

**QUESTION**

**a) How would you have voted on incentives for affordable housing in those areas of downtown Bethesda that are within 200 feet of a single-family house? Would your first preference have been to offer the 12-foot height incentive (i) in none of those areas, (ii) in all of them, (iii) only on property owned by the Housing Opportunities Commission, or (iv) as adopted by the Council, on HOC property plus a few other parcels?**

**b) Would you have voted in favor of the Lyttonsville sector plan as adopted?**

**c) At the old Silver Spring Library site, do you prefer the plan to build new affordable housing or the plan to reuse the current building?**

**d) Do you support making it easier to build accessory apartments by holding hearings on waivers of off-street parking requirements only when a neighbor objects, and placing the burden of proof to show the unavailability of on-street parking on the objector?**

**e) Do you support the Council's decision to discontinue reliance on vehicle-movement tests (such as LOS or CLV) in urban areas when it adopted the current Subdivision Staging Policy?**

Candidate		Party	Verbatim response <i>[or edited in brackets]</i>
County Executive			
Robin	Ficker	R	a) Undecided b) Undecided c) Undecided. Would use some of the site for parkland. d) I generally do not favor allowing the government to do anything it wants until a citizen objects. e) No

County Executive (cont)			
Roger	Berliner	D	<p>a) I voted for the Council approved option. Following the recommendations of the Planning Department and Planning Board to restrict height incentives outside the high performance area, this vote made sense – greatest heights and densities near Metro and at the core and more predictability around the edges of the plan for existing neighborhoods. Option ii would have, in reality, resulted in very few affordable units according to planning and council staff I consulted and would have made it harder for us to achieve our vision for Bethesda.</p> <p>b) Yes. It was important to create incentives and opportunities for growth around the Purple Line and provide access to transit to as many people as possible.</p> <p>c) I believe opportunities involving county owned property are rare and that we must maximize the potential of such sites. I believe the site could and should be used for new affordable housing and child care. I sponsored and passed a Council bill that requires the county to evaluate every such site for affordable housing before any redevelopment occurs. If elected county executive, I would ensure this happens in a meaningful way.</p> <p>d) Yes. Accessory apartments are a critical tool in addressing the shortage of affordable housing and helping owners stay in their homes, and I support easing the process for applicants to increase the availability of these units.</p> <p>e) Yes. I voted for it in favor of a more comprehensive transportation/mobility approach involving the creation of urban mobility programs for each urban node. These UMPs will help plan for and secure a comprehensive package of mobility infrastructure and tools.</p>

County Executive (cont)		
Marc	Elrich	<p>a) The incentives don't increase the square footage that can be built - density built on the edges reduces density available to the core. The edges have existing affordable housing while the core is primarily commercial. The Planning Board explicitly recommended against rezoning most of Bradley and Battery because it increased the loss of affordable housing, and the eastern edge also has affordable housing. Development in the core increases net new units and the total number of affordable units; development on the edges results in a net loss of affordable units. I favored incentives in the core and on HOC property.</p> <p>b) No, I would have ensured no net loss of units and that we maintained both the price and the unit sizes. Family-sized units are rare and are not required to be replaced in the current code, or by the plan. HOC could have redeveloped on the park and added new market units to the mix and the other complex was considered in good condition and containing a good unit mix. I was fine with the zoning changes on Lyttonsville Road and near the Purple Line station.</p> <p>c) The county needs both affordable housing and affordable daycare - we have a deficit of both. I would support a mixed-use project that addresses both deficits and I'm also okay with the solution of affordable daycare because the winning bidder committed to assisting the other bidder with the construction of affordable senior housing on land that the winning bidder owns. There are creative ways the library could have been re-used and housing added above.</p> <p>d) I have not heard of any problems or denials. If there have been issues, I'd be happy to consider it.</p> <p>e) I don't like CLV. LOS depends on what's measured. Intersection delay and link analysis identify problems, but I'd use mode shares to achieve a functioning transportation network that puts greater reliance on transit. Tests shouldn't be used to require adding lanes and widening intersections. You can't reduce GHG emissions unless transit service increases (with higher frequency and capacity) so people have a viable transit option. Density without transit is not Smart Growth and isn't TOD; that's why I laid out a comprehensive BRT network to provide the backbone of a transit network that can serve most of the county.</p>

County Executive (cont)			
Rose	Krasnow	D	<p>a) When I was working on the zoning code rewrite in 2014, we put in numerous incentives to increase affordable housing opportunities. We also put in new requirements to improve the compatibility between single family homes and highrise development by requiring that height increments be stepped back at a 45 degree angle, with the height of the lower floors matching that of adjacent residences. With these protections in place, I would support allowing the extra 12 feet of height for projects providing additional affordable housing within 200 feet of a single family house in all areas.</p> <p>b) Yes. The planners and council worked diligently to preserve the industrial land that supports so many small businesses while allowing some increases in residential density, improving connectivity, expanding parks and green space, and preserving the community’s African American heritage. Communities that don’t grow, stagnate. The coming of the Purple Line should increase property values and make Lyttonsville an even better place to live and work.</p> <p>c) In Montgomery County, our Master Plans are more than just guides to development; applications must conform with the zoning recommendations they contain. On the Library site, it would have been difficult to make the finding that a large affordable housing project met the requirements of the plan, which is why I believe the daycare center was the option chosen. Since I strongly believe in the need to provide additional affordable housing in areas in or near our Central Business Districts, I would support an effort to allow exceptions to master plan recommendations so that good affordable housing projects on publicly owned land could proceed.</p> <p>d) Yes.</p> <p>e) I am thrilled that the latest Subdivision Staging Policy looks at person travel, not vehicle travel. Doing so should help us win support for transportation improvements that help get people out of cars. I also do not think that LOS and CLV accurately address many congestion issues. However, much of our county is still suburban in nature, and in those areas, I though requirements to look at LOS and CLV are still appropriate. The extra level of testing required in residential suburban areas seems to offer little benefit and discourages needed development.</p>
George L.	Leventhal	D	<p>a) I have consistently come down on the side of affordable housing at transit hubs. I opposed the successful effort by Councilmember Berliner to eliminate height incentives for affordable housing in downtown Bethesda adjacent to residential neighborhoods earlier this year.</p> <p>b) Yes.</p> <p>c) I expected Mr. Leggett to propose the Victory Housing option and would have supported that. But that isn’t before us now, so we don’t actually face the choice posited in this question. I have many questions that will need to be answered before I decide whether to support the Early Childhood Center proposed by Mr. Leggett.</p> <p>d) Yes.</p> <p>e) Yes.</p>

Council At-Large			
Robert	Dyer	R	<p>a) i - None of those areas.                      b) No, it's taking advantage of an already-neglected community.                      c) N/A - the latter has now been selected by the County.                      d) No, parking is already tight.                      e) No, the new measurement is inaccurate, and will lead to greater traffic congestion.</p>
Marilyn	Balcombe	D	<p>a) I generally agree with offering density incentives for affordable housing. We need to increase affordable housing stock throughout the County. I understand the concerns about offering the density to properties next to single-family homes. The compromise reached in Bethesda seems reasonable. I don't know the specifics on each of the parcels included, but I assume considerable thought went into the decision.                      b) I was not engaged in the Lyttonsville plan, but have read the plan and the 454 pages of public comments highlighting resident concerns. As a Council member, I would have extensive knowledge of the plan prior to voting. As it stands, I can't take a position without the knowledge to make an informed decision. I am prepared to say that as a County, we have a significant housing shortage and need to increase housing density, while respecting existing communities - particularly communities with historical significance like Lyttonsville. We also need to increase density around transit and with the Purple Line station coming, increased density makes sense.                      c) It is my understanding that the County has made its decision to move forward with the Gudelsky Child Development Center instead of the Victory House proposal for senior housing. I did not have a strong objection to this as they are both desperately needed amenities in the community. I also think it was a rare opportunity to get both - the child care center AND the senior housing - just not in the same location.                      d) Yes and no. Accessory apartments are a great option for additional housing. I agree that it sounds reasonable to hold hearings only when a neighbor objects assuming that there is significant, documented, outreach to all neighbors. I don't agree with placing the burden of proof on the objector. If there is a concern over parking, the onus should be on the owner of the accessory apartment to show that there is sufficient parking available. The owner of the accessory apartment will benefit from the new unit, the burden of proof shouldn't shift to the neighbor.                      e) Absolutely. It took me years to fully understand how the tests were calculated and once I understood the calculation I realized that they were counterintuitive and made no sense.</p>

Council At-Large (cont)			
Hoan	Dang	D	<p>a) I would have supported incentives for affordable housing as described. I support item (iv) because the 12-foot height incentive can be applied to some parcels that are not HOC property. I would review those on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>b) Yes, based on its revisions needed for the two Purple Line stations. Lyttonsville is an area that will have changes but the Master Plan recommends maintaining its cultural and historic nature. I will work to make sure revitalization occurs within those bounds.</p> <p>c) I believe there is a great need for affordable housing in the Silver Spring downtown and would work to fulfill some of that need by setting aside parts of the old library for such use. I also believe a mix of small, local commercial businesses alongside the housing would be preferred.</p> <p>d) I believe it is up to the developer of accessory apartments to show they have adequate parking for the development before a public hearing.</p> <p>e) I believe the Council made the right decision on this issue, although they still can apply the LOS and CLV in specific cases.</p>
Lorna Phillips	Forde	D	<p>a) How would you have voted on incentives for affordable housing in those areas of downtown Bethesda that are within 200 feet of a single-family house? Would your first preference have been to offer the 12-foot height incentive (i) in none of those areas, (ii) in all of them, (iii) only on property owned by the Housing Opportunities Commission, or (iv) as adopted by the Council, on HOC property plus a few other parcels? I would have voted for affordable housing incentives that was adopted by the Council – on HOC plus a few other parcels.</p> <p>b) Would you have voted in favor of the Lyttonsville sector plan as adopted? I would have voted for the Lyttonsville sector plan that was adopted.</p> <p>c) At the old Silver Spring Library site, do you prefer the plan to build new affordable housing or the plan to reuse the current building? I prefer and support the plan to build new affordable housing as opposed to reusing current buildings.</p> <p>d) Do you support making it easier to build accessory apartments by holding hearings on waivers of off-street parking requirements only when a neighbor objects, and placing the burden of proof to show the unavailability of on-street parking on the objector? Yes, I support this, as long as neighbors are still provided with notice of the plan to build an accessory apartment so that they have the opportunity to request a hearing, if they desire.</p> <p>e) Do you support the Council's decision to discontinue reliance on vehicle-movement tests (such as LOS or CLV) in urban areas when it adopted the current Subdivision Staging Policy? I support vehicle-movement tests in urban areas. We need to remain vigilant about the growing needs of our communities – safety measures, commute times, and repair and replace initiatives.</p>

Council At-Large (cont)			
Jill Ortman	Fouse	D	<p>a) We're short 50,000 units of affordable housing. Studies have shown low inventory decreases affordability. Lower income residents are most in need of transit accessible housing. So I support the incentives in the zoning code for developers to provide affordable housing beyond the 12.5 percent required minimum. I would have allowed height bonuses in the downtown core, HOC property and parcels closest to the Metro. Residential property owners want neighboring development to be compatible with existing development, and to protect the character of neighborhoods. But, I also recognize the need to create opportunities for new housing (both regulated affordable housing and market-rate housing) near transit, especially in areas near jobs and services. I think by working respectfully with neighborhoods on common goals of affordability and accessibility, best outcomes can be achieved when not constrained by limited choices.</p> <p>b) I know the community had concerns as maintaining the character and history of the neighborhood was a priority. We must seek to be engaged and thoughtful partners when working with communities to best honor their contributions and insight. That would be my approach as a Councilmember. In the end, I think the compromise attempts to balance the desire to preserve existing affordable housing with opportunities for new investment in transit oriented development with the coming of the Purple Line.</p> <p>c) I could see an argument for both sides of this debate, but I thought the outcome chosen by the County Executive - no affordable housing and no additional space for the adjoining park - was disappointing. I certainly believe that any redevelopment of publicly-owned land should incorporate affordable housing wherever possible. The proposal I was most excited about was the combination of senior housing and pre-k. This combination has proved to be a win-win in other areas to seniors who want to contribute, and children who appreciate the attention of engaged adults.</p> <p>d) Yes. I think accessory units can play a role in providing more affordable housing options and supplement the income of homeowners who otherwise might not be able to afford to stay in their homes in retirement, after the death of a spouse, or when facing other financial difficulties.</p> <p>e) I am not an expert on traffic tests, but my understanding is that the new policy looks at each planning area comprehensively instead of performing separate analyses of the transportation impact of each building being constructed. This makes sense to me because it seems to allow for consideration of how the different elements of transportation fit together - cars, transit, walking, and biking - and can be implemented as part of a long-term plan.</p>

Council At-Large (cont)			
Evan	Glass	D	<p>a) As vice chair of Montgomery Housing Partnership, the county’s largest nonprofit developer of affordable housing, this issue is near and dear to me. Given that there is a need for 50,000 affordable housing units, clearly we aren’t doing a good job, which is why I want to update and improve our affordable housing policies. This rethink would modernize our MPDU policies to factor in high-rise condos (like in Bethesda and Silver Spring), where the unit might be affordable but the condo fee isn’t. This is a major problem. With regard to the specific question, I would support more affordable housing across the county and select preference 2 (ii).</p> <p>b) Yes.</p> <p>c) I was proud that MHP submitted a proposal to build affordable housing at that location. Ultimately the MHP proposal wasn’t selected. I would prefer a plan that includes affordable housing.</p> <p>d) In my desire to create more affordable housing, I am open to new/other ways to achieve that goal – including a change to the county’s accessory apartment laws.</p> <p>e) Yes. The county’s urban areas should be prioritized for multimodal forms of transportation, including pedestrian, bicycle and public transit.</p>
Richard	Gottfried	D	<p>a) I have two suggestions for future housing shortage. One is to create a public-private partnership to purchase vacant homes in the County and Two is to support “Design for Life” programs where the residents can age in place by building additions to existing homes so that our parents can live with their children in separate buildings.</p> <p>b) No. I quote a resident answer about the plan “I believe this plan will add intolerable traffic congestion, make the area unaffordable to lower and middle-class residents, and destroy the current character of Lyttonsville,” added Erwin Rose, who has lived in the community since 2001.” We need to stop destroying our neighborhoods and have real solutions when we develop and increase the traffic, overcrowd our schools and decrease our quality of life and increase the cost to live in Montgomery County!</p> <p>c) Quote from the residents that live in that area is that the residents liked the idea of a day care center versus the idea of affordable senior housing from Victory Housing’s presentation. I will always lean towards what the residents want for their neighborhood since the residents know best! The daycare center was voted in! Good choice.</p> <p>d) No. If residents do not have a driveway and or a garage, they can only park on the street and residents should absolutely have enough parking to do so.</p> <p>e) We need to implement a new level of review called the A Policy Area Mobility Review (PAMR) which enhances the Policy Transportation Area Review (PATR) which also includes the Local Area Transportation Review (LATR).</p>

Council At-Large (cont)			
Seth	Grimes	D	<p>a) I would have voted for the incentives. It is important to add to affordable housing stock in transit-rich, walkable communities. My first preference would be to boost requirements and, where incentives are needed to encourage MPDU creation beyond requirements, have the incentives to all parcels.</p> <p>b) Yes. I like the sector plan's location of development near the planned Purple Line stations although I regret the likely loss of larger, affordable rental units at the Friendly Garden apartments. I note Councilmember Marc Elrich's statement that "the greatest densities were not zoned along 16th Street, which is near both a future Purple Line station and the existing Metro station." Had I had a vote, I would have pressed for protection of the existing apartments and for density along the corridor. Failing those improvements, I would nonetheless have voted for the plan as adopted.</p> <p>c) My preference was the Victory Housing proposal for a four-story building with 92 mixed-income units for senior citizens as well as a CommuniKids child care center. I'm on the record. From October 6, 2017: <a href="https://www.facebook.com/SethGrimes/posts/10155058726862685">https://www.facebook.com/SethGrimes/posts/10155058726862685</a></p> <p>d) Yes. Accessory units are a good way to increase housing supply, including affordable housing.</p> <p>e) Yes. Such tests don't measure what truly counts: People moved.</p>
Will	Jawando	D	<p>a) My first preference would have been to include the height incentive for all areas. Montgomery County is suffering from a severe shortage of affordable housing. Every neighborhood should welcome mixed-use and mixed-income development.</p> <p>b) Up and down the Purple Line route we are seeing developers eager to tear down existing and naturally-occurring affordable housing, in order to replace those cheaper units with much more expensive units. That includes the sector plan in Lyttonsville. Even as we welcome re-development of neighborhoods near mass transit, we must expand the stock of existing affordable housing units.</p> <p>c) I would have preferred the mixed-use plan, with both affordable housing for seniors and the new child care and early childhood education center.</p> <p>d) Yes.</p> <p>e) I'd need to know more about what forms of measurement they are using in place of LOS and CLV tests. While there are questions about the methodology around CLV (as seen near the Naval Hospital, when road wire tests led some to say traffic had decreased after the merger of Walter Reed and the Bethesda Naval hospital put more cars on the road – when in fact, it just simply meant more congestion and fewer cars being able to cross test wires).</p>

Council At-Large (cont)			
Danielle	Meitiv	D	<p>a) My primary concerns in downtown Bethesda are preserving and increasing the supply of affordable housing. Therefore, I would have voted to allow the 12-foot incentive on the HOC property and a few other parcels, as adopted by the Council.</p> <p>b) Yes, with some reservations. I strongly support bringing the Purple Line, redevelopment, and greater density to the Lyttonsville area. However, I fear that the current plan will encourage gentrification and drive out the residents of this historic, but struggling community, as it does not do enough to preserve affordable housing, especially large family-sized units. With more protections and affordable housing guarantees, I would be fully support of this plan.</p> <p>c) I strongly supported the proposal to build senior housing and a childcare facility on the site and was disappointed to learn that plan was rejected in favor of a much more limited childcare project. The combination of childcare and senior living had the potential to create a wonderful intergenerational facility and micro-community, which has been shown to benefit children and elders alike. Silver Spring desperately the 800+ person waiting list for newly opened The Bonifant. As the caregiver to an 80-year old parent who lives with me in downtown Silver Spring, I am committed to helping our seniors age in place, which includes living in vibrant walkable communities with easy access to amenities and transit.</p> <p>d) YES. Accessory apartments are an easy, cost-effective way to increase the availability of affordable housing in neighborhoods dominated by single-family homes. They can provide homeowners a way to “downsize” and earn money from their properties, which can be especially beneficial to seniors who own their homes, have limited incomes, and wish to age in place. From experience, I know that many of the tenants of these apartments do not have cars, so the parking requirements are often moot.</p> <p>e) YES. Both LOS and CLV measure transportation efficiency in terms of cars, ignoring the needs of pedestrians and cyclists and often result in faster, more dangerous streets.</p>
Hans	Riemer	D	<p>a) iv, as adopted and as I proposed</p> <p>b) Yes, I vote for that plan, and I substantially crafted it</p> <p>c) I support new housing and childcare. I do not support a plan without housing on site.</p> <p>d) Yes, I believe that is current policy. There has been some confusion on this point but the PHED committee recently clarified that hearings should only be held if there is an objection. As for who has the burden of proof, I think the assumption is that the unit is compatible and the finding must only confirm that.</p> <p>e) Yes, but we decided to use the Highway Capacity Manual in urban areas.</p>

Council At-Large (cont)		
Michele	Riley	<p>D</p> <p>a) I support the requirement for 15% MPDU.                      b) No.                      c) I agree with the County's policy of considering County owned property for two of our most important priorities: affordable housing and child care. I understand that the County Executive's review process determined that the site would have child care on site and the affordable units will be constructed at the VIVA White Oak development. While I would prefer to have affordable units closer to a metro station, child care services are also in short supply and my understanding is that 70% of the seats would be reserved for low income families.                      d) The current licensing process which has been significantly streamlined allows for administrative approval if the unit meets the code requirements. The vast majority of units are approved administratively. Brief hearings are only held if it does not meet the code or if someone objects to the findings of the agency determination which is a small percentage of units.                      e) I agree with the changes in the most recent SSP which now provide for evaluating person trips rather than just vehicle trips. Evaluating person trips helps determine adequacy of pedestrian, transit and bike facilities. I also agree with eliminating CLV methodology in the Red and Orange areas.</p>
Steve	Solomon	<p>D</p> <p>a) iv                      b) Yes, the sector plan will get Lyttsonville more prepared for the two future purple line stations there.                      c) I support the Victory Housing project - senior affordable housing and child care center                      d) Yes                      e) Yes, the LOS grading system doesn't always tell the whole story of a road or its traffic congestion.</p>

Council District 1			
Bill	Cook	D	<p>a) Local residents lobbied vehemently for specific height restrictions near homes. I would not have traded away those efforts for additional affordable housing. However, I believe we should increase the minimum requirement of 12.5% affordable housing to 15% across the board - without trading incentives. To slow the loss of affordable housing, we should adopt a policy of 'net zero loss on affordable housing'. Meaning, if you demolish a number of affordable units for new construction, the new construction must provide at least that number of affordable units.</p> <p>b) No, I wouldn't. The plan, as adopted, is likely to diminish affordable housing and displace many of the current residents.</p> <p>c) I support the idea of using the facility to create affordable housing.</p> <p>d) Yes.</p> <p>e) I support any effort to find more reliable and accurate traffic data. Accurate traffic data is critical for making sure that our development plans observe the limits of our infrastructure - and traffic analysis have been overly optimistic in the past.</p>
Pete	Fosselman	D	<p>a) With reference to affordable housing, I would support most incentives in favor of affordable housing no matter what organization is involved. I do believe existing low rise, townhome, and single-family homes should be protected from new overarching structures. While Mayor, the County created the CRN Zone to accommodate Kensington and is now a countywide zone. CRN should have been used in the Bethesda Plan.</p> <p>b) Yes, I would have voted for the Lyttonsville sector plan. A lot of effort and comprise went into the plan. The community, which comes first, is relatively happy.</p> <p>c) As of a few weeks ago, the County chose the Child Development Center proposal for the old Silver Spring Library. However, I would have chosen the affordable senior housing which also included a child care center. Our County needs more affordable housing for seniors, particularly within walking distance of Metro. Our Aging Population is one of my three priorities (<a href="https://petefosselman.com/top-priorities/">https://petefosselman.com/top-priorities/</a>). Aging in place is an affordable and significant desire for many seniors.</p> <p>d) Yes. In fact, I support zoning changes to streamline building of accessory apartments. The secondary units allow supplemental income for property owners and more importantly, provide our aging population with an option of living closer to family.</p> <p>e) I believe the County should overhaul their transportation funding methodology to an enhanced version of the new Local Area Transportation Improvement Program. White Oak is the guinea pig for the successful LATIP.</p>

Council District 1 (cont)			
Andrew	Friedson	D	<p>a) We have to ensure that new development is compatible with existing neighborhoods, but we also cannot afford to miss out on opportunities to build affordable housing in transit oriented areas like Downtown Bethesda when it so sorely needed. As someone who lives on the edge of the Bethesda CBD, I appreciate the value of living in a livable, walkable and accessible area with the energy and amenities that go along with it, and I believe that Downtown Bethesda can and should play a larger role in attracting and retaining businesses, workers, and families.</p> <p>b) No sector plan is perfect, and there are amendments I would have liked to see if I were on the Council at the time, but on balance, I support the significant opportunity for walkability, connectivity, and transit-oriented development with the Purple Line for a community in Lyttonsville that has long been overlooked and shamelessly neglected in the past.</p> <p>c) I supported the County Executive’s original proposal to provide affordable senior housing in addition to a daycare center. I was excited by the dual-use and intergenerational opportunity for the facility, and saw its affordability for our growing aging adult population and access to childcare for young families. I’m particularly disappointed that we now will neither have an attractive, affordable senior housing facility in a vibrant area to help our seniors live with vitality, dignity, and mobility nor an attractive park in downtown Silver Spring.</p> <p>d) Yes. We should be making accessory housing easier as it is a win-win to help solve two of our county’s most vexing problems – affordable housing, particularly for young people, and seniors’ ability to age in place.</p> <p>e) Yes. I recognize that a unified study of each planning area including roads and transit, along with bicycle and pedestrian mobility needs, is a better way to plan for future transportation infrastructure improvements than a project by project transportation study that relies exclusively on tests such as CLV.</p>

Council District 1 (cont)			
Ana Sol	Gutierrez	D	<p>a) I would have supported the Council’s preferred option-- (iv).</p> <p>b) Yes, I would have voted for the Lyttonsville sector plan as adopted that will provide for transit oriented development along the Purple Line planned stops. However, I have serious concerns regarding the possible loss of affordable family rental units that are currently available in this area. Due to high densities allowed by the plan, we could see replacement of large, family-sized affordable rental units with higher-priced efficiency and onebedroom units that are no longer available to low-income families.</p> <p>c) Yes, I would support building new affordable housing at the old Silver Spring library. As reflected in my previous answered, I am a strong advocate for increasing the availability of affordable housing.</p> <p>d) Yes, I support policy and regulatory changes that would make it easier to build or convert accessory apartments in single family homes. Currently, unreasonable requirements make it very difficult or financially unfeasible to divide a house into two units. Often single-family houses near transit become more expensive and middle class families cannot afford to purchase such housing. Families with children would find that two-family house offers a better livable location having access to a yard at a more affordable price..</p> <p>e) Yes, I support discontinuing use to these tests, which no longer adequately measure what is important in making decisions regarding traffic flow and congestion.</p>
Jim	McGee	D	<p>a) This seems a bit like asking if you prefer the pimple on your right cheek or left cheek. As the question is posed, I would likely have voted for “none of those areas”. But it seems there ought be other incentives for affordable housing than height incentives. And as I understand it “affordable” for the Bethesda sector is still out of reach for too many – 80% of AMI</p> <p>b) No. While the sector plan has much to commend it, it is one more example of suburban gentrification of communities in the county founded by former slaves. Where possible, we should memorialize these communities. I support the county enabling a museum to that history as is currently being proposed by the River Road Macedonia Church</p> <p>c) Again, the Council was boxed in by alternatives that should not have been alternatives. But given the two choices, I probably would have voted for the affordable senior housing.</p> <p>d) I live across the street from a neighbor who routinely has 6-8 cars, mostly adult children, I think. I say that to argue that those other than accessory apartment occupants can cause crowded on-street parking. The answer to your question is yes. Additionally, the objector should need to demonstrate that current residents are not and will not be the cause of the unavailability of on-street parking.</p> <p>e) Yes. The new emphasis on Local Area Transportation Review moves away from a one size fits all approach and takes into account the different contexts that exist throughout the county. For the more “urbanized” areas of the county it takes a multimodal approach instead of simply looking at vehicular traffic. It attempts to recognize that reducing traffic congestion means reducing trip demand and offering alternatives to vehicular traffic.</p>

Council District 1 (cont)			
Regina "Reggie"	Oldak	D	<p>a) While I cannot put myself in the shoes of a prior Council, I support the proposal adopted by the Council.</p> <p>b) Although, as I said above, I cannot put myself in the shoes of a prior Council, and I understand the concerns of local residents regarding overall density and the future fate of naturally occurring affordable housing in the neighborhood, I probably would have voted for the sector plan as adopted. I believe the increases in density were appropriate given the Purple Line stop planned for the neighborhood.</p> <p>c) In general, I support building new affordable housing. But in this case, I agree with the decision to use the former library site for an early childhood education and development center. Affordable, high-quality childcare and education is essential to enable parents to get and keep a job and to give children a strong start toward success in school and life. Achievement differences start early, and children who enter kindergarten behind their peers may never catch up. It's also fundamental to the economic security of women and families and central to the economic health of our County.</p> <p>d) Yes, I would support that approach.</p> <p>e) Yes.</p>
Meredith	Wellington	D	<p>a) (i)</p> <p>b) No.</p> <p>c) I understand the CE has chosen to build a childcare center serving predominantly low income families on the site. I support county law that County property not needed for public agencies must then be considered for childcare or senior affordable housing.</p> <p>d) No. Hearings are currently only heard when neighbor objects or DHCA rejects application for not complying with code requirement.</p> <p>e) Yes, because those tests must be replaced with better measures that allow for staging development with infrastructure.</p>
Council District 2			
Craig L.	Rice	D	<p>a) As a current member of the Council, "as adopted by the Council"</p> <p>b) As a current member of the Council, I voted for the plan as adopted.</p> <p>c) I support the construction of affordable housing.</p> <p>d) I agree with the first part of the question but don't think the objector should be required to show proof of unavailability of parking.</p> <p>e) As a current member of the Council, I support our decision.</p>

Council District 3			
Sidney A.	Katz	D	<p>a) I voted for the incentives adopted by the Council. I support additional incentives that would allow some new developments to have 25% affordable housing.</p> <p>b) Yes, I voted in favor of the Lyttonsville sector plan as adopted.</p> <p>c) The County has now chosen the proposal to create a childcare center in the former Silver Spring library site. In general, I am in favor of residential with an increased percentage amount of affordable housing.</p> <p>d) Yes.</p> <p>e) Yes</p>
Ben	Shnider	D	<p>a) I would have voted for the incentives. Every time we water down such a proposal, we make our community less inclusive, less sustainable, less affordable, and less economically competitive. My first preference would have been to offer it in all the areas referenced.</p> <p>b) Yes.</p> <p>c) I preferred the plan to build new affordable housing (Victory Housing, on site).</p> <p>d) Yes.</p> <p>e) Yes.</p>