



THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

MCPB
Item #2
November 14, 2002

November 6, 2002

Memorandum

To: Montgomery County Planning Board

From: Karl Moritz, Research & Technology Center, 301-495-1312 *KARL*

Re: Amendment to Annual Growth Policy to Revise Boundary of Grosvenor Policy Area

Summary

The Montgomery County Council is considering an amendment to the Annual Growth Policy to revise the Grosvenor Policy Area boundaries "to include the entire 15 acre property classified in the PD-28 zone under Local Map Amendment G-796." The owner of the property in question, Georgetown Preparatory School, plans 473 multi-family residential units on the property and has requested that the entire property be located in the Grosvenor Policy Area. Currently, most of the property is already located in the Grosvenor Policy Area, but approximately 11 percent is located in the North Bethesda Policy Area.

Currently, the North Bethesda Policy Area is in moratorium for new residential subdivision approvals, while the Grosvenor Policy Area has a positive net remaining capacity of 540 units. Expansion of the boundary would permit all of the residential development planned by the Georgetown Preparatory School to pass the Annual Growth Policy's Policy Area Transportation Review ("staging ceiling") test.

Park and Planning staff recommends that the Montgomery County Planning Board support the AGP amendment because the type and location of the proposed project are consistent with those of Metro Station Policy Areas: relatively dense residential development within walking distance of the Metro station. Although deviating somewhat from the original Sector Plan boundary (upon which the AGP policy area boundary is based), the location of the proposed development is justified because it minimizes the environmental and topographic impact to the site and provides compatibility with the adjacent neighborhood.

A related issue is the availability of additional AGP capacity from the programming of Montrose Parkway. Each November, Park and Planning staff estimate the amount of development capacity from transportation improvements that are anticipated to be fully funded in the first 5 years of local and state capital budgets. In this year's *Staff Draft FY 2004 Annual Growth Policy Ceiling Element*, Park and Planning staff anticipate that the programming of Montrose Parkway West will allow the County to increase staging ceilings in the four North Bethesda policy areas by 2,450 housing units and 8,000 jobs. This is more than enough capacity to eliminate the jobs deficits in North Bethesda and Twinbrook and the housing deficit in North Bethesda and as well as meet the staging ceiling needs of planned development in Grosvenor. Council action on the *FY 2004 Annual Growth Policy Ceiling Element* is scheduled for July 2003.

The allocation of capacity from Montrose Parkway can address a potential conflict on the Grosvenor Policy Area boundary change issue. Granting Georgetown Preparatory School's request will allow their development project first access to the 540 housing units available in Grosvenor, which would leave just 67 units available to Grosvenor Village, which is the other major multi-family residential project moving forward in Grosvenor. Grosvenor Village is located on the WMATA site, where it plans approximately 400 units. Allocating 500 housing units of the capacity from Montrose Parkway West to the Grosvenor Policy Area will be sufficient to support the approval of both planned projects.

Local Map Amendment Boundary and Transportation Issues

In their consideration of Local Map Amendment G-796, the Montgomery County Planning Board and the Montgomery County Council have recently reviewed several issues that are relevant to the proposed AGP amendment. These include consistency with the sector plan boundary (upon which the policy area boundary is based) and transportation issues.

Consistency With Sector Plan Boundary

The subject property is located mostly in the Grosvenor Sector Plan area of the North Bethesda – Garrett Park Master Plan and the Master Plan supports residential development around the Grosvenor Metro Station. As noted in the September 6, 2002 staff memorandum supporting approval of Local Map Amendment G-796, the Master Plan states, "the exact configuration of the 15 acres of the site to which the PD-28 floating zone may be applied will depend on environmental, topographic, or other similar reasons. Any deviations from the Sector Plan boundary would be expected to be minor in nature." The recent approval of the Local Map Amendment by the Planning Board and County Council indicates agreement with staff's finding that the deviation from the Sector Plan boundary is both minor and justified. The report notes that, "Locating the development in the proposed location minimizes the environmental and topographic impact to the site and provides compatibility with adjacent residential development." An excerpt from the staff report to the Planning Board is attached at circles 1 and 2.

The Grosvenor Policy Area boundaries were set by the County Council in the *FY 1994 Annual Growth Policy*, which also set the boundaries for the White Flint and Twinbrook Metro Station Policy Areas. The boundary determinations were made following adoption of the North Bethesda – Garrett Park Master Plan, and the boundary of the Grosvenor Policy Area is identical to the boundary of the Grosvenor Sector Plan Area shown in the North Bethesda – Garrett Park Master Plan. When developing Metro Station Policy Area boundaries, planners typically begin with boundaries that are the same as Sector Plan boundaries, but the final policy area boundaries may be different for a variety of reasons. For example, the Glenmont policy area is smaller than the Glenmont Sector Plan Area because the Glenmont Sector Plan Area included some areas that were single-family detached residential subdivisions, not planned for redevelopment, and farther than one-half mile from the Metro station.

Local Map Amendment Transportation Analysis

In general, Metro Station Policy Area boundaries are drawn to include planned development that will have a markedly higher transit mode share than a similar project located elsewhere. Transit mode shares are highest for development projects within one-quarter mile of Metro stations, and transit mode shares drop off sharply beyond a one-half mile radius. Metro Station Policy Area boundaries therefore vary from one-quarter to one-half mile from Metro station entrances. Metro Station Policy Areas with one-half mile radii are those with large concentrations of development in an urban pattern: Bethesda CBD, Silver Spring CBD and Rockville Town Center. One of the newest Metro Station Policy Areas, Shady Grove, is approximately one-third mile in radius. In Shady Grove's case, a one-quarter mile radius would have included only development on the east side of Rockville Pike. However, it was felt that the multi-family residential development in the King Farm along the west side of Rockville Pike would have a relatively high propensity to use Metro, and so it was included within the Metro Station Policy Area.

The September 12, 2002, *Revised Transportation Planning Staff Report for Local Map Amendment G-796* addresses the expected transit mode share of Georgetown Preparatory School development in the proposed location, which is approximately one-third mile from the Grosvenor Metro Station entrance. An excerpt of the report, beginning under the heading "Site Generated Traffic," is attached at circles 3 and 4.

The staff report notes that 20% of the site-generated traffic from the proposed 473-unit apartment development is expected to walk or bicycle to the Grosvenor Metrorail station rather than use their vehicles. "The 20% transit mode share is lower than the 25% mode share previously used for the approved Grosvenor Village development. The 5% difference in the transit mode share is because the pedestrian path from Inigo's Crossing [the Georgetown Preparatory School development] is approximately 2,000 feet compared with Grosvenor Village located next to the Metrorail station."

Park and Planning staff also prepared an October 2, 2002 memorandum for Hearing Examiner Phillip J. Tierney which addresses the point that an AGP amendment is required to amend the Grosvenor Policy Area boundary. Excerpts from that memorandum, including maps, are attached at circles 5 to 8. The map on circle shows the Grosvenor Sector Plan Area, which is also the current Grosvenor Policy Area boundary. Transportation Planning staff has drawn in the location of the proposed Georgetown Preparatory School development.

Park and Planning staff believe that the proposed boundary adjustment results in a new boundary for the Grosvenor Policy Area which is consistent with the purpose and objectives of Metro Station Policy Areas. This belief is primarily based on the type of development (multi-family residential) and its proximity to the station. A much less useful, but possibly relevant, argument is that there are sections of the existing Grosvenor Policy Area that are farther away from the Metro station than the proposed Georgetown Preparatory School development. This is a less useful argument because the more distant sections of the Grosvenor Policy Area do not have the potential for redevelopment. Metro Station Policy Areas are never perfectly round, so there will always be some stretches of a boundary line that are farther from the station than others.

Recommended Allocations of Development Capacity (Staging Ceiling) from the Montrose Parkway Project.

Early each November, the staff of the Department of Park and Planning release a *Staff Draft Annual Growth Policy Ceiling Element*. This document provides information for the County Executive as he prepares his recommendations for capital programming by identifying areas of the County where there are capacity deficits for transportation and school facilities. A focal point of this review is the calculation of the amount of development capacity, or staging ceiling, that can be added due to the programming of new facilities. Staff is now completing its review for the *FY2004 AGP Ceiling Element*.

For FY 2004, Park and Planning staff anticipate that the Montrose Parkway West project can be counted in this year's AGP staging ceiling analysis. This project includes:

- The widening of Montrose Road to 6 lanes from east of I-270 to the Montrose Parkway and
- The construction of Montrose Parkway as a 4-lane divided major highway from Montrose Road to East Jefferson Street.

Last year, Park and Planning staff reviewed the potential development capacity from this project in combination with the State's MD355/Montrose Road interchange project. The interchange project is not part of the current analysis because it is not yet funded and therefore not countable for AGP purposes. However, staff's previous analysis of the capacity from both projects may be useful when reviewing staff's analysis of the capacity from the Montrose Parkway West project.

Last year, Park and Planning staff estimated that the Montrose Parkway West project in combination with the MD355/Montrose Parkway interchange would allow the AGP to increase staging ceilings in North Bethesda Metro Station Policy Areas by 2,500-3,000 housing units and 5,000-6,000 jobs, and would allow the AGP to increase ceilings in the surrounding North Bethesda Policy Area by 3,000-3,500 jobs.

Park and Planning staff's current analysis, which analyzes the Montrose Parkway West project *only*, is that the project would allow the AGP to increase ceilings in North Bethesda Metro Station Policy Areas by 2,250 housing units and 5,000 jobs, and would allow the AGP to increase ceilings in the surrounding North Bethesda Policy Area by 200 housing units and 3,000 jobs.

There is some flexibility in the allocation of new development capacity in North Bethesda. The nature of Policy Area Transportation Review, which considers the average congestion on all major roadways within the policy area, is that capacity from new transportation improvements may be allocated anywhere within the policy area. In other words, proximity to the roadway improvement is not a factor. The Planning Board and Council have in the past followed a policy that the transportation impact of development within any of the three North Bethesda Metro Station Policy Areas is equivalent for the purposes of Policy Area Transportation Review (Local Area Transportation Review is designed to test for the different local transportation impacts of development in these three areas).

In the *FY 2004 Annual Growth Policy Ceiling Element*, Park and Planning staff have an initial recommendation for the allocation of the capacity from the Montrose Parkway West project. Staff believes it is useful to review these recommendations in this memo since the need for scarce development capacity is the primary motivation of this AGP amendment.

Staff's recommended allocations for the new capacity are based on the following principles:

- *Allocate new capacity to eliminate existing deficits first.* This has been the County's policy except cases where there was an important public policy objective that would be served by a different allocation.
- *Allocate the remaining capacity to Metro Station Policy Areas.* This principle supports the County's objective of encouraging development, when it occurs, to locate within walking distance to high-quality transit.
- *Take into account pending development projects in making allocations.* There are several pending development projects in the Grosvenor, White Flint, and Twinbrook policy areas. Staff's suggested allocation would accommodate all of the housing currently anticipated in the Grosvenor and Twinbrook station areas, and would substantially support expected development in the White Flint station area. Staff's suggested allocation also meets the expected staging ceiling requirements for jobs in Grosvenor and Twinbrook, and substantially meets the job ceiling needs of expected development in the White Flint station area.

Staff recommends allocating the 2,450 units in housing capacity thusly:

- 200 housing units to North Bethesda to eliminate the existing deficit of -131;
- 500 units to the Grosvenor Policy Area, which combined with the existing 540 units in capacity, will result in a total of 1,040 units (thus accommodating the Georgetown Preparatory School and Grosvenor Village projects);
- 900 units to the Twinbrook Policy Area, which, when added to the existing 300 units, will be enough to accommodate the 1,101 units expected there; and
- 850 units to White Flint, which, when added to the 208 units already there, will provide most of the 1,415 units needed by the LCOR project.

Staff recommends allocating the 8,000 jobs in non-residential development capacity thusly:

- 3,000 jobs to North Bethesda to erase the 2,799-job deficit;
- 250 jobs to Twinbrook eliminate the small deficit (-60 jobs) there and to accommodate potential job development; and
- 4,750 jobs to White Flint, which, when added to the 1,203 jobs already available, will provide 5,203 of the 6,063 jobs planned by the LCOT development at White Flint.

The Montgomery County Planning Board will formally review an updated *Staff Draft FY 2004 AGP Ceiling Element* in mid-to-late April of next year (2003). At that time, it is possible that there will be additional information that the Board will wish to consider. For example, it is possible that an extension of Nebel Street (near the White Flint Metro Station) will also be able to be counted. The list of pending development projects may also change.

The Montgomery County Council reviews the Planning Board's recommended staging ceilings, and other components of the *Final Draft FY 2004 AGP Ceiling Element*, in June for adoption by July 15, 2003.

Staff's staging ceiling analysis strongly concludes that the capacity needs of the Georgetown Preparatory School can be accommodated without the proposed AGP Amendment. However, staff still supports the proposed AGP amendment because it is desirable to avoid situations where a single development project (and potentially, a building within that development project) straddles a policy area boundary line.

Procedural Note

Park and Planning staff note that AGP amendments for specific applicants have traditionally been deferred by the County Council to the next AGP Policy Element. Several such amendments were deferred to, and considered during, the 2001-2003 AGP

Policy Element process. Staff recommends that in the future, such deferrals should continue to be the norm.

On the other hand, an AGP amendment is now under consideration that has the effect of supporting a major public initiative, a technology park in Eastern Montgomery County. Staff is not suggesting that this amendment should have been deferred.

**Table 1: Recommended Transportation Staging Ceilings for Housing
Based Upon Capacity Created by Montrose Parkway West**

Housing

Remaining Capacity Under Fiscal Year 2002 Transportation Staging Ceilings

January 2002 Base

Policy Area ¹	Current (FY 2003)			Draft (FY 2004)	
	Housing Ceiling ² D	Pipeline E	Remaining Capacity F=D-E	Change in Capacity E	Remaining Capacity F=D-E
Aspen Hill	(5,571)	1,749	(7,320)	0	(7,320)
Bethesda CBD ^{5,6, 10}	1,503	1,089	414	0	414
Bethesda/Chevy Chase	6,191	553	5,638	0	5,638
Clarksburg ⁷	12	9,280	(9,268)	0	(9,268)
Cloverly	1,521	275	1,246	0	1,246
Damascus	663	352	311	0	311
Derwood ¹⁰	2,053	10	2,043	0	2,043
Fairland/White Oak ⁹	(1,928)	1,444	(3,372)	0	(3,372)
Friendship Heights	971	947	24	0	24
Gaithersburg City ^{3, 10}	(1,030)	2,486	(3,516)	0	(3,516)
Germantown East	4,056	1,132	2,924	0	2,924
Germantown West	645	783	(138)	0	(138)
Germantown Town Center	1,764	1,165	599	0	599
Glenmont	499	122	377	0	377
Grosvenor	1,400	860	540	500	1,040
Kensington/Wheaton ¹⁰	2,817	321	2,496	0	2,496
Montgomery Village/Airpark ¹⁰	(5,181)	156	(5,337)	0	(5,337)
North Bethesda	1,216	1,347	(131)	200	69
North Potomac	1,635	377	1,258	0	1,258
Olney ¹⁰	993	1,026	(33)	0	(33)
Potomac ³	1,592	631	961	0	961
R & D Village	1,437	1,009	428	0	428
Rockville City ^{3, 10}	(656)	4,385	(5,041)	0	(5,041)
Shady Grove	500	0	500	0	500
Silver Spring CBD ³	6,066	1,601	4,465	0	4,465
Silver Spring/Takoma Park ¹⁰	2,396	72	2,324	0	2,324
Twinbrook	300	0	300	900	1,200
Wheaton CBD	1,464	441	1,023	0	1,023
White Flint	693	485	208	850	1,058
Total Policy Areas ⁴	42,387	34,098	28,079	2,450	30,398

Source: Montgomery County Planning Department, Research & Technology Center, Revised October 8, 2002.

Table 1: Recommended Transportation Staging Ceilings for Jobs Based Upon Capacity Created by Montrose Parkway West

Jobs

Remaining Capacity Under Fiscal Year 2002 Transportation Staging Ceilings

January 2002 Base

Policy Area ¹	Current (FY 2003)			Draft (FY 2004)	
	Jobs Ceiling ²	Pipeline	Remaining Capacity	Change in Capacity	Remaining Capacity
	D	E	F=D-E	E	F=D-E
Aspen Hill	153	119	34	0	34
Bethesda CBD ^{5,6, 10}	2,772	2,051	721	0	721
Bethesda/Chevy Chase	883	701	182	0	182
Clarksburg ⁷	2,526	3,904	(1,378)	0	(1,378)
Cloverly	185	234	(49)	0	(49)
Damascus	1,356	523	833	0	833
Derwood ¹⁰	2,311	1,596	715	0	715
Fairland/White Oak ⁹	6,893	3,519	3,374	0	3,374
Friendship Heights	4,176	3,833	343	0	343
Gaithersburg City ^{3, 10}	8,135	14,614	(6,479)	0	(6,479)
Germantown East	13,030	11,972	1,058	0	1,058
Germantown West	13,045	9,515	3,530	0	3,530
Germantown Town Center	5,806	1,445	4,361	0	4,361
Glenmont	200	17	183	0	183
Grosvenor	80	52	28	0	28
Kensington/Wheaton ¹⁰	3,043	259	2,784	0	2,784
Montgomery Village/Airpark ¹⁰	619	624	(5)	0	(5)
North Bethesda	3,516	6,315	(2,799)	3,000	201
North Potomac	615	35	580	0	580
Olney ¹⁰	2,192	159	2,033	0	2,033
Potomac ³	2,116	319	1,797	0	1,797
R & D Village	10,357	13,878	(3,521)	0	(3,521)
Rockville City ^{3, 10}	4,802	31,276	(26,474)	0	(26,474)
Shady Grove	998	213	785	0	785
Silver Spring CBD ³	6,026	4,023	2,003	0	2,003
Silver Spring/Takoma Park ¹⁰	1,524	286	1,238	0	1,238
Twinbrook	600	660	(60)	250	190
Wheaton CBD	2,668	69	2,599	0	2,599
White Flint	3,191	1,988	1,203	4,750	5,953
Total Policy Areas ⁴	103,818	114,199	30,384	8,000	35,525

Source: Montgomery County Planning Department, Research & Technology Center, Revised October 8, 2002.

EXCERPT 1: LOCAL MAP AMENDMENT SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT
FROM PLANNING STAFF TO MONTGOMERY CO. PLANNING
BOARD 9/12/02

Master Plan

Master Plan Consistency

The subject property is located mostly in the Grosvenor Sector Plan area of the North Bethesda - Garrett Park Master Plan. The Master Plan supports residential development around the Grosvenor Metro Station.

The application would provide 473 multi-family residential units, including 53 MPDU's, in the vicinity of the Grosvenor Metro Station, while preserving the campus character of the Georgetown Preparatory School.

The Master Plan supports retaining open space on the Georgetown Preparatory School property by recommending that any future residential development on the site to be located in the portion recommended for PD-28 zoning. Specific recommendations in the Plan for residential development on the Georgetown Preparatory School site include:

1. Maintain as much of the properties existing open space as possible.
2. Provide convenient pedestrian access to the Grosvenor Metro Station.
3. If feasible, provide vehicular access from Tuckerman Lane.
4. Restrict residential development under the PD-28 zone to 15 acres, more or less conforming to the 15 acres of the site within the Grosvenor Sector Plan boundary.
5. Submit a landscaping plan that provides a buffer between the residential development and the remainder of the site.

Open Space

The proposed project retains a significant amount of open space on the campus. The open green adjoining Rockville Pike, along with the area across the street at Strathmore Hall, would provide a green corridor along Rockville Pike and an entry statement into North Bethesda.

Access to Metro and Tuckerman Lane

Walking distance to the Metro Station is approximately 1/3 mile. The applicant has an agreement with the Grosvenor Park Condominiums to allow pedestrians use of the path through the condominium property and use of the tunnel under Rockville Pike accessing the Metro Station. This walk is relatively easy

compared to the trek up Tuckerman Lane and across Rockville Pike at the signal. The proposed project would take vehicular and pedestrian access from Tuckerman Lane. As a result of the agreement with the Tuckerman Heights community, the applicant will be able to get an easement through the community's property so that access is opposite Grove Ridge Place. This is the optimum location for safety and efficiency.

Location of PD-28 Zone

The Master Plan states, "The exact configuration of the 15 acres of the site to which the PD-28 floating zone may be applied will depend on environmental, topographic, or other similar reasons. Any deviations from the Sector Plan boundary would be expected to be minor in nature."

The Master Plan depicts a square-shaped site of 15 acres at the corner of Rockville Pike and Tuckerman Lane as part of the Grosvenor Sector Plan area. The Planning Board had previously suggested that the minor deviation from the Sector Plan boundary be in the 10 percent range. The applicant's current proposal deviates by approximately 11 percent. Staff finds that the deviation from the Sector Plan boundary is justified. Locating the development in the proposed location minimizes the environmental and topographic impact to the site and provides compatibility with adjacent residential development.

The placement of the proposed building along the proposed zoning boundary will require a waiver. To assist in accomplishing compatibility, all development in Planned Development zones are required to maintain a 100-foot setback from land that the Master Plan recommends for a one-family zone. In this case, the Master Plan supports the existing R-90 Zone for the remainder of the Georgetown Preparatory School campus. At time of site plan, staff recommends that a waiver be granted from the setback requirement a permitted under Section 59-C-7.15 (b) of the Zoning Ordinance. As described below, a buffer would be required as a binding element of the development plan to ensure compatibility.

Landscaping and Buffer

The view of the development from the Georgetown Preparatory School facilities to the north and the Tuckerman Heights community would be substantially buffered by the topography and the addition of a landscaped buffer provided as a binding element of the development plan. The buffer between Tuckerman Heights and the development would be a minimum of 223 feet in width and would address compatibility by providing three tiers of landscaping: an evergreen screen, woodland buffer, and campus landscaping. In addition, existing specimen trees would be retained. The buffer would also protect Tuckerman Heights from activities that could occur if the strip of land continued to be used by the school. As a religious affiliated private educational institution, the school is

EXCERPT: REVISED TRANSPORTATION PLANNING STAFF REPORT FOR LIMA G-796, 9/12/02

would be extending the southbound left-turn lane on Rockville Pike by approximately 350 feet and creating a second westbound left-turn lane on Strathmore Avenue. The second left-turn lane is to be created by moving the northern curb line from four to seven feet and re-stripping the pavement markings. Construction funding is appropriated and construction was anticipated to start in July 2002. A public hearing for a mandatory referral was held on March 1, 2002 to receive the Planning Board's comments.

3. Strathmore Avenue:

- a. SHA has a concept study to reconstruct Strathmore Avenue as a two-lane urban roadway, identified as Contract No. MO783-83. SHA will be developing the concept design with no reconstruction funding programmed at this time. This SHA project will be folded into the SHA project above and should not affect the intersection capacity at Rockville Pike.
- b. DPWT has plans to provide sidewalks along Strathmore Avenue between Jolly Way and Stillwater Avenue as PDF 11-109, Project 506747, to be included in the SHA reconstruction project.



Site-Generated Traffic

In the submitted revised traffic study, addendum, and two supplemental analyses, the number of site-generated peak-hour trips was determined using trip-generation rates as garden apartments as follows:

1. Without considering the site proximity to the Grosvenor/Strathmore Metrorail Station, the proposed 473-unit apartment development would generate a total of 192 peak-hour trips during the weekday morning peak period (6:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m.) and 224 peak-hour trips during the weekday evening peak period (4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.).
2. With a 20% transit mode share, the proposed apartment development would generate 154 (or 38 fewer total) vehicular peak-hour trips during the weekday morning peak period and 179 vehicular (or 45 fewer total) peak-hour trips during the weekday evening peak period.

A revised traffic study, addendum, and two supplemental analyses were submitted to satisfy LATR because the proposed development generates 50 or more total peak-hour trips during the weekday morning peak period and the evening peak period. The congestion analysis in the revised traffic study and addendum included the following:

1. Transit Mode Share: Based on the results from WMATA's "Development-Related Ridership Survey II", 20% of the site-generated traffic would walk or bicycle to the Grosvenor/Strathmore Metrorail Station rather than use their vehicles. The 20%

transit mode share is lower than the 25% mode share previously used for the approved Grosvenor Village development. The 5% difference in the transit mode share is because the pedestrian path from Inigo's Crossing to the Metrorail station is approximately 2,000 feet compared with Grosvenor Village located next to the Metrorail station.

2. Background Development and Traffic: In the submitted revised traffic study and addendum, the traffic from the approved, but unbuilt nearby developments was analyzed in the background traffic condition. The background traffic included Grosvenor Village, Strathmore Concert Hall, Strathmore Educational Center, Grosvenor/Strathmore Metrorail Station's parking garage, and the Montgomery County Conference Center.
3. Use of the School's Tuckerman Lane Access: The transportation consultant conservatively assumed some vehicular traffic currently is using the existing Tuckerman Lane access although it is supposed to be only for emergency use. In the traffic study, those weekday peak-hour trips entering from Tuckerman Lane were diverted to the main access from Rockville Pike. The number and reassignment of vehicular trips would be further refined at the time of preliminary plan review.
4. Consistency of the Traffic Count at the Intersection of Rockville Pike and Strathmore Avenue: In previous traffic studies, the traffic data was collected and had different approach volumes during weekday morning and evening peak hours. Specifically, a 1999 traffic count used in the traffic study for the Grosvenor/Strathmore Metrorail Station's garage and Strathmore Hall had been compared with three other traffic counts. The four traffic counts were collected between 1997 and 1999 during days when schools were in session. Upon Staff's comparative analysis, it was determined that the counts used in the Strathmore traffic study were representative of the typical weekday traffic conditions. Only one of the older traffic counts was excluded because it was more than 10% higher than the highest of the other three counts. Traffic counts collected in December 2001, for the subject housing development are consistent with the previous traffic counts.

Congestion at Nearby Intersections

Based on the results of the submitted revised traffic study and the Transportation Issues Addendum for the Planning Board hearing of May 9, 2002, the critical lane volumes (CLV) at nearby intersections for the existing, background, and total traffic conditions during the weekday morning and evening peak periods are as follows:



THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

EXCERPT 3

October 2, 2002

MEMORANDUM

TO: Phillip J. Tierney, Hearing Examiner

VIA: Ronald C. Welke, Supervisor
Transportation Planning *R. Welke*

FROM: Ed Axler, Planner/Coordinator EA
Transportation Planning

SUBJECT: Local Map Amendment No. G-796
Georgetown Preparatory School
Policy Area Boundary Issue

RECOMMENDATION

The staff recommends approval of the proposed local map amendment for the PD-28 Zone and the development plan subject to binding elements. With respect to the allocation of transportation staging ceiling capacity, staff submits that it can only be used at the time of the preliminary plan amendment approval.

DISCUSSION

Policy Area Boundary

The exact location of the housing units proposed in the local map amendment straddles the established boundary between the North Bethesda Policy Area and the Grosvenor Policy Area.

The North Bethesda Policy Area is currently in a moratorium with a remaining staging ceiling capacity of negative 130 housing units as of August 1, 2002. However, the adjacent Grosvenor Policy Area has a remaining staging ceiling capacity of positive 540 housing units. Any housing units determined to be within the Grosvenor Policy Area at preliminary plan review may take advantage of the available remaining capacity. The County Council adopts the policy area boundaries through the Annual Growth Policy bi-annually. Only the County Council can revise the policy area boundaries.

Sector Plan Boundary

The Grosvenor Sector Plan boundary was first established with the adoption of the 1978 Sector Plan. The area affected by the local map amendment was delineated by the recommendation to extend Grosvenor Place Road to north of Tuckerman Lane. The 1992 North Bethesda/Garrett Park Master Plan removed the recommendation to extend Grosvenor Place Road, but kept the Sector Plan boundary. The Sector Plan boundary was established through the Master Plan process and has no cause and affect relationship to the County Council established policy area boundary.

The 1992 Master Plan discusses the area on pages 69 and 70 stating that:

“Restrict residential development under the PD-28 Zone, which is a floating zone, to 15 acres more or less conforming to the 15 acres of the site within the Grosvenor Sector Plan boundary. The exact configuration of the 15 acres to which the PD-28 floating zone may be applied will depend on environmental, topographic, or other similar reasons. Any deviations from the Sector Plan boundary would be expected to be minor in nature.”

The word “generally” refers to the area within the Sector Plan boundary, and gives no reference to moving the sector plan boundary. Contrary to the applicant’s interpretation, the Master Plan did not anticipate the exact location of the proposed PD-28 zoning.

The applicant refers to a “2,000-foot radius of the entrance to the Grosvenor Metro Station” as a delineation of the desired development in the Sector Plan Area. The referred to “radius”, however, is part of the description for the general area encompassed by the Grosvenor Sector Plan under the sections “Existing Conditions” on page 48 of the 1978 Sector Plan and page 63 of the 1992 Master Plan. There is no specifically stated requirement for development to be within 2,000 feet of the metro station. The reference is taken from the entrance point of the Metro Station.

Access Location

The transportation access points, either vehicular or pedestrian, are not a consideration in the Policy Area Transportation Review (PATR) component of the transportation-related Adequate Public Facilities (APF) test. For local map amendments, the impact from site-generated traffic is analyzed similarly to the APF test for a preliminary plan.

The consistent practice has been to measure the traffic impact for the PATR of all developments based on their location within adopted policy area boundaries. This practice has been applied to all development cases even if they straddle a

policy area boundary or the boundary between Montgomery County and a neighboring county. One example is the Great Oaks Redevelopment (Riderwood Village) where only the development within Montgomery County was considered for the APF test, while the portion in Prince Georges County was considered as concurrent background traffic.

Conclusion

The local map amendment is consistent with the Master Plan recommended density in the PD-28 zone. The exact location of the housing units proposed in the local map amendment straddles the established boundary between the North Bethesda Policy Area and the Grosvenor Policy Area as established in the *FY 2003 Annual Growth Policy*. Only the County Council can revise a policy area boundary line.

If you have any further questions, please contact Ron Welke at 301-495-4533.

EA:RW:xxx
Attachments

cc: Robert Metz
Martin Klauber
Norman Knopf
Bill Landfair
Margaret Kaii-Ziegler
Karl Moritz
Malcolm Shaneman

LtrG796PATR.doc

GROSVENOR SECTOR PLAN SUB-AREAS

FIGURE 23

