Why would rezoning of single family neighborhoods be considered when a significant amount of already-zoned capacity in transit-oriented areas, per existing County master plans, is still unbuilt today?
- Why wouldn't the County be following its community-based master planning that already exists – which was developed with public input, review, and engagement – in which upzoning is scaled to local market conditions, rather than proposing a one-size-fits-all approach to the entire County?

- Rather than focusing on changing zoning in the densest corridors of the County, why not focus on improving existing transportation systems for commuting individuals, such as extending the red line metro to reach more County residents?
- After considering all of the potential impacts, how would such significant changes be implemented without negatively impacting the quality of life for existing residents?

We STRONGLY OPPOSE the AHSI proposals and request that the Council REJECT the AHSI proposals. In order for such impactful proposals such as the AHSI to proceed, every single Montgomery County resident should be given the opportunity to vote in favor of or against the proposed initiatives.

Matt Felts & Dane Grossnickle

[REDACTED]  
Bethesda, MD 20814

Part of the Greenwich Forest Historic District

394

### **Tim Vogel - Bethesda, 20817**

I am unequivocally against the Planning Board's proposal in its current form.

Some of my main concerns about the ASI proposal are as follows:

1. **Property Taxes Go Up.** Maryland assesses residential property (land) based on market value. Value means developing an estimate of value for the land and improvements at the highest and best use of the property, not its actual use. This means that single family homeowners in the affected zones (R-40, R-60, R-90 and R-200) have the potential to see their assessments rise as developers bid-up the price of existing single-family properties for conversion to multi-dwelling structures. Even if a lot has a single family home on it and is not for sale or sold, the value of the land can lawfully be based on the prices paid by those seeking to build multi-dwelling structures, and tax assessments can increase accordingly every three years.
2. **Retail Home Buyers Disappear Overnight.** Many buyers wanting to purchase a home in a single-family zoned community will look elsewhere, so the buy-side retail demand for single-family homes in the affected communities falls immediately.
3. **Uneven Impact of Rising Density.** Everything from the diameter of the waters pipes in the neighborhoods, to the size and location of water supply tanks, the width of the streets, the number of nearby hospital beds, the number of EMT personnel, the size of the schools and the numbers of classrooms in them, and many other aspects of infrastructure supporting the affected communities has evolved over the past at-least 60 years based on the underlying population and housing density assumptions. Not only does the ASI upset all of those assumptions in one fell swoop, there is no attempt in the ASI plan itself to mitigate the potential for drastically uneven spikes in population density at the micro-level (street or neighborhood or census block group or zip code).



4. Attainably-Priced Housing Won't Materialize. I ran some Zillow searches in several of the Bethesda-area neighborhoods looking at sales prices of town-homes and multi-family homes. None of them are attainably priced.

I have other concerns as well. Bottom line, the Planning Board's proposal to allow developers to build what they want, where they want, when they want, and sell it for as much as they want is a developer's dream; retail buyer competition decreases, property tax increases drive increased supply of sellers, all administrative red-tape is eliminated, and they don't even have to build attainably-priced housing in return.

All of the areas above, and others, should be studied and pressure-tested with actual data.

Tim

395 **Noah Merlin - Bethesda, 20817**

This is a scheme at its finest to put money in the wrong people's pockets. In order to create affordable housing, limit the permits of developers so they can't buy and tear down every house all of the surrounding neighborhoods. This proposal is a farce and there will be a lawsuit, as there was in Arlington when a similar act was proposed. It was a bad idea there, it's a bad idea here.

396 **Jill Bochicchio - Rockville, 20852**

I am totally against this plan.

397 **Paul Guinnessy - Silver Spring, 20910**

What I want to know is what happens if a developer buys two lots next to one another? Can they simple build 38 units by pretending they aren't connected and get round the affordable dwelling regulations that way? What happens if they buy 5 lots next to each other?

And with the MacMansions that everyone pulls up as a rationale for going ahead with this, when I look at the replacement for the most recent teardown done on Bonifant I see a concrete drive with very little grass out the front and a concrete basketball court out the back, so where is all the water going to go if there's no ground for it to be absorbed? You just have to look at the weather in the last few days to realize it's critical that we improve water absorption by the soil.

The planning board has a lot of work to do to prove that when they say 35% of the property ground has to remain a garden for water absorption they actually mean it. Because that what people are worried about. That and their property being overshadowed by a large complex.

It would also be more encouraging if we heard from actual developers over their plans for when this goes ahead. Because the last developer I spoke to (who wouldn't go on the record) said their plan was to focus on luxury townhomes, condos and apartments in the \$1 million + range.

The additional question I have is that there is a significant number of small lots in the county with small homes on it. Surely if you instituted regulations to protect those small houses (i.e. not let them have extensions), that would create cheaper 'starter home' stock than some of the proposals here? Like in Greenbelt?

I do want to emphasize that I think the idea has some merit, but more work needs to be done to convince people that it is not simply a giveaway to developers but an actual structured proposal to solve a problem.

It would also be helpful if there was some controls on what they look like, as some in Takoma Park are pretty ugly designwise too.

**398 Jose Alzate - Silver spring, 20910**

Attainable housing seems to lay the way for developers to completely change neighborhoods' character. This appears to be working more for developers and less for the people. Re-zoning certain commercial areas to residential would be a more useful/effective method for making more attainable housing.

**399 Karen Elkins - Chevy Chase, 20815**

We write to register our strong disagreement with this initiative. We have read much of the information on the Planning Department's web site and come to the inescapable conclusion that, despite our agreement with the idea of adding affordable housing to MoCo in general and our area in particular, this plan has poor/muddy goals and is so poorly thought out that it will accomplish nothing good. Without belaboring the obvious, it's a lose-lose plan that benefits no one (except maybe greedy developers, whose fingerprints appear to be all over this).

**400 Stacey Band - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Follow the lead of DC and convert vacant office space to affordable housing. The COG and several County Councilmembers have said the affordable housing should be built in urban areas near transit hubs and other amenities. This is where most of the vacant office space is located. MoCo just passed the MOVE act because 20% of office space is already vacant. MoCo should follow DC's lead and convert that empty space to the only housing shortage that is a crisis, "affordable" housing.

In regard to the Planning Staff's Utopian "complete" community and desire for more multiplex condos, these units could be built in conjunction with the revitalization of depressed areas of MoCo including White Flint Mall, Lake Forest Mall, Burtonsville Shopping Center, Viva White Oak, and other large tracts of land in MoCo. In this manner, Planning could build their complete communities from the ground up with all the required infrastructure to show proof of concept before condemning all single family developments to a haphazard redevelopment plan built on old infrastructure not equipped to handle the increased density.

401

**Wendie Smith - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I will be on the Oct virtual session and I highly oppose the AHSI. The homes are already arms length apart and many homes with shared driveways. The area is already congested, I am curious to know where the extra parking and utility infrastructure will come from just to meet your housing supply needs.

402

**Linda Dreeben - CHEVY CHASE, 20815**

The proposal seems to be being rushed through, without sufficient data and study. There are many questions not answered. It would be better to be more transparent with information than has happened to date.

How does the plan define "attainable" housing v. affordable housing?

1. Consistent data that explains the county's housing challenge is difficult to find. I think everyone agrees that housing costs are too high, many people are priced out, and changes are needed. But the data about population growth, housing starts, and projected housing needs are debatable. It's hard to weigh the proposed solution against the stated problem because the problem isn't that clear. For example: the 2020 housing needs assessment, supported by DPS records, says we've seen about 2500 housing starts a year in the last 10 years. But the Office of Legislative Oversight has recently corrected the numbers upward, to almost double the previous count - we're building over 4,000 units per year, not 2500. The housing needs assessment says we need to build an average of 2700 new units each year for the next 15 years for a total of about 40,000 units. If that's true, we're building what's needed, and the crisis is all about affordability, not quantity. But members of the planning board also say we need 60,000 new units. Which is right, what strategy will make housing more affordable, and how do we know?

Will County Council take a professionally credible, peer-reviewed look at all the data, get more precise about the nature of the actual need and the actual shortfall, and refine the Attainable Housing Strategy based on those conclusions?

2. The Attainable Housing Strategies seem to curtail community input into development proposals that will have significant impact on neighborhoods. The increase in 'as right' status for conversions, new construction, and 19-unit apartment buildings means that neighbors will only discover big changes afoot after they have been approved and permitted. Planners argue that this expedited, administrative treatment is necessary to cut red tape and reduce 'soft costs' for developers and property owners developing attainable housing types.

Will County Council reconsider this approach so that more of the traditional norms of community engagement can remain in place?

3. The Optional Method of Development proposed for "growth corridors" applies one single development goal and one very loose set of development rules to diverse, very different communities along 120-plus miles of busy roads running all across the county. The strategy encourages a piecemeal development approach, with very little master planning or deliberate attention to coherent traffic management, utilities and infrastructure planning, and place-making. A worst-case outcome might be a random assortment of 19-unit apartment buildings inserted along busy roads wherever developers can find available property.

Will the Planning Department and County Council consider more location-specific, targeted, and coherent planning strategies so that neighborhoods along the growth corridors experience new developments that are master-planned, technically responsible, and integrated into their settings?

4. Would County Council consider a more incremental or locally-tailored approach instead of a broad-brush solution? This is really an experiment at heart - what about establishing pilot projects in select areas to see what actually works?

**Jared Hautamaki - Silver Spring, 20902**

403

Build up urban cores like the Wheaton Urban District. But DO NOT ELIMINATE SINGLE FAMILY ZONING. The last thing I want is for a denser Wheaton Hills.

The streets are narrow and parking is already difficult due to some homes having 14 residents (I did Census enumeration in 2020).

We can't handle storm runoff now. You start adding impermeable area to the already small lots and the flooding would be horrendous.

The units added won't be any more affordable than they are already...no developer will add units at below market cost. The only way to do that is with subsidized housing and that will only occur at large unit developments in urban areas.

This won't be impacting wealthy white neighborhoods in Chevy Chase and Bethesda...this will impact the east side of county and further strain our education system, accelerate gentrification and otherwise displace the middle you believe you are trying to assist.

This is not a progressive plan. This is undermining Montgomery County's middle class homeowners and will most impact minority neighborhoods.

**Wendy Bazil - Kensington, 20895**

404

I have been a homeowner in Montgomery County since 1994. As such, I know first hand how very scary it is to have so much personal equity tied up in our homes. It is scary to think that the value could go down.

However, I very much support incorporating more housing types into county residential neighborhoods and I hope the Council Members support additional density to address our housing shortage in addition to the very important separate efforts to increase truly affordable housing. The Planning Dept. has set out many good reasons for this approach to addressing the housing shortage and I don't need to go into those. I believe the research shows that home values do not go down, and that well thought out greater density can enrich the community.

I'd just like to add a few other perspectives:

First, in Montgomery County, the high cost of housing is a large contributor to a situation where a family of four with income of over \$127,000 can be at risk of food insecurity. The Capital Area Food Bank recently issued a report on the rising need for food bank assistance in our local areas and the OFSR has also stated this. However, we don't seem to tie these two issues together tightly enough. The people who are requiring more use of food banks might have too much income for federal food assistance benefits. The county's new (and amazing) Instacart partnership recognizes this. So addressing the needs of the working class for more affordable housing for those making 50% to >100% AMI will go a long way to reducing the need for food assistance. I heard US Rep. Brian Schatz on a podcast recently, repeating something that bears repeating here: do we want communities where our firefighters (teachers, nurses, librarians, police officers, etc) can not afford to live near where they work?

Secondly, many of my neighbors mention concerns about the neighborhood changing too much with additional density. I would argue that in a general way, change always happens in neighborhoods over time and keeps them meeting needs of residents. But more specifically, I argue that our neighborhoods are already changing and are likely to continue to do so if higher density is not permitted.

When I moved into an unincorporated area of Kensington in 1994, my neighborhood consisted of homes of a variety of sizes from small ramblers, to splits, and small and medium-sized colonials. My neighbors were US government employees, teachers, writers, NIH post-docs, firefighters, etc. at a variety of income levels. Without the allowance for greater density in this neighborhood, the financial incentive for developers who have been buying up all the smaller houses on the market is to build as large as the ordinance allows. We now have 5000-6000 sq foot homes in an R-60 neighborhood that are selling at prices approaching \$2,000,000. This gentrification (full disclosure, in 2006 my family moved from one home in the neighborhood into another--a 3500 sq ft. developer spec house that is larger than the house that was there before--so I'm part of this!) changes who can live in this neighborhood. Most people I know, myself included, cannot afford the market price of our current home. My Millennial children cannot afford to buy a home near me. If we need to sell our homes to use the equity towards retirement, it will be challenging to downsize in this area. So I believe that allowing more density--while not eliminating single family homes for those who want them--will help to end the distorted incentives for developers to build such large homes and perhaps, they will start to build other options.

I know that I would love to be able to build a stacked three family home and live in one in retirement and either rent out or sell the other two (condo?). This kind of option actually increases our usage of our own property.

I do think that the Planning Department might need to look more specifically at some neighborhoods, though, and ensure that ease of accessing the transit stations from which proximity is mentioned is actually within the distance that will induce people to walk, bike, scooter, etc. Some of our neighborhoods were built decades ago to impede through traffic and so the route to a bus or metro station is perhaps longer than is measured radially. It might mean that some neighborhoods that are seemingly within a mile of a station or bus line will still have many people using cars at the current rate. I hope that there will be more buses in other than the main corridors, micro bus routes maybe can help with this, perhaps on internal roads that already have school bus traffic. For example, for some near me, within a mile radially of Grosvenor Metro, we need better walking access across Rock Creek Park and Beach Drive to support more pedestrian access.

Thank you for considering.

405

**Amber Tofilon - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I am thrilled that the County is focused on affordable and attainable housing. We have an excessive amount of single-family zoning in the most desirable areas (close to the District, close to transit, close to jobs) and it is long past time to change that. We need to allow for more diverse housing options to meet our residents' needs, preferences, and budgets.

I know that many of my well-off NIMBY neighbors in Chevy Chase are organizing opposition to the zoning changes. I wanted to reach out to voice support for the hard work ahead and to encourage you all to press on.

406

**Aron Newman - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Rezoning in Chevy Chase West to include multifamily dwellings will not address the housing shortage because of the relatively small number of new units that will become available. The answer is a larger apartment building which is significantly offset from single family homes. A location like Geico in Friendship Heights is ideal for a large apartment building that can provide affordable housing for hundreds of residents. Will Geico sell?

407

**Laurie Rubenstein - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I am strongly opposed to the Initiative as currently envisioned.

Such breathtakingly broad changes should not even be considered without far more serious and detailed analysis as to the need for and impact of them. According to the County Executive, the County has ample housing units for our projected needs in the pipeline. Indeed, anyone who has driven through Bethesda in recent years can see how many new units have been brought online under the current pro-development policies. The Planning Board never should have forwarded this proposal without a detailed analysis of what the County's actual needs are, how this proposal will specifically meet them, any costs and environmental risks resulting from the implementation of the proposal, and who will bear those costs and how they will be covered.

---

Perhaps even more importantly, there is nothing in this proposal that suggests it will meet the supposed need for AFFORDABLE housing. It defies common sense to think that a developer will pay current market rate for houses in close-in neighborhoods -- where \$1-\$2 million is the current norm -- pay to tear them down and then to build duplexes and more and then somehow sell them at rates that middle-income families can afford. Where is the planning board's analysis showing that such alchemy is possible?

Moreover, there is nothing in this proposal that addresses the stunning impact such exponential growth -- and of course exponential growth is the point of a proposal that allows single family homes to become triplexes and apartment buildings-- will have on our infrastructure and services. Many of our schools are already overcrowded, with many more already in need of serious capital improvements. There is exceedingly limited parking on many close in streets -- especially the ones this proposal would burden with entire apartment buildings. We have already seen in Silver Spring, where the police recently had to get involved over street parking disputes caused by limited parking, what happens when more people with more cars move into a neighborhood. Has the Planning Board provided its projections for how those disputes would be avoided and, if they happen, resolved? And if it is asserting that there won't be an additional need, because of the proximity of these neighborhoods to public transportation, where is the evidence of that, beyond wishful thinking (all evidence of actual homeowner behavior is to the contrary).

While there may well be some neighborhoods that can both absorb additional housing AND do it in an affordable way, it should be on those proposing these changes to point to them and limit their proposals to such neighborhoods. At a minimum, zoning changes should be done on a case-by-case basis, and only when there is a showing that, in fact, conversion of a single family home into a duplex or triplex will result in homes selling at an affordable rate.

This are just a few of the many problems with this proposal. Although I strongly suggest sending it back to the Planning Board to start over with a more serious analysis of need, affordability and impact, if the Council insists on proceeding with consideration of this proposal, I urge it to include two specific provisions:

(1) Conversion of single family plots into multi-unit housing must be done on a case-by-case basis and only after the developer pledges that the resulting units will be sold for an affordable rate, defined as something a family earning the county's median income can afford. In addition, the developer must analyze parking on the particular block and show that there is sufficient off-street parking to ensure the new units will neither cause nor exacerbate existing parking conflicts.

(2) Because this proposal, if it passes as is, will unleash a mad dash for developers and private equity firms to purchase existing close-in homes for conversion to apartment buildings or other multi-family unit structures (depending on category into which the current home falls), many existing neighborhoods will see the market rate for their homes increase. As a result, the assessments on their homes will increase, as will their property taxes. For so many families who bought into these neighborhoods twenty and thirty years ago or more -- and especially older people on fixed incomes -- these rates will quickly become unaffordable. So, the council must, if it passes this proposal, include a provision providing that no existing homeowner will see increased property taxes as a result of an assessment based on

---

a sale for a multi-unit structure. It would be the irony or all ironies for this effort cloaked in a cry for affordable housing to result in our seniors having to leave their family homes because property taxes have made their homes unaffordable for them.

**408 Milena Kalinovska - Chevy Chase, 20815**

How can you aim to destroy communities that took time to build and develop including thoughtful plans for transportation, schools, recreational parks. Your ideas are to support developers business aims. Very disappointing and indeed against all of us residents of MD. I have disabled daughter of 38 and you have ignored her needs that are not part of your incoherent and irresponsible push over!

**409 Gus Zimmerman - Silver Spring, 20906**

I write to support the proposed Initiative. I live in a multi-unit community near a metro station in the county. This community was built nearly 50 years ago for single families to live in. Due to the outrageous housing prices in this county, we have 5-6 adults having to share these units. Montgomery County has a choice. We can keep our current policies and become a playground for rich retirees as the county shrinks into irrelevance, or we can pursue policies to allow young people and families to successfully live in this county.

**410 Hooper Nichols - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I was at the presentation at BC-C last week and was surprised at how the planning committee presented the proposal as one size fits all. I am against the proposal as it stands and would like the planning committee to reconsider a proposal which would lead to more affordable housing without upending neighborhoods. Improve the schools and public transportation.

**411 Stephen Kaplan - Chevy Chase, 20815**

This seems to me a disgraceful sellout to the developers in the County, who are surely licking their chops at the prospect of this. I could not oppose this action more strongly. This housing won't be especially "affordable," which is why you don't call it that. It's to make the developers happy and bring in more taxes at the expense of current homeowners. Why not take over the golf courses and put up properties there? Are you all trying to get yourselves thrown out of office?

**412 Keith Korenchuk - Chevy Chase, 20815**

The proposal is a gift to developers. It has nothing to do with "affordable" housing. I strongly oppose the initiative. I question the way County government has developed this effort. No review of traffic, parks, environment, impact on established communities. No regard for voters.

**413 Aaron Droller - Silver Spring, 20901**

Good afternoon Montgomery County Council,



I attended the Attainable Housing Listening Session in Wheaton. Thank you for the opportunity to listen to the Planning Department and provide feedback. I have been reviewing the Attainable Housing Plan ("Plan") carefully, specifically within the context of my neighborhood. I live in South Four Corners in Silver Spring. This area is inside what the Plan calls a "Priority Housing District."

The Plan calls for a 75% reduction in parking requirements for newly built units. This is completely unworkable in my neighborhood. My neighborhood is filled with small homes on small lots built in the 1940's. Most of the homes are around 1500 square feet and do not have driveways or off street parking. As such, most people rely on street parking in our neighborhood.

This Plan would severely impact the quality of life given the particular characteristics and infrastructure of my neighborhood because street parking is already so limited in particular corridors. It is simply not possible for the parking infrastructure in our neighborhood to support a multitude of quadplexes that could be built under this plan. Given that there is no limiting principle to the potential number of units that can be built, over time, this Plan will severely diminish the quality of life in South Four Corners, and the Four Corners/Forest Glen area generally. The Plan and Mr. Sartori suggest that people will forego cars and take public transit instead. While this might be an aspirational goal of the Planning Department, it is not based in reality on the habits and lifestyle requirements of people who live in South Four Corners. New quadplexes under this plan will continue to bring in additional cars, without the infrastructure to support them under the Plan. Parking will become a nightmare for everyone in South Four Corners.

I am not addressing at length the issue of school overcrowding in this message, which is another critical concern not adequately addressed in the Plan. My children attend MCPS with overcrowded classes and this Plan makes no genuine attempt to address this issue. This is treated as an afterthought by the Planning Board, but I can assure you it is top of mind in our neighborhood.

I ask that the Council reject any legislation premised on the current Plan. The Council should direct the Montgomery Planning Department to go back to the drawing board and create a plan that looks into the nuances and infrastructural challenges of individual neighborhoods, instead of the current one-size-fits-all Plan that is currently before the Council.

**ELIZABETH REMBOLD - KENSINGTON, 20895**

414

How long after the last listening sessions will comments from residents be taken

**V Q - silver spring, 20902**

415

I have been a resident of Montgomery County for 57 years. The county used to be a great one for raising a family, but now I question these proposals to make space for more people. How about taking care of residents that are already here. The need to address the "potential" residents is a slap in the face for existing residents. You are adding more people to an already congested area. I listened to the proposal for my area, and you are just creating anger, hatred and conflict toward the council and planning board. Instead of addressing the existing problems for current residents, such as numerous work vehicles parked in residential areas, overflow parking up and down our residential streets from neighboring apartments or "other people", trash, litter, and the major uptick in crime, you are worried about "potential" residents. Handle the existing problems first.

There are significant problems in the downcounty area that are not being addressed. Maybe the planning board's goal is to get rid of residents trying to age in place so your council and planning board can make room for younger residents. And, whoever came up with these bus lanes, needs to come back and add cameras to see if their goal of more traffic, speeding cars and absolute confusion has been reached. I have yet to see all the residents the planning board presentation speaks of with bicycles and people "walking" in those lanes. It is very easy for the Planning board to create havoc in a neighborhood where they do not live. Does your Attainable Housing strategies address the added influx of cars, trash and parking? Does it address the extra workload on trash pick-up, water and sewer usage, and the need for resident mediation with these added "potential" residents?

The planning presentation is such a contradiction to what is really happening in these residential neighborhoods. Why do you think residents go to the television networks to get the problem broadcasted, so officials will finally do something. Everything falls on deaf ears. Nothing is done to address the current problems.

Your planning presentation also says our neighborhoods are environmentally "red due to heat". You, the planning board and council are the cause for the red areas. For example, Northwood Church on University is selling their property to a builder, which translates to them probably cutting down trees, specifically trees next to Sligo creek trees to make room for what.....more people, more cars, more trash and more congestion. So, stop selling the county to every builder, or every business with the highest bid or those that say they have an environmental plan but really do not. Follow-up on the existing problems, listen to the constituents of the county and do something to clean up existing neighborhoods.

416

**Nell Rumbaugh - Rockville, 20852**

1. This should be rolled out on a ballot.
2. These affordable housing "strategies" LACK true strategy. This proposal to roll out "attainable housing" should ONLY be considered after the present state of inadequacies of this County are addressed; lack of walkability, school overcrowding, crime on public transit, prevalence of reckless and dangerous driving on our roads, police recruitment and an undeniable uptick in violent crime. Make good on promises like #FixGeorgiaAvenue.
3. Attainable is one thing; but affordable is another. Home ownership should be the thing that is made attainable.

417

**edward bieber - Bethesda, 20814**

I oppose the county governments plan. I do not think it will have the intended effect. It will benefit developers and very few middle income buyers. There are many other tried and true programs for affordable housing. Improving public transportation will make more affordable locations far more viable. It will destroy neighborhoods and reduce green space and tree canopy. It seems that it is an effort to impose some individuals view on many citizens who are overwhelmingly opposed to this idea.

418	<p><b>ROY BOWMAN - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>Strongly oppose attainable housing proposal. Does nothing to produce affordable housing. All it does is invade single family areas to produce high cost market rate units. Bethesda has more than 20million sq ft additions. Chevy Chase lake has about 3000 new units. Preservation of single family zoning is necessary to maintain attractive living areas in the down county region. County wide ZTA is the wrong approach. Some areas might benefit but uniform destruction of single family zones not the way to go. What happened to the millions of bonds issued by HOC? HOC is better way to achieve truly affordable housing.DO NOT PROCEED WITH THIS ILL ADVISED INITIATIVE</p>
419	<p><b>William Sinclair - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>I am registering my opposition to the Montgomery County Council's initiative to change zoning regulations in the county to permit multi-family units and apartment buildings in what have been single family neighborhoods. Such development would destroy the character of these neighborhoods some of which families have called home for over a hundred years. It would stress infrastructure and decrease property values for existing homes. Please abandon this effort.</p>
420	<p><b>Lori Nicholson - Olney, 20832</b></p> <p>Interesting proposal. It would really help young kids (like my 23-year-old) who are just starting out. However it would be weird to have an apartment building right next to our house, when there's not another apartment building for miles (and certainly not at the end of our cul-de-sac). Lifting all restrictions completely seems kind of abdicating all planning. Maybe you're trying to avoid the problem of picking and choosing which neighborhoods stay single-family zoned and which don't; but it seems like this could use some more review and input--a bit more thought into how and where this could occur.</p>
421	<p><b>Sheila Blum - Chevy Chase, 20815-5150</b></p> <p>I currently live in the Town of Chevy Chase. But prior to that I lived for 30 years in Silver Spring near Northwood High School in a more modest neighborhood. So I have experienced two different neighborhoods in Montgomery County. I certainly support the concept of attainable housing and understand the need, but I want to say a few things in opposition to the current Attainable Housing Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>--One size doesn't fit all.</li> <li>--The land and existing housing in Chevy Chase are too expensive to yield "attainable" housing, even with multiple units on a lot.</li> <li>--There's clearly a need for "attainable" housing in Montgomery County but multi-family dwellings should be built in areas of the county where land is cheaper. Proximity to the metro should not and cannot be the primary criterion.</li> <li>--Most municipalities/counties all over the U.S. (and the world) have a variety of neighborhoods – affluent, moderate, and modest. --In the Town of Chevy Chase, many homes – including mine – have small lots and would not support multi-family dwellings at all well.</li> <li>--As has been pointed out, the Chevy Chase area cannot handle to environmental, infrastructure, school, traffic, and other impacts that upzoning would bring.</li> </ul>

--My husband and I worked very hard to be fortunate enough to move to the Town of Chevy Chase after many years. We love our community and the people. Living in an affluent neighborhood in a single-family home is not a crime – and think about how much taxes we pay that benefit the county and state.

Finally, Andrew Friedson keeps denying that this is an “affordable” housing initiative. However, here’s a quote from an interview with Mr. Friedson in the Washington Jewish Week last year:

“What are the most prominent issues that you’re focusing on at the moment?”

I focus a lot on housing, housing affordability and economic issues, providing job opportunities for people and making sure that Montgomery County is affordable to people who move here, who stay here.”

The Town of Chevy Chase is not a place to try to build affordable or attainable (whatever buzzword you want to use) housing. ONE SIZE DOES NOT FIT ALL. Modify the Attainable Housing Strategy to reflect the issues and concerns I and others have mentioned.

422

**DAVID SEARS - Bethesda, 20814-4752**

I've lived at [REDACTED] in East Bethesda for 46 years. I love Montgomery County; that's why I've stayed put for almost half a century. But I'm concerned about two key challenges that we currently face -- anemic economic development; and insufficient housing opportunities. These are interrelated -- we need more housing to help accelerate economic development in the county. To move quickly in amping up the county's supply of housing there is no "silver bullet." But I strongly support the Att Hsg Initiative as a key piece of the much-needed approach to create more housing in the county.

423

**Jamie Keller - Kensington, 20895**

I haven't taken a deep look at the specifics of the proposed zoning changes but want to express my general support for eliminating single family zoning. I have concerns about plunking a 19 unit apartment building surrounded on all sides by houses, but my concerns are mainly aesthetic which I realize is mildly absurd. I do support owners ability to add accessory dwelling units, and construction of duplex and triplex units on current single family plots. Single family is historically intentionally racist and exclusionary and I hope it's days are numbered. But I'm not sure what the best zoning update looks like. Perhaps scaling back to a 1,2 or 3 unit per lot proposal would garner more support and less resistance from NIMBYs?

424

**Debra Sheldon - Bethesda, 20816**

Leave our single family home communities alone. We are paying taxes for the privilege. There is not enough parking for multi family units. Our schools are already overcrowded. Noise is already a problem. Multi family units need ample parking, space for children to play, seats in schools. You are not providing those things, but giving away our lifestyles to greedy developers who buy their way into your coffers.

425

**Lloyd Guerci - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Thank you for posting a web-based opportunity to comment on the Planning Board’s version of the Attainable Housing Strategies (AHS) report, 2024-AHS-Final-Report.pdf (montgomeryplanning.org) (June 2024).

---

I have lived in the DMV for over 51 years, and in Montgomery County, between Bethesda and Friendship Heights, for over 29 years. On March 20, 2024, I submitted comments on the staff draft AHS report to the Planning Board. In short, some of my comments were not addressed at all and others were not addressed meaningfully in the Planning Board's AHS report. I oppose the Planning Board's AHS proposal.

#### INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

In these comments, I make the following points that the Planning Board's AHS Report

- Does not provide for adequate parking, did not respond meaningfully to my comments on parking and is not based on a foundation of sufficient data and analysis
- Does not adequately address safety or provide for adequate consideration of safety
- Does not adequately address environmental concerns or provide for adequate consideration of environmental concerns
- Does not adequately address economic development impacts
- Should be changed significantly to consider alternatives. As Council President Friedson said, there is a lot of room between doing nothing and doing everything in the AHS report. A Priority Housing District of ½ to 2/3 of a mile from a Metro or similar station based on a measured distance on a pedestrian infrastructure approach should be considered. Assuming and subject to proper analysis, an alternative for small scale buildings could be to allow a duplex as one out of every 5 residences per block in a single family detached zone; allow reduced on-site parking associated with a one-bedroom unit; and provide for a short period for a focused hearing to address lot-specific environmental and safety concerns.

#### PARKING

The Planning Board recommends reducing minimum parking requirements for attainable housing types within the R-200, R-90, R-60 and R-40 zones under both the standard and optional methods of development, with the deepest reduction in parking requirements for attainable housing within the Priority Housing District (PHD). AHS Report p. 42. Inside the PHD, which includes a huge swath of the county area inside the I-495 beltway, where there is street parking on one or both sides of the street, requirements for provision of parking spaces would be reduced by 75%. AHS report, p. 43.

My comments to the Planning Board led with and substantially concerned parking (March 20, 2024); they were not a flat objection to some increases in density. Overall, my comments on parking were not addressed by the Planning Board. The Planning Board's AHS report swept my and others' comments on parking aside and relegated them to a secondary concern without addressing their substance, saying broadly: "The Planning Board received a lot of correspondence out of concern for parking and took this concern seriously, but ultimately one of the goals of this initiative is to make housing more attainable, and reducing parking requirements has the potential to help achieve that goal." (Bold in original) p. 44.

Under Summary of Stakeholder Concerns, the AHS report said: "Parking concerns: The Planning Board believes that it is important to create policies today that promote the desired future of tomorrow. As envisioned in Thrive, the county's future is expected to be more multimodal and connected. The Board used guidance from Thrive and best practices from transportation literature, which prioritized decreased motor vehicle parking per unit of development and adoption of policies that reflect the economic and environmental costs of driving alone. The Board believes that reduced parking minimums are appropriate for walkable communities with access to services,

---

---

amenities, and multiple modes of transportation. Creating housing with reduced parking in these areas will attract households with less of a reliance on personal automobiles.” p. 61.

Beyond unsatisfactorily relying on their stated “belief” in promoting a multimodal future and belief that reduced parking minimums are appropriate for walkable communities with access to services, amenities, and multiple modes of transportation (assumed to be entirely sufficient near all Metro and Purple line stations and apparently even a MARC station in Garrett Park which is commuter rail – not frequent, mass transit – and has almost no commercial presence), the Planning Board’s failure to analyze with data and address both parking needs and impacts of reduced parking spaces, as well as foreseeable problems with their AHS proposal, is very troubling. To begin, parking has been recognized by at least one councilmember as a noteworthy and recurring issue in comments from residents; it is not a secondary issue. In addition, parking needs and problems associated with insufficient numbers of parking spaces must be addressed with detailed facts, analyzed and resolved in a meaningful way – not broadly sidelined and then left unaddressed - before any variation of the AHS is adopted.

Third, the failure to address important issues associated with parking and other issues is related to six general shortcomings of the Planning Board’s AHS report, which did NOT: (1) quantitatively and realistically define the problem to be solved, taking into account real world constraints such as employment at various income levels, employment growth, prices/costs of buying and renting a residence, and market demand; (2) present and fully assess alternatives (instead, it unloaded mainly a single proposal for each of three scales of housing on the County Council); (3) state assumptions and justify them including with data; (4) address significant issues and problems including adverse impacts associated with its proposal and alternatives; (5) consider and address possible unintended consequences that may follow recommendations; and (6) explain quantitatively how each alternative did or did not solve the identified problem to be solved, and address impacts and unintended consequences. The Planning Board dodged the details of substantive issues and, instead, attempted to mollify residents by telling us how many procedural engagement sessions the Board has had.

#### Several Real-world Examples of Parking Problems.

My family lives in a single unit residential dwelling on a R-60 lot in a residential area on an old, narrow street platted in about 1903, located off Wisconsin Avenue (Rte. 355). There is one-side of the street parking (this is the correct approach for safety on this narrow street). The zoning code now requires two parking spaces for R-60 residential properties. See, section 6.2.4.B Parking Requirements. Under the AHS report, our home would be within a Priority Housing District (PHD). While there is only one side of the street parking on our street (for the purposes of the AHS report, parking reductions apply to streets with on-street parking on one or both sides of the street; AHS report p. 43, fn 10), there would be a 75% reduction in parking requirements for duplexes and multiplexes. AHS report p. 43. Assuming the buildout of duplexes and multiplexes on this street, as would be allowed by right under the AHS, under various scenarios of families with multiple motor vehicles given their employment locations and activities (that in fact exist in our neighborhood today) where would vehicles be parked? The AHS report does not provide any response or answer to comments on the issue of where would people park.

To provide a feel for the real-world parking problems, consider the block where I live. There are 27 houses on this block, which is roughly 750 feet long. If each became a quadplex, there would be 108 residential units on this block. There is more. There are 28 on-street parking spaces on this block, all on one side. In general, the vast majority of these spaces now are occupied at night. Sometimes a few remain open and on occasion, for on-street parking, it is necessary to park on the next block. In the daytime, spaces become available, but many of them are used by delivery trucks and vehicles operated by trades people and service people such as renovators, landscapers and

---

---

HVAC technicians. When Concord Hill School, which is on the corner of the street I live on and Wisconsin Avenue, has an event for parents, no on-street parking spaces are available, even next to fire hydrants. Arithmetically, the ratio of houses to on-street parking spaces now is almost 1:1. What would happen if there were 81 (108-27) more residential units on the block? How will this problematic situation be exacerbated if on the Wisconsin Avenue “corridor” so-called medium scale apartment buildings without adequate-in-fact parking are built? And, what will be done in coming decades when electric vehicle owners need to charge their cars? Where will motor vehicles on our street travelling in the opposite direction of the MCPS busses travelling to Westland Middle School go when the bus is approaches? The AHS report does not address these real-world concerns.

And consider this. Adjoining our neighborhood and close to where I live is Norwood Park, a very old park. The primary vehicle route to this M-NCPPC park is Norwood Drive. Norwood Park does not have adequate parking for moderate and high use periods. On-street parking, inadequate as it is on Norwood Drive, is shared by Norwood Drive residents and park users, with spill over to other roads. The Planning Board’s AHS report does not provide for consideration of and is callously indifferent to already highly strained parking situations such as this, as it seemingly assumes, mistakenly, available on-street parking for duplexes, triplexes and quadplexes. Such units without parking would exacerbate an already problematic situation.

Third, consider a recent problem in Silver Spring reported by WTOP news on September 20, 2024. Montgomery County Transportation officials taking action on Silver Spring parking issues - WTOP News. People who live on Quebec Terrace in Silver Spring, Maryland, have been frustrated about the lack of parking. “When you come home late you struggle to find parking.” Residents took matters into their own hands; they used objects and cones to save spaces. The County Police and the Department of Transportation removed them, filling three dump trucks with a variety of objects and cones people used to save their parking spots. MCDOT is advancing a residential permit parking program as a first step. Each household will be eligible for a [one] permit. But this does not solve the problem of too many vehicles for available parking spaces. The Planning Board’s AHS report would create more of these problematic situations. And, more local governmental resources will be required to deal with them, to the satisfaction of none.

Why parking is necessary

Why do people have motor vehicles

The need for parking spaces is closely related to the transportation needs of Montgomery County residents. Many need to use and therefore have motor vehicles. The AHS report does not fairly deal with this fundamental reality.

A basic need is getting to work.

Let’s start with not working from home (working in person) vs. working from home. Although I presented the NY Times data that follow in my comments, the Planning Board’s AHS report document does not address this. A March 16, 2024 New York Times Business Section article, based on U.S. Census Bureau data and entitled “Who is still working from home?” does. The vast, vast majority of people in the United States work fully in person. Out of 143 million people, 115 million work fully in person, 14 million have hybrid schedules and 15 million are fully remote.

A recent CNBC article, citing an Owl Labs report (<https://www.cnbc.com/2024/09/24/despite-more-return-to-office-mandates-hybrid-and-remote-arent-dying.html>), noted:

- 62% say they work from a physical office five days a week
  - 11% say they work fully remotely
-

---

- 27% of workers say they work in a hybrid arrangement

Hybrid workers continue to face challenges in what they want versus what their employers require. Most say they prefer to be in-office three days a week (33%) followed by two (20%), but the most common in-office schedules actually require three (41%) or four (32%) days a week.

Many people, including people in the trades such as construction workers, painters, plumbers and landscapers, need trucks to get to job sites. The lack of adequate, assured parking would preclude them from living in numerous areas as a practical matter and otherwise adversely affect them. As the numbers of buildings with inadequate parking grow so too would the problems that working people who must drive to work face.

It goes beyond the trades. Take, for example, MCPS schools. Many if not most schools are not near mass transit. Teachers and other school staff must drive to work, and park at home. Many other people have jobs that are not located near Metro stops, and travel by car. One cannot assume (and the AHS report did not even lay out assumptions) a broad-scale mass transit buildout that would eliminate the need to travel to work by car or truck. Much of the county road network was not built to enable mass transit. Massive expenditures to create wide-scale, local mass transit are not simply unlikely; they are not going to happen. In my decades in the county, before elections candidates for office have said that they are for mass transit, but it has not been designed or implemented. And seemingly the situation has gotten worse. With pandemic era federal funds having dried up, WMATA/Metro is in need of and will consume massive annual subsidies of up to a billion dollars. See, The Washington Post, "Billion-dollar deficits, drastic cuts: Metro faces fiscal catastrophe." August 9, 2024. The structural operating deficit will continue to grow reaching an annual deficit of approximately \$1.2 billion by FY2035. FY2025 Proposed Budget Effective July 2024 (wmata.com) p. 2. A substantial part of this shortfall will be funded by the State of Maryland, which affects whether there will be other state-funded projects in the counties. The Purple Line keeps costing much more than projected, and will operate at a deficit. Bus Rapid Transit is in substantial part dependent of State funding and, so far, ridership is low. To make matters worse, last year, economic pressures forced the state of Maryland to put off any new construction for transportation projects. A recent proposal suggests delaying planning for new projects as well, and replacing outdated buses with diesel or hybrid buses rather than electric vehicles. "Literally, the dollars aren't there." "A slow state economy, exacerbated by inflation and high construction costs, has limited [Governor] Moore's ability to act on his vision or even to fully maintain the current network of state highways." See, The Washington Post, "Md. plans to delay bridge expansion, electric buses in \$1.3 billion cuts," September 3, 2024.

The County Council needs to address with real data how people in the county will get to work and, if there is a significant probability that it is by motor vehicle, where they will park their vehicles.

A basic need is getting food.

People need food. Food prices are high and cramping people's existence and resources. The economic way to buy food is at a large supermarket or a mega store such as Walmart or Costco. Often this is achieved by driving to Walmart, Costco or a supermarket and parking at home.

Parking requirements would be reduced dramatically in a Priority Housing District (PHD). To define the PHD, the Planning Board's AHS report used a straight-line buffer (essentially a radius) of one mile from Metrorail's Red Line, the Purple Line light rail, and MARC rail stations, plus 500 feet from a Thrive growth corridor. p. 4. They justified this not on documented human experience and data, including on food shopping, but by a bureaucratic reference to the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) parking requirements, which included 1-mile

---



---

straightline buffers. p. 63. But, the ADU program is so much smaller in scope and potential as a practical matter for expansion and has so much less parking impact than the AHS, that it is different in kind from the AHS.

The AHS report did not consider the fact that there are not supermarkets within a mile of some Metro, Purple Line and MARC rail stations. Even where there is a supermarket within a mile, the supermarket will not be on top of the Metro or other station. This means that for some people, who live on the opposite side of the Metro or other station from the supermarket, the supermarket may be more than a mile away.

Also, the PHD is measured by a straight-line buffer, essentially a distance “as the crow flies.” Very often, a person will not walk a straight line from supermarket to home. This is another reason the distance walked to a supermarket may be greater than 1 mile.

Are people going to drive to a supermarket or Walmart or Costco, or walk? And if they drive, where are they going to park their car? The County Council needs to take a hard, County data-based look, be honest and say, this distance, X, in our view is a fair distance to walk to a supermarket and return with multiple bags of groceries, including on hot summer days and rainy days. Even if the distance is X feet, it cannot be assumed that everyone will walk X feet and therefore not need a vehicle. Some will drive to a local supermarket. Some will drive to Walmart or Costco. They need a space to park in when they get home.

The PHD covers a huge swath of the area inside the beltway. See Map of the Priority Housing District, AHS report p. 21. It is unarguable that overall, within the PHD for attainable housing purposes, most people will walk to supermarkets and not need vehicles.

Next, beyond the PHD, the Attainable Housing Report needs to explain how people will travel to and from a grocery store and where they will park their vehicles at home (if that is the mode of transport).

And the PHD buffer concept is retained, it needs to be changed, as it understates some walking distances. Assume a square grid of streets (some situations will involve longer distances than this and some shorter). Assume further a radius (straight-line buffer) of 1 mile, as proposed for the PHD, and that someone lives 1 mile from a grocery store as “a crow flies.” Geometrically, this 1 mile to a grocery store would be the hypotenuse of a triangle, and each side of the triangle (the roads actually walked) for some =  $1/\sqrt{2} = 0.7$  miles, applying the Pythagorean theorem. The total walk to a grocery store from the outer area of the PHD would be two legs of a triangle or 1.4 miles, and the total walk to and from the supermarket would be 2.8 miles. In view of this Any buffer should be based on actual pedestrian paths, determined by an existing sidewalk and shared use path connections. (This is referred to as a measured distance on pedestrian infrastructure approach in a National Capital Planning Commission document. Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements – Amendments to the Transportation Element and Submission Guidelines Update (ncpc.gov) p. 9.) The planners have the mapping systems and software to do this.

An important aspect of life, family activities and friends

Many people have families, including children. Regardless of whether they work from home or take mass transit to work, very often, they still need a motor vehicle. The following is a real-world example. While a student in MCPS, our son, like many other county children, played in MSI soccer, played on a Montgomery County Recreation league basketball team and swam on a non-exclusive team based at the Bethesda County pool. It was not possible to go to the games (e.g., the Soccerplex in Boyds) or away swim meets without a car.

In addition, my wife and I have driven to county regional parks and Seneca Creek State Park. We frequently drive to buy items other than food and to meet friends to socialize, to name a few purposes of trips.

The County Council needs to address how people engaging in these activities with family and friends will travel to and from them and park their vehicles at home.

---

---

### Parking for the Elderly

Montgomery County has a large and, as has been noted by Council President Friedson, expanding elderly population. Many elderly have very limited mobility. In meeting their needs, which include shopping for food, medical appointments and some social activities, they often drive short distances. How are they going to be assured of a place to park when they get home? Relying on the “market” is not adequate. There may not be a dollars-based, market place interest to the real estate developer, but it is an important social interest.

### Handicapped Parking

As a practical matter, there could be an insufficient parking spaces for handicapped people. This is a civil rights matter. When parking spaces become unavailable, people who are not handicapped park in handicapped spots.

### Redistribution of Parked Vehicles and Consequences

It is necessary to consider unintended consequences and “what-ifs.” My written comments urged the Planning Board to consider unintended consequences. They did not. In the context of the Attainable Housing Strategy, one fundamental concern is that there will be more vehicles that need to be parked than spaces in garages, driveways and on the street. The County Council needs to preclude and mitigate problems such as this.

The AHS report refers to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) where the Council agreed to reduce parking requirements within a mile of transit or where adequate on-street parking was available. pp. 20, 43, 63. But it has been recognized, and conveniently ignored in the Planning Board’s AHS report, that as a practical matter ADUs would not be widespread. The ADU program is so much smaller in scope and has so much less parking impact than the AHS that it is different in kind from the AHS.

If a lot or building does not have sufficient parking spaces to satisfy the need, a naive assumption may be that those who do not have a parking space will throw up their hands and decide to not have a motor vehicle. But some or many, who have to get to work, shop for food, go to doctor’s appointments, support their children’s activities, and visit relatives and friends, will have a vehicle.

What will happen is that, in the high-rise rental market place, when there is a shortage, people with money will pay to get available spaces. (High prices would benefit building owners and burden renters.) Others, of lesser means, will not get spaces in the building. And, market based – supply and demand-based pricing – will increase the price for parking.

If there are inadequate numbers of parking spaces in a building or on a lot, numerous people will park elsewhere, often on the street. Particularly in older urban areas (such as the street where I live which has parking on only one side), there is limited on-street parking infrastructure. If there is not adequate on-street parking, there will be problems and conflicts. The problems of demand exceeding supply will multiply when, with time, as allowed under the AHS, multiple buildings and/or lots do not have sufficient on-site parking for residents and turn to the streets. People will park in driveway entrances, etc. There will be competition for and blocking of parking spots. The situation may turn ugly and vile, which will create civic strife.

Problems like those at the Quebec Terrace apartments in Silver Spring, discussed above, have not been resolved; a government permit program has been applied. It would be wholly irrational to create a regulatory code that would result in more and new situations like this. The net result of the AHS proposal itself will not be very substantially reduced number of vehicles. It will be unsatisfied demand for parking spaces and problems. The developer saves money on parking spaces and people in the neighborhood suffer the consequences. As noted in the AHS report, “surface parking lot spaces cost upwards of \$5,000 each, while above-ground parking garages average around \$25,000 per space . . . That can translate into higher rent and higher housing costs.” p. 42. Apparently, it has not occurred to the Planning Board

---

---

that the developers should absorb much of the cost. After all, they are charging a million dollars or more for a townhouse and a lot for apartments.

\*\*

Other options floated in the Planning Board report:

The Planning Board report says:

While the Planning Board is supportive of reducing parking minimums and has recommended the above strategy, the Board is also supportive of working with the Council on other options to modify parking requirements. These include: 1. Basing the amount of required off-street parking on the width of street frontage available. 2. Allowing the required parking to be based on overall parking, which includes both on- and off-site, instead of just what is required on-site. 3. Using the existing multifamily parking minimums for attainable housing types, which ties parking to the number of bedrooms. 4. Allowing tandem parking, which would allow two parking spaces that are a configured like a single spot, one in front of the other. This means that the car in the front spot has to move in order to allow the back spot to move out of the space. 5. Modify the provisions of Section 6.2.3.A.5. that allows on-street parking to count toward required parking. Currently only retail/service or restaurant uses can take credit for onstreet parking that was created as part of a development application. If attainable housing developments are able to add street parking where none existed before that should also count toward required parking. pp. 43-44.

The Planning Board did not expound upon these bare-bone notions. Some of these are really problematic and it is unclear how others would be implemented. This is particularly so in the context of the report's ideological, overarching drive to reduce parking requirements: "ultimately one of the goals of this initiative is to make housing more attainable and reducing parking requirements has the potential to help achieve that goal." p. 44.

For example, relying on on-street parking assumes a space is available, but due to competing demands from neighboring residential units, public facilities or nearby commercial enterprises, that assumption at times in various locations will be invalid. Tandem parking is highly problematic where the two spaces are allocated to different residential units. There will be ongoing issues of getting a vehicle moved at various hours of the day and night. Even worse, if a resident of an adjoining unit in a duplex or triplex blocks the vehicle in another unit and does not come to the door to move their vehicle, then what?

There are other concerns about curbside space, noted in the Pedestrian Master Plan, but not in the AHS report. This includes the demand for curbside space, beyond on-street parking for residents, by bicyclists, for delivery services and for dockless vehicles. The Pedestrian Master Plan says:

"There is a need to think strategically about how curbside space is used. Demand for this space has risen sharply with increased use of delivery services and transportation network companies like Lyft and Uber as well as conventional taxi service and on-street parking. These demands affect pedestrians in a variety of ways, including at crosswalks, which are sometimes blocked by delivery trucks and transportation-network company drivers loading and unloading. The key action encourages the development of a plan to manage this space more effectively." B-11 p. 90. Key Action: B-11a is to develop a curbside management plan and pilot innovative approaches to curbside management. Definitionally, a Curbside Management Plan is a plan that guides the use of space along the street curb, including loading and unloading passengers and freight, motor vehicle and bicycle parking, parklets, outdoor dining, etc. p. 261.

Recommendation EA-2c of the Pedestrian Master Plan calls for the provision of "additional on-street parking corrals for dockless vehicles in high-use areas and coordinate with operators to provide incentives to encourage their use. Dockless vehicles are often left in the middle of

---

---

the sidewalk where they can pose tripping hazards to pedestrians, especially older pedestrians and pedestrians with vision disabilities.” A corral is an on-street location where bicycles, scooters, and other similar devices can be securely parked. p. 107. These would present additional demands on curbside spaces.

## SAFETY

Safety is barely mentioned in the AHS report. Vision Zero is not mentioned.

Two groups of safety issues are safety to motorists and bicyclists using roads, and safety to pedestrians. These will be addressed below by examples.

I live three blocks from Dorset Avenue in Somerset and I drive on Dorset Avenue to travel from Wisconsin Avenue (Rte. 355) to Little Falls Parkway and beyond. Dorset Avenue is a highly used (by cars, trucks and school buses), old, narrow street with parking on one side. It has one generally available lane which is eastbound. Westbound vehicles travel in that space when they can -- except that when an eastbound vehicle approaches, westbound vehicles then drive into curbside spaces between parked cars. If Dorset becomes redeveloped with a significant number of duplexes, triplexes and quadplexes (by right) and many vehicles are parked on the street, there will be inadequate space for westbound traffic to drive into when faced with oncoming traffic. The street will be unsafe to motorists and bicyclists using the road.

Second, as explained by a local resident at the County Council’s AHS listening session at Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School on September 25, 2024, with significant development, the road he uses has become dangerous due to traffic. Listening Session at 59:56 – 101:28.

A key element in implementation of the AHS is the pattern book, which does not exist at least in the public domain. The AHS report says: “The pattern book will also provide an overview of the regulatory process, which will include details about development applications, permitting steps, and links to relevant forms. Additional guidance and information for other development related issues such as environmental considerations, safety, and off-site parking may be included in an appendix.” (emphasis added) p. 30. What stands out is that “safety” may merely be included in an appendix. This is a nothingburger. The public cannot rely on the Pattern Book saying anything or, if it does, being sufficient.

## ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

### General

The environment is barely mentioned in the AHS report.

As to On-Site Parking Layout – the AHS report merely refers in vague, conclusory terms to Options for sustainable parking designs that are environmentally friendly and ensure that asphalt, car ports, and garages don’t dominate the site. p. 29

The not-yet-existing Pattern Book, referred to above in the discussion of safety, merely “MAY” address environmental considerations in an appendix. The report says: “The pattern book will also provide an overview of the regulatory process, which will include details about development applications, permitting steps, and links to relevant forms. Additional guidance and information for other development related issues such as environmental considerations, safety, and off-site parking may be included in an appendix.” (emphasis added) p. 29

And there is very limited reference to the environment elsewhere in the AHS report, e.g., to the optional method (limited disturbance (p. 31), Master Plans-walkable Street environment (pp. 36-37) and corridor zones-built environment (p. 37).

---

	<p>It is very obvious that environmental concerns have not been addressed meaningfully and adequately in the AHS report and that there is no explanation, much less a satisfactory one, on how they would be taken into account and effectuated in a "by right" system for duplexes, triplexes and quadplexes in the PHD and elsewhere.</p> <p>Electric Vehicles and Transition to Electric Vehicles</p> <p>The transportation sector is one of the three major sources of greenhouse gases. Nationally and in Maryland, the transition to electric vehicles (EV) is facing significant expansion challenges. Apart from the cost of an EV, the maj</p>
426	<p><b>Michael Kirvan - Kensington, 20895</b></p> <p>I am against this plan. Terms are vaguely defined. This is the most complex, expensive and ill conceived solution to a market based problem Let markets solve this. Look at Columbia MD. A corporation did what you are trying to do and generated new jobs and taxes and it is one of the best communities in the country as rated by independent analysis.</p>
427	<p><b>Christina Sommer - Kensington, 20895</b></p> <p>I am against this initiative as it will negatively impact our family oriented community. This seems to be a pro-developer effort that doesnt take into consideration the neighborhood feel of our community. I grew up in MoCo, specifically in Kensington and have chosen to raise our family in the same town due to the small town feel and family focused environment. The AHS will negatively impact our neighborhood.</p>
428	<p><b>Katie Skinner - Kensington, 20895</b></p> <p>This plan is premature. It shouldn't be enacted until a thorough assessment can be done on how the changes would affect water use, sewer, power, and most importantly traffic. Traffic is already an issue and this would only contribute to the problem.</p>
429	<p><b>Danielle Magid - Kensington, 20895</b></p> <p>I have serious concerns about the proposal to rezone single family neighborhoods to allow for multifamily housing. In addition to the common concerns such as increased vehicle congestion, reduced tree coverage, and less open/public space, my primary concern is that additional multifamily housing will attract investors who will buy up and rent out the units, ultimately resulting in fewer owner-occupied homes in our neighborhoods. This will drastically change the character of the neighborhoods as they will have a higher renter ratio, become much more transient, and feel less community-oriented (the community-feel being thing we love the most about our neighborhood!). Will policies be put in place to incentivize the development and sale of owner-occupied properties?</p> <p>Additionally, multifamily doesn't necessarily mean affordable or attainable. In our area, a new development near Holy Cross on Strathmore will consist mostly of townhomes. I am told that the estimated costs will be between \$700k - \$1.1 million. Housing prices in another luxury townhome development on the corner of Strathmore and Rockville Pike are over \$1 million. I do not see how this proposal will result in more attainable housing.</p>

430

**Paul Hurley - Kensington, 20895**

I attended the information session on the AHS initiative in Bethesda on September 25, 2024. I would like to let you know that I agree with several of the comments I heard.

I wonder why the initiative is not taken up as part of the county's established long term planning process.

The changes proposed for single family zoning are so momentous that I think the strategy warrants further discussion and revision, and ultimately should be the subject to a referendum.

Among the concerns I have is that the impact of dramatically increasing residential density on social infrastructure, especially roads, schools and other public services, has not been taken into account.

I also wonder how water, sewer, electrical, gas and cable services will be able to adjust to higher residential density. We probably would experience constant nuisance as our crowded thoroughfares are dug up and otherwise blocked so that public utilities could be "heavied up."

I also fear the environmental deterioration that would accompany increasing residential density, particularly as green space is eliminated.

431

**Lola Anjou - Silver Spring, 20901**

I am adamantly opposed to allowing multiple housing dwellings, i.e. duplexes, triplexes, townhouses, etc. to be built in areas zoned for single family houses. After growing up in a very dense urban community, my greatest desire was to live in a neighborhood that was not densely developed and provided ample parking in close proximity to my house. With the proposed zoning changes by the council, my dream area in which I have resided for decades, would be altered drastically, changing the entire aesthetics of my community. Please find another way to provide additional housing options.

432

**Patrick Joyce - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I am writing to STRONGLY encourage you to proceed with the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative.

Relaxing single family only zoning will enable desperately needed housing to be built.

I was born in Montgomery County and apart from my time at the University of Maryland and a few years living in Pennsylvania and California for work I have lived here my whole life. I want Montgomery County to continue to grow without continuing to sprawl. Reducing barriers to building is critical to enable that growth.

I am a homeowner, my children attend public schools (North Chevy Chase Elementary and Silver Creek Middle School), and I vote every election and will vote against candidates who oppose building housing.

Thank you.

**Joe Gillespie - Paris, 75015**

433

Hello,

I hope this message finds you well. I realize with the large number of participants in the virtual listening session, I may not be able to make a comment. However, I wanted to put my substantive comments into the record just in case. I am a Montgomery County voter and homeowner who is temporarily residing outside of the country, with plans to move back to the area.

Specifically, I want to reiterate and applaud the planning board and the County Council for its bold vision to increase the supply of new housing in the County. The development of this strategy is the culmination of years of hard, thoughtful work, backed by a strong analysis of the status quo and the impact of the proposed changes. I would especially like to thank Ms. Govoni for her hard work and thoughtful responses to feedback I gave early in the process, alongside some of the great presentations she gave on this topic the past few years. I also want to thank the council, especially Mr. Friedson, Mr. Glass, Ms. Fani-Gonzalez, Ms. Mink, and Mr. Jawando for supporting the study and consideration of these issues.

My family of four moved to the County in 2017, living in and renting a two-bedroom condominium and then, after expanding our family once more, to a three-bedroom condominium in North Bethesda. We then moved to the City of Rockville and are now living an apartment in Paris, France. I only include all of this to say is that families can and do live and thrive in apartments and other housing types aside from single-family homes. I've heard feedback at other listening sessions suggestions that these changes would ruin neighborhoods, making them unsuitable for families. I frankly find this type of suggestion repugnant and is dismissive of the many people who live in the County who would be happy just to live and raise families in different types of housing near the families, friends, schools, and work.

With respect to the substance of the report, I am fully in support of its recommendations. As found in the report, homes, especially those in single-family neighborhoods, are being torn down right now and rapidly replaced with larger, single-family homes, which has only served to exacerbate existing disparities in the county. Increasing the supply of housing is a local and national imperative to help reduce the costs of housing for families here. The data, which I am sure the Council and Planning Board are aware of, is clear that more housing is the only remedy to reduce costs in the long-term, and there is no reason why large swaths of the most desirable portions of the county should continue to remain low-density.

---

As to criticism, my only concern is that this effort is not being pursued fully and quickly enough. In 2021, I wrote to the Planning Board that I had concerns over the need for a Pattern Book, which I think adds an unnecessary burden to those looking to build new duplexes, triplexes, or quadplexes. I have included a copy of my email below, explaining why I believe Neighborhood Compatibility is an overblown, unnecessary concern, especially when compared to the rapid redevelopment of original homes throughout the county that include no such requirement.

Finally - I want to highlight the urgency of this issue. The recommendations should have been implemented yesterday. It has been over **\*\*three years\*\*** since I emailed my concerns that we were not moving quickly enough. At that time, I stated that it was important for the county to “move swiftly and with urgency to allow greater development” and that “Every day, these original neighborhood homes, oftentimes sold only for the cost of the land, are being replaced with brand-new, single-family homes that will not be removed for decades.” This has only accelerated in the meantime. Housing prices have grown even further, and we are still handwringing about the exact same issues, even though the solution being presented will take years if not decades to really make an impact. Certainly there has been improvement in the data and the overall strategy, which is now more expansive than was discussed three years ago. But there has been enough talking and enough listening. Politically, it is best for the council to simply move forward and implement recommendations and move forward.

Sincerely,  
Joe Gillespie

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*Email from September 2021 reproduced below\*\*\*\*\*

Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2021 2:01 PM

To: MCP-Chair <mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org>; Govoni, Lisa <Lisa.Govoni@montgomeryplanning.org>

Cc: councilmember.riemer <councilmember.riemer@montgomerycountymd.gov>; Councilmember.Friedson@montgomerycountymd.gov;

Councilmember.Jawando@montgomerycountymd.gov

Subject: Attainable Housing Pattern Book

Montgomery County Planning Board and Ms. Govoni,

I hope you are doing well. I am writing to provide my thoughts and input on the County’s Attainable Housing Strategies work. I currently live in North Bethesda at the Grosvenor Park II Condominium at 10500 Rockville Pike, Unit 801, in District 1 and work for the federal government near White Flint Metro Station. I strongly support the aims of increasing the supply of more dense, market rate housing, elimination in parking minimums, and ending the legacy and effects of exclusionary zoning in this county. Overall, I applaud the county’s efforts to allow denser developments that permit more people to live in the area.

---



---

I saw in the preliminary recommendations a section on “Compatibility concerns.” It stated that the “Staff recommendations would allow the creation of duplexes, triplex, and quadplex by-right only if they follow the contents of the pattern book” (emphasis in the original) and that in the details, that pattern books are used by many jurisdictions to control architecture or form-based development standards. Additionally, they recommendation creation of this pattern book in FY22, that it be finalized, subject to public comment, and presumably, revision based on public comment, before any duplex, triplex, or quadplex by-right development is permitted.

I think mandate of a pattern book is a mistake and does not reflect what is currently happening in the single-family uniplex market in the county’s neighborhoods. Every day I take my kids to school, we bike by teardowns in neighborhoods that, as far as I know, have none of the same restrictions. Further restrictions on other types of housing, limiting the form of smaller scale houses, will further increase the already-high cost of new construction duplexes or helps prevent them outright. And the extra delay in preventing different housing types will only exacerbate the current housing challenges and encourage large-scale detached home construction.

Specifically, I want to highlight three neighborhoods and specific homes that I think clearly demonstrate why a pattern book is counterproductive and unnecessary.

First, is 5810 Grosvenor Lane, zoned R-60. This is a home in the Lone Oak Neighborhood, though it was titled in a plat named “North Bethesda” (Plat No. 818). In 1936, the property was sold subject to a racial covenant that prohibited future sales “to any one other tha[n] a member of the Caucasian race, and that [the] covenant shall be a covenant to remain on this land forever” (Book 634, p. 58). The neighborhood was later developed, and I believe a house was built in the late 80s/early 90s (the adjacent home is listed as being built in 1993). In 2014, it appears to have been completely torn down and redeveloped. It now 4,952 square feet of above-grade living space and 2,300 square feet of basement space. It has what appears to be a three car garage, a large pool, and is a completely modern design. It also has ample taxpayer funded, delineated on-street parking. Its current Redfin estimate is roughly \$2.2 Million dollars. The other, original homes in this neighborhood, are consistently being torn down and replaced.

Second, is 1721 Evelyn Drive. This is located within the city limits of Rockville and is zoned R-75. I could not determine whether this had historically been subjected to a racial covenant. It is listed as built in 1960 in SDAT, but I believe it was completely rebuilt in 2015, based on the City of Rockville permit data (Permit OCC2015-06765 “New Singe Family Dwelling”). It now has 3,608 square feet of above-grade living space and 1,353 square feet of basement space. It does not appear to have a garage, but it has a nice, new, modern exterior finishes. Its current Redfin estimate is roughly \$800,000, though I think this is actually undervalued compared to recent sales in the neighborhood.

Finally, is 11409 Luxmanor Road, zoned R-200. It sits in the Luxmanor Neighborhood, very close to the Josiah Henson Museum on property once owned by Josiah Riley where Josiah Henson and other people of African descent were held in bondage, forced to work, and beaten. 48 years after Mr. Henson died, in 1936, the owner of the property, the Luxmanor Corporation, for “protection against such depreciation” and assure “uniformity” prohibited any “lot or structure” from being “sold, rented, or conveyed, as a whole or in part, to any person or persons of African descent” “in perpetuity” (Book 648, pp. 34–35). The next item required that there be a 25 foot setback from the street.

---

---

All other restrictions were set to expire. The home on the property was rebuilt in 2006. It now has 6,414 square feet of above-grade living space and 2,100 square feet of below-grade living space (though Redfin lists 3,492 feet below grade) and a 3 car garage. Its current Redfin estimate is \$2.55 Million Dollars. Like Lone Oak above, almost every original home is being torn down and replaced with maximally-sized houses for the half-acre minimum lot sizes.

But I point out each of these for a few reasons. One, none of these single family detached homes matches the original style of the neighborhood. Two are completely modern designs, and all three are far larger than anything that had been built in the neighborhood at the time. They were not subject to any pattern book design or architectural review. They are now far more expensive and far larger than any of the original homes in the neighborhood. The Luxmanor Home, for example, has enough square footage to fit six of my 1400 square foot three-bedroom condominiums where our family of five currently lives. And they were all done by-right.

Second, each of these properties is within one mile of a metro station. They are walkable and bikeable to amenities like offices, schools, and shopping centers. They each have county-subsidized on-street parking available to them, in addition to any personal off-street parking. And they can each only house one family.

Third, it is no coincidence that at least two of these homes were the product of explicitly racist covenants and zoning policies. And while the covenants themselves are no longer enforceable, and these neighborhoods have minimal restrictions by covenant on density, the county has continued to perpetuate, by law, restrictions that would increase access to these neighborhoods. Each of these neighborhoods has continued to exclude, through restrictions on density based on minimum lot sizes, setbacks, and parking requirements. And now each of these neighborhoods may have the opportunity to continue having an opinion on who and how people can live in property near them, by giving input on the pattern book.

And just to be clear, I don't fault people for having money or for building nice houses. Old houses oftentimes have poor layouts, are energy inefficient, and make poor use of the land. That's ok to want something new, and these old houses weren't meant to last forever! I believe people should generally be free to build a house on their property. My concern is the fact that the County's zoning laws do not allow for anything else, and as a result, encourage such development by (1) preventing competition for these lots from multi-family units and (2) increase the per-housing cost for families by limiting total supply.

Accordingly, the county should move swiftly and with urgency to allow greater development on properties like this. Every day, these original neighborhood homes, oftentimes sold only for the cost of the land, are being replaced with brand-new, single-family homes that will not be removed for decades. Action must be taken now. These are desirable areas close to amenities and good schools. But preventing development prevents people from living there, encourages sprawl, and perpetuates systemic racism.

Sincerely,  
Joe Gillespie

---

\*\*\*\*\*

**434 Neil Kopit - Chevy Chase, 20815**  
I don't have to repeat the numerous objections to the Attainable Housing plan. It is ill conceived and not researched enough. It is a detriment to Montgomery County and will ruin the existing environment.

**435 Karl-Eric Lerebours - Silver Spring, 20910**  
Thank you for taking the time to conduct this research and saw a proposal. Please implement this proposal. You cannot please everyone. If you believe this then implement this.  
  
Increasing the housing supply will be great for the future of this county. We need a diverse housing supply.  
  
Please implement this. I BEG you! Thank you for everything that you do. Much appreciated.

**436 Jeevan Mammen - Bethesda, 20814**  
I am a single family home owner in Bethesda, Maryland and I completely support the Attainable Strategies Initiative. We need to do as much as we can to densify housing and improve mass transit use. We need to do this because of climate change, housing costs and making sure our neighbors don't go homeless. Please let me know what I can do to push the envelope on this because this is policy that we needed a decade ago and it needs to pass asap. Thank you!

**437 Katie Young - Germantown, 20874**  
I am NOT in favor of allowing homeowners or developers to build small apartment buildings OR multiple homes within our neighborhoods. Our neighborhoods are what define and keep Montgomery County unique. It is unconscionable that this option is even being considered as it would disrupt the beauty of our county and the neighborhoods that have both historic and intrinsic value. I have lived in Montgomery County my entire life, in Chevy Chase, Damascus, Olney, and Darnestown. This proposal will reduce the attraction to living in this beautiful county. We are NOT northern Virginia and we do NOT offer the employment opportunities that N VA does and we never will. We just do not have the capability of offering the employment base that N VA offers. We have SO MANY other options for housing, for example, building AFFORDABLE housing in and along 355. Stop building luxury apartments and build affordable housing. Keep Montgomery County's neighborhoods intact and special. It is what sets us apart from our surrounding counties. I shake my head in wonder how this proposal is even being considered. It is NOT about "not in my neighborhood" it is about working together to find solutions that MAKE SENSE. This proposal makes NO sense unless you are a developer whose pocketbook will expand by this proposal.

438

**Caroline Hickey - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Dear Councilmembers,  
I strongly oppose the Affordable Housing Strategies plan.

County Exec Marc Elrich has clearly stated that he is firmly against the plan, that it relies on old data and doesn't account for current permitted housing in the works, and that the plan is a "fraud." I attended the listening session at BCC last week where hundreds showed up to protest this plan.

Why do you continue to push this plan, when the constituents you serve and the County Exec are so firmly against it?

Regards,  
Caroline Hickey

439

**Thomas Shuler Jr - Chevy Chase, 20815**

You obviously do not understand what has made Montgomery County appealing--close-in single family communities. This effort at elimination of single- family zoning will destroy these communities for your fraudulent claim of "attainable housing"--which you know is a lie. As stated at the BCC "listening" meeting, your data, facts and assumptions are manipulated and you are knowingly and repeatedly lying to us--your constituents. As someone said, if your politician does not listen to their public, who is really paying them?

440

**beverly piccone - Rockville, 20852**

I am writing to express my opposition to the AHI as it will likely exacerbate stormwater management issues, traffic and congestion problems, school overcrowding, environmental impact and infrastructure demands.

I have concerns that it will negatively impact single family home neighborhoods and the quality of life, neighborhood character and property values.

441

**William Maher - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I think that it is a good idea. Thanks for doing this

442

**J.A. Hirn - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Hello. Even on its face, the initiative clearly embodies the Council's and Planning Department's true greedy, self-interested agenda of pandering to real estate developers for their own profit, at the expense of the interests of their constituents and all the residents of the County. The lack of integrity is so obvious - "attainable" is not "affordable", nor is it even attainable in this case - \$3 million a unit is extremely expensive and much higher a value than single family residences throughout the county. Your blatant disregard or

reasonableness, transparency, practicality (the infrastructure - the thoroughfares...!) and honesty are horrific. No one will vote for you but the developers, profiteers, and the few people who don't read between the lines and are tricked on this matter. Shame on you.

**443 Regina Reed - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I am asking the Council to PAUSE on the rezoning initiatives.

Insufficient studies have been done in the impact of higher density in these areas (environmental, educational, economic, traffic, crime-- just to name a few)

Insufficient studies/ support that this is the best way to increase attainable housing. There are many other options!

Impact on availability of single family homes and single family neighborhoods. Many families would like single family home living and this change would further push up prices while developers make more \$. Families lose in this change.

**444 Joseph Dugan - Rockville, 20852**

My wife and I have lived in Old Farm since buying our home in 1982. We raised 4 kids there right across the street from Old Farm elementary. 3 of our 4 kids have moved back to the neighborhood and 11 of our 14 grandkids live within walking distance to our home. The Worch family is similar to ours in that all 4 of their kids moved back into this neighborhood where they grew up. They want their kids to have the same great experience they had and they never thought for one minute the neighborhood might change to the extent you are considering! When they scrimped and saved to get into their homes they relied on the zoning laws that have been in existence since the 1960's when the neighborhood was constructed to protect their investment and relied on them when they moved in. Now you want to put up duplexes and change the character of a neighborhood for what purpose? To make more money for the developers and more tax money for the county. WJ is now 30% over capacity and Farmland built an addition to do away with their portables but it didn't happen for long and there are 3 more now! This is a very poor decision that will only lead to more traffic congestion, less green space, more school overcrowding and the prices will be over 1 million dollars and not attainable. The zoning laws that existed and we relied on at time of purchase and for years afterward are there for our protection as homeowner so you can't just change the character of our neighborhood. If you don't oppose and abandon this ridiculous idea we will make sure to vote you all out of office. This is a decision that should be voted on by the homeowners who will be devastated by this decision. Sincerely, Joseph A Dugan. Jr

**445 Christopher Vroome - Silver Spring, 20910**

The attainable housing initiative is a good starting point for improving housing availability for the county.

much of the county is rapidly becoming unaffordable to healthcare workers like myself and puts the regions health care network in jeopardy. hospitals are currently struggling to find workers, recently an endoscopy center I worked for decided to close because it was unable to find nursing staff.

theses changes are desperately needed to continue the growth and success of the region

446	<p><b>Tammy Paidas - Brookeville, 20833</b></p> <p>I own a multi family home in Montgomery county. I am trying my best to keep my rent as low as possible but it is difficult when my property taxes are through the roof! These large increases are affecting how much we charge. How about a tax credit for keeping the rent stable for our tenants?</p>
447	<p><b>Eric Fowler - Gaithersburg, 20877</b></p> <p>I think we need to aggressively tackle the housing shortage, which means high rise apartments surrounding every metro station and avoiding building any sf homes going forward. That said, relaxing our zoning laws is a decent first step towards realizing the housing needs our county has.</p>
448	<p><b>Robert Hartmann - Bethesda, 20816</b></p> <p>This Initiative does nothing to provide attainable housing. It simply increases density, clogs our schools, overwhelms our sewer systems and county services. It is a sham as has been noted in the media and by elected officials including our County Executive. The initiative uses MAGA-style fear and intimidation tactics to make a false case when the county has enough units on hand or planned to take care of future needs. The initiative needs to be shut down before the Planning Department loses all credibility.</p>
449	<p><b>Kenneth Krosin - Bethesda, 20816</b></p> <p>I am opposed to upzoning for the many reasons set forth in the following article:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Research and Publications Relating to Upzoning</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Patrick Condon, a professor at the University of British Columbia School of Architecture, landscape architect, author, and former city planner, for twenty+ years was an eloquent advocate of densification/upzoning, concluded in 2021 that upzoning is a costly mistake: ....“upzoning” of neighborhoods drives up housing costs and cannot create affordable housing. “.....densification in the city of Vancouver has not improved housing affordability. [He further states that ] “indisputable” evidence convinced him [that densification/upzoning] does NOT create affordability. Condon also provides a reminder that “upzoning” [actually] increases the value of land (by increasing the development value)1</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Does upzoning make housing more affordable/attainable: No, Upzoning Might Not Lower Housing Costs? “We’re witnessing a sea change in the way American cities regulate residential development. In roughly the past decade.... cities in every region of the country have begun to re-examine exclusive single-family zoning. Some cities, such as Minneapolis; Sacramento, California; and recently Arlington, Virginia, have</p>

---

loosened zoning restrictions to allow small, multi-unit buildings citywide..... Many cities are also taking steps to allow more and taller apartment development along major transportation corridors.

..... today the momentum is firmly on the side of upzoning advocates. And the fire fueling this trend is unquestionably a widespread sense of alarm about the high cost of housing.

.....But the evidence that rolling back those zoning codes will offer a meaningful or rapid solution to high housing costs is far weaker. And so, the fear I have is that this [to try to remedy affordability] will ... provoke backlash.. when upzoning fails to deliver upon the ...overzealous promises of its champions.....<sup>2</sup>

Housing researcher Yonah Freemark recently published a review of the recent scholarship on zoning changes and their effects on the housing market<sup>3</sup>. Freemark finds extremely mixed and uncertain evidence for the effects of upzoning, and one of several reasons he identifies is that the link between upzoning and actual housing production is tenuous. In other words, “Are they allowed to build it?” is a different question from, “Are they building it?...”

If Upzoning Doesn’t Lower Rents, Is It Worth Doing? “There are a lot of reasons why zoning reform might not lower rents. It might not spur much building. It might spur building, but only at the high end of the market—particularly if it is focused on allowing or facilitating high-rise buildings which are more costly to construct. Upzoning narrowly targeted to a neighborhood or corridor might induce a speculative rush, pumping up land prices in that neighborhood and ensuring that any housing built is expensive. On the other hand, upzoning that is broad but shallow—such as Minneapolis’s citywide legalization of triplexes—might be met with crickets if the newly legal projects aren’t profitable or physically viable, or there simply isn’t a critical mass of the kind of builders prepared to undertake them.

Every upzoning is different and happens in a different market context, and so the question of whether “upzoning” will meaningfully promote affordability is, indeed, uncertain and probably so context-dependent that there isn't a meaningful general answer. Yet the incentive for a local elected official trying to pass a policy package is to offer definite answers and simple explanations. This is where I fear that hanging the entire prospect of zoning reform on the promise of affordable housing that may or may not materialize is dangerous”<sup>4</sup>.

1 Livable California Teleconference on Feb. 6, 2021; <https://www.livablecalifornia.org/vancouver-smartest-planner-prof-patrick-condon-calls-california-upzoning-a-costly-mistake-2-6-21/>; Also see Sick City; <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/cag.12791>

2 <https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2023/4/26/upzoning-might-not-lower-housing-costs-do-it-anyway>;

3 <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/2023-04/Zoning%20Change%20pre%20print%20version.pdf>

4 <https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2023/4/26/upzoning-might-not-lower-housing-costs-do-it-anyway>.

“Already, we’re seeing media narratives take shape that push back against the value of zoning reform as a political priority. A recent, widely circulated Bloomberg story about Austin, Texas, is titled “Cities Keep Building Luxury Apartments Almost No One Can Afford.”<sup>5</sup> The summary blurb at the beginning offers a harsh assessment: ‘Cutting red tape and unleashing the free market was supposed to help strapped families. So far, it hasn’t worked out that way.’”<sup>6</sup>

“There is an expectation in some quarters that densification of existing urban areas will lead to improved housing affordability. This argument is used to justify densification policies around the world. However, an examination housing affordability and the density of built-up urban areas corresponding to the 53 major US markets (metropolitan areas over 1,000,000 population) suggests just the opposite — that higher urban densities are associated with worse housing affordability, for both owners and renters..... “

Density, Market Structure and Housing Affordability: “The widely circulated view that densification improves housing affordability is far from proven. Indeed, the actual data shows that where urban densities are higher, housing affordability is worse.”<sup>7</sup>

---

---

A Planning Report article by Michael Storper, Distinguished Professor of Regional and International Development in Urban Planning; Director, Global Public Affairs at UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs states:  
Upzoning has been proposed as a solution to the affordable housing crisis, aiming to increase supply and affordability through trickle-down economics. .... Our analysis shows that blanket upzoning is likely to miss its affordability target..... Blanket upzoning is a blunt instrument, whereas people’s housing needs are diverse. Even if the upzoning is aimed at, for example, transit-served corridors, it doesn’t mean that all such areas are going to attract housing investment. This is because, even with transit, people don’t live and work in the same neighborhoods, and there is no evidence that transit changes these patterns in any significant way. So, when we upzone around transit corridors, for example, only some locations are likely to attract big increases in housing construction. These are areas with strong attractiveness. It will favor those who can pay the price of housing in high-demand areas—marginally improving the housing prospects for highly skilled people at the upper end of the income distribution.

What it’s not going to do is solve the housing crisis for the middle classes and lower-income people. Even with so-called affordability set-asides, the trickle-down effect will be small. It could even be negative in the highly desirable areas.... This is just one example of the many unintended consequences that proponents of blanket upzoning don’t take into account, and that is why it will fail.” 8

The Effects of [Upzoning] .... Aren’t Neatly Reversible: “Imagine a river teeming with salmon—you can practically reach in and grab one. A dam is built on this river, disrupting the annual migration, and the salmon disappear. Decades later, a growing environmentalist movement successfully campaigns for the removal of the dam, and it is blown up, restoring the river’s unimpeded flow. Will the salmon be back in their former numbers the next day? Or even next year? Of course not...”9

5 <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2023-04-21/luxury-apartment-boom-pushes-out-affordable-housing-in-austin-texas> (paywall).

6 <https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2023/4/26/upzoning-might-not-lower-housing-costs-do-it-anyway>

7 <https://www.newgeography.com/content/007221-higher-urban-densities-associated-with-worst-housing-affordability>

8 <https://www.planningreport.com/2019/03/15/blanket-upzoning-blunt-instrument-wont-solve-affordable-housing-crisis>

9 <https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2023/4/26/upzoning-might-not-lower-housing-costs-do-it-anyway>;

Other references:

Densification has its academic critics. Andrés Rodríguez-Pose (London School of Economics) and Michael Storper (UCLA) have concluded that there is insufficient evidence that “upzoning” ... can improve housing affordability and that it could “increase gentrification within prosperous regions and would not appreciably decrease income inequality.”

A “meta study” by Gabriel M. Ahlfeldt, Elisabetta Pietrostefani. They compiled 200 separate studies on the issue to understand the influence of density on cost and on a number of other issues of interest to urban designers (e.g. transportation, pollution, etc). Their conclusion? Maybe adding new density reduces prices sometimes but, in most cases, it does not.10

Upzoning Does Not Mean Affordable Housing; January 23, 2023; <https://acedmonds.org/upzoning-does-not-mean-affordable-housing/>;

Use Upzoning Sparingly, New Report Suggests, Cinnamon Janzer, Next City: Backyard – Next City on Housing Equity, August 31, 2021 Use Upzoning Sparingly, New Report Suggests ([nextcity.org](https://nextcity.org))

Brookings Institute: The Double Edged Sword of Upzoning: <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-double-edged-sword-of-upzoning/>

---



Upzoning Affordability Impacts: The Latest Research: <https://www.planetizen.com/news/2023/12/126834-upzoning-affordability-impacts-latest-research>

The Most Destructive Housing Form: <https://stopbtownupzoning.org/2021/02/01/the-most-destructive-housing-form/>

**450 Kristin Green - Kensington, 20895**

Summit Avenue between Knowles Avenue and Cedar Lan in Kensington is already terribly congested at all hours of the day and night with people speeding and blasting their music. I oppose the these new housing developments that will bring even more traffic along the roads and in/out into parking garages/lots that support these developments. There needs to be a solution to the traffic before you bring more residents to increase the population!

**451 Kathleen Breslin - Kensington, 20895**

I am extremely concerned by the Planning Department's Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative.

As a resident of Montgomery county I believe this plan is a major oversight. Why isn't this proposal being thoroughly studied and evaluated under the County's Master Plan? If it was, I believe it would come to the conclusion that it will not solve any problems. It will only add issues and new problems for the residents and county to deal with.

I am also concerned with the impart on traffic and parking. We already have Major traffic issues we need to address throughout the county and in particular my direct neighborhood.

People buy in single-family neighborhoods for the community it offers. This plan threatens to pull the rug out from under them, undermining their biggest investment. Many of these neighborhoods are older and simply cannot support a higher density of housing.

With all of this said, I believe it would be irresponsible and a travesty to move forward with this initiative.

**452 Joan Bull - Kensington, 20895**

I bought my house because I wanted the feel of an R-60 neighborhood. I do not want R-60 re-zoned for attainable housing. Re-zoning would reduce the value of my home and negatively impact the quality of my life. I doubt the massive need for traffic mitigation and utilities enhancement has been considered as part of this re-zoning concept. The real issue is that not everyone has to live in Montgomery County. Jobs and infrastructure should be designed so that people are drawn to live in less crowded, less expensive areas. Montgomery County government has always been under the influence of real estate developers. This re-zoning concept smells of that.

453	<p><b>Lisa Rose - Brookeville, 20833</b></p> <p>My immediate family &amp; extended family have been residents of this county forever.</p> <p>While I understand the need for more affordable housing changing the single family code is NOT the answer! Already crowded roads, parking,, home values etc. would all be impacted. If you own large land 5+ acres maybe but not neighborhoods that are already on small lots.</p> <p>Provide tax credits for multifamily communities, apartments, developers to lower rental rates.</p>
454	<p><b>Stu Simon - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>Congrats on forwarding a long overdue strategy to address the housing affordability crisis in our county. During the past few years, as legislators have debated this issue I have watched as the majority of modest houses on Leland Drive between Woodmont and Bradley have been torn down, and their lawns bricked up and replaced by multi million dollar mansions. All around are apartment buildings and townhouses which should be on Leland as well but due to red lined inspired zoning plots that could be housing dozens of middle income folks are housing one small super rich family. This is absurd and grossly unfair.</p>
455	<p><b>Graciela Mangassarian - Chevy chase, 20815</b></p> <p>I am totally against the idea of the “attainable housing initiative” proposed by the Montgomery County council. I have purchased my house in a single-family neighborhood and i would like to keep it that way. We are already dealing with the failed purple line project - we do not need another project imposed on us!</p>
456	<p><b>Mary lou Kenary - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>What exactly does this mean to established neighborhoods</p>
457	<p><b>Edward Rose - Brookeville, 20833</b></p> <p>I want to submit my STRONG objection to this initiative. Established and planned single family housing communities cannot support such an initiative. The addition strain on power, water, roads, parking decrease in home values, are all serious issues. I have lived in my home for 29 years and would not want my neighbor / neighborhood to start subdividing homes into multiple dwelling units. The character of the neighborhood would be ruined.</p>

458

**Jill Berry - Rockville, 20855**

I am the Senior Manager, Grant Development, Engagement for The Arc Montgomery County and I want to know how housing for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities will be handled by Montgomery County. What resources are available?

459

**John Meenan - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I am strongly opposed to your plan to jam multifamily homes into beautiful historic single family home neighborhoods. Your proposal will do nothing but destroy our community and further erode the tax base as these areas become crowded and ugly.

It seems like the Council cares about nothing more than antagonizing their highest taxpayers with ridiculous and dangerous ideas that will cause long time residents to flee the area. Perhaps that is your real goal. Please leave us alone.

460

**Elaine Akst - Chevy Chase, 20815**

This strategy is an ill-conceived notion that will add density without meeting needs. Current information from the county executive indicates that there is enough housing right now to meet the needs of the county. There has been no research or report on whether these new units will be affordable, and indeed there is no reason to believe that a developer will purchase expensive properties and turn them into affordable units.

There has also been no environmental impact research or statement on the effects of increased non-permeable surfaces. Multi-unit buildings will take up more space on lots, creating greater run-off and overwhelming our storm drain infrastructure and flooding homes. Already, there are many areas in our neighborhood that flood, and storms are only predicted to become more extreme.

In addition, the council seems to dream that if they build more units without parking, while taking away local roads (like Little Falls Parkway), new residents will magically not use cars. It's like taking away sex ed and hoping that teens won't have sex. It's ridiculous reasoning, and our neighborhoods cannot handle more traffic.

There has been no discussion of the cost of increased county facilities for the increasing number of people - fire, police, schools, ambulance. Already, it can take 45 minutes for a 911 response because emergency personnel must triage. Our infrastructure cannot handle increased density without taking into consideration all of the services required.

There has been no discussion on the increased cost to current homeowners, many of whom bought decades ago, before property prices increased. The county council and planning board seem to treat current county residents as their rich enemies, to milk us for money and ignore any insight we may have as to how we want to live. However, the tax increases on our homes when developers buy properties will force many residents to sell, ironically sending them to look for more affordable housing, which will not exist.

	<p>Residents need to know that their comments are taken into full consideration, not just collected so that the council members can check a box and ignore us. We also need to see how much money from developers is going to every single council member's campaign. And we need this entire process slowed down so that full research and reporting can be done on the need, the impact (environmental, cost, infrastructure).</p>
461	<p><b>Dean Howell - Bethesda, 20816</b></p> <p>Thank you to council for on your work on this. I know it is a divisive issue. I wholeheartedly support this effort and am looking forward to the actual legislation being released soon. It's important to get the actual legislation out as soon as possible, because the more time we spend in the waiting period the more myths NIMBYs can make up about what this will actually entail.</p>
462	<p><b>Michael Reutemann - Cabin John, 20818</b></p> <p>If this initiative negatively affects schools, safety, services, and traffic, many of will simply move across the river.</p> <p>I'm already paying almost \$14,000 in property taxes on a very modest and 100 year old house. I'm a third generation resident of montgomery county, and I'm not going to pay these kind of taxes if quality of life starts to deteriorate.</p>
463	<p><b>Ellen Sandler - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>I firmly believe in the concept of both attainable and affordable housing. However, I believe the execution of the concept is poorly conceived. There are an abundance of commercial buildings located in areas convenient to public transportation that are vacant and could be repurposed. There are large plots of land, i.e. white flint, located next to Metro that could have provided both attainable and affordable housing. The only people who benefit from attainable housing in single family neighborhoods are developers.</p>
464	<p><b>Cheryl Winebrenner - Bethesda, 20816</b></p> <p>Please pause and get more studies done before you proceed. When I talk with some neighbors in my neighborhood, Green Acres, one area which will be significantly affected by this proposal — they are completely unaware that this is happening and will affect them. EVERYONE needs to know about these possible changes and you need to solicit input from everyone.</p>
465	<p><b>Lauren Fernandez - Chevy Chase, 20715</b></p> <p>I feel that our single family zoning should remain as such in our neighborhood in Mont Co. There is an abundance of multi family housing very nearby, townhouses, apartments and condos. Single family housing within neighborhoods should stay as such without other types of housing intermixed.</p>
466	<p><b>Andrew King - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>I urge you to oppose this housing initiative. It is ill conceived and incredibly short sighted as it will do very little to help with affordable housing.</p>

467 **Shelley Yeutter - Chevy Chase, 20815**

This plan is so flawed. It's incredibly disappointing that the PB and council are focusing so much time resources and energy on a side project that has so much opposition due to it's sweeping changes that fail to honor zoning that your constituents bought into. Furthermore your efforts would be much more admirable and appropriate if you would subsidize and address affordable housing. If this AHSI goes through as currently designed there's a high probability that I will leave the county within five years. Others will follow. Question is do I take the first bid from a developer for the most profit and have my neighbors hate me and forever change the functionality of our neighborhood- or seek a family longing for their first single family home? What a shame. You need to change course with dignity asap.

468 **Timothy Ethier - Silver Spring, 20906**

I am writing to urge you to oppose the subject initiative. I am a voting constituent living in a R200 area. I share the sentiments contained within this article and do not want the character of my neighborhood changed for the worse. Please listen to the people that live here.

<https://moderatelymoco.com/opinion-what-does-it-mean-when-a-politician-no-longer-listens-to-their-constituents-it-means-they-are-getting-their-money-elsewhere/?amp=1>

469 **Anne Easby-Smith - Kensington, 20895**

I am opposed to the the AHSI for many reasons to include overcrowding of schools, parking, traffic, environmental concerns, loss of green space, density issues, disturbing neighborhood integrity, and infrastructure issues to name a few. Although the planning board has been working on this for 3 years, I don't feel it has been thoroughly thought through. I don't think enough data has been researched. I also don't think residents knew about this consideration until very recently.

I have attended a listening session at BCC where a parent talked about how crowded the school is now and how the buses have students sitting on the floor and that they already don't have enough desks for all of the students. It is hard to think adding more students will improve this situation.

In priority areas, where it is possible to have a quadplex, only 1 off street parking place is required. Is that feasible in MOCO that only one family in four would have a car? While it is a good intention that everyone is going to take public transportation but it is not realistic. What if a child is playing at the soccer plex?

The other thing is when the drawings are shown of these units with the intention of how showing how well they fit in, the people are left out. If each unit has 4 people, that is a lot of people to share the yard and one parking spot. Where are the dogs, trash cans, bikes, yard furniture and other items that usually go with homes?

Are each 2,3,or 4 unit AH going to be it's own HOA? Who is going to figure out the yard/lawn care, replace a roof, and other typical issues to home ownership?

This seems like a dream for builders/developers. They can build the units and charge whatever they want. It does not need to be affordable or actually even serve the missing middle group. It appears it will also have builders/developers competing with larger pocketbooks with families trying to purchase single family homes. This is only going to raise the prices of the lower end of single family homes, especially in the areas where more units can be built.

The apartments that are planned to be allowed on major streets are also bad for lower MOCO. The traffic on Connecticut Avenue and Wisconsin Avenue are already terribly congested and adding more and more people is only going to make it worse. It also seems that the the number that can be built, 19, is deliberately skirting the affordable housing requirement.

This is going to ruin the residential neighborhoods of Montgomery County and I think even more people are going to leave the county.

The Council should be listening to the residents of Montgomery County, many of which are just finding out about this issue. The session that I attended was full and I understand the zoom session is also full at 950 people. This is an enormous change for the county and voters should have more of say in the decision.

I urge the council to vote NO.

470

**Bob Easby-Smith - Kensington, 20895**

I am very much opposed to the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative for the following reasons:

- Lack of data
- Favors developers
- Lack of voter input
- environmental impact
- traffic and parking congestion
- storm water management
- Crowding of neighborhoods, schools, police, and services

471

**George Carlisle - Columbia, 21045**

Do you see a roll for CDFIs in this quest for attainable housing strategies?

472

**Ryan Murphy - Rockville, 20850**

I want to express my strong support for the attainable housing strategies proposal. I'm a single family homeowner in Rockville that welcomes rather than fears having more neighbors, and think people that are not fortunate enough to afford a single family home in Montgomery County should still have the opportunity to live near jobs, transit, parks, and our great schools. Although Rockville will not be directly impacted by these specific proposals due to having its own land use authority, folks there can tell you that I fiercely advocate for ending exclusionary zoning in my own neighborhood as well. The crisis of high housing costs affects this entire region, and the solution includes breaking down barriers to housing development at all jurisdictional levels, including liberalized zoning and eliminating parking minimums.

I know you've been hearing from a lot of folks that are afraid of change, and either out of ignorance or selfishness, think a duplex will somehow ruin their lives. However, objective surveys show that these views are not representative of the people of Montgomery County. More importantly, what no survey or community meeting can capture is the voices of those that want to live here, but currently can't afford to. These reforms, which would likely take many years to manifest as significant change to the neighborhood even if dramatic zoning revisions are made, are about the future, rather than the past. The voices that need to be considered the most are who is going to live here 20+ years from now. Unfortunately, these voices are typically very underrepresented in these types of forums.

Without action, MoCo homes will continue to be torn down and replaced with larger "luxury" single-family homes, or people will continue overcrowding in single-family homes, because nothing more dense and affordable is allowed to be built here. In addition, the increased efficiency of denser housing would reduce our tax burden and increase access to services. Exclusionary zoning also exacerbates the climate crisis by encouraging sprawl and reliance on cars due to restrictions on housing near major transit and employment centers. Although it may be tempting to blame greedy corporations or landlords, in reality high housing costs are policy choices made MoCo leaders of the past, and codified in our zoning code. Although I actually wish they went further in some ways, I think it is imperative that the council at the very least pursues the Attainable Housing Strategies.

473

**Michelle High - Chevy Chase, 20815**

There are many shocking things about the casually tossed-out plan to decimate 100-year-old neighborhoods.

To think that these duplexes or triplexes will be affordable to middle-income families is a just a wish.

To add high rises to stunning century-old neighborhoods with unique community feels and unique architectural mixes is a historic and aesthetic sin.

I don't understand - where's the housing shortage? We have a zillion new high rises all around us,. What's the housing NEED? This area was cherry picked with no explanation.

To add density to the area between the Friendship Heights and Bethesda metros - which has been done to no end with all the high rises - is a sin against the quality of life of those who live here AND those who don't live here. The schools are maxed out; the roads are congested to the point of hostility. (I get the middle finger from a driver about once every 2-3 weeks; red lights are being run constantly with impunity because people are desperate to beat the next traffic light and save time on their frustrating journeys). The electricians, plumbers, roofers, and other contractors who travel from farther out to get to our area have to travel a minimum of 2 hours in each direction. I cannot believe how insensitive the "add density" plan is to them.

I am flabbergasted because this is a terrible idea for so many reasons. Ultimately our local councilmembers are elected officials and must listen to the constituents who elected them and whom they serve. This plan serves no one - it's a pipe dream, an imagined scenario, with suffering on the other side of it should it be enacted by a handful of people with tunnel vision. There are many metro stops in Maryland - find another area near one with land where you can actually build a cohesive community with a coherent architectural concept and maybe just create that elusive middle-class home that some imagine should exist in the exclusive neighborhoods they sneer at.

**474 Jamie Go - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Having listened to those backing the Initiative, I have concluded that there are no data to support the sweeping changes proposed. There is zero evidence that it would make housing more affordable -- or even more 'attainable', whatever that means in this context. The market will decide the prices of these units and everything we know about that market suggests the prices will be high and definitely not affordable. So, under the guise of equality, your Initiative will ruin neighborhoods and the only ones who will benefit are the developers who have donated to the campaign chests of Council members. This is not good.

**475 Mark and Joan Green - Potomac, 20854**

Dear Montgomery County Council –

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Council's consideration of the Planning Department's Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative recommendation to replace single-family with multi-family zoning.

While the proposed zoning changes are well intended, we believe that they are fatally flawed and, as a result, are adamantly opposed to them. If they are adopted, we would expect to support litigation to reverse them.

We are concerned, among other things, about the following –

Notice – We only recently learned of the Planning Department's recommendation and Council's consideration. We believe many other county residents are unaware. Due to the lack of awareness and far-reaching consequences of the proposed change, we believe the county should provide written notice to every resident of the recommendation, council's consideration of it and related information including the studies referenced below.



---

Council Consideration Timing - Given the lack of general awareness, overflowing feedback sessions, and highly controversial nature of the recommendation, we also believe the Council should table its consideration of the recommendation until the following occur: (i) notice has gone out to all residents; (ii) there is ample opportunity for public and written comment; and (iii) the next election cycle for the Council and County Executive has passed so that voters can take into account candidates' stands on the recommendation in choosing how to vote.

Safety – Less safety because more people and vehicles in less space that was not designed for multi-family housing. Have extensive studies been done in this regard and, if so, who did them, what was the methodology and what was the outcome? If not, why not?

Schools – More students will strain capacity of schools with current capacity based in part on existing single-family zoning. Consequently, there will be poorer educational outcomes. Have extensive studies been done in this regard and, if so, who did them, what was the methodology and what was the outcome? If not, why not?

Environmental Effects – More population density will lead to more waste, noise, traffic/other pollution, and utility use. It also will lead to less green space because single-family homes likely would be expanded outward as well as up. Have extensive studies been done in this regard and, if so, who did them, what was the methodology and what was the outcome? If not, why not?

Owner/Occupant Decline – Multi-family dwellings are more likely to house non-owner families who, as non-owners, will have less of a stake in the community in general and property in particular, undermining neighborhood stability and community ties and relationships that otherwise could have a positive impact. The prospect of purchasing what to date have been single-family homes likely will bring out private equity and other investors who bid up the price of houses, convert them into income-producing multi-family properties and, thereby, raise the cost of home ownership even further. It is well established that for most people home ownership is key to wealth accumulation. We believe it would become even harder for families to purchase homes to live in and build wealth if investors bid up home prices. Have extensive studies been done in these regards and, if so, who did them, what were the methodologies and what were the outcomes? If not, why not?

Research Into Alternatives – What has been and could be done to facilitate development of multi-family units in areas already zoned for them? For example, is the county doing everything in its power to facilitate high-rises along Rockville Pike where they already are permitted and the occupants easily could access mass transit and shopping without the increase in traffic that would result from multi-family units in areas zoned for single-family housing? There seems to be ample capacity for multi-family dwelling units in the model of, e.g., Connecticut Avenue, N.W. in the District of Columbia. And these multi-family units could be both apartments and condominiums. Condominiums would have the benefit of enabling purchasers to build equity and accumulate wealth. Have extensive studies been done in this regard and, if so, who did them, what was the methodology and what was the outcome? If not, why not?

Reasonable Expectations – My family and countless others in Montgomery County bought single family homes based largely on the reasonable expectation that our neighborhoods would remain single-family zoned. It would be especially inappropriate to destroy those

---

expectations in light of the many concerns the proposed change would raise and the ample capacity for multi-family housing in areas already zoned for it.

Thank you for considering our views.

Mark and Joan Green

476

**Thomas Tracy - Bethesda, 20816-3416**

I am doubtful that extending the zoning change on River Road beyond Westbard Center makes much sense. Westbard has some transit access: a mile to the Metro at Friendship Heights and bike access to the Crescent Trail to Metro Bethesda. Beyond Westbard to the Beltway there is very limited bus service.

There are 100 townhouses under construction at Westbard now selling for \$1.5 million up. The proposed change on River Rd. beyond Westbard looks more like a gift to developers than accessible housing.

477

**Patricia Johnson - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Dear Councilmembers, Planning Board Director and Montgomery County Planning Staff:

I have attended several "listening sessions" during the month of September. The lack of any answers to many voting citizens' questions are of grave concern to all of us in many neighborhoods that are now zoned for single family homes. I am on the executive board of the Citizens' Coordinating Committee on Friendship Heights, and part of the Kenwood Citizens Association. I am also an active member of the Montgomery County Community Coalition which includes many citizens from all over the county. There are many points about the Attainable Housing Strategy Initiative that we question. We have not received answers supported by necessary analysis and research. Why is this the only proposal being considered?

Artie Harris, the Planning Board Director (an unelected official) has gone on record with this unfortunate statement: "The time has come to break free from Montgomery County's outdated zoning. We can no longer afford to devote so much land to so few people." The AHSI plan fosters racism and classism with policies that result in the displacement for lower/ middle income residents. This policy eliminates naturally occurring affordable housing. Citizens see it in action already. The leveling of the many affordable apartments on Battery Lane in Bethesda is but one example. That project of market priced high rises has produced a 60 unit loss of affordable apartments, even with a 12.5% required MPDU. This ASHI policy eliminates NOAH. Those existing smaller affordable homes near transit will be the first to go. It ignores and misrepresents the needs and desires of people who are older,

disabled, or of low income and many in the black and hispanic communities. This plan also demonizes residents who have done nothing wrong but question this huge change that will not solve the problem of affordable housing.

We have no confidence in Mr. Sartori or Ms. Govoni. Montgomery County Planning and the Planning Board Process have been derelict in detailed analyses. Their policy proposals are based on incomplete and inaccurate data. Do you know how many housing units are in the pipeline? We have obtained these numbers from the County Executive's Office, and some of these numbers even come from the planning department's own report on housing. There are currently 35,000 units in approved projects in the County development pipeline, that are

---

not yet built, and only await permits. There are an additional 10000 units in approved projects not yet built--in municipalities with their own zoning authority. That total is 45000 units which is enough to house about 100000 people. No one has opposed these approved projects. In addition to those projects not yet built, there is additional zoning capacity in master plans for another 85,000 units. That is enough to house another 200000 people. AHSI is based on a manufactured crisis and is a developers dream. We citizens feel like we are "getting played." The county is not growing. Growth is slowed. People are not coming to Montgomery County because there are insufficient well-paying jobs. The issue is jobs not housing. Why can't you accelerate the existing housing in the pipeline. We have heard it is because developers can't charge high enough rents. They can't charge higher rents because the median income can't support those rents. We need better paying jobs and the

education to get those jobs. If you are looking at median incomes of \$50000- \$125000 per year, you are looking at a tax base that can't afford the services the county must provide (ie MCPS). The tax burden will be too great, it already is.

We have no confidence in Montgomery County Planning and the Planning Board. There has been a failure to do impact studies considering the excess density planned with this new zoning regulation. For instance: 1. stormwater management 2. transportation 3. school overcrowding 4. tree canopy loss 4. parking 5. county services like garbage/recycling collection 6. roads 7. light pollution 8. noise pollution 9. internet and wifi capabilities. There is insufficient attention paid to the people who live here now-- those that have deep needs for housing as well as those who already pay significant taxes to the county. One of the egregious answers that Ms. Govoni has responded with to these infrastructure questions is: "the impact will be minimal because not many of these types of housing will be built". No-one challenged this statement: if this is true, why are the Planning Department and County Council wasting so much time and money on this futile and divisive exercise?

There has been a focus on getting state or national awards. The latest planning fads have been embraced by County Government employees rather than well thought out specific policies and plans. One size does not fit all. This is blatantly a political move to gain votes through incomplete and inadequate information. Paid lobbyists are being allowed the loudest voices. The county has been run by a land use-based economy, and developers are lining the political coffers of

politicians. Where does that leave the voting, tax paying public?

We see a refusal to consider different needs in different communities: for instance, the burden on roads that shows up in the rejection of masterplans in favor of a one-size fits all rezoning. We should approach this affordable housing (not attainable) using a trial program with smaller target projects with the involvement of a citizens' advisory board. There are areas of land that have been vacated, like office buildings in Silver Spring and Bethesda, the vast White Flint area (and near Metro!), Lakeforest Mall in Gaithersburg, and the Geico acreage which will soon be vacated. There is plenty of space in this vast county to create affordable and attainable housing without destroying neighborhoods that continue to work well. There are excellent solutions possible, and an Advisory Board or Commission of informed citizens, leaders in their communities, should be selected to find them.

Growth Corridors have been the focus for up-zoning. The County Council voted to name River Road a Growth Corridor along with Connecticut Avenue, Georgia Avenue, and Old Georgetown Road, to name a few. The standard was that a thoroughfare had to be within a mile of mass transit to be named as such. River Road is only within a mile at its eastern end, and the vast remainder is well more than a mile from rapid transit--and that delineation was vehemently opposed by voting citizens. The River Road Corridor is chock-a-block with

---

single family neighborhoods and businesses, and has at best, an inefficient bus service. The River Road Growth Corridor stops at the Beltway. We wonder why? The AHSI plan for upzoning stops at Falls Road. Potomac, for the most part, is

exempt from this zoning change. There is plenty of acreage to put all types of multiplexes and apartment buildings in that district where there is more land. Why is that district exempt? Do political donors and developers live there? Do some of our councilmembers live where this upzoning will not touch them? Whom are you protecting? Why is it okay to remove zoning protections from 80% of the county but not the remaining 20%? Is this a conflict for some of our County Councilmembers?

You have used these listening sessions not to listen but to “check the box’ and then claim that you asked for public input. Our concerns have not been answered or considered. You continue on with your set insiders’ plan. The outreach has been weak and the engagement is edited and controlled. The answers to the questions on the Planning Department’s website leaves no room for argument or creative problem solving. The answers, if given, are not detailed or well researched or informed. The outreach is weak at best. You have held listening sessions but have you heard anything but what you wanted to hear?

The Planning Staff, the Planning Board and the County Council have ignored the reality that the further out you plan the more likely you are to be wrong, especially in a world subject to climate change, pandemics, population shifts, economic and political disruptions. This rezoning plan is uninformed, short sighted and woefully derelict in vision and solid data. It will not result in affordable housing which is what is needed. This project has thus far been authoritarian and void of the democratic process. This is a developer’s dream. Sincerely,

Patricia Depuy Johnson [REDACTED] Chevy Chase [REDACTED]

478

**Dr. Pauline Imbrigato - Silver Spring, 20901**

I am against the attainable housing strategies initiative because building mutiple dwellings in a single family neighborhood would be detrimental to property values, and cause an increase in crime due to mixing lower income families with middle and higher income families. Some lower income families have teens who belong to gangs, deal drugs, bring guns to school, fight, steal etc. endangering children from middle class families. Also people living in apartment buildings, duplexes, etc. vary in taking care of their property. I implore the committee to consider our safety and children’s future. Please don’t pass this initiative.

479

**Alex Demarais - Silver Spring, 20901**

I love in a single family home near wayne and Sligo which is also a future purple line station. I am strongly in favor of the attainable housing initiative. I know some single family home owners are afraid of increasing density, but increasing density this is the only way for our region (and country) to transition into more sustainable transportation systems. This attainable housing initiative is a step in the right direction and I will vote for representatives who support this and similar initiatives.

480

**Harriet Getzels - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Dear Planners, Re. Section 5,  
We have been overseas the past few months. We have tried to keep up with developments in Section 5 and surrounding areas. I am relieved to find a group that wants to Pause. We have read and re-read the maps, codes, colours, definition of need and proposals. I am

sorry to say that none of it is clear. I understand how you define need and population growth. However I need more data as to how those projections are made. I am rather amazed at the lack of clarity. I never liked or believed in the need for 'McMansions' which were built far and wide in our region, despite knowing that they conserve no energy, cost a lot to run, and do not fit in with the climate change efficiencies that are needed. I believe the very same people are now promoting the opposite type of building plan. Why should I support this, knowing how misconceived the idea of building oversized single family homes was? Zoning in MoCo has never made sense to me. Huge half-empty office/apartment buildings stand tall with little or no retail buying in to the ground floor. The decision to allow landowners to let Barnes and Noble, our flag ship community gathering center, great for kids and adults of all ages and stages, simply 'go away' so more rent could be collected brings me deep distrust of planners in our area. If the plan, maps and charts were transparent to people who have a graduate education at least, I'd comment more specifically. However I have no takeaways other than people in MoCo want to change who lives where in an area that established itself in the past century, a move from without and not from within. We were unable to attend public meetings due to being in other time zones. Nevertheless, much as I've tried to keep up, I have not come away with a positive view of this effort. Transparency, clarity and named beneficiaries must be the highest priority. For us, the effort has fallen far short.

481 **William Moore - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I cannot be on the listening session today because I will be having a medical procedure scheduled after I signed up for the session.

482 **Becky Lavash - Silver Spring, 20901**

I do not support the councils and planning board strategy for adding multfamily dwellings in single family neighborhoods. Current infill homes by house flippers are poorly monitored and don't fit in. Streets are overfilled with cars.

483 **Marcel Borde - Chevy Chase, 20815**

This is clearly a distasteful and dishonest money-grab by officials. Densify the high income/property areas under a disguise of 'attainable housing'. This will only serve to destroy the communities and existing neighborhoods that have flourished for generations and at the same time, give false hope to individuals who think they would get homes at lower prices.

I would like to have a list of elected officials who have proposed and/or supported this plan so I can distribute to the North Chevy Chase and other neighborhoods where we can let our voices be heard with our vote.

I am disgusted and yet can't say that I'm surprised as this County is very much in favor of a 'tax and spend' mindset. I plan to move out of Maryland as soon as it is feasible because of this very approach to city planning.

484 **Tracey Mulrooney - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Without a plan for the impact additional people will have in our area, this plan should not go forward. Plans detailing how infrastructure, schools, traffic, police... will all be enhanced is a requirement that needs to happen in parallel. If the county is not going to listen to the residents this change will impact and bulldoze through without consideration for neighborhood rules, I find that to be an abuse of power.

485	<p><b>Anita Morrison - Silver Spring, 20901</b></p> <p>Attainable housing is a critical element of a just society. The proposed zoning reforms are smart and necessary. We need to provide opportunities for smaller homes to be built in locations close to jobs and transit. Over my life, I have lived in an apartment over a garage, a duplex, a six-plex and a house with an indoor ADU. Each provided affordable access to good housing without any ill effects on the surrounding single-family neighborhood. Unfounded fears should not stand in the way of building attainable housing.</p>
486	<p><b>Beth Hisle-Gorman - Takoma Park, 20912</b></p> <p>Im writing to strongly express my support for zoning legislation implementing Attainable Housing Strategies recommendations.</p> <p>In order to stay vital and prosperous our county needs a wider range of housing choices to support people at all stages of life. Different housing types are also needed to meet the needs of different types of families, condos apartments and town homes help to draw young adults and young families, and make our communities more supportive to all. These zoning changes also allow sustainable land use and better transit access: Allowing multifamily housing options that can be more affordable than new single-family detached homes in places with existing infrastructure and amenities and provides an alternative to car-dependent sprawl development, and will help give more people the chance to access transit and opportunity. Please support this important legislation.</p>
487	<p><b>Nicole Van Houten - Silver Spring, 20902</b></p> <p>I support attainable housing. At different stages of life I have lived in an apartment, duplex and single family house. At every stage, I have enjoyed transit access which encouraged more sustainable land use. Multifamily housing is more affordable than new single-family detached homes in places with existing infrastructure and amenities. This provides an alternative to car-dependent sprawl development, and will help give more people the chance to access transit and opportunity. Thank you.</p>
488	<p><b>Kemi Williams - North Bethesda, 20852</b></p> <p>I attended a listening session and did not get much information about how the initiative could support someone like me who cannot afford to buy in this county. Are there any plans to expand the MPDU program and would that support this initiative? I reside in an MPDU rental but there are many disconnects with the county and the leasing team. Additionally, the listings are outdated, people are not notified in a timely manner of availability, there are mostly 0 and 1BRs included in the program but far less 2BR and 3BR for families that truly need the space and cannot afford the current rent for those units. Also, the MPDU sales program has low inventory and income limits that do not truly reflect those making "moderate" income. I am a single mother of two and my children should be able to have their own rooms. I share with my daughter so that my teenage son can have a space. Just sharing my perspective and am happy to continue a discussion.</p>
489	<p><b>Lawrence Kennedy - Poolesville, 20837</b></p> <p>This is negative feedback as I oppose the attainable housing strategy of tearing a single-family home to be replaced by a multi-density structure. Regardless of what is now presented this will affect the community's quality of life.</p>

490

**Linda Bergofsky - Poolesville, 20837**

The AHS fails to adequately address the dearth of affordable and accessible housing for older people or people with disabilities. It only focuses on new housing and not on efforts to rehab or renew housing units that are a mismatch for older adults who purchased them when they were younger and raising a family. In the Ag reserve, there is no housing that would allow an older person or PWD to downsize and stay in the community. We just keep building big houses that saturate the market, while leaving whole populations out in the cold. Also, there must be rigorous adoption of of universal design.

491

**Marina Bowsher - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I do NOT support this initiative because it fails to adequately address the infrastructure (school overcrowding, increase in traffic), safety (increase traffic and street parking in neighborhoods with no sidewalks), and environmental concerns, while at the same time not providing any guarantee that the additional housing will actually be "attainable" for the "missing middle".

492

**Lisa Potetz - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Having grown up in a New England factory town where single family homes, triple decker multi-family homes and even small apartment buildings were found on the same block, the concept of zoning that allows for this is familiar to me. As a resident of the Town of Chevy Chase since 1998 I have seen many older, small homes like mine replaced with larger homes that have footprints that could accommodate multifamily structures.

However, my concerns about the proposal to modify existing neighborhoods to accommodate multifamily housing follow:

1. Who is this policy aiming to help? In neighborhoods like mine, introducing multifamily housing will not result in homes affordable to most families. A duplex or triplex replacing what would have been a \$2+ million single family home will still be out of reach for most. Developers should never be the primary beneficiary of any county policy.
2. Setback rules must be maintained, and jurisdictions like the Town of Chevy Chase with authority to establish these rules must be allowed to continue to do so. Changing setbacks or routinely allowing variances for construction of multifamily homes will result in irreparable environmental damage by increasing stormwater runoff and eliminating wildlife habitat.
3. Parking on older narrow streets is already insufficient, and approval of multifamily structures needs to take this into account. Planning that assumes that an appreciable percentage of families living near public transportation will choose to forego owning a car is unrealistic. (For more than 20 years I walked and Metro-ed to work every day and never considered it would be possible to live without a car.) Off-street parking for multifamily homes would need to allow for independent movement of vehicles, increasing impervious surfaces and the associated environmental damage.

---

**Jonathan Siegel - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I live in the town of Chevy Chase. I am strongly opposed to the county's proposed zoning changes. Here are my reasons:

1. These changes will increase density without sufficient regard for the limitations imposed by our available infrastructure. Particular points of concern include:

A. Traffic. It is already difficult for me to come home from work. Often, traffic on Connecticut Avenue northbound is bumper-to-bumper and very slow from Chevy Chase Circle to Bradley Lane. If the zoning proposals are adopted and apartment buildings are built on Connecticut Avenue and on other streets within 500 feet of Connecticut Avenue, traffic will go from bad to impossible.

B. Parking. Available parking in my neighborhood is limited. If, as is proposed, density is considerably increased without requiring adequate off-street parking for every new residence, parking will become a big problem.

C. Schools: I happily send my daughter to Chevy Chase Elementary School. But the classes are rather large, and the school board recently had to increase the permissible class size. Additional density will further crowd the school classes.

D. Quiet. One thing I love about my area is that it is quiet. This will likely change for the worse under the zoning proposals.

E. Drainage. My home is at a low point and already has drainage issues. The proposed development will likely make this problem much worse.

In short, I understand the desire for more housing, but it is vitally important not to build more housing than can be supported by the available infrastructure.

2. The proposals will also lead to a fundamental change in the character of my area. I moved here because I wanted my family to live among single-family homes. If these proposals are adopted, developers will likely buy all houses as they are sold and convert them all into multi-family dwellings. People who want to buy existing houses for single-family use will not be able to compete with the prices developers will be able to offer. In 10-15 years the character of my area will be completely changed.

3. I understand that property owners and developers want to make money, but they should not be allowed to enrich themselves at everyone else's expense. The problem is a classic example of what economists call "externalities." Under the zoning proposals, developers will make a lot of money by imposing costs on everyone else. They will get to keep the profits of building multi-family housing, while everyone else will have to bear the costs of increased traffic, noise, parking and drainage problems, school crowding, and other problems that the development will cause.

---



For these reasons, I strongly oppose the multi-family housing proposals. At a minimum, towns such as the town of Chevy Chase should have more authority to regulate multi-family development than current law and the proposed law would permit.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on these proposals.

494

**Ayesha Amsa - Silver Spring, 20910**

I support attainable housing. I used to live in a single-family house and now live in an apartment. I'd love to afford continuing to live in Montgomery County in a small townhouse and triplex. Also, allowing multifamily housing options that can be more affordable than new single-family detached homes in places with existing infrastructure and amenities provides an alternative to car-dependent sprawl development, and will help give more people the chance to access transit and opportunity.

495

**David Johnson - Chevy Chase, 20815**

The single family neighborhoods are the big draw for people coming into Montgomery County. When a citizen buys a house in a community protected by zoning, there's an unstated contract involving the buyers, sellers and county government, that the zoning protections put in place by the local government will protect their investment and way of life into the future. Even the 2017 Bethesda Downtown Plan specifically makes reference to preserving single family home neighborhoods. It's unconscionable for you break that contract to the overwhelming majorities of Montgomery County communities—and who will ever want to come here afterward?

The River Road Growth Corridor and the Attainable Housing Plan extend from the District Line to the Beltway and Falls Road, respectively, where every square inch is occupied by established single family home communities and established businesses with limited public transportation and few sidewalks. Where is the space to grow? Outside the Beltway, however, there's plenty of space to put in multiplexes. So who are you protecting? Do your political donors and developers live out there? Or any of the Council or Council's relatives? Why is it OK to remove protections for 82% of the County, but not the remaining 18%? Who are you protecting?

Very few service workers, teachers, police or firemen will be able to afford buying or renting the multiplexes at proposed market rates. To afford living in any market rate housing, we will need higher paying jobs brought into the County, and so far, this is being ignored. Bill Marriott made Bethesda home for his international business, providing employment for 7500 office workers in Bethesda alone. Montgomery County will need many Bill Marriotts to bring their businesses here, but just like Bill, who lived in a single family neighborhood, none will want to buy or come here if they can't be assured that an apartment building won't be built on either side of their house. Regardless of wishing otherwise, your plan is doomed to fail.

Many look upon the loss of zoning protections as an existential threat to their communities. Many of your political donors who are developers are the silent beneficiaries from your passing this ZTA (just consider why the proposed apartments have 19 units and not 20, which would trigger less profitable affordable housing for developers), but although these donors may be able to deliver contributions, they

can't deliver votes. If the Council decides to embrace this third rail, and pass the ZTA that removes these zoning protections, do any of you on the Council realistically believe that going forward you'll continue to have a political future here?

This whole process is a sham. You "LISTEN" but you don't HEAR your constituents. We are reduced to 30 seconds, questions are not answered, and there's no dialog. Just as in the Little Falls Parkway debacle, you "listened" and then ignored the overwhelming voice and needs of the citizens, and the Parkway is still as dysfunctional as it was. These "listening sessions" just give you and the Council cover, because you will end up doing what you want, regardless of the wishes and needs of your constituents. I don't know who you and the Council represent, but it's not us.

This process needs a shot of democracy. You have "listening sessions", but don't HEAR our voices. We have no voice over choosing an authoritarian ZTA over a thoughtful Master Plan. Decisions as to multiplexes or apartment buildings are "by right", eliminating any voice by those affected. And only you—just 11 people in the County—get to vote on what will be the most far reaching and transformative change to all citizens living in 82% of the entire county—and we have no vote as to what happens to us?! What country is this? This is far too big and too important for us not to have a vote. This should be on the ballot, where all affected can have a voice in the future of their communities. So—instead of you voting for this ZTA, you should give the vote to the people in a plebiscite! It's too big and too important!

496

**Jamin Bartolomeo - Burtonsville, 20866**

Please don't move on this initiative. The area is already crowded and the infrastructure can't handle what we already have. More people in a compact area means congested roads, difficulty parking conditions, and the potential for more crime. Please reconsider and put a halt on this program.

497

**Charles Briggs - Burtonsville, 20866**

We absolutely do NOT want increased congestion and cars in our neighborhoods.

The county has this problem currently with people in Silver Spring saving parking spaces because far too many people are crowded into one neighborhood.

The county already has home owners who rent single family homes to several families at once and the other homeowner suffer the brunt of increased noise, traffic and homes that function more like gas stations than residences.

We are adamantly against destroying the peace and quiet we bought a home in Montgomery County to have and will make certain any Councilperson in favor of these plans will be voted out of office.

498

**Michelle Grace - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I am opposed to the current Attainable Housing Strategic Initiative. I am in favor of providing more affordable housing in Montgomery County and Chevy Chase. However, the current plan does not provide for affordable housing, especially as it would be implemented in Chevy Chase. In addition the plan does not consider the impact on the local infrastructure and important info on local schools. Our school systems are already overburdened. I fear this is a plan that is going to benefit the developers much more than anyone else.

499

**Randy Cooper - Rockville, 20852**

what data are you looking at (and what is the source) that shows this will solve the problem?

we know the "pro's" of why you think this is the answer... what do you consider the "con's" to be?

500

**Jason Starbird-Tierney - Takoma Park, 20912**

The proposal is a step in the right direction and I support more diverse housing options across the county and integrated within neighborhoods. However, it should be improved and needs to do more to address affordable housing for middle class low income residents. If 2-4 units isn't enough to produce affordable housing we should also allow larger buildings to achieve that goal. To address these issues, I believe you should apply the medium scale housing parameters to the same housing priority zones as the small scale to allow small apartments integrated within neighborhoods like we see in Takoma Park or East Silver Spring. The medium scale proposals which are the most likely to create actually affordable housing are currently only on dangerous major highway corridors where those residents will be exposed to significant pollution, noise, and traffic danger from crossing 6 lane high traffic corridor roads. This will lead to disparate health outcomes between racial and economic groups and does not promote economically integrated communities. These are the types of buildings I have always lived in and would like to continue to live in going forward but I don't want to live on a 6 lane highway and I don't think its fair that me and my family should be exposed to the pollution and noise of drivers as they go into quiet neighborhoods away from the road that only wealthy residents can afford. The proposal doesn't allow medium density apartments even next to Metro stops, Purple Line stops or near downtown job centers which makes no sense from a transit, environmental or equity standpoint and seems like bad politics meant to continue the segregation between rich and poor within our county and keep low income residents from moving into high income areas. This is a very important matter to basic fairness and equity. In order to get people to use transit and promote equity, more housing should be built on the periphery of downtown areas instead of along the corridors. This would allow much more walkable and transit oriented communities, as it makes much more sense for someone to live without a car in an area that is a 10 minute walk to stores and jobs with access to multiple local bus routes going to multiple places, than expecting someone to rely on a single BRT that takes longer to go to just one place. I lived here in Takoma Park, far from the metro, without a car for many years and I would not have been able to meet my basic needs without a car on one of those corridors. I personally live in a small apartment building next to single family homes in a neighborhood with a diverse mix of housing types, its a community with incredible economic and social diversity in a quiet area with little traffic that is safe for walking and biking that provides a great community to those rich and poor alike, but many of the very affordable apartments in my neighborhood would still not be allowed under this proposal.

Thank you,  
Jason Starbird-Tierney

501

**W. Chris Farrell - Wheaton, 20902**

I attended the White Oak listening session and learned a lot. I support the unanimous recommendation of the Planning Board.

502	<p><b>Marcus DelPonte - silver spring, 20910</b></p> <p>As a resident of Montgomery county, i support the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. as it stands right now, in order for me to move from renter to homeowner i would need to leave the county i grew up in for one further out in the suburbs. loosening zoning restrictions to allow for the construction of middle income housing is 100% a positive step in my opinion.</p>
503	<p><b>Lei Liu - Rockville, 20852</b></p> <p>This initiative will only benefit developers, builders and the politicians who benefits from them. As Marc Enrich has rightfully pointed out, this initiative is misleading and will not achieve what it purported. The ones who built mulitple units on their lots will not live there ---they will simply pocket the money and buy somewhere else without such initiative, and leave their neighbors with the consequences of more stormwater runoff, congested roads, schools and other facilities. This initiative is against the communities that it targets.</p>
504	<p><b>Jack Husted - North Potomac, 20878</b></p> <p>This is so awesome! Thank you! I'm a college student and I'm excited for MoCo to do its part to make the DMV a housing superpower!</p>
505	<p><b>Sam O - Rockville, 20810</b></p> <p>1) If I am a first time home buyer looking to utilize the FHA 203k loan to add another unit if in the attainable housing areas would this be feasible? 2) when would this bill be passed ?</p>
506	<p><b>Stefan Gunther - Silver Spring, 20910</b></p> <p>Hi, could you please clarify what appears to be a contradiction: it's my understanding that in zones currently earmarked for single family, duplexes, triplexes and quadplexes would be allowed on the current footprint. However, by virtue of public transport in those areas, wouldn't those zones fall within the 1-mile zone and thus become open to the larger scale construction? Thanks!</p>
507	<p><b>Stacy Kaplowitz - Rockville, 20850</b></p> <p>This is great, but it will not make a significant dent in meeting housing demand. Focusing resources towards improving and creating efficiencies in the permitting and approval process will allow more housing to be built and meaningfully meet market demand. Thank you for all your hard work!</p>
508	<p><b>Alan Goldstein - Bethesda, 20814</b></p> <p>To ensure that the AHSI results in creation of affordable housing, especially small rental buildings, zoning changes should be implemented in conjunction with financing tools to support this new development. Traditional tools, including the Low Income Housing Tax Credit are not well suited for small scale affordable housing development.</p>

509

**Kevin Jordan - Potomac, 20854**

As a member of an HOA I'd like to understand what actions MoCo intends to take undercut the ability of communities to decide for themselves what type of neighborhood they live in.

510

**Melinda Power - Kensington, 20895**

I am not opposed to expansive zoning in principle, but am opposed to doing so without substantial infrastructure investment to address the needs this will create. As the county moves forward in this process I encourage you to recognize that your existing infrastructure improvement plans and processes will be insufficient to deal with the increased demands associated with more liberal zoning.

As an owner of a home in East Bethesda, and am now a resident of Kensington and single unit landlord in East Bethesda. I have seen first hand how the infrastructure has not kept up with current development in the Bethesda area despite plans that are supposed to address this.

When my kid was in first grade, there were 38 kids in my son's 1st grade by 2nd week. There was no option to add another class due to no place to have a classroom for another class. Adding more population will increase the need for school capacity.

As the smaller homes in my neighborhood are torn down, and new homes are added, the bigger footprint of new homes and requirement for dry wells for runoff means that the existing soil is often waterlogged and so the sewer/rainwater runoff system regularly becomes overwhelmed. The road regularly floods and many of my neighbors basements now flood regularly, not having flooded for decades prior. Adding more homes with large footprints and hard surfaces to allow needed onsite parking will increase this issue.

Street parking is still easy on my road, but is coming to the point that the road really should be a one-way street - Our road is not wide enough for two cars to pass. Adding more cars will require making streets one-way. Off-street parking requirements need to be linked to frontage - right now there will be more cars than available off street parking available based on the reduced parking requirements in the proposal.

Travel from one end to the other of Bethesda takes over 20 minutes at rush hour by car. Walkability and bike-ability has not improved, and has in fact deteriorated with the loss of the trail due to purple line construction and delays. Increased population density will increase congestion, particularly if walkability and bike-ability is not improved.

511	<p><b>Captain Obvious - I Will Vote You Out Road, Brookeville</b></p> <p>The solution to the problem is simple, however the board and its members are trying to create solutions when they don't fully understand the problem.</p> <p>First thing you need to do to get builders and developers to want to build in Montgomery County is that you need to create JOBS!!!</p> <p>Attracting large companies to relocate here, vs. Northern Virginia, will thus attract builders who want to invest in building homes for its residents!</p>
512	<p><b>Rachel Migone - Rockville, 20853</b></p> <p>I am against getting rid of single family homes zoning.</p>
513	<p><b>Tiffany Leclere - Brookeville, 20833</b></p> <p>Attainable housing is a "fancy" word for CHEAP housing to bring people to a neighborhood they can't afford. Let's speak truth. Cheap housing will bring property values down, bring crime and nuisance to our communities and neighborhoods, and cause overcrowding on our roads and in our schools. When the government comes knocking, your neighborhood is sure to turn to shit. People on government programs do not add value to communities. They add crime and cheapen the area. Period. If people don't have money to live in a neighborhood, then they should look elsewhere. I can't live in Potomac or Chevy Chase so I live in Olney. If you can't afford to live in Olney, then move to a neighborhood you can afford and save until you can. Work your way up. Stop sucking on the taxpayer tit and start earning your way. Tired of all the government forcing poverty and crime on our neighborhoods while they exempt their own. When you start putting affordable housing in Potomac and Chevy Chase, next door to corrupt Jamie Raskin, then come talk to me.</p>
514	<p><b>Pierre Baez Ortiz - Germantown, 20874</b></p> <p>The "attainable" HSI is not intended to increase the number of affordable housing in the county. It does nothing to address the root cause of housing challenges in the county.</p> <p>The initiative does not assess the risk, nor does it have a plan for the consequences, of increasing density of residents, pedestrians, vehicles, in already established communities and school districts.</p> <p>The AHSI should be dismissed for it's inadequacies and insufficiencies. It is not a solution, and it has a potential of becoming a root of new problems.</p>

515	<p><b>Jennifer Lavorel - Bethesda, 20816</b></p> <p>Is there some element of Thrive Montgomery that compels the Montgomery County Council to act on a recommendation to eliminate by-right, single-family zoning as proposed in the Attainable Housing Strategies initiative? If the answer is yes, then what is that element?</p>
516	<p><b>Chris Bruch - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>I support by-right duplexes in single-family neighborhoods, subject to the same single-family scale and massing guidelines.</p> <p>I support by-right townhomes in single-family neighborhoods where R-60 is adjacent to commercial. Towns serve as a buffer between R-60 and commercial.</p> <p>I do not support by-right quads or small apartments building in single-family neighborhoods.</p> <p>Suggest the plan be considerably downsized so we start walking before we try to run... start with duplexes and let's see how it goes.</p> <p>This plan could be a dud like the ADU legislation, and nothing actually happens.</p>
517	<p><b>Sarah Efird - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>Here are my complete comments from earlier this summer: The Montgomery County Planning Board's proposed attainable housing zoning scheme is blind to reality on the ground and will harm the County if implemented. No one doubts that housing prices are high in close-in suburbs nationwide; our area is no exception. With due respect, it is a huge mistake to tackle this problem with a broad-brush zoning change in which local conditions are an afterthought and the needs of existing homeowners are ignored.</p> <p>The proposal vastly underestimates the parking currently needed in our community, adopting the delusion that a family can comfortably carry out all its activities in the Washington region without a car.</p> <p>The proposal incentivizes development without appropriate regard for the substantial water runoff problems managed by individual localities, challenges that will only increase in the face of global warming.</p> <p>The proposal seeks to add density everywhere, especially in the "Priority Housing District," with little consideration of existing density and lot sizes.</p> <p>My own street is a perfect example of the naïveté of the approach being taken by the Planning Board. As indicated by Page 11 of the presentation provided at a recent town council meeting, my 100 year old, 5 bedroom home is in the Priority Housing District — in other</p>

---

words, the Planning Board would like to see it torn down and replaced by a quadplex or even an apartment building under the Optional Method Medium Scale development allowed under their proposal.

The parking recommendation is completely detached from reality. "As of right," a builder would be able to construct a quadplex on the west side of my street (where my house is) with only 2 parking spaces provided. With a width of 16 feet, our street allows parking only on one side. Numerous houses on our street have only a narrow driveway for parking. Some houses have no driveway at all. Garages are a rarity. There are only about 9 parking spaces on my block, with many taken by cars associated with the nearby Chevy Chase United Methodist Church, its preschool or its playground. Rarely is a legal space available even for the U.S. Postal Service. This situation will only worsen when construction of the Corso development across Connecticut Avenue gets underway and workers try to avoid the inconvenience of on-site parking. Increased use of public transportation indeed lessens the need for cars, but it defies reason to suggest that there will not be one or more cars introduced for every new individual, couple or family moving into the community. As you know well, a car remains a necessity for almost every family in the DMV.

Let me tell you about teardowns and even significant additions in our neighborhood. Invariably, builders wind up with a house-sized pit full of water and encounter very long delays, substantial unexpected expenses and irate neighbors as they figure out what to do after hitting our high water table. These construction projects create dangerous circumstances in a community full of young children, older people, trees, pets and wildlife, not to mention churchgoers, preschoolers and visitors to our small Gazebo Park.

President Friedson, I know you are familiar with our neighborhood, because I met you in my driveway a few years ago. Please don't take steps to make our entire community a teardown when you have seen with your own eyes the existing density of homes, the substantial water management problems that already exist, the narrow streets and tight parking, the mix of young families with small children, empty-nesters endeavoring to "age in place" (by the way, it seems like the Planning Board hopes to drive our elders out of their homes and into assisted living!) and older children and teens walking and cycling to their school or school bus. Please don't bring in developers to dismantle this already dense, already bustling, tree-lined and historic community.

Some other large questions have been raised in connection with the Planning Board's proposal and bear repeating here:

How can a private homeowner compete with a development company when bidding on a single home, when the developer can knock down that home and build a quadplex?

How can you prevent development companies and/or private equity firms from in-state or out-of-state from "rolling up" small lots and parceling them for sale or rental units?

How will the county deal with arms-length landlords that don't exist in the County?

---



And, most importantly, can changes not be made in a more incremental, specific way through the Master Plan process that provides more opportunity for community outreach and involvement?

Please adjust your approach to address the individual circumstances of each neighborhood, starting with Section 3 of the Village of Chevy Chase! Please do not hesitate to call me at [REDACTED] if you would like more information about the topics raised here, and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Sarah Efird Stephens

[REDACTED]  
Chevy Chase 20815

518

**Hector Chang - Takoma Park, 20912-4440**

I am in support of the policy proposals put forth of the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative because, frankly, I would love to be able to put down roots in Montgomery County but the math does not make sense. Currently my partner and I live in Takoma Park, by Old Town, and we love it here. We love the small town charm, our friendly neighbors, the farmers market and restaurants, the greenery, and the easy access to Metro.

We can currently make it work because of our \$1600/month rent-controlled apartment and great landlords that keep the apartment in good order. But as two married 30-something "DINKs", we have thought about setting down roots and purchasing a condo or house in the same area. That dream was quickly put to bed when one-half-of-a-duplex next to us was sold for over \$700K, which would've been an astronomical mortgage payment if we even seriously considered it. It is also possibly one of the few duplexes that exist in the ward I'm in, which is an adequate amount of house that we'd love to move into next, if we could.

I would like to stay and grow with the community we have grown to love, and I believe it is possible to grow while keeping much of the character of the places me and my neighbors love so much. In Takoma Park, there's already duplexes and low-rise condo buildings which blend very well with their surroundings, and we'd love to live in one of those. It just so happens that none have been built since I've been alive, so until there's more of them in the area, it is unlikely we will ever get a chance to put down roots where we live. I hope that these Attainable Housing Strategies Initiatives are seriously considered so that people who are in a similar situation as me have a chance of building a life in Montgomery County.

519

**Elizabeth Malone - Silver Spring, 20910-5560**

This initiative could make a huge difference by addressing various discrepancies in housing, neighborhoods, schools and businesses. I strongly support it.

520

**Marcia Keppel - Kensington, 20895**

My reaction to the proposed Attainable Housing Program is that it is TOO RADICAL to be considered without a lot more time devoted to study and discernment. Actually, it needs to be reformulated to meet its objective and the needs of all county residents!

My concerns include:

Environment : How much more green space must we lose? Tree canopy, etc.

Negativity regarding water/sewage issues already problematic

Parking: So many community roads too narrow to accommodate additional vehicles

Traffic: Unfortunately, it is naive to think residents will choose public transit over cars

Schools: Already overcrowded

By the time developers buy a lot (how expensive even that can be in Montgomery County) and then build, what will units cost? So who benefits : residents or developers?

I also am concerned with people who have mentioned WHO gets to vote on this issue ~ Residents vs. a few members of the council???!!!!!!!

I encourage our planners and leaders to get back to work ~ yes! ~ slowly and steady to quote one of them!!!!!!

521

**Kathryn Doyle - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Don't rush to rezone.<sup>[P]</sup><sup>[SEP]</sup>The Montgomery County Council is considering a radical change to its zoning laws that would make it possible for developers and private equity firms, as well as residents, to build duplex, triplex or quadruplex housing on many lots zoned for single-family homes.<sup>[P]</sup><sup>[SEP]</sup>This plan's backers emphasize the "attainability" of housing, which is not the same thing as affordable housing. New units built

under this plan will be sold at market rates with no income-based requirements. How will developments such as the ultraluxury townhouses on Walsh Street in Chevy Chase, one of which is on the market for \$3.65 million, help most residents? In the County Planning Board's limited presentations to residents, its representatives could not cite a single local comprehensive economic, environmental or infrastructure study that explored the impact of a more dense population on school population, sewage and water systems, or traffic and parking. Not only that — the representatives said they had not conducted site visits to the communities in which they planned to make these changes and that their department was not responsible for assessing the true impact of this proposal. Tearing down single-family homes and replacing them with higher-density housing will only increase the number of residents, rather than making Montgomery County more diverse or equitable. Those seeking affordable housing will still be left out in the cold under this plan. I urge the council to pause consideration of this plan until a proper and thorough assessment of its impact has been conducted. Voting for a plan before such an assessment would be a disservice to both current and future Montgomery County residents.

Kathryn Doyle , Chevy Chase

522

**Diane Dorfman - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I don't understand how housing can be attainable if not affordable. Opening up housing types in many communities in Montgonery County will only mean that more very wealthy people will be able to live in these neighborhoods. This will not help the nurses, teachers, policemen and others with similar careers whom I presume (hope) you are trying to help. The tract of land that houses White Flint mall would have been a perfect place to build many, many affordable housing units. Instead, it is being used for scientific/tech purposes (also a good use, but still). The agricultural preserve is critical, but maybe a plan can be designed for including some housing there. I am sure you are aware that the 3 townhouses built at 4500 Walsh are selling at 3.6 million each. Again, that land could have been used to provide housing units for at least 6-8 families. Is there really no space in this county for new moderately priced housing? Of course I realize all of the above costs money. Perhaps there t could be partnerships with the federal or state government, or non-profits to fund.

523

**Anne Gardner - Kensington, 20895**

I am opposed to the Attainable Housing Strategies initiative.

This initiative seems to benefit developers more than the community. besides the fact that it does not address affordable housing by any means. Instead, it as a way for developers to market slightly cheaper homes or duplexes that still remain out of reach for many local residents.

why is this not being put to a ballot? How can 11 elected officials decide on the largest neighborhood transformation the County has ever seen?

Major concerns like traffic and parking are being glossed over

**Ursula Scott - Silver Spring, 20902**

I have concerns about the current proposal:

1. Traffic infrastructure will be affected by density. It will increase cars on major streets. Connecticut is backed up in Kensington, just south of the beltway & near Bradley at many times of the day. Density will only increase that b/c of shopping & errands.
2. Many historic neighborhoods have a lot of on-street parking now (my neighborhood has 1 car driveways thus there is currently a lot of street parking causing single lane traffic on a street wide enough for 3 cars.
3. After listening, I realize that if multiplexes of any kind are built in neighborhoods, they would be expensive b/c land in some established neighborhood cost so much that the units could not be affordable & would need to be expensive to rent or buy. This really seems a gift to developers. It can only work if an existing homeowner could modify to accommodate to a duplex. But 3 or 4 plex or more is asking for a developer to build new, not keeping the existing character and buildings with modification.
4. Street parking would really be a problem in some exiting neighborhoods. This plan needs to be customized as to where it is allowed.
5. Why is there not a plan to build nice affordable multiplexes on empty land? I get there is limited land. But it seems smaller homes should not be allowed to be torn down for larger expensive homes. Keep small homes with minor modifications. At least, they would be affordable.
6. Zoning should not be changed without corresponding increasing capacity in some infrastructure: roads, major roads, electricity, schools, etc. I would worry green space will be destroyed. And ground would be covered with large buildings & parking spaces (and less trees and green space on the lot).
7. By limiting the rule to buildings (19 units & under) that are not required to have affordable units, this change cannot guarantee cheaper apartments. I think it begs for the opposite-like more expensive apartments to cover the cost of building and cost of the land.
8. I did not see limits or standards on developers to keep the price down. What incentive is there to have affordable units but not have sub-standard buildings (quick & cheap) which will create slum buildings in single housing neighborhood. And I do not see how the county can keep developers from buying small homes, tearing them down and building, instead of creating incentives for established homeowners converting a home to accommodate a family member apartment in the building or attached (or a caretaker apartment or student apartment). Bigger projects invites developers, who have no loyalty and vesting in the community or neighborhood character and feeling.
9. Why has there not been a larger notification? A friend notified me. I have not received anything in the mail. Such a major change that affects the quality of life, traffic, infrastructure, schools, my taxes (for improvements) and value of homes in MoCo NEEDS notification of ALL homeowners.
10. Why is this being developed in isolation to the infrastructure impact? It assumes Metro will be transportation. But after living here 24 years, I find public transportation inadequate. Metro is good into DC and some of VA but not neighborhood shopping, doctor appt, recreation, and normal life. One needs a car, which adds to congestion. Bicycling is often not possible, nor is walking because of distances in most of the county. This plan seems misguided and shortsighted.

525	<p><b>Lindsay Haake - Silver Spring, 20904</b></p> <p>Vote no! This is not a way to increase low income housing, but for a few rich people/developers to make more money. My neighborhood is so packed with cars currently, that my sons can't even safely ride their bikes. This would just make it 10x worse! Don't be greedy - vote no!</p>
526	<p><b>Sheri Zielinski - Rockville, 20852</b></p> <p>Wonderful. We're homeowners in North Bethesda and I applaud the initiative to build more affordable housing. You have my backing! Go for it!</p>
527	<p><b>Allen Taylor - North Bethesda, 20852</b></p> <p>I do not support this approach. Our communities are overly congested, overly trafficked, and heavily taxed. The County does terrible things to its residents on residential housing, and has cranked up tax assessments and spends money like there is no tomorrow. This is the usual money grab; and puts political agendas above communities. The other awful policy is the one which permits Jewish Chabads in residential areas. These aren't places of low grade activity; they are highly active religious BUSINESSES which are permitted to degrade our neighborhoods. I've had enough of the County and its destructive policies against its citizens.</p>
528	<p><b>Frank Malone - Silver Spring, 20910</b></p> <p>While I am supportive of the effort there is one aspect that is particularly wrong headed. That is the concept that "market forces" would determine whether parking was provided for the newly densified lots on existing neighborhoods. Builders would always find it easier to market an extra bath or an eat in kitchen than off street parking. Affordable housing purchasers would always prefer to believe that parking on the street is possible at no cost so why not spend that money on improved living space, not parking. Yet we are talking of doubling or quadrupling the number of units on a lot. Meaning that instead of one or two cars parked in front of the newly densified lot, there are now two to eight cars, meaning that up to six cars are now seeking to park in front of existing non-densified units, where parking is frequently already fully utilized. I realize providing for a parking analysis/requiring parking cuts against affordability because parking will frequently be needed. But to not provide it when needed makes neighborhoods less livable and residents less supportive of attainable housing.</p>
529	<p><b>Jonathan Bernstein - Silver Spring, 20910</b></p> <p>I am in favor of these changes. Hewing to the old Zoning rules that govern so much of the county land area harks back to the days when it was part of the means of excluding community members from living there. When our county is growing, it seems foolish to keep so much of land limited to single family housing. At the same time, we should recognize the concerns that many residents have, and I am pleased at the Planning Board's efforts to address those concerns. Next, all evidence is that this will be a long, gradual process, and not "the end of single family housing" that I've heard repeatedly on my civic's email list. Finally, just because this step will not quickly address all affordable housing needs is no reason not to move forward. As one elected official mentioned, we have to do ALL of these things - free building of other housing types, AND look for every chance to build much more affordable housing.</p>

530

**Caryn McTighe Musil - Bethesda, 20817**

I support the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative in Montgomery County and think we have to continually be creative about the affordable scale. I grew up in a single home in Philadelphia but when I married, I moved into what I could afford: a twin house. Twice. And I loved both of them and the neighbors with whom I shared a wall. It was common in many Phila neighborhoods to have a mix of single and what we called twins which are called duplexes here. It meant young people, teachers, social workers, and a die machine worker could all live in the neighborhoods of lawyers and doctors. In my Bethesda brick single home where i have lived for 35 years, I would be happy to have a twin next door instead of the what will likely happen when a neighbor leaves--a gargantuan mega mansion with 3 people in it, at most 4 but which would tower above my current house and leave no lawn because every inch is used to create a huge unnecessary footprint. No one has balked at such enormous big single homes. I think we should welcome duplexes that together would be smaller than the mcmansions going up for 1.5 and 2 million dollars a pop. I could not move back into my neighborhood anymore. It is made almost exclusively for the wealthy. We can do better. And be more just.

531

**Ann Rose - Chevy Chase, 20815-5348**

While I support more attainable housing near public transportation, you need to include affordable housing, control the prices developers can charge, look at each individual neighborhood, and consider realistic parking, infrastructure, trees, green spaces, sewers and runoff. I have lived on Norwood Drive since 1962. Our street is one block long; the lots are narrower than current zoning allows; we share narrow driveways; the houses and infrastructure date from 1928. We have many McMansions; the land is extremely valuable. The market price of multifamily homes here would not be "attainable"; it would be exorbitant, the street would be congested, and the occupants would certainly have cars.

532

**Vincent Burke - Kensington, 20895**

Having spent the bulk of my career in urban planning in Montgomery County, I am well qualified to comment on this plan. This approach will not solve any housing shortage or affordability issue in Montgomery County, which is a national issue driven by macro business & credit cycles and not particular to Montgomery County. The County should focus on easing the path toward larger scale development around transit nodes, which was the plan pitched to County residents for the past two decades. I personally participated in many Master Plan efforts throughout the County that have added a great deal of potential density throughout. Has the County calculated the sum total potential residential supply of Bethesda, Wheaton, White Flint, White Oak, Hampshire Langley, City of Rockville, City of Gaithersburg, Burtonsville, etc. master plans? If you add to that all of the potential supply coming from repositioning obsolete office parks into town homes and garden apartments, the number is huge without adding the attainable housing strategies. What is the goal and vision for the County? TOD and Smart growth made sense. This plan does not. It is a bait and switch to densify the urban cores as a smart growth concept and then come back and change the character and scale of single-family neighborhoods. The County should focus on encouraging those smart growth plans by decreasing the burden of proffers, permitting, and excessive regulation that has a direct correlation on increasing rents.

533

**Brandi Panbach - Silver Spring, 20904**

I strongly support the attainable housing strategies as proposed and recommended by the planning board. The current average cost of a single family detached home in Montgomery County is over \$970,000. We need to build more market rate family sized housing. By increasing the supply of missing middle housing, we can reduce costs of all units and create more pathways for families to find housing that fits their needs and budget. We need desperately need the small and medium scale housing proposed in the attainable housing strategies. I strongly urge the county council to adopt the zoning reforms necessary to implement these strategies.

534

**Sue Present - Silver Spring, 20903**

COMMENTS OF SUE PRESENT RE: THE PLANNING BOARD'S  
RECOMMENDED ATTAINABLE HOUSING STRATEGY INITIATIVE (AHS)  
OCTOBER 2, 2022

Thank you for holding this series of listening sessions on the Planning Board's recommended Attainable Housing Strategy initiative (AHS). My name is Sue Present. For decades, I have advanced fair, safe, affordable, and appropriate housing. I support the Resolution of the Montgomery County Civic Federation (Civic Fed) on Proposed Rezoning of Residential Neighborhoods,\* and I oppose the AHS. The following comments discuss my key concerns about the adverse consequences of the AHS recommendations and about AHS failures to focus on, prioritize, or effectively address the dire housing needs of low-income households.

The global upzoning of the R-60, R-90, and R-200 single-family zones that is recommended through the AHS is dangerously wrong. Among my concerns are the adverse impacts that AHS-recommended global upzoning would have on infrastructure, particularly the infrastructure in older, established single-family neighborhoods. This infrastructure includes the water mains that deliver safe and adequate drinking water to our single-family detached homes and also provide critical water capacity for fire hydrants, and the sewer mains, which carry away our wastewater. Sizes, linings, and age of this water and sewer infrastructure have been evaluated by WSSC to meet the existing and already-projected demands, but not the increased demands that would come with implementing the AHS. Of course, fire suppression capabilities can become more critical as housing is densified and as the actual setbacks from homes and distances between homes is reduced. Yet, I gather that the anticipated strains on our water and sewer systems have evidently been so unimportant to Montgomery Planning that it did not consult WSSC before the AHS was produced or recommended to the Council. Apparently, even after the Planning Board recommended the AHS, and well after Montgomery Planning acknowledged receiving resident concerns about impacts upon the water and sewer infrastructure, Montgomery Planning continued to keep WSSC in the dark. Montgomery Planning did not apprise WSSC about the AHS until the second week in September (which is the same week that listening sessions with the public on the AHS began).

In the first paragraph of Montgomery Planning's July 2024 publication, Attainable Housing Strategies – What We're Hearing, Montgomery Planning responds to community concerns about "Increased Demands on Infrastructure." There we are told that the "impacts on infrastructure (schools, transportation, water and sewer) (...) can be addressed through existing policies including those contained in the

Growth and Infrastructure Policy.” But, as I understand it from my communications with WSSC representatives, because (re)developments would not be subject to rigorous development/subdivision reviews, the existing regulations that hold developers financially responsible for water and sewer infrastructure impacts (presumably including the County’s 2024-2028 Growth and Infrastructure Policy (GIP)) would not govern typical (re)developments in single-family neighborhoods that would result from the upzoning that is recommended in the AHS. Planning Board representatives did not meet with WSSC representatives concerning the AHS until last week. At that time, WSSC presented its recommendation that every development and redevelopment should be required to undergo a Hydraulic Planning Analysis, and for all developers to be financially responsible for that analysis and any related mitigations deemed necessary. Taking into consideration the apparent disregard for impacts on WSSC infrastructure and the erroneous information that Montgomery Planning has provided to the public, I am skeptical that the County will approve WSSC’s recommendation in its totality; and I am concerned that, instead, the (re)developments that would be newly allowed in single family neighborhoods through this upzoning may be given exemptions, leaving residents to suffer burdens of the impacts and/or to foot the bill for their mitigation.

The AHS-recommended global upzoning of single-family neighborhoods would allow and implicitly encourage (re)developments that would maximize structure footprints. The resultant significant expansion of impervious surfaces would lead to residential properties’ and their single-family neighborhoods’ increased vulnerability to flooding. And, because the pressures favoring such (re)developments would also threaten the mature trees growing on the lots of those residential side and rear-yards, the AHS would also undermine County climate change initiatives.

As discussed above, Montgomery Planning has misled the public about the applicability of existing policies including those contained in the GIP to control impacts on water and sewer infrastructure. So shouldn’t we also expect that Montgomery Planning has likewise misled the public when claiming that existing policies including those contained in the GIP would protect against adverse impacts on other types of infrastructure? Shouldn’t we presume that, with the upzoning of single-family neighborhoods that the AHS recommends, the by-right duplexes and triplexes, and sometimes multiplex housing (re)developments in single-family neighborhoods would not be subject to Planning Board reviews and/or would escape requirements to mitigate other infrastructure impacts? For other types of infrastructure, too, I am concerned that, instead of requiring the developers of these (re)developments to be responsible for mitigating a variety of infrastructure impacts, (re)developments that would be newly allowed in single-family neighborhoods through this upzoning may be exempted from requirements to mitigate the infrastructure impacts, leaving residents to suffer the burdens of the impacts and/or to foot the bill for their mitigation.

I am also concerned about other adverse consequences of the global upzoning that the AHS recommends. I have resided in the same Silver Spring house for more than 30 years. My house is one of 25 historically significant single-family detached homes in the Crest Park subdivision that were designed by renowned architect Charles M. Goodman, as identified in Montgomery Planning publications and in the National Register of Historic Places. The global upzoning of single-family neighborhoods that is recommended in the AHS would encourage developers’ purchase and tear-down of our historic Goodman homes and also of other homes in my neighborhood with relatively smaller-footprints, lower heights, and lower roof-pitches. Despite Montgomery Planning’s own documentation, confirming that these homes were designed as modest dwellings for middle-income homeowners, it has produced AHS recommendations that advance razing and replacing



these homes “by right” (without development reviews) – replacing them with maximum-footprint, maximum height duplexes and triplexes, and sometimes multiplexes. The AHS implicitly promotes the destruction of historic and smaller older homes, many of which, due factors such as their age and size, are often categorized as “naturally occurring affordable housing” for middle-income homebuyers, and which data show would be likely to remain more affordable as they are to the middle-income purchasers than new duplex, triplex, and multiplex replacements with comparable numbers of bedrooms.

This is not a simple choice between the AHS and doing nothing. Presenters have cast this false dichotomy, suggesting that there can only be a binary choice. They point to the mansionizations of single-family homes as reducing housing affordability and having the same concerning environmental effects that commenters have raised about the AHS-recommended upzoning. That’s true. However, presenters are using absurd scare tactics to promote the AHS. They’ve been asserting that without the recommended upzoning in single-family neighborhoods, the properties would inevitably be mansionized, and they have suggested that their hands are tied to prevent mansionizations. That’s nonsense! For example, rather than upzoning, which would give financial benefits to outside developers and incur strains on our infrastructure, the County could curb mansionizations by offering reduced property taxes and/or other incentives in exchange for the single-family homeowners establishing deed restrictions that would retain existing single-family home sizes. Doing so would encourage home-price stabilization, prevent adverse environmental effects, and limit strains on infrastructure. Financial incentives to homeowners could be graduated, at tiered intervals (for instance five, ten, twenty-five, fifty, and ninety-nine years), offering increasingly greater financial incentives to align with longer-lasting covenants.

I agree with the many commenters who have criticized the AHS as misguided for its focus on “attainable” housing, rather than on much needed “affordable” housing. To date, the County has missed an important opportunity to add affordable home-ownership opportunities in single-family neighborhoods across the County. In the sampling of neighborhoods that I examined, I located County right-of-way land that could be repurposed to accommodate the foundations for architecturally compatible factory-built homes. This County land includes paper streets (meaning land dedicated for streets, but not constructed as such) and unnecessary tails of existing dead-end streets. Many factory-built houses on the market are sufficiently narrow that, if erected on rights-of-way-turned-(undersized) residential lots, their distances from neighboring properties with single-family homes would meet the standard setbacks. Factory-built houses offer a cost savings over traditional houses that are stick-built on site, a savings that would likely be greater if purchased in quantities, and the time to erect factory-built houses on foundations offers a time savings, too. If the houses themselves were made available for sale to lower-income buyers, and if the County would retain ownership of the underlying land, then homebuyers’ purchase prices could be drastically reduced, by an estimated 40% based upon typical real property assessments of single-family homes. The County’s continued ownership of the land could help keep these houses perpetually affordable, and yet this method of homeownership could still be a pathway for households with lower-incomes to build wealth. From my sampling of neighborhoods examined, I extrapolate that approximately 200 of these affordable houses could be added to single-family neighborhoods across the County in just one year.

On one point I agree with the presenters: We must have and use many different tools in the toolbox to address the County’s housing needs. However, the AHS, which recommends global upzoning of single-family neighborhoods and fails to focus on, prioritize, or effectively address the need for affordable housing, does not belong in Montgomery County’s toolbox. Please reject the AHS.

\*See the Resolution of the Montgomery County Civic Federation (Civic Fed) on Proposed Rezoning of Residential Neighborhoods at <https://montgomerycivic.org/files/20211011-MCCF-Resolution-Upzoning-Residential-Neighborhoods.pdf>

535	<p><b>Teresa Alutto-Schmidt - Rockville, 20853</b></p> <p>Re-zoning areas that are currently zoned for single family homes is not the answer. MCPS and our roads cannot handle new developments in these areas.</p>
536	<p><b>Michael Endrias - Bethesda, 20817</b></p> <p>I LOVE IT</p>
537	<p><b>Julian Lord - Kensington, 20895</b></p> <p>I want attainable housing in my town of Kensington. I want action taken to make sure there aren't restrictions put in place that limits the construction of attainable housing. Like what I saw in this video <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DX_-UcC14xw">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DX_-UcC14xw</a></p>
538	<p><b>Don Cortez - DAMASCUS, 20872</b></p> <p>This is an outrageous initiative that will give investors that have no connection to the community an opportunity to crowd our schools, overwhelm the already high traffic areas and likely hve zero impact on affordable housing.</p>
539	<p><b>Curtis Schroeder - Silver Spring, 20901</b></p> <p>Let's look at some numbers: An investor buys an existing R60 house for \$500k and plans to convert it to a duplex. A 1500 sq ft house will need an additional 1000 sq ft in order to achieve two 1250 sq ft units with living space, kitchens, bathrooms, and separate utilities. Cost estimate for the renovations is \$250K. Add a 13% profit (\$100k) plus 5% real estate sales commission for a total cost of \$892K, or \$451K per unit (\$400 per sq ft). The original house was only \$49K more and \$333 per sq ft). The new unit costs more per sq ft for a smaller unit. Explain how this more attainable and more affordable.</p>
540	<p><b>Mike Marsh - Chevy Chase Village, 20815</b></p> <p>Dear County Council,</p> <p>First, I abundantly against the rezoning proposal for Chevy Chase Village - where I live with my family for 10 years now. Albiet, one of the smallest homes off Wisconsin Ave., it is mine, mortgage is paid off and we bought here per the "single family mandate." If we knew of your plan then - would would have bought elsewhere.</p>

Secondly, I was offended by the very rude stereotype verbalized by one of your “rezoning supporters” who stated that we are all rich snobs that do not want to allow the financially struggling in our neighborhood!

Thirdly, my father was a blue collar welder and I worked with him to put myself through college. Thus, I am not a “trust fund baby” or snob. When I was a struggling post college grad., I sleep in a sleeping bag in my rented studio apartment in NJ, until I could afford to buy a bed and ate at my kitchen counter until I could afford a kitchen table - etc... I am not a CCV snob. But I would appreciate it if persons that are struggling financially, as I was for many years, also, live within their means and save (as I did) for enough cash to procure a mortgage for the house of their dreams.

Finally, I am offended that I worked hard and sacrificed to realize my current dream, but your plan is offering a way for others not to do what I did responsibly - to eventually be able to buy a house for my family in CCV.

There are many affordable housing in Friendship Heights and many are currently being built. There is also unused land in the Sacs parking lot and in White Flint ready for your \$\$\$ developers to build.

Stop this wolf in sheep’s clothes plan - not motivated by financially struggling persons but by greedy developers and my political appointees. Again, although Wisconsin Ave is loud - I saved for 20 years to buy here to be in a community of single family home owners. How dare you use the snob card to push your unwelcome \$\$\$ agenda.

November elections are soon!!!!

### **JORDAN DAY - SILVER SPRING, 20910**

541

My name is Jordan Day, and I am a renter living in Downtown Silver Spring. I would like to start by stating my support for this plan and commending the Planning Board for their comprehensive and clear-eyed analysis of the housing crisis in this county, as well as the solutions to this crisis.

The era of SF zoning has been a disaster for the county, for our environment, our housing market, and our equity goals. Rigid zoning in core neighborhoods has forced acres of spread-out development where driving is the only viable form of transportation, contributing to spiraling traffic as it strangles transit solutions. At the same time, single-family zoning has contributed to a crisis of affordability, as housing supply in desirable neighborhoods remains stagnant while demand only grows. I grew up in one of these neighborhoods, in Bethesda zipcode 20817. I was born in 1997 when 45% of county residents could afford a home there. As of 2019, only 27% of residents could afford to live in 20817, a number that is now out of date thanks to a 33% increase in average home values post-pandemic. Even with the fortune of a solid white collar job and no college debt, I will likely be unable to afford a home in Bethesda without significant outside help if prices continue to rise. I am the best-case scenario. The vast majority of people my age who have college debt or a less lucrative job will be shut

out of the neighborhood I grew up in, and the opportunities and advantages I enjoyed, without a major stabilization in housing costs. This situation is plainly inequitable.

Luckily, this plan provides a comprehensive, balanced solution to our housing crisis, allowing neighborhoods to organically grow to accommodate new people, rather than remaining stagnant and exclusionary walled gardens. It goes beyond “missing middle” to allow a broad range of housing scales and types, and begins the work to dismantle rules as diverse as zoning regulations, parking minimums and covenants which work to enforce our status quo. It mitigates potential negative impacts, limiting the highest densities to transit corridors and ensuring new units meet aesthetic and walkability goals with a pattern book. It ensures the county will be able to comfortably fit a projected 200,000 new residents by 2050, new residents we need to maintain competitiveness and ensure financial stability. It ensures we will be able to take care of an aging population, as the elderly can move to a “right sized” unit or age in place with a steady income stream from a renter. It ensures our housing stock can accommodate multi-generational families. It ensures essential workers like teachers, firefighters, and paramedics can live in the communities they serve. Most importantly, it will give thousands opportunities they would have otherwise missed.

Tackling the housing affordability, climate change, and equity issues in this county will require far reaching changes to the status quo. We are living in the world that status quo created. We know it hasn't worked. The era of SF zoning has left us with a deeply inequitable and unhealthy built environment, and I commend the board for taking the bold and forward thinking steps required to solve these intertwined crises. I urge them to proceed as quickly and efficiently as possible to approve this plan. I was born in this county, I live in this county, and I want the opportunity to stay in this county. This plan helps me do that.

542

**Paul Brown - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I live in Chevy Chase. I strongly support the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. I regret that due to work, I was unable to attend any of the listening sessions.

We need greater diversity of housing types, including in neighborhoods zoned for single family houses. There should, at a minimum, be no barrier to duplexes in all neighborhoods, and multifamily housing or townhouses along major arteries and near Metro stations. The vast public investment in our transit system demands that we maximize transit oriented development to leverage those tax dollars.

The county just unveiled at Wisconsin and Western historic marker commemorating the Belmont Syndicate, an early 20th century development in Chevy Chase by Black entrepreneurs which was blocked by legal efforts by the Chevy Chase Land Company. That legacy - of opposition to diversity in housing - is still reverberating today. As a Chevy Chase resident, I am ashamed that, 120 years later, some neighbors are actively trying to prevent greater diversity in our neighborhood - maybe not overtly based in race, but based on economic income disguised as housing type.

Some say duplexes are inappropriate in Chevy Chase, Yet Friendship Heights DC, just across the boundary, has examples of duplexes built 75-100 years ago, without changing the desirability of the neighborhood. Those duplexes are desirable and eagerly snapped up housing option for younger families.

I worry that our daughters, one of whom is in her mid 20s and in a minimum wage job in Bethesda, do not have affordable housing options anywhere near transit. Except to live with us, her parents. She sees no route to affordable housing except in far off areas that require lengthy commutes by car. While options for her in our neighborhood may never be realistic, options should exist for young families. At present, they do not.

The Council can help advance smart housing options, I urge Council members to approve the Initiative. Thank you for the opportunity to express my thoughts.

543

**Michael McKee - Silver Spring, 20905**

Hello,

I strongly support allowing duplexes and triplexes to be built in areas currently zoned for single family homes throughout Montgomery County, and for small apartment buildings to be built near major corridors and transit stations, as recommended by AHS.

Increasing the supply of market-rate housing will result in more affordable prices. This will not end the housing crisis by itself, but it is certainly an indispensable part of the solution. Filtering results in lower housing costs for poorer residents, which will decrease wealth inequality in the county in the long term. Increasing density will also allow residents to commute shorter distances to work, and emit less CO2 in the process.

Thank you,  
Michael

544

**Aidan Larsen - Rockville, 20852**

I am strongly in favor of the Attainable Housing Strategies plan.

My wife and I currently live in a townhome near the Grosvenor metro and I grew up in single family homes in Kensington and Bethesda. After spending a few years away, I was excited to move back to Montgomery County when it was time to buy my first home, but we would not have been able to afford a home in our neighborhood if not for our townhome, which was much cheaper than the surrounding single family homes in our neighborhood.

I would like to voice my support for the attainable housing strategy and believe it would help make more homes of cheaper prices available to residents like me. When I jog around my neighborhood, I see so many of the original smaller homes from the 50s & 60s being torn down

and replaced by the only housing type allowed under the status quo: massive single family homes that only the richest can afford. But these lots could support more than one family if we just let multiple homes be built by right, which would bring down the price of each new home too.

If anything, I would support allowing greater density in even more areas of the county and with fewer restrictions on size and shape than comparative single family homes, to ensure that as many homes as possible can be built.

While there are many benefits of allowing more types of housing at more price points throughout the county, I would like to focus on the people; the Attainable Housing Strategy will allow for more people to live and experience the true wonders of Montgomery County - among them our incredible schools, safe and diverse neighborhoods, and support for LGBTQ+ and abortion rights, which are not present in many areas of the country. We should be proud that so many people want to live here and not limit our community to just those that can afford expensive single family homes. While the strategy is not perfect, it is better than the status quo and we should not let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

When the time comes, I hope the county council will act to make the Attainable Housing Strategy a reality in Montgomery County.

545

**Lee Peeler - Bethesda, 20816**

Thank you for the opportunity to listen to the presentations today on the proposed attainable housing initiative. Based on the full discussion that I heard today it seems clear that the current initiative is misdirected and should be shelved. It does not address the need for affordable housing, does not protect the integrity of existing neighborhoods, consider the infrastructure or parking needs of the particular neighborhood, or have thought through the likely effect on development gamesmanship.

I was particularly struck by the prevalence of negative comments on the ongoing "megamansion" development in Montgomery county, including comments by the County staff. I also find this trend in which existing houses are torn down and replaced by ever larger edifices personally bothersome. But couldn't simple zoning changes address this issue by encouraging retention of current housing ? Whereas the proposed attainable housing strategy will ratchet up the incentives to tear down existing housing and replace it with even larger structures not in keeping with the neighborhood.

Thank you for the opportunity to listen, learn and comment.

546

**Raphael Satter - Bethesda, 20814**

I'm thrilled that Montgomery County is tackling the "missing middle." I'd encourage county officials to think about eliminating parking requirements altogether in most if not all areas.

547

**Kristin Link - Bethesda, 20817**

This initiative is simply awful. I spent time in Austin, TX where zoning was 'relaxed" There are literally homes built in backyards that people are renting out as AirBnB's Real Estate prices are still high. It has destroyed many neighborhoods there.

548

**Chuck Rybos - Chevy Chase, 20815**

My wife and I, residents at this address for 24 years, strongly support the goals of attainable housing. From the street, you would not be able to tell that our house was converted to a multi-family duplex, since the second entrance is in the back. There is more than adequate parking etc. It's a shame not to have two families (rather than just us) share this home, which is a short walking distance to Bethesda Metro.

Many homes in our Sacks Neighborhood have been torn down and large, custom, non-attainable houses built in their place. This fate could be avoided for our home if we can make it a duplex. From an individual financial point of view, having one (or two) of the units as rentals would benefit us (proving cash flow to maintain the home) and our homes value would not be reduced to just land value. The one, or two units, would indeed be affordable - either as rentals or if one were sold. We could indeed 'age in place'.

The ADU rules as written are problematic for us, but that is a topic for a different time (Feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss). What works for us, and meets the County's needs for attainable housing, is to by-right be able to convert our home to a multi-family unit.

549

**D P - Bethesda, 20850**

The all caps in this message is proper (there's no way to bold text)- this overcrowding has been going on DECADES and NOTHING is done about it.

Has Council President Andrew Friedson, Jason Sartori- actually WALKED neighborhoods in Montgomery County???

AHSI is already happening, in violation and also disrespect to communities - in largely Hispanic areas - e.g. along 193 and Veirs Mills Road all the way to Gaithersburg and Germantown.

Single family homes typically have 4-6 or more cars - for a 3 bedroom home.  
These Hispanic neighborhoods have RUINED property values.

And there's now an idea for MORE people?

There will be MORE crime, more congestion. Even simple things like more trash and more cars crowding streets, blocking driveways.

Please - all of you - LOOK AT NEIGHBORHOODS yourself - before even asking for input.

Phone number not given. Use email for contacting.

Also I suspect that virtually little feedback or email is read- by just about all local government entities. If there is criticism, it becomes political - and therefore ignored. Decades - this has been happening.

Montgomery County Resident

550

**Behrad Behbahani - Rockville, 20852**

It is far past time for the County Council to take bold action to address our housing crisis. Montgomery County is a national leader in innovative strategies to fund affordable housing production and preservation—and we now have the opportunity to become a national leader on undoing outdated zoning restrictions and making our county a more welcoming place.

We urge the Council to take into account the needs of all their constituents, and urge Council President Andrew Friedson to introduce a zoning text amendment based on the Attainable Housing Strategies recommendations as soon as possible.

551

**Katherine McKay - Silver Spring, 20910**

I support the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative and encourage the Council to adopt it largely as-is.

As the Planning staff have laid out, attainable housing is important for the well-being and diversity of our communities, and Montgomery County does not have very much of it. Denser, smaller homes are not only the most affordable first-time homeownership option for today's young families, they are also better for the environment, enable growth without compromising our abundant green spaces, and would allow the county to make the most of the space we have for infill development. It is not a panacea for all of our housing challenges, but it is one essential part of the set of solutions we need.

I live in the type of housing that AHSI promotes so I know how much it benefits not only me and my family, but also our neighborhood. We own a townhome in an infill development in Silver Spring. This option allowed us to buy something that we could afford in a place where I can have a life as a disabled non-driver. With a budget of \$515,000 in 2019, townhomes were the only options we could afford that were move-in ready and transit accessible.

Today, our family of three adults owns one car. My wife drives to work in PG County. I can walk and bike to transit. Our partner commutes from home to work in Downtown Silver Spring by bike. Not having multiple cars saves us about \$1,000 per month in expenses.

We purchased this "attainable" house out of lack of other options, but we love our neighborhood so much. It is diverse in every way that Montgomery County as a whole is, condensed into about 20 homes: some people moved in in the 80s, and others moved to the United



States in the past couple of years; we are white, Black, and Asian; Christian, Orthodox Jewish, Muslim, and without religion. Neighbors with kids can safely let them run around outside. We know each other well, often from chatting across our decks on nice evenings. I value these things so deeply now that I have experienced them. If we were to move, I would prioritize a slightly newer townhome a little closer to Downtown Silver Spring over a large single family home.

Finally, I encourage Council members to trust the Planning staff's work. I attended a listening session at BCC high school and was dismayed at how my neighbors dismissed the rigorous work that went into the AHS proposal and the data underlying it. As a research professional, I recognize quality analysis. I have also followed this issue closely for several years and observed the level of effort and care put into the recommendations you are considering now. The data they present is accurate.

Once again, I encourage the Council to approve AHS largely as it is now. This policy will be good for Montgomery County's homebuyers, communities, environment, and tax base.

552 **Katherine Shapiro - Brookeville, 20833**

Montgomery County needs to have the infrastructure in place before they pass any attainable housing strategies. Creating denser communities creates a negative affect on police, fire and rescue, schools, transportation, etc. Also Montgomery County needs to be sensitive to current neighborhoods and the impact to homeowners' property values. Montgomery County is not an inexpensive place to live and I feel my property values should be protected against a government that wants to change the environment where I live. I have worked hard to get my home and should not be subjected to anything that changes my community and home values negatively. If so, then lower my taxes.

553 **Barbara Jost - Bethesda, 20814**

I think the current favored strategies have a lot of problems and the best thing the Council can do right now is hit "pause" on this matter.

554 **Jeffrey Grimes - Rockville, 20850-1563**

I am very excited to see the county's plan for attainable housing. The plan allows for the types of housing that have been missing (made illegal) in the decades when the county has grown the most. I applaud the planning board and council for this plan to allow for the flexibility in land use which the market needs in order to meet the demands of housing. Allowing for a variety of housing types and densities to be built in a wider varieties of areas would be a boon to younger families struggling with affordability or senior citizens wanting to age in place. I hope that the county passes this plan in order to serve as an impetus for cities such as Rockville, where I live, to follow suit.

555 **Jacqueline Crawley - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Dear Council President Friedson,

---

Thank you for holding extensive listening sessions concerning the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. As you heard loud and clear from the majority of residents, we quickly recognized that the outcome will be a giveaway to real estate developers, NOT affordable or missing middle opportunities.

At least in our Bethesda and Chevy Chase neighborhoods, we see that small houses are bought up by developers and corporations for around \$1 million, then built out into three townhouses on the small lot, which are sold for over \$1.3 million each. Or a 6000 square foot McMansion is built on the lot and sold for \$4 million. New down-county apartment buildings permitted through AHSI would benefit these developers, who will continue to sell new apartments for one to three million dollars, and to rent new apartments for two to four thousand dollars a month.

You mentioned County initiatives for low- and low-middle-income housing. Please tell us more about these. Please publicize County efforts to convert underutilized office buildings into AFFORDABLE apartments, and to enforce low-income prices for the required percentage of apartments in the recent luxury apartment buildings in downtown Bethesda and Chevy Chase. Please explain why available unused properties near Metro stations, such as White Flint and GEICO, are not moving forward to create missing middle and affordable housing.

Further, the opportunity for a homeowner to create an Accessory Dwelling Unit on their property, to allow family members to live close by instead of moving to Frederick County, is already an option in Montgomery County. Adding a second door and associated renovations to a single-family house, as shown in Jason Sartori's slide #4, could similarly be made an explicit option, granted through case-by-case approvals which prohibit tear-downs by developers.

My personal goal is to increase AFFORDABLE housing so our wonderful teachers, police, nurses, firefighters, etc. can live near their essential work. We certainly do not want to think that the goal of the Montgomery County Planning Board and Council is to benefit developers through the proposed AHSI real estate give-away. Nor to indirectly benefit themselves. If an underlying motive is to generate more property taxes for the county, this is shortsighted thinking. New tax income will quickly be overspent on new teacher salaries, street repairs, water management, and other infrastructure necessary to accommodate additional residents.

Hopefully the AHSI proposal will be viewed as an honest mistake by the planning board, who tried for three years and could only come up with a broad solution that had some success in other cities such as Austin, Texas. Hopefully your Council now appreciates our evidence-based concerns and will now reject AHSI. Hopefully future members of the Montgomery County Planning Board will be selected for their analytic abilities and community listening skills, to ensure that future proposals are based on fine-grained, data-driven understanding of the needs of each specific neighborhood.

Lastly, let's think deeply about the real reasons underlying our county's housing shortage. One is that so many baby boomers who bought houses in Bethesda and Chevy Chase in the 1970s, 80s and 90s are choosing to age in place instead of moving to retirement communities. I am one of these. Many beloved neighbors are doing the same. We are a happy community. We pay our considerable property taxes for the privilege of living in quiet, pleasant, green neighborhoods. Please understand that we won't live forever. Over the next decade, our

---

single family houses will come on the market for young families to buy. Your task is to ensure that missing-middle houses get sold to young residents, NOT to profit-driven developers. Please think long and hard about strategic initiatives to ensure this logical goal.

With thanks for your attention, and for all you do,  
Jacqueline Crawley

556

**Cecelia Adams - kensington, 20895**

I sat in on the listening session held October 2nd and would like to submit my opinion here. I have been a resident and homeowner in Montgomery County for nearly 30 years. I own and operate a small business (title company that conducts real estate closings) located in Rockville, MD for 20 years which has been my sole source of income to support my 3 children whom I raised them as a single mom. While I agree that housing is unaffordable in our County (and I worry about my young adult children being able to afford a home), I am certain that your proposal is misguided and will not result in the intended outcome. I will offer my reasons why I voice my strong opposition to this proposal. First, the concentration of potential new housing in an already overwhelmed section of the County will cripple the roads, resources, and result in overwhelming our already crowded school system. When you were describing the additional off street parking spaces required for these new developments, all I could think about was the increased water run off and flooding that will occur. Being in the real estate field, we hear all too often of homeowner's basements being flooded and damaged by additional runoff due to less trees, grass and new developments with increased hard surfaces. There needs to be a comprehensive study on the impact of resources, water management, schools and roads.

The idea that being so close to public transportation for these new developments will reduce traffic is very misguided. Many years ago when I worked in DC, I used the metro but now it makes no sense as there is no metro stop anywhere near my house or office. Same with every person in my family and their significant other. Their jobs require them to be in their cars meeting clients on a daily basis, nor is there a metro stop near their employers. If that is the case for my family (7 total), I suspect that is the same for the majority of others. Also, please take the time to drive on Connecticut Avenue during peak rush hour which seems to be growing by the day. Increasing housing along this road will result in more cars idling for longer periods of time which decreases productivity and pollution. This will impact businesses as most people will just stay put rather than shop or eat at local business to avoid sitting in their cars. Also, it is my understanding that you consider the Marc train the same as the Metro system for the proposal. These systems aren't even in the same ball park due to the limited train service and user count. So please make that correction.

I work with developers and unless you put restrictions on pricing like MPDUs on these new properties, you will get very high priced homes which will remain unaffordable. But I doubt any builder will build without a decent profit. Due to inflationary effects and labor costs, the cost to build a home has sky rocketed –resulting in increased home prices. That is simple math, not zoning. Have you seen the new developments near Chevy Chase Lake? Two million for condos?? Over a million for townhomes? Affordable? I think not. Or you will get poorly, cheaply built homes that in the end will end up costing the homeowner to pay for constant repairs for poor workmanship.

Solutions for reducing the costs of housing? Let's start with property taxes. Please reduce those and allow for more credits to reduce the costs based on income, age, etc. Reduce the permitting, fees and over regulation on new homes such as sprinkler systems and other requirements. Please conduct proper and comprehensive impact studies before enacting any new changes such as the one you proposed. Also, please be sure EVERY homeowner is aware of this proposal so more people can understand and comment on the effects of these types of changes. Thank you.

557

**Andrew Lambeth - Rockville, 20852**

I was disappointed to hear about the dissent at the recent meetings and want to throw my support behind the proposed changes. This area desperately needs housing and there is obviously a demand and supply if we let people build.

558

**Mike Baccari - Rockville, 20852**

Good afternoon,

I want to make it clear that I support wholeheartedly the changes and don't want a few people with too much free time ruining the proposed changes for the majority of people who want them. We desperately need more housing and it has to be built somewhere. Please don't cater to a minority of homeowners by conceding parts of a good plan. Big fan of the duplex/triplex/quadplex changes most of all.

559

**Leisa Sarecky - Brookeville, 20833**

Agree that more needs to be done, but the neighborhood (or street) lot size should be at least 1/2 acre to build a multi-family unit. There needs to be space on the street for enough parking as well as the other resources need -- roads, schools, etc. In the lot is any smaller, the County creates parking/traffic issues making it difficult for school buses, trash trucks and emergency vehicles to move through a neighborhood because of the cars. Growth should be smart. When I see infills of rows of townhomes but no parking anywhere, you are creating another problem.

560

**Tobie Bernstein - CHEVY CHASE, 20815**

The AHSI proposes increased density by right across most of the county. Yet many neighborhoods covered by the plan lack the infrastructure to handle this increase. As a result, the AHSI poses a number of significant health, environmental, and safety risks that the Council must address in any new zoning legislation.

\*Increased Car Traffic and Safety Impacts. Reducing car use is an important public policy goal. Given the current transit options, however, it is not realistic or reasonable to assume that people will give up their cars when they move into the vast majority of new units built under this plan.

o The one-mile measure for the priority housing zone is double the half-mile buffer widely accepted as a transit “walkshed.” To make matters worse, the plan proposes a straight line measure, so a significant percentage of homes in the zone (including those on my block) will even be more than a mile on the ground.

o Older neighborhoods with narrow streets are not equipped to handle 3 or 4 times the number of cars and the corresponding increase in service providers and delivery trucks. The plan thus poses serious safety risks for children who walk/bike to school and to residents who walk/bike through their neighborhoods. These risks are heightened on streets like mine that have no sidewalks.

o Any increase in density - even if the county ultimately allows only duplexes and ADUs by right— must require adequate onsite parking to handle the increase in cars. Many streets, like mine, have parking on only one side. If adequate onsite parking is not required, residents, visitors, and service providers will all compete for spaces on the street and will circle neighborhoods, creating added safety risks.

\*Increased Environmental and Public Health Impacts. Climate change means more heavy rainfall events and higher temperatures in the years ahead. The AHSI increases density without taking important environmental risks into account.

o What rules are in place to address runoff from new development, especially in neighborhoods already impacted by flooding and storm water challenges?

o How will the removal of mature trees and the increase in impervious surface exacerbate the heat island effect and affect the overall health and wellbeing of county residents?

These are a few of the impacts that are not addressed in the AHSI. Moreover, the plan does not provide supporting evidence that its market-based approach will increase the number of attainable housing units and prevent displacement of current residents who are living in homes that are currently affordable to them. Until transit and other infrastructure improvements are provided, the Council could consider limiting by right development to ADUs and duplexes. For all new residential development, it is important to revisit how to handle runoff and prevent loss of trees and impervious surface; the protection of green space is not only important for the environment but for the health and wellbeing of county residents.

### **Callum Vicary - Silver Spring, 20910**

561

Hello! I am writing to express my support for the conclusions outlined in the Attainable Housing Strategies Report. As a 23 year old who grew up in Silver Spring (though only recently moved back after a few years in Boston), Montgomery County is home to me, and it is an area who's future I care deeply about. The national crisis in housing affordability has affected people in my generation quite severely, as rents have spiraled out of control and even renting often seems out of reach to many people. I currently don't have a place of my own, and am with my parents, though I am fortunate enough to have the means to move into my own place soon. Other young people and many peers from MoCo are not so fortunate, or do not work in industries that pay well enough where even renting in this county is a viable option (I am lucky to be an engineer). I've seen friends who've lived their entire lives here have to rent in other Maryland counties further

out, or spend most of their adult lives living with their parents as that is all they can afford. I am grateful to see this being acknowledged as a problem facing everyone in the county, and strongly support the recommendations to relax zoning laws in this county and allow for far more housing construction. Especially in areas with good transit, as a lot of young people, myself included, are interested in living car-free for sustainability and cost reasons.

What made MoCo such a great place to grow up wasn't the protected, idyllic single-family home neighborhoods, but the dense and vibrant neighborhoods like downtown Silver Spring. The fact that I could take the Ride-On or Metro or MetroBus and experience the freedom to move around the county and explore without the need of a car was a wonderful opportunity that more people should be able to experience.

Montgomery County is such a vibrant and diverse place that affords so much opportunity for young people like myself, and I would hate to see a once-in-a-generation effort to grow our county, improve sustainability, and make housing more accessible to all go to waste to appeal to a shrinking and increasingly unrepresentative sample of wealthy homeowners worried about "destroying single family neighborhoods" or whatever inanities. These people are disconnected from what makes MoCo so great to begin with, and the solutions needed to make it great for far more people. I hope the planning department and the county council have the sense to ignore the negativity and look to the future well being of our county and our region. Affordability of housing is one of the greatest challenges facing young people, and addressing affordability in a way that improves density, especially around transit, is the perfect solution to this problem. MoCo's future lies in building up, not out, in my opinion.

As an aside, I actually think the county council should go even further, relaxing far more land use regulations (especially concerning mixed used land uses, people should be allowed to open bars and restaurants in residential neighborhoods if the demand for it exists), but I realize that is a whole other political battle. Maybe someday in the future. I appreciate all that the Planning Department has done and hope the council has the will to do the right thing and make MoCo more affordable, sustainable, and urban.

Best,  
Callum

562 **Fiona Vicary - Silver Spring, 20910**  
I support allowing more affordable housing to be built in the county!!

563 **Judy Karasik - Silver Spring, 20910**  
I don't think the proposed changes in zoning will result in more affordable housing. Quite the reverse.

Comments have focused largely on buyers ("I could not afford to buy my house today.") but I'd like to examine the process -- and the likely results -- from the point of view of the sellers.

A home is almost always a family's biggest financial asset. When a family chooses among offers, the responsible thing to do for the future of the family is to make that decision on the basis of the size of the offer. A family takes the highest bid, sells the house, and at that moment loses all control over what happens next.

For instance, the bungalows on my tree-lined street in North Woodside. A high bidder may be able to make that high offer because they plan to knock down the bungalow and build two or three luxury condos on top of one another, or two semi-divided townhouses, effectively doubling or tripling the value of the property. And effectively changing the nature of the neighborhood into a more high-density community. (Incidentally, probably residents with more cars per unit, since to afford these luxury homes, they're more affluent.)

Even if the aim is to create more "attainable" housing, the nature of the neighborhood will be irrevocably altered. Instead of tree-lined streets with shaded backyards, we'd see, after ten years of turnover, rows of tall semi-divided townhouses, many fewer trees, and more space out back devoted to parking spaces, not green space for trees, gardens, and play. I know that neighborhoods change; I grew up here. But the feeling of this kind of neighborhood -- quiet front porches, yards for children's play, neighbors who know one another -- seems to me a defining characteristic of southern Montgomery County.

Once regulations change, the flipping will begin. We've already seen plenty of flipping in other neighborhoods by entrepreneurial individuals and plenty of action by aggressive developers.

Capitalism drives development in the direction of increasing property value. Zoning is a neighborhood's -- and a county's -- only protection.

Because of this, I believe that Montgomery County's proposed changes to zoning laws are not likely to increase affordable housing, but, even if they increase "attainable" housing, they are likely to radically alter the nature of neighborhoods like mine.

564

### **Cathy Kristiansen - Silver Spring, 20910**

This is to give feedback on the Attainable Housing concept, after reading much about it and attending the Silver Spring public meeting. From what I have learned about this concept, I am utterly against it for several reasons and here list just a few:

- 1) It is transparently a developer-led (investor-led) scheme and designed to facilitate maximum profits for them without regard to concurrent destruction in established neighborhoods.
- 2) Many MC residents want the option of single-family housing neighborhoods and worked to afford that, and this plan destroys what they have bought into, pulling the rug from under them.

- 3) In this plan, taxpayers would bear the infrastructure, schooling, traffic mediation, and other costs associated with an influx of new residents, with developers wiggling out of as much responsibility as they can.
- 4) The "all rights" for developers is the single most hair-brained idea in the plan, giving them free rein to destroy carbon-capturing trees, the look of neighborhoods, increase impervious surfaces to accommodate car parking areas, and so on. I would not for a minute trust any "agreement" holding them to aesthetic, environmental or just payment standards, which are wont to be chipped away.
- 5) This plan apparently began before the pandemic and seemingly has not adjusted to the reality of WAY lower numbers of commuters, something that will never revert, in fact is likely to accelerate as AI changes the workforce in additional ways.
- 6) Actually the most important point for action: There are now so many unused office buildings with huge impervious parking lots (e.g. the business parks off I270 just after the Beltway) that are crying out for demolition and development as AFFORDABLE housing. That is where I believe your entire MC housing focus should be.

In fact, I'd ask that you drop the ATTAINABLE ruse, please! More developer profit is NOT what is needed but rather a hugely stepped-up supply of apartments and condos for people with lower incomes or those saving to one day move to single-family home neighborhoods. It makes no sense to destroy the look and feel of these old existing neighborhoods to "mix and match" into them multi-family buildings that could readily be built elsewhere in their own comprehensive, aesthetically pleasing and public transport-accessible communities.

Thank you.

### **Brenda Freeman - Silver Spring, 20910**

565

The bottom line is that the County Council has no concern about residents who live in single-family zoned property. Your goal, I believe, is to follow the developers' lead and let them choose areas to "densify" in order to get maximize their profits without building either "affordable" or "attainable" housing.

We got into this mess 2019 based on the Planning Board's manufactured charges of racism using the pretext that restrictive covenants that expired over 70 years ago meant that homeowners who moved into single family zoned areas decades later benefitted from past racism. Thank you very much. As a black woman I have never benefited from past or present racism.

Silver Spring is one of the most diverse areas in Montgomery County and while we were targeted for densification other less diverse areas such as Potomac were not. I am not accusing residents of Potomac of anything but stating a fact about the Planning Board.

Eliminating single family zoning in a dense areas like Silver Spring is a gift to builders and hedge fund managers who can demand to build large profitable apartment buildings subsidized by taxpayers.

The Council and the Planning Board have do not, repeat, do not encourage builders to look at less dense areas with lower construction costs and where lower cost housing could be built.

Besides zoning changes, the County has also come up with social engineering objectives and 20-minute communities where the builders, lobbyists, possibly contributors would determine which stores, shops would be put there.

Transportation: Forcing people out of cars by eliminating most street parking is "Danger by Design."



---

Your plans ignore reality. Taking public transportation everywhere is impossible for some. I use both Ride-on and the Metro whenever possible. That is not possible for medical appointment in Healing Way or North Bethesda which would total three hours for the bus for 30 minute appointments.

Also, Metro ridership has declined as more people work from home. Meanwhile County Council members and the Planning Board members drive to work and have parking spaces.

Transportation: Forcing people out of cars by eliminating most street parking is “Danger by Design.”

Your plans ignore reality. Taking public transportation everywhere is impossible for some. I use both Ride-on and the Metro whenever possible. That is not possible for medical appointment in Healing Way or North Bethesda which would total three hours for the bus for 30 minute appointments.

Also, Metro ridership has declined as more people work from home. Meanwhile County Council members and the Planning Board members drive to work and have parking spaces.

Support for a People’s Counsel had large support among County residents. Again using a false narrative at first some the County Council members said they would support the People Counsel.. until it came to voting. Then using another false narrative the County Council and Planning Board claimed a People’s Counsel might not support concerns of lower income residents. Because residents from wealthier neighborhoods would be able to hire attorneys and lower income residents would not. In other words, implying that the People’s Counsel would not represent lower income residents?

How cynical. Even the Office of Equity and Racial Justice supported having a People’ Counsel.

Instead the County came up with a Development Review Commission. The DRC provides information about a project where interested parties can attend the first informational meeting. That’s it.

Now to ensure even less transparency in development decisions re zoning in single family zoning areas, it appears that the Planning Board Director Jason Satori would approve certain building projects to speed up the approval process. I am not aware that Mr. Satori will be required to let the neighbors know that an apartment building or multiplex or other would be going up next door.

Differential Impacts of Zoning Changes

County Council members Kate Stewart and, Mary Anne Sales live in incorporated cities and won’t be impacted. Council member Will Jawando lives in Ashton an area unlikely to be “densified” anytime soon. The County Councilman from the Potomac excluded his area from development because of lack of infrastructure and not being on a traffic corridor, despite the fact that River Road is a traffic corridor for all intents and purposes. And today this was mentioned by an area resident in the listening session.

Finally, the OLO BIPOC REPORT showed people in minority communities have specific concerns:

“They wanted assurances that the housing strategies (designed to integrate their communities) would not, in fact, displace them replicating challenges experienced during 'Urban Renewal' and also expressed. Residents also expressed concerns about Transportation policies being too focused on transit and not acknowledging the needs of the working class who rely on their vehicles to access jobs and employment”.

All property owners should be entitled to similar assurances.

---

566	<p><b>Madeline Amalphy - Gaithersburg, 20877</b></p> <p>As a Gaithersburg resident who is extremely concerned about the climate crisis, I strongly support the Attainable Housing Strategies initiative. Montgomery County urgently needs more sustainable land use and better transit access to combat climate change. Allowing multifamily housing options that can be more affordable than new single-family detached homes in places with existing infrastructure and amenities provides an alternative to car-dependent sprawl development, and will help give more people the chance to access transit and opportunity.</p>
567	<p><b>Ari Rickman - Silver Spring, 20902</b></p> <p>I urge the council to introduce and pass Attainable Housing Strategies as soon as possible.</p> <p>I grew up in Montgomery County and would like to one day raise a family here as well. Growing up, I saw how small apartment buildings in Forrest Glen allowed diversity to flourish in the neighborhood. Several of my closest friends immigrated to the US and lived in small apartment buildings, these buildings were their foothold that helped them reach the American Dream. I want MoCo to stay a place where people can come with relatively little, go to good public schools, and get ahead. I also want MoCo to be a place where older people, like my parents, can afford to downsize in their old age without having to leave their neighborhoods, and a place where young people who haven't figured out exactly what they want in life (like my brother) can still afford to move out and take the first step toward adulthood. Without building more housing, and more affordable, diverse types of housing, MoCo cannot be a place where all these ideals come true.</p>
568	<p><b>Charles Rodrigues - Gaithersburg, 20877</b></p> <p>Although I appreciate MC's efforts to address the housing crisis and affordability in general, this step does not address the global balance of Montgomery County. Conceptually, this plan intends to increase density of housing/population by increasing supply of houses with existing boundaries. However, with increased housing density comes increased utilization. This report acknowledges, but does not address, any modifications that will be necessary to the streets, energy sources or water resource allocation and utilization after such a plan is</p>

implemented. To address the needs of improving the infrastructure, the fiscal burden will shift to the residents which will eventually move them out of these areas. I oppose this initiative.

569 **Keith Campbell - BETHESDA, 20817**

I support this initiative. I have college age kids, and this initiative will up the odds they can live nearby if they want to, which is very important to us.

570 **Julia Seeley-Hall - Silver Spring, 20902-3614**

I strongly support the proposed zoning changes to allow more duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes to be built in Montgomery county. With the projected growth in our region, it's imperative that we are able to build adequate housing supply. I do not want to see overpriced McMansions being built as a result of overly restrictive zoning, while people who already live here become priced out amid soaring demand! Allowing denser housing is the only possible way forward.

571 **Peter Frandsen - Silver Spring, 20902**

I have been a resident of Montgomery County, Maryland, since 1965.

When my parents bought a single family house in Silver Spring in 1965 they wanted to live in a single family residential neighborhood. If they wanted to reside in a densely packed, traffic-choked suburb they could have moved to Los Angeles County in California or Brooklyn in New York. Instead they picked a relatively new single family residential area. They did not anticipate, nor could they, nor should they, expect to have the rules changed from under them. Keep things as they are. Please don't destroy our residential neighborhoods. Maintain single family zoning.

The support systems for these neighborhoods are in place and have been more-or-less sized to fit the conditions at the time of first building. As they age and decay, they cannot handle more. Parking is already maxed out and the newcomers will not walk or bike to work as some living in a fantasy world believe. Just recently, the County filled three dump trucks with street parking spot saver items (cones, trash cans, etc.). The County is only now thinking about the idea of parking permits! Increasing density will only make the problem worse. No new building should occur unless there is adequate parking available.

I have seen 75 plus year old oak trees cut down and greenspace destroyed in the name of affordable housing. The developers substitute tiny fragmented "native plant gardens" and fool the County into thinking the developers are helping the environment. The developers walk away with the profits as the tiny fragmented gardens are not maintained and die. Perhaps these developers should make mitigation payments to the taxpayers of Montgomery County.

As Montgomery County and the State of Maryland continue to chase jobs to Northern Virginia, the people living in the bedroom communities here will need cars to get to work there. It is ridiculous for Maryland to subsidize the housing costs of Northern Virginia. If the jobs are kept here, there will be less need for cars (but not zero-need ever.)

Where does this development end? What will you do after you have cut down every old growth tree and paved over every lot and woods to build more housing. This continued development will ruin the county and turn it into another Los Angeles.

There is a housing crisis in Montgomery County and elsewhere: property taxes are too high! The developers make the profits, but the middle class pay for it through ever increasing property taxes to support development. The County cannot tax its way to prosperity or fix the country's social ills. Stop the increase in property taxes.

Finally, members and employees of the affordable housing commission appear to be heavily biased one way. As government appointees and members these people should be unbiased and willing to listen to the people who pay the taxes in this county.

Respectfully yours,

/s/ Peter A. Frandsen  
[REDACTED]

**Samuel Williams - SILVER SPRING, 20910**

572

I strongly urge the Montgomery County Council to adopt the attainable housing strategies developed by the Planning Department. As someone in my 20s, it is extremely disheartening to live in a county in which housing prices are so inflated due to a lack of housing supply. I hope to someday buy a townhouse or other small-scale house - not a single family home - but the housing prices, coupled with the fact that the majority of the housing market consists entirely of large single family homes, means that that is unlikely to occur. It seems extremely unlikely that any strategy other than allowing more homes - and more types of homes - to be built in Montgomery County will alleviate our housing crisis. Additionally, I find it admirable that the Planning Department is pairing these recommendations with the pattern book, which will allow new types of houses in existing neighborhoods to be built without disrupting the character of those neighborhoods.

I recently went on a walking tour of East Silver Spring, a relatively old neighborhood in MoCo featuring many types of housing that were built before current zoning made those types of housing illegal. What I found surprising is that it is very difficult to identify the difference between a duplex and a single family home, or which houses along a street feature accessory dwelling units. The consistent look-and-feel of those houses means that the neighborhood just looks like... a neighborhood. What the Planning Department is recommending is, at its core, simply allowing people to build similar types of buildings on their property, and therefore allowing people like myself purchase and

live in a type of dwelling that fits their needs and aspirations. It would be a disservice to the residents of MoCo to stand in the way of that, considering the minimal impact on current homeowners. Therefore, I firmly support the Planning Department's recommendations, and urge you to implement those recommendations to the fullest extent possible.

573 **JoAnn Burke - Bethesda, 20817**

Much more info is needed re how such denser housing has affected property values in other locales, the issue of additional cars, effect on schools, water run-off mediation, and, most importantly, how affordable would be such new housing. It seems now that only developers would benefit.

574 **Martin Gonzalez - Silver Spring, Silver Spring**

Not for this , this is not affordable housing just window dressing .So builders really going to meet these price points call me skeptical or really just based in reality .,I've seen this movie before , builders built three 500, 000 houses 25 years ago across the street from my house. Who are you kidding .....Please Vaya con Dios !

575 **Jeffrey Baker - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Hello, my name is Jeff Baker & I live in the Hamlet.

I am a Partner at a real estate development firm & have worked across all facets of development assets including multifamily, single-family for-sale, mid-rise condo, affordable housing, office, hotel, and retail. At my previous employer, I worked on several developments in downtown Bethesda in close proximity to the metro station and am familiar with the Comp plan / zoning changes that took place over the past several years.

I am writing to express my grave concern about this proposal & the impact on the surrounding area, specifically my community the Hamlet. I am an adamant supporter of increasing the availability of affordable / attainable housing (our most recent development in Baltimore including a successful public / private model to increase community benefits) so my opposition is not a typical resident expressing concerns about home values, traffic, schools etc although those are obviously valid concerns. My concern is specifically about the broad stroke brush in terms of categorization & lack of specificity to the context of the neighborhoods where this proposal could apply. I understand the intent of increasing density around metro centers, but would point out the following as it relates to the Chevy Chase metro station.

The increase of density at the Chevy Chase Purple line station (while following traditional principles of zoning) has created a Ritz Carlton Residence, a mix of retail targeting high-end shoppers (including the grocer), apartment buildings with rents above \$3/SF, and an ultimate plan to increase density above the existing retail strip on the opposite side of Connecticut with additional high-end density in a phased plan. All of this comes with traffic on a narrow over-used road, school impact etc but the tradeoff for affordability is obviously not there. I am not faulting Bozzuto at all - the free-market is the free-market and they built exactly to what the demographics of the neighborhood demand.

That brings me to this proposal. This proposal will increase density with the intent of increasing affordability in the Chevy Chase neighborhood by using broad stroke, general zoning principles. It will not work. There is a reason that developers support this legislation and it is getting traction - they know that they can build for "missing middle" density but in wealthy areas such as Chevy Chase, this will simply yield high-end increased density targeting the upper middle class clientele. Specific to the Hamlet, this neighborhood is entirely & intentionally hidden from Connecticut Avenue & has no remote connection (separated by a creek & significant foliage) to the Purple line station. It is not walkable unless you decide to walk down Connecticut Avenue on an extremely narrow & dangerous sidewalk next to three narrow lanes of fast-moving traffic. The tires marks on the sidewalk prove that case.

This proposal needs to be studied in terms of practice not theory. Use the Ritz Carlton residences on the Purple Line Station as an example. This type of zoning needs to be studied in the context of area demographics, specific evaluation of geographic constraints & connections, and ask the fundamental question on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis - "will this actually create additional affordable options?" For some neighborhoods, the answer may be yes - for the Hamlet, it is clearly a no.

576

**Alice Koethe - Silver Spring, 20910-4513**

I oppose the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. I live in a neighborhood in downtown Silver Spring with a mix of older single family homes and older affordable apartment complexes. During COVID, a surprise re-zoning was implemented to expand the downtown Silver Spring commercial district with no public meetings and no advance notice to residents. This rezoned my close neighbors into a fully commercial zoning area, despite the fact that the character of the neighborhood is completely residential.

My neighborhood actually has green space and trees, which I enjoy immensely-- that's why I decided to live here. But because we are near a metro stop and an incoming light rail station, I worry about future overdevelopment. The Council should instead start an initiative to re-green and redevelop some of downtown Silver Spring, which has abundant vacant commercial space and CO2-sucking concrete. That way, developers could still make money without destroying our beautiful neighborhoods and ecosystems.

I was inspired to write this by Dan Reed's comment in the Greater Greater Washington blog- I'm tired of self-serving developers and realtors trying to push THRIVE50 and other similar initiatives on MoCo citizens.

577

**Andrew Lepczyk - Silver Spring, 20901**

As a homeowner in this county I am strongly in support of attainable housing. It furthers our county's goals on making homes more affordable and our county more in line with climate goals. We need this legislation now more than ever. Any delay makes the situation worse.

578	<b>Mukilan Natarajan - Silver Spring, 20910</b> I support Attainable Housing legislation. Please advance this legislation as soon as possible. Thanks!
579	<b>Rebecca Luib - Chevy Chase, 20815</b> I am writing to register my opposition to the Attainable Housing Strategy (AHS). Lower Montgomery County is already too crowded. We have awful traffic, little parking, and over-crowded schools. The proposed housing will adversely affect housing prices, which is the primary source of wealth for a vast majority of citizens. I also don't believe that in the long-run these units will go to middle-income citizens as developers and landlords will surely raise prices/rents and aim to squeeze as much value out of the housing as they can.
580	<b>Arthur Cox - Chevy Chase, 20815</b> I oppose the AHS proposal as it will not solve the housing issues addressed and will destroy neighborhoods with traffic, inadequate utilities and loss of values.
581	<b>Chris Moldes - Rockville, 20850</b> I'm a homeowner in Rockville and fully support the recommendation to relax zoning to allow homes other than single-family homes to be built. More housing, by any means!!
582	<b>Hannah EPSTEIN - Bethesda, 20817</b> Hello! I am very much in support of expanding affordable housing opportunities in Montgomery County. I am in support of allowing multi-family homes in areas previously only zoned for single-family homes. Thank you!
583	<b>Eddie Baron - Silver Spring, 20910</b> Attainable Housing Strategies is an effort to change the barriers to multi-family housing. Over the next several months, we're going to have a countywide conversation about how to provide more types of homes, in more locations, for more budgets. It is better to do it here, and now, than on a project-by-project basis in which that larger goal gets lost amongst more parochial concerns. To solve the housing crisis we must put more types of homes, designed to accommodate more diverse needs and budgets reflecting the diversity of this county, on the same footing as a single-family house. Thank you for your time.
584	<b>Jacob Barker - Takoma Park, 20912</b> Please introduce legislation on Attainable Housing Strategies. We need to follow the recommendations ten years ago to combat the affordability crisis we have in this region. In addition, move funding away from roadway expansions and fund increased bus frequencies of at least every 15 minutes on every single line while also expanding bike and pedestrian space.

585	<p><b>Susan Whalen - Brookeville, 20833</b></p> <p>Completely OPPOSED- Increasing the density of the population by building multifamily houses/buildings in areas currently zoned for single families, will overcrowd our already stretched infrastructure and have a significant negative impact on home values. The laws already require MPDUs in developments, so additional lower cost housing should be zoned in commercial areas or further out county and NOT decrease our established home equity savings for retirement!</p>
586	<p><b>C Maguire - Silver Spring, 20901</b></p> <p>Please put your brakes on inform all residents in the affected areas and give MORE time to consider the detrimental loss of tree canopy and greenspace if this proceeds. Our schools, already bursting at the seams. Our roads—no sidewalks and no extra parking available. I only found out our home was in the zone when I attended a virtual meeting and zoomed in on the map! No knocks on our door, one very vague postcard.</p>
587	<p><b>Lynne Baum-Villavicencio - Bethesda, 20816</b></p> <p>The rezoning to eliminate most single family housing in the county is a terrible idea. It will destroy neighborhoods, eliminate yards where children can exercise and play, eliminate gardens and trees, and further stress the environment. Plus you've not done any studies on how it will impact affordability and stress our already crowded schools.</p>
588	<p><b>Susan Sawtelle - Bethesda, 20816-2720</b></p> <p>To Council President Friedson,</p> <p>The AHS "initiative" is a sanctimonious power grab by the Planning Board, whose members were appointed by you and your colleagues. It's illegal, unneeded, and undemocratic. I've lived in Montgomery County for 36 years and have never seen such an outrageous proposal. Your support of it will be the end of your political career. Stop acting to benefit developers and start working for your constituents.</p>
589	<p><b>Matt Morley - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>There are at least four major problems with the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. (1) This plan does not address housing affordability. The Planning Board has acknowledged as much. (2) People need clear notice of the Initiative. They haven't had it. (3) The Initiative would undo most of the master plans around the county – yet it is the master plan process that affords residents an opportunity to weigh in, and for careful review of impacts on neighborhoods and infrastructure. (4) Perhaps most importantly, there has been no meaningful review of how the plan will impact our infrastructure and environment.</p>
590	<p><b>Joy Abel - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>I agree with all of the thoughtful views expressed by Marc Elrich, our elected County Executive. The Initiative is a boon to developers who have no interest in the quality of life in Montgomery County. Our neighborhoods do not have the infrastructure to support this proposal.</p>



	<p>The plan does not take into account the detrimental environmental impacts of the proposal. And, importantly, the Initiative will not help make the housing in the county more affordable. I am opposed to the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative.</p>
591	<p><b>Deryl Davis - Silver spring, 20902</b></p> <p>I agree with County Executive Marc Elrich's concerns about the premature and ill-advised Planning Board's "Attainable Housing Initiative." County residents need much more voice in this process.</p>
592	<p><b>Mary VanDeWeghe - Bethesda, 20817</b></p> <p>I am very much opposed to the Attainable Housing Strategies proposal. I think it would created extreme stress for our infrastructure, would result in higher taxes and would result in lower property values. Please listen to Marc Elrich on this topic!</p>
593	<p><b>RICHARD BOWE - Bethesda, 20817</b></p> <p>I am a Montgomery County resident who opposes the Initiative's proposal to re-zone established neighborhoods. It appears this proposal is a product of academic social engineering that does not take account of the real world and fails to adequately identify and address consequences.</p> <p>You should meet with County Executive Elrich to create a more sensible plan.</p>
594	<p><b>Michael DeLong - Silver Spring, 20910</b></p> <p>I wanted to thank you for your holding various forums on the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. I strongly support building more housing and more affordable housing in Montgomery County, since rents have risen so much.</p> <p>We should build more duplexes, triplexes, townhouses, small apartment buildings, and condos along major transit lines--such as near Metro stations, the Purple Line, and major roads. This new housing will be more affordable than single family homes and give younger people more opportunities for homeownership. It will also reduce suburban sprawl, preserve green space, and help reduce our dependency on cars.</p> <p>Please contact me at [REDACTED] with any questions.</p>
595	<p><b>Julie Greenberg - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>This is one of the most ill-conceived development plans ever devised by local government. The only people it will benefit is developers.</p>

I want the county to 1) find ways to turn empty office space and retail into residential and 3) invest in social housing. If you go ahead with this farce of a plan, everyone on the council up for reelection in two years will face fierce opposition for being complete sell-outs to special interest groups.

MoCo residents will simply not stand for this power grab.

### **Charlotte Dye - Bethesda, 20814**

596

I think it's a good idea to increase density and stop allowing wealthy landowners to dictate housing policy. I certainly think the duplex recommendation is very important. These would make it easier for families to combine financial resources to afford a home they couldn't afford separately. It would even increase the age diversity in certain neighborhoods; in many areas of the county, young professionals are few and far between. They simply cannot afford to live here. Especially with young families. Allowing people to pool resources would make a big difference. People already fortunate enough to own a house would be free to build something for relatives or rent something out.

This is most needed in the areas of the county most likely to be resistant to such a proposal. The county is very segregated. Certain areas of the county would prefer to keep things this way. They fear their schools will be harmed by people with a little less money. They fear that diversity will ruin their communities. And of course it's not just about financial status. It's about race, disability, etc. There is no way bussing to integrate our schools would be politically feasible. I believe that if wealthy landowners were told they they must agree to some option to integrate the county, many would pick something like this. The council will probably do some fine tuning about triplexes and quadplexes. I hope they still allow them in places where they make sense. This is so much better than the giant luxury condo buildings in our downtowns that block light. This is much better than allowing only McMansions, which waste more green space on fewer people and increase carbon footprints. All environmental concerns would be best addressed by changing standards for single family homes, which have been allowed to become enormous and cut down all the trees to house only one or two people.

In fact, I believe that for duplexes, any structure that would be allowed as a single family unit should be expedited. For example, if someone can fit two dwelling units in the same square footage as a house would be allowed to have, this should be encouraged. Expediting duplexes of this nature would finally create an incentive for people to consider decreasing the sizes of their homes and in so doing, decreasing their carbon footprints.

My biggest concern about this proposal is that it's hard to believe the County will really allow it to work as designed. The County already puts barriers in the way of ADUs. If you have a small house, you can barely have an ADU at all, no matter how big the lot. They do this by ignoring all but the first story of the house. Then they provide special forms just for people to file objections. If you need a variance for any reason, the standards are designed to disincentivize anything new, and references to master plans last revised in the 1990s result in incorporating past discrimination into the variance process.

Much of this is done supposedly to protect the interests of landowners. The County knows perfectly well that landowners skew white, wealthy, able bodied, etc. Those who cannot afford to own land are considered intruders who are interfering with currently perfect neighborhoods.

Rules about the number of structures and their uses that are arbitrary (e.g., you can have the same setbacks as a house and the same lot coverage but if part of it is an accessory structure of any kind, that structure must be arbitrarily smaller no matter how legitimate the purpose) do more harm than good.

The Planning Board should consider recommending expediting projects that would be allowed now if only they housed one family instead of two, or if only they were or were not split up in various ways. And the county must weigh the concerns of every citizen equally, rather than prioritizing the wealthy white landowners.

597

**Drew M - Bethesda, 20816**

This may be one of the most short sighted plans to come through this council. You have eroded all faith in most of your constituents. The lack of any resemblance of feedback from the communities impacted is mind boggling.

I suggest you go door to door in your districts to understand the immense lack of support for the plan as outlined.

Good luck with your future political careers because you have lost substantial support from the people that elected you.

No one is arguing that affordability is an issue, but this clearly does not provide a solution - no matter how hard to try and rationalize it. Developers > your neighbors.

598

**Daniel Marcin - Silver Spring, 20902**

Pass attainable housing now. What is the delay?

599

**Brian Malkin - Bethesda, 20817**

Attainable housing should be located in more urban areas where Metro subway stops are readily accessible rather than in residential areas that already are overcrowded with car traffic, given the multi-unit situation. At the same time, they should not be zoned in MoCo school districts that are already overcrowded or at capacity. Further, there should be limits to the number of multi-units in any residential area to prevent overflow situations at local retail establishments such as grocery stores, as well as reducing property values that translate to lower taxable units. Finally, there should be an open public process before anything is enacted in a particular zone, because it will likely be tough to undo what is done once the units are built.

600	<p><b>Jessica Krieg - Bethesda, 20817</b></p> <p>For the reasons listed in County Executive Marc Elrich's Oct 4 newsletter, I do Not support this initiative.</p>
601	<p><b>Julie O'Brien - Gaithersburg, 20878</b></p> <p>Rezoning MoCo single family home properties in a wholesale manner is a terrible idea. Previous studies have shown that we have capacity for housing until 2050. There have been no studies on environmental impact, impact to infrastructure, traffic, schools, etc. there has not been adequate studies to show that rezoning would reduce housing costs to make it more accessible. This act will undermine master plans for communities. This should NOT be passed!</p>
602	<p><b>Evarist Soribe - Silver Spring, 20906</b></p> <p>I am concerned about The Attainable Housing Strategies (AHS) as it does not address affordability. This will end up pricing the very few African Americans that live in Montgomery county out of the market. Most of my relatives, friends, and co-workers live in Prince Georges county and my co-workers make fun of me that " Evarist live in Montgomery county with the white boys, and how are they treating you?" some zoning laws are made to force some people out of the area. The Attainable Housing Strategies (AHS) is a strategy to keep some people out of the area. it will hold back our cities. A Single family home will no longer be a single family home. Please don't do this.</p> <p>Thank you. Sincerely,</p> <p>Evarist Soribe</p>
603	<p><b>Ann Humphrey - Bethesda, 20816</b></p> <p>I support Executive Elrich's position and urge the council not to go forward on changing zoning laws with further study and consideration of the environmental and infrastructure impacts.</p>
604	<p><b>Deborah Beebe - Silver Spring, 20901</b></p> <p>I do not support massive re-zoning which more than likely will happen in my region (eastern) of the county for 'attainable' housing that has no intention of providing 'affordable' housing that the County needs. Furthermore, this 'plan' does nothing to address the infrastructure needed to support such massive development. This looks like a developers dream and a resident's nightmare. Please do not vote for any legislation promoting rezoning for attainable housing.</p>
605	<p><b>Helen Frazer - Silver Spring, 20910</b></p> <p>These planning initiatives lack feasible strategies to cope with increased density, the concentration of housing for only high income individuals, the increase in automobile only transportation in already highly congested areas. Montgomery County has already an excellent</p>

plan for housing. It should be followed with plans to increase reliable, energy-saving public transportation, and preserve the parks and green spaces that would ameliorate environment degradation.

**606 Bryan McCann - Silver Spring, 20910**

Dear Councilmembers,

I am strongly in favor of zoning changes to encourage greater density close to public transportation in MoCo. I live in the single-family home neighborhood of Rosemary Hills, but I have no fear that removing single-family zoning restrictions in this or similar neighborhoods would lead to a sudden rush of multifamily housing development. Research shows that such growth will tend to be incremental. This should be part of the fabric of a changing county. Our neighborhoods should not be set in stone in accordance with the development priorities of 1951.

**607 Jean Swift - Silver Spring, 20906**

I am writing to express concern about the proposed AHS initiative. Among other concerns, insufficient studies have been done to determine its impact on roads, schools, and other infrastructure and services. Also, it does nothing to ensure that additional housing would be affordable to the majority of MoCo residents. Cost of housing is more of an issue than existing stock. Also, we currently have the means to expand stock should the need arise without the AHS. I do not want to see the AHS initiative passed and implemented.

**608 Dominic Puller - Silver Spring, 20910**

I am really happy that the attainable housing strategy supports a granular way of changing zoning to allow density in neighborhoods. I encourage the council to push through legislation adopting these measures and to not get bogged down on the complaints of many of the wealthy homeowners in the county that don't want any type of change. We have seen how many homeowners are fight any change by talking about parking, the environment, or supporting other affordable housing when we all know that measures like zoning reform alleviate those concerns. As I stated when I joined the zoom session, this is also a financially sound choice for the county as increased density in our less dense neighborhoods means more tax dollars for our schools and parks and less money spent on infrastructure in the counties exurbs. Don't let the naysayers weaponize the environment like they did with the purple line. Move forward with this and move forward to quickly. We owe it to our children and other people that should be in MoCo but aren't because it's unaffordable to enact this tool and enable more housing options for our community.

**609 Stephanie Ban - Potomac, 20854**

I am against rezoning single family homes. This does not achieve the goal of affordable and equitable housing and it would devastate our lovely county's natural beauty.

610	<p><b>Sandra Marder - Bethesda, 20816</b></p> <p>I disagree with the Attainable Housing Proposal that will affect 82% of the single family zoning. I strongly agree with the County Executive's analysis and that this proposal is severely flawed and needs actual studies on impacts to schools, parking and the environment. In addition, there are plenty of housing units in the pipeline to meet population growth. I also am curious to know why Potomac was excluded? Much bigger lots of land per home that would make more sense but I still disagree on this initiative even if all of Potomac included. This initiative will likely make housing in Montgomery County less affordable and actually further increase prices for single family homes and other housing. The residents of Montgomery County should be able to live in single family neighborhoods and not have that taken away by literally a few park and planning and council members.</p>
611	<p><b>Tom McCann - Bethesda, 20816</b></p> <p>I share the AHS and GIP concerns raised by County Executive Elrich in his October 4, 2024 Montgomery County Update message. Consistent with his message, I believe that those two proposals exhibit recklessly inadequate consideration of their impacts and ineffectiveness for our communities. The Council should not approve these Planning Board proposals, and I will not vote for any Council member who fails to oppose the proposals at this time.</p>
612	<p><b>Tom Humphrey - Bethesda, 20816</b></p> <p>I oppose the Attainable Housing Strategies initiative for the reasons stated In Marc Elrich's letter. This does not deal with fact that problem is affordable housing, not just supply, and does not deal with impact on transportation and the environment, particularly tree cover, traffic congestion and parking. In short it is the kind of blinders bureaucratic policy making that causes problems instead of solving them.</p>
613	<p><b>Sandra West - Silver Spring, 20901</b></p> <p>As a South Four Corners resident, I have many concerns about the Attainable Housing Strategies initiative. Concern #1: Re-zoning our neighborhood to allow for multiple dwellings on land that is currently zoned for single family homes will significantly increase the density/resident population in the Four Corners area. In an already crowded, high traffic area, this will have a significant impact on commutes, on infrastructure, and on space. Each day, the Colesville Rd./University Blvd. intersection is choked with cars. Re-zoning will most most certainly make things worse. Trust me. People will not take advantage of the rapid bus transit. In this area, they are beholden to their cars. Concern #2: This housing will most certainly NOT be affordable/attainable. Silver Spring is now very much desired because of its proximity to DC and public transport. Housing and rental prices in the area reflect this. Look at townhouse and condo prices in downtown Silver Spring. They are astronomical. Rents for apartments are not attainable for residents with lower incomes. The new apartments and condos/townhouses will be unattainable. The only people who stand to benefit from this project are the developers. That's why they are so eager to get started. Concern #3: Re-zoning will fundamentally change the neighborhood here and the Four Corners area. Trees will come down. There will be an increase in pavement/concrete. Streets will be crowded with people looking for impossible to find parking spaces. It will fundamentally change the feel of this neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods. Concern #4: This will have an environmental impact. In a time of climate change and ever stronger storms, where will the water drain with the inevitable increase in concrete/pavement? What will buffer the storm/winds when the trees come down? How will this limited drainage impact the health of</p>

	<p>nearby Sligo Creek? How will significantly increased neighborhood density impact trash in the area? These plans are short-sighted. Information presented to area residents is deceptive. Do not do this. Please.</p>
614	<p><b>David Margolis - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>Montgomery County needs more attainable housing for individuals and families who are looking for homes in the "missing middle." We need zoning reform now so that we can legalize building duplexes, townhouses, and other apartment types that can fill this need in the market and increase the supply of affordable housing. At the same time, we need to increase housing density in mass transit corridors so that we can build in an environmentally sustainable manner.</p>
615	<p><b>W &amp; J Rager - Olney, 20832</b></p> <p>We oppose the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. It does not provide affordable housing and affects major change. Likely results are overuse/scarcity of public facilities in over 82% of single-family neighborhoods of Montgomery Co. Residents were not given a voice in this decision. Rezoning 82 percent of the County where single-family detached homes are designated would be destructive to the current functioning of these neighborhoods. The existing master plans address the growth needs of this County for the next 30 years and longer. We already have the plans in place and the space needed to accommodate the anticipated growth. Most people had no idea that the bulk of the single-family communities in the County could be rezoned if Planning's recommendations were wholly adopted. Affected residents would have no say in the process because the development would be "by right." We oppose this Initiative.</p>
616	<p><b>Haya Hakim - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>No! I am against this initiative. I wholeheartedly agree with Executive Elrich's points in his County-wide email.</p>
617	<p><b>Fredrika Moser - Garrett Park, 20896</b></p> <p>I agree with County Executive Elrich that the planning board has done a poor job of analysis as they push forward the Attainable Housing Strategies which at first glance seemed designed as a 'give away' to developers. The inattention to the environmental consequences of the AHS is grotesque. There are many ways to increase use of public transportation in the county but the AHS seems to throw thoughtful planning (aren't the authors of this supposed to be planners?) to the wind here in an effort to make blanket changes to housing density without any thought of unintended consrqsursnce or thoughtful analysis of what this would actually mean in meeting MD and US decarbonization goals. Back to the drawing board. As a MoCo resident and tax payer I wholeheartedly DO NOT support the AHS as currently conceived. Why not think about some 21st century solutions rather than developer friendly 20th century planning that got us into the current climate change mess we are in.</p>

618	<p><b>Vicki Seed - Bethesda, 20814</b></p> <p>the builder's of new projects add many people to already congested area in Bethesda. These companies need to start paying impact fees for the services (schools, transportation, etc.) that come with the growth.</p>
619	<p><b>Virginia Nuta - Gaithersburg, 20886</b></p> <p>I have long suspected, as County Executive Marc Elrich has stated, that the comprehensive rezoning proposal is a load of crap. I've lived in this county for over 50 years and I have watched the empty spots in the county fill in with more and more and more townhouses and apartments, and yet, so few of them are affordable. The reason has everything to do with the location of the county, next to a world capital. Close-in housing is going to be expensive, no matter how many beautiful neighborhoods are torn up. This proposal is just another developer proposal. People who have lived here a long time all know that.</p>
620	<p><b>Andrea Murino - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>This is a terrible idea. Please do not advance such a short-sighted, ill-conceived, massively detrimental plan.</p>
621	<p><b>stephenie moczylowski - NORTH BETHESDA, 20852</b></p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity.</p> <p>My name is Stephenie Moczylowski. I did speak, but unfortunately ran out of time. Please take the time to read the rest of my comments and questions.</p> <p>I recently moved from Sacramento, California to North Bethesda and am impressed by the planning board recommendations. I first wish to state that I am in favor of the AHSI. And I look forward watching it evolve. In particular, I am strongly in favor of improved public transportation. We moved to the Symphony Park Community right out side of Rockville turnpike specifically because it is on a transportation corridor and I use the public buses and metro. Because of it, we were able to downsize to one car, and only use it 3-4x/week.</p> <p>I have reviewed and attended most of the sessions that have been discussing the pros and cons of the AHS. With what is available to the public regarding the plans, what seems to be lacking are provisions for individual oversight of locations where a SFH might be turned into for example a four plex. I do realize that will be unlikely in practice – but in theory seems plausible.</p> <p>Issues that are concerned include parking, preserving green space, and infrastructure. These are older communities and have old infrastructure. And with the increasing moisture from climate change just adds pressure to this.</p> <p>From what I have seen from the planning board, it appears that if a lot size of an older home is going to meet the size criteria outlined in the pattern book, and if the developer agrees to follow pattern book guidelines – the developer can run with it. What I would like to see</p>



going forward is some assurance that there will be guardrails in place that force a review of a particular neighborhoods ability to adjust to an increase in the population of the street. I understand that it is important to make it easier for developers to take on these projects. But there must be some kind of oversight as well. I don't want to see an increase in McMansions. But neither do I want to see these smaller neighborhoods overwhelmed by poorly considered infrastructure management resulting in flooding, and excessively crowded streets because there isn't adequate and predictable public transit available.

Finally – for the larger complexes how are you going to ensure that the homes are going to be in fact affordable? If the developer is not required to create lower priced properties such as with the MPDU laws – who is the watchdog to make sure this plan achieves what it is seeking to accomplish?

Thank you for your time, and I am sure there is a way through.

**622 Steve Metalitz - Silver Spring, 20910**

While I support increasing the supply of housing in our county, including in neighborhoods currently zoned for single family residential use only, I am very disappointed to learn that this initiative proposes nothing that will produce or preserve more AFFORDABLE housing. This strikes me as the primary challenge facing our county now in the housing field. The failure to address the issue of AFFORDABLE housing, especially larger units for families, is a major flaw and this initiative should NOT move forward without addressing this need.

**623 Grace Palladino - Bethesda, 20814**

I applaud the County Executive's use of public channels to enlighten taxpayers about the reality of Planning Board "plans." I appreciate candor and his willingness to let residents why he disagrees with the attainable housing plan. I agree that increased density will not benefit low-waged residents as the plan now contends.

**624 Sarah Link - Rockville, 20853**

I disagree with the Attainable Housing Strategy. The city's infrastructure and schools are not keeping up with this massive population growth.

**625 Anne Absalom - GERMANTOWN, 20874**

When I first learned about this, I thought it sounded like a terrible idea. After seeing The County Executive speak about this I decided to make my voice heard. I am 100% opposed to this plan. It sounds like The Council is listening to developers at the expense of Montgomery County Residents. After sending this, I plan to see which Council members are supporting this plan. I do vote and will remember who needs to go. Thank you

626	<p><b>David Stevens - Silver Spring, 20910</b></p> <p>I support County Executive Elrich's critique of the Attainable Housing Strateging Initiative as laid out in his recent message of October 4th. Since GIP will be voted on November 15, this issue must be addressed now if infrastructure costs are allowed to be passed on to residents rather than shared with developers. Most importantly the Initiative does not address affordability. Mr Elrich makes several other important points---listen to him and the residents of MC and respond with evidence based arguments.</p>
627	<p><b>Mike English - Silver Spring, 20910</b></p> <p>I strongly support the attainable housing proposal, and urge the council to introduce legislation to adopt these recommendations as outlined by the planning board and planning staff. If anything, I wish they were more ambitious, but progress is progress. That said, I urge the council to keep in mind that a "compromise" position, in which the AHI recommendations are watered down in order to placate people upset by the changes, will not placate them, it never does. Just this past week the Montgomery County Civic Federation, in its monthly newsletter, floated the idea of a "pilot project" for AHI, just like they did when they opposed Thrive. They, the Coordinating Committee on Friendship Heights, and others, keep calling AHI rushed, but both MCCF and CFFH decried an earlier version of the AHI in 2021. Waiting 3 years hasn't gotten them to stop calling it rushed, nothing will. When I and others supported a modest upzoning to allow duplexes and triplexes in Woodside and other DTSS adjacent neighborhoods as part of the Silver Spring Downtown and Adjacent Communities plan, Woodside residents put up signs saying "don't annex our neighborhood". As I've spoken and written about before, this is fundamental fear of change at play here. Do not try to appease it, it will not work. It does not make the opponents to this plan bad people, but it does mean that no amount of deference to the status quo will please them save for a promise not to change it at all, and that is not an option that should be on the table with a housing shortage as severe as ours driving up prices as much as it is.</p>
628	<p><b>Patrick Meade - Bethesda, 20814</b></p> <p>I absolutely, whole heartedly support the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. As a young couple, my fiancée and I love Montgomery County and would hope to live here for quite some time. Unfortunately, high housing costs make it likely that we'll eventually move elsewhere when we finally decide to buy and stop renting. Building out the local housing supply by easing zoning and other requirements is necessary to address the current housing shortage, and by adopting the ideas included in the Initiative, Montgomery County will take an important step in trying to make our community more affordable for people of all backgrounds.</p>
629	<p><b>John Gorman - TAKOMA PARK, 20912-4638</b></p> <p>I support the proposal completely. Every day without abundant housing policies we harm our environment, economy, and society with long commutes, limited job opportunities, and divided neighborhoods. Please pass these proposals quickly so that members of our community can continue to find housing options in the county.</p>
630	<p><b>Ann C - Brookeville, 20833</b></p> <p>I am against this and anything else that will add significant housing in Montgomery county. The county is already overpopulated, the roads cannot handle the traffic, the schools cannot handle the number of kids, and crime has increased, all while the police support has not</p>

increased. I paid a significant amount for my home to live in Montgomery county and do not want by value going down based on mass, dense housing at lower price points to be added. We need to keep the little bit of open land left in our communities for exercise trails, tot lots, space between houses, wildlife, etc. There is nothing wrong with people purchasing outside of Montgomery county. We are already saturated enough and I don't want mass housing squeezed into our county at a lower price that will pull down the value of all other houses that were originally purchased based on the current county environment.

### **Lynn Mathias - Chevy Chase, 20815**

631

First, while the energy and creativity of Council members may be applauded for this initiative, that enthusiasm should be tempered with the knowledge that they are not planning to settle a new continent but to redevelop land currently occupied by existing human beings. With the approach of Indigenous People's Day (which seems to have supplanted Columbus Day, my own people's holiday), it seems only appropriate for the Council to provide current Montgomery County residents the same consideration they would have provided indigenous Americans had they been there at the time: respect for their previous ownership. In the case of this initiative, which everyone knows is but a meal ticket for real estate agents, developers and builders, and a small number of middle-class strivers looking for a really nice zip code, the Council is undoubtedly already aware of the hardship that quadrupling existing density will cause current residents; I live in an un-fancy (but still overpriced) neighborhood in Chevy Chase and spend about half an hour a day just managing parking and traffic overflow from Connecticut Avenue maneuvering through streets built in 1920. Our houses are already chock-a-block against each other. The schools are occupied. There are fights in the over-used dog park because even the dogs feel crowded. These issues are not unique to Chevy Chase; a law that permits multi-family housing will destroy middle-class areas in places like Wheaton and Rockville that are currently occupied by people who worked hard to get OUT of multi-unit housing and into a place with a yard for the kids and dog to run in, and multi-unit housing in those areas (can we be honest?) will end up slum housing. (Sorry, I was born and raised in NYC and I don't hold back.) Furthermore, the question of affordability is never properly addressed by the government, which always comes up with half answers to old questions. Housing affordability is a nationwide problem; young people in New York, Tallahassee, and Des Moines complain about it; its causes are numerous and DC is loaded with people happy to lecture you on it, but the solution is not a government building campaign. The market will solve the problem, at least in part, when people like me (Baby Boomers) move out or die (which, thanks to a medical system that delays death without actually prolonging a good life, may be another 20 years). Quadrupling density with hulking multi-unit housing that is only favored by the young and the elderly, not those rearing children, will result in an overstock of unwanted homes in 10 years, at the cost of environmental degradation (good-bye trees, hello flooding), even smaller families, and (mark my words!) a loss of population to Virginia, where there is still single-family housing stock. I understand the wrath with which many contrast rich Bethesda folk with the teachers, nurses, letter carriers, and cops who live on government salaries, much less the landscapers, babysitters, and house cleaners who are, in effect, just personal servants. I would remind everyone that the former group, at least, hopes one day to buy a nice single family home, and the better way to accomplish that would be to increase their salaries, redevelop shopping centers and parking lots rather than occupied housing, and enact laws prohibiting tear-downs (the bane of my current existence) in order to preserve the stock of smaller houses that already exists. As to personal household help performed by immigrants, it seems that Montgomery County has already thrown its hat in the ring on the foreign labor-supply question so I won't stir muddy waters addressing it. I will conclude by saying that, even more than doctors, politicians need to first, do no harm before marching, or perhaps hiding, behind banners of diversity and inclusivity, particularly when the results will be neither.

632	<p><b>David Valenstein - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>The County Planning Commission’s proposal for medium scale and large scale “Attainable Housing” and along identified “Growth Corridors” in Thrive Montgomery 2050 is flawed because the Growth Corridor plan embraced by Thrive is flawed. The county adopted a vision of high-density corridors using Bus Rapid Transit that crisscrosses our vast county over long distances. This vision is flawed. The County has succeeded over the past 50 years to develop dense business, service, and residential clusters at of urban and town centers, especially those with rail transit stations. The growth corridor vision would see dense housing along avenue like streets like in the District of Columbia. In reality, Montgomery County growth corridors are busy highways connecting urban and town centers over long distances with all the noise and traffic they must carry to connect the vital business and communities of Montgomery County. Dense housing along growth corridors would be relatively isolated along busy roads that are not walkable to urban or town centers. Bus corridors on these highways can only promise convenient access to other points on the corridor and not to the County as a whole and certainly not to the region. Auto travel would remain dominant even from the new growth corridor housing. Transfers to the Metrorail network to reach distant locations would incur substantial time penalties and would not differ greatly from existing bus services. Instead, the County should focus and allow more development at existing clusters of density in urban and town centers, where there are rail transit stations, and where there is evidence of market success like in the downtowns of Bethesda and Silver Spring. Further, County plans must anticipate that vehicle travel will remain dominant and accommodated, which Thrive does not do. Thrive Mongomery and the Growth Corridor plans need to be revised and replaced. These plans are certainly not a sound basis for a zoning change for medium and dense development.</p>
633	<p><b>Zachary Cross - Silver Spring, 20910</b></p> <p>I'm strongly in favor of the Attainable Housing Strategies initiative. Please don't listen to the naysayers -- we need to provide more options for more types of housing across the county in order to increase the housing supply and thus decrease costs.</p> <p>The County Executive's suggestion that the initiative is flawed because it doesn't explicitly contain low-income housing is itself fundamentally flawed; the only way to lower housing costs holistically is to dramatically increase the supply.</p>
634	<p><b>Dinah Singer - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>As currently structured, the attainable housing initiative will disrupt entire communities, severely stress the electrical grid, water, fire, police and schools and result in the development of expensive multifamily homes, which will be neither attainable nor affordable. Given the amount of real estate currently zoned for apartments - even in Bethesda - consideration should be given to converting that real estate into higher density affordable housing before destroying existing residential communities. In addition, any new development needs to include an environmental impact analysis that include the impact on all services that the county needs to provide to residents.</p>
635	<p><b>Jennifer Gibson - Chevy Chase, 20815</b></p> <p>The AHS appears to be solving the wrong problem. Indeed housing is needed, but to rezone all of the areas proposed in this plan appears to benefit developers, not the current or potential residents. Simultaneously the plan would reduce green space and increase hard surfaces.</p>

We need only look at Bethesda, which is being overbuilt with no regard for ensuring green public spaces. The result is a heat island, increased run off, and lack of public spaces—forget the corner bench provided by a developer, it will disappear. In contrast think of some American cities where green squares placed at intervals actually increase real estate values while providing needed open and areas for public use.

At the same time, is there a plan to invest in the infrastructure needed to support all of the new residences?

At a time when research confirms the health benefits of greenery (hospitals are being constructed to provide patients with views of trees because their health outcomes improve), the reduction of heat and runoff by reducing hard surfaces, we appear to be heading in the opposite direction. Several story multi-family dwellings inserted in areas zoned for single residences does little other than make the people who already live there move. They sell to the developers and the cycle goes on. Costs don't drop and many people still can't afford the homes. Better to build bigger buildings and keep some green space around them.

I oppose this plan and encourage the MNCPPC to rethink its approach to both housing and retention of public spaces in an increasingly urban environment.

636 **Georgina Guernica - Bethesda, 20816**  
I do not support the Planning Dept's proposal for the reasons recently articulated by County Executive Elrich. The Dept hasn't demonstrated a need for the proposed rezoning at this time and has failed to consider the impacts of its proposal, including on transportation infrastructure and schools. Also, the fact that if the proposal were to be passed, it would be self-executing deprives Montgomery County residents of the opportunity to comment based on changing circumstances in the future.

637 **steve lorber - SILVER SPRING, 20904**  
I am against re-zoning our communities for multi-family homes--keep the zoning the way it has been for the last 20 years. If my representative votes to make this change--I am retired and will make it my mission to see that he is kicked out office--there are other ways to find revenue rather than to destroy the beautiful fabric of our community

638 **Bill Le Roy - Silver Spring, 20910**  
Incentivize: Metro Station parking lot development with County Funding; permit developers to build market rate duplexes, quad-apartments/condos; conduct architectural design competitions - that result in county design commissions; require sector plans to adopt Vienna-style housing with outdoor terraces; Enforce ADA compliance; Require age-restricted housing in mixed-use infill development near Metro and Purple Line; Threaten NIMBYS in Potomac with eminent domain to build denser around retail, service and medical centers and build age-restricted accessible housing.

639 **Jennifer Swandby - ROCKVILLE, 20852**  
I support the Attainable Housing Strategies (AHS), which would rezone 82 percent of the County where single-family detached homes are designated.