Submitted June 26, 2013
Approved as of
Date June 26, 2013

MINUTES OF THE ROCKVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING NO. 10-2013
Wednesday, May 22, 2013

The City of Rockville Planning Commission convened in regular session in the Mayor and Council Chambers at 7:00 p.m., Wednesday, May 22, 2013.

PRESENT

Jerry Callistein, Chair

Don Hadley
David Hill
Kate Ostell
Jack Leiderman
Dion Trahan
John Tyner

Present: Council Liaison/Councilmember Bridget Donnell-Newton
Susan Swift, Director, CPDS
Andrew Gunning, Assistant Director, CPDS
David Levy, Chief of Long Range Planning
Clark Larson, GIS Specialist

I. ROCKVILLE PIKE PLAN PUBLIC HEARINGS - This is the last evening for oral comments; written comments will be accepted through May 31, 2013.

A. Rockville's Pike Plan: Revised Draft for Planning Commission Public Hearings

David Levy provided an overview of the public hearing stating that this is the final day of public testimony and that May 31st will conclude all Rockville Pike testimony.

Chair Callistein advised the audience of the rules for public testimony.

The following provided their testimony for the Rockville Pike Plan:

1. Barbara Sears, attorney with Linowes and Blocher, representing the applicant, Woodmont Country Club supports the mixed use zoning for the Woodmont frontage but expressed concern about E. Jefferson Street going through their property. She referred to language on page 4-36 on the creation of a regional park and stated it should be revised to a more accurate description of a smaller park.
2. Nadia Azumi of 6 Hampton Ct. and Vice President of the Rose Hill Falls Citizens Association spoke on her own behalf opposing the Pike Plan because there will not be

enough parking, the buildings will be too high blocking sunlight throughout the neighborhoods, and small businesses will be driven away because of higher rents.

3. Jacques Gelin of 105 S. Van Buren Street and Corresponding Secretary for WECA, and speaking on behalf of WECA, opposes the Pike Plan because there will be greater density, more commercial development and Rockville will lose its small town atmosphere.
4. Kevin Zaletsky of 101 North Street is in favor of a unified plan for Rockville Pike, but he feels the current revision creates artificial demands for density.
5. Kate Savage, Chair of the Recreation and Parks Advisory Board, along with Roline Millford a member of the Recreation and Parks Advisory Board, supports the plan overall but has concerns about the lack of planned parks within close proximity (a 10 minute walk) in the plan area and lack of adequate and affordable parking.
6. Richard Yarrow, Richard Montgomery Student Government Association commented on the Fleet Street extension, stating that many students use the pathway during lunch and its dangerous now and is concerned it will be more dangerous in the future.
7. Karl Harger of 1024 Paul Drive spoke against the plan, stating traffic and pollution will dramatically increase and doesn't feel the democratic process has been honored during this process.
8. Brian Barkley of 513 Falcon Park Lane spoke on behalf of the Rockville Chamber of Commerce in support of the Pike Plan because it will strengthen the business community, preserve Rockville as a regional retail destination, it will accommodate walkers to Twinbrook Metro Station, create new neighborhoods, coordinate plans with APFO/APFS and create a vision and strategy for Rockville.
9. David Winstead, attorney with Ballard Spahr, spoke on behalf of the White Flint Partnership on the transportation element of the plan and feels that the Rockville Pike Plan will provide continuity with the Bus Rapid Transit concept for the White Flint Plan.
10. Jason Goldblatt of WILCO Construction Company said the plan has not fully considered building height in the area of his properties (Chapman and Bou avenues) and would like to have building greater in height so there's more consistency with the White Flint sector.
11. Robin Corridon of 433 Winding Rose Drive spoke in opposition of the Pike Plan because it threatens quality of life with increased traffic, high-rise buildings, inadequate infrastructure, over-crowded schools and a negative impact on small businesses.
12. Dennis Cain of 502 Carr Avenue opposes the plan because the infrastructure would be overwhelmed and the schools over-crowded.
13. Patricia Woodard of 111 N. Van Buren Street opposes the plan because it will force small businesses out, it will be nearly impossible to safely cross over Rockville Pike and Rockville will lose its small town feel.
14. Fei Wong of 814 E. Jefferson Street spoke in opposition of the Fleet Street extension and asked if there will be a tree buffer placed on the resident's side to reduce traffic noise and pollution as well as a visual barrier.
15. Sam Shipkovitz expressed concerns about building heights and inadequate parking.
16. Vicki McMullin of 100 North Street opposes the plan because it will inadvertently diminish Rockville's diversity, high rents will drive out small businesses, more residents will bring more traffic, and there is too much urbanization.
17. Marlene Berg of 718 Beall Avenue opposes the plan because there will not be enough green space and too much traffic.

18. Mary Ann Barnes of 1204 Allison Drive opposes the plan because of increased traffic and high buildings.
19. Jim Farelly of 119 Clagget Drive opposes because there will not be enough parks and open space.
20. Jim Coyle of 14 Fire Princess Court opposes the plan with concerns about Rockville's economy, aging infrastructure, excessive traffic/pollution and over development.
21. Stewart Bowman of 707 W. Montgomery Avenue opposes the plan because it will make the traffic worse and the proposed green space will benefit only a few.
22. Christina Ginsberg of 1204 Simmons Drive and President of the Twinbrook Citizens Association opposes the plan.
23. Judy Miller of 5920 Halpine Road opposes the plan because the increased traffic will make driving and walking unsafe, walking across Rockville Pike will be extremely unsafe, and there will not be sufficient parking.

There being no further speakers, Chair Callistein closed the Rockville Pike Plan testimony.

The meeting recessed and reconvened at 8:50 p.m.

B. Proposed Rockville Pike District Zone

The following provided their testimony for the Rockville Pike District Zone:

1. Noreen Bryant of 207 S. Washington Street and President of WECA opposed the Zoning Plan stating it does not reflect the citizen's views and gives the developer the "green light." She stated the population will double and the traffic will double. She stated the zoning revisions are in direct conflict with the APFO.
2. Brian Shipley of 211 S. Washington Street opposes the plan and doesn't see the benefits. He believes the infrastructure will not support such rapid growth, there is lack of funding, there is not enough park space designated, and the citizens have been excluded from the Pike's design (not enough citizen input from the beginning).
3. Barbara Sears, attorney with Linowes and Blocher and representing Woodmont Country Club, referred to page 9 of the District Zone Regulating Plan, stating that some neighborhood retail uses excluded would be appropriate and would assist in creating sustainable and lively neighborhoods.
4. MaryAnn Barnes of 1204 Allison Drive, stated that she doesn't think that someone grocery shopping would be able to walk or carry a large amount of groceries for several blocks to their home.
5. Brian Downey, attorney representing The Saul Centers, a real estate company located in Bethesda, purchased 1500 Rockville Pike and supports both the Rockville Plan and Zoning Ordinance. He stated that the Twinbrook Station and Rockville Pike area are suited for transit oriented mixed-use development.
6. Heather Dlhopolsky an attorney with Linowes and Blocher said that the structured above-ground parking was infeasible, and through-block every 500 to 1,600 feet are impractical and would not permit ground floor retail.
7. Brigitta Mulligan of Lewis Avenue spoke in favor of the Zoning Ordinance and that Rockville needs the revenue generated by new business. She also said that the City doesn't have enough land for another park and to use what is available now. She believes

the developers are here to improve the quality of life and that the City needs the State and Federal funding to improve the roads.

8. Christina Ginsberg of 1204 Simmons Drive and President of the Twinbrook Citizens Association, believe the citizens are paying too much for taxes with little to no readjustment of developers fees, and that the amenities should be accessible to every citizen, and there is a lack of park space included in the plan.
9. Judy Miller of 5920 Halpine Road is concerned about how the plan and code have been shared with the public. She also expressed concern about form-based zoning, taller buildings, language that addresses waivers is too general, and lack of park space and playgrounds.

There being no further speakers, Chair Callistein closed the public testimony for the Rockville Pike Plan District Zone.

David Levy informed the Commission that a transcript of both hearings will be provided as soon as possible, but the written testimony will be provided during the second week in June.

Commissioner Tyner suggested the record for the Rockville Pike Plan stay open for an additional week. The Planning Commission concurred that the record will remain open until June 7, 2013.

II. COMMISSION ITEMS

A. Staff Liaison Report – Andy Gunning provided an update on the next meeting's agenda and reminded the Commission of the upcoming ULI bus tour as well as the walking tour of Upper Rock at the Gables.
B. Old Business - None
C. New Business – Commissioner Hill made a statement about the terms of the present Planning Commissioners and that information about their terms are readily available in the Planning Commission Rules of Procedures and on the City's website.
D. Minutes - None
E. FYI Correspondence

I. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

_____

Sandra Y. Driver, Commission Secretary