This case study examines Phase I of the Rockville, Maryland Town Center Master Plan, Rockville Town Square. The master plan establishes a 60-acre mixed-used development district in Rockville’s downtown. This study looks at the first project to be developed since the adoption of the master plan and its success as a transit-oriented development.
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Executive Summary

Today, global warming has become less of a theory and more of a fact of life. With the implementation of the Kyoto Treaty, most of today’s industrialized countries have agreed to measure its impact on the environment and implement policies and measures to reduce its contribution to global warming. This has created a new sense of responsibility by our national and local governments to limit growth and revitalize older urban and suburban neighborhoods. Our awareness of global warming and how we contribute to it can be seen on today’s development.

Development in the twenty-first century is complex despite where it is and who it’s for. It involves more than market study, more than financing. Today, development has to take into consideration a host of issues facing our society. A developer has to consider the impact of the project on the environment. Not only must the developer consider what it might mean to place new houses and streets on otherwise green land, the developer must also consider the “carbon footprint” of new development. Today, measuring the environmental impact of a project is multifaceted and there are many stakeholders in the process.

Our awareness of global warming also seems to have influenced what is desirable to the end users of development – homeowners, renters, and businesses. Rather than living in one area and traveling by car to work, eat, and shop, many people want all those amenities in one place. And many people want access to good public transportation so they can be less dependent on their automobiles. This is what transit-oriented development (TOD) is about. “Transit-oriented development in the twenty-first century can be a central part of the solution to a range of social and environmental problems.” (Dittmar & Ohland, 2004)

“Development around transit promotes compact development, multiple rather than single uses, a pedestrian orientation, and attention to civic uses. Successful development around transit also demands a new form of community building that not only supports and encourages transit use but also transforms the surrounding area into a place that is so special and irresistible that people will invest there, live there and visit again and again.” (Dunphy, Myerson, & Pawlukiewicz, 2003)

This project examines a transit-oriented development in Rockville, Maryland and the master plan that dictated its development – Rockville Town Square and the Town Center Master Plan. The city of Rockville is located in Montgomery County, Maryland’s largest county. Rockville is the county seat and the location of many of Montgomery County’s government office buildings. An analysis of the project was done using interviews with the private developers and the city of Rockville as well as data provided by an Urban Land Institute case study.
In the 1990’s, Rockville’s downtown was underutilized and usually empty after five in the evening. The main attraction, Rockville Mall, was demolished and the city decided to engage in an intensive, community-driven planning effort to revitalize the town center. The result of the effort is the Town Center Master Plan and the first project to be developed since its adoption is Rockville Town Square.

Rockville Town Square is a mixed use suburban infill project including restaurants, shops, public buildings, residences and open spaces. It was developed in partnership with the city of Rockville, RD Rockville, LLC, Federal Realty Investment Trust, and Montgomery County. It incorporates urban design and consists of approximately 180,000 square feet of commercial space, 644 for-sale and rental residential units, a 100,000 square foot regional library branch, a 40,000 square foot arts and business innovation center, and over 2000 parking spaces in three separate garages and on metered streets.

The results of the Town Center Master Plan (and Rockville Town Square as Phase I) in creating a transit-oriented development are generally positive. The policies and guidance provided by the master plan support the development of mixed use neighborhoods supportive of transit and incorporates the Rockville Metro Station into the core town center area. In some ways, the implementation of the plan’s guidelines falls short, specifically in the area of signage and connectivity to the available transit. Future development in the town center can improve upon the lessons of Rockville Town Square and create a truly transit-oriented community in Rockville’s town center.

The first section of this paper will define transit-oriented development and provide illustrative examples. The second section will review the literature on transit-oriented development and highlight the overarching themes. The third section will provide the details of the case study. The fourth section will analyze the case study’s success as a transit-oriented development. The final section will provide some conclusions to the analysis and identify the implications to the future development of Rockville’s town center.
**What is Transit-Oriented Development?**

Transit-oriented development (TOD) is high-density mixed-use development located within a half-mile radius of a transit station. The goals of TOD are to increase location efficiency allowing people to walk, bike and use transit; increase transit ridership and reduce automobile traffic; provide a mix of housing, retail and transportation choices; generate revenue for both the public and private sector and provide value to new and existing residents; and create a sense of place or destination. (ReconnectingAmerica.org -- Center for Transit-Oriented Development)

TOD is about creating sustainable communities where people can live, work and play. The TOD movement is gaining momentum in today’s economic climate because it promotes affordability by reducing transportation costs. But the TOD concept is not new and has taken many forms and names in the past. One previous iteration of TOD is the concept of “new urbanism.” New urbanism promotes the creation of communities where one’s basic needs for work and life are met in the same place. New urbanism encourages locating employment, shopping and retail, and civic and religious uses all in one place. It encourages walkable or easily navigatable communities with less focus on the automobile and more on the pedestrian. Prior to the automobile’s dominance in transportation, all development was transit-oriented and contained most of the elements promoted by TOD today.

Many local governments are looking at TOD to revitalize underutilized sites, increase revenues and reduce traffic. TOD is being utilized by cities, suburbs, and even rural commuter hubs as a way to support the extension of transit beyond the city lines.

One example of TOD is the Brewery Blocks in Portland, Oregon. (Iams & Kaplan, August, 2006) In Portland, transit-oriented development has brought new jobs and investment to the urban core and enhanced the city’s transportation network. In the wake of the dot.com burst, Portland and other west coast cities were facing economic decline, but Portland’s growth policy supported urban infill projects making the Brewery Blocks an attractive project to private developers. Portland is serviced by a 4.7 mile light-rail loop called the Portland Streetcar, which opened in 2001. The streetcar bridges the city’s central business district and the Pearl District, a light industrial area north of downtown. The Brewery Blocks covers five blocks, previously a former brewery, on the southern edge of the Pearl District. The Pearl District underwent dramatic change as the city became less industrial. The warehouses were being converted to loft apartments and the area opened up into galleries, boutiques, clubs and restaurants. (Iams & Kaplan, August, 2006)

The Brewery Blocks consisted of “1.7 million square feet of mixed-use development, including renovated office space, new Class A office space, high-end retail destinations, and
luxury apartments and condominiums.” (Iams & Kaplan, August, 2006) The project added a total of 500,000 square feet of office space, 300,000 square feet of retail space and 368 residential units. Each block contains a mix of uses with street-level retail. The streetcar line has several stops accessible to the Brewery Blocks. “The Pearl District’s cultural amenities, housing options, and transit access drew a highly educated, high-income workforce, which in turn brought national retailers and helped the project succeed.” (Iams & Kaplan, August, 2006)

The total development cost of the Brewery Blocks project was approximately $300 million. It was supported by $8 million from the city of Portland in the form of a $6 million loan to construct a three-level underground parking structure and a $2 million grant for infrastructure improvements. The remaining costs came from private investment giving the project a 36:1 private/public investment ratio. (Iams & Kaplan, August, 2006) The project generated a $1.3 million increase in property taxes and increased streetcar ridership in the area.

Another example of TOD is the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor in Arlington, Virginia. The Rosslyn-Balston Corridor represents a thirty-year effort to limit growth and development to a small area along the Washington D.C. metro line. Even before transit-oriented development became a buzz word, the citizens of Arlington saw the metro expansion as an opportunity to revitalize its aging commercial corridor. The city successfully lobbied the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) to build its extension along Wilson Boulevard. It also successfully lobbied to have the metro-rail line built underground. Originally, WMATA was leaning on building an above-ground rail line along Virginia’s Route 66. Then the city developed a General Land Use plan with strong stakeholder engagement. The General Land Use plan established a “bull’s eye” approach to development with the greatest densities allowed within a half-mile of the metro station and then lessening further outward. Additionally, mixed-use development at the metro stations was required. This is the same land use plan in effect today. (Dittmar & Ohland, 2004)

The result of this planning effort has been dramatic:

“The corridor has become as densely populated as many city centers in the United States. Between 1972 and the end of 2002 there has been a net increase of more than 11,000 housing units, 16 million square feet of office, 950,000 square feet of retail, 1,900 hotel rooms, and an 81 percent increase in the assessed value of land and improvements.... If all the development in the two-square-mile corridor area were constructed instead on vacant suburban land at standard densities, it would cover more than fourteen square miles.... Transit ridership in the corridor is higher than anywhere else in the region other than the District of Columbia, and most transit users get to stations on foot or by bus – there is little long-term commuter parking.” (Dittmar & Ohland, 2004)
**Literature Review**

There has been extensive writing on transit-oriented development (TOD) in recent years. The literature can be divided into several categories including policy-oriented papers, analysis and case studies. Due to the volume of literature available, only pieces that provided relevant information to the case study were reviewed.

There is a changing demographic that makes the development of TODs more and more compelling. The ideal of a house in the suburbs on a half acre lot is no longer the norm. More and more people want to live in a community where the amenities are accessible and there is a mix of uses in one place. This change in the norm was identified in the literature.

A review of the literature also revealed a number of themes relating to best practices in the development of TOD. A key element in a successful TOD is planning. The literature showed that planning on the part of the local government went a long way in enabling and encouraging TOD. An important element of planning can be referred to as “place-making.” Place-making means creating a destination, and including an attractive and appropriate mix of uses in the project. The design of and incorporation of the right mix of uses is critical to a TOD’s success. Another key ingredient is the presence of a private-public partnership. The active engagement on the part of the local government throughout the development of the TOD resulted in projects that met multiple goals on the part of the developers and the community. Last, but not least, is the incorporation of a mix of residents, both by family type and income level. In a TOD, the transit function should be supported by including residents most likely to use transit. This section will expand on each element.

In *10 Principles for Successful Development Around Transit,* by Robert Dunphy, Deborah Myerson, and Michael Pawlukiewicz, the authors define transit-oriented development and describe ten principles to adhere to when developing TOD. The authors state:

*Development around transit promotes compact development, multiple rather than single uses, a pedestrian orientation, and attention to civic uses. Successful development around transit also demands a new form of community building that not only supports and encourages transit use but also transforms the surrounding area into a place that is so special and irresistible that people will invest there, live there and visit again and again. (Dunphy, Myerson, & Pawlukiewicz, 2003)*

**The Changing Market**

In “Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) – Here to Stay,” John Gosling discusses the market in implementing TOD programs. Gosling identifies the typical demographic for TODs as young professionals and empty nesters – people with discretionary income and a taste for amenities. (Gosling, Summer, 2002)
In “Transit-Adjacent Housing in Hot Demand Reports Market Study,” Gloria Ohland points out that “at least one-quarter of all households entering the market could be looking for housing within a half mile of a transit station in the next 20 years.” (Ohland, February, 2005) The article highlights the cost of transportation as the second highest household cost after rent or mortgage. TOD makes housing more affordable by reducing transportation costs. According to the article, “America is in the midst of a transit building boom, and the availability of developable sites near transit, together with the new popularity of urban and suburban town center neighborhoods, is stoking interest in transit-oriented development.” (Ohland, February, 2005)

In The New Transit Town: Best Practices in Transit-Oriented Development, edited by Hank Dittmar and Gloria Ohland, the book first identifies why TODs are on the rise and what comprises a good TOD. The authors identify a “tectonic shift in consumer preferences, employer location strategies, and transportation planning values” over the last decade. (Dittmar & Ohland, 2004) “Sitting, as it does at the convergence of these trends, [TOD] has the potential to form a new approach to development that builds on their synergy and results in places and regions that meet the demand for location-efficient mixed-use neighborhoods, supports regional economic growth strategies, and increases housing affordability and choice.” (Dittmar & Ohland, 2004)

“Hidden in Plain Sight: Capturing the Demand for Housing Near Transit,” from the Center for Transit-Oriented Development focuses primarily on determining the market demand for housing choice at TODs. (Reconnecting America’s Center for Transit Oriented Development, September, 2004) The study focused on four things:

- National real estate and consumer trends that affect the potential market for housing within a half mile of fixed guideway transit stops (TOD);
- the demographics and travel behavior of residents who live near transit;
- the potential demand for housing within walking distance of transit stations in the year 2025; and
- the ability of transit-served regions to accommodate this emerging consumer market.

The study determined that there is a demographic shift in family composition. “Household size is shrinking, producing more households of empty nesters, singles and non-family residents. … The traditional nuclear family that made up 40 percent of households in 1970 now comprises less than 24 percent of households.” (Reconnecting America’s Center for Transit Oriented Development, September, 2004)

The analysis was conducted using CTOD’s national TOD database, a GIS platform used for analyzing the nation’s 3,341 existing fixed transit stops and the 630 additional sites scheduled to be built by 2025. The study notes “even those who live outside central cities are expressing a preference for the convenience and vitality of urban life. Many suburbs are revitalizing their
downtowns to make them more pedestrian friendly, encourage street life, and create a mix of land uses, and they are using their commuter rail stations as an anchor and major asset.” (Reconnecting America’s Center for Transit Oriented Development, September, 2004) The study identified several sources that demonstrated the changing tastes in consumer demand. Currently, the demand has shifted to smaller lots and densely populated urban areas.

According to the 2000 Census and the national TOD database, “a total of 14 million people or 6.3 million households live within a half-mile radius of existing fixed-guideway transit stations. ... This equates to 12 percent of the total population of the 27 metro regions covered in this study.” (Reconnecting America’s Center for Transit Oriented Development, September, 2004)

The median income of households located in transit zones tends to be slightly lower than those of the larger metro region. This study found that because every metro region has a significantly higher proportion of low-income households living in transit zones, the income data is skewed. Moving beyond the low-income bracket, the remaining income brackets are equally represented in the transit zone to the region as a whole. (Reconnecting America’s Center for Transit Oriented Development, September, 2004)

Car ownership rates and commuter habits are also different within transit zones. Ownership rates are significantly lower, with an average of 0.9 cars per household compared with 1.6 cars per household in the greater metro region. The study found that only 54 percent of residents living within a transit zone commute by car, compared to 83 percent in the larger metro region. The Washington D.C. area is one of the regions with the lowest percentage of residents commuting by car. (Reconnecting America’s Center for Transit Oriented Development, September, 2004)

One of the major contributions to the literature on TOD is the Location Typology developed by Dittmar. Looking at TOD through location typology can help in identifying the unique location characteristics each typology offers. It is also useful in understanding the market in each area. Each typology has a unique land use mix and minimum density. There are six typologies identified in The New Transit Town (See Appendix A):

1. Urban downtown
2. Urban neighborhood
3. Suburban town center
4. Suburban neighborhood
5. Neighborhood transit zone
Planning

In 10 Principles, the authors start with “Make it better with a vision.” (Dunphy, Myerson, & Pawlukiewicz, 2003) In describing the vision, the authors argue that it should be stakeholder centered, collaborative and educational, flexible, oriented toward the future and based in reality, and focused on implementation. (Dunphy, Myerson, & Pawlukiewicz, 2003) The authors pay special attention to getting stakeholder buy-in. Stakeholder buy-in makes implementation smoother because there will be less opposition to specific projects when they are modeled from a stakeholder-centered TOD vision.

The authors also examine the advancement of transit with development in mind. Transit agencies have to consider development opportunities when planning for transit including routes, type of transit and cost. “Real estate opportunities should always take priority over low-cost transit solutions. For example, running transit along the median of an interstate may save the transit agency from having to pay for a new right-of-way, but it will decrease accessibility for riders and eliminate opportunities to promote higher densities and economic growth around the stations.” (Dunphy, Myerson, & Pawlukiewicz, 2003)

Dunphy also addresses planning in Developing Around Transit: Strategies and Solutions That Work. Planning for TOD is a critical element in its success or failure:

In transit districts, the planning framework comprises both the public process that identifies a vision for the transit station area and the supporting policies that are implemented by the public entities. Public participation in transit district planning is needed to avoid or overcome local opposition to changes in development patterns and to specific development projects. Supporting policies for transit district planning include the adoption of appropriate zoning, the provision of infrastructure, and the granting of incentives for development. (Dunphy R. T., 2004)

The New Transit Town also examines the regulatory environment for TODs, specifically zoning. The book lays out six recommendations for the policy and planning approach to TOD. The first is to create customized zoning for projects integrating transit facilities.

Common approaches for planning customized projects are the use of specific plans ... and the use of the planned unit development (PUD) process.... The specific plans focus on a small area, sometimes with multiple ownerships, and both express policy and establish development regulations uniquely tailored to the location. The specific plans are generally prepared by local government, and often require a detailed master plan to be submitted by the developer in order to demonstrate compliance with the specific plan’s provisions. (Dittmar & Ohland, 2004)
The second recommendation is to minimize customized planning and discretionary review for standardized projects. Specifically, in a transit-oriented district, the zoning provisions should require “active, walkable streets, building density and intensity, and careful integration of transit.” (Dittmar & Ohland, 2004) Projects with those characteristics should be permitted “as of right,” and review of the development proposals incorporating them should be minimized or eliminated.

The third recommendation is to provide an explicit foundation in policy and politics that support the development of TOD. Public policy favoring TOD is tremendously important in an environment where long time frames exist for the planning and design of TOD projects. “Successful projects all along the continuum are founded in clearly stated political and policy guidance for local officials, public agency staff, and project proponents. Formal policies as well as funding and program priorities help establish shared expectations among community members, transit agencies and developers and smooth the way for development projects.” (Dittmar & Ohland, 2004)

The fourth recommendation is to engage transit organization policy leadership in the development of TOD. One of the elements required for the successful development of TODs was an active transit agency that held a “comprehensive view of their goals and mission rather than one that focuses exclusively on conventional notions of transit productivity.” (Dittmar & Ohland, 2004)

The fifth recommendation for TODs is to meet multiple objectives. “TOD projects can be judged as successful only when measured against multiple yardsticks. The best TOD projects integrate diverse elements to serve multiple public and private objectives, thereby expanding the constituent base in support of the project and justifying public and private investment.” (Dittmar & Ohland, 2004)

The final recommendation is to anticipate a lengthy timeline for customized projects. TODs take a long time to plan, design and build. The planning and policy foundation must be in place to support the development of TODs through the years.

Gosling also examines planning, specifically plan approvals. Unlike a typical development on green land, TODs can be controlled by a number of agencies and levels of government. Additionally, mixed-use zoning is unusual in suburban areas, requiring variances or re-zoning. Similarly, the design requirements of TODs are unusual in suburban areas and may also require variances. Gosling points out that zoning for TODs needs to be flexible to consider not only the mix of uses, but also the mix of daytime and nighttime activities, private use of public space, and countercyclical peak parking demands. (Gosling, Summer, 2002)

In “A Rail Runs Through It,” by Steve Bergsman, Bergsman discusses the redevelopment of Chicago’s commuter towns into thriving TODs. A key element to the success was the implementation of redevelopment or land use plans. In the cities of Arlington Heights,
Palatine, Le Grange, Des Plaines, and Mount Prospect, the redevelopment plan created an environment for redevelopment. In the cases of Des Plaines and Mount Prospect, the redevelopment plan came after beginning the redevelopment efforts, making them slow despite starting in the 1980s. The opposite is true for Arlington Heights and Palatine, both of which created redevelopment plans and have had great success with their efforts. (Bergsman, March, 2002)

**Place-making**

Place-making refers to the elements of land use mix, density, connectivity, urban design, transit access and parking in designing the TOD. (Dittmar & Ohland, 2004) In 10 Principles, the authors suggest applying certain principles to TODs that would support the creation of a sense of place. These principles include locating the transit station in the center of the development, design the station to encourage activity from all sides, ensure the design is high quality and reflects the character of the community, include public open space, promote pedestrian connectivity, create attractive landmarks, and ensure round-the-clock activity, incorporating a variety of residential uses. (Dunphy, Myerson, & Pawlukiewicz, 2003)

Dittmar states it this way - “Understanding the station’s role in the transit system is key to planning for development around it, and one goal should be to balance the overwhelming peak hour nature of transit system travel by incorporating a mix of nonwork uses into most sites.” (Dittmar & Ohland, 2004)

In order to create a destination and a sense of place, place-making involves using the appropriate mix of uses. Dittmar applies the concept of Location Efficiency to place-making. Location efficiency is defined as the “conscious placement of homes in proximity to transit systems.” (Dittmar & Ohland, 2004) The authors focus on this aspect of TOD as a way to create social equity. A region that is dependent on owning a car puts people with limited resources at a disadvantage. The key components to location efficiency are:

- **Density** – sufficient customers within walking or bicycling distance of the transit stop to allow the system to run efficiently.
- **Transit accessibility** – transit stations and stops that are centrally or conveniently located within the TOD and service that allows riders to reach their destinations easily.
- **Pedestrian friendliness** – a network of streets within the transit district that is interconnected and scaled to the convenience of pedestrians. (Dittmar & Ohland, 2004)

In Developing Around Transit, Dunphy considers the concept of “new urbanism,” a concept that urban designer Peter Calthorpe is credited with refining. (Dunphy R. T., 2004)

Calthorpe’s concept of new urbanism includes the following fundamental principles:
- On a regional level, organize growth to be compact and transit-supportive.
- Place commercial, residential, employment, open space and civic uses within walking distance of transit stops.
- Create pedestrian-friendly street networks that directly connect local destinations.
- Provide a mix of housing types at varying densities and costs.
- Preserve sensitive habitat, riparian zones, and high-quality open space.
- Orient buildings and neighborhood activity to public spaces.
- Encourage infill and redevelopment along transit corridors within existing neighborhoods. (Dunphy R. T., 2004)

Developing Around Transit also looks at making the various planning elements more transit friendly. In the case of TOD, mix use often refers to a vertical mix of uses such as office space above retail in a single building. Higher density is favored in TOD to support transit and make the development of TOD more profitable to developers. Connectivity, urban design and transit access are all interrelated.

The specific issue of how to integrate parking into a TOD requires a lot of consideration. In today’s age of automobile dominance, parking cannot be eliminated even in a transit-oriented development. A major consideration is where to place parking so as not to disrupt the pedestrian connectivity. TOD should provide for the relaxation of parking requirements which again supports transit and provides more profitability for developers. Some parking has to be provided, though there are strategies to reduce the amount necessary and the impact it has on design. The nature of TOD can reduce some of the parking need because more people will be arriving by transit. “Parking requirements for the land uses in transit districts – excluding parking for transit riders – can potentially be reduced by shared parking among uses and by increasing the propensity of people arriving by transit, foot, or car to walk to multiple destinations (linked trips).” (Dunphy R. T., 2004)

The Role of Local Government

This section will examine the role that local government plays in partnership with developers of TOD. In 10 Principles, this is referred to as “Apply the power of partnerships.” (Dunphy, Myerson, & Pawlukiewicz, 2003) Specifically, the authors note that the “public sector has the power to resolve land-assembly problems, ensure that the site is development-ready, ease the entitlement process, and contribute land, infrastructure costs, or both.” (Dunphy, Myerson, & Pawlukiewicz, 2003)

In Developing Around Transit: Strategies and Solutions That Work, Dunphy asserts that local governments “must lead the process of determining what types of development should be
sought for particular station areas, adopt appropriate regulations and incentives for private
development, implement the timely completion of supporting public facilities, assure that all
parties remain in continuous communication, and maintain a long-term commitment to transit
district development.” (Dunphy R. T., 2004)

In The New Transit Town, Dittmar suggests that local governments play a part in reducing
the uncertainty and risk in financing TOD projects. Specifically, local governments can change
the planning and zoning rules that typically scare off developers and investors by proactively
addressing the zoning and permitting barriers to TOD development. Additionally, the zoning
can support the higher densities needed to make TODs more profitable and attractive to
developers and investors. (Dittmar & Ohland, 2004)

A critical factor in supporting the financing of TODs that the local government can provide
is an upfront investment in the predevelopment and infrastructure needed to support a TOD.
Some agencies can help developers by providing the land acquisition for the development,
including accepting less than market value for land and delaying payment for land to improve
the economic position of the developer of the TOD.

In “A Rail Runs Through It,” Bergsman highlighted the use of Tax Increment Financing
(TIF) districts by the local government to entice developers. With TIF funds, the villages went
about improving streetscapes, sidewalks, and open spaces. (Bergsman, March, 2002)

**Housing**

Incorporating residential development in TOD is essential in a project’s success.
Residential development, when included in a mixed-use strategy, can attract “wealthier
households, resulting in escalating real estate values, numerous upscale conversions, and
rising rents.” (Dunphy, Myerson, & Pawlukiewicz, 2003) Dunphy also notes that it is
important to develop and preserve affordable housing opportunities in TOD. Lower-income
people represent transit’s core constituency and by including affordable housing, the transit
portion of TOD will be further supported. “Local agencies should link transit funding with the
provision of affordable housing so that transit and housing can reinforce each other.” (Dunphy,
Myerson, & Pawlukiewicz, 2003)

In “Hidden in Plain Sight,” the authors analyzed the market demand for housing around
transit stations and found the potential to be very significant.

*Our market assessment shows that at least a quarter of all households that will be looking for housing in the next 20 years – 14.6 million households – will be looking to rent or to buy housing within a half mile of fixed-guideway transit stops. ... The national estimate is based on household demand projections for each region that have been segmented by household type and by age of the head of household – two key variables affecting demand for housing near transit. ... The*
potential demand estimate takes into account, explicitly or implicitly, a number of factors that could drive demand for transit-based housing: overall population growth, growth in the number of household types that will show a greater propensity for living near transit (such as “empty nesters”), the current size of a transit system and the current number of stations, as well as any expansions that might be funded by the FTA. (Reconnecting America’s Center for Transit Oriented Development, September, 2004)

In the Washington D.C. area, there will be significant growth in the number of households, increasing by 28% by 2025. By 2025, the Washington D.C. region could have a potential demand of 650,417 transit zone households, an increase of 158%. (Reconnecting America’s Center for Transit Oriented Development, September, 2004) “Nearly two-thirds of the total demand for housing near transit will be generated by single householders or couples without children, a disproportionate share given the size of these groups relative to the size of the U.S. population as a whole. ... Households with children will account for only about 20 percent of the demand for housing in transit zones.” (Reconnecting America’s Center for Transit Oriented Development, September, 2004)

The study shows that to capture the demand for housing in transit zones, each transit station (existing plus in the construction pipeline) would need to add 2,100 new units. Since a significant portion of the existing stations are completely built out, additional units will have to be added to the stations in categories such as Urban Neighborhood, Suburban center, and Suburban neighborhood.

The Washington D.C. metropolitan area is an ideal spot for expanding the housing opportunities near transit. “Washington D.C. with 3.1 stations per 100,000 people and 10 percent of the metro population living in transit zones, ranks quite high in terms of population living in transit zones, even when it is compared to the five regions that have extensive transit systems [such as New York, Chicago, San Francisco Bay area, Philadelphia, and Boston].” (Reconnecting America’s Center for Transit Oriented Development, September, 2004)

Conclusion

Most of the literature supports the development of transit-oriented developments. There are common themes in all the literature reviewed. First, TODs require advanced planning and
support from local governments. TODs will not just happen on its own. The creation of a master plan with TOD-supportive zoning is a critical element in the success of TODs. Specific attention has to be paid to design, inclusion of a mix of uses, and place-making. The support of the local government in the form of explicitly stated policies, upfront investment, and relaxation of the review and permitting process are also critical to the successful development of TOD. Finally, TOD is not a one-size-fits-all concept. TODs have to be considered in the context of location, demand, and appropriateness within the region.
The Case Study

Rockville Town Center and Rockville Town Square

This case study is divided into two parts – Rockville Town Center and Rockville Town Square. Rockville Town Center is a 60-acre area marked for redevelopment by the city of Rockville and is the subject of a master plan known as the Rockville Town Center Master Plan (TCMP). Rockville Town Square (RTS) is the first project to be developed since the adoption of the master plan in 2001. It covers approximately 12.5 acres of the town center area. The main focus of the Rockville Town Center portion of the case study is a description of the TCMP. The TCMP was created to incite development in Rockville’s underutilized town center. The focus of the plan was to create a 24-hour pedestrian-oriented downtown, building on Rockville’s existing assets, specifically the Rockville Metro center.

The case study is based on interviews with Mike Schwartzman, Vice President and Director of Development for Ross Development and Investments, one of the private developers of RTS and David Levy, Chief of Long Range Planning and Development for the Department of Community Planning and Development Services for the city of Rockville. In the summer of 2009, the Urban Land Institute (ULI) published a case study of RTS which is used here to provide a description of the project, including project data such as land use information, residential and commercial tenant information, and a summary of the financing. The ULI case study does not provide an analysis of the success or failure of the RTS project as it relates to the TCMP or the principles of transit-oriented development.

This case study will analyze RTS’ success as the first project developed under the TCMP and as a transit-oriented development.

Rockville, Maryland

The city of Rockville is located in Maryland’s largest county, Montgomery County, and just north of the nation’s capital, Washington D.C. It is the county seat and hosts most of the county’s municipal buildings including the Montgomery County Courthouse. Rockville dates back to before the Revolutionary War. In 1776, the settlement on the main road between Georgetown and Frederick was selected as the seat of Montgomery County government. The
The town was incorporated in 1860. The town bloomed when in 1873, the expansion of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad enabled Rockville residents to work in Washington D.C. In 1888, the citizens of Rockville elected its first mayor. Rockville saw major growth in the 1950s, and as of the 2000 census, has a population of over 47,000. Rockville is the second largest city in Maryland. The greater Rockville area has become renowned as the high technology, bio-technology, retail and business center of Montgomery County. The I-270 corridor is known as Maryland’s technology corridor. Rockville can be accessed by car, bus and metro-rail. Rockville is connected to the Washington D.C. metropolitan area by the Metro, Maryland’s Commuter Rail MARC train, and by bus. The MARC train also connects Rockville to Frederick and points further west as far as West Virginia. (Town Center Master Plan)

Previous efforts to revitalize Rockville’s downtown had been made in the past. The downtown was part of one of the first urban renewal plans in the 1970s which led to the development of the Rockville Mall, an enclosed mall on the current site of RTS. The mall was never very successful. It lacked good access, the parking was “dark” and economically, the mall never secured an anchor tenant. The mall was demolished in the 1990s which was one of the sparks for the development of the TCMP. At the time of the mall’s development, indoor malls were sprouting up in many downtowns. It was a common model that turned out not to be a very successful revitalization strategy. In creating the TCMP, the city made sure to conduct extensive public engagement in the process, which is thought to be what is making this revitalization strategy more successful.

**Town Center Master Plan**

In 2000, the city of Rockville’s town center consisted of unremarkable retail strips and a vacant lot where the failed Rockville Mall once stood. The development of the TCMP came out of the Imagine Rockville movement, a city-wide visioning effort on what was important to the city of Rockville. Several workgroups were established under this effort, one being focused on the town center. It was a commonly agreed upon that the site of the old Rockville Mall, and the main focus of the town center area should be developed as mixed-use. From the Imagine Rockville movement, the town center became the city’s top priority. The work done in the
visioning workgroup created a momentum in the city to do something about the under-utilized downtown area.

Other areas within Montgomery County had embarked on successful revitalization efforts and the city of Rockville decided to do the same. With the momentum of the Imagine Rockville movement, the city council hired consultants to develop a master plan for the town center area. The result was the Town Center Master Plan, an intensive, community-driven effort to redefine Rockville’s downtown into a vibrant, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented destination.

The goal of the TCMP is to “create a daytime, evening, and weekend activity center that is easily identifiable, pedestrian-oriented, and incorporates a mix of uses and activities.” (Town Center Master Plan) To achieve that goal, the TCMP states nine objectives:

1. **Provide an environment conducive to and supportive of living, working, shopping, and entertainment.**
2. **Accommodate a variety of densities and scales of development that are sensitive to an urban neighborhood environment and the demands of the marketplace.**
3. **Enhance links to transportation options which improve their visibility and accessibility.**
4. **Provide improved connections from neighborhoods to the Town Center.**
5. **Minimize the divisive impact of Rockville Pike and the Metro and CSX rail lines.**
6. **Make the Town Center a unique, high amenity destination for local and regional customers.**
7. **Utilize urban design to establish zoning and density requirements that will assist in defining the Rockville Town Center.**
8. **Provide sufficient parking for new mixed-use development and visitors to the Town Center.**
9. **Address integrating new aesthetic public parking garages with linkages from road networks.** (Town Center Master Plan)

The area contained within the Town Center is approximately 60 acres bounded by Edmonston Drive on the southeast, Wootton Parkway, Mount Vernon Place and The Courthouse Walk community on the south, Van Buren Street and Adams Street on the west, commercial uses near Frederick Avenue on the north, and properties fronting on North and South Stonestreet Avenue on the east. (See Appendix I.) This area, known as the Town Center Planning Area, was established through previous master plans. (Town Center Master Plan) The TCMP created a set of “Guiding Principles for Future Development” as a tool to direct private development. These principles clearly outline the intention of the community to create a transit-oriented development in the town center. The principles are as follows:
• Development in Rockville’s Town Center will be organized around an L-shaped, pedestrian oriented spine extending from the Metro Station westward along East Montgomery Avenue and a northward extension of Maryland Avenue to North Washington Street. As the primary organizational element of the Town Center, this spine would serve as the focal point for future development activities. All projects throughout the Town Center should be supportive of, and not detract from, that role. The street must exhibit outstanding streetscape, signage, landscaping and architectural design solutions that make its centerpiece role immediately recognizable.

• North Washington Street will be a comfortable pedestrian and vehicular corridor that will serve as a transition area between western neighborhoods and the core of the Town Center while accommodating north-south vehicular traffic. Development along North Washington Street—particularly on its west side—will present a recognizable edge to the mid- to high-intensity uses present in the core of the Town Center.

• Connectivity between Maryland Avenue and other traffic corridors—particularly MD 355 and North Washington Street—will be provided in a manner that does not compromise the pedestrian character of Maryland Avenue or North Washington Street.

• The Metro station will have a recognizable presence in the Town Center. Redevelopment efforts including the station and area to the west are viewed as opportunities to bring the station perceptually closer by favoring development and densities of activity toward the Town Center. Connections between the station and the Town Center will be viewed as an extension of the L-shaped spine.

• As the center of the Rockville community, the Town Center will be well-connected to adjacent neighborhoods but will not use them for funneling tremendous amounts of traffic. Future development will be supportive of the economic viability of adjacent properties while not presenting dramatic conflicts in uses.

• Partnerships between property owners, businesses, citizens, civic associations, governmental entities, and other groups will be actively encouraged and supported. These groups will help support the implementation of the plan’s goals and objectives. Additionally, these groups will continue to be involved in future activities by providing comments, observations, support, and encouragement. (Town Center Master Plan)

Additional elements to the TCMP included a physical plan of the town center which outlined the Desired Framework and the development guidelines; an implementation strategy which outlined the first steps to be taken to encourage future development of the town center; and regulatory recommendations which defined the specific zoning...
changes that should be made to facilitate development. The regulatory recommendations also included specific design/architectural guidelines to be adhered to during development. The zoning established by the adoption of the TCMP allowed for the greater density and a mix of uses in the town center. The greatest densities are found on the L-shaped spine of Montgomery and Maryland Avenues.

The Implementation Strategy contained the specific steps that the city of Rockville should take in order to facilitate future development of the town square. The implementation strategy delineated three “catalyst physical improvement projects” the city should complete. The first was to complete the Maryland Avenue Extension, the major pedestrian thoroughfare of the project; the second, to participate in a city-facilitated mixed-use development; and the third, to complete the pedestrian promenade that would connect the Rockville Metro Station to the L-shaped spine of the town center. Each recommended project included the specific steps and partners needed for their completion.

The city hoped to achieve a transit-oriented development by connecting the Rockville Metro station to the L-shaped spine of East Montgomery Avenue. Currently, the metro station is connected to the area by a foot bridge over Route 355, Rockville Pike. TCMP suggests some potential solutions to the pedestrian connectivity. The ideal solution is to recess Route 355; however this solution is too costly. Another suggestion is the Implementation Strategy’s third catalyst project - create a pedestrian promenade over Route 355. This promenade would provide the pedestrian with an attractive entryway to the town center. The promenade itself would be a public plaza between the metro station and Montgomery Avenue. As a major public improvement project, development of the promenade would involve all levels of government and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA).

**Existing Conditions**

The TCMP includes a market study detailing the existing conditions and trends in the town center. The market study area focused on an area with a ten-minute drive time of the town center – approximately 483 acres. The properties within that area generally fell into one of the following categories:

- Motor vehicle-oriented commercial uses,
- Public and institutional uses, such as schools, churches and government uses,
- Single family residential neighborhoods,
- Single family homes being used as office uses,
- Mixed use areas,
- Predominantly office uses, and
• Light industry.

At the time of the market study, the market potential in the town center area was very high. The town center area was estimated to add an additional 26,000 residents in the next five years. Current residents in the area had an annual median income of approximately $54,000. The study identified the consumer characteristics of the current town center population and estimated that the town center could support an additional 1 – 2 million square feet of retail and commercial space. The study showed that the current town center population was grossly under-served by the existing retail space.

The TCMP identified trends in Rockville’s real estate market. Rockville’s office market consisted mostly of small users (under 25,000 square feet) which was due mostly to lack of larger space available and concerns over parking issues. However, as of the 2nd quarter of 2000, Rockville had an additional 641,000 square feet under construction, and construction was predicted to continue due to the low (0.96%) vacancy rate and strong economy at the time.

The current retail market at the time was dominated by the retail available on Rockville Pike, the major automobile-oriented thoroughfare running through the town center area. Based on the consumer characteristics above, it was thought that the town center could capture a large portion of the retail market.

Residential units had been added steadily to the town center area in the 1990s. In that time, Montgomery County authorized 34,310 new housing units for construction. Local real estate experts believed that Rockville Town Center could attract additional homebuyers in the $200,000 to $400,000 price range, given its economy, city services, schools, and amenities.

Rockville Town Square

The Rockville Town Square development is the realization of the TCMP. It is the first development in the town center area based on the implementation strategies set forth in the TCMP. It is a city-led development that includes the basic elements of transit-oriented development and meets many of the goals outlined in the TCMP. It has encouraged more mixed-use private development within the town center.

RTS is an urban, mixed-used, infill development jointly developed by the city of Rockville, RD Rockville LLC, Federal Realty Investment Trust (FRIT), and Montgomery County. RD Rockville, LLC is a partnership of Ross Development & Investment and DANAC Corporation, both of which were local developers headquartered in Montgomery County. Ross Development specializes primarily in residential development and
management; DANAC Corporation specializes in commercial development. (Stern, April-June, 2009) RD Rockville, LLC won the job from an RFP issued jointly by the city of Rockville and FRIT, both of which owned the majority of the land for the development.

RTS is the first project to be completed since the Rockville City Council adopted the Town Center Master Plan, and, as will be demonstrated in this case study, accomplishes the first two catalyst projects recommended in the TCMP. At the center of RTS is a 28,000 square-foot landscaped plaza, owned and developed by the city of Rockville. The plaza includes an interactive fountain, sculptures, a seasonal ice-skating rink, a rock garden, green space, trees, and a play area. The plaza serves as a downtown gathering spot for community events and concerts.

The project also includes four new mid-rise buildings containing more than 180,000 square feet of shops and restaurants, and 644 for-sale and rental units, ranging from 553 square-foot studios to 2,225 square-foot, three-bedroom units. Ninety-four (94) of the units are moderately-priced dwelling units (affordable to households earning under 60 percent of the area median income). The project is anchored by a new 100,000 square-foot regional library branch, developed by Montgomery County. The project also includes 40,000 square-feet of office space for the city’s arts and innovation center, known as the VisArts building, developed by the city of Rockville. Both the library and the VisArts buildings front the public plaza. The first floor of the library contains a Thai restaurant from which the county collects rent. The city also developed the three public parking garages which include 1950 parking spaces. A small amount of parking can be found at metered spots along the street, as well. The restaurants in the project all include ample outdoor dining along tree-lined streets with wide sidewalks.

The site is bordered by Beall Avenue on the north, East Middle Lane on the south, North Washington Street on the west, and Maryland Route 355 (Hungerford Drive/Rockville Pike) on the east. Within that area, a triangular plot at the intersection of East Middle Lane and 355 known as Rockville Metro Plaza is not part of the RTS site, but is being developed separately as a three-building, 620,000 square foot office complex by another local developer. (Stern, April-June, 2009) Two new streets were developed as part of the RTS site, Gibbs Street and the Maryland Avenue extension. Both streets help to complete the street grid and run north/south between Beall Avenue and East Middle Lane.

**Public-Private Partnership – The Public Side**

As recommended by the TCMP, the city of Rockville played a significant role in the development of RTS. First, the city assembled all the land which enabled the project to
be built in a single phase. Prior to redevelopment, the site was home to an aging 100,000-square-foot strip shopping center, a gas station, and some townhouse-style office buildings. The city already owned approximately 4.5 acres of the site (demolished Rockville Mall). It entered into a “friendly condemnation” agreement with FRIT for the strip mall and two other privately owned properties on the northern and eastern sides of the site. The city provided generous financial support to the businesses that were relocated as a result of the condemnation, and all of the businesses were given a chance to relocate in the new RTS. The city spent approximately $7 million to $8 million in the effort. The land assembly significantly reduced the land acquisition costs to the private developers.

The project was developed under a General Development Agreement (GDA) that included the city of Rockville, FRIT and RD Rockville. Montgomery County’s participation was formalized with a Memorandum of Understanding which committed $12 million in county funding over six years to support the development of this phase of the master plan. The county also developed the project’s anchor, the library, and funded the business incubator located in the VisArts building. The city of Rockville convinced the county to locate the library on the north side of the project so as to encourage people to travel through the project to get to the library. The city also convinced the county to allow the mixed use of a restaurant on the first floor of the library.

The city also financed and developed the infrastructure for the project. The city built the plaza, the sidewalks and all the public improvements including the three parking garages. This also included the development of Gibbs Street and the extension of Maryland Avenue through to Beall Street (which was the first catalyst project in the TCMP).

The city’s ongoing involvement in the project comes in the form of the joint ownership arrangements for each building/block. Each building in the project has its own unique form of condominium ownership based on the uses in the building. For example, a building with ground floor retail and apartments on the upper floors is structured in three condominium “units” with the ground floor retail owned by FRIT, the residential portion owned by CIM (which purchased the residential units from RD Rockville), and the parking garage owned by the city. The common areas are shared by the three owners. Another unique aspect of the ownership is that sidewalks are owned by the building to which they are adjacent, to allow for outdoor dining.

A business improvement district (BID) was established for RTS. The private owners of the blocks chose to self-impose extra taxes to support cleaning and maintenance of
RTS. The city runs the BID and collects the taxes, with private oversight, in the model of the highly successful Times Square BID in New York City.

The city's financial investment goes beyond the project's pro forma. For example, the Metropolitan Center for the Visual Arts at Rockville, located in the VisArts building, only pays $1/square-foot for rent to the city. Additionally, the parking facilities for the project are currently run at a deficit, which was approved by the City Council because it was important to the city to keep ownership of the parking lots and provide affordable, convenient parking.

The town square was developed using a Planned Unit Development (PUD) within the newly created Mixed Use Transit District (MXTD) zone (created under the TCMP).

**The Public-Private Partnership – RD Rockville, LLC**

RD Rockville, LLC was responsible for the construction of all the residential and retail spaces in RTS. Management of the residential units would stay with Ross Development & Investment; management of the commercial space would fall to FRIT. RD Rockville, LLC won the competition to develop RTS over several national development companies. Their local status was determined to be a huge benefit in the development process. All the principals of the development project worked closely together throughout the entire construction of the project, even sharing office space. The level of coordination led to a smooth development process and increased level of trust between all the partners.

RD Rockville convinced the city and FRIT that choosing one contractor to construct the entire project would make the process more efficient and easier to manage. Whiting-Turner Contracting Company was selected to be the contractor due to its experience with constructing complex mixed-use development projects. Whiting-Turner constructed the entire infrastructure, including the public parking garages and the streets, and most of the buildings (Montgomery County used another contractor to build the library).

The TCMP focused a lot on the design of new projects in the town center area. Prior to construction beginning on RTS, the city and the development team held more than 40 public meetings to inform the community and all the stakeholders about the proposed development. The RTS plan created a strong urban design by placing all buildings within 15 feet of streets. The street-level retail “included tall, detailed storefronts set against wide, tree-lined sidewalks with benches and inlaid paving patterns to add character and provide human scale.” (Stern, April-June, 2009) Decorative lighting lines the streets.
Urban design used small setbacks, wide sidewalks, & monumental pillars.

Large canopies were used to mark the entrances to the residential buildings, and monumental pillars are located at the prominent entrances to RTS. Signage throughout the project directs drivers to the available parking.

The architectural framework was reviewed by the community. As the first project built in the town center, it would set the stage for future development. The illusion of incremental growth over time, a concept that gives the town square a more “natural” look, was created by varying massing, design and materials across block-long elevations. This also created the illusion of dozens of individual buildings in one block. (Stern, April-June, 2009)

The design focused on placing priority to the pedestrian experience within RTS. In addition to the varying facades, two other design elements are used to define RTS’ character: varying rooflines and towers. The towers punctuate significant corners and act as beacons to establish a sense of arrival. “Rooflines facing the plaza are the most detailed and varied, while those that frame the edges of the neighborhood are simpler.” (Stern, April-June, 2009)

Residences

There are four residential buildings with a total of 644 units. Common areas for each building include secured main and secondary lobby entrances with sitting areas and mailrooms; club rooms; fitness centers and landscaped terraces. Two of the buildings include swimming pools set above the parking decks and terraces that are shared by the community. (Stern, April-June, 2009) There are multiple floor plans for studio, one-bedroom, two-bedroom, and three bedroom units.

“Rockville’s Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit Program requires that between 12.5 to 15 percent of homes in new projects with 20 units or more be moderately priced dwelling units (MPDUs), which must be affordable to households earning under 60 percent of the area median income.” (Stern, April-June, 2009) Therefore, ninety-four (94) of RTS’ units were designated as MPDUs. Twenty-three (23) of the ninety-four units are for-sale condominiums; the remaining seventy-one units are rental, predominantly one-bedroom units. The tenants for those units were selected from the city’s waiting list of eligible participants.
The number and type of residential units to be included in the project changed over time as the residential market fluctuated. Originally, the project was to include all rental apartments, but then changed to an approximately 50/50 split between rental and for-sale condominium units. The GDA “called for the construction of 665 to 775 units, including 350 to 400 rental apartments and 315 to 375 one- and two-bedroom condominiums.” (Stern, April-June, 2009) In 2004, the condo market heated up and the city approved plans to make all the units for-sale condominiums. Sales for the units were “quite brisk; about 160 units were sold during the first two months – 30 of them on the first day of sales.” (Stern, April-June, 2009)

In 2006, the condo market evaporated. RD Rockville changed its strategy. It sold three of four buildings to a multifamily owner, CIM, to operate as rental apartments which are now known as the Fenestra Apartments. (These units are managed by Ross Development & Investments.) The remaining building with 152 units was retained by RD Rockville as condominiums, now known as the Palladian Condominiums. By June 2007, RD Rockville had settled on 81 of the units and placed the remaining 71 units in a “rent-to-own” program. “By December of 2008, all but five of the condominium units were occupied, as were more than 370 (more than 75 percent) of the 492 rental apartments.” (Stern, April-June, 2009)

Parking for the residential units is located in the city-built parking garages. RD Rockville bought 1000 spaces for the 644 units, a ratio of 1.55.

Commercial

RTS has a total of 181,893 square feet of retail space with forty-eight tenant spaces. Thirty-five percent of the total commercial space is occupied by seventeen restaurants. The second largest category of retail is special services with twenty-one percent. The largest tenant is a Super Fresh, which has yet to open, with 32,663 square feet. The second largest tenant is Gold’s Gym with 20,095 square feet.

FRIT began leasing the project two to three years prior to completion. “FRIT was unable to attract large, national retailers, in part because of the site’s location between two large Montgomery County malls and in part because of the stigma remaining from the failed Rockville Mall.” (Stern, April-June, 2009) As a result, the retail mix is heavily dominated by service/entertainment-oriented uses.
The most difficult issue on the commercial side has been filling the grocery space. “After discussions with upscale grocer Harris-Teeter fell through, regional grocery chain Super Fresh signed a lease for the project’s 32,663-square-foot grocery store in March 2007. Although the grocery originally was expected to open in November 2007 – and Super Fresh began paying rent on the space then – the store’s build out and opening have been delayed. The store is now expected to open by January 2010.” (Stern, April-June, 2009) The missing grocery store gives RTS an “incomplete” feel. The boarded storefront is a dominant feature on Gibbs Street and disrupts the pedestrian flow of the square.

In addition to handling all the construction on site, Whiting-Turner was also responsible for the fit-out of the retail and office spaces.

Parking for the retail can be found in the three parking garages. 950 spaces are available making the parking ratio 5.25. However, if the 100,000 square-feet for the library is included in the parking ratio calculation, the ratio goes down to 3.37. This would be a better estimate of the ratio as library users get several hours of free parking.

**Financing**

The public financing for this project is estimated at about $100 million. The city’s investment for its portion of the development is valued at over $40 million. This includes the costs of Gibbs Street and Maryland Avenue, the three parking garages, the public plaza, and the sidewalks. Additional city funds were invested in the land assembly including relocation costs for the businesses affected by the eminent domain. In order to finance the city’s construction costs, Rockville sold General Obligation (G.O.) bonds. The city’s bond ratings were favorable for the use of G.O. bonds over tax-increment financing (TIF) and the G.O. bonds didn’t have associated transactions costs. The payments on the G.O. bonds are made from the increased sales tax from the new retail and the increased property taxes. (The city’s bond rating was actually raised after the project’s completion as well.) The county paid $27.5 million to build the library in addition to the $12 million it committed in ongoing financial support. Federal funds were used to finance some of the pedestrian improvements. Other funds came from the
state’s capital budget, including a $1 million grant to help finance one the public parking garages.

The private investment in the project totaled $220 million. The structure of the financing is pure debt consisting of two first mortgages and a mezzanine loan – with equity from Ross Development and Investments and DANAC Corporation, each of which contributed five percent of the equity as cash up front. The private financing structure proved advantageous to the development partners because it allowed them flexibility with their development plans when the market changed. Ross and DANAC own the remaining inventory of the Palladium Condominiums.

The public/private financing ratio is $1/$2.20. But the public’s investment can be seen as even greater given its ongoing role in the management and ownership of the project. In the city’s fiscal year 2009, which ended June 30, 2009, RTS generated a total of $1,802,475 in taxes to the city. This consisted of $572,759 into the general fund; $209,005 into the parking district fund; and $1,020,711 into the Town Square Management District Fund. (Levy, 2009)
Analysis

This section will analyze the success of Rockville Town Square in the context of the Town Center Master Plan and as a transit-oriented development. The TCMP established a set of objectives and Guiding Principles. The degree to which the project meets those objectives and principles will determine the project’s success. The same can be said of the broader scheme of TOD. The themes identified in the Literature Review will be used to analyze the project as a TOD.

Town Center Master Plan

The TCMP has nine explicit objectives and one goal, to “create a daytime, evening, and weekend activity center that is easily identifiable, pedestrian-oriented, and incorporates a mix of uses and activities.” (Town Center Master Plan) The city of Rockville did not intend for RTS to be everything the TCMP would accomplish. Nonetheless, as the first project to be completed since its adoption, RTS sets the stage for future development. This section will examine RTS’ adherence to the objectives and Guiding Principles of the TCMP.

TCMP’s Guiding Principles are broad statements about the development of the 60 acres encompassed by the town center. RTS supports TCMP's Guiding Principles in two ways. The first principle identifies Maryland Avenue as the focal point for all future development activities. Maryland Avenue is to be pedestrian-oriented. The Guiding Principle requires design solutions that make this role easily identifiable. RTS’ main street is the Maryland Avenue extension. It is designed as the main pedestrian thoroughfare of the project. There are wide sidewalks with benches lining the street. The street is landscaped with mature trees to enhance the pedestrian experience. Additionally, the public plaza bordered by Maryland Avenue further defines Maryland Avenue’s function as a focal point to the project. Across the street from the plaza is the Central Clock Tower, which defines the densest point of the project.

The second Guiding Principle RTS adhered to is that of “partnerships.” The TCMP encourages an ongoing partnership with the community including businesses, neighbors, and community associations. RTS was...
developed with the active participation of the community including businesses, citizens, civic associations and multiple governmental entities. The high level of coordination and cooperation left all the partners feeling that RTS was a successful project.

Below are the objectives established by the TCMP. Each objective will be considered in relation to RTS. Two of TCMP’s objectives are not applicable with respect to RTS and will not be addressed in this section.

• Provide an environment conducive to and supportive of living, working, shopping and entertainment.

With over a seventeen restaurants, a regional library and a variety of service amenities, RTS meets the objective in the form of shopping and entertainment. However, the absence of a grocery store to serve the community is a major hindrance for those who live there. The goal should be to get all one’s daily needs met within the town square community. The delayed opening of the Super Fresh has been criticized by the community and forced residents to leave the area to do their grocery shopping.

At seven percent, office space represents a small portion of the overall project. RTS cannot be considered a major employment development. However, directly outside of the RTS site is the site of a 650,000 square-foot office (yet to be built) which was a main market driver for RTS, according to Rockville’s Department of Community Planning and Development. The additional 644 housing units and retail amenities in RTS provide supportive functions to the office space coming on-line in the near future.

The additional retail provides a modest amount of new jobs in the area. Most of these jobs are low-wage, service-oriented jobs. Still, RTS has 94 affordable housing units which theoretically would allow residents to live and work in the same place.

• Accommodate a variety of densities and scales of development that are sensitive to an urban neighborhood environment and the demands of the marketplace.

This objective is most appropriately measured by the town center as a whole. RTS is a medium density project. Most of the buildings do not go above five floors. The floor area ratio is 3.3. (Stern, April-June, 2009) The maximum density allowed by the town center zoning is 6.0 (suggested in the TCMP). RTS has an urban design and was created with the demands of the marketplace in mind. As the first development in the town center, there was an element of the unknown as to what the market could bear with respect to density. The development agreement dictating the project allowed for up to 775 residential units. Eighty-six percent of the allowable units were constructed and put on the market as either rental or for-sale based on what the residential market was commanding at the time. At the time of the ULI case
study, the rental units were seventy-five percent leased (all MPDU units are leased). The condominium units have been harder to sell because of the market, but they are almost one hundred percent occupied, and fifty-three percent have settled. The effect that RTS has on this objective can only be measured after further build out of the town center.

+ **Enhance links to transportation options which improve their visibility and accessibility.**

With respect to connectivity to transportation options, RTS falls short. The accessibility of transportation options is good. Montgomery County is serviced by *Ride On Montgomery County Transit*. The city of Rockville succeeded in getting buses into the town square. Four major bus routes support RTS in connecting it to other parts of Montgomery County. (See Appendix D, *Using Google Maps.*) The Rockville Metro Station is a seven minute walk (per Google Maps). But no steps have been taken to enhance the links of the transportation options. The visibility of the transit is poor. There is no signage in RTS directing pedestrians to the Metro or the Ride On bus stops. Neither are there accessible transit maps to inform pedestrians how to get to other parts of the county or Washington D.C. Including these would go a long way in creating a sense of connectivity for RTS to Greater Rockville and the Washington D.C. metropolitan region.

+ **Make Town Center a unique, high amenity destination for local and regional customers.**

RTS offers a great deal of amenities in the form of entertainment and specialty services. Due to its location between two area malls, shopping is limited and none of the retail would be considered “high end.” Nevertheless, the use of the public plaza for concerts and other events is a magnet for local and regional customers. Combined with the many dining options in the square, RTS definitely functions as a destination. Visitors can find a number of events and promotions by visiting the Rockville Town Square website. (See Appendix G.)

+ **Utilize urban design to establish zoning and density requirements that will assist in defining the Rockville Town Center.**

RTS employed many elements of urban design giving the project unique character and a definite sense of place. As mentioned earlier, it remains to be seen if the density in this project will be appropriate in relation to the greater town center, but the design sets a very high standard for future development. Elements of the urban design include the use of multiple facades giving a look of individual buildings.
facades to create the look of individual buildings, small set-backs and large storefronts, and double-globe light fixtures mounted on decorative poles lining the street. The project also included a variety of rooflines and fenestrations to give it an urban appearance.

- Provide sufficient parking for new mixed-use development and visitors to the Town Center.

RTS has ample parking in three garages. A total of 1950 structured parking spaces were included in the project, in addition to a small number of street parking spaces. According to Rockville’s Department of Community Planning and Development there is an oversupply of parking due to the retail recession and the missing grocery store. Additionally, RTS residents can park for free across the street from Town Square. That area will be redeveloped moving the residents back to the structured parking that is part of RTS. Until there is some normalcy to the visitation of RTS, it will be hard to determine if the supply of parking is appropriate.

- Address integrating new aesthetic public parking garages with linkages from road networks.

The three parking garages in RTS can be accessed from the streets bordering the project from the outside and inside the project itself. This was done to reduce the impact of cars visiting RTS on the pedestrian experience. It provides an additional benefit in that it allows RTS’ “main street,” Maryland Avenue, to be shut off to vehicular traffic during special events while still making RTS accessible to visitors by car. From a pedestrian point of view, the parking garages are mainly out of view sitting behind the residences and retail areas. The entrance to the main garage on Maryland Avenue is highly visible, but the garage itself is out of view diminishing its impact on the pedestrian experience.

Transit-Oriented Development

Three themes were identified from the literature on transit-oriented development:

- TODs require advanced planning and support from local governments in the form of explicitly stated policies, upfront investment, and relaxation of the review and permitting process.

- The creation of a master plan with TOD-supportive zoning is a critical element in the success of TODs.

- Specific attention has to be paid to design, inclusion of a mix of uses, and place-making.

This section will use these themes to analyze Rockville Town Square as a TOD. In some cases, it is appropriate to consider the TCMP in this analysis and then determine if RTS furthers the town center’s development into a TOD.
From the perspective of the developer, RTS is not a TOD and was not intended to be a TOD. The presence of the Metro was a benefit to the project and a justification for the project. The developer believes that the project tried to encourage metro ridership. The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) was not a partner in the project because RTS is not directly on or adjacent to the Rockville Metro. On the other hand, the Rockville Department of Community Planning and Development asserts that the TCMP is TOD so it is appropriate to consider this project from that perspective.

**Advanced Planning and Government Support**

RTS demonstrates the importance of advanced planning and government support. In January 2003, RD Rockville, LLC was selected as the private developer for RTS. The General Development Agreement with the city of Rockville, FRIT, and RD Rockville was signed in September, 2003. Between 2002 and 2004, the city hosted dozens of public meetings to educate the community and garner support for the project. This effort to gain stakeholder buy-in was very successful. RD Rockville held open houses after the project’s completion and received a lot of positive feedback from the community.

As illustrated in the case study, the city of Rockville took a lead role in developing this project which included years of planning. Additionally, the city and county made upfront investments in the project reducing the project’s risk. The city of Rockville assembled all the land for delivery to the private developer. This simplified the financing and reduced the upfront costs the developer was required to spend. The city’s partnership eased the way for the developer in getting plan approvals and financing.

The project is anchored by a public library built by the county. The benefit to having a public anchor in the project was two-fold. First, it removed the burden of finding an anchor from the private developers. This made it easier for the private developers to locate other tenants because of the commitment from its public partners to locate business in the project. Secondly, it buffered the project from the economic downturn. There is little chance of the anchor “going under” due to the economic climate. (Of course, in a strictly private development, an anchor tenant going dark could economically destroy a project.)

The county also committed to funding Rockville’s business incubator in the VisArts building. The two top floors can support up to fifty start-up companies with available
office space. This is a good economic benefit for the local retail businesses located in the square.

The city’s largest contribution is the public infrastructure including the streets, sidewalks and parking garages. The private developer was not responsible for any of the public improvements associated with the project, an unusual circumstance for developers. The cost of the infrastructure was over $40 million.

The project received a lot of support on the political side as well. Montgomery County’s County Executive was Rockville’s mayor when the Rockville Mall was demolished. He continued to support Rockville’s revitalization after taking higher office. The mayor who replaced him was a planner by profession and a previous city council member. The city council’s members stayed the same through the entire development process. Both the city of Rockville and the private developer credit the success of the project in part with this consistency in the political environment.

**TOD-supportive Master Plan**

As stated in the Case Study portion, the city of Rockville dedicated time and resources to the creation of a Town Center Master Plan whose goal is to create a mixed-use community which is pedestrian-oriented and extends out from the Rockville Metro.

The overall process of developing the TCMP created the momentum and impetus for the RTS development. The master plan established a desired framework which all future development proposals would adhere to in the town center. The desired framework expressed the expectations of the community to the developers and property owners of town center.

Prior to the adoption of the TCMP, the existing zoning in the town center area would have been insufficient in allowing for a project like RTS. There were 14 different zoning classifications within the town center area. An examination of the existing zoning done as part of the master plan determined a change in the zoning had to be made to facilitate future development in the town center area. The city of Rockville adopted a category of TOD-supportive zoning referred to as Mixed Use Zoning. All the zoning for the town center is mixed-use with various distinguishing factors. RTS is actually a PUD on the city’s zoning map. Three other PUDs are identified on the map for future development. Surrounding the PUDs is a Mixed-Use Transit District (MXTD). According to the city’s zoning ordinance, “the purposes of the Mixed-Use Zones are as follows:

1. To create high-quality neighborhoods and zones that are attractive and pedestrian-oriented;
2. To allow for a mix of different types of land uses in a compatible manner, both vertically and horizontally;
3. **Consistent with the Environmental Guidelines, to ensure the provision of public spaces that enhance the built environment;**

4. **To minimize automobile use and maximize the use of public transportation, bicycle, and pedestrian access within the City;**

5. **To promote a variety of uses in close proximity to each other in compliance with the Master Plan’s recommendations;**

6. **To establish performance standards to ensure that allowed uses will not create a nuisance for other uses within the same development;**

7. **To provide standards and guidelines for assuring that the appearance and design of buildings, structures, and neighborhoods are compatible with existing nearby buildings and structures, and/or complies with any adopted design guidelines in the relevant Plan for the area in which the building or structure is to be located;**

8. **To provide for a variety of residential uses and diverse styles of housing which are compatible with the intent of each of the Mixed-Use Zones; and**

9. **To provide for more efficient land use, particularly a development pattern more flexible in adjusting to market conditions and local growth fluctuations.” (Rockville Zoning)**

The Mixed Use Transit District zoning guidelines adhere to the principles of transit-oriented development. RTS was developed using the guidelines of the TCMP and includes a mix of uses with a pedestrian orientation. Both the TCMP and RTS can be considered examples of TOD from this perspective. However, neither the master plan or RTS goes far enough in minimizing automobile use nor maximizing the use of public transportation, one of the goals of the city’s mixed use zoning. The city’s oversupply of parking in the project would indicate that it is not serious about supporting the existing transit options.

**Design, Mix of Uses, & Place-making**

The element of place-making is one of the most critical elements in the success of a TOD. A TOD should be both an origin of transit and a destination. Place-making is judged by looking at the land use mix, density, connectivity, urban design, transit access, and parking. Some of these elements have been considered earlier.

A good TOD should have commercial, residential, employment, and public open space within walking distance of transit stops. The mix of uses is both vertical and horizontal. RTS has all these uses. All the residential buildings have ground floor retail. As stated before, it is not the most ideal mix of retail, but it does support the project’s function as a destination. Once the grocery store opens for business, residents should be able to meet most of their daily
needs without having to leave their neighborhood. Also stated earlier the project itself is not a major employment project given the small amount of office space developed, but being located next to a planned office building fits this purpose. Rail and bus transit are easily accessed by foot.

Another issue previously examined is density. As stated earlier, it is hard to determine if the density is right at RTS. RTS was not designed to support the Rockville Metro Station. The appropriate densities to support transit are measured within a half mile of the transit station, so RTS only covers a portion of the density needed to support the heavy rail Metro. However, RTS makes a good start at the established density needed with 51.5 units per acre (644 total units/12.5 total acres).

RTS’ urban design is very successful at creating a sense of place on a pedestrian scale. The use of multiple facades creates “individual” uniqueness to storefronts and a sense of multiple buildings as if they developed there over time. The small setbacks and wide sidewalks create a comfortable pedestrian environment. There is ample parking but placed behind residential and commercial buildings to reduce the impact on the pedestrian environment.

Where RTS falls short is creating connectivity to the available transit. This could be accomplished with improved signage directing pedestrians to the Metro and bus stops. Area transit maps should be made available to pedestrians.
Conclusion

This project was designed to examine a mixed-use development in Rockville, Maryland and determine if it adhered to the principles of transit-oriented development. Rockville’s town center is the focus of an intensive redevelopment effort being guided by the Town Center Master Plan. Phase I of the master plan is Rockville Town Square – a mixed use, suburban infill development with rental apartments, for-sale condominiums, retail shopping, restaurants, public buildings and open spaces. This project considered both the Town Center Master Plan and the Rockville Town Square as it relates to transit-oriented development.

The Town Center Master Plan covers sixty acres of downtown Rockville and includes the Rockville Metro Center. Its goals are to use a mix of uses to create a day and night activity center that is pedestrian-oriented, reduces the need for automobiles, and creates a sense of place as Rockville’s downtown. The plan’s design uses two major through streets as the pedestrian spine of the project – Maryland and Montgomery Avenues. The Rockville Metro Center will deposit travelers onto East Montgomery Avenue which will lead them to the heart of the town center area.

Rockville Town Square is quite successful in meeting the goals set forth by the TCMP. Its mix of uses creates a day and night, live/work destination. It utilizes urban design to create a sense of place with a pedestrian focus. The partnership between the private developers and the city of Rockville can be considered a model of cooperation. Both the developers and the city view the project as a success and credit the partnership with facilitating the process. The city’s investment in the project facilitated the private developer’s development process. In this way, the project meets many of the principles of TOD.

There are several weaknesses in the project with relation to its transit-oriented function. Specifically, there are two major areas where the project could have provided more focus on transit. The first is creating better connectivity with the project and the surrounding transit options. The project is served by both bus and rail transit that is easily accessible. However, there is little focus within the project to direct people to the transit options. This could be achieved by improving the signage along the streets directing people to the metro or bus routes.

The second area of weakness is the parking ratio applied to the project. RTS has an abundance of parking in three separate parking garages, built at the expense of the city. The city could have used the project’s proximity to transit links to reduce the parking provided. In the city’s zoning codes, parking reductions are allowed for projects within seven-tenths of a mile of a metro stop and for parking with shared uses. Rockville Town Square meets both of those requirements, yet an analysis of the parking shows that no reduction of spaces was applied. This is a missed opportunity on the part of the city to take advantage of its own
parking allowances and the transit availability in the project. A reduction in the amount of parking provided would have saved the city money and made the parking provided more profitable.

The TCMP achieves a blueprint for the town center area that adheres to many of the principles of transit-oriented development. It encourages the mix of uses both horizontally and vertically. It requires higher densities that would support greater transit use. The additional density in the town center also supports the round-the-clock, live/work environment that is the hallmark of TOD. The TCMP establishes policies and a framework for development that are supportive of TOD.

The major obstacle to the TCMP is how to mitigate the effects of Maryland’s Route 355, Rockville Pike. Rockville Pike serves as one of Montgomery County’s main automobile-focused roadways. The majority of Rockville’s retail shopping is currently located along the Pike. The Pike cuts through the town center area creating a physical barrier that is not easily crossed and severs the Rockville Metro Center from the core of the town center.

The TCMP addresses this issue, but the solutions are hard to implement. The final recommendation of the TCMP is to create a pedestrian promenade spanning Rockville Pike that would serve as the town center’s grand entryway for those coming from the Rockville Metro. This solution would require a significant financial investment and the participation of every level of government.

Not only does Rockville Pike cut off the town center core from the metro, but it also divides the town center into two distinct divisions, east and west. The TCMP encourages connectivity between the neighborhoods on either side of the pike, but lacks details in how to achieve it.

One suggestion is to enhance the intersections of the town center’s major east/west through streets (Park Road, Baltimore Road, Beall Avenue and Jefferson Street) to draw automobiles off Rockville Pike and into the town center areas where the cars could be parked and people could explore and enjoy the town center on foot. These intersections should also provide for pedestrian right-of-ways like dedicated time for crossing and no right turn on red. This would have a calming effect on Rockville Pike’s traffic, slowing it down through the town center area. It may also have an unintended consequence of pushing vehicular through-traffic into adjacent neighborhoods to avoid the possible “bottlenecking” that would occur around the town center area. Given its function as a major thoroughfare through the county, there may be public opposition to this proposal.

Another suggestion to traverse the Rockville Pike barrier is to provide a local town center shuttle that provides frequent service from the Rockville Metro to the core of the town center. Local shuttles have been used successfully in other cities to enhance access to transit.
As suggested by the TCMP, the ideal solution to the Rockville Pike conundrum is to recess Route 355 underground and allow for only local traffic at street level. Unfortunately, this seems like a cost-prohibitive solution.

**Implications for Future Development of Rockville’s Town Center**

Rockville Town Square provides some valuable lessons for the future development of the town center area. The city’s role in the development of Rockville Town Square facilitated its development on many levels. Both the private developers and the city credit the cooperation between the partners with providing a foundation that led to the success of the project. Rockville should take an active role in all future development in the town center. This would create continuity in the development process and a consistency in the projects through the town center.

Specifically, the city as land “banker” is a critical function that Rockville provided to the Town Square project. The city has additional tools at its disposal for land assembly and can do it with less risk than a private developer. The city’s upfront investment in the land assembly facilitated the development and reduced the risk to the developer. The city should consider using this power to continue with land assembly efforts for upcoming projects in the town center area as appropriate.

Another function the city should continue is providing the infrastructure needed for these mixed use projects. The public financing of the project’s infrastructure was critical in the project’s success and made the project economically viable to the private developers. It may not be necessary to support the infrastructure development to the same degree as with RTS, but the city should continue with some level of investment in infrastructure in future town center projects.

Another element that led to RTS’ success was the ongoing commitment from Rockville’s elected officials to the town center redevelopment. Over the past decade or more, there has been consistency in the elected officials involved in the revitalization of the town center. While this isn’t a result of design, it has led to less time spent on re-educating policy makers about the goals of the TCMP. Over time, there will be turnover in the elected officials of the city of Rockville, but that doesn’t have to result in less commitment from the policy makers to the redevelopment of the town center. In November, the city of Rockville elected a new mayor and city council. Only one member of the new city council has not previously been involved in the city council or the town center planning process. That is a good indicator that town center revitalization will continue to be supported by the city’s elected policy makers.

There are several projects in the pipeline for the town center. One of the goals for these projects should be to provide a seamless connection to one another and Greater Rockville. As
the first project built since the adoption of the TCMP, RTS stands out in the town center area. Its urban design is different from what surrounds it. While the design gives the project distinction and function, it also creates a sense of being somewhere that is not Rockville. Its distinction almost makes it feel out of place. As more projects come on line, they will have to blend into the environment created by RTS. Once the town center is built out, it should feel like it has always been there and developed naturally over time. That will require coordination in the design of the individual projects, but it will help to create the connectivity desired by the TCMP.

Another goal of the upcoming projects should be to integrate the available transit servicing the area into the project design. Bus stops and the metro station should be the center of intense retail, residential and office functions. The transit should be enhanced by the project. Bus stops with multiple routes should have shelters that can be spotted by pedestrians from a distance and be supported by service retail. The developers should consider improving the transit experience and giving more consideration to its role as a carrier of consumers to the project site. The city should require enhancement of transit links in future projects as it is a goal not only of the TCMP but also of the city’s own zoning regulations.

Rockville Town Square is a good start to meeting the objectives set forth by the Town Center Master Plan. The city of Rockville will have to remain an active partner in all the future development of the town center to ensure that each project meets the TCMP’s ultimate goal of revitalizing Rockville’s town center in a downtown with day and night activity that provides a positive pedestrian experience with a mix of uses and activities. The success of this project should demonstrate to private developers the opportunities in mixed-use development in the town center. Private developers should take a greater role in future development and build on the lessons of Rockville Town Square.
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## Appendix A – TOD Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOD Type</th>
<th>Land Use Mix</th>
<th>Minimum Housing Density</th>
<th>Regional Connectivity</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Downtown</td>
<td>Office Center, Urban Entertainment, Multifamily Housing, Retail</td>
<td>&gt;60 units/acre</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>&lt;10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential, Retail, Class B Commercial</td>
<td>&gt;20 units/acre</td>
<td>Medium Access to Downtown, Subregional Circulation</td>
<td>10 minutes peak, 20 minutes off-peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>Primary Office Center, Urban Entertainment, Multifamily Housing, Retail</td>
<td>&gt;50 units/acre</td>
<td>High Access to Downtown, Subregional Hub</td>
<td>10 minutes peak, 10-15 minutes off-peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential, Neighborhood Retail, Local Office</td>
<td>&gt;12 units/acre</td>
<td>Medium Access to Suburban Center and Access to Downtown</td>
<td>20 minutes peak, 30 minutes off-peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Town Center</td>
<td>Retail Center, Residential</td>
<td>&gt;12 units/acre</td>
<td>Low Access to Downtown</td>
<td>Peak Service, Demand Responsive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D – Using Google Maps Transit Map

Using Google Maps, someone can plan trips using the Public Transit Option. A click on any of the bus stops will show the bus route information including upcoming departure times.
Appendix E

Questions for Rockville Department of Community Planning and Development:

1. This was the third time that Rockville tried to revitalize the town square. What went wrong the first two times and how was this approach different?

2. What prompted the development of the Master Plan?

3. Was this intended to be a transit-oriented development? Was WMATA a partner, and at what point were they involved (from the beginning or some other point in time)?

4. Affordable housing isn't really addressed in the TCMP. Was it always a goal or was it expected because of the MPDU program?

5. Did Rockville follow the Montgomery county planning model?

6. What tools were offered for development from Rockville to the developers of the retail, office and residential space? TIFs? Land swap? Zoning changes? Others?

7. How did the city choose the projects to be developed? Was there an RFP? Or did developers prepare unsolicited proposals after the adoption of the TCMP?

8. Distribution of space? How much office, retail, and residential was developed? All new construction?

9. Sources and uses of financing? Investment distribution, public vs. private?

10. Parking was a concern in the master plan. What requirements were placed on the parking as part of the overall development? What ratio was used?

11. Is there data available on the change in metro ridership due to the development?

12. What was the median home price?

13. What was the median household income of the new residents?

14. How did the property values change in the surrounding area and for the Town Center?
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15. Did the city see increased tax revenues? In what way? Income? Property? Sales?

16. Did the city meet its goals?

17. What issues remain?
Appendix F

Questions for RD Rockville, LLC

1. This was the third time that Rockville tried to revitalize the town square. What went wrong the first two times and how was this approach different?

2. What prompted the development of the Master Plan?

3. Was this intended to be a transit-oriented development? Was WMATA a partner, and at what point where they involved (from the beginning or some other point in time)?

4. Affordable housing isn’t really addressed in the TCMP. Was it always a goal or was it expected because of the MPDU program?

5. Did Rockville follow the Montgomery county planning model?

6. What tools were offered for development from Rockville to the developers of the retail, office and residential space? TIFs? Land swap? Zoning changes? Others?

7. Sources and uses of financing? Investment distribution, public vs. private? Was it easy to find financing or did the City help?

8. Parking was a concern in the master plan. What requirements were placed on the parking as part of the overall development? What ratio was used?

9. How difficult or easy was it to work with Rockville city government?

10. What was appealing about this project?

11. What issues remain to be resolved?

12. What phases are left to be developed?
Appendix G – Rockville Town Square Website
### Appendix A – TOD Typology

**Table 14: Typology of transit-Oriented Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOD Type</th>
<th>Land Use Mix</th>
<th>Minimum Housing Density</th>
<th>Regional Connectivity</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Downtown</td>
<td>Office Center</td>
<td>&gt;60 units/acre</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>&lt;10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Entertainment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hub of Radial System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multifamily Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>&gt;20 units/acre</td>
<td>Medium Access to Downtown</td>
<td>10 minutes peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subregional Circulation</td>
<td>20 minutes off-peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class B Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>Primary Office Center</td>
<td>&gt;50 units/acre</td>
<td>High Access to Downtown</td>
<td>10 minutes peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Entertainment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subregional Hub</td>
<td>10-15 minutes off-peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multifamily Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>&gt;12 units/acre</td>
<td>Medium Access to Suburban Center and Access to Downtown</td>
<td>20 minutes peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 minutes off-peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Town Center</td>
<td>Retail Center</td>
<td>&gt;12 units/acre</td>
<td>Low Access to Downtown</td>
<td>Peak Service Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C – City of Rockville Zoning Grid
Appendix D – Using Google Maps Transit Map

Using Google Maps, someone can plan trips using the Public Transit Option. A click on any of the bus stops will show the bus route information including upcoming departure times.
Appendix E

Questions for Rockville Department of Community Planning and Development:

1. This was the third time that Rockville tried to revitalize the town square. What went wrong the first two times and how was this approach different?

2. What prompted the development of the Master Plan?

3. Was this intended to be a transit-oriented development? Was WMATA a partner, and at what point where they involved (from the beginning or some other point in time)?

4. Affordable housing isn’t really addressed in the TCMP. Was it always a goal or was it expected because of the MPDU program?

5. Did Rockville follow the Montgomery county planning model?

6. What tools were offered for development from Rockville to the developers of the retail, office and residential space? TIFs? Land swap? Zoning changes? Others?

7. How did the city choose the projects to be developed? Was there an RFP? Or did developers prepare unsolicited proposals after the adoption of the TCMP?

8. Distribution of space? How much office, retail, and residential was developed? All new construction?

9. Sources and uses of financing? Investment distribution, public vs. private?

10. Parking was a concern in the master plan. What requirements were placed on the parking as part of the overall development? What ratio was used?

11. Is there data available on the change in metro ridership due to the development?

12. What was the median home price?

13. What was the median household income of the new residents?

14. How did the property values change in the surrounding area and for the Town Center?
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15. Did the city see increased tax revenues? In what way? Income? Property? Sales?

16. Did the city meet its goals?

17. What issues remain?
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Questions for RD Rockville, LLC

1. This was the third time that Rockville tried to revitalize the town square. What went wrong the first two times and how was this approach different?

2. What prompted the development of the Master Plan?

3. Was this intended to be a transit-oriented development? Was WMATA a partner, and at what point where they involved (from the beginning or some other point in time)?

4. Affordable housing isn’t really addressed in the TCMP. Was it always a goal or was it expected because of the MPDU program?

5. Did Rockville follow the Montgomery county planning model?

6. What tools were offered for development from Rockville to the developers of the retail, office and residential space? TIFs? Land swap? Zoning changes? Others?

7. Sources and uses of financing? Investment distribution, public vs. private? Was it easy to find financing or did the City help?

8. Parking was a concern in the master plan. What requirements were placed on the parking as part of the overall development? What ratio was used?

9. How difficult or easy was it to work with Rockville city government?

10. What was appealing about this project?

11. What issues remain to be resolved?

12. What phases are left to be developed?
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