

Submitted September 3, 2021

Approved September 8, 2021

**MINUTES OF THE ROCKVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING NO. 13-2021
Wednesday, August 11, 2021**

The City of Rockville Planning Commission convened in regular session
via WebEx at 7:00 p.m.
Wednesday, August 11, 2021

PRESENT

Suzan Pitman - Chair

Anne Goodman
Sarah Miller

Andrea Nuñez
John Tyner, II

Absent: Charles Littlefield
Sam Pearson

Present: Nicholas Dumais, Assistant City Attorney
Jim Wasilak, Chief of Zoning
Ricky Barker, Director, Department of Planning and Development Services
Craig Simoneau, Director, Department of Public Works
Sachin Kalbag, Principal Planner
Faramarz Mokhtari, Senior Transportation Planner
Shaun Ryan, Landscape Architect

Chair Pitman opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m., noting that the meeting is being conducted virtually by WebEx due to the coronavirus pandemic. Rockville City Hall is closed until further notice to reduce the spread of the virus, based on guidance from the Center for Disease Control (CDC) and state and local officials.

The Chair noted the possibility of severe weather during the meeting which could affect the Commission's ability to hold the virtual meeting. Chair Pitman then called for a motion that in the event a quorum of members is lost or if the Commission is otherwise unable to conduct the meeting due to technical difficulties, all outstanding items on this meeting agenda would be continued to the next regularly scheduled Commission meeting. Such motion was made by Commissioner Miller and seconded by Commissioner Nuñez. The motion carried by a vote of 4-0 with Commissioners Tyner, Littlefield and Pearson absent from the vote.

I. REVIEW AND ACTION

- A. Level 2 Site Plan Application STP2020-00399 for the Construction of Approximately 99 Townhomes, 96 Multi-Family Units and 213 Multi-Family Senior Housing Units in the Mixed-Use Corridor District (MXCD) at 11511 Fortune Terrace, EYA Development, LLC Applicant**

Chair Pitman reminded the Commissioners and those present at the meeting that the public hearing for this item would be conducted in accordance with the Commission's Rules of Procedure. She further detailed how members of the public could engage and give testimony on this item after the applicant's presentation.

Mr. Wasilak introduced the subject application, noting that final approval of a Level 2 Site Plan is fully within the approval authority of the Planning Commission. He added that this and several subsequent applications would be required for full approval by the Commission, including approval of a forthcoming preliminary subdivision application to create the lots associated with this proposed development.

Mr. Kalbag presented the application to the Commission, explaining that the proposal intended to demolish an existing 100,000 square foot office building while retaining an existing 70,000 square foot health club on the site in order to proceed with a mixed-use development comprised of the health club, townhouses, condominium units, multi-family senior housing and a parking garage. He noted that several public outreach meetings had taken place over the last three years concerning this project, including a recent community meeting on July 29. Mr. Kalbag stated that the public concerns within the authority of the City had been addressed within the Ordinance requirements and that the subject application complies with the City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Kalbag summarized the concerns of the public expressed through the outreach process as being traffic impacts from the project to surrounding neighborhoods, traffic impacts on Fortune Terrace and additional access to Seven Locks Road and vehicular speeding in the area. Mr. Kalbag briefly addressed these concerns, detailing that signal timing adjustments will be added along Seven Locks Road and Wootton Parkway to reduce the traffic queue, Fortune Terrace would be reclassified and improved to provide greater pedestrian safety and a variety of other traffic measures implemented to provide efficient traffic movements throughout the development.

Mr. Mokhtari of the Department of Public Works continued with a presentation detailing the technical review of the subject application for transportation. He noted that the original traffic study for the site was submitted in 2019 before the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and reflected traffic levels at that time rather than lesser traffic numbers currently. He added that the report was prepared in accordance with the City's requirements and while the total number of units had been reduced compared with the inception of the project, the traffic study provides trip generation numbers based on the original number of units proposed, and thus is a conservative outlook for traffic conditions and impacts anticipated for the site. He continued that the report increased observed traffic volumes along the major roadways to represent an 8-year growth rate based on historical traffic data in order to comport to the 8-year anticipated timeline for full buildout of the project.

Mr. Mokhtari also added that the report incorporated anticipated traffic from development that had been approved in the vicinity of the site but had not yet been completed. He noted that the proposed development would generate additional traffic to the level which would warrant

additional frontage and on-site improvements including reconstructing Fortune Terrace as a Business District Type II Roadway with bike lanes and buffered sidewalks, improving the traffic circle with pedestrian and bicycle accommodations and improved access in the vicinity of Seven Locks Road with the elimination of left turns at the two existing western access driveways and the provision of a three-lane section. In analysis of the level of service (LOS) for surrounding intersections in the area, Mr. Mokhtari explained that most intersections would remain at a Level of Service (LOS) "A" rating. He noted that the Seven Locks Road and Wootton Parkway intersection would result in a LOS "D" rating, thus requiring mitigation. He added that such mitigation would be recommended in the form of signalization through signal timing adjustments at this intersection to improve the LOS to a LOS "C." He added that no other signalizations were warranted in the area to facilitate the proposed development.

Commissioner Goodman inquired about when the traffic study was completed. Mr. Mokhtari responded that the study was completed in 2019 and reflected conditions prior to the beginning of the pandemic. Mr. Simoneau added that traffic conditions have likely lessened since 2019, as a result of the pandemic.

Chair Pitman then welcomed testimony from City Councilmember Beryl Feinberg. Councilmember Feinberg noted challenges that she and other attendees were having accessing the virtual meeting and thanked staff for their assistance. She added that she would like to offer additional input later in the meeting.

Mr. Simoneau described the major roadways associated with this development. He noted that Fortune Terrace would be recommended to be upgraded to a business type road from its current industrial classification to reflect more intensive uses being served in the area, including the proposed development. He added that certain areas of proposed parking along Fortune Terrace were being eliminated in order to provide for increased pedestrian and traffic safety measures.

Mr. Kalbag indicated that the staff's recommendation was to approve the subject site plan application, waivers to the requirement to plant three trees per townhouse lot and Road Code waivers from the City's standard details for the secondary residential roadways, subject to the conditions in the staff report and with several revised conditions. Mr. Kalbag also indicated a correction to the staff report in that 15 MPDU townhouses will be provided in lieu of the 16 and 18 townhouse units stated in the staff report.

Commissioner Nuñez asked if the City had ever considered installation of a roundabout at the intersection of Twin Oaks Drive and Seven Locks Road. Mr. Mokhtari responded that the City had not considered a roundabout at this location because the current LOS is rated as "A," and he added that a roundabout is usually used to mitigate some observed issue with traffic for which none was identified with this particular intersection.

Commissioner Goodman inquired about further explanation on the recommended approval of waiver for tree planting on townhouse lots. Mr. Kalbag and Mr. Wasilak responded that given the lack of minimum lot size standards for townhouse lots and the subdivision requirement of 3 trees per lot established and intended for single-family dwellings, such requirement poses a hardship to

the applicant in providing a townhouse product, and thus staff recommended approval of the waiver subject to the required number of trees being planted throughout the development rather than the strict requirement of 3 trees per townhouse lot. Commissioner Goodman further inquired what the standards are for making a “hardship,” finding in the granting of such waivers. Mr. Dumais responded that the standard for hardship is high in that an applicant must demonstrate that in denial of the request, the applicant would be denied some significant use of the site that they would otherwise be entitled to. While noting that the term “hardship” was unique in regards to a waiver request, he further referenced instances from Maryland case law to compare where such “hardship” language was considered in the granting of variances to explain how such hardship standards may be applied to the subject request. Commissioner Goodman also inquired on the meaning of the term “substantial justice” in its use of the waiver provision. Mr. Dumais commented that he was not aware of the use of such term in Maryland case law, and that his interpretation of the term meant that the Commission weighs the benefits and costs to the applicant versus the benefits and costs to the community in approval or denial of the waiver. Commissioner Goodman commented that, in general, she would like to receive more general information on what the cost of such request would be to applicants in such cases.

Jason Sereno of EYA Development, presented the project on behalf of the applicants, noting the extensive timeline and development of the project as it was initially submitted for review prior to the onset of COVID-19 pandemic in late 2019. He explained that the proposed project adds to the ongoing development of the surrounding area, noting recently approved development on vacant parcels to the south within the Park Potomac mixed-use development. Mr. Sereno continued explaining the specifics of the project and how the proposed uses would be composed on the site. He noted the various changes to the project and additional improvements which have been added including reducing the density of residential units, preservation of a large oak tree, and an increase in stormwater management measures and public use space. He continued by describing the proposed architecture for the site’s buildings, noting the contemporary style and the use of traditional building materials throughout the various components of the project.

Commissioner Goodman inquired about the proposed sound wall proposed to intervene between the senior living building and Interstate I-270, and its effectiveness to mitigate noise on upper floors of the building. Mr. Sereno responded that the senior living building will incorporate architectural treatments to the building façade and windows, which will mitigate interior noise levels to the necessary levels required by the City code and also will employ architectural features to similarly mitigate outdoor courtyard noise levels for the building. He continued that the sound wall will mitigate outdoor noise levels for public use spaces north of the proposed senior living building. Commissioner Goodman additionally inquired about who would be responsible for the existing forest conservation easement. Mr. Sereno responded that the developer would improve the conditions of the easement area by installing additional plantings in the easement area, but ultimate responsibility and maintenance of the area would be by Montgomery County government.

Commissioner Miller commended the development’s incorporation of multi-generational housing and the connection to the investments already made in the adjacent Park Potomac development. However, she expressed concern on how the development would provide safe connectivity for

pedestrians to surrounding area amenities. She also commented that the location of the parking garage would seem more suitable abutting Interstate I-270 rather than the senior living building as proposed. Mr. Sereno responded that ideally, if Lifetime Fitness was located on the eastern portion of the site, locating the garage there would have been more feasible. However, with the Lifetime Fitness currently existing and proposed to remain in that location, he offered the proposed location of the garage was most suitable and the garage was sited as such to be complementary to the immediately adjacent office uses, and to not be a focal point of the development.

Chair Pitman again welcomed comments by Councilmember Feinberg. She asked Mr. Sereno if the MPDU townhouse units would be of a consistent height with the market-rate units proposed, noting that the architectural renderings presented showed facades of townhouse units each as 4 stories. Mr. Sereno responded that the height of the MPDUs are typically not of the same height as the market rate units. He added that the proposed MPDUs were not 4-story units but working with City staff, the units will be provided with options up to a certain threshold of the purchase price. He continued that the market rate units would have an option for four stories for the buyer and added that the renderings were shown as 4-stories given the popularity of the 4th-story terrace option, and as a result, to show the massing of the buildings accordingly. Mr. Sereno further stated that final building programs for the MPDUs had not yet been determined and would be finalized at a later time. Councilmember Feinberg requested that such final information on the MPDU features be sent to her once available.

Councilmember Feinberg continued in her questioning, asking if elevators were proposed in any of the units. Mr. Sereno indicated that elevators would be offered as options in the front-loaded townhouse options of 20-foot width and greater but could not be accommodated in the smaller width units. She also asked if the MPDU multi-family condominium units would offer 3-unit bedroom options. Mr. Sereno responded that only 1 and 2-unit MPDU bedroom options would be offered. She additionally expressed concern about the environmental impact of the proposed public use space being sited within 500 feet of a major interstate, interfering with the standard set by the EPA, and inquired of how vehicular emissions would be mitigated. Mr. Sereno commented that he was not familiar with such EPA guidance and recalled that his development team have developed similar developments along major highways in accordance with the regulations in place.

Commissioner Goodman inquired if this project was indeed a “champion” project as indicated in the staff report. Mr. Wasilak responded that such reference was an error and that the project was not a “champion” project. Commissioner Goodman also asked about invitations to a community meeting for the project that was referenced in the staff report. Mr. Wasilak responded that the City code requires pre-and post-application meetings and that surrounding properties within 1,250 feet be notified of such meetings. He added that a third meeting was sponsored by the City to gain additional input from the public on the project, and notification for the meeting was completed in the same manner as the previous two required public meetings.

Several members of the public provided testimony to the Commission for this site plan application, beginning with Benjamin Israel of 2622 Oakenshield Drive, who identified himself

as a resident of Rockville for over 20 years, and provided testimony indicating that due to the known impacts of traffic occurring since the completion of the traffic study, along with traffic impacts proposed with the development, he requested that the Commission delay its decision on the subject application until an updated traffic study could be provided that considers current traffic conditions and recent developments. Mr. Israel also commented on some deficiencies he observed in the public outreach process for this project which he asked the Commission to take into consideration. He further asked the Commission to consider his oral comments given at the meeting in addition to the written comments which he had also submitted.

Chair Pitman then called for testimony from Karen Lechter, a citizen. However, Mr. Wasilak informed the Chair that Ms. Lechter did not wish to speak and Chair Pitman thanked Ms. Lechter for her participation.

Councilmember Feinberg offered comments on the project as part of the public testimony. She raised concerns on the lack of flexibility in the offering of the most recent community meeting in regards to scheduling to provide wider access to engagement on this project. She further countered comments in support of this project likening it to other recent projects such as Twinbrook Quarter or King Buick redevelopment. She stated that unlike such projects, the subject proposal is not transit-oriented or readily accessible to major transit stations. She further echoed the comments by Mr. Israel concerning traffic and the need for an updated traffic study to represent the current conditions on the site and consider the most efficient movement of traffic to and from the development.

Mr. Wasilak indicated that Michelle Basen, of 2513 Oakenshield Drive, had initially wished to offer testimony but was unable to be heard at the meeting, indicated via chat that she was in support of the comments offered by Mr. Israel and Councilmember Feinberg.

Richard Fultin of 17 Scotch Mist Court gave testimony citing that his comments echoed written comments submitted to the Commission by Dan Prywes and those which Mr. Israel previously provided. Mr. Fultin expressed his concerns over air pollution and traffic and whether the proposed development would both truly consider present traffic conditions and be complementary to the existing neighborhood character. He further indicated that he thought the Commission should further consider these issues before taking action on the subject application.

Ricky Barker commented that the staff understood and took seriously the concerns of area residents in regards to the proposed development. He added that he appreciated having a third community meeting in which 29 residents attended, to hear their concerns and gain further feedback on the project. He added that concerns mentioned by the community were addressed by staff. For example, he mentioned that the community raised concerns about traffic on Fortune Terrace, which had been addressed by the Department of Public Works recommending widening of Fortune Terrace to improve the traffic situation on this road. Mr. Barker emphasized that addressing the concerns of the community is important to City staff and he would not characterize such efforts as simply “checking boxes” by holding public meetings. He added that the staff had worked extensively with the applicant to ensure all City code requirements were

met, which resulted in the reduction of lots, increased buffers, and addressing noise impacts, all of which will benefit the public good.

Mr. Simoneau, adding to the remarks of Mr. Barker and responding to the comments by the public, added that the traffic study was done in accordance with the City's Comprehensive Traffic Review (CTR) and that it was not unusual for some time to pass between when traffic counts are made and when the application is considered by the approving authority. He added that the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic changed traffic patterns and noted that many public facilities such as fitness centers and restaurants were not open during the beginning of the pandemic which had resulted in a reduction in traffic observed had the traffic counts been taken at such time. Due to these changing conditions, Mr. Simoneau added that staff did not request an updated traffic study during the pandemic and if traffic studies are done during the pandemic, adjustment factors are implemented. He reemphasized that several of the intersections in the area of the proposed development would continue to operate at a LOS "A" and he added that after careful scrutiny, he was confident that traffic would perform well, in accordance with the CTR standards. Mr. Mokhtari added that if a new traffic study was required, staff would ask the applicant to use the traffic counts gathered from before the pandemic as they would be most reliable and would apply the same gross factor as recommended by the CTR. Mr. Serano added that if a new traffic study was required, it would also be done with a unit count of approximately 100 less units than the previous study considered, as the project has been revised since the original study.

Councilmember Feinberg additionally asked about the project's construction phasing, how construction would commence and where construction worker parking would be accommodated. Mr. Sereno responded that construction parking would either be met on-site or through agreements with private parking facilities and not on public roads or public parking lots. In terms of phasing, Mr. Sereno explained that the timing of construction was still being determined but added that the project would happen in segments beginning with partial demolition of the existing building and installation of the public roads, followed by construction of the senior living building and garage, and ultimately the remaining residential units. He added that the existing parking lot for the fitness center will remain for use by the fitness center patrons while initial construction begins. Councilmember Feinberg requested that the developer communicate with the adjacent community to inform them on the development's progress. She also asked if the developer would be implementing both a noise attenuation wall and vegetation along the site's border and I-270, and whether such improvements would encompass the entire length of the senior living building. Mr. Sereno responded that the noise attenuation wall will begin just to the north of the senior living building and wrap around the north perimeter of the site behind the front-loaded townhomes, and the landscaping will extend behind the entire length of the senior living building, as the façade of the senior living building will also be treated to mitigate noise from the abutting highway.

Chair Pitman then called for deliberation among the commissioners. Commissioner Nuñez commented that she was comfortable with the application as presented. She emphasized the importance of adequate public facilities being provided for the development and also inquired about the total amount of trees that would be provided. Shaun Ryan responded that the site plan

meets all of the tree requirements including afforestation on the site and provision of street trees. He noted the only forestry/landscaping requirement being deviated from was the required trees per residential lot for which the applicant was seeking a waiver with the subject application. He continued that 378 trees were proposed to be planted on the site with the preliminary Forest Conservation Plan.

Commissioner Goodman inquired if the forest conservation easement area would be located off-site, for which Mr. Ryan confirmed that the easement area would be located on the adjacent Montgomery County parcel. She also inquired if the planting proposed for the forest conservation easement area were being counted towards the required number of trees being required to be planted on-site. Mr. Ryan responded that all the required number of 378 trees would be physically planted within the subject site and added that all the plantings within the easement area would be separate and apart from the planting required on the property.

Commissioner Goodman expressed further concern about the traffic study, noting from her experience the traffic and full parking lots within the adjacent Park Potomac development. She also noted her concerns about the community engagement process for this project. She emphasized that while she was not in opposition to the project, she would like additional information including a new traffic study due to changing conditions, so that the best possible project could be produced.

Chair Pitman requested further clarification on traffic and what would be required for a new traffic study. Mr. Simoneau responded that traffic counts generated during the pandemic would be viewed by staff with skepticism due to the unpredictability of conditions during the pandemic. Therefore, he continued that because restrictions may change during the pandemic, staff would ask for traffic counts from before the pandemic in order to generate a more conservative view of traffic which are more accurate and more reliable.

Commissioner Miller commented that she thought that an updated traffic study was not needed and stated that she thought that the 2019 traffic counts were most appropriate to use in this situation. She added that she was favorable to the different options of housing this project proposed in this area of the City. She also reemphasized her concern about the residents of the proposed development being able to safely access the neighboring amenities in a safe manner due to the intensity of the uses on and around the site, but overall signaled that she was not in opposition to the project.

Chair Pitman relayed several questions from Commissioner Tyner, who had technical difficulties during the meeting, but was able to participate in the meeting via the virtual chat feature and by phone. Commissioner Tyner asked whether the input from Montgomery County was sought on this project. Mr. Mokhtari responded that as part of established guidelines within the CTR, staff did coordinate with Montgomery County staff and staff of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) to review the traffic study, and he explained that they concurred with the findings and recommendations of the traffic study. Commissioner Tyner also voiced his concern on traffic and agreed with Commissioner Goodman on the need for an updated traffic study. Chair Pitman commented that she would not be in agreement with an

updated study given the current conditions in which a study might underestimate traffic in the future due to those currently working from home. Commissioner Tyner also inquired about the residents in Montgomery County just to the south of the site and if they had provided any input on the project. Mr. Barker responded that staff did reach out to the residents immediately south of the site within Montgomery County about the project, and that several residents attended the July 29 meeting for the project in which they expressed issues with traffic from their community and potentially from the subject project. Mr. Barker added that the residents expressed that they were agreeable to the improvements recommended by staff for the developer of the subject site in order to improve traffic conditions impacting the area. Commissioner Tyner further expressed his support for the redesigned traffic circle proposed for the site.

Upon further comments from Chair Pitman and Commissioner Goodman, Mr. Dumais noted that an updated traffic study could not be included as a condition of approval for the project because in his estimation, a traffic study is used by the Commission to determine the adequacy of public facilities regarding traffic improvements based on the project. Thus, he added that a traffic study would be needed prior to the Commission approving the project to make such determination and in this case, concerning the previously submitted traffic study, the applicant has satisfied the requirements of the CTR. Mr. Dumais explained that if the Commission determined that a new traffic study was warranted, such determination would also mean that there was not substantial evidence in the record to find that this project would not overburden public facilities or otherwise adversely affect the health or safety of persons residing or working in the area.

Commissioner Tyner noted that while the traffic study may have been thoroughly conducted and technically sound, he was not convinced that it effectively addressed the concerns voiced by the community for this project. He further offered that given the explanation by Mr. Dumais, the Commission could reason that that project has not demonstrated full compliance to warrant approval due to impacts to the neighborhood that would result from traffic deficiencies. Mr. Mokhtari responded that based on the guidelines and policies within the CTR, unless the Mayor and Council revises the CTR, an updated traffic study would mimic the same study which was previously submitted by the applicant. Mr. Dumais added that the Commission did have the ability to determine that the evidence presented to it was not adequate to make a decision. In such instance, he stated that staff would be bound in its subsequent analysis to the regulations and guidelines adopted by the Mayor and Council. Thus, he added, staff could be directed to evaluate a new traffic study, but the way in which they would evaluate it would be predetermined by the documents that the Mayor and Council have approved such as the CTR and the City code.

Chair Pitman further inquired of Mr. Dumais for what determinations the Commission would have to make with its decision on the subject project. Mr. Dumais responded that the Commission weighs evidence in consideration of approval for a site plan in which there are seven required findings including gauging the effect of the project on the health or safety of persons living nearby, whether or not the project is detrimental to public welfare, and whether the project would overburden existing public facilities, all of which touch on the traffic analysis. He added that the Commission is charged with looking at all the findings and determining whether there is substantial evidence to either support the findings being made or to not support the findings. Mr. Dumais stated that if the Commission believed that it had sufficient evidence in the record to

support it making all seven findings, then it should approve the plan. He added that if the Commission believed there was not sufficient evidence to make such findings, the Commission could vote to deny the plan or defer action on such plan. He added that if the Commission determined that a new traffic study was warranted, the Commission could deny the approval of the site plan or vote to defer the site plan, subject to the submission by the applicant of a new traffic study. Upon this explanation from Mr. Dumais, Commissioner Tyner commented that although large in scale, the site plan put forth a good project and added that he wouldn't want to defer the project for completion of a new study if such study would likely provide similar findings and recommendations. He continued that he could agree to approve the project given the explanatory comments given by staff.

Commissioners Miller and Nuñez indicated that they were in support of the project and not in favor of a new traffic study, emphasizing that they thought that the current traffic study which was evaluated by staff was sufficient to represent the best data given the continuing unpredictability of conditions during the pandemic.

Commissioner Nuñez moved that the Commission approve Site Plan Application STP2020-00399 for the construction of approximately 99 Townhomes, 96 Multi-Family Units and 213 multi-family senior housing units located at 11511 Fortune Terrace, subject to the findings and conditions in the staff report, including the waiver for trees per lot and the revised conditions presented by staff. Commissioner Tyner seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-1, with Commissioner Goodman opposed and Commissioners Pearson and Littlefield absent.

II. RECOMMENDATION TO MAYOR AND COUNCIL

A. Recommendation to the Mayor and Council on Zoning Text Amendment TXT2021-00259, to Allow Self-Storage Warehouse Use in the MXE Zone Under Certain Conditions; Miller, Miller & Canby for U-Haul, Inc., Applicants

Given the lengthy discussion and deliberation of the first agenda item, Chair Pitman inquired of the applicant if they would like to continue to be heard at this meeting. Jody Kline of the law office of Miller, Miller and Canby, representing U-Haul in this case, commented that he was comfortable in deferring consideration of this text amendment until the Commission's next meeting.

III. COMMISSION ITEMS

- A. Staff Liaison Report** – Mr. Wasilak reported that the next Planning Commission meeting would be September 8. He indicated that in addition to consideration of the zoning text amendment deferred to the next meeting (item II.A of this agenda), he added that a Transit Plan for the I-270 Corridor would be presented by M-NCPPC staff at the next meeting as well.
- B. Old Business** – Mr. Wasilak noted that the Mayor and Council adopted the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and noted the Commissioners' substantial input and contributions to such plan being formulated and adopted.

- C. New Business** – Commissioner Tyner commented that despite complications with the technology associated with tonight’s virtual meeting, he further thanked Mr. Wasilak for his efforts to provide solutions to the technical difficulties experienced.

Mr. Barker noted the departure of Andrea Gilles, Comprehensive Planning Manager, with the Department of Planning and Development Services. Mr. Barker further noted the significant contributions of Ms. Gilles to the City, including her work on development of the Comprehensive Plan, the East Rockville Design Guidelines and the plan and zoning amendments for infill housing along Stonestreet Avenue. He further commended Ms. Gilles on her dedication to service and the impact which she made to the City. He also expressed his appreciation to the Commissioners for their work and service on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Tyner requested from Mr. Wasilak that a listing be provided to the Commission of the future items needed in order to further implement the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

D. Minutes Approval

Chair Pitman asked if there were any changes needed to the minutes of the Commission’s July 14, 2021 meeting. Commissioner Tyner moved, seconded by Commissioner Nunez, to approve the July 14, 2021 minutes as drafted. The motion carried 3-0-2, with Chair Pitman and Commissioner Goodman abstaining and Commissioners Pearson and Littlefield absent.

Mr. Wasilak inquired about alternatives to approval of minutes in which an extended period of time had passed since the meeting which those minutes covered, providing challenges to the Commissioners recalling such meetings. After discussion amongst the Commissioners, it was agreed that an unapproved version of meeting minutes could be provided with the disclaimer that such minutes were not formally adopted by the Commission in order to continue to provide such information to the public.

- E. FYI/Correspondence** – Mr. Wasilak noted several pieces of correspondence received from residents which were referred to by staff during tonight’s meeting in regards to consideration of the site plan application.

IV. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, Commissioner Miller moved, seconded by Commissioner Goodman, that the meeting be adjourned at 10:34 p.m. The motion was approved unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,



Commission Liaison