

113
9

Saul and Gail Goodman - Chevy Chase, 20815

Dear Montgomery County Council,

We have been residents of Montgomery County for more than 30 years. We reside in Chevy Chase Village.

We are sympathetic to the goal of providing adequate affordable housing for all County residents, but we ask that you kindly hit the pause button on the current Planning Board proposal (the Attainable Housing Strategy Initiative or AHSI) to consider and address the thoughtful procedural and substantive comments on the AHSI that were just submitted by the Chevy Chase Village Board of Managers. The AHSI proposal would have potentially significant impacts on our community, and, accordingly, we ask that you kindly consider and address the comments that our elected Village Board of Managers has sent you before taking any further action on the AHSI.

Thank you!

Best regards,

Saul and Gail Goodman


Chevy Chase MD 20815

114
0

Lucy Schoenthaler - Chevy Chase, 20815

I do not support this initiative.

114
1

Riju Srimal - Chevy Chase, 20815

We are opposed to the current initiative because it will create urban and environmental (e.g. traffic, sewage, water management) challenges. It will be counterproductive by opening up the neighborhoods to big developers who are already ruining the character of these neighborhoods with giant houses, and negatively impacting current middle-income residents.

<p>114 2</p>	<p>Jean Shorett - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>**Do not proceed with this proposal**</p> <p>Good intentions are not enough. There is no legitimate basis for proposing major public actions without a thorough and systematic assessment of environmental, infrastructure + school capacity impacts. This has not been done - or not shared with residents. In addition, a fully-budgeted plan to mitigate those impacts needs to accompany the assessment.</p> <p>Particularly with increasing climate instability + increased intensity of rain events, there is zero excuse for increasing hard surface coverage in older neighborhoods without compensatory plans in place to avoid flooding and property damage. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>
<p>114 3</p>	<p>Benjamin Mann - Bethesda, 20816</p> <p>I am strongly in support of zoning changes that would allow for duplexes/triplexes/quads in more areas. Current zoning is extremely restrictive, and housing prices are out of control. Rents are bleeding people dry, and home ownership is often unattainable even for people with good jobs.</p> <p>Everyone agrees that more housing is necessary, but no one wants it built near them. I hope that the Montgomery County Council will have the political will to do what is right, even if it is unpopular.</p> <p>Mid-rise and high-rise multifamily residential buildings are economically unfeasible in the current environment. Just look at what is happening in Westbard, where Phase 2 of the Regency redevelopment (which is supposed to involve 5-story multifamily on top of retail) is completely stalled, because it cannot be built profitable.</p> <p>The only thing that makes economic sense right now is for-sale product: houses, townhouses, and 2-over-2's.</p> <p>Please allow the construction of more of these properties, which will be cheaper than standalone single family houses. A great many 1950s/1960s teardowns could become duplexes or triplexes, instead of mansions.</p>
<p>114 4</p>	<p>Kirstin Austin - Silver Spring, 20910</p> <p>I am not in favor of this plan as it allows too much unchecked development in established neighborhoods. Tri and quad plexes are too big for single family neighborhoods. And we do not have the infrastructure to support</p>
<p>114 5</p>	<p>Louise Maillett - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I supported the move to have ADU's allowed since that may provide affordable housing in the County, allow multi-generational living, senior health providers AND is a decision made of the property owners not the County or developers. This, along with the many high rises on Wisconsin has certainly increase density. Perhaps the number of affordable units in future high rises should be significantly raised?</p>

I would love to see more affordable housing but am very skeptical of that happening with this initiative. Developers spend a lot of money for lots in this area and because they want to make the most profit put in high end homes or very high end townhouses like the \$3.5M townhomes at 4500 Walsh Street. If you really want to support affordable housing in this area you will need to provide lots of money to compensate developers for their loss of profits or undertake buying, building and managing the housing yourself.

114

6

Anne Stevens - Silver Spring, 20910

I do not believe that increasing attainable housing will increase affordable housing. Developers will build the most expensive housing they can to maximize their profit. I also agree with Mark Elrich's concerns that proper infrastructure will not be built. I live in North Woodside and the narrow streets can not accommodate more cars, and additional parking for more residents. Anyone can see the amount of traffic on 2nd Ave during rush hour. I have often sat through several light changes before moving forward. There are not enough roads in North Woodside to provide for more residences. I do not want more growth in North Woodside.

114

7

Michael Gil - Olney, 20832

I am very much opposed to the Attainable Housing plan. I was present for a meeting and watched the other meetings and it is very clear that an overwhelming amount of residents are very much opposed. I am very disappointed in the council and the planning board's non-transparency, and this misguided plan. It is very clear not enough research has been done on the impacts of this plan on communities, neighborhoods, traffic, utilities, environment, crime, overpopulated schools, etc. I trust the council has common sense to put this plan to the side until it is properly planned out and proof is presented that any plan would actually be beneficial to the county.

114

8

Lara Trager - Rockville, 20854

We are opposed to AHSI and there is widespread opposition in our community, association, and neighborhood. Thank you.

114

9

Dana Scanlon - Kensington, 20895

I would love to be able to say that I whole heartedly support this initiative. As a realtor committed to fair housing and first time home buyers, it could prove to be helpful in supplying new inventory to fulfill the needs of our growing community. However, you failed to put any requirements for at least some affordably priced units -- why? The MPDU program is a nationally recognized model, and you could have easily included a requirement that one out of three new units be reserved for folks at the median income or just below median income level. So you have only my tepid support. DO BETTER!

115 0	<p>Miriam Pemberton - Silver Spring, 20910</p> <p>I support the overall goals of the initiative to increase housing density around transport hubs and make housing more affordable for less affluent folks. I hope the Council will find ways to put restrictions on developers so that those goals are actually achieved.</p>
115 1	<p>Mary Hugo - Potomac, 20854</p> <p>I, Mary McNamara Hugo, highly oppose the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. I am a lifelong Montgomery County resident.</p> <p>Again, I OPPOSE this initiative.</p> <p>Mary</p>
115 2	<p>Merrie Blocker - Silver Spring, 20910</p> <p>A law that is one size all for rezoning is as inherently dangerous as any other one size fits all measure. I thought individual sector plans were how we do rezoning. This is a huge, diverse in land and people, county. The same remedy can't possible be possiitve for all of us. So please vote against the Attainable Housing Initiative.</p> <p>Glven that, I am not against duplexes or triplexes on streets now zoned for single family but I want services such as schools and utilities considered.</p> <p>Also experience has shown that new modern multi units are often more expensive than existing old single homes so I only support these changes if there are subsidies or laws that ensure that a good percentage of those multi family units are really affordable by police, firemen, nurses and teachers.</p> <p>And I do not want any streets now zoned for single family to be rezoned for apartment buildings. That is too big a change.</p> <p>I would think four-unit sturctures should be the limit on sts currently zoned for single family.</p> <p>We have a street at our corner Columbia Blvd in 20910 that is single family and under this plan would be zoned for large apt buildings . NO to that.</p> <p>Also we have another street Brookville Rd that was zoned residential (all Black at the time) and then zoned for light industrial.</p> <p>This Rd is in the middle of a residential area - why not rezone it for residential - it is a wide road that could easily handle apartment buildings.</p>
115 3	<p>Robert Stevens - Silver Spring, 20910</p> <p>This proposal does away with homeowners having any say in their communities development or treatment by the county. It does not take into account traffic, safety or the quality of life of neighborhoods. Please vote no to the Attainable housing Strategies. I am not against growth but it neds to be in a thoughtful and planned way.</p>

115
4

Laura Lederman - Chevy Chase, 20815

No on the attainable housing strategies initiative. This initiative is half baked at best. Where are the studies re: sewer use, water run off, parking, school use, emergency vehicle access? The council is proposing a radical change to land use in the county and has no data about the actual impact on the people who live here. Why was this not an issue during the last election?. Why was this introduced in the summer and only 5 listening sessions held? The council has acted in bad faith through this entire process. How about a pause and let the voter (ie your constituents) have a say. That this is not a ballot initiative is an act of bad faith. The initiative in it's current form should be stopped. Even the County Executive knows this initiative is a fraud on MoCo residents.

115
5

Tim Shaver - Chevy Chase, 20815

Hello.

Please slow down and do more research before trying to slam this change through on unsuspecting residents.

I build homes in Arlington VA and my boss is the exact person you don't want in Chevy Chase Village. He has no regard for what the neighbors think and only cares about building whatever product will make him the most money.

In the Missing Middle lottery, he won a few parcels and was planning to build townhome and condo buildings in residential neighborhoods that would have looked ridiculously out of place and awful. They just were not the right fit for a neighborhood with brick and stone single family homes. Luckily the law was shot down by a judge a few weeks ago and sent back to the drawing board, as you know. I'm sure another version of the law will be proposed, and that's fine, but it needs to exclude neighborhoods where multi-family development makes zero sense.

This is exactly how much sense it makes in Chevy Chase Village. I don't think I need to explain what a multi-unit condo building would do to the Village tucked between beautiful single-family homes. It would increase traffic, affect stormwater runoff, and destroy the character of the neighborhood, to highlight a few issues. Friendship Heights is ripe for multifamily development, but not this neighborhood.

Thanks for your time.

Tim Shaver

115
6

Eleanor Wachtel - Chevy Chase, 20815

I strongly support this initiative and believe that multi-unit housing options should be a use by right in identified areas of Montgomery County. I believe it will support equity, opportunity, community character, vibrancy, and vitality. Please add density to our neighborhoods! They can take it! I grew up here and deeply appreciate both the denser neighborhoods and farmlands/rural areas of Montgomery County. I

also believe this is an important solution to reduce commuting distances and improve quality of life, the environment, and safety for all county residents.

Kathleen Philbin - Chevy Chase, 20815

115
7

I strongly encourage you to oppose the Planning Board's AHSI recommendations. Please stop consideration of any zoning text changes.

Very little, true, research and impact assessments were done specific to Montgomery County to support the Planning Board's recommendations.

A change impacting 80+% of the county should be derived from a clearly defined problem set and policy need. Neither is clearly articulated.

Furthermore, the advocacy language of "affordable" and "attainable" housing is misleading. This is, purely, a market rate development plan that is outside of the county's own master planning process.

I attended three in person AHSI listening sessions and watched the others online. Whether it was Bethesda, Silver Spring, Germantown, Wheaton or White Oak residents are wise to the economic realities of this initiative. The policy will result in an unchecked value grab by economically, powerful buyers, including investor backed LLC's, corporations and developers. Unaffordable expansion will occur in a "by right" unplanned rollout, disrupting neighborhoods and stressing county infrastructure.

Indeed, this initiative is a free-for-all devoid of planning. Developers will target areas of the county where they can make the most money. This kind of unmanaged development will have terrible and irreversible outcomes on our county's infrastructure and services.

Again, I strongly encourage you to oppose this plan.

terrence day - Chevy chase, 20815

115
8

I just spent over an hour writing comments and the form froze and booted me after I put in my name etc, and was at the email stage(which by the way once you have a verifiable name and address should really not be required.

in any case, I have run out of time and cannot write it all again.

In summary, the plan is disingenuous, doesn't solve any attainability problems to the degree that there is a link between price and attainability;

ignores all of the infrastructure issues that are noted; will result in the irreversible changing of neighborhoods that by all measures are super successful; serves only to satisfy the desires of the development community at the expense of current residents who will have to live through some sort of real estate hunger games; and most shamefully achieves absolutely no common good. --except for the common good of folks with an financial interest(either directly or tangentially)in the development community

115
9

Elizabeth Vorrasi - Chevy Chase, 20815

Hello, as a resident of Montgomery County and an advocate for affordable housing, I was deeply saddened to read the housing plan and see the original presentation presented before Council Member Friedson.

It was shocking to see the favorable terms given to the developers, which eliminated all infrastructure responsibility through the elimination of their tax responsibility. How are our Council Members putting corporations over its residents? Are they funding your election campaigns? Many families cannot afford to raise their taxes to create more infrastructure. There is clearly a vendetta against what is perceived as an area entirely of wealthy residents looking to exclude and paint this area as a bunch of Nimbys.

How are market-rate duplexes attainable for teachers, public servants, and area business owners? These people deserve to live in this area and pay what they can afford. A carless society would be fantastic, but ignoring walkability studies and assuming that people will walk one mile to a grocery store and one mile back after a long day of public transportation.

How would a family with children be able to remain carless? School buses are a huge issue with the lack of drivers. Do you want to keep these kids out of school? Are these units only for dinks? Are you asking parents to walk two miles with small children to get food for their family? How will these parents get food for their family if they are sick and one parent has to work? How will they pick their kids up from school if they are sick? Is this discrimination against families?

Are developers paying you and funding your campaigns? How are individuals chosen to be on the planning board? You have awakened your constituents and those who advocate for affordable housing and income equality. You have exposed yourself as council members who ignore their constituents and paint them negatively. What happens on the planning board and within the council will be exposed. Our own County Executive has discovered

Propose a real affordable housing plan with adequate infrastructure. Do the right thing.

116
0

John Higgins - CHEVY CHASE, 20815

To: Montgomery County Council

From: John E. Higgins, Jr.

[REDACTED]
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Date: October 18, 2024

Re: Attainable Housing Initiative Strategic Proposal

I am writing to comment on the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative Proposal (AHSIP). In my view, it is not a good idea for the following reasons:

1. Overall view. I endorse the points made by the Chevy Chase Board of Managers in their letter of October 17, 2024, to the County Council regarding the AHSIP. In addition, I would like to add the following points about traffic and safety.
2. Traffic. This proposed increased in housing in Chevy Chase will increase traffic on Connecticut Avenue –traffic that is already a problem, particularly during rush hour. It is a fallacy to think that the additional people who will be residing in Chevy Chase will use public transportation. Right now, for example, the Chevy Chase area has outstanding bus service between Chevy Chase and Friendship Heights. Unfortunately, Chevy Chase residents do not make sufficient use of it. Indeed, very few Chevy Chase residents take the bus to the Red Line

Friendship Heights station, and there is no reason to believe that the Purple Line will generate an increase in the use of public transportation by present and/or future Chevy Chase residents. I speak from experience because I used the bus system during rush hours for 40 years of commuting between Chevy Chase and downtown Washington, DC, where I worked for the Federal government. What I saw over the years was a tendency to use public transportation less rather than more, notwithstanding the ready availability of bus and Metro service.

Given that people do not take the direct north-south bus route now (L8 and Ride On 1 and 11) in order to access Metro, there is no reason to believe that anyone in Chevy Chase will go east or west on the Purple Line in order to go downtown. I speak here as a resident who has made so much use of the bus and Metro for 40 years, that I consider myself an expert on the subject of the use of public transportation in Chevy Chase.

3. Safety. The AHSIP will very clearly increase rush hour traffic on Connecticut Avenue in Maryland. Right now, if there is a call for fire or rescue service north of the Chevy Chase Fire Station during the evening rush hour, the traffic jam from East-West Highway to Kensington often does not permit the fire and rescue equipment to go north on Connecticut Avenue WITHOUT GOING INTO THE SOUTHBOUND LINE AND DRIVE NORTH AGAINST THE SOUTHBOUND TRAFFIC. This happens frequently now, and AHSIP, with its potential for more traffic and more people, will make it happen much more frequently. It is a serious accident waiting to happen, and AHSIP will only reduce the timeliness of the fire and rescue service in responding to calls for service north of the Chevy Chase Fire and Rescue Station during evening rush hours. The AHSIP will clearly make this dangerous situation worse and will result in a serious safety problem both because of the delay in getting equipment to the north of Chevy Chase and is a danger to drivers and fire fighters on a collision course in the southbound lanes.

Richard Chipkin - Bethesda, 20184

116

1

The idea of changing the zoning to allow for multiple dwellings is ill conceived. It would negatively affect the neighborhood social environments and decrease property values. More importantly, it wouldn't solve the problem of affordable housing since it's likely that these multiple dwellings will be extremely expensive because of their location.

I respectfully urge the council to find other solutions to this problem.

jeffrey frey - chevy chase, 20815

116

2

No factual data has been presented which demonstrates a need for the recommendations of the Planning Board, which are excessively specific, yet intended to affect the entire county uniformly. The need for "attainable housing" in specific areas and at specific prices has not been shown, and the report therefore has no more weight, county-wide, than any other political document. Rather than speaking in generalities about "need" the Board has not shown that its specific remedies are not only needed, but appropriate for all parts of the county, considered in light of the needs and status of each part.

116 3	<p>Katharine Radi - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I am not in favor of this initiative because it will lower property values in some areas that have very expensive homes and thereby lower property taxes given to the county to fulfill important work with those funds.</p> <p>If there are multi dwelling properties built they should only be in areas where the property they are replacing is similar to what the new property will ultimately sell for.</p>
116 4	<p>Lisa Dunner - Bethesda, 20816</p> <p>There are too many unanswered questions coming from citizens, who deserve a more thorough public discussion on the issues being raised. Upzoning should be implemented through site-specific master plans, not through a County-wide zoning text amendment. The County should enact legislation to protect mature trees and limit stormwater runoff in connection with all redevelopment. Market rate housing (which is what this is), is not affordable or attainable housing. AHSI is highly unlikely to produce its intended outcomes, while reducing the quality of life for all County residents.</p>
116 5	<p>Barron Williams - Chevy Chase, 20815-5326</p> <p>This is the wrong first step. If you want to diversify and expand existing single-family neighborhoods, the correct first step is to amend Building Permit rules to allow the placement of pre-fabricated ADU's in backyards. They get inspected off-site at the factory. Many other jurisdictions do this. Its so much more cost effective than stick-building.</p>
116 6	<p>Tim Vogel - Bethesda, 20817</p> <p>Follow the Dots to Hyper-Densification</p> <p>In the 2024 Attainable Housing Report, the Planning Board predicts that “duplexes, the development typology most easily fit onto an existing single-family parcel, is most likely to occur in the same neighborhoods where the majority of replacement homes were built since 2010.” (pp. 66-67). Those areas are depicted on the map contained in the 2024 AHS Report (figure 14 at p. 67):</p> <p>This is the recipe for hyper-densification of these communities.</p> <p>Despite this obvious observation, throughout the report, the Planning Board repeatedly asserts that the impact on community infrastructure is likely to be low. (See, p. 60 (impact on schools will be “de minimis”); p.61 (no analysis of impact on parking); p.73 (unlikely to generate 50 or more net new peak hour person trips); p.73 (“a limited and moderate impact on” existing infrastructure)).</p> <p>On page 78 of the report, the explanation for this inexplicable disregard for community impact finally appears. Montgomery Planning “forecasts that the market for house-scale attainable housing will be a small portion of the existing market for replacement homes.” (p. 77). The Board provides an example and explains that, in the community studied, if 30% “of replacement homes built over 10 years had instead</p>

become multi-unit attainable housing properties, it would have resulted in...less than one multi-unit attainable property per block over a 10-year period." (p. 77).

If that is Montgomery Planning's assumption, it should become the rule: any implementation of the Small Scale Attainable Housing recommendations must limit multi-unit attainable housing properties to no more than 1 per block unless a local impact study is performed that demonstrates the feasibility of more.

116
7

Sarah Bower - Bethesda, 20816-3328

We urge you to listen to our neighbors. Please do not change zoning in Springfield Bethesda that would automatically upzone our single family home neighborhood for duplexes and triplexes. We urge you to listen to our neighbors. Thank you, Sarah

116
8

Matthew Handorf - Chevy Chase, 20815-6616

The Attainable Housing plan is terrible. My family owns a single house in Chevy Chase. The Attainable Housing idea has a myriad of issues. 1) The general threat of having a small or medium scale house next to a single house reduces property values (i.e. who wants this next to them?). In turn this will reduce property taxes. Which in turn will make people want to live in MoCo less (take a look at NYC or CA for examples). 2) The fact that I need to write 'general threat' suggests that as a homeowner with young children, this would have a negative impact on my quality of life (more cars around / reduced safety). 3) Isn't an easier/more practical solution more vertical housing in a downtown area (Bethesda / Silver Spring / DC / etc)? Much higher concentration = more help than single homes. Please use common sense here.

116
9

Tim Vogel - Bethesda, 20817

Many Communities Are Denied the Benefits of Attainable Housing Under the Board's Plan

In the 2024 Attainable Housing Report, the Planning Board lays out exactly where it believes attainable housing will be developed. The Board writes that neighborhoods in green are where efforts to acquire the lower-cost properties to build attainable housing would be likely to occur. Areas in red are ones in which, under the Board's plan, a builder is unlikely to find a sufficiently low-cost property for a duplex project. Within the areas in gray, the anticipated revenue from the new units does not cover the cost of constructing the duplex, indicating that new duplex development is not feasible in these areas at this time. (see figure 14 on p. 67 of the 2024 AHS study).

It's not unreasonable to think that multi-family structures may be a desirable source of starter homes for the adult children of the residents of these neighborhoods, and more-convenient and cost-effective alternatives to high-priced senior living centers for the residents themselves and their aging loved-ones. Why are the closer-in neighborhoods in green the only ones benefiting from the construction of these small-scale attainable housing options under the Planning Board's proposal?

Every community in the county should have access to attainable housing. But the current proposal almost completely omits most communities by not actually requiring that attainable housing be built anywhere or equitably. This must be fixed. Any implementation of the Small Scale Attainable Housing recommendations must require developers that construct multi-unit attainable housing properties in the green communities to also engage in such construction—to some degree, at least—in the yellow, red, and gray communities depicted in Figure 14 on page 67 of the 2024 AHS report.

117
0

Christopher Betti - Silver Spring, 20910

Overall I think the initiative is an appropriate step for our county, but living on a quiet street 200 feet from Georgia Ave (within AHOM), I think there aren't appropriate controls to divide me from my immediate neighborhood with a 4 to 19 unit apartment building.

117
1

Brian Mandel - Silver Spring, 20910

I'm supportive of Attainable Housing only under 2 important conditions. 1) The higher density of people also brings the right level of increased crime oversight/policing. We need to maintain the safe neighborhood standards, not with good intentions, but concrete plans to have police presence as needed and crime avoidance strategies. And 2) the increased density also comes with some commercial benefits, such as new buildings with ground floor retail and/or cafe options. The increased density should be attractive to and businesses should be encouraged to set up shop to create a walk-able, viable commercial environment.

117
2

Genevieve Hernandez - Chevy Chase, 20815

As a Montgomery County resident, I oppose the AHSI for several reasons. At a high level, the proposed zoning changes would have irreversible and enormous impacts for residents, which would be felt very differently by residents in different parts of the county. The intended benefits of the plan, which are speculative at best, would come at the expense of guaranteed negative impacts that would fall disproportionately on a subset of county residents. Those negatives have not been adequately identified, discussed, or quantified, much less mitigated in the current plan. This is precisely the kind of equitable issue that the County Council is charged with avoiding. In short, the sweeping changes the plan proposes have not been sufficiently shown to have benefits that would outweigh the certainty of negative consequences for current residents. Even if the plan worked precisely as intended, the benefits are purely aspirational, but the negatives are guaranteed and could not be undone. Such a plan is per se inadequate and should be rejected.

First, the rezoning recommendations reflect woefully insufficient analysis of the likely impacts on county residents, including on quality of life, parking, schools, and traffic, among others. The AHSI fails even to quantify these risks to residents, much less propose solutions. No plan should be approved if it fails to address these issues to the satisfaction of the residents who would have to endure both the foreseen and unforeseen consequences of the changes.

Second, the AHSI fails to provide any evidence that the zoning recommendations would in any way lead to more attainable housing. On the contrary, the zoning changes would be a boondoggle for developers and real estate prospectors, allowing them to take unattainable, single-family homes and turn them into a greater number of similarly unattainable properties and make an enormous profit in the process. The

AHSI contains no safeguards whatsoever to prevent this kind of profiteering. Instead, it removes local restrictions that currently serve to protect neighborhoods from development by moneyed interests and developers who have no intention to live in the areas they are profiting from.

Third, the AHSI divests towns in the county of any meaningful control of how their neighborhoods function. The noble goal of creating more attainable housing should not be achieved by destroying all local control and allowing profit-minded, non-resident developers to benefit from more lax restrictions than the town residents have long followed for their own homes.

Fourth, the AHSI fails to address the impact of the zoning changes in a variety of environmental areas, including tree canopy, stormwater management and runoff, and car use. The failure to address these issues of course means that no solutions have been proposed.

Fifth, the AHSI is more aggressive than even the earlier discussions and recommendations of County Councilmembers. For example, without explanation or justification, the proposal extends walkshed further than had been discussed in the leadup to the AHSI. This would have enormous impacts on residents and is merely another example of how the plan reflects inadequate analysis of how goals must be balanced against impacts and negative externalities.

Finally, I oppose the AHSI because the large amount of public opposition to (and confusion about) the zoning changes reflect an acute need to pause this process and address residents' questions and concerns. No plan should be passed when residents have expressed such substantial concerns. The goal of a representative democracy is to advance policies that the majority believes will improve their lives. Although no plan will ever have universal support, it is clear that this plan has such substantial opposition that the Council must conduct further analysis to remedy the now-identified shortcomings and resident concerns.

Tim Vogel - Bethesda, 20817

117

3

Montgomery Planning's Property Tax Subterfuge

In the 2024 Attainable Housing Report, the Planning Board's treatment of expected property tax increases is quite a piece of work. The Board quotes a letter from the State indicating that the zoning changes "may or may not" result in changes to assessed values. (p. 72). The Board also states that the "tax rates" are based on actual use, not potential use, in a seeming attempt to obfuscate the basis on which properties are assessed in this State. This is quite a sleight-of-hand.

Of course property taxes will rise. Here's why. Multi-family structures will only be built if they generate greater profits for developers than single-family structures. These greater profits will lead developers to pay more to buy single-family homes to redevelop. This puts upward pressure on the sale price of single-family homes. Sale price is a primary factor in assessments.

Assessments Will Rise as a Result: The State of 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. The letter from the State says exactly this: "... if properties are acquired at...higher purchase prices over time and the comparable sales warrant...[an] increase in the assessed value of those similar properties upon the next reassessment cycle, it may indirectly impact the assessments for similar properties in that market area." (p. 72).

The Tax Rate Doesn't Mitigate Rising Assessments: The tax rate to be applied may be based on the actual use of the property, but property taxes will go up when that rate is applied to a higher assessment.

The Report's failure to be forthright on this important topic is disappointing and duplicitous.

117
4 **William Single - Chevy Chase, 20815**
Please stop this effort. It will do nothing to promote affordable housing or the "missing middle" but will do irreparable harm to existing single family neighborhoods that current don't have the necessary infrastructure (roads, sewer capacity, parking or school capacity among other things) to support increased density.

117
5 **William Shaw - Silver Spring, 20910**
Opponents of the Attainable Housing Strategies do not sufficiently account for the role of single family zoning in perpetuating economic inequality. Nor do they appear to understand the importance of increasing density to reduce reliance on cars as a means of limiting climate change. I am an admirer of Mr. Elrich and voted for him in both his campaigns for County Executive. But his objections to the Initiative focus on the need for more studies and the process, rather than cooperating with the proponents to achieve the essential goal of increasing density. Certainly the zoning changes should be designed to limit damage to the tree canopy, be accompanied by infrastructure improvements, and focus on areas near public transportation. But I am dismayed that the County Executive is acting as a barrier to change that could in a small way contribute to critical national and global goals rather than cooperating to craft an improved approach to increasing density.

117
6 **Margaret Eastman - Chevy Chase, 20815**
Please leave our established neighborhoods alone. They are dense enough as it is. Trying to make them even denser will not only reduce the quality of life but it will also put a strain on infrastructure, such as water and sewers, parking, pedestrian sidewalks, mail delivery and schools. I believe in affordable housing, but it should not be plunked into the middle of neighborhoods that are already fully built out.

117
7 **Andy Davis - Olney, 20832**
I will start by saying I have a young child who I worry will not be able to afford to live in this area when she is grown up. Apartments have skyrocketed in price, seemingly unchecked, and housing is beyond the reach of many people now, I can only imagine what it will be like in 15-20 years. Having said that, I do not believe that the strategy outlined will garner the full outcome the planning department is seeking to

fulfill; lowering housing costs and adding significantly to the missing middle. It also has the potential to adversely affect current neighborhood dynamics. It seems to me that to meet the projected demand for additional residence over the coming years, we need to have a LOT more affordable large scale apartment buildings both inside and outside the Bethesda/Rockville/Gaithersburg area. North and east of these areas are severely lacking when it comes to larger scale apartment buildings. In addition, I believe that all current housing should be disqualified from being allowed to be converted to duplex/triplex, or higher. I believe that not excluding existing housing has the potential to backfire on the affordability front as it is possible that a builder might come in and buy up a property, convert it to a higher density residential plot, and simply charge up for the divided unit since it will take a lot of money to convert in the first place. Imagine a \$1mil property being bought by a developer, being converted to a duplex and upgraded, and the developer puts the two units up for \$1mil each. How would that solve the affordability problem? In addition, people, myself included, purchase homes based on a number of factors which certainly include what the houses around them look like. I personally would not have purchased my current residence if there had been a duplex/triplex, or higher next to it. It is both unfair and shortsighted to current residence to have the rules changed due to a lack of foresight by county planners. I strongly implore the leaders of this county to listen to the needs of current citizens on this and other issues as it seems a vocal minority are leading the charge to the detriment of everyone else with shortsighted and haphazard "solutions" to the county's problems.

Klaus Lorch - Martins Additions, 20815

117
8

The Attainable Housing initiative is horrendously misconceived and disingenuous. (i) The existing infrastructure (roads, parking, stormwater drainage, schools, etc.) would be completely overwhelmed, no sufficient additions are budgeted by the County, and no sufficient charges would be levelled on developers/builders to pay for infrastructure. (ii) Existing local community regulations that have evolved in response to genuine specific local needs and circumstances would be overruled. (iii) Thus, democracy at the true grassroots level would be a victim. (iv) Nothing in the initiative ensures that the majority of the added housing would be financially "attainable"; this makes a farce of the initiative and fools of those who believe in the disingenuous sales pitch. (v) The massive environmental impacts have been entirely ignored. (vi) Developers and builders neither need nor warrant such a giant boost to their profits. (vii) The nauseating odor of state capture or outright corruption would forever taint those in the county government who approve an initiative whose primary beneficiaries would be generous developers/builders. It is shameful.

Jeff Brindle - Potomac, 20854

117
9

I am in opposition to the attainable housing initiative. i will lose my democratic voice in the determination of changes affecting my property and wider community.
Thank you. Jeff Brindle

Christiaan Poortman - CHEVY CHASE, 20815

118
0

I am all in favor of finding/constructing affordable housing for low and medium income families. But I don't believe that constructing such housing in an established neighborhood should be considered. As a resident of Chevy Chase Village, I fear that the construction of such housing would negatively affect the character of the neighborhood -- a neighborhood of single family units, well-established greenery, quiet

streets, strong community spirit and long-standing traditions. It should be possible to find more appropriate locations for new housing construction -- without interfering with established neighborhoods.

118

Brooke Thomas - Chevy Chase, 20815

1

We ask the County Council to "press pause" on any legislative vehicle to change residential zoning so you can thoughtfully consider the multiple issues with the Attainable Housing Strategy Initiative (AHSI).

The County Council tasked the Planning Board with recommending "zoning reforms that would allow greater opportunities for missing middle housing in Montgomery County." The resulting AHSI recommends building different types of market-rate housing, such as duplexes, triplexes, quads, and medium-sized multi-unit buildings. Unfortunately, increasing the types of housing available does not automatically make housing cost less in many of our neighborhoods. Recent, real-life examples in the County prove that simply building smaller units or -plexes or townhomes or apartments does not solve the problem of "missing middle" housing – if anything, it raises the supply of more expensive housing and too often pushes out lower-income residents. Please consider just a few examples from our own area:

-- The West Avenue townhomes in Bethesda, where a single \$1.65 million house was torn down to build three townhomes currently on sale for over \$3 million EACH.

-- The County just allowed the tear-down of 133 modest garden apartments and townhouses in Chevy Chase and is replacing them with "luxury townhomes" that will surely cost more on the whole than the previous housing stock. Roughly seven years ago, the Planning Board green-lit a similar teardown of the Housing Opportunities Commission multiple garden apartments on Chevy Chase Lake Drive to make way for EYA's Brownstones at Chevy Chase Lake, a 62 building "luxury townhome development," with five bedroom, two-car garage, elevator units selling for \$1.5-2 million. Studio apartments in the recent Chevy Chase Lake development currently rent for \$2200 and up. The only walkable grocery store is an Amazon Fresh.

-- A \$650,000 home in Kensington is being replaced with six \$1 million townhomes.

Even the Planning Board's March 2021 "Missing Middle Housing Study" showed that market-rate housing in most neighborhoods slated for upzoning will be out of reach of the "missing middle." (page 12). We believe that residents are more concerned with overall housing costs rather than whether there are multi-plexes or condos or apartments instead of a stand-alone home. Yet, in the goal of changing the type of market-rate housing supply, the current AHSI proposal is silent on the displacement and gentrification when "naturally occurring affordable" units are torn down to build these new "market-rate" units.

This overall attainable housing effort would benefit from a very clear definition of what constitutes "missing middle" housing in Montgomery County: is primarily it the typology of the dwelling or the cost of the dwelling? Once we can establish that goal, could we as a county consider a range of ways to best address missing middle housing? These could include everything from commercial conversion, to a policy to ensure "no harm" for existing more-affordable housing stock, to owner incentives to rehab homes, or the existing Master and

Sector Planning Process, where significant upzoning is already happening, as recommended by the Planning Board. Before making sweeping additional zoning changes, the County Council should pause to holistically assess the Master and Sector Planning Process and their impacts on our housing supply.

Additionally, in their explanations regarding their AHSI proposal, the Planning Board has acknowledged they did not consider issues outside of their purview that may be exacerbated by their AHSI plan. We understand that these issues are not their responsibility, but we hope the Council will take a comprehensive look at the significant public health, environmental, and safety issues for all county residents raised by such a massive change. The issues include:

-- Ensuring hospitals, EMS, police, and fire have the capacity to care for residents. Right now, Suburban hospital, despite doubling its ED capacity, is routinely closed to ambulances and forced to board patients in the ED, even on stretchers in the hallways because no rooms are available.

-- School capacity estimates are often unreliable. B-CC high school classrooms lack desks for all the students in a class; overcrowded bus routes mean students are sometimes sitting on the floor of buses. New and rezoned schools like Silver Creek Middle and Bethesda Elementary are already above capacity.

-- Existing county stormwater drains that are already overwhelmed and cause home flooding, leading to a host of serious problems including mold, structural issues, erosion, and unsafe pedestrian sidewalk conditions.

-- Traffic congestion and declining pedestrian safety, particularly in growth corridors that also funnel heavy Beltway and other commuter traffic into DC.

-- Amending the tree canopy law so existing trees are maintained to prevent neighborhood heat islands and absorb emissions.

-- Conduct a full fiscal impact study to understand what unexpected costs, including infrastructure modification costs, the County may face from this proposal. Also consider concerns specific to prioritizing condo development, where there are significant issues county and state-wide with condo fees, adequate maintenance, and governance.

The Planning Board suggests these issues can be dealt with permit-by-permit, after the AHSI Plan is adopted because the building rate will be "low." We believe the Planning Board has fundamentally underestimated the interest homebuilders and developers have in building new market-rate units. Residents in our area have already received scores of targeted emails, texts, and flyers asking whether they would sell their houses to developers and home builders. And, at least one of these developers (whose projects include the \$3 million plus townhomes on West Avenue) states on its website that its primary goal is: to identify and extract maximum value from properties that were underutilized, overlooked, and ripe for redevelopment. In other words, they saw valuable development potential where others were unable

to see it, and this enabled them to uncover profitable development opportunities. This philosophy seems quite different from “missing middle,” let alone affordable housing solutions.

We encourage the Council to thoroughly consider and address these impact issues before changing any zoning, particularly if the changes will be "by right" with no appeal process. The fallout of dealing with these issues only after zoning is changed is worsened by the fact that the County does not accurately collect data used in the Growth and Infrastructure Policy and Adequate Public Facilities Ordinances. These are critical issues of safety, environment, and education that will have life-changing effects on the people of Montgomery County, often disproportionately harming those of lower economic means. These ideas may be beyond the Planning Board's jurisdiction but are squarely within your duty to consider as a County Council.

We hope we have convinced you to proceed more prudently with rezoning only after adequate consideration of other tools to address housing costs as well as any plan's effects on existing infrastructure and key community needs. However, we want to take this opportunity to note major flaws in the underlying assumptions of the proposed Plan should the Council choose to proceed to consider a ZTA to implement AHSI.

- The mile-long walkshed along growth corridors is unrealistic in many neighborhoods with few sidewalks, narrow streets, congested intersections, poor signalization, and insufficient public transportation. The accepted standard is .5 miles or less of actual walking distance (not as a crow flies).
- The housing Pattern Book should be completed prior to any ZTA, with true community input.
- Limits should be invoked on speculative buyers and absentee property owners.
- On-street parking is not adequate in areas with many curb-cuts or parking on only one side.
- All related legislation, such as changes in fees and subdivisions, should be considered together so the public can actually understand the true scope of the County's proposal.

In many conversations with neighbors, we heard a hope that the County Council will take the appropriate time to consider the broad range of housing cost solutions along with the quality of life of County residents. Please “press pause” so that we can all contribute to solving our shared housing issues in a way that will produce a lasting solution that benefits the diverse needs of our county.

Respectfully,
Brooke Thomas and Lyric Winik
Section Five, Chevy Chase, MD

Paul Regan - Chevy Chase, 20815

118

2

I oppose the AHSI because it's not designed to help working people to get housing in this area. Instead it's designed to enrich developers.

<p>118 3</p>	<p>Robin Cleary - Bethesda, 20816</p> <p>We are strongly opposed to this proposal. Our neighborhood is already facing increased congestion as a result of the new Westbard development. If single family homes were replaced with du/tri/quadplexes then there would be an unreasonable number of cars on the road. These projects rarely lead to affordable housing without some sort of economic cap, and they will not increase inventory by a significant margin.</p>
<p>118 4</p>	<p>Mary-Margaret Lewis - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I attended the information session on the Attainable Housing Strategies recently held at BCC High school. I am adamantly opposed to these plans. The plans outlined represent an enormous change to our neighborhoods and will affect the infrastructure such as schools and streets. Increasing housing in my neighborhood, the town of Chevy Chase, will only lead to more crowding but not improved prices, an example are the new townhouses on West Lane in Chevy Chase, each on the market for \$3.5M. This strategic proposal should be brought forward to the people in the county as a referendum on which to be voted. These decisions with vast implications should NOT be left to a minute number of people on the Planning Board and Council, who are not necessarily representing the interests of the citizens of Montgomery County.</p>
<p>118 5</p>	<p>Barbara Vivona - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I write as a very concerned citizen about this proposal. I concur with those who have concerns about the impact on current infrastructure, including roads, sewers and schools. I live in Rollingwood, which is defined by its name. It is not only hilly but has many trees. With builders cutting down trees and removing green space to build McMansions, it has already created issues with flooding for the neighbors. From my own experience in the past year, I have had to pay thousands of dollars to divert water drainage away from my house. I know many others who have had to do the same. While AHS proposed homes may hold more people, the effect will still be to take away the green space and we need to prevent these issues from happening. The people that will benefit the most from this proposal are the builders who will charge outrageous amounts for the properties and pay nothing to contribute to the negative effects they are leaving behind, as is already evident. As well, it will penalize homeowners who have made needed improvements to their property. The proposal will do nothing to make homes more affordable for anyone as has been witnessed already on Walsh Street. It is wise to take a pause. Much more data and information is needed before proceeding. Maybe starting with a more limited area that is truly metro acceptable, within the 3/4 mile specified in the Housing Affordability and Expansion Act of 2024, might be advisable.</p>
<p>118 6</p>	<p>Ronda Barrett - Kensington, 20895</p> <p>This Attainable Housing approach is very concerning. After learning that there is a large portion of the needing zoning in place through 2050 that could be expedited, it is unnerving to hear this plan for floating rezoning that can be approved by one person. Especially when that role is currently held by an individual whose own district pushed to not have this concept be applied to their area of the county. It is additionally concerning that the branding of this seems intentionally confusing as to be mistaken for affordable housing, which is what there is a larger demand for at this time, not market-rate housing. It also allows developers to avoid triggering the requirement to include affordable</p>

housing with the number of units created. Not to mention the failure to study and address infrastructure-related concerns. If one of these things were part of the presentation, we might believe that a particular detail may have been overlooked. The fact that there are so many questionable facets to this plan speaks either to incompetence or something far more cynical. We have to do better in terms of transparency, smart growth approaches, and equitable outcomes. If the planning board lacks the will to do so, it speaks loudly to county residents about their motives and disregard for the quality of life in the county. Growth needs to happen. Change will be uncomfortable. We need an approach that shows some earnestness about serving all, not benefiting the few.

Robert Bein - Chevy Chase, 20815

118
7

Attainable? Affordable? You're using the wrong approach

Planning Board chair Artie Harris acknowledges that what's being proposed is NOT meant to increase affordable housing because the County already has a lot of those units planned. When he says "attainable" he is really talking about affordable for middle income residents.

The Planning Board defines middle income for a family of four as earning \$120,000 to \$150,000 a year. Financial advisors recommend that such income can afford a house that costs between \$450,000 and \$750,000. Do you really think a developer can buy a single-family house in most Montgomery County neighborhoods, tear it down and build 2 townhouses that sell for even \$750,000 each and still make a profit? Talk to a homebuilder, do the math, and you'll see the equation doesn't work.

No, the answer is apartment living for those senior citizens who are downsizing, the families with no children or just a few kids. And the source for those apartments should be those office parks that are emptying, or the individual office buildings that are now not even close to being fully occupied.

And let's not forget the impact of higher population density on traffic (we are NOT going to go everywhere on our bikes), school overcrowding (bad enough as it is), diminished parking availability, and increased governmental expenses which make the County's budget even tighter.

The Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative should NOT go forward.

David Kramer - Chevy Chase, 20815

118
8

I have been a Montgomery County resident since 1981 - my entire life. My wife and I have been homeowners since 2016, and my sister and my parents are also Montgomery County residents and homeowners.

We consider the AHSI to be extremely ill-advised and misdirected, for the following reasons, among others:

Over time, it would destroy one of the county's most valuable assets – its beautiful single-family residential neighborhoods.

It would impose sweeping changes in zoning law without considering the circumstances of individual covered areas within the county.

It would not provide affordable housing, but instead would likely have the reverse effect.

It fails to take into account serious likely adverse consequences, including increased traffic congestion, and infrastructure and environmental impacts.

It would implement a model designed for urban areas where undeveloped land is scarce or nonexistent, while Montgomery County has large expanses of undeveloped land, including land designated to be used for new housing construction.

For these and other reasons, we strongly oppose approving the AHSI.

John Scruggs - Bethesda, 20816

118

9

I am writing to state my firm opposition to the Montgomery County Planning Board's Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative and its proposed upzoning of my single family property, our Springfield/Wood Acres neighborhood, and single family neighborhoods across the county.

For consideration:

The plan to upzone single family neighborhoods, if activated, is a one-way door that will irreparably change and alter the fabric of our community.

This plan will drastically change neighborhoods while doing little if anything to help achieve the stated goal of achieving affordable housing in Montgomery County. Million-dollar duplexes and quad-plex units may enrich speculators and developers, but the density that follows this proposed upzoning will not increase the supply of affordable housing.

Multiple stakeholders involved in this process and review have stated and reported that the AHS initiative is based on flawed data and assumptions about population growth. A change of this magnitude (even at the consideration stage) deserves the utmost in due diligence and data analysis. I have no confidence that either of those conditions have been met thus far in the Planning Board's process.

I suggest the Board table this proposal based on the widespread opposition and concerns, revisit the underlying data, and develop an alternative less radical approach that is more aligned to achieving the stated goal and honors the character of the neighborhoods that make Montgomery County a desirable place to live. You cannot use broad zoning changes and the irreversible changes they would invite as a sandbox for experimentation on policy ideas you think might work.

Regards,

John P. Scruggs

[REDACTED]
Bethesda, MD 20816

119
0 **steven tarkington - Silver Spring, 20910**

To the County Council,

Like most of my Northwoodside neighbors, I am opposed to the AHSI. I bought in an R-60 zoned neighborhood for the single family living style. R-60 zoning is supposed to protect against higher density and other uses. Zoning is like a contract; a contract that some now want to abrogate. Doing so would rapidly change desirable neighborhoods into more urban high density housing and apartments, and would do it without addressing the need for the additional infrastructure.

Please vote against AHSI and changing R-60 zoning. Making Accesory Apartment exceptions easier to attain may be an acceptable alternative on a limited basis.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Steven Tarkington

119
1 **Grace Huntington - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I strongly oppose the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative.

Please read the Petition to Protect Single-Family Zoning in Montgomery County. I agree with all points made in the petition at this link: https://www.change.org/p/protect-single-family-zoning-in-montgomery-county?recruited_by_id=42919ba0-8cdb-11ef-aac2-c16b5a7eacc8&utm_source=share_petition&utm_campaign=psf_combo_share_initial&utm_term=f7e195740e0b435393d0ace3e8e1268b&utm_medium=copylink.

119
2 **Arlene Bein - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Attainable? Affordable? You're using the wrong approach

Planning Board chair Artie Harris acknowledges that what's being proposed is NOT meant to increase affordable housing because the County already has a lot of those units planned. When he says "attainable" he is really talking about affordable for middle income residents.

The Planning Board defines middle income for a family of four as earning \$120,000 to \$150,000 a year. Financial advisors recommend that such income can afford a house that costs between \$450,000 and \$750,000. Do you really think a developer can buy a single-family house in most Montgomery County neighborhoods, tear it down and build 2 townhouses that sell for even \$750,000 each and still make a profit? Talk to a homebuilder, do the math, and you'll see the equation doesn't work.

No, the answer is apartment living for those senior citizens who are downsizing, the families with no children or just a few kids. And the source for those apartments should be those office parks that are emptying, or the individual office buildings that are now not even close to being fully occupied.

And let's not forget the impact of higher population density on traffic (we are NOT going to go everywhere on our bikes), school overcrowding (bad enough as it is), diminished parking availability, and increased governmental expenses which make the County's budget even tighter.

The Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative should NOT go forward.

Tim Vogel - Bethesda, 20817

119

3

Dear Council members,

Are you aware that the Montgomery Planning Department did not reach out to Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and PEPCO until September 2024, to brief them on the Attainable Housing Study and the small scale attainable housing recommendation to rezone over 80% of the single-family home communities in the County?

Overview

On page 60, the 2024 Attainable Housing Strategies report lists "Demands on infrastructure" as a "Stakeholder Concern" that arose from the Department's various outreach initiatives. It says, in response, "The Planning Board heard concerns about the increased demands on existing infrastructure, like schools, roads, and water and sewer. The Planning Board believes the demands on infrastructure can be addressed through existing policies....Demands on other infrastructure can be addressed through the 2024 Growth and Infrastructure Policy, where Planning Staff is contemplating a focus on water and sewer."

But there appears to be no basis for these conclusions. Montgomery Planning Department emails obtained through a request under the Maryland Public Information Act indicate that Department staff first reached out to PEPCO via email on September 12, 2024, "in due diligence" to "meet with the right person(s)...to help inform you all of what we're recommending, and to understand if that does raise any concerns about future distribution capacity." The emails further indicate the same was done with WSSC. The emails indicate the Department planned to use the meetings to "present our 15ish minute presentation hitting the high points of the initiative."

This outreach wasn't initiated until months after the Department heard the stakeholder concerns; months after the Department summarily dismissed the concerns, in writing on page 60 of the report (and with no basis, as is now evident); and three months after the Montgomery Planning Board voted to approve the report and transmit it to the County Council.

This is irresponsible and unacceptable at every level of policy-making, governance, and representative government.

This is just one of the many ways in which the 2024 Attainable Housing Strategies report, and in particular, the recommendations for small scale attainable housing, fail to pass even the barest of scrutiny, rigor, and analysis. The small scale attainable housing recommendations should be rejected outright and sent back for further study, with express instructions to the Planning Department to include representation from the affected neighborhoods and communities, schools, infrastructure providers, and other stakeholders in an appropriate study of the small scale attainable housing recommendations.

Best regards,

Alex Mooney - Chevy Chase, 20815-4110

119

4

Dear Council Members,

I am a resident of Chevy Chase Section 5 and I am reaching out to express my significant concerns with the attainable housing proposal.

While I agree that housing costs in our region are far too high and support several of the underlying objectives of the proposal, I believe the current proposal is poorly conceived, overly broad and will not solve the affordability issue. Perhaps most troubling is the broad brush with which priority growth zone designations are being proposed. Such proposal does not adequately account for the fact that many streets within 500 feet of a commercial area are primarily residential and not appropriate for small apartment buildings. There may be cases where an apartment building 500 feet from a Growth Corridor makes sense, such as where a commercial space or vacant lot already exists.

However, in many cases, this zoning decision is not suitable.

Moreover, there appears to have been very little thought to how certain neighborhoods like Chevy Chase will be able to handle a significant growth in density from an infrastructure, environmental, and public education perspective. Perhaps most disappointing if I have attended two of the listening sessions and heard zero satisfying answers to these very serious concerns from our elected leaders.

The Council owes it to its constituents to be responsive to the very real concerns that were expressed during the listening sessions and press pause on this proposal.

Taylor Keith - Kensington, 20895

5

The purpose of this note is urge a NO vote on the Montgomery Housing Planning Board's "Attainable Housing" concept which proposes to do away with single family housing zoning and replace it with multi-family housing. The alleged purpose is to provide Attainable Housing for the "missing Middle" i.e. "Provide housing options affordable to a range of incomes for an increasingly diverse population of downsizing seniors, professionals without children, young families, and new comers to the region".

During the Bethesda Chevy Chase Community Engagement on September 25th, Mr. Jason Sartori, Montgomery County Planning Director, presented a slide show that categorized the Attainable Housing Strategy range of types and scales as Small, Medium, and Large. He stated Small Scale developments i.e. duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes could be constructed By Right. By Right enables a property owner to go directly to the Department of Permitting Services to obtain a permit to demolish the owners existing home and get a permit to build a duplex, triplex, or quadplex there by completely bypassing the communities' building requirements. Note than an "owner" could be an individual or a developer.

The Attainable Housing concept has a number of shortcomings that appear not to have been thought completely through. Some examples: What is the impact on infrastructure such as roads, sewage, electricity and gas of increasing the occupancy of a formerly single building site by a factor of 2, 3, or 4? What if such a "build-out" occurs multiple times in a neighborhood? What is the impact on the local schools of such an increase? What will the costs be of those new units? Will they really help fill the so called "Missing Middle"? Will there be a limit to the number of Attainable Housing build-outs in a particular neighborhood so that the "character" of the neighborhood is not destroyed?

Should owners/developers be allowed to build-out with no limits whatsoever? I invite your attention to Kaiser Place here in Kensington where last year a run-down single-family home was torn down and replaced with six four story units that sold for over \$900,000 each. Clearly this example does not "solve" the missing middle goal of building a wider variety of housing types that meet the needs of people of diverse ages, incomes, and household sizes. It does, however, clearly and unmistakably illustrate the motive/business objectives of developers -- MAKE MONEY.

Prior to going forward there needs to be more research on Attainable Housing's impact on support systems such as sewage, electricity, and water as well as schools, on street parking, roadways, and the character of the neighborhood. Outside studies should be conducted to determine hidden costs and unintended consequences.

Rather than "BY Right" there certainly needs to be a control "mechanism" established. One such control could be that prior to approving a homeowner's or developer's plan to build a multi-unit structure there should be a statement from them guaranteeing the projected sales price of each new unit of the replaced structure and a penalty imposed on the builder if the sales price exceeds the projected sales price. For after all, the objective is not to prioritize density but to meet the needs of people of "diverse ages, incomes, and household sizes." Otherwise remember Kaiser Place.

Additionally, to prevent turning an existing neighborhood into high density housing, there should be a limit placed on the number of multi-unit “houses” that can be built in a particular neighborhood.

Finally, please note, the Planning Board in order to substantiate and justify its Attainable Housing concept, cites several DMV communities that have approved Attainable Housing. One of those is Arlington, VA. However, Arlington’s plan was recently reversed by the Arlington County Circuit Court because “Impacts were not adequately studied. (Washington Post September 28, 2024 – Metro Section). That court decision should indicate to one-and-all that trying to “keep up with the Joneses” does not constitute a viable justification, nor does a plan that omits comprehensive “What if” impact and cost studies.

Once again, I urge the Council Members to vote NO on the existing plan and send it back for study of unintended consequences and implementation of local and county controls of the Attainable Housing initiative vice implementing “By Right” particularly for developers.

119 Maria Dias Raynal - BETHESDA, 20816-1235

6 I am strongly opposed to the current version of AHSI.

119 Nancy Ferris - Chevy Chase, 20815

7 My husband and I believe the county must do more to help young people and lower-income families find affordable housing in Montgomery. But the Attainable Housing initiative proposed by the Planning Board is not the right solution. It would cram too many people and their cars into neighborhoods that are crowded already. It would benefit developers more than the under-housed households. Most importantly, it does nothing to ensure that newly built units would be attainable or affordable. Please ask the Planning Board to come up with a better plan.

119 Wendy Lunde - Chevy Chase, 20815

8 Thank you for providing space for feedback. I have a number of questions and concerns that I would like to see addressed during this process.

1. A thorough and clear understanding of the need for housing (who specifically needs housing, what they are looking for (size etc.), what price range is needed, and how much).
2. A full understanding of infrastructure needs (electrical, water, sewer, parking, streets, emergency response, access to hospitals, police services, schools, etc.) along with a plan to provide them and clarity on who is paying for all of it and how those resources will be made available.
3. A full analysis on how existing vacant spaces are being rehabilitated or repurposed for housing. How will all of the vacant office spaces/retail outlets/malls, etc. be utilized FIRST before needless changes are put into effect?

4. An understanding of how/if affordable housing would be part of this initiative.
5. How are we partnering with the surrounding counties in Maryland, Virginia and DC to find attainable housing through existing vacant structures (or ones that will become vacant due to remote work, for example) and existing space before we consider making changes to existing zoning.
6. What are the costs to the environment as we lose trees/green space?
7. What are the costs to the integrity of neighborhoods and the desirability of the county? Intentionally planned and developed communities maintain their value over time whereas we have all seen the effects of poorly planned neighborhoods that no longer feel or look cohesive.
8. If rezoning happens, what restrictions would remain in place to preserve historic preservation and what other restrictions would remain in place in terms of easements, etc.?

Based on the information that has been made available thus far, I do not see any compelling reasons to move forward with the rezoning recommendations. A thorough and informed case has not been made and without a thorough, thoughtful review backed by experts, any such move would be negligent and have long lasting ramifications for the county.

119
9

Sally Maran - Chevy Chase, 20815

Attainable Housing Strategies as outlined at the listening sessions appears to benefit no one but developers - certainly not the owners of properties involved and there is no consideration given to affordable housing or the impact on infrastructure within these areas. I will be watching how Council members vote on this initiative if these issues are not addressed.

120
0

Jennifer Irving - Chevy Chase, 20815

Dear Montgomery County Council,

I agree there is a housing crisis, but I strongly oppose the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative as it will not result in affordable housing. Attainable housing is not affordable to MC DOT bus operators (starting salary \$51,000); MC police officers (starting salary \$69,000), and MC public school teachers (starting salary \$70,000). The strategy benefits developers, not hard-working residents seeking attainable housing.

This county-wide zoning strategy is not a solution to the housing crisis and will greatly impact our public-school population and quality of education; pedestrian/cyclist safety; traffic; storm water management; canopy and green spaces; and parking. Please do not approve the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. It is not a solution to the housing crisis.

120
1

Michael Connell - Chevy Chase, 20815

Dear Montgomery County Council,

I agree there is a housing crisis, but I strongly oppose the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative as it will not result in affordable housing. Attainable housing is not affordable to MC DOT bus operators (starting salary \$51,000); MC police officers (starting salary \$69,000), and MC public school teachers (starting salary \$70,000). The strategy benefits developers, not hard-working residents seeking attainable housing.

This county-wide zoning strategy is not a solution to the housing crisis and will greatly impact our public-school population and quality of education; pedestrian/cyclist safety; traffic; storm water management; canopy and green spaces; and parking. Please do not approve the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. It is not a solution to the housing crisis.

Virginia Leachman - Chevy Chse, 20815-3332

120

2

We are strongly opposed to this initiative. The process has not been adequately transparent. As United States citizens, our rights are being abused. We purchased our homes with covenants under the law. This binding legal agreement cannot be broken and we will take this to the Supreme Court. Rather than include citizens in this bogus, dishonest effort, the Council has turned a majority of us against them. Instead of working together on an idea, you have splintered our community and everything that it stands for, with regard to zoning and housing. Make no mistake, the real reason behind this initiative will be tracked down, and quickly. There is more than adequate housing of all types in the pipeline, for all walks of life. We are a reasonable, responsible, kind community. I beg you then, to directly answer the question of why you are pushing this "attainable" housing initiative. Why?

Dina Lassow - Chevy Chase, 20815

120

3

I have owned my home and lived in Chevy Chase Village since 1985. I love this neighborhood because it is beautiful, quiet, friendly, and within easy walking distance of the Friendship Heights Metro and the Connecticut Avenue commercial area. While I do not want to be a "NIMBY", I fully support the letter submitted by the Village on October 17, 2024. This letter fully shows that there is no good reason for zoning changes that could severely and negatively impact the Village.

I attended the Village Board meeting in July of this year hosting the Planning staff, at which the staff focussed on their desire to increase affordable housing in Montgomery County. Following that meeting, while sympathetic to that goal, I did not see how changing the zoning in the Village would contribute to meeting it. Now, I understand from the Village's letter, that the Planning Board is focussing on market rate housing, and that it acknowledges that its plan will not increase affordable housing. Therefore, there is even less reason for the plan that harms Chevy Chase Village and other similar neighborhoods.

I would like to add one other matter to the concerns in the Village's letter. My street and others are only wide enough for three cars. Therefore, if two cars are approaching each other, one car must pull into an empty space while the other passes. This will not be possible if there are more residents, and more cars on the street. Not only will parking be difficult for me (I do not have practical off-street parking), I will not be able to drive down my street!

In sum, for all the reasons discussed in the Village's letter, I strongly urge the rejection of the AHSI recommendations.

Montgomery County Civic Fed - Silver Spring, 20910

Montgomery County Council
100 Maryland Avenue
Rockville, MD 20850

Dear Councilmembers:

The Montgomery County Civic Federation, Inc. (MCCF) appreciates the Council's recent listening sessions on the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHSI) and your invitation to submit comments on its proposed zoning changes. The Civic Federation is a not-for-profit, county-wide umbrella group established one hundred years ago to promote cooperation, education, and effectiveness of civic and community associations in Montgomery County. Our membership includes civic associations and other organizations and individuals from across the county, reaching thousands of households.

MCCF is in the process of drafting and submitting to our members a resolution specifically addressing AHSI. But given today's deadline for initial comments, we write to share that although there is a diversity of viewpoints among our members on its specifics, our members have voiced profound concerns about this proposal. Accordingly, we believe it would be premature to move forward with the AHSI proposal until much more work is done.

First and foremost, the scope of the County's housing needs must be analyzed based on reliable data, with priority attention to the housing needs of low- and moderate-income families, middle class workers, county employees and first-time homebuyers. In the process of consideration, it must also be determined whether the proposal serves, and does not undermine, other objectives. In that regard, consideration must be given to the environmental, infrastructure, school, and racial equity impacts of the proposal, along with means of remediating any adverse impacts. The importance of the master plan process and ensuring resident input also are great concerns. These are just some of the matters that members have raised so far, and we will provide a more complete discussion shortly.

In the meanwhile, we submit our "Housing Policy White Paper," approved by our membership in April of this year, which describes our vision for sound future housing policies along with factors that must be considered. The paper includes our guideposts for the priorities and strategies that we believe are necessary in a county wide housing initiative and is applicable to the AHSI.

MCCF applauds and supports AHSI's stated goals of accommodating future growth, embracing diversity, welcoming new residents, and providing affordable and equitable housing opportunities (both ownership and rental) to current and future residents. Our vision includes an emphasis on solid empirical research and genuine affordability as crucial priorities.

We hope that rather than presenting residents the choice of "AHSI or nothing," the Council and Planning Board will consider alternatives to meet the Council's commendable goals.

We hope you will carefully consider our views, and we will submit our AHSI resolution shortly.

Signed

Cheryl Gannon, MCCF President

Elizabeth Joyce, 2nd Vice President, Chair of the MCCF Housing and Land Use Committee

Ken Markison, Co-chair, MCCF Housing and Land Use Committee

Montgomery County Civic Federation

Resolution

Priorities and Approaches for Housing Policy and Legislation

Whereas,

The Montgomery County Civic Federation (MCCF) acknowledges that housing is a human right, acknowledges the predicted future growth in county population, welcomes new residents, embraces diversity, and supports providing equitable and affordable housing opportunities (both ownership and rental) to current and future generations of residents. These needs should be met through policies that provide all residents, especially groups historically subject to racially discriminatory housing policies, access to quality affordable housing and opportunities for economic growth, and policies that are effective, environmentally sound and based on data. The MCCF wishes to partner with the county to achieve these goals.

Be it Resolved,

That the MCCF adopts the following Priorities and Approaches to Housing Policy and Legislation as the policy of MCCF and to guide MCCF evaluation of housing legislation and policies as may be proposed by the Montgomery County Planning Board and the Montgomery County Council.

Priorities

Although estimates can vary, the Metropolitan Council of Governments estimates that Montgomery County needs to add 41,000 housing units in the next ten years to meet housing demand and that 75 percent of this housing should be affordable to low- and moderate-income households. (incomes between 30% and 150% of AMI). Housing to meet this need will not be met by private investment alone.

To this end, the following measures using governmental resources and programs should be priorities:

- Co-locating affordable housing on county-owned properties. This has been accomplished with a few properties and should be continued and expanded. Co-location presents opportunities for public or nonprofit/private developer partnerships to build more deeply affordable housing.
- Implementing a simplified process for zoning flexibility for income-restricted housing on properties owned by faith-based organizations. One effort in this direction is the Zoning Text Amendment (ZTA) 24-01, also known as the Facilitating Affordable Inclusive Transformational Housing (FAITH) ZTA, recently adopted by the Council. An ongoing effort

to track data on success of this initiative and identify barriers that impede success is important.

- Increased financial support for the Montgomery County Housing Initiative Fund. The Montgomery Housing Initiative (MHI) Fund is the County's local housing trust fund that provides loans to the Housing Opportunities Commission (HOC), nonprofit developers, experienced rental property owners, and for-profit developers to build new housing units, renovate deteriorated multi-family housing developments, preserve existing affordable housing, and provide special needs rental housing.
- Montgomery County's MPDU program has led the nation in inclusionary zoning requirements for more than fifty years. MPDU requirements provide that up to 15 percent of housing units in County residential developments are available for low- and moderate-income families. The MPDU program should be reviewed to assess how well it achieves its four program goals: enable county residents and workers to purchase or rent affordable housing; better distribute low and moderate-income households throughout the county; expand and retain an inventory of housing accessible to low- and moderate-income individuals and provide funds for future affordable housing projects via windfall. To maximize the availability of low- and moderate-income units, policymakers should consider expanding MPDU's reach, where possible (by, for example, increasing the percentage of required units, adjusting the MPDU income requirements requiring that MPDU units reflect the mixture of unit sizes available in the project, and ensuring that projects replacing projects meeting MPDU requirements at least maintain the percentage of affordable units.). Policymakers should be mindful that too stringent MPDU requirements can be counterproductive if they hinder the development of projects with additional affordable housing.
- The membership continues to urge the Montgomery County Government to establish an effective policy of No Net Loss of Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing (NOAH).] Where NOAH exists in older multi-family developments slated for redevelopment, policymakers should seek to ensure that replacement projects will include affordable units at least equivalent in number, size, and rental cost to those currently available. The county should pursue anti-displacement initiatives in vulnerable communities.
- Increasing attention to and focus on workforce housing, including housing for teachers, police, first responders and public servants. For this purpose, policymakers should utilize and consider expanding the Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) program, where possible. Identify projects on county owned or faith-based properties that might designate a specific number of units for the county workforce housing program lottery.

Approach

- The process of developing a housing policy for the County must be a search for the best way forward and result in a dynamic roadmap to implement the results of that search. The process must be data driven and informed by the work of a range of experts (including economists and social scientists) with differing approaches and conclusions, all following rigorous accepted research standards of reliability, objectivity, and relevance. Policymakers should set benchmarks and periodic reporting requirements and must be willing to re-evaluate and change direction if initial (or modified) plans and tools are not achieving the intended results.
- The MCCF affirms its support for the Montgomery County law requiring all legislation, including zoning changes and zoning text amendments, to undergo racial equity and social justice (RESJ) analysis by the Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) and urges the Council to observe OLO's RESJ recommendations in formulating all zoning and housing policies or make

public statements as to disagreement and reasons for disagreement.

- It is important that policymakers consider the existing wide variations, from urban to rural and in between, in our County. It is also important that new housing be distributed throughout the County, working through the master plan process. The goal is to increase the availability and

affordability of housing for current and future residents while enhancing the quality of life across the County.

- The Civic Federation reaffirms its commitment to Master and Sector planning for modifying zoning within planning areas as those processes allow for consideration of important factors

unique to a neighborhood, including existing density, transportation, infrastructure and adequate public facilities, and environmental concerns. These processes also allow for meaningful engagement with the specific community.

- The Civic Federation supports the goal of creating greater opportunities for home ownership particularly for communities that have historically been denied these opportunities. We note that 95% of the new multi-family housing approved and built in Montgomery County (Bethesda and Silver Spring) since 2017 has been rental and not ownership housing. This trend

must be analyzed, data tracked and policies to promote more home ownership opportunities in new developments must be put in place.

- The Civic Federation notes that scarcity in housing, particularly for home ownership opportunities, is one factor causing housing prices to increase. Scarcity can be worsened by recent trends in investor-owned properties and land banking. The SDAT recently noted an increasing trend in investors buying single family homes in Maryland, and the estimate for

inventory of investor-owned single-family homes in the DC metro area is now at 10%. There is a danger that first time home buyers have a difficult time outbidding an institutional investor. The County should address these issues before trends worsen, looking at a variety of tools to

discourage land banking or investors buying single family homes including possibly tax measures and owner occupancy requirements as the county ADU law provides.

- The MCCF reaffirms its commitment to the adequate public facilities ordinance and the need to evaluate the impact of new development on an area and the adequacy of public facilities.

Data

- There are conflicting views on the extent of the housing needs in our County and on how needs at different income and price points should be prioritized and addressed. Policymakers should compile reliable housing-related statistics that residents can easily understand. Such data should include: the number of additional housing units needed, especially for those of low to moderate income (including workforce housing); how much of these housing needs can be accommodated by development under the current zoning requirements; how many residential units have been approved but are still in the pipeline (and, if construction has stalled, why, and how it might be expedited); and how many approvals have been pending for a number of years, suggesting that land has been “banked” as an asset. Median housing prices should be tracked on a regular basis.

- Where zoning changes are being considered policymakers should prepare and share with residents relevant supporting data including: the types of housing sought; the extent to which

zoning changes are needed to accommodate those types of housing and what those changes might be, under alternative scenarios; and projections of how much and what types of housing such changes might yield under different scenarios. Significant housing initiatives, such as the

Attainable Housing Initiative, should begin with laying out specifics, including the number and type of ownership opportunities and tracking sale prices on homes sold after the initiative as well as average rents on new units.

Community Engagement

- Community outreach must be intentional and inclusive to advance and highlight diversity of thought and lived experiences in the discussions of housing policy, and to be fully inclusive of race, ethnicity, age, disability, economic status, and geographical location. Further, where

changes in communities are sought, they will be more timely and more successful if they gain local community acceptance and support.

Community engagement with meaningful dialogue between community representatives and representatives of the County at every stage of the

process is essential. With effective outreach and notice and presented as a true search for solutions and not as a platform to sell a pre-determined approach, community engagement can be highly effective. Meetings and town halls are excellent means for policymakers to become

informed and educated by the views and concerns of residents, and vice versa

Matthew Gilday - Kensington, 20895

120

5

I believe the Attainable Housing proposal is a terrible idea. This proposal will do nothing to make housing more attainable or affordable. it will make housing more expensive and at the same time it will make our overcrowded roads and schools worse. you will now allow 2,3 or 4 homes and families to live on a lot that was once a single family lot. say each family is 4 total people you are now adding as many as 16 people and 4-8 more cars per lot? Every major road in the area , Connecticut Ave, Mass. Ave, Georgia Ave, University Blvd., Randolph Rd. River Rd., Cedar Lane, Old Georgetown Rd., East West Highway, Western Avenue, Bradley Blvd., are jam packed at rush hour and all hours of the day. Thus car traffic bleeds over to the secondary and tertiary roads making them more crowded and dangerous. And NO people will not take the Metro line or Purple line its not going to happen. And if they do they need to get to Metro most live too far away to walk.. there is not enough infrastructure, electrical, plumbing, Sewer, to handle this. The County schools are already overcrowded and now you want to add, 2,3 4 more families on every lot that contains a single family home. in one of the meetings I attended one of the County council members discussed the cost and size of new homes and how that was an issue (the McMansion problem) . so if this is an issue why not limit the size of a new home that can be built on the current lots? builders are way overpaying for small (900-1,500+_ square feet) ramblers, cape cods and colonials then tearing them down and building 3,000 sq feet or more homes at double and triple the cost. this proposal will do nothing to make housing more attainable.

why was Westbard project or Chevy Chase lake project not all affordable/attainable housing? why not build affordable housing at the empty White Flint lot on Rockville pike? or on some other large plot of land in the County?

I'm sure most county residents are unaware of this proposal. if you live in area with an active association you may be aware of this but otherwise probably not. I received numerous flyers on my front door from the County regarding the banning of gas leaf blowers. I have not received one notification/flyer on this major idea!

This should be up to the voters of Montgomery County and not decided by the County Council. Maybe the Council and leaders of Montgomery County can focus on bringing in new business into Montgomery County and more better paying jobs that will improve the lives of lower and middle income residence? this would be a way better idea and then these residents may be able to afford housing. that is a much better idea for all county residence.

120
6

Michael Clark - Chevy Chase, 20815

I am writing to strongly oppose the implementation of the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHSI) recommendations for a massive rezoning of 82% of Montgomery County's single-family residential properties.

The proposed rezoning would radically change the character of these neighborhoods and fundamentally change the entire county. The impact on livability under the proposed changes has not been adequately studied and carefully reviewed. The potential impacts on the infrastructure including transportation and parking, utilities, storm drain infrastructure, environmental concerns, and school capacity have not been carefully and thoroughly examined.

Furthermore, the proposal does not address or expand access to housing affordability which has been identified as the most pressing housing issue confronting Montgomery County. It does nothing to demonstrate that eliminating single-family housing would achieve that goal. Instead the recommendations focus on disrupting existing communities and creating a lengthy list of infrastructure and livability issues by creating large scale multiplex units sold at "market value".

I respectfully request that the Council and the Planning Board pause consideration of the AHSI and revisit their overall approach.

Sincerely,

Michael

120
7

Reed Fawell - Chevy Chase, 20815

Dear Montgomery County Council Members,

We are writing in opposition the Montgomery County Planning Board's Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHSI) recommendations and ask the Council and the Planning Board to revisit their overall approach.

Procedurally, these recommendations have not received the review and discussion warranted for such significant potential changes to our communities. Further review and discussion are necessary to ensure that all potentially affected Montgomery County residents are aware of the recommendations in the AHSI and have the opportunity for comment.

Substantively, we are concerned that if adopted, the recommendations in the AHSI are likely to do irreparable harm to existing communities and produce little or no attainable housing. Instead, the zoning changes would generate profits for developers and investors, while bankrupting small municipalities and imposing immense congestion costs, environmental losses, and infrastructure burdens (transportation and parking, utilities, storm drain infrastructure, and school capacity among others) on County residents. These burdens and other costs (e.g., pedestrian safety) have not been adequately studied or taken into account by the Planning Board and must be thoroughly considered before any proposal moves forward.

Critically, the AHSI is not supported by relevant data or by a credible economic analysis. There is no data to show that this drastic zoning change is required to meet the need for attainable housing. It may reduce, not increase, the supply of “missing middle” housing, by incentivizing developers and investors. Further, there are many projects already in the pipeline that have not been taken into account by the AHSI. We are concerned that the AHSI recommendations not only will not create attainable housing, but also would displace the work being done to create affordable housing, for which the need is most acute.

In short, the recommendations in the AHSI would be economically damaging and contrary to the public interest.

Paula Desio - Chevy Chase, 20815

120
8

To all Council members:

I am a long time resident of the Village of Martin’s Additions (since 1991) and I wish to express strong opposition to the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative as it is presently presented. I support the letters of opposition submitted by many members of the Chevy Chase community and wish to emphasize three key points of my opposition:

1) Fire Safety Planning: There is no adequate consideration for fire safety if duplexes, triplexes, and quadriplexes replace existing single family homes. Before adding structures and many more inhabitants and on street parking, there needs to be a plan and funding in place by the county to ensure that there are additional fire stations, additional fire personnel, and the flow of traffic to get to the buildings.

Details: On the east side of Connecticut Avenue and Brookville Road, at rush hours but increasingly so at other times of the day and evening, the fire station vehicles from the station at the corner of Bradley Blvd and Wisconsin Avenue cannot cross Bradley Lane to get east of Connecticut Avenue. It is a two lane road with no room on either side; there is not even a sidewalk on the south side of Bradley Lane that is next to the Chevy Chase Country Club. Perhaps if the County would widen the road by eminent domain on the Country Club side that could assist in resolving a part of the problem. The personnel of that firestation loses valuable time going south on Wisconsin Avenue, across Western Avenue, around Chevy Chase Circle at Connecticut Avenue and back up Connecticut or east down Western towards Rock Creek Park and all the Maryland communities that abut the park.

The sole station that is east of Connecticut Avenue just north of East West Highway (Route 410) is the only fire station that serves this area. It is already burdened by the additional dwellings at the Purple Line where numerous condominiums have been built but no additional personnel or equipment have been allotted to this station.

Most of the residential streets here east of Connecticut Avenue and east of Brookville Road are very narrow; some do not even have sidewalks and parking is restricted to one side. Even so, fire trucks and other emergency vehicles have difficulty getting through with the number of cars per household. Even with driveways, on any given day the streets are parked up and deliveries are made by vehicles with flashers on stopped on the "non parking" side. Again, a continuing hazard for the safety of residents.

2). Storm water management and drainage planning: There seems to have been no consultation with WSSC prior to the plan's publication. I was shocked to hear at a recent listening session that WSSC (I presume its management/planning personnel) had not learned of the super expansion of dwellings proposed until just a few weeks prior. Most of the streets and sewers in this area suffer from storm water backup and lack of good drainage. It has gotten worse since 1991 when I moved here because of the increased building out of houses in this area. The intersection of Bradley Lane and Brookville Road has been "repaired" numerous times and consistently floods in a heavy rain.

The infrastructure for water and draining does not exist to support additional plumbing that would result from duplexes, triplexes, and quadriplexes with plumbing for additional kitchens and bathrooms in this area. This must be planned and funds allocated before developers start willy-nilly selecting lots and causing more run off problems. A case in point. On Quincy Street a recent developer planned to install an elevator but did not talk to residents first, of course. When they dug for the place to install the elevator shaft, they hit the underground stream that runs on that side of the street under and around most of the houses built many years ago. It was only with the help of involved neighbors and a long-time resident who recalled some work on the street (for which WSSC apparently did not have records according to what I was told) that allowed for some drainage issues to be resolved at additional cost to many parties, but did not allow for the anticipated elevator. Hopefully the houses below that house in question will get some relief from additional flooding now. This is the kind of consultation with communities that should happen before rezoning a single lot for additional buildings. Consultation and cooperation with the communities, a slow trial of one or two duplexes and resolution of the issues that arise, and other such measures should occur before building is allowed.

3) The cost of increased infrastructure problems if rezoning is allowed, and the builders take their market priced profits and leave. Who is left holding the bill for increased costs and deteriorating conditions? The local municipalities will be left bearing the burden.

I believe that a referendum is justified for this drastic a change to the communities that will be affected. These rules have been in place for many years, and as I have heard County Executive Erlich explain at a Village Council Meeting for Martin's Additions last evening (April 17), the minority population decrease in this area did not occur because of the current zoning but because of the relationship between jobs and public transportation. I am not even sure that the proponents of the Initiative expect the minority population in this area to increase with the proposals for larger buildings with increased density. They may be just as expensive as the condominiums in Bethesda and the Purple Line area on Connecticut Avenue.

This initiative/proposal seems ill thought out despite its length. More careful work needs to be done.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula J Desio

CC,MD 20815.

120
9

Anne Cantrel - Chevy Chase, 20815

While I agree there is a need for affordable housing in our County, I strongly oppose the Attainable Housing Strategies approach as it will not responsibly address the issue. The initiative is counterproductive. It incentivizes the destruction of more affordable single family homes in favor of multi family units that could end up costing even more. Economics would drive the decisions on what is built and charged. Developers would be the winners! The strategy benefits them, not the “missing middle” population, such as police, firefighters, teachers, etc. who would not find the housing affordable.

This county-wide zoning strategy is not a solution to the housing problem. The present infrastructure in our neighborhood would not support the increased density. There would be a negative impact on our community, the public-school population and quality of education; traffic and parking, storm water management, canopy and green spaces. Residents of older, established single family homes such as in our neighborhood should not be penalized because the County planners want to force as much density as possible into “priority housing districts”. There are swaths of open land in the County, such as Lakeforest and White Flint, that are near major roadways and transit. Has the County considered incentives to some of these large landowners to develop attainable housing?

Please do not approve the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. It is not a solution to the housing problem. It simply creates other problems of urbanizing the suburbs without adequate infrastructure and a sensible, sustainable plan for growth.

121
0

Robert DiGiovanni - Chevy Chase, 20815

I categorically oppose this initiative. It fails to deliver true affordable housing for our county, is based on insufficient data, and does not adequately address critical issues such as education, infrastructure, and transportation. Instead, it prioritizes the interests of specific groups over the needs and desires of the broader population. Further, this initiative was not preceded by the requisite data gathering and constituent feedback solicitation that should be a predicate of any democratic process, especially one involving changes of this magnitude. If this initiative moves forward, I will not support Friedson for County Council or County Executive, and I will strongly advise those within my circle to do the same.

121 1	Laura Bates - Chevy Chase, 20815 <p>This initiative would ruin the historic neighborhoods of Chevy Chase. Quality of life for existing and new residents would be poor. It is already crowded here. This would make it worse and create more traffic. It would not be a desirable place for families. If this initiative passes, we will move.</p>
121 2	Andrew Brown - Chevy Chase, 20815 <p>I am very concerned that the AHS as currently proposed will not achieve its goals of creating more affordable housing in our County, which I strongly support. Instead, it creates powerful incentives for developers to encroach on established middle-income neighborhoods that provide affordable housing for families and create incentives for developers to build UNaffordable multi tenant housing which does not solve the housing crisis problem.</p> <p>The AHS was created with no cost-benefit analysis and does not account at all for the impact on infrastructure, including water and power lines, fire/rescue, parking, and schools. The ones who will be stuck with the bill? Current homeowners, through increases in property taxes making already expensive housing even LESS affordable.</p> <p>Most importantly, the AHS will do nothing to ease the problem of affordable housing. Indeed, this is a huge giveaway to developers, who are not required to provide any affordable housing in buildings under 20 units. The County should address affordable housing but needs to do so in a thoughtful manner. It is irresponsible to turn over planning and development for a county as big and diverse in terms of land use to private developers, and permanently cut out the voice of regular homeowners. But that's exactly what the AHS does. Please do not vote for this extreme, under-researched, and rushed plan.</p>
121 3	Brie Kaufman - Bethesda, 20816 <p>I do not in any way support this "strategy" and I will not continue to support or elect any office holder who endorses this proposal. The proposal fails to take into account current infrastructure or provide money to build additional infrastructure to support increased density. Further, this year the MCPS budget was cut—with duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, and god only knows how many more apartments, how will MoCo be supporting the additional students if it cannot support current students at previous fiscal levels. The community feedback has been so strongly against this proposal, and yet it seems MoCo elected officials are hell bent in passing this. I will not vote for anyone who moves forward on proposals that his/her constituents clearly do not want.</p>
121 4	Radhika Sinha - Bethesda, 20816 <p>I am strongly against the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative as currently envisaged. I believe the only motivation of the current proposed legislation is to enrich real estate developers rather than create any form of affordable housing. Further the initiative does not even take into consideration the available infrastructure - parking, traffic, schools - to name a few while proposing this poorly conceived proposal. The substantial new development in our neighborhood is in the form of apartments and townhomes and they have been priced at \$1.5 million plus. How is this affordable or attainable? Similarly we have significant overcrowding in schools as well as huge traffic on our</p>

streets already. This measure will worsen that without providing any real benefit. This appears to be a measure to enrich real estate developers who want to find new ways to make money given the paucity of land available within the beltway. Instead of really trying to make a difference, the county council appears to be as usual formulating a short cut that will not only not achieve the desired result but also make living conditions very difficult and untenable for existing residents. There are large tracts of land available in the county - instead of developing those properly and creating infrastructure there - the county is just trying to put more cars on the same streets and more students in the same schools causing a decline in living conditions for everybody. Why ??

Elizabeth Joyce - Silver Spring, 20910

121
5

I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative, as well as the listening sessions the Council recently held throughout the County. I also ask that the Council take seriously the reasonable and urgent concerns expressed by residents before moving forward with any plan.

During the past four years, I have carefully read many County documents and attended many hearings about Thrive Montgomery 2050 and the AHSI. I have also read a large number of scholarly articles questioning the efficacy of densification and upzoning. Yet it appears to me that the Planning Board started with a conclusion: upzoning and increasing density, particularly down county, is the ONLY way to address the perceived housing crisis. It also seems clear that the Council, as CM Katz pointed out during the discussions on Thrive, has seemed willing to hear only supporters rather than informed and well-intentioned critics of these narrow and often discredited theories on how to meet our housing deficit.

Rather than tackling the expensive and politically controversial process of providing adequate affordable housing, the Planning Board invented a definition for "attainable," a meaningless term that amounts to "affordable to those who can afford it." As the Planning Board discovered in its Silver Spring Missing Middle Study, the cost of duplexes, townhouses, and even triplexes often exceeds that of homes torn down to replace them. And the environmental impact of a plan based on teardowns is likely to be damaging if not catastrophic.

AHSI appears to lack a solid evidentiary basis; estimates of needed housing from the Council of Governments have been misused, often to create a false picture of actual need. A recent column by Adam Pagnucco (a fan of the Council) quotes a recent OLO finding that "Revised data prior to 2019 are not available. DPS's internal systems prior to 2019 did not allow for tracking of trends in numbers of units authorized by permit." The report also states, "Corrected BPS data are not available for the period from 2000-2019." In other words, our \$25M+ per year Planning Board staff has no idea how many homes were permitted in this 19-year period. So all of its calculations on which AHSI is based are fundamentally flawed.

AHSI is unfair to current homeowners. While the Council busily contemplates reduced impact and other waivers for developers, residents would face radically altered neighborhoods, perhaps higher property taxes and lowered quality of life, and a sense that the Council has arbitrarily but permanently altered the property they thought they bought. While the Council claims that the impact of AHSI on infrastructure would be "minimal," they have no data to support this claim. Why wouldn't schools, roads, public safety, tree canopy, and other needed infrastructure suffer significantly if this haphazard plan is put into effect?

The burden of AHSI on unincorporated communities, like mine in East Silver Spring, is likely to exacerbate rather than relieve existing inequities. Although we are the most diverse district in the County (with many minority homeowners and renters who could well be displaced), we have no separate governmental structures like those of municipalities that are likely to fend off the more damaging impacts of AHSI. Furthermore, AHSI as now envisioned will sharply attract investor home buyers, who reduce the housing supply for individual homeowners and drive up home prices artificially. We just discovered that a home next door to me, which has been unoccupied for more than a year, has been sold to a private equity firm based in Dubai. How will these absentee speculators help our County, community, and neighborhood? They won't, and the Council has no plan to prevent AHSI from exacerbating this disturbing trend.

It is unfair and deceptive to tell residents that they must accept AHSI or nothing. The Planning Board appears to have considered no other alternatives, despite the years and millions of dollars that have been spent developing it. While the plan's goals are admirable, it is unlikely to achieve them. Montgomery County needs a fair, transparent, equitable, and evidence-based housing policy. Please go back to the drawing board rather than pass a sweeping, irrevocable, and damaging set of zoning policies that will not achieve its stated goals.

121
6

Paul Jarosinski - OLNEY, 20832

October 18, 2024

Montgomery County Council
101 Maryland Avenue
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Re: AHSI Proposal

Dear County Council:

The Cherrywood Homeowners Association is a 606-unit homeowners association located in Olney, Maryland. We are a County Master Plan planned community that includes single-family detached homes, townhouses, and MPDUs that were built in the late 1970's to late 1980's. We held a duly called general membership meeting on October 16th where we addressed community business including the AHSI proposal on the table before the Council. The vast majority of the meeting, more than an hour, was spent reviewing and discussing the AHSI proposal among the more than 50 adults that attended the meeting. Approximately half the audience had never heard about the AHSI proposal other than the HOA notice of the annual meeting and had come to get details.

After an extensive review and discussion, a motion was made from the floor to oppose the implementation of AHSI. The motion was seconded and passed UNANIMOUSLY. I typed the word UNANIMOUSLY in capital letters because the membership stipulated that I do so to indicate our strong disapproval of AHSI.

The reasons for opposing the AHSI plan were many. It took the County Executive 14 pages to list just some of the many flaws in this proposed unnecessary change for zoning in existing neighborhoods so I am not going to attempt to cover them all in this submission. First and foremost, it is a breach of the contract people signed when they invested their life's saving in a home in a particular planned development in Montgomery County. To change the zoning after all the homes are purchased is a breach of trust to property owners especially when a couple of irresponsible appointed planners make that determination for 134,000 property owners in this County. The membership found that Arte Harris' statement that "We can no longer afford to devote some much land to so few people" a clear indication that he was coming after our property. Jason Sartori's excuse that single-family housing was exclusionary and "racist" and therefore needed to be eliminated is equally pompous and absurd especially when AHSI will replace naturally occurring affordable housing with market rate housing displacing the poorest of residents that tend to be people of color. Both these men seem intent to inflict their distorted vision on County homeowners and will stop at nothing to do so.

County Executive Elrich has now presented multiple reviews of the many flaws in the AHSI proposal. The community concurs with the County Executive that the plan is fiscally and environmentally irresponsible and the level of deception in the proposal is "unprecedented." AHSI is not about planning for the future, but about destroying the neighborhoods we currently have. The current single-family communities that now exist were engineered for houses with one house per lot. Our streets are narrow and our culverts are small. To allow for density to triple in communities engineered for single-family homes will most assuredly create multiple infrastructure problems and is irresponsible and perhaps illegal. When Planning has been challenged with these issues, they simply ignore the infrastructure problems and loss of mature tree canopy and give their opinion that the problems will be "de minimus" because they don't think that many units will be built. This is an illegitimate assessment because AHSI will create multiplexes by right and there are no brakes to limit overdevelopment. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to know that a community engineered for one house per lot is going to have massive problems if the density is allowed to triple or quadruple.

County Executive Elrich has pointed out that there are already over 30,000 housing permits approved with another 80,000 units in approved Master Plans so that is already enough housing in the Planning process to handle all the growth projected well beyond 2050 even if Planning continues to use outdated COG 9.2 projections that were lowered in COG 10. COG 9.2 projected MoCo population growth of 200,000 over 30 years, but that projection was lowered in 10.0 and was further diminished when Adam Pagnucco revealed MoCo actually lost 3,591 over the first 39 months of the 2020 decade putting the COG 9.2 population projection off by 30,000 people. Yet, even as of last week, Planning lists on their website as 200,000 people now coming in just 25 years. This is just more manufactured data to create hysteria at the Council level to approve their plan. This is just one of the reasons Elrich has publically labeled AHSI a "fraud" (WTOP news). The membership of our HOA fully embraces Elrich's assessment that AHSI is a fraud.

Another example of dishonest manipulation of data was displayed at the Germantown listening session (and others as well). In Mr. Sartori's presentation he presented several slides with 2023 housing data. When he got to his "affordability" slide, he went back to 2022 data because "that is the data they have." This is blatant misinformation. The reason Planning only has 2022 data is that they didn't want to use the better data from 2023 or 2024. In 2022, inflation hit a century high 9.1% and mortgage rates peaked. These are the worst numbers possible and that is why they used "the data they have" to make his proposal look better than it should. These purposeful deceptions may fool some people and councilmembers, but are not productive for accurate data. This type of behavior is another demonstration of the chronic honesty problems with the Planning staff. One only needs to go back to 2022 when the entire Planning Board was fired for misbehavior and the Planning Director fired. It appears nothing has changed at Planning as they continue to ignore or create excuses to ignore citizen input. Mr. Katz has documented twice on recorded tape at Council meetings that the Planning Board only reports on people that support their plan while omitting comments from opponents (video supplied on request).

Mr. Elrich has supplied other evidence of purposeful misrepresentation of data by the Planning staff as well as examples of gratuitous self-serving assumptions (e.g. infrastructure needs will be "de minimus") to draw conclusions that are faulty. Mr. Elrich has estimated infrastructure needs from AHSI will exceed a billion dollars. He has publically labeled the plan as a fraud. Due to their on-going shady efforts, we would ask that Council to suspend Mr. Harris, Sartori, and Govoni (perhaps others) until a third party who are NOT members of the current planning board or staff can investigate the on-going fraud that our County Executive has pointed out. It is critical that we use current updated figures to make decisions. As inflation moderates and mortgages rates fall, affordability and housing sales will change dramatically. For example, Page 5 of the handout for the PHP meeting on 9-16-24 seems to indicate using State data (SDAT) that MoCo has already built 16,354 units as of 2023 since COG 9.2 was issued. Given the history of the current Planning group, it is absolutely outrageous that the current Planning staff be allowed to continue burying citizen comments and manipulating the data. Having identified the source of the misinformation, it is easy to see the false hysteria by the Council regarding the distorted information on the table from the Planning Staff. The current lead planners should be suspended until a third party investigation can be completed.

The only real housing crisis is with affordable housing and Planning's own slide verifies that AHSI supplies Zero affordable housing. Shame on the moderators of the listening sessions for letting the verbal supporters of AHSI think that AHSI will provide "affordable" housing in Bethesda or Chevy Chase. Any new market rate housing built in that area is going well over a million dollars and nowhere near affordable. Thus we would note that even the few supporters of AHSI have been duped.

To address the affordable housing crisis, we suggest the Council follow the lead of the DC government and convert some of the more than 20% vacant office space in MoCo to truly affordable housing. Have Mr. Glass and Mr. Jawando work together to merge the MOVE Act with Mr. Jawando's effort to put affordable housing where most people say it belongs; that is, in urban areas near transit and other amenities. The empty office space in these areas could be converted to affordable housing. Sure it will be expensive, but likely less expensive than the billion dollars of infrastructure costs associated with AHSI that would still leave the real problem in the County (affordable housing) untouched and unfunded.

As for Mr. Harris and Sartori's inexplicable desire for tiny multiplexes (1000-1500 square feet per their presentations), have these units incorporated into the existing building permits and the redevelopment of depressed large land masses in MoCo such as White Flint Mall, Lake Forest Mall, Burtonsville Shopping Center, Viva White Oak, GEICO headquarters site, Discovery center, and other large available land masses in MoCo. In this manner, Planning could build their complete communities from the ground up with all the necessary 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.

In summary, we implore you to outright reject the AHSI plan presented to the Council that literally throws out four decades of Master plans and destroys 82% (134,000 homes) of the planned single-family neighborhoods that have been around for many decades. Instead of destroying existing neighborhoods, hire some new planners who will concentrate on developing the tracts we have instead of being intent on taking away something enjoyed by 134,000 households. As one listening contributor pointed out, most single-family homes in MoCo sell in less a month. This is an indication we need MORE single-family homes instead of less. A shortage of single-family homes may be one of the real reasons middle class people are moving out of the County rather than they cannot find a multiplex unit they like as Planning would have you believe.

The only real reason for going forward with AHSI is to deliver a gift to developer-related interests and the candidates they support. Not only would AHSI open up the entire County for redevelopment, but the document for the PHP committee meeting on 7-22-24 shows that Planning staff has lots of additional goodies lined up at taxpayer's expense up for developers including up to a 75% discount on property taxes for 10 years, \$5 million in loans interest free for the first year, reduced parking requirements, reduced driveway standards, lower impact taxes, and \$5 million in grants to the developer that can build the most multiplexes. This discounted property tax structure would mean that the redevelopers would be paying less property taxes than the single family homes left behind to deal with the overcrowding and infrastructure problems. If you think people are fleeing MoCo now, AHSI would make it many fold worse. In the last election, MoCo 360 reported that 7 of the 11 current councilmembers took money from the Charlie Nulsen's developer PAC Progressives for Progress. We hope these contributions will not lead you to make a bad decision to support AHSI. There are 100,000 housing units and several large tracts of land to develop so there is plenty of business available for developers without another handout from the Council at taxpayer's expense.

Sincerely,

Paul F. Jarosinski
President

121
7

ELIZABETH DUGAN - Chevy Chase, 20815-4225

I categorically oppose this initiative. It fails to deliver true affordable housing for our county, is based on insufficient data, and does not adequately address critical issues such as education, infrastructure, and transportation. Instead, it prioritizes the interests of specific groups over the needs and desires of the broader population. Further, this initiative was not preceded by the requisite data gathering and constituent feedback solicitation that should be a predicate of any democratic process, especially one involving changes of this magnitude. If this initiative moves forward, I will not support Friedson for County Council or County Executive, and I will strongly advise those within my circle to do the same.

121
8

Charles and Kathleen Buffon - Chevy Chase, 20815

We endorse the letter dated October 17, 2024 from the Chevy Chase Village Board of Managers in its entirety. The plan outlined by the planning board is incoherent. It does not address the problem of affordable housing, which in theory is its objective, ignores readily apparent existing approaches to affordable housing, disrupts and destroys existing communities, including Chevy Chase Village, for no apparent purpose. It is entirely ill-conceived, an exercise in bureaucratic muscle flexing. The County Council must have the backbone to reject it in its entirety and demand that the planning board come up with a practical plan that addresses the need for more affordable housing in a truly achievable/attainable fashion without destroying what is unique and historic about our residential areas. The County Council represents us, the residents of Montgomery County. Show us that you are capable of doing the right thing! Turn this down and if necessary appoint a new planning board that isn't beholden to developers and others who stand to profit from mindless rezoning and building projects that fail to address the real problem!

121
9

Stephen DeGenaro - Bethesda, 20816

I wanted to offer my feedback on the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. I am aware of the the frequent common objections to the Initiative--lack of citizen input, the haphazard and arbitrary boundary lines drawn, serious constraint on parking in the future, the effect on schools, the potential of Geico as a better alternative for future development, and the prioritization of developers and future hypothetical constituents over current constituents.

For brevity sake, I will say that I concur wholly with these objections without belaboring the points further. For now, I want to add two additional comments against, which I have not seen made.

First, the Attainable Housing Strategies Report finding that an undersized R-60 lot (which is zoned to be a minimum of 6,000 sqft) could accommodate duplex, triplex, or even quadraplex on an undersized lot of only 5,000 sqft strikes me as misguided and missing some nuance. The report's analysis at 17-20 appears to lump R-60 in with R-90 and R-200: "Furthermore, the majority of the undersized lots are located in the R-200 zone, where the optional method of development is the predominant type of development and allows lot areas as low as 6,000 SF. While most are substandard, they are still large enough to accommodate duplexes, triplex, and quadplexes, as shown in Figure 9."

While that is true enough, I do not see in the report where there is any consideration given to the fact that being 1,000 sqft undersized is a bigger deal proportionately for a 6,000 sqft lot than on a 20,000 sqft lot--in the former, the lot would be undersized by 1/6 of what it should be, in the latter, it is merely 5%. When you're dealing with a smaller lot size, those extra square feet matter.

This is particularly concerning given that Greenacres has a very high proportion of undersized R-60 lots in the neighborhood. Thus, the Initiative would permit an even greater number of people living on lots that are technically already undersized to accommodate current population density.

As such, the Initiative should reconsider the impact of permitting upzoning in areas where there is a high density of undersized lots at all--or at the least consider limiting development only to duplexes in undersized R-60 lots to account for the size issues I have mentioned.

Second, it seems that every week our listserv gets an email from the Little Falls Watershed Alliance about the high levels of fecal bacteria in the Little Falls and Willett Branch creeks. Obviously, a greater residence density in these areas would exacerbate the problem--more people and more pets living in the same space would increase fecal coliform contamination from those sources. It does not appear that an impact study has been conducted to review this important issue--what would the increased residency do to the fecal bacteria levels in the streams? This obviously should be given some consideration.

Katharine Vodraska - Chevy Chase, 20815

122
0

A quien corresponda:

Estoy en total desacuerdo en la iniciativa de planteamiento de cambiar la zonificacion del vecindario de Chevy Chase que afecta nuestro vecindario con la excusa de que se construyan viviendas mixtas con precios asequibles . Estoy seguro que los desarrolladores de proyectos/constructores plantearan diseno para construir viviendas costaran como minimo \$1,000,000. Eso es un precio asequible? los unicos beneficiados con este plantamiento son los constructores que se llenaran los bolsillos al maximizar sus utilidades por m2 destruyendo un vecindario tranquilo, donde no solo impactara con la contaminacion sonora, y de trafico sin considerar q como impactara a la calidad de educacion pues potencialmente incrementaria la demanda de estudiantes para acceder a escuelas publicas que estan colapsadas. Nos pueden demostrar un estudio de mercado indicando cuanto cuestan las viviendas mas cercanas en Chevy Chase Lake por ejemplo?? Por tanto me opongo rotundamente a su planteamiento.

Fabiola Perez - Olney, 20832

122
1

It sounds like a poorly thought out plan that will only benefit builders and contractors.

It doesn't pass the smell test- I'd like to know whose pockets are being lined in order to endorse and pass this plan.

Why destroy existing neighborhoods? "Attainable"

Housing doesn't sound like it will be affordable, and will destroy neighborhoods not equipped to handle extra traffic of people.

Our street does not have sidewalks and our local public elementary school is already making use of the portable classrooms. Riding a bicycle or a scooter in front of my house is already not safe, I can't imagine what a demolition crew, construction crew and more people and traffic will do to our neighborhood

If you really want to make housing attainable or affordable, I suggest using buildings that are not being utilized or areas that do not have existing homes. There are tons of buildings sitting empty because so many people work from home, why not start there!?!

Or instead of giving BUILDERS tax incentives, why not give that money DIRECTLY to the people that need it for housing!?!

Help them with down payments and tax credits, whatever money would go to builders then give that to the people instead

Also, have you considered the impact to our environment that results from knocking down houses!?

Also as it is, houses that go on the market always receive multiple offers from people that want to live there- why make it MORE competitive by introducing BUILDERS into the mix?

I suggest you listen to the people and not to small groups interested in getting rich

John Bates - Chevy Chase, 20815

122

2

I am strongly opposed to the Attainable Housing Initiative. It would destroy our historic neighborhood! I'm also concerned about the environmental impact as well as the increase in traffic and congestion. Thank you

Tom Gann - Chevy chase, 20815

122

3

I am a section 5 five resident. While more housing in our county makes sense, the process to achieve this goal requires more substantial data. Thus the county needs to hire objective research firms to determine the costs and benefits of the current development plan to take into consideration of the economic, environmental and social, quality of life perspectives. Until the council has done it homework, any large scale development strategy should be put on hold.

Drew Pollekoff - Chevy Chase, 20815

122

4

While the purported policy rationale and goals of this plan/proposal are admirable, we are deeply concerned that the plan/proposal is over-sweeping, without being properly vetted, without being supported by corresponding infrastructure investments in these areas and without taking into account the specific (and differentiated) needs of particular communities (including, as has been mentioned by myself and others in the listening sessions and in written communications on behalf of Section 5, with regards to preservation of greenery/trees, environmental, infrastructure, overcrowded school, parking, traffic congestion, cut-through traffic, and pedestrian safety concerns (which

are paramount in Section 5, CC – streets are extremely narrow and overcrowded and insufficient as it is; cars are parked on one side of the street, and it's unrealistic to think there will not be additional cars with an influx of duplexes and quadplexes being developed in the area)). Many questions, concerns and points that have been raised during the listening sessions have not been addressed and remain unanswered.

Of paramount concern to our strong opposition is the fact that there's no limiting principle and no check on developers. We're deeply concerned this will ultimately not only lead to unintended consequences, but also be counterproductive to the plan's purported goals with respect to affordable housing (i.e., pricing will be very high in desirable living areas, as developers, without any limiting principle or affordable housing requirements, will essentially have free range to develop expensive duplexes and quadplexes of up to 19 units).

122
5

Nicole Silver - Chevy Chase, 20815

I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the Attainable Housing Strategy Initiative (AHSI). Put simply, the AHSI is not right for MOCO.

In a prior letter to the Council Members, I raised various material reasons to oppose the AHSI, including: (i) the Planning Board's failure to conduct any, let alone robust, infrastructure studies; (ii) the dire financial consequences that will befall and potentially bankrupt the affected villages and municipalities; (iii) the vast opposition of the citizenry to the plan, which does not in any way address the need for affordable housing; and (iv) the failure to afford affected residents with due process and the right to vote.

Now, I would like to raise several additional points, which similarly militate against pushing through the AHSI.

First, the actual need for market rate units is far less than the Council Members and Planning Officials state is needed. In other words, the Planning Board's own evidence demonstrates that Montgomery County does not need the number of houses contemplated under the AHSI; indeed, the market area contemplated by the AHSI may be oversaturated with market rate houses that are not being sold or bought.

Second, the plan does not create affordable housing for MOCO residents, which is the type of housing that is actually needed. Moreover, there are multiple studies from other parts of the country, including in the Chicago suburbs, where similar plans resulted in long-time residents being displaced from their neighborhoods, particularly families of color.

Third, there is no pilot plan to see if this type of initiative will work and no caps on development. Further, current data suggests that the plan will fail. Only large apartments, senior housing, and "McMansions" are revenue neutral for the county — ALL other forms of housing development cost the county money because it needs to provide services for such housing, which means the residents will face increased property taxes and cuts in services, or both. To be sure, a County Council subcommittee met recently to discuss eliminating the two main taxes that would address needs like sidewalks and school overcrowding. A developer of a 150 unit building in Bethesda appeared to request a complete exemption from any transportation and school impact taxes.

This cannot stand. Our schools, which are already overcrowded, will be crippled. At the very least any plan implemented must recognize the density existing in the affected communities and provide appropriate guardrails on the overall density level to ensure that (more) overdevelopment cannot occur.

Fourth, a large portion of the affected population remains unaware of the proposed plan and how it may affect them and their homes and property taxes. The Council should therefore undertake a campaign to ensure public awareness of what is proposed and the process by which the proposal would be enacted. Notice of the proposed legislation should, therefore, be mailed to all households located within the impacted zone – R-40, R-60, R-90, R-200 – and to all communities abutting the Growth Corridors identified in Thrive Montgomery050.

Thank you again for your consideration and I urge you to press pause on the AHSI.

Tracy Van Grack - Chevy Chase, 20815

122
6

We are strongly against this housing initiative as currently proposed. Above all we are most concerned about the lack of analysis and plan (neither at the county level, and more importantly, at the neighborhood level) to accommodate increased density. This one size fits all approach fails to identify and factor in the impact this proposal would have on schools, traffic, parking, sanitation, the environment, and infrastructure. At a bare minimum, an undertaking of this magnitude should evaluate each of those potential impacts across each neighborhood so we can both optimize its stated goals while minimizing any negative impacts. Failure to proceed in that reasonable manner would not just be negligent, but a complete abdication of your responsibility as public servants. As an example, downtown Bethesda (and neighboring town of Chevy Chase) has increased materially in a relatively short period of time, with more high rises and thousands of residents to come. Yet there has been no effort to identify how the community—schools, traffic, parking etc —can absorb that influx, nevermind what would happen if this proposal was adopted. Already, traffic is often at a standstill, prohibiting residents from exiting out onto Wisconsin.

We hope you take these thoughts into consideration.

GORDON GRIFFIN - Chevy Chase, 20815

122
7

I categorically oppose this initiative. It fails to deliver true affordable housing for our county, is based on insufficient data, and does not adequately address critical issues such as education, infrastructure, and transportation. Instead, it prioritizes the interests of specific groups over the needs and desires of the broader population. Further, this initiative was not preceded by the requisite data gathering and constituent feedback solicitation that should be a predicate of any democratic process, especially one involving changes of this magnitude. If this initiative moves forward, I will not support Friedson for County Council or County Executive, and I will strongly advise those within my circle to do the same.

Adam Arkel - Chevy Chase, 20815

I oppose the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (the "Initiative") in its current form. I believe that the Initiative would negatively impact myself and thousands of Montgomery County homeowners without attaining the benefits the Initiative seeks to achieve. Below are several considerations:

1. The materials made available by the Planning Board in connection with the Initiative posit a housing "crisis" and an expected 200,000 person population increase for Montgomery County over 25 years. There appears to be no demonstration of how this projection is founded in any recently updated, methodologically sound analysis of relevant data and population trends. The County has a duty to attend to the needs of its residents who are here now. The authors of the Initiative fail to show why the current situation rises to the level of a "crisis" or what is the imminent danger that justifies applying the term "crisis" to the current situation.
2. The Initiative ignores or dismisses the ameliorative effect of numerous building projects that are either currently underway in the County or are substantially in the planning phase. The Initiative gives no apparent consideration of how market forces may adjust the price of housing in Montgomery County over time in light of evolving conditions. Rather than undertake such a rigorous analysis, the Initiative is proffered as an effort to achieve "equity" in housing. The Initiative's vision of "equity" would operate as a redistribution of housing value from current homeowners to those who would purchase "attainable" homes under the proposed zoning. As such, the Initiative by its terms would constitute a taking of value from current owners of single-family homes in Montgomery County. This goes far beyond the proper scope and purpose of zoning authority.
3. The Initiative would open the way to profound alteration in the affected single-family neighborhoods. Neighborhoods would be vulnerable to unremitting construction, crowding and congestion as developers seek to exploit the new zoning provisions. Thousands of existing homeowners in Montgomery County purchased their homes in the expectation of being able to enjoy peaceful, stable neighborhoods. Under the Initiative, they would be deprived of these benefits. Homeowners would be subject at any time to duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes and more in their immediate neighborhoods, with all the accompanying construction, congestion and disruption. The County in its current condition already suffers from crowding and congestion. The Initiative ignores any consideration of this impact. The Initiative tars the owners of single-family homes with the label "exclusionary" and ignores their legitimate interest in the benefits of the peaceful enjoyment of property ownership in stable neighborhoods.
4. The authors of the Initiative place reliance on the fact that other jurisdictions have enacted similar measures. Yet, these developments are new. Nowhere near enough time has elapsed to evaluate the experience of these other jurisdictions. There is no basis to conclude at this early stage that the Initiative will bring benefits to the residents of this County.
5. The Initiative will result in making Montgomery County a very unattractive place to live and raise a family. Residents will not be able to enjoy stability in their neighborhoods. Rather, they will be subject to the whimsies of developers and related interests. The result will be discord and friction throughout the affected areas of the County.

6. The authors of the Initiative make reference to various sorts of “engagement” with the community. To date, I have not received a single mailing or other communication from the County that explains, in plain language, what the Initiative could mean for me as an affected homeowner. The County should clearly explain to all affected homeowners how their neighborhoods could change as a result of the Initiative as currently proposed.

I thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter.

122
9

Angela Morrell - Chevy Chase, 20815

Dear Montgomery County Council,

While I understand there is a housing crisis, I cannot support the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative, as it does not effectively address the need for truly affordable housing. For example, attainable housing under this plan remains out of reach for many of our essential workers, including MC DOT bus operators (starting salary \$51,000), MC police officers (starting salary \$69,000), and MC public school teachers (starting salary \$70,000). Instead, it seems to primarily benefit developers rather than the residents who need affordable options.

I believe this county-wide zoning approach is not the right solution to the housing crisis. It risks negatively impacting our public schools, pedestrian and cyclist safety, traffic, stormwater management, green spaces, and parking. I urge you to reconsider and not approve the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative in its current form. We need a solution that truly serves our community’s needs.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Angela Morrell

123
0

Brian Friel - Chevy Chase, 20815

We 100% oppose this initiative. It will not result in more “attainable” housing, will enrich the developers and politicians they donate to, and ruin our neighborhoods. They are jamming this down our throats. Something this significant with long term impacts should at least be put on ballot for full vote by all residents. Oppose!!

123
1

Jean Sperling - Chevy Chase, 20815

This is a really bad idea that will create more problems than it solves.

123

2

Jessica Jones - Olney, 20832

I am opposed to the AHS proposed by the Planning Board. This plan has not shown any viable improvement to the current Montgomery County housing deficit. City planning, master planning, neighborhood planning, allocating schools for number of houses built, having roads to support traffic, parks and green space, basic access to water and electricity are critical to the development and preservation of living spaces. All of these essential needs will be strained with the current plan. This plan is poorly thought out and completely under developed in it strategy and implementation. It should not be allowed to move forward. As representatives of Montgomery County residents, and by choosing to run for office and be public servants, I have an expectation of my fellow public servants to put the wellbeing of the county and it's residents first.

This plan is a focus on fulfilling the interest of developers. New builds are not "attainable" in Montgomery County. In the last 3 months, 59 townhouses have been sold that were built 2023/2024. Not a single one sold for less than 555,000 dollars. And the new build townhouses that are south of 370/200 all sold for over 680,000 dollars. My understanding is that one of the core groups to be served by "attainable" housing is civil servants. In 2022, the average Montgomery County Employee salary was \$86,440. Double that to make a two-income household and you get \$172,880. That is right between the average household income in Montgomery County (\$184,600) and the median household income (\$125,371). Not one of these amounts of income can afford a \$555,000 without contributing more than 20% of their income, which needs to also includes principle, interest, insurance (mine went up last year, did yours?) and taxes (mine have gone up over 13% in the last 2 years – but you already knew that one). It is recommended that the very top % that a person should contribute to housing is 28%. Well,

28% of 86,440/12 months = \$2,016, that is the mortgage for a house costing about \$335,000

28% of 125,371/12months = \$2,925, that is the mortgage for a house costing about \$500,000

28% of 172,880/12months = \$4,033 that is the mortgage for a house costing about 700,000

28% of 184,600/12months = \$4,307, that is the mortgage for a house costing about 725,000

What do all these numbers mean. The AHS does not create attainable housing for Montgomery County residents. At best, it creates a handful of townhouses at the stretching top budget of the missing middle, if attainable at all. This does not help County employees who build our roads, provide our public safety, does not help our teachers, or our civil servants trying to meet the needs and services of our county residents. I will not vote for a council member who approves this plan. And if 125,371 is the middle – that means 50% is below that and it becomes even less affordable. If it excludes out that large of a population, than I can not support it and my public officials should not either.

123

3

Thomas Dann - Chevy Chase, 20815

Dear County Council,

My wife Melissa Dann and I strongly support the positions set forth by the Chevy Chase Village Board of Managers in its letter dated October 17, 2024.


While there may be broad support for the proposition that the county needs more affordable housing, the Planning Department's focus on "attainable housing" is entirely misguided and likely to lead to unintended consequences. There is insufficient evidence that there is not enough "available housing", but even more to the point, the measure proposed to rezone Chevy Chase Village would only contribute to the availability of luxury housing. As a case in point, the apartment buildings recently built at Connecticut Avenue and Manor Road all bill themselves as "luxury apartments". So, the likely result of the proposed zoning is to open Chevy Chase Village to construction of luxury apartments, which don't sound particularly "attainable" except to the wealthy.

This all begs the question of whose interests are really being served by the proposed zoning change, people in genuine need of housing that they can afford, or developers who are in need of additional luxury housing inventory that they can sell? It is clearly the latter.

This cynical motive underlying the proposed rezoning is further underscored by the equally cynical process by which this entire rezoning has been undertaken in a manner calculated to minimize community input. The original draft of the planning report recommended denser zoning within 100 feet of major traffic corridors, but then without further public comment the final report was released with a recommendation to rezone for greater density within 500 feet of traffic corridors -- thus including the entirety of Chevy Chase Village. And this was done at a time over the summer when many residents were away for vacation.

The bottom line is that the process for developing this zoning proposal has been flawed from the outset, so it should come as no surprise that the most pressing housing need in the county -- for affordable housing -- has been ignored and in fact undermined. That need cannot be addressed by building more density into expensive neighborhoods like Chevy Chase Village, because the basic economics for private developers will dictate that only luxury housing could be profitably developed -- which seems to be exactly the point of the supposed "attainable housing" proposal.

Sincerely,
Thomas and Melissa Dann


Chevy Chase Village

Peter Herscovitch - Chevy Chase, 20815

123

4

I live in the village of North Chevy Chase in Montgomery County. I am writing to express my very strong opposition to the county's Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHSI). In my neighborhood and many others, AHSI will not achieve the positive results that it intends, and in fact, will result in negative impacts. The single-family homes in my neighborhood are rather expensive, so converting these properties to multiunit housing, such as triplexes and quadruplexes, will not result in attainable housing. It will result in condos or town

houses that will cost 6, 7 and \$800,000 or more. This will not be affordable for our county's teachers, first responders, nurses, etc. However, AHSI will have several negative impacts, on parking, traffic congestion, water management, trees and green spaces, and school crowding. But of course, it will benefit property developers, who are known to donate to politicians running for county office.

Furthermore, I feel this initiative represents an unconstitutional government taking. When I bought my house, it was not only for the value of my dwelling, but also for the value of my charming NCC neighborhood of single-family homes. By allowing conversion of single-family dwellings into condos and town homes, Montgomery County will be taking a lot of what I value in my neighborhood away from me without just compensation.

So given my strong opposition to the proposed AHSI, I am most interested on knowing how you plan to vote and how you actually vote on this disruptive plan. It shouldn't come as a surprise that how you vote will affect how I vote and donate in future county elections

Elizabeth Goldberg - Chevy Chase, 20815

123
5

We are absolutely opposed to the proposal regarding "Attainable Housing Strategies". The proposal would not be either "attainable" economically for any but the most well off future home buyers. And it is not strategic since it is not based on updated, accurate data regarding projections for population, employment and available land in Montgomery County for this purpose. In addition, there is no evidence presented by the Planning Department for impact studies on water and waste management, roads, transportation, parking, education and safety. Furthermore, any proposal of this magnitude, requires full transparency and opportunity for ample public hearings, comments and participation by the taxpayers who are paying your salaries. The recent 30 second opportunity to speak at a single listening session is a badly disguised mockery of citizen and community participation. Before you approve transforming historic 100+ year old single family neighborhoods and communities, we suggest you do a proper needs assessment study of housing based on updated population and jobs trends and an exhaustive evaluation of existing degraded, underutilized, or vacant land in your transportation corridors. My husband and I have been homeowners for 50 years and we do not approve of "Attainable Housing Strategies". If this project continues to go blindly forward at the expense of residents' opinions, you may regret your actions at the next election.

Maria Dias Raynal - BETHESDA, 20816-1235

123
6

Addendum

Your proposal destroys the quality of life of those who live here. Additionally, what you are proposing will not provide economic equity. It is apparent that very little thought has been put into your proposal. Springfield is an established neighborhood. I feel violated by your desire to make unrealistic changes that have no merit. You are also increasing our property taxes. Stop.

123
7

Patricia Kolesar - Bethesda, 20816

No one wants this proposal - I second all comments submitted by Springfield Civic Assn and the CCCFH on this matter of proposed "attainable housing strategies." Stop ruining neighborhoods.

123
8

Giovanni recchia - CHEVY CHASE, 20815

Giovanni Recchia [REDACTED]

I am absolutely opposed to our County Council adopting the current Planning Boards Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative proposal (AHS) to eliminate single-family zoning throughout most of the established Montgomery County neighborhoods. I urge you to reject the AHS until it is substantially revised.

The current AHS should be returned to the Planning Board with clear direction to:

1. Modify it to be less radical, abrupt, and all-encompassing in form;
2. Establish measurable objectives, such as how many units will be re-developed, in what price ranges and over what periods of time;
3. Develop a phased-in "Pilot Program" implementation for a scaled down AHS;
4. Establish some semblance of monitoring and control over the AHS implementation to determine if the AHS is meeting its objectives; and,
5. Minimize the environmental and financial impact on current and future County residents.

I have attended two listening sessions and spent untold hours reviewing the AHS and other Planning Board documents. It is clear to me that the AHS, while voluminous in form, is weak in supporting documentation regarding how the AHS will meet its objectives or benefit the current and future residents of the County. Granting private sector developers largely unfettered rights to re-develop our current neighborhoods with only broad, vague, and ethereal limitations is a roll of the dice regarding desired outcomes.

While many of the goals set forth in the AHS are laudable, the County Council is taking no responsibility for developing a process to ensure success of the AHS. In its current form, the AHS would allow the County Council to outsource to the private sector their elected responsibilities to the current and future residents of the County. Private sector developers have no responsibility to the residents of the County and can be predictably expected to act only in their own self-interest. Delegating to the private sector the authority to re-develop

housing units and implement the AHS does not relieve the County Council of oversight responsibility to its current and future residents. This approach only serves to privatize profits while socializing ill effects of poorly thought-out re-development.

As the AHS currently exists, the only certain result of implementation is increased density of housing with no assurance that inclusionary and attainable objectives would be met. There should be clear, actionable, and measurable objectives in the AHS that assure that attainability will be met. For instance, the AHS should state how many new units are targeted for re-development and into what price range those units should fall. For the sweeping changes set forth in the AHS, setting measurable goals should not be avoided or viewed as too difficult to develop. If the County Council is unable, for whatever reason, to establish clear AHS re-development objectives and monitor the progress toward those objectives, then the AHS is too complex and unworkable and should be vastly scaled back or eliminated.

No matter how laudable the goals of the AHS, how many hours have been utilized in its development, or how significant the resources expended, the AHS in its current form is lacking in substance and even the basics of control over its vast, impactful, and permanent changes to the county. One only needs to look at two major disastrous programs to see that well intentioned changes do not make for a successful implementation. During the late 1970's and 1980's lessening the oversight and regulation of the Savings and Loan industry with a goal of increasing availability of housing units and allowing the private sector to take the lead, led to a collapse of that industry in the late 1980's and 1990's. Over 700 Savings and Loans were declared bankrupt and closed, with a substantially negative effect on the overall national and many local economies, while accruing billions of dollars in bail-out debt that we will pass on to future generations. In the 2000's the laudable concept that everyone should have access to residential mortgage financing led to decreased supervision of residential and commercial lending underwriting and a proliferation of subprime real estate loans. Lack of adequate government regulation and reliance on private sector judgement led to a near total collapse of our economy, massive losses to borrowers, lenders and retirement accounts, and more billions of dollars in debt to be paid-off by the taxpayers of the current and future generations.

With the unproven benefits of the AHS, why is there no "Pilot Program" proposed? No one knows what benefits or unintended consequences will result from implementing the AHS. Only through a thoughtful "Pilot Program" or "Proof of Concept" will the County Council be able to assess if the program is moving in a successful direction or if additional changes in the AHS need to be made. The "all in" nature of the AHS sets the stage for a program that develops in an irreversible manner which was not intended, damages our current neighborhoods, and does not meet the objectives for improving the diversity and inclusion in our housing stock. The County Council should strictly limit the number of units to be re-developed over the next five years, with limitations on the density by neighborhood and then conduct a critical look back evaluation of the modified AHS.

While the "Pattern Book" has been referenced by County Officials as a control over the appearance of re-developed properties, to my knowledge there is no substantial information regarding what the completed "Pattern Book" will look like or what it will require. Adopting the AHS, as is, without a finalized "Pattern Book" does not provide any meaningful control over re-development of our neighborhoods. With the possible substantial and permanent impacts to our neighborhoods allowed by the AHS, its approval without a finalized "Pattern Book" is nothing more than an unsubstantiated talking point the County Council should not buy-in to.

During one of the AHS Listening Sessions, County representatives were questioned regarding the success of the Auxiliary Dwelling Unit Program (ADU). I was shocked to hear that the County representatives could not provide even the barest of information regarding the ADU implementation, such as number of units constructed, number of residents served, or the rental costs of those units. The ADU was promoted as addressing many of the same issues identified in the AHS. If the County Council is not monitoring its current programs designed to provide increased density and lessen the cost of living in the County, I do not understand why the Council would approve a much more impactful AHS without increased controls or monitoring.


Much reference is made to the elimination of Single-Family Dwelling Zoning in other municipalities. What I do not see is a thoughtful and critical analysis of the outcomes of those programs and what the differences are between the demographics of municipalities such as Minneapolis and Montgomery County.

I am also concerned about the environmental and financial impacts of implementing the AHS. While the AHS may add additional housing density, it will do so at an environmental cost and impact. Perfectly adequate, functional, and well-built housing will be torn down, with the detritus hauled off to landfill sites and wasted. Doing so will squander the natural resources originally utilized to build the existing units and expose our neighborhoods to increased construction traffic, dust, exposure to hazardous materials, and overall disruption. Once the existing structures are demolished, an even greater allocation of resources will be required to rebuild prior housing that was perfectly serviceable and usable. Many existing trees will be cut down and green spaces that serve to absorb rainfall will be lost and require additional infrastructure to handle runoff. It also appears that the AHS re-development does not take into account the increased burden on our current infrastructure such as water, sewer, rain water absorption and road systems. I can not imagine that an infrastructure developed and maintained for single-family dwellings would successfully absorb an unlimited number of "by right" additional duplexes, triplexes, quads or 19-unit buildings. Our infrastructure will eventually need to be improved to support the increased density at significant cost to current and future County residents. The cost of all this re-development should be borne by the private sector developers and the cost should not be socialized to all residents who do not benefit from new housing units.

While I have a very negative view of the AHS, as currently proposed, I do encourage the County Council to devote more action towards developing Affordable Housing in Montgomery County. Our residents that qualify for Affordable Housing are in great need and have few options. I encourage the County Council to scale-back the AHS and to focus more time and resources towards meeting our County's Affordable Housing Needs.

Sincerely-

Giovanni Recchia



Chevy Chase, MD 20815

123
9 **Elizabeth McCluskey - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I'm opposed to the plan as it currently stands. there has not been a thorough analysis of the implications of such a plan in terms of sewage, wastewater, traffic, school crowding, tree canopy, etc. Without considering these impacts and necessary offsets or improvements to the community's infrastructure, the ramifications of adding such density to single family neighborhoods such as section 5 would be disastrous. I encourage our council members to listen to their constituents who are vehemently opposed to this plan.

124
0 **Mathews Pierson - Bethesda, 20817**

Oct 18, 2024

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

Dear Members of the Montgomery County Council,

On behalf of the neighbors of Kenwood and the Kenwood Citizen's Association we submit the following comments in regards to the County Council's Attainable Housing Strategies.

Many of Kenwood's residents are for increased development in Montgomery County. We also understand and support efforts for more affordable housing in Montgomery County. Unfortunately, the Attainable Housing Strategies in its current form is flawed and is unlikely to lead to an increase in affordable housing supply. The initiative is also likely to produce many negative side effects, especially in regards to traffic and strains on infrastructure.

The Goal of Affordable Housing:

First and foremost, the new policy is unlikely to actually result in affordable housing. The name of the initiative as "Attainable Housing" rather than "Affordable Housing" admits as much. Any sober reflection of the economics involved in many of the down county areas targeted for rezoning would reach the conclusion that duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes would be beyond attainable housing parameters, let alone affordable levels, due to land acquisition and construction costs. As the County Executive Elrich has pointed out, \$1,000,000 per unit appears to be a likely starting point for any of these units which does not solve attainable or affordable needs. Another likely scenario

given these economics, is an increase in rental properties. In down county areas, these are likely to be high rent luxury units, and in farther out regions of the county these units run a high risk of absentee landlords disrupting the fabric of neighborhoods regardless of rental prices.

Transportation:

The wholesale rezoning of the entire county without regard to location of supporting infrastructure will lead to increased congestion at both the local and countywide levels. Current high density development is positioned along corridors with public transportation and/or robust automobile infrastructure to handle the increase in transportation users.

Many of the neighborhoods that are intended for increased density through this policy are already experiencing unacceptable levels of traffic due to existing constraints on infrastructure that promote cut-through traffic. Adding density in and around these neighborhoods would exasperate an already troublesome issue. Any policies to increase affordable housing must be targeted to accommodate the increased demands for transportation infrastructure.

The comments above are not meant to be exhaustive, and we want to hue to concrete issues beyond amorphous arguments about the character and feel of communities. However, we do recognize that the character and feel of communities that will be impacted is deeply troubling to many citizens of Montgomery County. That should not be read as NIMBYism, but as care and concern for one's community.

We welcome additional opportunities to discuss the laudable goal of affordable housing in ways that actually increase the inventory of affordable housing and have a minimum of unintended consequences.

Sincerely,

Mathews Pierson
President, Kenwood Citizens Association

Cc:
Gabe Albornoz
Marilyn Balcombe
Natali Fani-González
Andrew Friedson, President
Evan Glass

Will Jawando
Sidney Katz
Dawn Luedtke
Kristin Mink
Laurie-Anne Sayles
Kate Stewart, Vice President

124
1 **Debra Graham - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I wish to echo the concerns raised by the Chevy Chase Village Board of Managers and oppose the Planning Board recommendations and ask the Council and the Planning Board to revisit their overall approach.

My concerns include the ways in which the plan will change the historic nature of Chevy Chase Village, add to the already taxed infrastructure including the roads, schools, and storm water management. I am also concerned that the plan may not address the root causes of affordable housing and may even make housing more expensive.

124
2 **George Mickum - Bethesda, 20816**

I am fundamentally against this proposal.

124
3 **Elizabeth Melcher - Kensington, 20895**

First, I agree that single family zoning is too restrictive and should give way to more diverse housing types in the county. My Kensington neighborhood will still have both its charm and its amenities if other types of housing are built. BUT I am deeply skeptical of the role developers play in this process and fear they will be the primary winners here. I think developers already have too many incentives to build overly large and expensive houses instead of renovating those smaller “tear downs” as attainable options for families. I certainly want developers to contribute to added infrastructure costs and believe there should be limits on the size and price points of what they build. There is a perception that this proposal plays to developers. The county can counteract that perception either with additional conditions on developers or with information that refutes it. Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on this topic.

124
4 **Sheri Steisel Weiss - Rockville, 20852**

Members of the Montgomery County Council and Members of the Planning Board-

I write to you as President of the Luxmanor Citizens Association (LCA). Established in the 1930’s, LCA is the civic and community association that represents Luxmanor, Windermere and The Oaks. We live in a residential community of almost 900 households, schools, businesses

and religious institutions. LCA is very concerned with the Board's Attainable Housing Strategies (AHS) initiative to the Montgomery County Council. We understand that as of today there is no legislation before the Council to implement the AHS initiative. However, we are compelled by the Board's listening sessions and virtual presentation to address our concerns directly to the Montgomery County Planning Board and the Montgomery County Council.

Our community has been proactive in addressing the implementation of our County's growing population and housing needs. For years, our community members have sat, and continue to sit on County committees that address growth and housing initiatives by this County. We appreciate the need to address growth from both a financial perspective for the County as well as a legal one to provide housing opportunities for all.

That being said, we have deep concerns regarding the implementation of the AHS initiative and its formation.

First, this plan does not address housing affordability.

In fact, the Planning Board has acknowledged that this plan is not about affordability. In study launched three years ago, the Planning Board concluded that new townhouses in Silver Spring would cost between \$700,000 and \$855,000, and townhomes are already well exceeding those prices in downtown Silver Spring. The average income of Black and Hispanic residents is about \$75,000. This is a clear indication that those homes are not affordable. In fact, those communities are facing possible displacement with this proposal.

More recently, a townhome in Bethesda is on the market for \$3.65 million. It was built on a lot that previously had one single-family home; that home was sold for \$1.6 million, and a developer has now built three townhomes on that property. While a \$3.65 million home may make the homes down the street that sell for \$1.5 million to \$2 million look less expensive, it does nothing to address affordability – that \$2 million home is still out of reach for most.

The goal of addressing the "missing middle" with attainable housing must honestly address the cost of housing. This proposal will not do this. At this price point, it will price out the families it is trying to serve.

Because Attainable Housing is housing policy that does not have an affordable housing component and does not increase the amount of affordable housing, it raises the question of what is Planning Board trying to accomplish?

Second, people need clear notice of AHS.

These large turnouts at the public listening sessions reflect only a small percentage of who is affected, and if it were to be approved as currently proposed, these residents would have no say in the process because the development would be "by right." 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.

While Council President Andrew Friedson has been clear to explain that there is no legislation currently before the Council, the Planning Board has recommended this proposal and sent it to the Council for their approval.

Third, the Planning proposal is premature.

It is based on theory, not solid plans based on real-world assessments. This plan undoes most of the master plans around the county, and it is the master plan process that affords an opportunity for residents to weigh in and for careful review of impacts on neighborhoods and infrastructure.

Fourth, there has been no review of the impacts to the infrastructure and the environment.

No studies have been done on AHS's impact on the environment—what will happen to trees? Will there be an increase in impervious or paved surfaces, and what will that mean to potential flooding?

With climate change, our neighborhood has faced increased flooding and overflowing storm drains. Our community has sustained catastrophic damage from stormwater. Homes have been flooded, basements and valuables destroyed, and WSSC infrastructure seriously compromised.

There is also no study about the impact on the schools. There is no consideration of how this proposal would align with the impact of already approved buildings on school overcrowding. There is no consideration of traffic and congestion impacts as well. There is no discussion of a process to consider community impacts as well as the impact of development projects being implemented and in the pipeline.

A master plan process considers the impacts of infrastructure needs in a much more deliberative manner.

We need adequate infrastructure to accompany development. This initiative has no evaluation of what we need and what it will cost.

A few years ago, the Planning Board recommended to the Council a revision to the County's General Plan, called Thrive 2050. As part of the Council's review of Thrive, the Executive departments had to provide cost estimates as part of the review. Those estimates were in the billions of dollars, far beyond our normal spending. Alarming though, the then-Planning Board Chair and a then-Councilmember dismissed the study by simply saying, 'We don't believe it.' No analysis, no study, just we don't believe it and we're not considering it. That is not meaningful planning.

AHS is a massive rezoning that could affect about 164,000 homes, and yet a thorough and careful analysis of this proposal is missing. That is absolutely not fair to our residents

We all agree that housing affordability is a major concern, both for people wanting to become homeowners and for renters. Attainable housing is a laudable goal. Unfortunately, this proposal does not help them and threatens to damage our beautiful and diverse County.

Sincerely,
Sheri Steisel Weiss
President,
LCA
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Betsy Dodson - Bethesda, 20816

124
5

I live in the Springfield neighborhood in Bethesda, between River Road and Massachusetts Avenue. I am opposed to the AHSI proposal to change zoning in our single-family home neighborhood to allow duplexes throughout and quadplexes along the River Road corridor. I do feel Montgomery County needs more affordable housing, particularly inside the beltway, but it seems that most of what has been built over the past 10 years has largely been market-rate housing that has done little to provide housing to middle-income residents who would like to own a home as opposed to rent. A number of townhomes have been built near us, by EYA, with another 70+ in the works at Westbard, and all but 3 or 4 have been \$1.2 million plus. I can't imagine that's an affordable price-point for families making under \$150k per year.

Single-family homes are important, preserve much-needed green space at homeowner expense and should not be wiped-out for the sake of expensive, high density townhome structures. Please go back to the drawing board to find other alternatives that would increase the inventory of starter-homes and condos without eliminating the majority of single-family homes in 20816.

Thank you.

JP Raynal - Bethesda, 20816

124
6

I am against the proposed AHSI in the Springfield neighborhood.

Laura Simo - Chevy Chase, 20815

124
7

As a resident of Chevy Chase Village, I strongly oppose the AHSI for all the procedural and substantive concerns clearly outlined by the Chevy Chase Village Board of Managers in their letter to Montgomery Country Council dated October 17, 2024. The only beneficiaries from the AHSI are the developers who will build as much market-rate housing as cheaply and fast as they can - to maximize their profits - at the

expense of what few attainably-priced properties remain in the Village. I am fairly recent resident (12 years, after renting in Alexandria, VA, for 7 years before that) and live outside the Historic District, where I believe the greatest amount of development will take place. We are already experiencing perfectly fine, well-built, early- to mid-20th century houses being purchased in the \$1,000,000s and "flipped" up to the \$4,000,000s - with the entire structure demolished or expanded upon to the maximum allowable. These behemoths are already impacting drainage on neighboring properties and the Village's stormwater infrastructure as they cover more land and take down more trees, not to mention all the disruption caused by their construction. They are harbingers of what will happen under the AHSI: the character of not just the Historic District but the entire Village, creating problems where none currently exist even as it fails to meet its objectives of attainability, diversity and inclusion. On that note, I was outraged to learn that the AHSI only applied to 82% - and not all - of Montgomery County, and at both listening sessions I attended (Chevy Chase Village Hall and B-CC High School) felt slighted by County personnel who repeatedly labelled residents as "affluent" and having "inherited wealth." While that is true for many in Bethesda-Chevy Chase, it is most certainly not true for all, who work hard and long to be able to live here. This ham-handed, one-size-fits-all legislation-by-stereotype is not the solution to creating the viable, vibrant communities I believe Montgomery County has and supports. Thank you.

Lyric Winik - Chevy Chase, 20815

124
8

Two additional questions: when it comes to du-tri-quadplexes: where is the cost analysis? Each unit will require separate kitchens, multiple bathrooms, and it's own HVAC and hot water system. These are some of the most expensive components of a house -- and many will need to be specially sized for design and space. There is a presumption that simple math allows a duplex to be half the cost of a single family house -- but that is not the case in terms of basic systems. In fact, it may well be far more in terms of price per square foot and less in terms of affordability. Nothing in the presentations or discussions has addressed this basic issue. Second, mandatory WSSC and Washington Gas repairs in some of the older neighborhoods in the county have uncovered severe, unexpected issues and deficits in the infrastructure that are very disruptive and costly to fix. Has any study been done of those impacts and issues? Who will pay for repairs and how? Will there be enough crews and capacity to handle emergencies and long repairs? Because there is definitely infrastructure that cannot handle any increased density. Please directly address these issues in your future discussions.

Pete Rizik - Chevy Chase, 20815

124
9

Please reconsider the attainable housing strategy before legislation is enacted. The recent Chevy Chase High School event (Sept 2024) showed a rump hand-raise poll at about 80% against it. The way to achieve attainable housing is not by attacking generational wealth or single family home neighborhoods in lower MoCo. Let's figure out how to boost MoCo tax revenues and attract skilled workers to MoCo through other means. Lifting or relaxing zoning hasn't worked in other communities and it will result in lawsuits and a lot of division here in MoCo. Most know there are many buildable lots and areas outside of lower MoCo (old white flint mall?). If the objective is to make Bethesda a walkable community, please come out and say it so we can figure out how to develop that without injuring the many seniors who cannot walk or ride bikes into and out of Bethesda.

Edward Glynn - Bethesda, 20814

125
0

This proposal would undercut the expectations and economic aspirations of many Montgomery County residents who have, over the years, invested in housing which reflects certain assumptions about the neighborhoods in which they have chosen to live. While increasing

affordable housing is a laudable goal, care should be taken not to undercut the dreams of the people whose hard earned assets are reflected in the homes of the neighborhoods they have chosen as their own.

125 Shaazka Beyerle - Chevy Chase, 20815

1

AHSI is touted as a tool to address an acute housing shortage, and the need for a diversity of housing options for what the Planning Board describes as the “missing middle.” Council members and Planning Board officials say that MOCO needs 31,000 more housing units by 2030. [https://montgomeryplanningboard.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Local-Housing-Targets-Planning-Board-07.20.2023_Final.pdf] But we already have this capacity and more. The Planning Board’s own data for September 2024 shows there are 35,240 approved but not yet built housing units of all types throughout our county. [https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/Sep2024Pipeline_RecordLevel.pdf]. And a 2020 Planning Board study found that the county, excepting the separately zoned Rockville and Gaithersburg municipalities, had zoned capacity for 65,000 units. [<https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/housing/residential-development-capacity-analysis/>]

The housing crisis is for affordable housing, which AHSI doesn’t address because it’s based on market prices. Let’s look at the math. For example, what would a triplex unit cost in Zone R-60 and is this attainable housing for the missing middle? Two years ago a 1965 house sold for 1.6 million and a triplex was built. The West Avenue units went on the market last month. Guess how much? The asking price for one unit is 3.475 million... [https://www.zillow.com/homedetails/6980-West-Ave-Chevy-Chase-MD-20815/441697721_zpid/] The Planning Board states: “Attainable housing is not income-restricted nor part of an affordable housing problem – it’s offered at market rate – but because of its ‘middle’ status and location, it tends to be attainable for middle-income households due to their smaller size.” [<https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/housing/attainable-housing-strategies-initiative/>]. Essentially, this is shrinkflation – pay market prices and if you buy something small enough, it will be attainable. What could a missing middle household get if a triplex unit in Zone R-60 is 3.475 million – a closet?

If AHSI is passed as is, it will affect over 80% of MOCO, and increase density in some of the most highly dense parts of the county. Does that make sense? Citizens from various communities in MOCO have voiced their concerns, including: 1) gentrification and displacement of moderately-priced single family homes will be sold, torn down, including those owned by moderate income people of color; 2) added overcrowding of already overcrowded schools; 3) unpassable streets for emergency vehicles, school buses, garbage trucks from increased street parking (due to reduced parking requirements); 4) dangerous conditions for pedestrians and children, particularly in communities which don’t have sidewalks; 5) increased demands on aging infrastructure (electricity, sewage, stormwater) that cannot handle a surge in density and impact of climate change; 6) no impact assessment done; 7) increased taxes to pay for new infrastructure and big giveaways to developers; 8) loss of tree cover; 9) superficial effort to inform citizens; 10) limited opportunities for citizen input; 11) AHSI’s one-size-fits-all approach violates County and County Council commitments in Thrive 2050 to preserve and respect the existing Zoning Ordinance, and such an approach ignores existing high-density levels in some areas; 12) AHSI is a developer giveaway.

Citizens - taxpayers - demand that the Council sends AHSI back to the Planning Board to genuinely research cases from around the US to draw lessons of innovative approaches to spur the creation of moderately-priced housing. Then the Planning Board should propose a new plan that is shared with all county residents through a mailing and Zone-by-Zone community consultations. Already existing proposals to create real moderately-prices housing include:

- Set aside attainable and affordable housing in developments on County land. The Council should direct the Planning Board to examine all County-owned land and, where feasible, mandate that a percentage of any new development be devoted to affordable and mid-market/attainable housing.
- Evaluate the feasibility of converting vacant schools into housing. County-owned schools vacant for a number of years could be evaluated to be converted into housing.
- Create incentives to convert office buildings into residential housing. Just as the County has low interest loan programs for owners of naturally occurring affordable housing to renovate and maintain their existing units, the County could create incentives to convert office buildings and hotels, particularly low-rise buildings, into housing. This trend of office conversions to housing is already happening in DC and in the Virginia suburbs.
- Survey the owners of the 363 licensed ADUs to see if they are addressing the needs of seniors and middle-income families.
- Establish deed-restricted affordable housing units. In order to provide affordable housing for local workers, Vail, Colorado developed a deed-restricted housing program that limited resale price or rental rates for certain properties to ensure they remain affordable, categorized properties into different affordability levels to serve a range of local workers, and offered developers incentives to include deed-restricted units in their projects. Montgomery County could explore this and other alternatives for providing more housing for teachers, firefighters, policewomen/men, and other first responders employed by the County. A program that truly focuses on the needs of its employees might even make Montgomery County more competitive in attracting officers to our woefully understaffed police department.

125

2

Susan Glynn - Bethesda, 20814

I am very strongly opposed to the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. Quadplex housing does not belong in single-family zoned neighborhoods.

125

3

Larry Wasson - Chevy Chase, 20815

I am against the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. I am a registered voter and will vote accordingly.

125

4

Lu Breault - Chevy Chase, 20815

I am strongly opposed to the AHSI. I will list a few of many reasons.
Inadequate parking
Over crowded schools

	<p>Storm water management Squeezes out young families who would like to live in this neighborhood Changes completion of a neighborhood in which many homes, including mine are over 100 years old. I purchased this home in 2002 with a promise of single family zoning and a mature neighborhood/community. This only size fits all zoning is absurd.</p>
125 5	<p>Mark Zalubas - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>My biggest concerns about this plan is that no studies were performed to estimate its potential effects on individuals, families, neighborhoods, traffic patterns, and unintended consequences. It appears to have been considered only on its financial impact to the county. That may be all that's important to the county leaders, but it's not all that's important to its residents. Before implementing a plan that could dramatically change the landscape and vibe of long-established neighborhoods, it seems reasonable to do some studies and modeling. Also, a one-size-fits-all strategy for all areas doesn't seem reasonable either. Listen to the residents and protect our interests too, please. >Mark Zalubas</p>
125 6	<p>Althea Harlin - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I strongly oppose the AHSI and its wholesale repudiation of single family zoning applicable to my property, my village municipality, and the surrounding Chevy Chase community. This initiative blithely ignores the reality of current physical conditions on my street and many others in Chevy Chase, including narrow one lane streets, limited parking, and storm drainage issues, as well as legitimate community concerns about how AHSI will impact school enrollment, municipal services currently provided by the village governments, and the environmental impact of increased density. It also does not take into account the limited land use authority granted to our local municipalities regarding construction activity that help ensure the livability of our neighborhoods. The initiative fails to adequately address and give due consideration to all of these facts and issues and should be rejected by the Council as overreaching, premature, and inconsistent with the needs of Montgomery County citizens.</p>
125 7	<p>Dan Martin - Bethesda, 20816</p> <p>We are completely opposed to this proposal and do not believe the planning people have examined this issue thoroughly. The recent groundbreaking of townhouses at Westbard were supposed to be affordable housing but at \$1 million per unit is not our idea of affordable housing. To wholesale an entire neighborhood such as Springfield to rezone it is absurd. Rethink this horrible proposal.</p>
125 8	<p>Greg Cope - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I am writing to register my strongest opposition to the AHSI. Based on my review of the proposal and after attending an informational meeting with the Planning Department, it appears that this proposal is a sweeping proposal to solve a problem that does not exist. There is ample supply of housing that has been approved but not yet built to address the demand anticipated for the next several years. Approving a wholesale reasoning without consideration of each neighborhood's infrastructure and without making developers pay for upgrades to the infrastructure will result in many problems with our schools, runoff, traffic, parking, etc. The proposal also upends all prior urban planning and attempts to turn residential neighborhoods into an area similar to downtown Bethesda. This runs counter to the promises of the</p>

County Counsel when Thrive 2050 was adopted. If developers want to build multifamily housing in neighborhoods, then they should follow the current zoning rules and go through a public hearing process on a project by project basis so that proper consideration of the impacts of these developments can be understood by the community and permit objections to be raised. I also fear that the AHSI will adversely impact property values and change the character of certain neighborhoods. I think that these changes if adopted will cause many families to vote with their feet and move to other communities, including Virginia and DC, that provide the residential neighborhood feel that they currently enjoy, which could further reduce property values and adversely impact the County tax base.

Kevin Bromberg - Chevy Chase, 20815

125
9

I have been a resident of Section 5, Chevy Chase, since 1979, and I strongly oppose the imposition of this extreme and unsupported plan to rezone 82% of currently single-family homes in Montgomery County. After carefully reviewing THRIVE 2050 and the AHSI plan, it is evident that neither the Planning Commission nor the Council has engaged in meaningful planning. These documents seem to be based on assumptions, animus against single-family zoning, and unsupported conclusions. In my 45 years in Chevy Chase, I don't recall such egregiously misguided action by the County. For those of us familiar with local history, this feels reminiscent of the Clarksburg debacle. It is clear that over the past two years, the Council and the Planning Board have not been listening to the citizens. The much-repeated claim of substantial public outreach has hardly reached even a small fraction of the affected population. In fact, even today, within the highly informed Section 5 community of 225 households, I estimate that fewer than half of the residents are even aware of this proposal. However, all of Section 5, as well as residents across Montgomery County, will remember how the Council has handled this proposal when the next election arrives.

A few key points:

1. While the AHSI is full of rhetoric around admirable goals such as affordable housing, racial and economic diversity, and equity—objectives universally supported by the citizens of Section 5—it fails to demonstrate that eliminating single-family housing will actually achieve any of these goals. This plan is a mirage, pretending to accomplish progressive objectives, with no real chance of doing so.
2. The County Planning Board has neglected to examine the substantial adverse effects of implementing the AHSI, including impacts on parking, schools, transportation, housing prices, public safety, public facilities, stormwater management, senior accessibility, and fiscal stability. The failure to present such analyses shows a lack of planning by the so-called Planning Board. The County has ignored the basic principle of "showing your work," and the explanations given thus far are an insult to the intelligence of County residents.
3. The Planning Board has failed to consider whether the existing Master Plan could sufficiently address affordable housing needs. When the PHED committee recommended prioritizing the Master Plan and local area planning processes, which involve robust citizen input, the Council staff rejected this approach.
4. Experiences from other similar communities, where similar initiatives have been implemented, have demonstrated adverse effects, which the Planning Department has chosen to ignore.
5. The success of abolishing single-family zoning and constructing multifamily units across large portions of the County relies on displacing current residents—many of whom love their homes and neighborhoods—and replacing them with new occupants.
6. Contrary to its stated goals, the AHSI plan will likely have the opposite effect on racial diversity and affordable housing. Instead of promoting diversity, minority residents may be displaced, leading to increased gentrification.
7. The only clear beneficiaries of the AHSI plan appear to be developers, builders, realtors, and the politicians who support it.

I respectfully request that the County halt further consideration of the AHSI until it conducts thorough analyses, facilitates meaningful public participation, explores alternative plans, and pursues any future zoning changes through the Master Plan process.

Kathy Rizik - Chevy Chase, 20815

126
0

I am not impressed by the goings on at/with the Montgomery County Council and the Planning Board. Clearly they are rushing through the (what should be THOROUGH) planning stages and pushing initiatives that have not been well thought out. And the data behind these initiatives is inaccurate and/or misconstrued! As far as AHSI is concerned they have inaccurate, low conclusions about the numbers of existing housing stock and the future capacity. According to Planning, as of September 2024 there are 35,240 UNBUILT approved units which need to factor into the total number in zoning. The Bethesda/Chevy Chase area already has 28 ongoing projects slated to deliver 6,978 units (including 942 MPDUs) in the next several years, which EXCEEDS the target of 3,425 units!!!! What about a MASTER PLAN?!?! AND... Planning is using the 2023 Travel Monitoring Report to make transportation assumptions. The OLDEST (Most recent) data used in this report is from 2022 - when commuting was STILL significantly reduced due to COVID!!!! AHSI is the wrong program for our County. MoCo needs a REALISTIC, TRANSPARENT housing plan, SUPPORTED by the DATA. AHSI is not that!!!

David Forman - Bethesda, 20816-2915

126
1

I strongly oppose the current version of the AHSI. It is allegedly designed to make more housing that middle-income people can afford. Yet there is no dispute that the housing it creates will be market rate, which is too expensive for middle-income people to afford. It will not accomplish its goals. Worse yet, the likely result is that much of the conversions will result from investors (many out-of-state hedge funds or even foreign investors) buying a less expensive single-family home (one affordable home lost) and turning it into market rate (too expensive for middle income) rentals. Public policy should not promote absentee landlords.

Also, the way the plan is presented is misleading. The pictures show only duplexes. A well-designed duplex may be able to fit into a neighborhood without looking too different from a single-family home, and have not too much more demand on infrastructure than a single-family home. But a triplex or quadplex will be intrusive and will necessarily be too small for a family and too demanding on infrastructure. Why not instead adopt a policy favoring townhouses?

I agree with the astute observations on this issue by County Executive Marc Elrich.

Frank Nieder - Chevy Chase, 20815

126
2

I am fully supportive of the attainable housing strategy, under the requirement, which I understand is included, that the built-up space limitations of the original are maintained, regardless whether a single family or multiple family unit is built.

Instead of, for example, of a maximum 4000 Sq. Ft single family unit being built, a maximum of two 2000 Sq ft units would be built. Density increased but not size and green space not reduced.

126
3 **Mark Heaslip - Chevy Chase, 20815**

I'm very much against moving forward at this time on this Initiative!
We need to take a pause immediately!

126
4 **Bridget Hartman - Chevy Chase, 20815**

It seems to me that Montgomery County's housing issue is that of affordability. Yes, creating a variety of housing types in single-family neighborhoods can help address affordability. But the Attainable Housing Strategies document is not focused on affordability. Moreover, the unintended consequences of this one-size-fits-all rezoning recommendation of more than 80% of the County's neighborhoods and small municipalities could and probably will exacerbate the affordability of housing costs in the County. Real estate speculation has already begun.

In addition, the Attainable Housing Strategies puts at risk County livability. A pattern book is not going to address the impact of additional multi-family housing on school capacity, traffic congestion, neighborhood parking, stormwater management and the loss of trees and increased lot coverage.

I urge the County Council to pause this process and refocus efforts on the real housing issue - affordability. Shouldn't the County's goal be to encourage reasonably priced, affordable housing in livable communities? Creative solutions may include changes to County zoning laws, but also could include County incentives for developers and County programs for home ownership. Thank you. Bridget Hartman

126
5 **Mary Elaine Shannon - Chevy Chase, 20815-4230**

I have lived in Chevy Chase, Md. for many years, and I vote in every election. I plan to vote No on Question A. I agree with Mark Elrich on this issue.

126
6 **Lynn Weidenschilling - Kensington, 20895**

I am in favor of the plans for attainable housing. We desperately need options for the younger generation which has been priced out of many neighborhoods. Many who oppose the plan decry the possible change in the character of the neighborhood - but that character has already been subverted by the destruction of smaller homes in favor of overly large luxury houses costing \$1-2 million. The community will

be better served by more economic diversity in its population. The environmental benefits of denser housing should also be a consideration. I very much hope that the Planning Board's proposal will be approved and implemented to whatever extent is feasible.

126
7 **Peter Ross - Chevy Chase, 20815**

Improving the availability of affordable housing nationwide and in Montgomery County is an important goal. But even important public policy goals must be pursued lawfully, rationally, wisely, and in a manner reasonably tailored to produce benefits without unnecessary or undue harm. That is why I strongly oppose the AHSI and its wholesale repudiation of single family zoning applicable to my property, my village municipality, and the surrounding Chevy Chase community. This initiative blithely ignores the reality of current physical conditions on my street and many others in Chevy Chase, including narrow one lane streets, limited parking, and storm drainage issues, as well as legitimate community concerns about how AHSI will impact school enrollment, municipal services currently provided by the village governments, and the environmental impact of increased density. It also does not take into account the limited land use authority granted to our local municipalities regarding construction activity that help ensure the livability of our neighborhoods. The initiative fails to adequately address and give due consideration to all of these facts and issues and therefore, even beyond its procedural and legal defects, should be rejected by the Council on policy grounds as overreaching, premature, and inconsistent with the needs of Montgomery County citizens.

126
8 **Amanda Heidenberger - Chevy Chase, MD, 20815-4958**

Dear County Council Members,

I am a resident of Chevy Chase Section 5 and I am writing to express my strong concerns over and opposition to the Montgomery County Planning Board's Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHSI). As one who has worked to further Democratic initiatives and policies that expand opportunities for all communities, I understand and believe deeply in the urgency of making housing options more available for more people. But based on the information we've been privy to to date, this proposal is woefully misguided and would carry myriad negative impacts on this small community and its existing infrastructure.

What is perhaps most concerning is the fact that when this idea was presented, representatives were unable to provide adequate answers about how to resolve issues with traffic, parking, or storm water. My family and I live on [REDACTED] one of the narrower streets in Section 5, and already there are serious issues with through-traffic, congestion, and parking availability. As the mother of a toddler, I am deeply concerned about traffic safety in the neighborhood and this proposal would only make that worse.

The changes reflected in the AHSI would be sweeping, and there is no indication that adequate planning, studies, or work to understand impact has been done. Again, I support the idea behind building housing opportunity for communities in Montgomery County and beyond. But it would be wildly irresponsible to proceed without further work to understand whether it a proposal like this would actually improve conditions or worsen them.

Thank you for considering my concerns, which I know are reflected very widely across residents in Section 5.

Sincerely,

Amanda Heidenberger

126
9

marilyn HANLON - Chevy Chase, 20815

We do not approve of the housing changes you are considering. There are many reasons. One small one is parking is already tight and this will make it worse. Also there seems to be very much more spaces close to us that could be utilized. I doubt the committee has looked into the problems which your plan will cause like the traffic on Conn and EW Highway which is already very stressed. Just downright making a mess of an already busy area.

127
0

Alexandra Cullen - Chevy Chase, 20815

I am a recent homebuyer in Section 5 and would like to express strong disapproval of the AHSI proposed rezoning plan. I whole-heartedly support the concerns raised in the Section 5 AHSI Letter, dated as of October 18, 2024, and hope that more time is taken to study the character of the portions of Montgomery County subject to proposed re-zoning under the AHSI. My family would not have purchased our home if the possibility of reduced street parking were even possible, and the concept that we could regularly walk to the metro from our home (about 510 feet from Connecticut Avenue) in lieu of owning a car is absurd.

127
1

Pamela Edison - Chevy Chase, 20815

I am a resident and voter in Rollingwood, Chevy Chase, MD a targeted area for the proposed plan to remove all zoning single family housing and address and crisis of housing for people "in the middle", specifically teacher and firefighters.

I have read the documents that have been made public and attended the public session at BCC. I am surprised at the number of intelligent and engaged neighbors who know Councilman Friedson by name who reflected on the way they were blindsided by this proposed rezoning proposal. Apparently, this Planning Commission has not done its due diligence to confer with existing neighborhood groups, including the Rollingwood Community Association or other obvious neighborhood groups who would have a vested interest in a decision to allow building up to 19 units, with special enticements with reduced off-street parking and set back requirements, by right.

I am in favor of smart development and potential for denser housing in existing neighborhoods, as long as the county is doing its job - to replace our lead pipes, our bursting gas lines, reduce class sizes with additional teachers, improve school facilities with more permanent


classrooms, improve safe pedestrian travel - particularly in neighborhoods with no sidewalks such as Rollingwood. The concept of letting developers and wealthy individuals simply build - and then we later figure out what to do is not planning at all. It is a greedy and cynical view of the current residents who make this area their home and community. In point of fact, there is no consideration of community in the planning or zoning appraisal of "crisis" or burning platforms for this significant and immediate sweeping change. There are many other options for how to build more housing that is affordable - which seems to be the preamble intent of this AHSI proposal - but has no clear path to getting there by way of regulations or requirements for affordability. A teacher or firefighter family could not afford to buy the expensive townhouses that are being approved near the Purple Line. Ironically, Rollingwood was the area that people who sought housing in the middle moved to 20-40 years ago. And now those same people stood up at the BCC meeting to ask why their leafy, quiet neighborhoods were being targeted to be up to 19 units. I do not think either the Planning Commission or the County Council have adequately laid out how they are going to take care of the current residents with support for the aging infrastructure in those communities.

Rollingwood, at one point, petitioned to become incorporated but was denied because we were told our tax revenues were needed to support services in other parts of the county. Now, it appears, our homes are similarly being subjected to "ideas about the greater good" - ignoring the work the county should be doing for us.

When the public good is involved, there is every reason to expect the Planning Commission to be engaging often and transparently with the communities and neighborhoods to understand their priorities. It is clear that this Commission is not engaging in communications with us - to plan for our communities. Instead, it appears to be an opportunistic reach to override existing neighborhood communities in the name of the greater good. It has also been made clear by Marc Elrich though left unmentioned in the proposal - that there have been significant moves to increase the supply of housing. Where is the transparency in data reflecting not only the permits but also the results of the more organic approach of approving ADUs. While other communities, like Berkeley, Calif have a major university with 30,000 people needing housing, it is clear we are not in that position. We can take a more informed and varied approach to truly planning for growth, not just offering a free for all developers to build beyond what our communities can sustain with transportation, education, electricity, clean water, gas, green spaces. In short, the things that entice people to move here should be valued by our elected leaders and especially our Planning Commission as we look ahead to make these places communities will continue to thrive.

In summary, I am wholly opposed to the proposed removal of most single family housing in Montgomery County with this one fell swoop, the poorly thought-out plan document as well as the deficient process in getting there. As this proposal indeed, changes everything, it should be on the ballot for a referendum. Further, I am disappointed, as I expected more respect and transparency from our County leadership, given its budget of \$6 B - like Paraguay and Ecuador.

Pamela Edison


Chevy Chase, MD 20815

127
2

Conor Crimmins - Kensington, 20895

Dear Council President Friedson and Members of the Montgomery County Council,

I am writing as a resident of the Town of Kensington. While I am a member of Kensington's Town Council, this letter expresses my personal concerns about the proposed Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHSI) and not those of the Town, as the Town has not yet taken official action concerning AHSI. While I strongly support efforts to increase affordable housing and homeownership opportunities in Montgomery County, I believe the current AHSI proposal has significant flaws that must be addressed.

First and foremost, I am deeply concerned that the AHSI does not further its stated goal of creating more homeownership opportunities. The county currently lacks a subdivision policy allowing fee-simple ownership of proposed multifamily housing units. Without such a provision, AHS cannot achieve its stated Goal #3, which is to promote greater homeownership and help more residents create generational wealth through housing.

The one-mile "walkshed" used to determine priority housing districts is unrealistic and not supported by data. Most planning standards consider a 1/4 to 1/2 mile radius as walkable to transit. Extending this to a full mile overestimates how far people will actually walk and risks upzoning areas without the infrastructure to support increased density.

Not all forms of transit are equal. The Metro's redline stations within the county carry, on average, between 2,400 – 5,000+ riders each weekday and 1,000 – 3,500 riders on each weekend day. Metro provides bi-directional service, on average, 18 hours each day. In contrast, MTA's MARC train service provides uni-directional weekday-only service, inbound in the morning and outbound in the afternoon, providing on average four hours of transit support in each direction. Moreover, MARC ridership is insufficient to be included alongside Metro. Daily ridership at Kensington's MARC station averages just 80 riders per day. At our neighboring station in Garrett Park, there are only 18 riders per day. While MARC's use may be undercapacity, its inclusion within the transit systems used for Priority Housing Districts (PHD) does not make sense.

I'm also worried about the lack of infrastructure planning to support the proposed density increases. In Kensington, we already face significant issues with stormwater management, traffic congestion, and school overcrowding. Any upzoning needs to be accompanied by concrete plans and funding to upgrade infrastructure.

The AHSI's one-size-fits-all approach fails to account for the unique characteristics of our diverse communities. In Kensington, we worked hard on our Sector Plan to thoughtfully increase density and provide more housing options. The AHSI risks undermining those carefully negotiated local plans. I encourage the Council to consider a more targeted approach that works within existing sector plans rather than overriding them wholesale.

While other parts of the county, namely Potomac, were excluded from consideration for AHS due to their lack of built infrastructure, no actual infrastructure analysis was done to determine the capacity of current infrastructure to support additional density. In Kensington, two

of the Town's three main stormwater central lines are at or over capacity. The Town is planning and/or executing multi-million-dollar upgrades to our stormwater management system. Such analysis should have been undertaken and considered as part of ASHI feasibility.

Furthermore, I'm skeptical of the assumption that simply allowing more density will create truly attainable housing, especially in high-cost areas. Without additional affordability requirements or subsidies, new market-rate housing in expensive neighborhoods is likely to remain out of reach for middle-income buyers.

To improve the AHSI, I recommend the County Council undertake the following:

1. Incorporate strong incentives or requirements for owner-occupied units to promote homeownership.
2. Reduce the "walkshed" to a more realistic 1/2 mile radius from transit.
3. Conduct thorough infrastructure impact studies and develop concrete upgrade plans before upzoning.
4. Work within existing sector plans rather than imposing blanket zoning changes.
5. Add affordability requirements or subsidies to ensure new housing is truly attainable for middle-income residents.
6. Focus on County-owned land for attainable and affordable housing development.
7. Remove MARC stations from inclusion in Priority Housing Districts (PHD).
8. An approved Pattern Book is required to be included with any proposed AHSI legislation.

I appreciate the Planning Department, the Planning Board, and the County Council's efforts to address our housing challenges, but I urge you to take the time to get this right. The AHSI, as currently proposed, risks harming our communities without achieving its stated goals. Please work with residents and local municipalities to develop a more targeted, data-driven approach that truly increases affordable homeownership opportunities while preserving the character of our neighborhoods.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Conor Crimmins
Town of Kensington

127
3

Kanthan Shankar - Chevy Chase, 20815

I have always felt fortunate to live in Montgomery County for the last 30 years, and have devoted my professional and personal life to poverty alleviation. I strongly urge the County to increase efforts to create affordable housing. But AHSI doesn't address this actual crisis, and wraps nice language and I hope good intentions around a lousy plan. As you know, AHSI will not create affordable housing, and simply allowing developers to build duplexes, triplexes, multiplexes, and apartment buildings (19 units that don't force them to provide MPDUs) at market prices on expensive land is a sham. People are confusing AHSI with affordable housing. If the County Council really wants to spur moderately-priced housing, they need to drop the notion of market prices, and drop AHSI as it currently exists.

127
4

Rebecca Brindle - Potomac, 20854

I am opposed to the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative as it has the potential to dramatically change the character of our neighborhoods with no input from the residents who are significantly impacted

127
5

Woody Campbell - Chevy Chase, 20815

To the Montgomery County Council:

I am a resident of the Village of North Chevy Chase. I urge you to move forward with the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. I hope that you are not persuaded by the rhetoric that none of the housing from this initiative would be affordable and it wouldn't do any good. This post by Matt Yglesias (<https://www.slowboring.com/p/housing-policy-lessons-from-the-microchip>) about the restrictions on car supply in early 2022 can dispel that misconception and many other misconceptions about building more market-rate housing. Here are a couple of excerpts from that piece:

“Nobody denies that the increased price of used cars is related to the reduced production of new ones. Nobody says that you can walk around any city and see tons of vacant cars and that must be the real problem — even though it is true that at any given time, there are tons of vacant cars. Nobody blames billionaire car-hoarders for the shortage of cars even though it is true that there really are rich car collectors who own far more vehicles than they actually drive. Nobody blames “speculators” even though it’s true that there are middlemen who make a living buying and selling used cars. And most of all, nobody blames the rapacious greed of the world’s car companies even though auto executives do enjoy the current high margins.”

“But car scarcity is bad. If vandals break 1% of America’s vehicle stock tonight, that will make people worse off. Now it’s true that those whose cars survive the Car Purge might find some financial upside. But fundamentally, the gains to you from your neighbor’s car being destroyed are minor compared to the losses to your neighbor.”

To continue in that vein, almost no one says we should mandate that car companies create “affordable cars.” We understand that expanding the supply of market rate cars would trickle down to making used cars somewhat less expensive and that would help low-income car-buyers. The same thing is true of market-rate housing.

In case any of you have not read this article(<https://worksinprogress.co/issue/the-housing-theory-of-everything/>) on the “Housing Theory of Everything,” I strongly encourage you to read it. The article makes the case to you that the any downsides to this proposal would be far outweighed by the benefits. The article cites a study that estimates a \$8,775 income gain for all Americans if just NYC, SF and San Jose put no restrictions on their housing.

I won’t rehash all the pro-housing arguments you’re probably familiar with. But I wanted to touch on one you may not have considered: That excessive restrictions on housing is a form of voter suppression. There are thousands of people from other counties from in the area who work, dine out and/or consistently visit in Montgomery County. They would love to live here and have their voice heard in the area they spend so much time in. But they cannot do that due to our zoning laws.

I am sorry that considering this initiative is making so many people angry at you. I hope you can stay strong and approve it with the knowledge that history will look very kindly upon you for taking such a brave stance. You would be doing the right thing, and I really hope you stick with your guns.

Best,

Woody Campbell

127
6

Claire Psillas - Chevy Chase, 20815

I do not agree with the attainable housing initiatives planned.

127
7

Giridhar Srinivasan - Chevy Chase, 20815

I’m writing to say that I support the strategy. I grew up in Montgomery County for a few years in the 1980s. Frankly, little has changed since then, especially when compared to other large cities such as the Bay Area, Austin TX, and Northern Virginia.

The county is badly in need of economic development. Revitalizing our housing stock, and building denser housing are critical inputs.

The county is overreliant on personal income tax from government employees for its revenue. No new large corporate headquarters have been established in the county in the last 20 years. In contrast, in Northern Virginia, over 50 large companies have relocated their headquarters to NoVA during that same period.

As someone who is the founder of a tech startup, I've sometimes questioned whether it still makes sense to stay here, when alternatives are so enticing. (Government officials in two major countries have literally have called me up, offering incentives for us to relocate.)

If we don't find a way to attract more people and companies to the county, it will be difficult to raise the corporate tax revenue that is essential to sustain schools, civic services, and ensuring our county remains a wonderful place to live and raise a family.

We must find a way to lower the cost of housing to stay competitive (among other initiatives). Building additional housing stock can do that. It's just a matter of supply rising to meet demand.

Change is never pleasant, but the alternative is that we become stagnant and uncompetitive. I say all of this as a life-long Democrat, married to an architect who has worked on historic preservation projects. I trust County officials will execute the strategy in a responsible way.

Mitzi Young - BETHESDA, 20816

127
8

This proposal is a BONANZA for developers and a DISASTER for single family home buyers. Purchasers of single family homes will be REPEATEDLY priced out by cash offers made by developers who can forgo the rezoning approval process. Construction of high-priced multiplexes or townhomes in close-in neighborhoods will exacerbate housing shortages. The minimal fraction of a few subsidized properties DOES NOTHING to put a dent in affordable or attainable housing. In fact, the proposal does the OPPOSITE. Reverse course NOW!!!!

In addition, MCPS won't be able to handle the unpredictable enrollment fluctuations cause by the proposal. DREADFUL community planning.

Mary Shepard - Chevy Chase, 20815

127
9

We are opposed to the proposed rezoning of Chevy Chase Village to include multi-family dwelling units. We moved to Chevy Chase Village because of its unhurried atmosphere, the lovely homes here, and the general "small town feel" of the Village. The proposed rezoning will

change the very nature of the Village. The layout of the Village streets cannot handle the parking or the increase in cars (it can barely handle the current needs of residents). Services are inadequate to meet the demands of the increased number of people proposed. Schools are already operating at their limit with typical class size of 27-30 students in elementary school. Rezoning the Village is not supported by any of our neighbors and we concur. Please reject this proposal as it is currently configured.

128
0

William Catherwood - Chevy Chase, 2p815

I oppose the Attainable Housing Initiative.

128
1

Charles Steiner - Chevy Chase, 20815

We are opposed to the proposed rezoning of Chevy Chase Village to include multi-family dwelling units. We moved to Chevy Chase Village because of its unhurried atmosphere, the lovely homes here, and the general "small town feel" of the Village. The proposed rezoning will change the very nature of the Village. The layout of the Village streets cannot handle the parking or the increase in cars (it can barely handle the current needs of residents). Services are inadequate to meet the demands of the increased number of people proposed. Schools are already operating at their limit with typical class size of 27-30 students in elementary school. Rezoning the Village is not supported by any of our neighbors and we concur. Please reject this proposal as it is currently configured.

128
2

Richard Dodd - Bethesda, 20816

I oppose AHS on the grounds that it sacrifices the settled expectations of single-family detached homeowners under established R-60 zoning and establishes one-size-fits-all Pattern Book designs as incentives for developers to intensify housing density with plexes and thereby disrupt neighborhood infrastructure. I am troubled by the unsubstantiated, wishful thinking stated in the AHS Goals that seems to serve developers rather than existing homeowners by promising to "diversify the county's communities by diversifying the county's housing stock," without expressly providing for affordable housing eligibility criteria, subsidies or resale deed restrictions to ensure continuity. The 2024 Planning Board Recommendations lack evidence-based studies of impacts on the environment (tree canopy), parking, storm-water drainage and school capacity. I agree with Marc Elrich that AHS is a massive, as-of right rezoning that could affect about 164,000 homes ...82 percent of the county where single-family homes are designated." This project seems like an affordable housing project that lost its way insofar as market pricing of units most likely will not address the goals of providing housing for the 'Missing Middle.' If this project is approved by the County Council as broadly as proposed by the Planning Board litigation contesting the process and substance of AHS is assured.

128
3

Hannah Graae - Chevy Chase, 20815

Dear Council Members,

I am a resident of Section 5 in Chevy Chase, Maryland and I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Montgomery Planning Board's Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHSI) recommendations. I agree with the points made by the Section 5 and Chevy Chase Board of Managers as well as many other groups and individuals who have submitted comments in opposition to these recommendations.

I support affordable housing efforts; however the AHSI recommendations have NOTHING to do with expanding affordable housing. The proposal would be a handout to developers, allowing them to make millions of dollars by encouraging tear downs and building multi-unit luxury condos at the expense of our community and neighborhood. The proposal was not created with thought or care for critical infrastructure limitations, including sewers, stormwater systems, parking, and schools. The proposal would also greatly alter the character of our neighborhoods, by encouraging older homes to be demolished.

I strongly encourage the council to reject these recommendations and go back to think more carefully about how to balance expanded housing in Montgomery County with the considerations and needs of the affected existing communities and neighborhoods.

Best,
Hannah Graae


Burt Braverman - Chevy Chase, 20815

128
4

We reside in Chevy Chase Village, Md (CCV). We support the comments submitted by CCV regarding the Planning Board's proposals for the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative, and incorporate them by reference. In brief: CCV is an historic village to which we moved 32 years ago. We, like others, have invested in our historic homes to preserve the character of those homes and our neighborhood, hopefully for decades to come. Development too often has destroyed the character and charm that distinguishes neighborhoods such as ours. It is in the interest not only of the residents of CCV, but of Montgomery County and the State, to preserve historic neighborhoods such as ours for the benefit of generations to come.

Further, with the development already occurring north of CCV at Chevy Chase Lake, west of CCV at Friendship Heights, and farther north in Kensington and beyond, our community is already struggling with the burdens of increased traffic and inadequate infrastructure. Other development already underway, e.g., at the old 4H site, and planned, e.g., the additional development slated for the blocks just south of CC Circle, will only worsen the congestion surrounding and running through our village. Connecticut Avenue, which as a practical matter cannot be widened, simply cannot handle ever-increasing traffic, which the AHSI proposal would further exacerbate. We ask that you consider these concerns and that you ensure that they are addressed in any legislation that is forthcoming on the AHSI.

Burt Braverman and Kathleen Meredith



Chevy Chase, MD 20815

128
5

Myla Williams - Bethesda, 20816

I am against the proposed AHSI in its current form for multiple reasons.

First, in high land value zip code areas such as Bethesda and Chevy Chase, allowing increased density will not result in market-based costs of new duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes at levels affordable to the missing middle -- which, according to MoCo's Planning Commission, is exemplified by teachers and firefighters, for whom average salaries are \$84,000 and \$64,000, respectively, according to the web). In fact, it will increase the supply of high-priced housing.

This is evident from the market-based asking prices of more than \$1 million for the townhomes going up in Bethesda at Westbard, and the ones that the same developer (EYA) built on Little Falls Pkwy between River Rd. and Mass. Ave. The AHSI needs to take a differentiated approach based on land value differences within the county. Fairfax County's approach to missing middle housing is a more relevant comparator for Montgomery County than Arlington or Alexandria for size and variability in land use reasons.

A 2023 Urban Institute study entitled "Land Use Reforms and Housing Costs: Does Allowing for Increased Density Lead to Greater Affordability?"

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

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

What's needed are government subsidies for first-time homeowners with household income within a specified range where the low end is the ceiling for MoCo's MPDU (moderately priced housing unit) subsidized housing eligibility. And to cover the cost of the subsidies, as well as to help pay for the externalities of higher density (infrastructure, schools, environment, etc.), the Council needs to raise taxes on developers, rather than cater to them, to the extent developers are donors to their re-election campaigns.

Furthermore, the AHSI needs to be revised to take into account: (a) the County's existing zoned capacity, (b) the impact of increased density on infrastructure, schools, and the environment, (c) neighborhood-level input. Importantly, the AHSI also needs to include a timeframe with specific targets, and metrics for monitoring progress toward achieving them, in order to determine whether the policy is working and if it isn't, whether to modify or cancel it.

I don't agree that the way to address the legacy of racial and religious covenants of the mid-20th century is in effect to eliminate single-family housing (SFH) zoning. Today, the "barrier to entry" to SFH in higher priced suburban areas is the market-based cost, not egregious but thankfully now obsolete covenants in which current homeowners had no hand, and which would have prevented many of them from purchasing homes in such neighborhoods.

I will be recommending that the County take a trial period/pilot approach, given that there isn't much successful experience yet of any significant scale with "missing middle housing" initiatives elsewhere in the country, as documented by the Urban Institute.

128
6

Kathryn Moore - Bethesda, 20816

I strongly oppose the AHSI in Montgomery County, specifically along River Road. In my neighborhood of Springfield (and Countywide) the plan would cause denser housing, increased traffic congestion in current single-family zones, and strain on our neighborhood schools to name a few impacts, reducing quality of life for current residents. I do not believe that the AHSI will achieve the goal of creating more affordable housing options in my neighborhood, where new townhomes not even built yet just sold overnight for over \$1 million. While I agree that providing more affordable housing in MoCo is a good cause, I believe this initiative falls short of that goal while causing a variety of other problems. Thank you for your consideration of community input.

128
7

Duke Schaeffer - Chevy Chase, 20815

Dear Council Member,

I am a resident of Section 5 in Chevy Chase, Maryland and I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Montgomery Planning Board's Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHSI) recommendations. I agree with the points made by the Section 5 and Chevy Chase Board of Managers as well as many other groups and individuals who have submitted comments in opposition to these recommendations.

I support affordable housing efforts; however the AHSI recommendations have NOTHING to do with expanding affordable housing. The proposal would be a handout to developers, allowing them to make millions of dollars by encouraging tear downs and building multi unit luxury condos at the expense of our community and neighborhood. The proposal was not created with thought or care for critical infrastructure limitations, including sewers, stormwater systems, parking, and schools. The proposal would also greatly alter the character of our neighborhoods, by encouraging older homes to be demolished.

I strongly encourage the council to reject these recommendations and go back to think more carefully about how to balance expanded housing in Montgomery County with the considerations and needs of the affected existing communities and neighborhoods.

Best,
Duke Schaeffer

128
8

Jim Murphy - Kensington, 20895

There is plenty of room for more houses in northern Montgomery County. The argument that homeowners need to be close to the Metro is fallacious. Ride-On does a great job getting from far flung neighborhoods to Metro stations.

128
9

JOHN HAINES - KENSINGTON, 20895

The Oct 15 presentation on Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHS) from Montgomery Planning persuaded me that AHS deserves our town's support. Particularly noteworthy are the genesis of the document, the scope and the relationship to other development needs besides housing, and the experience in other places where similar initiatives have been adopted.

First, the County Council requested recommendations from Montgomery Planning on how to bring about housing that is more affordable to families. They are aware of various environmental and development challenges the county faces, notably traffic congestion, dependency on automobiles, aging infrastructure, drainage, and preserving green space and trees. It is also true that limited housing options that the workforce can afford – even professionals with above-average family incomes – threatens future economic development.

The proposed strategy would open more housing development options near existing transportation infrastructure, especially infill housing and multiple units on parcels presently restricted to single family homes. The obvious questions – would multiple units be more affordable and would infill housing pop up quickly and overwhelm existing transportation and storm drainage? Answers: It takes time for the market to adapt, as scattered-site infill housing is not attractive to developers. When the time comes to to sell our house, we hope for top dollar. This might happen. Just outside the town on Saul Road and Kensington Parkway a corner lot was bought and the house was replaced with a new house offered for \$2.3 million. Will it sell? Will numerous other buyers who can afford something similar come forward for other sellers? Two other things happen under AHS – some home owners would stay in place by redeveloping a smaller home and another unit(s) on the land; others (either the current owner or the buyer) would use the land for multiple units as income property. This looks like a pathway to greater affordability over time.

As for drainage, traffic, better public transportation, and preservation of green space and trees – the Montgomery Planning representatives pointed out that building permits are still required and a drainage plan would be a condition. Beyond that however, transportation infrastructure built for fewer people than already live in the county and storm sewers for fewer major storms and less impermeable surface than exists at present are not solved by AHS. From my perspective it is not rational to hold a strategy to address our housing needs hostage to these non-housing challenges.

129
0

Judith Zielinski - Chevy Chase, 20815

The Attainable Housing Strategies is nothing more than a way for developers and real estate firms.to make more money and in the process have devastating economic effects on many areas in the county including Martins Additions. Affordability is not really the issue because none of the new housing proposed would have to be affordable. There is no mandate for affordability. This proposal would have devastating effects environmentally - loss of tree canopy, permeable surfaces yards gardens and green space eliminated. It would lower air quality as a result of congestion, there would be widespread overcrowding in our schools and on our roads. I have lived in this community

for over 40 years and love the small town atmosphere of neighbors helping neighbors, socializing, children forming lasting friendships. I am totally against this proposal

129
1

Matthew Nader - Chevy Chase, 20815

My name is Matt Nader and I'm a resident of Section III the Village of Chevy Chase. I'm also a member of the village counsel (Treasurer) but I'm writing to you in my personal capacity. Firstly, thank you for conducting the listening session at BCC High School. I attended the meeting and although I was disappointed with the tone taken by some of the attendees and at times some individuals' behavior and lack of decorum, I must agree with many of their points as it relates to the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative in its current form. I don't think anyone that is rational can argue that within our county and throughout many parts of the country, we have an affordable housing problem. However, I strongly question the merits of the plan in its current form. The recommendations are wide ranging, sweeping and alter the status quo significantly and swiftly.

As I think about sweeping changes in my personal life and professional life I always ask myself a couple of important questions: Will the change contemplated be effective in meeting the goal of the plan? Who would the changes benefit and how would that constituency be benefitted? As it relates to the question of effectiveness, I don't believe the plan will be effective for my neighborhood and many others creating either attainable or affordable housing. Many attendees pointed to a real life example of a small townhome development, recently built and currently being marketed in the Town of Chevy Chase. Those newly built townhomes are currently priced higher than the majority of single-family homes within the Town. Greater density for real estate creates higher values because land costs can be dispersed over multiple units. In this case, the developer is able to purchase the existing single-family house and land for a higher price than an end-user because of their ability to create more units and sell each unit for a collectively larger sum of money compared to a single user. I can't speak to other parts of the county, but as it relates to my particular neighborhood and the neighborhoods that border mine I think allowing, and in some cases encouraging moderately dense development, will actually have the opposite effect of the plan's intention. So I do not feel that the plan will be effective. If the plan will be effective, I think the authors of the plan must provide data and evidence supporting their hypothesis. I think real world, data driven examples of how this sweeping change to zoning has been effective in other markets and whether was/is successful is the bare minimum.

As others mentioned during the meeting, I would also question some of the assumptions made by the planners. I don't know of anyone who would routinely walk 1-mile (one-way) to a metro or purple line station. I also question who will benefit from the plan. Change is difficult for all parties involved and when asking a group to agree to or support change the party advocating for change must provide reasons why the change will be beneficial. Because I don't believe that the plan will be effective, or at least I haven't seen any data supporting the hypothesis, the only benefit to my current community would be increased home values. I don't think increasing home values at a greater rate is the type of benefit that the plan is trying to achieve. I do think the issues related to school overcrowding, traffic, stormwater management, parking (especially in our neighborhood) and others mentioned in the meeting are legitimate issues. I understand that this plan is not an all-encompassing treatise on local governance, but I struggle to see how anyone could support it without

addressing the challenges that could be exacerbated by its implementation. Ultimately, I struggle to see how this plan will be effective and I also struggle to see how this plan would benefit any of the affected constituencies.

In order to seriously consider a plan like this, that imparts swift and substantial changes I think much more work is needed to support the hypothesis. I would characterize this plan as an experiment if the plan is unable to provide clear data driven proof of concept. I would also characterize it as incomplete if the initiative does not include plans to address the consequences of these changes to our communities. Thank you for your service.

KATHARINE GIBSON - Chevy Chase, 20815

129

2

Dear Montgomery County Council,

I agree there is a housing crisis, but I strongly oppose the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative as it will not result in affordable housing. Attainable housing is not affordable to MC DOT bus operators (starting salary \$51,000); MC police officers (starting salary \$69,000), and MC public school teachers (starting salary \$70,000). The strategy benefits developers, not hard-working residents seeking attainable housing.

This county-wide zoning strategy is not a solution to the housing crisis and will greatly impact our public-school population and quality of education; pedestrian/cyclist safety; traffic; storm water management; canopy and green spaces; and parking. Please do not approve the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. It is not a solution to the housing crisis.

paul janes - bethesda, 20816

129

3

It's unclear whether or not there will be a lot size limit for zoning these attainable structures. Lots that are less than a half an acre and the neighborhoods which contain them are not well suited for large multi-family dwellings. I recommend that lots need to be at least a half an acre - and preferably larger.

William Kearney - Bethesda, 20817

129

4

We *vehemently* opposed re-zoning existing standards for single-family home lots.

This smacks of nothing more than catering to developer profits, with zero consideration for existing TAXPAYERS. They're going to dump random multi-dwelling units with zero consideration for roads, schools and infrastructure.

We feel the committees have not been honest about this entire effort.

Margaret McCloskey - Silver Spring, 20910

129

5

vote NO to this strategy. It does NOT solve the housing shortage and certainly will not solve the affordable housing shortage. This is a gift to developers, and will cause more problems than it says it will fix.

129 6	<p>Mark M - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>Please support this proposal in whole. Giving residents the choice of building different housing types will lead to a modest level of additional housing that will be built a lower prices than what would be built otherwise.</p>
129 7	<p>Daniel Messinger - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>Good afternoon.</p> <p>We strongly oppose the misguided and so called Attainable Housing proposal put forth by the Montgomery Country Council. This proposal does not account for myriad economic, social, education nor community implications and will likely have numerous, complex and unintended consequences immediately and years to come.</p> <p>In light of the near universal opposition from residents in impacted neighborhoods, we strongly urge the Council to abandon this proposal.</p> <p>Thank you for your considerations</p>
129 8	<p>Robert Carter - Silver Spring, 20910</p> <p>NO NO NO NO to this proposal that does not provide what it says it will and will have a disastrous ripple effect.</p>
129 9	<p>Kathleen Stallings - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>We are opposed to the council's current plan. It is not supported by fact-based evidence. It does not support its stated objectives - it actually makes things worse.</p>
130 0	<p>Andrew Geolot - CHEVY CHASE, 20815</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I am strong against the rezoning related to the Attainable Housing Strategies initiative ("AHSI"). As someone who works in the commercial real estate sector, I can attest that the only people who would benefit from this zoning change will be real estate developers. The land values in the Town are too high to support any reasonably priced family-oriented housing stock, as evidenced by the +\$3.3 million townhome units on West Avenue at the edge of the Town. As a real estate professional for the past 16 years, I can confidently state that the economics only work for high end townhome units in this price range that are counter to the goal of increasing affordable units in the county.</p> <p>Eliminating single family zoning will irrevocably change the character of the neighborhood. The strain on traffic, resources, stormwater management, and infrastructure will be highly detrimental to the current residents. My wife and I moved to Chevy Chase two years ago</p>

from Adams Morgan because we wanted a single family home neighborhood for our new baby; allowing medium density multifamily development will have a serious negative impact on the entire neighborhood and reduce the quality of life for our family and our neighbors.

The entire "one size fits all" nature of this strategy is poorly thought out and should be completely scrapped. I am supportive of additional density in transit-oriented locations that make sense, such as downtown Bethesda and Chevy Chase Lake. I was also very supportive of many high density developments in Adams Morgan. This is all to say, I am hardly a "NIMBY" but I am adamantly against the ("AHSI"). I implore you to not move forward with this misguided and harmful strategy.

Regards,

Andrew Geolot

130

1

Mary Tyson - Kensington, 20895

We are against the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. It doesn't do anything to address affordable housing and seems like a gift for developers. Why isn't this put on the ballot?

130

2

rich mckay - north chevy chase, 20815

Dear Montgomery County Council,

I agree there is a housing crisis, but I strongly oppose the Attainable Housing Strategies (AHS) Initiative as it will not result in affordable housing. Attainable housing is not affordable to MC DOT bus operators (starting salary \$51,000); MC police officers (starting salary \$69,000), and MC public school teachers (starting salary \$70,000). The strategy benefits developers, not hard-working residents seeking attainable housing. I have seen similar processes at the Chevy Chase Lake where the developer and land company tore down somewhat affordable apartments and shopping centers only to replace it with very high cost and high density condos and apartments. The high density concept was approved by the planning board on the assumption that the Purple Line would negate the need for cars in these buildings, that has not been the case. The Purple Line is late, and for the first time in my life (I've lived in this area for 65 years) we now need parking permits because of parking issues created by these buildings. This will be the same outcome with the AHS approach.

This county-wide zoning strategy is not a solution to the housing crisis and will greatly impact our public-school population and quality of education; pedestrian/cyclist safety; traffic; storm water management; canopy and green spaces; and parking. Please do not approve the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. It is not a solution to the housing crisis. My house (along with roadways) in the Village of North Chevy Chase was built in 1908, not the oldest structure in the village by any means, and the street layouts are from that time or before. Adding density to this neighborhood will tax the current infrastructure beyond what it can handle (it's probably at or past capacity now). It

will take millions of dollars in infrastructure upgrades that are not covered in the AHS, nor are the developers being made to address these issues, to even consider increasing building density. The village and county tax payer will be on the hook for these costs, i.e., in the form of higher property tax assessments (thus making affordable housing even harder to obtain). As noted in the first paragraph building duplexes/quadra-plexes in this area will only result in higher density and very expensive small houses still outside the reach of moderate income people that supposedly the AHS is helping. Another boon for the developers is all I can see, no solutions to affordable housing or the fixing of aging infrastructure in this county! Please do not push the AHS forward, it is a seriously flawed plan/proposal that doesn't address the issues it says it will.

Rich McKay

chevy chase, md 20815.

130
3

Anne Glynn - POTOMAC, 20854

I am opposed to the attainable housing strategies initiative. While I support affordable housing this initiative is not the right solution. Quadplexes are not appropriate for single-family zoned areas.

130
4

Suki Dicker - Bethesda, 20816

I oppose AHS on the grounds that it sacrifices the settled expectations of single-family detached homeowners under established R-60 zoning and establishes one-size-fits-all Pattern Book designs as incentives for developers to disrupt neighborhood infrastructure. I am troubled by the unsubstantiated, wishful thinking stated in the AHS Goals that seems to serve developers rather than existing homeowners by promising to "diversify the county's communities by diversifying the county's housing stock," without expressly providing for affordable housing eligibility criteria, subsidies or resale deed restrictions to ensure continuity.

The 2024 Planning Board Recommendations lack evidence-based studies of impacts on the environment (tree canopy), parking, storm-water drainage and school capacity. I agree with Marc Elrich that AHS is a massive, as-of right rezoning that could affect about 164,000 homes ...82 percent of the county where single-family homes are designated. This project seems like an affordable housing project that lost its way insofar as market pricing of units most likely will not address the goals of providing housing for the 'Missing Middle.' If this project is approved by the County Council as broadly as proposed by the Planning Board litigation contesting the process and substance of AHS is assured.

130
5

Linda West - Chevy Chase, 20815

I am 100 percent opposed to your rezoning proposal. It is clearly a giveaway to developers and will not provide low cost housing. At least now I know who NOT to vote for on Election Day for County Council.

130
6

Mark Shaffer - Chevy Chase, 20815

The Initiative is being misrepresented and is ill considered. It is unclear what the term obtainable even means. The Initiative contains no provisions to control pricing or subsidize rent. Land values in South County which are increasing will result in construction projects producing million dollar plus condos or like expensive pricing.

While develops will benefit, current and future neighbors will greatly suffer. After a limited communication with county officials working on this project, I have concluded that no consideration is being made of the infrastructure needs implicated population expansion, school seats and teachers, roads and commuting, sewers and stormwater management, and utilities.

Our schools are full. Our roads are inadequate now.

Traffic backs up on major for a half mile or more and onto highways for a mile during rush hour. Commuters are speeding on side streets as short cuts. Many of our residential streets are fully parked up now.

Our sewers are out dated and inadequate. The County planning and Permitting openly admits that it grants every requested exemption from Code prohibitions against new construction increases in stormwater discharge. Approximately ten villages including mine in the Chevy Chase area have created committees to figure out how to control stormwater flooding which the sewers don't handle.

All of these issues have to be addressed and plans made and County funding estimated and budgeted to address these issues now before the South County quality of life is adversely impacted and not after remedy is too late and more expensive.

Thank you,
Mark Shaffer

130
7

Kirsti Jones - Bethesda, 20814

Dear Council Members,

I appreciate the listening sessions on the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHSI), all of which I attended or viewed afterwards, plus the Planning Board's Speaker Series on housing. I've also read many academic studies about eliminating exclusively single-family detached zoning, and I believe the results are mixed at best. I agree with many of the concerns raised by attendees about infrastructure, parking, one-size-fits all zoning, deficient notification and public input, environment etc. I believe the Planning Department and Planning Board have lost credibility with their failure to provide to the public adequate data to support AHSI – and that the evidence available from their own studies in fact undermines the proposal, however good their intentions might be. I ask that you consider the following points.

Contradictory or misleading underlying data raises questions about whether AHSI is even needed.

- The Planning Department's own pipeline records state that as of September 2024 there are 35,240 unbuilt approved units (<https://montgomeryplanning.org/tools/research/development-pipeline/>).

-
- The Residential Capacity Analysis in 2020 (<https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/housing/residential-development-capacity-analysis/>) found that the county had zoned capacity for 65,000 units.
 - The recent finding that the county did not accurately report the number of housing units in issued permits (https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/OLO/Resources/Files/2024_reports/OLOReport2024-10.pdf) strongly suggests that underlying data used by Planning led to inaccurate, low conclusions about the numbers of existing housing stock and future capacity.
 - Income data presented to support the claimed need for attainable housing appears to be for individuals, not dual-income families. Without data on two-income families the income analysis is misleading.
 - Planning's analysis showing a rise in lower income residents, and COG's finding that 75% of new residents will need housing assistance, does not make sense with AHSI's focus on "attainable" as opposed to "affordable" housing (<https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Income-Shifts-Research-Brief-Final.pdf>).
 - AHSI fails to consider the lack of jobs for young professionals, both starting positions and opportunities to advance. https://montgomeryplanningboard.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/12_17Advancing-the-Pike-District-Briefing_Staff-Report_121720.pdf notes that White Flint has not attracted housing development because there are not enough jobs in the area. This is probably a more important factor in middle-income people leaving the county than housing issues, yet AHSI contains no recognition of this dynamic.
 - COG has changed the population projections downward several times but Planning continues to use the original, higher projections.

Transportation assumptions are unrealistic.

- We do not have a robust, reliable, frequent and affordable mass transit system.
 - Expectations that people will give up cars are not supported in local research. COG's population projections when considered in light of Planning's 2023 Travel Monitoring Report (<https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/2023TravelMonitoringReport.pdf>) suggest that a predicted 20% population increase could more than offset the decline in car travel as a result of the pandemic.
 - This report also shows a decline in bicycle travel.
 - It also shows that in every instance it takes longer to travel by public transit than by automobile.
-

- The report relies on data from 2022 at the latest, when commuting was still reduced due to Covid. An update is needed: the pandemic threat is diminished and there are increasing calls for people to return to the office.

AHSI is unfair to current residents.

- The Residential Capacity Analysis in 2020 (https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/housing/residential-development-capacity-analysis/#_ftn1) suggests that because various market factors are holding back market rate developers, our planners and the Planning Board have decided it is acceptable to burden older established communities and their residents with additional housing that the market is not providing.

- The proposed developer incentives and waivers will increase the tax burden on existing residents to pay for the infrastructure necessary to increase capacity for new residents.

- The burden on unincorporated communities, which often have smaller lots and narrower streets, will be exacerbated if municipalities and homeowners' associations are exempted from meeting any additional housing requirements or protected against specific zoning changes.

- It is unclear what AHSI will do to existing master plans. Current residents invested in their neighborhoods because of expectations created by master plans.

- It is unclear how, and even whether, the master planning process will be used in the future, and whether there is a meaningful role for public input.

Officials and planners are sending contradictory messages regarding the need for AHSI.

- We have been told by council members, planning commissioners and staff that the proposed changes need to be made now, on a large scale, countywide, to meet potential housing needs.

- We have also been told change will be incremental.

- These contradictions highlight the imperative to make any zoning changes through master plans. Without master and sector planning, implementation of the changes will be haphazard and unfair, as reflected, for example, in data showing that the Bethesda/Chevy Chase area

already has 28 ongoing projects slated to deliver 6,978 units (including 942 MPDUs) in the next several years, which exceeds the target of 3,425 units. (<https://www.townofchevy Chase.org/DocumentCenter/View/4547/TOCC-Testimony-AHSI-3-21-2024>)

The effort to "sell" AHSI has included questionable claims and assumptions and omits RE/SJ issues.

- Planners claim that height, lot coverage, and setbacks will remain the same as for single-family houses. This has not been the case with other housing changes, notably ADUs.
 - Planning's Missing Middle Housing Market Study (https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Missing-Middle-Market-Study_03-04-2021_Staff-Report.pdf) pages 2-5 lists among obstacles to missing middle that "The existing R60 zoning/development standards do not physically accommodate Missing Middle housing, even a duplex. Lot coverage, height limits, and setbacks were the most common items mentioned in relation to challenges with development standards."
 - AHSI assumes that developers will choose to build so-called attainable housing but the Missing Middle Market Study raises questions about how attainable multiplexes would be. (https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Missing-Middle-Market-Study_03-04-2021_Staff-Report.pdf, see page 12.)
 - Despite the OLO report (<https://www.scribd.com/document/558161463/OLO-RESJ-Review-of-Thrive-2-9-22-Revised>) and the outside consultant's findings on racial equity and social justice in Thrive Montgomery 2050, there is nothing in AHSI regarding displacement and gentrification, which are far more likely to affect lower income and Brown and Black communities.
 - Population and behavior projections become less reliable as they reach further into the future. AHSI also seems to include an implicit assumption that demand for single-family housing will diminish. A one-size-fits-all plan such as AHSI must include defined metrics and time periods for review and adjustment.
 - The developer of three \$3,650,00 townhouses at 4500 Walsh Street in downtown Bethesda chose not to take advantage of a change in zoning from R-60 to CRT 0.5 C 0.25 R 0.5 H 70. The CRT zoning would have allowed him to build a 70' tall apartment/condo building, and if he provided at least 17.6% MPDUs he could have had another floor or two including more market rate apartments.
 - Despite approved development applications already in Bethesda since adoption of the 2017 Bethesda Downtown Plan approaching the soft cap of 30.4 million square feet, amenities and infrastructure in the plan have not kept pace. With AHSI, Planning's claim that development provides funding for needed infrastructure and amenities in the County is ludicrous, especially as the Planning Board proposes more incentives including reductions and waivers in taxes and fees.
-

The Council must look at related planning efforts. For example:

- Planning is proposing to remove the density cap on development in Bethesda via a minor master plan amendment - despite the fact that, as noted above, none of the parks or amenities (for example, a recreation center) the plan calls for have been delivered. (Planning's recommendation to remove the cap will be published on Thursday, October 17, 2024.)
- A new master plan is in the works for Friendship Heights.
- The cumulative effect of AHSI, removal of the density cap in the Bethesda Downtown Plan, and adding density to Friendship Heights will make Wisconsin Avenue/355 unnavigable and living conditions around it difficult for every resident, visitor, and employee in the area.

AHSI would continue Planning's effort to reduce public input.

- The first draft of Thrive included specific language to drastically reduce public input, the first clear effort to do so. AHSI's proposal to allow more by-right development and administrative approvals as Thrive is implemented reduces public input.
- AHSI does not adequately address when, where, or how neighbors can raise concerns about development that is problematic. For example: drainage issues that affect neighboring properties, onsite parking for multiple cars within side and rear setbacks that reduce tree canopy and create air and noise pollution for neighbors.

There is a lack of clarity about the process going forward.

- The Planning, Housing, and Parks Committee has not made public its schedule or process for moving forward with AHSI.
 - The Council needs to consider the accuracy of the underlying data and projections made by Planning, and determine what additional studies Council staff or Planning or outside experts must do. Reassurances from Planning without data are meaningless (<https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/housing/attainable-housing-strategies-initiative/attainable-housing-strategies-what-were-hearing/>).
 - The necessary studies must be integrated into any housing proposal.
-

AHSI is the wrong program for our County. MoCo needs a realistic, transparent housing plan, supported by data and impact analysis. AHSI is not that.

Best regards,
Kristi Jones

Eric Endres - Chevy Chase, 20815

130
8

My wife and I moved to Chevy Chase just before starting our family. We specifically moved to this neighborhood because of its safety, character, and reputation for being a great neighborhood to raise children. We moved to this neighborhood for what it CURRENTLY is and as two working parents we work very hard to afford living in a safe neighborhood like this one. We have felt very welcomed as newer members of the community and we happily enjoy welcoming other new members as they move into the neighborhood. We are strongly opposed to any legislation that will change the zoning of our neighborhood because of what it is, not what the county wants it to be. This initiative seems like the county imposing itself on its constituents to push an agenda that just doesn't help anyone. Does the county simply want to squeeze as many people into its "growth corridors" as possible or does it want to create great, friendly, safe, neighborhoods that Montgomery County was once famous for? Chevy Chase is one of the few neighborhoods left in Montgomery County that can truly uphold this reputation but if this initiative moves forward then that won't be for much longer. I feel that this is a failure to protect the hard working constituents who chose to live in this neighborhood and trusted their county leadership. This opinion is shared by most members of our neighborhood and others potentially affected by this initiative. Some short-sighted politicians will believe this opposition is all about keeping people out but that is just not true. Our opposition to these changes is because our neighborhoods are a great place to live now and the people that live here just want to enjoy the place they chose to set down roots (and take on a mortgage) without monumental changes. The lots in our neighborhood are not large, there are already a lot of people living here and our infrastructure and roads are already at their limit to support the current population. We all know these types of changes could be the start of a landslide allowing developers to completely devastate the integrity of our neighborhood, a neighborhood that needs to be the example of what Montgomery County needs to try to model others after, not a neighborhood that Montgomery County should overrun with multi-family housing and eventual apartment complexes. We simply want to keep our neighborhood the same because that's why we moved here. Initiatives like this will only push us out of the neighborhood. If that is the goal, I wouldn't be surprised, but that is truly a shame. Montgomery County should be proud of what it once was, safe and hard-working, and Chevy Chase along with other neighborhoods potentially affected by this initiative are great models for what the county should strive for. Please do not change our neighborhoods that we love. Please think of our children!

130 9	<p>Liz Price - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I am supportive of expanding housing opportunities in MoCo and the proposed zoning changes</p>
131 0	<p>Austin Threadgill - Potomac, 20854</p> <p>I absolutely believe that this should be implemented. My wife and I are renters and active community members. We have made flower arranging courses for the homebound and help take care of a cemetery in Potomac. We partake in recreational sports in the community and go out of our way to support small businesses. We are also in the process of adopting.</p> <p>We also make over a quarter of a million dollars a year..and we can't afford housing in Montgomery County. We love our neighborhood, but, even though there are lots of homes that are empty and decaying, or lots with tons of space, we can't find an affordable home.</p> <p>The only thing I would recommend is that if more than 3 units are built, at least 1/3 of the houses be set aside for affordable housing (rounded up, so 5 units would require 2).</p> <p>There is no reason not to allow them and let the market create more housing. It is well known that the United States desperately needs millions of units, with Montgomery County especially needing it. Furthermore, much of the current stock created before 2000 was supported with government dollars and less stringent regulation. Finally, the average home in Montgomery County now sells for 50% more than it did before 2020. Even with the rise in salaries, how can anyone keep up with the pace necessary to pay those prices?</p> <p>I just ask that the same opportunity be given to me as was given to current homeowners. As someone who has built a life in this community, and gives back extensively to this community, I humbly submit that the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative be implemented.</p>
131 1	<p>Anne Barter - Bethesda, 20816</p> <p>You are really making a terrible plan! Our lots are not big enough to add extra living spaces!! What you are dreaming of is not in our best interest as tax payers in Montgomery County!! Quadplexes belong with other quadplexes and NOT next to single family homes!!!</p>
131 2	<p>Cheryl Gannon - Silver Spring, 20910</p> <p>Dear Councilmembers,</p> <p>I have been a resident of Montgomery County for over 30 years, first in Takoma Park and now in the Woodside section of Silver Spring. I understand the affordability problem and have tried to support efforts to make affordable opportunities for residents who need help. I organized a group that worked to promote support for the ADU expansion. I supported the Faith Based Initiative. As zoning chair, I led my Civic Association through a lengthy process that resulted in an endorsement of duplexes by right (with at least one unit owner occupied)</p>

and I have attended some meetings at the Church in Woodside that is planning an affordable housing project on their land. I've lent my support to the pastor and met with the building committee. However, I cannot support this initiative. I wish I could. I wish it would help people who really need a hand finding homes here. But instead, it throws open the doors to investors to buy single-family homes and make it harder for families to buy a home. Already, a modest price home in East Silver Spring has been purchased by a venture capital firm based in Dubai and has sat empty for months, no doubt waiting for this initiative to pass. It is likely that the lower priced homes will be torn down for more expensive development. Downtown Silver Spring has an 8% tree canopy, the lowest in the county. It is a heat island now, per NOAA. This is the result of years of neglect of the environment by the Planning Board. There is no consideration of infrastructure, schools, the environment or how the stressed infrastructure will be paid for in this proposal. There have been too many waivers over the years of impact taxes and tree requirements and particularly of storm water management rules. The Council should reject this proposal and refocus on a plan to build affordable housing while enhancing the quality of life in communities and protecting the environment. There is so much unnecessary overreach in this proposal. The 500 foot growth corridors will rezone many single family lots for medium density and homeowners on those blocks face 4 story buildings and apartment buildings with paved backyards for car traffic. One thing I learned as zoning chair in my neighborhood is that people will do the right thing if you are really straight with them about all the details. But the spin that the Council and Planning staff are engaged in is likely to just alienate people from your cause. Saying that this is just a proposal for duplexes and maybe a few triplexes will only make people angry when they find out about 4 story stacked flats and apartment building next to their home. Telling people that nobody will force them to develop their land is cynical when we all know that when developers buy your neighbors property and you will be next to a parking lot, you will be pressured to sell as well. People know this and the spin is just making people angry. When people find out that changing the classification of their property will create overlap with the state law that gives bonuses in size and allows commercial developments on formerly single family blocks-- they will be angry at this "omission" of important facts. Please start being completely transparent about all of the details.

Steve Saeger - Bethesda, 20816

131
3

I am deeply troubled by how ill-conceived this initiative is. There is little evidence that it will actually lead to the creation of more affordable housing in the county; at the same time, there is no effort to address the potential impacts on traffic, infrastructure, and the environment.

Jean Teichroew - Silver Spring, 20910

131
4

I am opposed to the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative because I do not think it will help people afford to live in Montgomery County. I think it will benefit developers, who will price multifamily units at higher rates. It has the potential to damage older single-family neighborhoods without ample resources for additional strain on infrastructure, including schools and traffic. It sounds good in theory, but it will be uneven in practice—and county residents who need the most help will get the least.

Douglas McManus - Bethesda, 20816

131
5

I oppose AHS on the grounds that it sacrifices the settled expectations of single-family detached homeowners under established R-60 zoning and establishes one-size-fits-all Pattern Book designs as incentives for developers to disrupt neighborhood infrastructure. I am

troubled by the unsubstantiated, wishful thinking stated in the AHS Goals that seems to serve developers rather than existing homeowners by promising to “diversify the county’s communities by diversifying the county’s housing stock,” without expressly providing for affordable housing eligibility criteria, subsidies or resale deed restrictions to ensure continuity.

The 2024 Planning Board Recommendations lack evidence-based studies of impacts on the environment (tree canopy), parking, storm-water drainage and school capacity. I agree with Marc Elrich that AHS is a massive, as-of right rezoning that could affect about 164,000 homes ...82 percent of the county where single-family homes are designated. This project seems like an affordable housing project that lost its way insofar as market pricing of units most likely will not address the goals of providing housing for the 'Missing Middle.' If this project is approved by the County Council as broadly as proposed by the Planning Board litigation contesting the process and substance of AHS is assured.

Anne Rzeszut - Chevy Chase, 20815

131
6

I have serious substantive concerns with the Planning Board’s Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative Recommendations. The proposed strategy appears to be primarily beneficial to developers not current homeowners or those looking for housing. The current strategy that allows small scale attainable housing is what would be found in single-family neighborhoods that allows multi-unit buildings such as duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes that maintain the general size and scale of single-family homes in existing neighborhoods with no consideration given to neighborhoods already burdened with inadequate public facilities, overcrowded schools, inadequate green space, limited parking and traffic congestion.

Many alternative options could achieve similar housing goals, but these are not being considered. For instance, lower-density residential or mixed-use zoning overlay districts could be established on underutilized land. This approach could accommodate retail and low- to medium-density residential developments without the need for the complex, endless Planned Unit Development (PUD) process within commercial cores of cities and towns along growth corridors, as stipulated by the AHSI. A prime example is the GEICO Insurance site in Chevy Chase or the previous White Flint mall. These transit-oriented locations would be much better suited for a mixed-use development that could support hundreds of attached, multiplex, and multifamily homes. The Planning Board should be directing and encouraging development in underutilized commercial cores, not dismantling single-family zoning.

It makes total sense to provide or construct both types of housing on less expensive land that is convenient to public transportation and provides an opportunity to increase housing in multiples, rather than random multi-unit housing in established single family neighborhoods.

Bernice DiMichael - Silver Spring, 20910

131
7

I am opposed to the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. I do not think that the Initiative will achieve its purported goal—there are too many loopholes and it will be a boondoggle for developers. It will ruin older neighborhoods, overcrowd already overcrowded schools and roads, destroy tree cover. Lots of damage with no guarantee that it will meet needs.

I think that the Council should focus on AFFORDABLE housing for low income people. Helping middle class people buy a house, if that is a sensible goal should not be done on the backs of other homeowners and their neighborhoods.

The Council should seek other ways of helping first time owners, such as tax deferments or breaks, low cost loans, etc.
I find it interesting that many of the Council and Planning Commission supporters of this initiative live in communities that will not be affected. For example, Mr. Jawanda who placed this proposal before the Council, lives in Sandy Spring—an area that will not be affected by this proposal. The Council President lives in Takoma Park, an area not regulated by the Planning Commission.
Please do not allow this poorly conceived wholesale change to Montgomery County zoning laws
Bernice DiMichael

131
8

Kenneth Markison - Chevy Chase, 20815

I appreciate the Montgomery County Council's effort to present new housing proposals - providing materials and listening sessions on the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHSI).

I am a near-lifelong resident of Montgomery County who has lived in the Chevy Chase West neighborhood for forty-seven years. I have also worked as a lawyer in government and in the private sector on housing issues for my entire career.

From what I've learned so far, I cannot conclude that this initiative will successfully address the County's future housing needs and make housing, particularly in our community, more attainable to most.

In the case of our neighborhood, AHSI is likely to crowd schools, exceed limited parking, overwhelm storm drainage and other infrastructure, thus diminishing the character of the neighborhood, while actually increasing already high home prices.

I recognize that the County's housing needs are growing and require planning to satisfy them. Indeed, I look forward to a growing population in the future.

I urge that -- rather than a broad brush focus on upzoning of most existing neighborhoods, the Council should determine -- based on data -- what its real housing needs are and will be for the coming years, and then propose a plan, including but not limited to, affordable housing, workforce housing and first-time buyer housing to meet its needs.

Montgomery County is an astute and caring community. I believe a thoughtful, workable comprehensive plan to meet the County's housing needs, utilizing vacant land, approved sites, naturally occurring affordable housing, and other resources would enjoy broader support than AHSI.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Nicholas DiMichael - Silver Spring, 20910

131
9

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am strongly opposed to the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHS) proposed by the Planning Board. The proposal would not affect the majority of County Council members, and would seriously hurt many residents of the large areas included in the proposal. The proposal assumes that residents a full mile from rail stations will desire to walk rather than ride or take a car to a the rail stations. That assumption is simply incorrect. and indeed it is inconsistent with current data, that indicates that only 20 percent of Metro rides in Montgomery county walk or ride bikes to Metro stations

In addition, there is simply no reason to believe that multiplex units in single-family neighborhoods will be less expensive to rent or buy than current residences. Numerous residences are old, and if they are torn down to build new multiplex residences, it is likely that builders will attempt to plan and build residences that will be as expensive as possible. The economics of construction make clear that developers and construction companies have every motive to construct residences that will equal or exceed the cost of the residences that they buy. Indeed, that is the entire economic point of construction -- to build NEW residences that are more expensive than the residence purchased for that construction.

The Council should NOT approve the AHS initiative.

Nicholas DiMichael

██████████ Silver Spring

Jennifer Hess - Silver Spring, 20910

132
0

Thank you, Lisa, for presenting at the North Woodside Civic Association meeting. I appreciate your explanation of the Attainable Housing Strategy.

I am writing to express my concerns about the strategy and proposed changes to North Woodside's current zoning (R-60). The proposed changes would allow private developers to purchase houses, demolish them, and put up duplexes, triplexes and quadplexes. Developers will aim to maximize profits and will build whatever structures will best meet that end. Tree canopy and aesthetic character of the neighborhood will not be a priority for developers. Moreover, the proposed changes do not require developers to plan or pay for needed infrastructure improvements to accommodate denser housing and do not address issues around parking. Under this plan, developers have no incentive to create attainable housing and bear none of the cost of denser housing.

I am also concerned that the plan allows apartments of up to 19 units within our neighborhood on Columbia Blvd. Such units would dramatically impact our neighborhood in terms of character of the neighborhood, parking, and infrastructure.

I understand the need to build more attainable and affordable housing. This plan leaves that goal to the discretion of developers who have no incentive to create either attainable or affordable housing. I am not convinced that the county has adequately looked at alternative

solutions like using land the county owns already to build attainable/affordable housing or redeveloping land that is zoned commercially for mixed use and putting retail on the ground floor with housing above.

132 Martha Vance - Silver Spring, 20910

1 I oppose the attainable housing initiative.

If duplex/triplex/quadplex buildings are allowed to be built within already densely populated areas, it could result in increased traffic, parking issues, and busier streets in a neighborhood with an abundance of young children, many of whom walk to the neighborhood school.

It's hard to imagine how affordable housing could be created in this area.

132 Christopher Reynolds - Silver Spring, 20901

2 I support the Planning Department's good work on the AHSI. Middle class folks are being priced out of Montgomery County, and especially out of the transit-rich downcounty areas. Meanwhile we have vast areas zoned exclusively for high-dollar single-family detached housing, and many of these zones are walkable or bike-able to transit and urban centers. In my neighborhood just northeast of downtown Silver Spring, we have a mix of townhouses, small apartments, a large condo building, single family homes, and even some homes that (perhaps unofficially) are duplexes or have ADUs. We also have a large senior housing facility. Many folks in the county seem to think that our neighborhood must be impossible or dysfunctional or that our property values must be in free fall. None of this is true. We are a very active, lively, and lovely neighborhood, and our neighborhood association even won a major award from the Montgomery County Civic Federation this year. I strongly believe that nobody's neighborhood will be "ruined" by legalizing additional housing types. Our neighborhood is living evidence of it. I hope that the Council looks for ways to bring the Planning Department's vision for new middle-class housing opportunities to life. Future generations will thank you for it.

132 Anne Simoneau - Bethesda, 20816

3 I strongly do not agree with the AHS initiative. I am a young mother who purchased a house on Ogden Court in the Springfield neighborhood because of the neighborhood feel; rezoning would change the whole fabric of this ESTABLISHED neighborhood. If you want a more attainable housing solution why wasn't that put into place in the new condos that were built down the street by the new Giant structure? Instead those condos are selling for more than most houses in the Springfield neighborhood. Put affordable housing in new developments and closer to metro systems, not in ESTABLISHED neighborhoods that attracted buyers because the lots were zoned for single family homes.

132 Laura Parks - Silver Spring, 20910

4 I am very concerned that in older, down county neighborhoods (houses over 100 years old in some instances) that have much smaller lots, that existing infrastructure will not support the proposed increased density. Does the Attainable Housing Strategies provide for (or even acknowledge) the need for additional funding to enhance storm run off solutions, sewers, public schools, and potential need to expand

public transportation if single family homes are converted to duplex/triplex/quad units on existing small lots? And where do people with vehicles park with increased density in small lot neighborhoods; already that's often a challenge with only single family homes and narrow streets. Finally, how does attainable housing address the critical need for affordable housing like public school teachers, fire fighters, etc, to say nothing about lower income individuals we also welcome and need in our county.

132
5

Nicole Virgo-Carter - Unit 204, Silver Spring

Thank you all for proposing this plan. My thoughts:

- 1) I am in favor of implementing the gist of this - upzone and allow for various “-plexes” on current single-family home areas. We definitely need an increase in housing supply, and “-plexes” do not fundamentally change neighborhoods in negative ways.
- 2) Urgent work needs to be done from a supply *and policy* perspective to ensure that housing affordable to ***low-income families*** actually becomes available. I do think this plan provides a solid step to relieve housing price pressure overall, but we need more done explicitly for low-income folks so they can stay in Montgomery County. Building several quality units explicitly for those communities should take precedence, and there need to be rules that restrict those units for residents with the qualifying AMI. Not a fan or believer in anything - money, homes, etc. - trickling down.
- 3) This cannot be limited to down county. Most affluent areas upcounty and west (hi Potomac!) need to also be upzoned accordingly. Public transportation needs to be expanded out in those directions as well. I know Rockville and Gaithersburg City Councils may have the ability to override any/all of the plan, but those areas should *definitely* be strongly encouraged or have some county benefits withheld.
- 4) I agree with what several residents said about making sure the infrastructure (road, water, sewage, stormwater drainage, parking, green space, etc.) is there for any additional residents. I spoke with someone at Evan Glass’ table at Taste of Bethesda - apparently money is available for some infrastructure resources, but it’s not a well-known program. Those resources should either be part of the plan or immediately applied for concurrently with the implementation of the plan.

Thank you!

Nicole (a Silver Spring native and homeowner)

132
6

Tony Altar - Garrett Park, 20896

I consider zoning changes like the ones proposed to be a violation of the covenant between government and property owners who buy and place their life's largest investment in a single property. We should have no worries that the zoning of their neighborhood will drastically change the town they live in and the value of their largest investment. My wife and I staunchly oppose changing the zoning in communities like the one we live in, Garrett Park Maryland.

132
7

Myra Jacobs - Chevy Chase, 20815

I want to register my strong objection to the AHSI. I attended a "listening" session at BCC, which strengthened my advance opposition to the rezoning plan to allow multifamily buildings in large swaths of our residential areas, thereby changing the character of our suburb from that which motivated us to settle here. #1 The areas proposed for higher density housing suffer from a lack of essential infrastructure to support a bigger population in the same space: poor public transport options (the Metro stations including Purple Line are not within quick and easy reach of large sections), always clogged roads, overcrowded schools up and down the Conn Ave corridor, to name a few. #2 Where the plan even before adoption/implementation is a total fail is that whatever multiple units might be erected, they will be neither "affordable" nor "attainable". We can be 100% certain of that, just observing what has already been approved and built. As a Chevy Chase Rollingwood homeowner, I myself would be hard pressed to purchase any of the new condos that are currently for sale eg at the massive high density Chevy Chase Lake development, or those at Friendship Heights. So while there is certainly a dearth of affordable housing in the DMV, the presented AHSI rezoning proposal will simply increase the number of extremely expensive housing units in the areas targeted by the AHSI, while further burdening our infrastructure. The heavy environmental (and aesthetic) impact of loss of mature trees and open space that is already far advanced (because of MoCo's approval of larger and larger homes on modest lots) is an important consideration, that would only get worse when shoehorning multiunit buildings into what was a single family lot. With warming trends we cannot afford to keep hacking away at our green canopy that gives some relief from the heat. #3 There are already MoCo approved apartment projects for tens of thousands of units yet to be completed - where is the data that these will leave an unmet need for the very expensive accommodation that this AHSI will generate? #4 Assurances were given at the meeting I attended that any multiunit buildings would blend in gracefully among single family homes eg with respect to setbacks etc. However, MoCo has a disgraceful and disastrous record of holding developers to their approved plans through inspectors apparently blind to infractions of plans and codes: I am thinking of at least one building in Bethesda that had extra floors erected before inspectors noticed. Of course, the builders were not required to restore their construction to what had been approved. Likewise Clarksburg - roads much narrower than approved. And literally in my own backyard, a McMansion that was approved with a requisite water management plan that was never carried out. The result is that all the abutting homes have struggled with runoff from that overbuilt property and have had themselves to adopt the water management strategies that were required, but ignored when the large home was approved. #5 In short, it is apparent to me that the proposed AHSI cannot provide meaningful improvements in housing capacity without destroying our area's character. As multifamily units multiply, it will become less and less appealing for residents to remain in their single family homes and ours will become a high density housing area. What is abundantly clear is that it will be a bonanza for developers.

132
8

Adam Vodraska - Chevy Chase, 20815

We oppose the AHSI initiative because the higher residential densities proposed will destroy the fundamental historic nature of numerous neighborhoods in Chevy Chase that have for over a century been centered on single family homes. The resulting higher densities from the initiative will lead to even more traffic congestion and environmental degradation such as increased stormwater issues. As long-time residents whose properties are already very heavily taxed by the county we hope you will listen to our voices.

132
9

David Frelinger - Gaithersburg, 20878

The Affordable Housing Strategies report contains a large number of recommendations for changes impacting both large numbers of people, and properties of significant economic values without anything approaching a serious benefit-cost analysis. While the objectives for the recommendations are clear, the policy recommendations are not traceable to any analyses that examines the sensitivities of outcomes to significant changes in assumptions, or the costs likely that will be attributable to the policy recommendations. Additionally, alternative approaches to addressing the housing problem are not presented in the report, with the result being that potentially less costly and less disruptive solutions are presented to the County Council, other decisionmakers, or to the public so they can properly understand the strengths and weaknesses of different policy recommendations.

It would not be prudent to proceed with any action at this point in time aside from developing a fuller analysis of the problem as well as examining the larger range of possible solutions to this problem of generating sufficient housing for the region's population.

133
0

Lorna Brundage - Gaithersburg, 20878

I have many, many concerns about the "attainable housing initiative" currently being considered. Here are three examples. First, it seems foolhardy to greenlight massive residential building by rights without planning for infrastructure changes that will be needed and how those changes will be paid for. Second, in many of the designated areas, there is already a lot of housing currently being built, including "missing middle" type housing, and there is still significant land available for residential building later on. So these are changes which would be disruptive, and in many parts of the county they are not needed. Third, this plan contemplates big increases in density in areas even if they are not near transit hubs. For example, my neighborhood would be authorized for the highest level of density, even though it is 5 miles from the nearest metro station. If part of the impetus for this plan is environmental, it does not make much sense to focus development so far away from metro and traffic corridors. Thank you

133
1

Bridget Collins - Kensington, 20895

I find myself troubled by several points but some of that may be settled with more research on my part.

But from last night - two main things occur to me.

1. Who exactly are the people the Planning Board expects to take this housing? From last night, I tried to imagine this future neighbor. They do not own a car. (The Planning Board specifically said that parking requirements for this new construction will be reduced 75% because the county is trying to move away from cars.) They do not therefore work off shift. The planning board said that we are scheduled for higher density because of the MARC station - which isn't useful for anyone who works a non 7-9 to 4-6pm shift. So no nurses, cops, EMTs or restaurant/hotel workers. These new neighbors must not be plumbers, painters, general contractors, electricians or food truck entrepreneurs because they would need parking, preferably off the street for their work trucks.

They do not currently have school age children because the planning board didn't seem to have a solid answer on how an influx of kids will be managed by down county schools.

They do not seem to need an increased sewage capacity - since the planning board person seemed unaware that older suburbs may have older sewage systems.

They will not be using public transportation to go downtown in the evening since there didn't seem to be any plan to increase buses. I guess Uber is going to make out like a bandit.

They will not need a yard since it sounded like the small buildings will be taking up most of the property. So I'm guessing no gardeners. And since they won't have cars, I guess that's why there was no thought about adding electric charging stations, increasing MARC parking or the fact that some streets will not be wide enough with on street parking to accommodate emergency vehicles.

These new neighbors have to make enough income to afford a \$600k house or condo, and at the same time, they have to want to live in Kensington without a yard or possibly sidewalks. (If we have to widen the streets, something will have to go.) And their job is something where they need to commute to an office instead of working remotely.

2. I noticed a very odd split between two takes on the speed of this change. Lisa from planning said in answer to several questions that this was going to be a county wide initiative and Planning did not have the time to look at the multiple Master Plans already passed by different areas. We needed to get working on "attainable housing" now. Right now.

In response to a question about down county schools being overcrowded, she responded that they would think of something (I am paraphrasing from rough notes) but the problem would be dealt with. Pretty much "Trust us."

In response to the question about sewage capacity, planning didn't have time to look at all the various sewage systems. Or street widths.

We needed to get housing for the missing middle right now.

At the same time, Lisa and Jason made it sound as if the actual building would be more gradual. That this wouldn't be an immediate change but as teardowns happened they would just be filled in with something more "attainable."

Well, if we're only doing a couple dozen tear downs a year, why isn't there time to look at the Master Plans? Why isn't there time to figure out the schools BEFORE this kicks in. How is this gradual change going to help this crisis?

Jason assured me that the people moving out of the country were younger, more diverse and we needed to keep them but I am curious how much of that is natural turnover since younger, well educated folks move more for jobs in their 20s and other younger well-educated folks move in to replace them. I'm also curious why there was no mention of commercial space being rezoned to condos & coops.

But either this is an immediate crisis, in which case 20 houses a year down county being converted to small apartment buildings isn't going to fix it. Or it's a long term problem, in which case why can't the Master Plans be coordinated to deal with this?

OR once this goes through it will not be a small number of houses being knocked down.

3. The planning board map made it clear that the goal of equity across the county does NOT include building infrastructure so that places like Potomac could have more affordable housing. Nor did anyone mention Clarksburg where they built the houses and then the infrastructure. Where by the way townhouses are also going for \$600k. Maybe it's just me but I can't see how this creates long term housing for working class & middle class people which isn't being sold to people in five years for the same amounts we're saying are unattainable now.

4. Any idea why if everyone in planning seems to think that tearing down small houses and replacing them with McMansions is the heart of our problem, we don't just regulate what can replace an affordable house? Because if a builder can't expand, they won't be driving up prices, right?

I'm sure I'm missing something but I felt big pieces of information were not available. Especially why the rush to get this passed.

Bridget Collins
[REDACTED]

Alex Sarria - Bethesda, 20816

133

2

I respectfully oppose the implementation of the Attainable Housing Initiative near R-60 zoned neighborhoods along River Road, specifically the Woodacres neighborhood. Though perhaps well intentioned, the Initiative upends the settled expectations of hundreds of homeowners who have invested in a community that is presently quiet, safe, walkable, and protected from both ill-conceived development and over-development.

The Initiative, as applied near a neighborhood like Woodacres, will depress single family home values, create even more traffic, add new pollution streams (air, water, and noise), overcrowd our already full local elementary school, and fundamentally change the character and aesthetic of a unique and historic neighborhood.

Those types of changes serve the interests of no one except private developers. As proposed, the Initiative calls for multi-family housing units similar to those being built near the Westbard development, only a few blocks south of Woodacres. Far from contributing to "affordable housing" stocks, the price points for those units border \$1M, well above the means of the underserved populations the Initiative aims to support. That reality defeats the entire premise of the Initiative because it fosters development for development's sake, with no benefit to underserved populations and to the detriment of existing residents.

The Initiative also lacks evidence-based analysis of issues that are critical to all residents, such as environmental impacts (storm water runoff, air and noise pollution), traffic patterns, public school capacity, and public service resourcing (sanitation, fire, police). That lack of

data reveals another major flaw of the Initiative: as written, the “plan” is for developers to build, yet there is little evidence of any real plan to ensure quality of life after the developers are gone.

At bottom, I oppose the Initiative because it creates hardship for existing residents and is not designed to achieve the goals it purports to accomplish.

Nicholas Clements - Silver Spring, 20901

133
3

I am opposed to the Attainable Housing Strategies in its current form. I live in the Woodmoor community. My street is one of the more congested as far as parking is concerned and houses are close to each other. Traffic is already heavy in many parts of my community especially during rush hour. When I come home I take a deep breath knowing that I am away from the congestion of nearby 495, 29 and 193. With this housing plan I will be driving into congested streets and parking may even be difficult to find. If this plan goes into effect I will have to consider moving out of the county. There are better ways to build affordable housing. THIS IS NOT ONE OF THEM.

Judith Coan-Stevens - Silver Spring, 20901

133
4

I support the allowance of more multi family buildings in neighborhoods currently zoned exclusively for single family homes

Marianne Hilgert - Silver Spring, 20910

133
5

I am not in favor of the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. I don't think that it will help people afford to live in my neighborhood. Individual multi-family housing units may be more expensive than some of our single family homes. In addition, it will change the character of my neighborhood. We are already facing many changes with the Purple Line and the effects of these have not yet been laid out as construction is ongoing.

Bruce Levin - Bethesda, 20816

133
6

The attainable housing strategies are a huge step to addressing social and economic challenges and the historically exclusionary results of single family zoning. The County is becoming more economically challenged and is less competitive due in part to the lack of more affordable housing and housing options in and around transit areas such Bethesda, Rockville, Silver Spring, etc. This could go a long way toward improving this imbalance and allowing for more mobility with and into MoCo. The proposed streamlining of the development process is a very good part of the proposal and this should be implemented throughout the County development process - by-right development jurisdictions historically respond to market conditions more quickly the site plan jurisdictions which have many obstacles to developing in accordance with existing zoning. The only concern we have is parking. There are excellent examples of parking regulation schemes in MOCO and DC that can limit parking for higher density development if it cannot be accommodated on-site. The most successful and easy to implement, in my view, is the Residential Parking Permit in DC, which is NOT issued for parking non-compliant properties\residents. Don't be cowards, stop kowtowing to the outspoken SF homeowners that want to keep the status quo established to exclude those with lesser means, minorities and Jews from neighborhoods.

133
7

Michele Baker - Bethesda, 20816

I do NOT want the council to approve the attainable housing initiative. Please stop this now!

133
8

Dennis King - Silver Spring, 20919

I don't feel that affordability should be the direct goal, it should be density, which helps affordability. But I don't think you are approaching this correctly in other ways. A larger inventory of units in the same space is likely to mean smaller numbers of bedrooms per unit, not only smaller overall size. This will drive out established working adult couples who need at least three bedrooms just for themselves (bedroom, den for each to work from) before any thought of children. If you do not ensure that many three-plus bedroom units are built, you will be making the need for established adults and families to leave, to move to farther-out suburbs to meet their needs, worse instead of better.

Build more, not less usefully.

133
9

D Goldfarb - Bethesda, 20816

I oppose the Attainable Housing Strategy. In its rush to provide housing for the Missing Middle, the 2024 Planning Board Recommendations lack study of tradeoffs and unintended consequences. It does not consider:

- * Affordable housing eligibility criteria, subsidies, or resale restrictions
- * School capacity
- * Storm Water Damage
- * Massive as of right rezoning
- * Parking capacity
- * Continued exodus of residents (and tax revenue) from MoCo/MD

134
0

ROGER REESER - SILVER SPRING, 20902

I'm against it. Where are the extra cars going to park.

134 1	MARTHA REESER - SILVER SPRING, 20902 I'M AGAINST IT.
134 2	Steven Rosenfeld - Silver Spring, 20910 It is more than apparent that the urban planners(new urban planners: WaPo Seeing red in Blue Md. county 10-19-24) who we have entrusted with providing solutions to the housing question have NOT been planning for the increased infrastructure overload. These planners are trained to plan "growth", not "limit growth". This North Woodside resident is ardently opposed to their illiberal progressive proposals.
134 3	Emily Grossi - Chevy Chase, 20815 I strongly oppose the AHSI for many reasons, including: -Planning hasn't provided evidence that AHSI will provide what the county needs, as it will be based on market-rates which is often NOT AFFORDABLE housing. Market-rate housing does not solve the need for attainable housing that is affordable. -Multiplex housing in single family housing zones will increase traffic congestion which also increases the likelihood of traffic accidents/safety concerns, lessen green space and wildlife habitat (already very threatened), and tax our public schools which are already over capacity. Our officials have decided that placing the burden for new housing on existing residential communities is one way to increase the housing supply, and I worry that even though listening sessions have been held, officials are only paying lip-service to our--their constituent--concerns. Thank you, Emily Grossi
134 4	Maura Gaffney - KENSINGTON, 20895 I am very concerned about the impact that rezoning will have on the parking situation in the area. I have a single-family home that does not have a driveway; I must park on the street. Allowing multi-family dwellings in my neighborhood may mean I, and the many other homeowners who have to park on the street, will be unable to park anywhere near our homes. I also do not think that this plan addresses affordability, and homes that are not affordable are not attainable.
134 5	Mari-Anne Pisarri - Silver Spring, 20910 I strongly oppose this Initiative. The many flaws with the proposal have already been explained by others, so I will simply summarize my strongest objections here.

1. The housing crisis is real, but it will not be resolved by a slavish devotion to density. Over the past 5 -7 years, scores of high-rise apartment buildings have been built in downtown Bethesda, downtown Silver Spring and DC without moving the needle on "affordable," "accessible," "attainable" (or whatever adjective you use to doctor up this plan) housing. (Ironically, the sprawling complex that sits on the old County Planning Board site on Ga. Ave. offers a very small number of "affordable" units.)

2. The Initiative ignores the societal benefits of land-use and architectural diversity. Communities with a variety of landscapes -- densely built urban areas, neighborhoods of single-family homes on small lots, and areas with homes on larger lots and more open space -- are more vibrant than communities whose only design imperative is to maximize the number of dwelling units.

3. The Initiative also ignores the societal benefits of historic preservation. My 350-home neighborhood of North Woodside is more than 100 years old. A newspaper ad from the 1920s touts the "Homes of diversified types--relieving from all chance of monotony," including "Bungalows of original designs and Cottages of Colonial character." Over the years, new homes have been added, of course, and thoughtful expansions of the original structures have taken place as well. We have miraculously been spared the tear-down and mansionization that has plagued other parts of the County. The original homes, like mine, were built with first-growth pine and other materials that cannot be replicated today.

Erasing these historic, and often quirky, single-family homes to make way for glue-board- and-siding multi-unit structures will result neighborhoods of uniform character, or more accurately, characterless uniformity.

4. The Initiative is environmentally disastrous. The proposed replacement of historic SFH neighborhoods with high-density residential tracts cannot occur without significant destruction of the tree canopy and hardscaping everything in sight. Older green neighborhoods that surround tree deserts like downtown Silver Spring provide essential air-cleansing and cooling. The local government should encourage the preservation of these neighborhoods instead of incentivizing their destruction in the name of expansive development.

5. The Initiative ignores collateral consequences to the existing infrastructure. As a result of uncontrolled cut-through traffic, the two-lane secondary residential streets in North Woodside are already beyond capacity at certain times of the day. Any meaningful increase in the density of this 350-home neighborhood will require widening the streets, thereby destroying even more trees. This would be a particularly cruel outcome, given the tireless efforts of some North Woodside neighbors to replace street trees that were lost to age and disease.

I appreciate the good intentions that motivated the development of the Initiative. However, good intentions cannot redeem this very, very bad idea.

<p>134 6</p>	<p>Moses Hetfield - Silver Spring, 20910</p> <p>I know there are a lot of loud people complaining about this plan, but PLEASE go forward with it! I am a young MCPS teacher living in downtown Silver Spring and rent consumes most of my income. I moved here from Texas, where I won a statewide teaching award, and have received excellent performance reviews from my current school, but I am considering moving back to Texas because housing is so expensive here. We are losing talent in education and, no doubt, in other professions due to the needlessly high cost of living. The other young teachers at my school either have wealthy spouses, work multiple jobs, or live with their parents because nobody else can afford to live here. If we had more of a free market for housing, with the legalization of duplexes and other options, we might actually have enough housing for middle class professionals to afford to live here.</p>
<p>134 7</p>	<p>Caitlin Simpson - Silver Spring, 20910</p> <p>I am in support of parts of the initiative but have the following concerns: More paved surfaces with no plan for storm water capture nor maintenance of tree canopy for heat island effects. I am concerned about putting in quadplexes in neighborhoods with smaller plots as found in many areas of inner Silver Spring. I am also concerned that the county is decreasing the impact fees, and this development will lead to more overcrowding in schools. I am concerned about the impact on neighborhoods such as North Woodside because it could have small apartment buildings with not enough parking for all of the new cars.</p>
<p>134 8</p>	<p>Jan Rothman - Kensington, 20895</p> <p>This is a disruptive, horrible idea. I lived in an MPDU in the mid 80s. The units were ugly and were built with subpar materials and did not fit in to the neighborhood. This unit was on Valerian Lane off of Tuckerman. There were too many residents, friends etc to support the parking spaces allowed. When large 3 level townhomes were built in front of us, it blocked all of our western sun. When it rained hard, our living rooms flooded from their water runoff. The management company did not maintain our lawns well so we were more of an eyesore. In essence, the neighborhood hated our units.</p>
<p>134 9</p>	<p>Frank Record - Bethesda, 20816</p> <p>I would like to express my concerns about the proposed Attainable Housing Strategy Initiative, AHSI. It is my understanding that the 'barrier to entry' to single family housing in suburban areas is the market-based cost and not discriminatory covenants that are now thankfully obsolete and no longer in place.</p> <p>I am not aware of any compelling evidence that allowing increased density will bring market-based costs down to levels affordable to the 'missing middle'. Furthermore, the AHSI does not take into account Montgomery County's existing zoning capacity or the impact of increased density on infrastructure, schools or the environment.</p>

In my view, it appears to be a 'one size fits all' approach lacking in mechanisms for neighborhood-level input.

There are, for example, numerous lower cost more affordable housing units/apartments in the area where we live including on MacArthur Blvd., Sangamore Road, Sentinel Drive, Westbard Bld., and River Road. Whatever their designation might be under the AHSI framework, it points up the need to consider the existing housing density in every neighborhood in any contemplated zoning changes.

**135
0** **Andy VanHorn - Kensington, 20895**

I strongly support the proposed zoning changes in the Attainable Housing Strategies initiative that would allow for greater housing density in our county. The lack of affordable housing has become a major issue, and economic research consistently shows that restrictions on housing supply, including zoning rules, are a key driver of high housing costs.

While some worry that the new housing created may not be low-priced, increasing the overall supply will help ease prices across all segments of the market. Economic research shows that as more units are built, pressure on rents and home prices decrease, benefiting households at all income levels.

Beyond economics, this issue is also about basic fairness and equity. Restrictive zoning disproportionately harms lower-income families and young people trying to enter the housing market. By allowing more homes to be built, we can make our wonderful county more accessible and affordable for everyone.

**135
1** **Caitlin Simpson - Silver Spring, 20910**

I'm supportive of the strategy with the caveat of making sure that the whole county is covered, and Silver Spring and Wheaton do Not carry the lion's share of the development as they have for affordable housing. I will also be watching how the council votes on the impact fees which should NOT be lowered.

**135
2** **Yitzhak Graff - Silver Spring, 20901**

I believe the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative is an important step for easing the housing shortage in Montgomery County. Allowing for the construction of missing middle housing in neighborhoods with high cost of land and throughout the county will provide a greater variety of housing options for people in the county, allowing for more sustainable population growth and economic development in Montgomery County. I am in favor of the initiative, and I hope the county council has an opportunity to vote on it.

**135
3** **Jay Tamboli - Silver Spring, 20910**

I think it makes sense to allow people to build multi-family housing on lots instead of only single houses, so I think the proposed changes

are a good idea. I'm concerned that they won't produce lower-priced housing, though. Still a good idea, even if prices stay high and just get denser, since that's better for transportation and the environment.

David Snyder - Bethesda, 20816

135
4

I am strongly opposed to the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative. It is misguided on almost all fronts, as many others have explained. It is also further evidence that the Planning Board does not understand the needs of County residents. I hope the Board and Council will adhere to democratic principles and make decisions based on the needs and interests of their constituents, the County environment, and our obligation to educate the children in our county.

Barbara Singer - Bethesda, 20816

135
5

We feel strongly that there is a need for a proper assessment of the areas that would be impacted. These areas are already very overcrowded with high levels of traffic and very full schools (30 students with one teacher in elementary). To sidestep assessment sends a message that leadership prefers to listen to investors rather than use a data driven approach.

Cheryl Shirley - Bethesda, 20816

135
6

I oppose AHS on the grounds that it sacrifices the settled expectations of single-family detached homeowners under established R-60 zoning and establishes one-size-fits-all Pattern Book designs as incentives for developers to disrupt neighborhood infrastructure. I am troubled by the unsubstantiated, wishful thinking stated in the AHS Goals that seems to serve developers rather than existing homeowners by promising to "diversify the county's communities by diversifying the county's housing stock," without expressly providing for affordable housing eligibility criteria, subsidies or resale deed restrictions to ensure continuity.

The 2024 Planning Board Recommendations lack evidence-based studies of impacts on the environment (tree canopy), parking, storm-water drainage and school capacity. I agree with Marc Elrich that AHS is a massive, as-of right rezoning that could affect about 164,000 homes ...82 percent of the county where single-family homes are designated. This project seems like an affordable housing project that lost its way insofar as market pricing of units most likely will not address the goals of providing housing for the 'Missing Middle.' If this project is approved by the County Council as broadly as proposed by the Planning Board litigation contesting the process and substance of AHS is assured.

Cynthia Winder - Bethesda, 20816

135
7

The negative impact of these housing strategies is immeasurable. Schools, roads, traffic volume, environmental impact all need to be more seriously considered.

If providing housing for middle-income wage earners is the goal, give up the White Flint 17 acres and dedicate it to housing for firemen, teachers, police, librarians with the deeds restricted to those who deserve affordable housing. Right now, as it stands, only the developers

are in line to profit. Think it over again, do your work, then return to us. I'm in support of attainable housing but not at the cost of disrupting established housing and the load it currently already bears.

Kyle Rees - SILVER SPRING, 20901-3341

135
8

Dear Members of the Montgomery County Planning Committee,

My name is Kyle Rees, and my wife and I purchased our home in the Seven Oaks-Evanswood community in December 2021. We were drawn to this area for its affordable housing, proximity to urban centers, and the peaceful, natural setting that provides a respite from city life. I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed Attainable Housing Strategies (AHS) initiative and to endorse the recommendations previously submitted by members of our community. While I appreciate the county's efforts to address housing affordability, I believe the current proposal falls short in addressing specific community needs and lacks sufficient planning for parking and infrastructure capacity.

****Community Input and Engagement****

Community input has not been adequately captured in the planning process. As relatively new residents, my wife and I were unaware of the significant changes being proposed until recently. The lack of effective outreach has prevented many residents from being informed or having the opportunity to provide input. Meaningful engagement is essential for developing solutions that reflect the needs of those who live here. I urge the Planning Committee to facilitate additional forums and extend the timeline for public feedback to ensure all voices are heard.

****Impact on Neighborhood Character and Infrastructure****

We chose this neighborhood for its unique character and balance between residential living and natural surroundings. Allowing multi-unit developments on single-family lots could significantly alter the neighborhood's aesthetic and environmental quality. The potential loss of green spaces, increased traffic, and parking congestion are concerns that have not been fully addressed. Additionally, increasing housing density without adequate infrastructure planning—including roads, utilities, schools, and public services—will put undue strain on existing resources, degrading the quality of life for all residents. I have not seen data indicating that the current infrastructure can support these changes or plans to enhance capacity accordingly.

****Developer Codes, Construction Quality, and Data Transparency****

Supporting increased housing density should not come at the cost of construction quality. Issues such as flooding, inadequate noise control, and poor maintenance have been prevalent in areas with insufficient developer codes. The Planning Committee must review and update

developer codes to ensure that new constructions meet high standards for environmental health, safety, and long-term sustainability. We cannot afford to repeat the issues faced by many duplex owners in DC, who suffered due to shoddy construction and inadequate maintenance coverage. Furthermore, transparent data collection methods are essential. The survey work being conducted lacks clarity about its design and administration, raising concerns about data quality and its impact on downstream decision-making.

****Recommendations****

I recommend enhanced community engagement, including expanded outreach and additional public meetings to ensure all residents are informed and involved. Comprehensive impact studies must be conducted on infrastructure, environment, traffic, and parking, and these findings should be shared publicly for community feedback. A collaborative planning approach that involves residents in developing solutions can help balance the need for more attainable housing with the preservation of neighborhood character. Alternative strategies, such as repurposing underused commercial properties, should be considered to increase housing options without disrupting established residential areas. Finally, developer codes must be updated to ensure that increased density does not result in subpar construction, and data collection methods must be overseen by experienced professionals to ensure reliability.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to contributing to a constructive dialogue.

Sincerely,

Kyle Rees
Seven Oaks-Evanswood Community
Silver Spring, Maryland

Arman Tanman - Chevy Chase, 20815

135
9

I am a concerned citizen from the Brookdale neighborhood and against the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative because of:

- added overcrowding which would result of already overcrowded schools, increased burden on the infrastructure of our already densely populated area;
- Increasing the property densities will significantly degrade the quality of life in the Brookdale neighborhood and permanently change it, an not for the better.
- since we do not have sidewalks it will be a safety concern for kids and pedestrians who routinely are walking and playing on the streets of our neighborhood;
- increased car traffic and street parking which is already a problem within the neighborhood reducing safety in the neighborhood

I have first hand experience (over the past 50 years) and have seen similar initiatives in other metropolitan areas degrade the quality of life in family neighborhoods. For example a very similar to the Brookdale neighborhood on the outskirts of the city of Ankara, Turkey in the 1970's and the city of Brooklyn, NY in the 1980's. Back then those were family neighborhoods with single family dwelling units where young families enjoyed living in and raising their children safely. Now they are highly congested apartments/duplex neighborhoods, with packed streets severely degrading the quality of life in those areas, where children cannot play outside. The increase of people and traffic resulted in significant increase in crime where families have moved out and resulted in areas where families would not care to live or raise their children anymore. Resulting in "Concrete" neighborhoods. I will gladly enlighten any Montgomery County Council to explain more about the consequences of such Attainable Housing Strategies.

Gerald Sharp - BETHESDA, 20814

136
0

I think the neighborhood could handle duplexes if they provided 4 off street parking spots per duplex, which i think the developers who want this would provide in order to sell the houses. But accessory dwellings units (ADUs), which like duplexes are two residences on one lot but are more affordable for renters, have been allowed in Parkwood since 2019, and almost no one has built these. ADUs would increase the housing density here just as much as a duplex would, but they are not as profitable for developers as buying a single house and then building and selling two million dollar houses on that single lot. Why not find ways to encourage ADUs if you want to increase affordable housing here?

The main problem I see is the parking. Quadplexes would be allowed in much of Parkwood because we are within a mile (as the crow flies, but we are not crows and the walking distance is farther) of the metro at Grosvenor and the Marc station in Kensington. But when was the last time anyone living in Parkwood walked over to Safeway to pick up their groceries? No, we are living in a suburb, and people will want their cars and probably at least two per residence. The plans for quadplexes show one off street parking place per quad dwelling. Where will the other 4 cars park? Or the 3 extra cars for triplexes? Many of the houses on my street do not have driveways, lets alone garages. Parking will be difficult here if this plan goes into effect and many of the houses are converted.

This plan will do nothing to increase attainable and affordable housing in Montgomery County. It would make much more sense to build large condo buildings on Rockville Pike near the metro or on what used to be White Flint Mall. And on other major roads such as Veirs Mills. And require that some units be priced low enough for low-income residents. That would actually increase attainable and affordable housing in Montgomery County. The plan to change zoning for us but not for Rockville, Gaithersburg, Potomac and other cities and areas in Moco that are exempted from the plan will not do that but will increase the profits of developers.

As a voter I will tell you that I will never support any council person who supports these zoning changes under this pretense that it increases attainable housing but actually does nothing to increase it and is instead a gift to the developer friends of council persons. There are 944 houses in Parkwood and many of the people living in these houses will also remember this betrayal of our neighborhood in future elections.

Gerald Sharp, Treasurer, Parkwood Residents Association

136 1	M Spellacy - Chevy Chase, 20815 I strongly oppose rezoning. This will hurt all families, stress infrastructure, and financially benefit developers.
136 2	Alexandra Acosta - Chevy Chase, 20815 I am writing to oppose the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative (AHSI). AHSI represents a complete failure on the part of the Planning Board and staff. Even at the most basic level, the Board and staff have not clearly delineated the goal of AHSI -- and indeed have failed even to define the term "attainable housing". Furthermore, the Board and staff have abrogated their responsibility to consider the impact on Montgomery County residents in the neighborhoods that would be included within AHSI. Instead, the Board and staff have been feckless in putting forth a sweeping and poorly-reasoned proposal that would give developers the virtually unfettered right to despoil the environment, harm our schools and the children who attend them, and strain Montgomery County's infrastructure and resources to the breaking point. In a recent listening session the Planning Department staff director could not provide any evidence to support the staff's notion that AHSI would make housing "attainable". In fact, when presented with tangible, concrete evidence of housing that developers have built and are currently building, including the new \$3 million + townhouses on Walsh Street in Bethesda, neither the Planning Board staff director nor the Board chair could provide any explanation of how AHSI would differ from this reality. Instead, they resort to labeling those who point out their failures as "NIMBYs". AHSI demonstrates a lack of imagination, rigor and professionalism on the part of the Planning Department staff and Board. If the Council supports AHSI, they will also be complicit in this utter sham.
136 3	Patricia Shea - Chevy Chase, 20815 I am sure this has been brought up before but please note the lack of attention to attainable housing in county's previous development plans for downtown Bethesda, Chevy Chase lake, and white flint mall. These areas all afforded opportunities for lower density family oriented attainable housing taking advantage of good schools and nearby metro access. Housing priority should be made for county teachers and first responders and their families. Instead there are expensive family unfriendly high rise buildings with no attention to traffic congestion along Connecticut and Wisconsin avenues.
136 4	Erika Brant - Silver Spring, 20901 I heavily disapprove of the MoCo attainable housing initiative. First, I believe the manner in which this plan has been communicated to the community is extremely sub-par. My home will be impacted by the University Corridor Plan, and I have attended two of the recent meetings as Blair High. For the second session, we received a flyer only one day in advance of the meeting and it was written in English only, disregarding the fact that many of our neighbors are Spanish and Ethiopian speakers (so much for the county's stated claim of aiming for more inclusivity and social justice). During the first session I attended last year, the topic of re-zoning was just a brief mention, instead the focus was on the safety of our streets. As such, stating that the county has given various opportunities for residents to state their concerns is simply not true. Only recently, when residents have insufficient time to respond, has the county been speaking openly about the rezoning in my area. It's no surprise that the county is trying to package the atrocious re-zoning measures with more desirable changes to our roads and sidewalks. It's also no surprise that they are trying to pass these changes through in the University Blvd area where many

of our neighbors come from historically politically disenfranchised groups. I would also like to raise the fact that the presentations we've seen have done nothing to address the concerns raised by residents around this plan. The plan and presentations are completely devoid of data indicating that this initiative is needed. Some examples of missing data would be data on bus ridership (how many people, where do they board and get off the bus, etc). The fact that this plan and the homes impacted is predicated on the existence and proximity to bus rapid transit stops is absurd, given those stops can be placed anywhere and the stops near my house never have more than one or two people waiting at any given time during rush hour. There is little demand for bussing where I live, but the county has arbitrarily chosen my community to create more demand. Find another location. I can state many many other problems, holes, concerns with the plan (including the lack of any assessment on how this will impact healthcare, schools, utilities, traffic in our communities). I would love to see the planning board work WITH the community, instead of trying to tear it apart. My husband and I moved here from NOVA because this was the only place we could afford a nice single-family home. Now the county is telling me to make way for the "missing middle" - unfortunately (via various recent case studies in MoCo), we all know that the homes that will replace mine will not be more affordable and in the meantime you're displacing people and families that cherish their homes, their community and their neighbors.

Margot LeF. Mahoney - Chevy Chase, 20815

136
5

Attainable housing is not affordable housing. Therefore it is the developers that will benefit. This is already proven by the \$3.6M townhouses just built on West. This is outrageous!
BCC cannot handle this type of increase in numbers and yes there WILL be families and traffic and the town and streets around it will be crowded, with a shortage of parking, etc.
This strategy is just wrong!
I can send photos of an example of this type of development in my daughters neighbor hood in Austin / and most of these townhouses and apartments are big ugly boxes with the front yards consisting of a driveway and a car or two. What happened to our tree filled lots? We moved here over 30 years ago for a green, tree lined, single family quiet neighborhood with sidewalks. We still want that.

Victoria Levitas - Chevy Chase, 20815

136
6

I strongly oppose AHSI because it does nothing to provide more housing at the market rate. I believe the council is selecting Chevy Chase because developers can charge more for housing there than in other neighborhoods already zoned for multi-use housing (Silver Spring, Rockville). Our schools are overcrowded and underfunded and AHSI fails to address any infrastructure impact. Once again your dishonesty is shining through in using data from different years to suit your agenda. Councilmember Friedson discussed winning back the BCC cluster's trust after our disastrous re-zoning, this only makes our distrust worse.

David Kahn - Bethesda, 20816

136
7

I oppose AHS on the grounds that it sacrifices the settled expectations of single-family detached homeowners under established R-60 zoning and establishes one-size-fits-all Pattern Book designs as incentives for developers to disrupt neighborhood infrastructure. I am troubled by the unsubstantiated, wishful thinking stated in the AHS Goals that seems to serve developers rather than existing homeowners by promising to "diversify the county's communities by diversifying the county's housing stock," without expressly providing for affordable housing eligibility criteria, subsidies or resale deed restrictions to ensure continuity.

The 2024 Planning Board Recommendations lack evidence-based studies of impacts on the environment (tree canopy), parking, storm-water drainage and school capacity. I agree with Marc Elrich that AHS is a massive, as-of right rezoning that could affect about 164,000 homes ...82 percent of the county where single-family homes are designated. This project seems like an affordable housing project that lost its way insofar as market pricing of units most likely will not address the goals of providing housing for the 'Missing Middle.' If this project is approved by the County Council as broadly as proposed by the Planning Board litigation contesting the process and substance of AHS is assured.

I sum there is not affordability component to the proposal, and therefore the proposal does not really solve for the affordable housing shortage in the county or country as a whole

136
8

John Yosaitis - Washington, 20007

Please please please change zoning laws to make housing more affordable

136
9

Juanita Hendriks - Bethesda, 20816

I believe the council needs to address affordable housing issues in Montgomery County. First time buyers need to be able to afford housing and "upgrade buyers" and "downsize" buyers also need to be able to afford something. I live in a 1.1million assessed 1966 house that is a dinosaur in my "tear down" neighborhood. I wouldn't be able to afford a nicer house in my own neighborhood, as they currently go for 2.7-3.0 million dollars. If the "system" to doesn't work for me, how on earth can it work for young people/ young families ?

137
0

Jack Benson - Chevy Chase, 20815

I am writing today to voice my strong opposition to the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative as currently designed.

137
1

Alissa Infinite Rothschild - Washington, 20010

Stop throwing Maryland residents in the street.

137
2

Matt Ptaszynski - Silver Spring, 20910

Montgomery County homeowners support zoning changes to allow missing middle housing such as duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes. We demand action addressing the housing shortage!

137 3	<p>Kevin Bromberg - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I I have read the propoganda from GGW, obviously sponsored by developers and believe that the great majority of informed citizens do not support the destruction of single family neighborhoods.</p> <p>Too bad people may believe these phony polls.</p>
137 4	<p>W Chan - Bethesda, 20814</p> <p>My family and I are very supportive of multi-unit housing in what is not sigle family zoning. We grew up in Chicago where 2 and 3 flat buildings were common and were inter-mixed with single family homes. My famiky still owns and occupies our 3 flat residence which my father purchased in 1962. We have had the same neighbors and even a renter for over 50 years. It is scare mongering to say that multi-plexes destabilize neighborhoods. Multi-plexes offer affordable rental and ownership opportunities which is what MoCo needs - desperately.</p>
137 5	<p>Julie Anderson - Kensington, 20895</p> <p>This is a terrible plan and only benefits builders and destroys our quality of life. Before allowing any more building, the infrastructure needs to be dramatically improved in this county with more roads and highway to accommodate all the cars and population. Stop destroying our way of life. People are not going to bikes or use mass transit.</p>
137 6	<p>JOAN DELORENZO - SILVER SPRING, 20901</p> <p>Go ahead and build, but NOT IN EXISTING SINGLE HOME NEIGHBORHOODS. Your plan will ruin nice neighborhoods and the homes in them will loose value.</p> <p>I suggest that you look at how multiple unit housing is built in Germany. The house looks like a single family house but there are three floors and each floor is a single apartment. They don't look like ugly "garden apartments".</p> <p>The existing single family neighborhoods don't want to see the crime that follows apartment buildings. If they had wanted to live in a crowded area they would have moved to a city, not the suburbs.</p> <p>If you go through with ruining my neighborhood with the ugly multi-family buildings you have planned I will remember that the next time election time rolls around.</p>
137 7	<p>Daniel Marcin - Silver Spring, 20902</p> <p>Can you introduce Attainable Housing legislation as soon as possible? What are you waiting for?</p>

137 8	<p>Davis Yewell - Gaithersburg, 20878</p> <p>I support any effort by Montgomery county to lower housing prices and the best way to do so is to end the exclusionary zoning that artificially increases scarcity while preventing the county from growing in population. It is important to make the county livable for all who wish to reside there, especially the workers the county depends on, it is unfair to restrict the majority of the county to wealthy single family homebuyers.</p>
137 9	<p>Susan Massey - Silver Spring, 20902</p> <p>Please allow additional housing units to be built to address the high cost of housing in our county, which prevents middle class families from moving here. This should include apartments and townhomes. I am aware that other community members in single family homes have voiced opposition to this; as an owner of a single family home, I have reached the opposite conclusion. Making our area more desirable can only enhance my property value and my overall living experience. (But do please require adequate parking to be built with new dwellings.)</p>
138 0	<p>Dwayne Holmes - Chevy Chase, 20815</p> <p>I'm a no on the strategy to change zoning. IMHO, this clearly is a failure of the county to foster a business tax base...unlike Virginia. I can't believe the white oak property is still vacant. Zero chance a property in this location would be vacant 10 miles south in VA. This is a clear handout to developers and is tone deaf to tax paying constituents. I'm not a NIMBY, and I supported bike lanes on conn ave and the purple line....however this idea lacks imagination and attainable housing is being used to pad politician and developer pockets. This is a direct effect of moving the 10% requirement for affordable housing north of areas that are expensive for decades. A 1M property sub divided into multiple 1M properties is not attainable housing unless you cap the price, which won't happen because you need the tax base. My family will consider leaving the county when we see a property sub divided within .5 miles of us and we will definitely vote against anyone who is responsible for this. Density is important, but I want to see attempted affordable housing in downtown Bethesda first. I see how much apartments cost and that is not affordable. So how is this helping anyone but developers and their politician friends. Use eminent domain on that white oak property first....this idea is extremely short sighted!</p>
138 1	<p>Karl & Laura Feinauer - SILVER SPRING, 20901</p> <p>As long time residence of south four corners and now woodmoor, we have experienced first hand the rapid growth causing reduced housing availability.</p> <p>However, it is premature at the least to start re-zoning single family housing lots as spelled out in the Attainable Housing Initiative. To assume that because there is rapid transit within a quarter mile, new residence will not come with multiple vehicles per household is highly inaccurate. Even if parking is provided (which is it not in the proposal) the traffic in and out of neighborhoods would become more unmanageable than it is now.</p>

The infrastructure (schools and water runoff/sewers) is currently not anywhere near adequate enough to support additional homes per a study done by the county government that was not addressed by the council and planning board. There are still areas of the county that are not built out. It would make much more sense to add housing where there is space (up county) and is actually more affordable than to try to break up existing lots in a part of the county that is already crowded and expensive. This would also increase the housing volume but in an area where new home buyers find more affordable. While this is not about affordability per se, to build multiple homes on previous single family lots, that are also not affordable because of their location, only exacerbates the problem. The Attainable Housing Initiative should not move forward until all other viable options have been addressed and or adequate infrastructure is in place to accommodate the additional homes. Thank you for allowing me to chime in.

138
2 **Lauren Knapp - Silver Spring, 20910**

I support adding multi-family housing to my neighborhood and all efforts to make housing in Silver Spring more affordable and accessible.

138
3 **Yulii Kurnosov - Bethesda, 20817**

I'm writing to express our family's opposition to the Montgomery County Planning Board's 2024 Attainable Housing Strategies initiative. In particular, we oppose the Board's recommendation to re-zone existing single-family home zoned neighborhoods to allow duplexes/triplexes/quadplexes. This is a critical issue for us that will determine all of our future voting decisions.

138
4 **Kyle Bishop - Silver Spring, 20910**

It's time to do something about high housing costs. I think this is a good idea, and I hope you'll keep it moving forward. I also strongly support the county not trying to dictate how this problem is fixed by prioritizing housing targeted at certain incomes, but rather by targeting more housing in general. Further, the county needs to make sure that all parts of the county share in these goals, and not allow certain areas to avoid density due to their wealth/status.

138
5 **Courtenay Ellis - Potomac, 20854**

15.No consideration of whether your "hub & spoke" premise for denser zoning around transport links into Washington DC has changed as people increasingly commute laterally between Suburban conurbations. Compare London underground/tube Circle Line initiated over 150 years ago.

16. No analysis of the failed British Victorian version of AHS where terraced affordable/attainable "town" houses have become nests of crime and riots triggering calls to demolish them. Why make the same mistake in MoCo?

138

Janis Bloom - Silver Spring, 20901

6

The whole plan as I understand it is awful! As Mr. Elrich points out, there has not been enough thoughtful consideration, research, and planning. This plan will greatly affect my community with adverse traffic, pollution and displacement. Do not pass this plan!!