DRAFT for JFAC Review – 3/20/2022

Dear Chair Cristol, Chair Kanninen, and members of the County Board and School Board,

Earlier this year, JFAC was given several questions to research by the County and by APS. We spent several months researching and discussing this question given to us by the County:

How have jurisdictions that have adopted missing middle housing policies addressed impacts on public facilities, including schools?

The Commission's approach to this question was to form working teams of two Commissioners per group. Each team researched a locality that implemented Missing Middle Housing Policies while narrowing the focus on impacts on schools and public facilities.

The localities that we researched were:
Charlotte, NC
Charlottesville, VA
Minneapolis, MN
Montgomery County, MD
Portland, OR
Sacramento, CA

Commissioners were asked to consider the following while conducting the research:

- How does the jurisdiction researched compare to Arlington in terms of population, cost of living, availability of land, and other relevant factors?

- Do the comprehensive plans in each of the cities already include or mention schools and public facilities?

- If there was a public process to plan for schools and public facilities, what did it look like?

- What policies or planning processes were changed on the city, county or school level? Were any new planning tools introduced?

MAIN TAKEAWAYS/COMMONALITIES

- Many jurisdictions undertook exploring Missing Middle housing as part of broader long-range planning efforts such as Montgomery Thrive 2050, Charlotte Future 2040, and Minneapolis 2040 Plan.
- In most all jurisdictions their intentions for creating new Missing Middle housing policies and opportunities were focused on increasing diversity, inclusion and access to housing opportunity and affordability.

- Commissioners noted that in all the jurisdictions researched there was very little attention given to impacts of schools and public facilities. Most of the jurisdictions included schools within their comprehensive plans, had policies in place that would limit impacts on schools (such as Montgomery County's APFO) and/or adopted Missing Middle policies as part of a broad long-range planning process.
- Many of the researched jurisdictions did not have the same land constraints as Arlington with only Charlottesville, VA being smaller at 10.26 square miles. All of the other jurisdictions were many multiple times larger with Charlotte, NC being the largest by comparison with 297.7 square miles.
- It was noted that the researched jurisdictions seemed willing to adopt missing middle housing policies while acknowledging that it may come with challenges and they felt confident that they would find solutions to the problems and did not let perfect be the enemy of the good. Some of the jurisdictions (Minneapolis) ran Missing Middle pilot programs.
- It was not clear from Commissioner research that the Missing Middle Housing in the jurisdictions researched were able to accomplish the goals of affordability, diversity, or inclusion or if significant enrollment growth occurred as a result of implemented new policies. Commissioners looked to try to find student generation factors from the new Missing Middle housing but either the implementation was too new for any notable difference or the information was not found.
- Of all the jurisdictions researched Arlington had the highest median home price at $615,000. By comparison the lowest median home price was Minneapolis, MN and the next highest (to Arlington) were Montgomery County, MD at $513,500 and Portland, OR at $515,000.
- It was questioned whether the economics of the implemented Missing Middle policies in the researched jurisdictions were considered and what they may do to the tax base and whether there are other possible income streams help fund affordability.
- Zoning was changed in each research jurisdiction to allow for Missing Middle housing such as Duplexes and Triplexes. In addition, some jurisdictions modified land use planning objectives including increasing access to public transportation. Some jurisdictions as part of broader and long-range planning processes adopted ordinances that work to protect public investment in public infrastructure such as water, storm water management systems, sewage treatment and disposal, solid waste treatment and disposal, schools, recreation, public facilities, and open space.
- In some jurisdictions (Portland, OR) incentives were put in place to encourage developers to create Missing Middle housing instead of single family homes.
- In Charlottesville, VA changes to policy called for restructuring multifamily zoning and approval processes in tandem with an inclusionary zoning policy.
- None of the jurisdictions engaged in a process that was specifically for schools and public facilities. There were extensive public engagement processes that were broad in scope and looked long-term (2040, 2050) asking specifically how the public imagined the future of their communities which included schools. The researched jurisdiction public engagement processes included web engagement, small meetings with neighborhood leaders and community associations, street festivals, artist designed engagement, and social media.

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

- If Arlington were to move forward with a pilot program of Missing Middle we recommend that the pilot be done in an area that is mindful of school enrollment and school capacities specifically in areas where school enrollment is under capacity and where there is very little planned new housing.
- Continue with the collaboration of the County and APS on student enrollment projections which are updated every year capturing student generation factors, new housing and new trends. This process will be important for tracking and understanding impacts of newly implemented policies and can identify if solutions or future planning needs to be put in place.
- Consider undertaking Missing Middle housing as part of a long-range vision of how we see the future of Arlington as a whole, including considerations for transportation, diversity, equity, parks, environmental conservation and schools and public facilities. We further recommend that schools and public facilities become an element of the comprehensive plan to facilitate integration into this long-range vision and plan.

As an appendix, I am attaching a chart that compares the demographics of Arlington and the researched jurisdictions and the notes from our research.

Thank you for asking and trusting JFAC to research this question. We very much enjoyed learning about the processes and policies that the researched jurisdictions presented and the discussion that followed.

Thank you,
Stacy Snyder
JFAC Vice-Chair

APPENDIX

Do the comprehensive plans in each of the cities already include or mention schools and public facilities?

Charlotte

Charlotte is in the middle of extensive significant planning efforts. In the summer of 2021, they adopted the Charlotte 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The plan included a missing middle policy, by changing policy to "[a]llow single-family, duplex, and triplex housing units, as well as small footprint homes and accessory dwelling units (ADUs), in neighborhood Place Types and corresponding zoning districts where single-family housing is allowed." This is less permissive than the original draft to allow duplex and triplex housing units on all lots.

In Charlotte duplex and triplex housing units are now by right on all residential lots. Quadplexes are allowed on R-8. Fire separation is required, but there are not specific occupancy limits. (In Arlington today, the ~73% area that is zoned single family does not permit duplexes or triplexes. Only certified caregiver suites or in-dwelling ADUs are permitted, and only if the home is owner-occupied.) Our initial review showed that there are ADU square footage restrictions, but not the same occupancy restrictions Arlington has in ADUs (up to 2 adults) and all dwelling units (up to 4 unrelated adults).

They are now in the process of adopting a Unified Development Ordinance, which replaces eight of their existing ordinances, including those on zoning, subdivisions, trees, floodplains, and more. One of the 12 goals of the UDO is to "Provide for the protection of public investment in transportation, water, stormwater management systems, sewage treatment and disposal, solid waste treatment and disposal, schools, recreation, public facilities, open space, and other public requirements".

Discussing the need for more schools, the implementation strategy indicates:
"Traditionally, CMS has been able to rely on the private sector support through land dedications and other contributions as new neighborhoods need school facilities to attract buyers/renters. As the City reaches build-out and new housing is being built in smaller, and more infill oriented, developments, CMS is challenged with obtaining locations and funding to build (or enhance) schools to support new students. Furthermore, the school facility models needed to support the community are more diverse and different in scale than the traditional models[SC5] (e.g. large schools serving several neighborhoods). The development review process provides CMS opportunity to highlight facility needs to developers and the City of Charlotte. More proactive planning between the City and CMS can help identify needs before development applications come in, but schools may need to become a priority community need that can be obtained through discretionary approval processes or capital investments. Even with more proactive efforts, a mechanism for obtaining land and/or funding to offset the impacts of new development is needed to support CMS. Tools such as land dedication requirements and/or impact fees should be explored.

The implementation strategy also calls for exploring expanded use of "value capture" (e.g. tax increment funding). It also mentions the potential use of "cost recovery" programs, including tools such as Impact Fees and Improvement Districts, although no extensive discussion of them was readily apparent.

Charlotte's older plans also included specific schools consideration, as well as infrastructure like water/sewer. Those plans indicated the Board of Education and Planning Commission would work together to create a School Facilities Master Plan to project school needs and identify general locations for future schools.No School Facilities Master Plan is available posted online.

Southern District Plan (1992):

```
There are sixteen elementary, six junior high, and three high
schools in the South District.  Sites for an elementary school
and junior high school/district park also are being acquired
through the Ballantyne development process.  As the residential
population in the South District and the county as a whole
continues to grow, additional schools will be needed.

Planning in advance for schools will be important, particularly
as appropriate sites becomes increasingly scarce and as land
costs continue to climb.  The School Facilities Master Plan, a
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education document being developed
in conjunction with the Planning Commission, will project school
needs at least through the year 2000 and will identify general
locations for future schools in the South District.
```

Central District Plan (1992?):

```
Planning Strategy:
  o  Adopt a School Master Plan for Charlotte-Mecklenburg.  The
     staffs of the Planning Commission, Board of Education, and
     other City and County departments should work closely
     together to identify the following in the plan related to
     Central District schools:

       o  schools that have expansion potential;
       o  potential reuse of vacant schools considering joint use
          by various City and County agencies and other uses that
          are an asset to neighborhoods such as elderly housing;
          and
       o  landscaping additions to improve the grounds of schools.
```

2040 Plan: "A key purpose of the Plan is creating an integrated framework for growth, development, and community design"

Charlottesville, VA

Yes, schools and public facilities are mentioned throughout Charlottesville's plan. In fact, in the mission statement for Community Facilities & Services section of its plan, Charlottesville states

that it *"will ensure that all residents have access to outstanding schools, parks and natural areas, recreational facilities and trails, urban agriculture, civic facilities and public buildings, public services, and the infrastructure needed to support a full range of educational and economic opportunities."* (Draft Comprehensive Plan {Nov. 2021}, p. 77).

Charlottesville devotes two of the sixteen goals in this section to schools and public facilities.

- o Goal #2 – <u>City Schools</u>:
  - **Strategy 2.1**: Complete all needed renovation, repairs and improvements according to the Public Works Department's system of prioritization and in close coordination with Charlottesville City Schools administration and School Board.
  - **Strategy 2.2:** Update the Memorandum of Understanding developed in 2013 and maintain school properties in accordance with the MOU.
  - **Strategy 2.3:** Implement a school building modernization program to continually redesign internal and external learning spaces that reflect best practices in education.
  - **Strategy 2.4:** Employ innovative technology and green building practices for all eligible capital construction and renovation projects, and in routine maintenance program efforts.
  - **Strategy 2.5:** Develop and maintain detailed inventories of all school facility elements and develop condition indexes to guide maintenance, replacement and improvement investments.

- o Goal #3 – <u>Government/Public Facilities</u>:
  - **Strategy 3.1**: Employ innovative technology and green building practices for all eligible capital construction and renovation projects, and in routine maintenance and custodial program efforts.
  - **Strategy 3.2:** Develop and maintain detailed inventories of all government facility elements and City-owned equipment, and develop condition indexes to guide maintenance, replacement, and improvement investments.

Goal #1 (Efficient Planning for Facilities and Infrastructure) in this section provides a related guiding principle:

- **Strategy 1.2:** Ensure that community planning addresses and responds to the impact of population growth on all public facilities, school facilities and other infrastructure.

Minneapolis, MN

Comprehensive planning for the "Minneapolis 2040 Plan," began in 2016 and was adopted in 2018 by the 13-member City Council. Racial equity was a large part of the conversation and why they moved forward with elimination of *exclusive* single-family zoning in the city.

- Elements of Comp Plan are fully integrated.
- Minneapolis created Comp Plan Goals and #1 is Eliminate Disparities which included educational attainment and gaps, and access to the city's public services.
    - Each GOAL has related POLICIES. For example, Goal #1 has the following related policies that include schools and public facilities:
    - Each POLICY has related ACTION STEPS. For example, an Action Step for Policy 51 is to *Expand the use of park facilities, public buildings, and cultural institutions for providing childcare* and for Policy 81 to *Ensure safe and welcoming community spaces for all, including parks, community and youth centers, and city streets and rights of way, located in all areas of the city*.

Montgomery County, MD

Montgomery County's planning department lists an extensive list of "Master Plans" but it does not list the Educational Facilities Master Plan that is updated annually by MCPS.

https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/countywide/growth-and-infrastructure-policy/schools/

"Planning for adequate public school facilities is a joint effort between Montgomery Planning and the Division of Capital Planning and Real Estate at Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS).

MCPS planners project student enrollment for the near future at the countywide and individual school levels, and develop strategies and long-range facility plans to meet capacity needs appropriately. They also coordinate relevant county and state budgets for the six-year Capital Improvements Program (CIP), and publish the Educational Facilities Master Plan annually.

Montgomery Planning administers the Annual School Test based on MCPS' projections and scheduled CIP projects, and conducts School Adequacy Analysis for development applications accordingly. Planning staff also produces student generation rates and relevant housing data, which is shared with MCPS to inform their forecasting and facility planning efforts as well."

- GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY (GIP)
- Guides the Planning Board's determinations under the APFO
- Replaces development moratorium with "utilization premium payments" and development impact taxes for areas with above-capacity schools
- Impact evaluated based on student generation rates

- ADEQUATE PUBLIC FACILTIES ORDINANCE ("APFO")
- Requires the Planning Board to determine whether "public facilities will be adequate to support and service the area" of proposed development
- "Facilities" include:
    - Roads and public transportation facilities
    - Water and sewage service
    - Schools
    - Police stations and firehouses

     o   Health clinics

Portland, OR

Portland's comprehensive plan policies 8.113-8.122 deal with school facilities (https://www.portland.gov/sites/default/files/2019-08/08_public_facilities.pdf) but mostly with the focus of encouraging schools to be anchors for multiple community purposes and all generations. The map doesn't have a separate designation for schools. (https://www.portland.gov/sites/default/files/2021/34x44_comprehensive_plan_webmap_1.pdf) * Note that Portland stated that the groups that benefit from middle housing include aging-in community folks, young adults entering into the housing market, recent college grads and renters, adults with disabilities living near caretakers, and single parents. Most of these groups do not include school age children.

If there was a public process to plan for schools and public facilities, what did it look like?

Charlotte, NC

Does not appear to be much of one, or not well documented. Older plans mention community engagement where undercapacity schools needed to be closed in the 1990s. A nonprofit arts coalition is active in planning programs and facility access for the community and schools. Most schools shown as recent projects are suburban style, with 1-2 stories and large athletic facilities.

Charlottesville, VA

Although, not specifically focused on its plans for schools and public facilities, Charlottesville used the following Community Engagement Activities:

a) Pop-up Events; **b)** Small-group Conversations, Virtual Meetings, Steering Committee Meetings, and Meeting with Neighborhood Leaders and Community Organizations; **c)** Emails & Letters, Website Comment Form; **d)** Toll-free Phone line; **e)** Interactive Map; and **f)** Surveys.

Minneapolis, MN
- Began Comprehensive Planning Process with a robust community engagement plan.
  - Community Workshops, Community Dialogues (facilitated), Street Festivals, Artist-designed engagement, Online Engagement, Meeting-in-a-box (for Civic Associations, Community Groups and Private Gatherings), and Tweet with a Planner (social media engagement)
  - City Officials published a comprehensive communications and engagement plan on their website.
  - There is nothing specific to schools and public facilities planning in any of the engagement materials.

Montgomery County, MD

Montgomery County Planning had several planning initiatives that focused on Missing Middle housing:

- *[Thrive Montgomery 2050](#) is the update of the county's General Plan, a long-range policy framework for guiding future land use and growth for the next 30 years. Thrive Montgomery 2050 provides the opportunity to look for new tools such as Missing Middle housing, to increase our housing production to meet the needs of current and future residents. We anticipate that the Montgomery County Council and the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission will adopt Thrive Montgomery 2050 in 2021.*

- *[Attainable Housing Strategies](#) is an initiative the Planning Department will oversee through a planning process that will evaluate and potentially refine various proposals to spur the development of more diverse types of housing, including Missing Middle Housing, in Montgomery County.*

Thrive Montgomery 2050 Communications effort:
- Examined the audience's place in the overall Thrive Montgomery 2050 journey. • Made it easy for people to participate. • Met people where they are rather than asking them to come to us. •Invited a conversation and sharing rather than participation in a process. • Shined a light on community contributors. • Showed what's at stake and what's possible for the future. • Framed questions differently and be provocative to pique interest and appeal to values

- -Online presence, creative engagement

- -Excite- "Thrive Week"- "How do you imagine the future?"

- "The way we think about growth needs to change."

What policies or planning processes were changed on the city, county or school level?

Charlotte, NC

The Charlotte Future 2040 Plan identified themes and priorities. Ordinances and planning processes are being updated now. The new Unified Development Ordinance will replace eight existing ordinances, including those on zoning, subdivisions, trees, floodplains, and more. One of the 12 goals of the UDO is to "Provide for the protection of public investment in transportation, water, stormwater management systems, sewage treatment and disposal, solid waste treatment and disposal, schools, recreation, public facilities, open space, and other public requirements".

Charlottesville, VA

a) Modified the city's Future Land Use Planning Objectives in the following manner:

- **Build upon land use recommendations** from other plans.
- Ensure citywide, equitable opportunities for **additional housing.**
- Increase opportunities for **development near community hubs and amenities, to maximize access**.
- Explore the potential of **vacant or underutilized properties**.
- Establish correlations between the **City's land uses, UVA, and the County's Urban Ring**.
- Increase access to transit, **as well as walking and biking infrastructure**.
- Protect, preserve, and enhance **natural and cultural resources.**
- Ensure **long term economic sustainability** of the City by planning for a wide range of commercial land use types.

b) Introduced a proposed **Future Land Use Map** that reflects increased housing density throughout the city.

c) Plan calls for **restructuring multifamily zoning and approval processes** in tandem with an **inclusionary zoning policy**.

Minneapolis, MN
- Engagement Plan grounded in racial equity. (*Mapping Prejudice* project to identify all racially restrictive covenants on properties in Minneapolis)
- Very little details found about student generation by housing type, planning for schools, community centers or other public facilities and infrastructure.

Portland, OR
HB 2001 passed in 2019 stated that Oregon cities over 10,000 residents can no longer ban duplexes—and cities over 25,000 must also allow triplexes or fourplexes—in residential areas.
* Portland City Council removed all parking mandates from three quarters of the city's residential land, and reformed apartment zones to make home driveways optional citywide for the first time since 1973.

Were any new planning tools introduced?

Charlotte, NC
During the Charlotte Future 2040 Plan process, there were a few new public engagement strategies including an ambassador toolkit, future simulation game, and a variety of virtual engagement options given the COVID-19 restrictions in place.

[6] https://www.cltfuture2040plan.com/docs/02-CF2040_Implementation_Strategy.pdf p33;
https://cltfuture2040.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/193159-Final-Report_Charlotte-FIA_1-21-21.pdf

---

 [SC1]Add cost of living. Age, hh size, new housing units/demand, unbuilt land?

 [SC3]What are the occupancy limits. In Arl, it is impossible to rent two floors of a SFH separately. Only allowed if the owner lives on site AND either a certified caregiver or ADU (<3 people). Coupled with the requirement that no more than 4 unrelated people may live in a household, this means very restricted use of SFHs for missing middle housing types or missing middle income levels. Also "all SFH lots" is much less restrictive than R-8+

E.g. an existing 3BR/2BA 1800 sf home could easily be split into two 2-3BR/1-2BA rental units at $2000/mo instead of $4000/mo.

 [SC4]Like Fairfax County proffers for schools and infrastructure

 [SC5]Important observation that the types of schools need to change – unclear whether suggesting larger schools are needed or more smaller schools for infill??

Charlottesville, VA

An **Inclusionary Zoning ("IZ")** study – will look at a variety of ways to require inclusion of affordable homes in market-rate developments. Still in process.

A **bonus program** for smaller-scale development, which will likely require subsidies to produce affordable units.

Minneapolis, MN

- Began with allowing gentle density to understand the impact: ADUs and allowing duplexes in some areas.
- Relied on pilot programs that are data- and research-informed that aren't studied to death. Location of pilots were driven by prioritizing racial equity / acknowledging past history of inequity.
- Zoning change to allow duplexes and triplexes in areas that formerly were zoned exclusively for single family homes.
- Funding mechanisms, like LIHTC and Tax Increment Financing (TIF), employed.

Montgomery County, MD

- Proposed comprehensive amendment to Montgomery County's General Plan
- Recommends removing "regulatory barriers and facilitate development" of "'missing middle' housing types"

Referring to Thrive 2050:

• Implementation will require changes to the zoning code, the building code, the subdivision regulations, and the <u>adequate public facilities ordinance</u>. These laws, which are part of the Montgomery County Code, establish setbacks, maximum heights, and parking requirements; specify which uses are permitted by right or subject to discretionary review; govern lot shapes and sizes; provide for dedication of rights-of-way and contributions of space and funds for parks and schools; and set other development standards and conditions that must be aligned with the recommendations of this plan.

Adequate public facilities. A preliminary plan of subdivision must not be approved unless the Planning Board determines that public facilities will be adequate to support and service the area of the proposed subdivision. Public facilities and services to be examined will include roads and public transportation facilities, sewerage and water service, schools, police stations, firehouses, and health clinics.

Portland, OR
There were 4 projects: updating the Residential Zoning Map; a Residential Infill Project, which increased the allowable floor-to-area ratio (FAR) for multi-unit buildings, and reduced FAR for new single-family homes; a Multi-dwelling Code Project, which expanded the geography of multi-family residential zones; and a New Comprehensive Plan Policy on Middle Housing to expresses general support and direct the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability to undertake a future study.

Resources Used:

Charlotte, NC
https://www.cltfuture2040plan.com/docs/01-CF2040_Policy-Plan.pdf
https://arlingtonva.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/38/2019/10/ACZO.pdf
https://www.bizjournals.com/charlotte/news/2021/05/21/revisions-city-2040-plan-development.html
https://charlotteudo.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Charlotte-UDODraft1-Oct2021.pdf
 https://www.cltfuture2040plan.com/docs/02-CF2040_Implementation_Strategy.pdf p31-32
[https://www.cltfuture2040plan.com/docs/02-CF2040_Implementation_Strategy.pdf p33](https://www.cltfuture2040plan.com/docs/02-CF2040_Implementation_Strategy.pdf);
https://cltfuture2040.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/193159-Final-Report_Charlotte-FIA_1-21-21.pdf
[1] http://ww.charmeck.org/Planning/Land%20Use%20Planning/South_District_Plan.pdf
[1] http://ww.charmeck.org/Planning/Land%20Use%20Planning/Central_District_Plan.pdf
https://charlotteudo.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Charlotte-UDODraft1-Oct2021.pdf

Charlottesville, VA
- https://worldpopulationreview.com/us-counties/va/arlington-county-population (2021) (last accessed on 1/23/22);
- https://www.bestplaces.net/housing/city/virginia/Arlington (last accessed on 1/23/22);

- census.gov/quickfacts/arlingtoncountyvirginia (last accessed on 1/23/22);
- A History of Residential Development, Planning, and Zoning in Arlington County, Virginia (Virginia Tech, April 2020);
- Arlington County Dept. of Community Planning, Housing and Development Profile 2021;
- Charlottesville City Council: Charlottesville Comprehensive Plan Update PowerPoint (Nov. 15, 2021);
- Comprehensive Plan: City of Charlottesville, Virginia 2021 (Nov. 2021 Draft).

Minneapolis, MN
- Andrea Brennan, Minneapolis Housing and Development Director, Minneapolis, MN video; AHS' Leckey Forum Keynote address; July 5, 2019; link: https://youtu.be/hXb3Z-pj9Ho
- Arlington Statistics: profile_2021.pdf (arlingtonva.us) and U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: Arlington County, Virginia and VDOE :: Program Statistics & Reports (virginia.gov)
- Minneapolis, MN Statistics: Minneapolis, Minnesota Population 2021 (Demographics, Maps, Graphs) (worldpopulationreview.com) and U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States and City Of Minneapolis MN Demographic Data and Boundary Map (hometownlocator.com)
- Arlington County's Comprehensive Plan:
- Minneapolis 2040 Comprehensive Plan:
- Minneapolis Civic Engagement Strategy: Planning Process (minneapolis2040.com) and minneapolis-2040-civic-engagement-plan.pdf (minneapolis2040.com)
- Bright Lights, Small City blog: Minneapolis Parent on School District's Proposed Redesign: Changes Should Not Be Pushed on Us | Bright Light Small City
- LandUseandZoningOverview-(1).pdf (minneapolismn.gov)
- Tell us: What are the biggest issues facing Minneapolis public schools? - StarTribune.com
- Minneapolis Schools' other issues on the back burner, but not CDD! – Southside Pride
- Parent advocacy group calls for boycott of Minneapolis Public Schools over distance learning model (fox9.com)

Montgomery County, MD
https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/master-plan-list/general-plans/thrive-montgomery-2050/
https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Thrive-Planning-Board-Draft-web.pdf
https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Council-briefing-on-11-16-21_GLMW.pdf
https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/housing/attainable-housing-strategies-initiative/
https://montgomeryplanningboard.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/item7_Attainable-Housing-Strategies-06.17.21_Final.pdf

https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/countywide/growth-and-infrastructure-policy/schools/

Portland, OR

https://www.portland.gov/sites/default/files/2019-07/code-dev_mid-housing_web.pdf [May 2016]

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1135&context=metroscape [Summer 2018]

https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2020/8/13/5-things-you-should-know-about-portlands-new-housing-reform [August 2020]

https://www.sightline.org/2020/08/11/on-wednesday-portland-will-pass-the-best-low-density-zoning-reform-in-us-history/ [August 2020]

https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-08-13/how-portland-dethroned-the-single-family-home [August 2020]

https://pamplinmedia.com/pt/9-news/527798-420233-forecast-pressures-growing-on-housing-market [November 2021]

https://www.sightline.org/2021/08/13/eight-ingredients-for-a-state-level-zoning-reform/ [August 2021]

Sacramento, CA

Demographic Element	Arlington	Charlotte, NC	Charlottesville	Minneapolis	Montgomery County, MD	Portland	Sacramento
Population	233,464	857,425	46,950 (9% projected pop. Growth by 2025 to 51,545)	439,012	1.06 million	645,000	525,000
Median Income	$136,510	$33,990	$59,471	$89,282	$110,389	$35,439	$68,414
Student Population	26,833	142,773* *Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools		36,370	160,564	47,314	46,000
Number of Schools	~42 Buildings ES: 24 MS: +Alt: 7 HS + Alt: 8	175 schools PreK:62 ES: 113 MS: 47 HS: 33	9 K-12 Buildings ES: 7 MS: 1 HS: 1	~71 buildings ES: 41 MS: 8 HS + Alt: 22	209 Buildings ES: 135 MS: 40 HS: 26 Special Schools: 5 Alt. Programs: 1 Early Childhood Learning Centers:2	81 buildings ES: 39 K-8: 18 MS: 13 HS: 10 K-12: 1	83 SCUSD ES: 62 MS: 24 HS: 15 Alt/Charter: 15 *Note: Several school districts touch the city; different #s from sources.
Land Area/Density	26 sq miles / 7,994 ppl per sq mile (math is 8,979)	297.7 sq miles	10.26 square miles	54 sq miles / 8,130 ppl per sq mile	507 square miles	145 square miles	97.68 square miles
Housing Units	119,700 units 8,652 CAFs	359,379 units 14,103 Affordable housing units	376 units of public housing; needs assessments identified need was 3,318 units, with projection of 4,020 in 2040	198,916 units 900+ units (Public Housing)	391,000^ units	287,372 ~48,000 Affordable units	201,932 dwellings; 94,832 owner-occupied; 97,418 renter; 192,250 occupied housing units

Median Home Price	$615,000	$370,000	$403,000	$300,000	$513,500	$515,000	$480,000
% of land zoned for SFH/ other uses	73% of residential developable land zoned for single-family detached homes; < 30% zoned for all other housing types and densities[+]		75% of city zoned for residential dev.; 70% of which is zoned for single-family residential			40% of land zoned for single family houses	43% of land area zoned for; 70% of residential neighborhoods zoned for SFH w/ duplexes only allowed on corner lots