

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Planning Commission Public Hearing Draft, Volume II
Complete Summary of Written Testimony, received between February 13 and October 7, 2020

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
1	Noreen Bryan and Patrick Woodward Co-Chairs, Planning Area 4 Committee			<i>Note: At the submitter's request, this testimony was removed from the record by the Planning Commission and was superseded by the testimony included as part of Exhibit 41a.</i>	n/a	n/a	n/a
2	Greg Ossont Montgomery County Department of General Services		1	Reiterates comments from April 26, 2019 letter on Vol. I: Elements (new testimony includes original letter and additional past correspondence), requesting removal of Fig. 3 (page 20) and Fig. 4 (Page 31) in Vol. I, since they show County-owned land at 301 E Jefferson Street (current juror parking lot, shown as Park) and 100 Maryland Avenue (current COB parking garage, shown as ORRM). Explains that, based on current investment and usage, the County does not anticipate these uses being redeveloped.	(a) Staff agrees that the Montgomery County Council Office Building (COB) parking garage at 100 Maryland Avenue is not likely to redevelop in the short-to-medium term, especially since the County has recently made investments to repair and upgrade the garage. However, since the Comprehensive Plan's land use policy map establishes the long-term vision for development patterns in the city, staff believes that a land use designation of ORRM is appropriate for the location to guide future redevelopment of the site within the city's downtown core. This designation in no way restricts the continued use of the COB or its parking garage, though if the county sought to sell the property or redevelop it as another use, the ORRM designation would provide guidance to establish a zoning designation that would permit a higher-intensity, mixed-use development. (b) Staff has also considered the testimony received for the assignment of the P (Public Parks) land use designation at the Montgomery County 'Juror Lot' (301 E. Jefferson St.). Staff recommends that a different approach be taken to indicate the city's desire for a future public park in this general area. Instead of applying the Public Parks designation to the entire property, (1) an asterisk should be placed in the general location where future park space is desired; and (2) a land use designation should be added as a replacement to the Public Parks designation, reflecting the current or future land use of the site if it were privately developed. To be consistent with surrounding properties, staff recommends the ORRM land use designation to replace the P designation.	(a) Retain the ORRM (Office Residential Retail Mix) land use designation at 100 Maryland Avenue (Montgomery County Council Office Building (COB) parking garage). (b) Replace the P (Public Parks) land use designation at 301 E. Jefferson Street ('Juror Lot') with ORRM and place a green asterisk indicating the general location where a Future Potential Park is desired.	(a) Follow staff recommendations. (b) Follow staff recommendations for change in land use designation, add cross-references in R&P Element
3	Jeffery Grimes Current: 1620 E. Jefferson St. Apt. 332 Future: 303 Taylor Avenue	X	2	Suggests placement of protected bike lanes along 'high-stress' thru-roads in East Rockville leading to the Rockville Metro Station, Town Center, Montgomery College, and other destinations, including to bike trails, such as the Millennium Trail and Rock Creek Trail. Specific roads mentioned: Baltimore Road, Park Road/North Horners Lane, and South Stonestreet Avenue. Recommends Montgomery County's Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Area in Silver Spring as a model for low-stress bicycle infrastructure in an urban area, and as a reference for the definition of low- and high-stress roads.	The draft Transportation Element of Vol. I includes several general policies and actions for the enhancement of the bicycle network in Rockville (see Policy 16, Action 16.1, Policy 18). The Bikeway Master Plan (2017), which is an adopted component of the current Comprehensive Master Plan and which would be adopted by reference into the new Comprehensive Plan, proposed a bicycle lane on only one road mentioned in the testimony - South Stonestreet Avenue. The Plan process included significant community input. In 2018, the South Stonestreet Avenue Road Diet project was completed between Baltimore Road and Park Road. A sidewalk was installed on the west side (Rockville Metro Station side) of South Stonestreet Avenue and a bike lane was added on the east side. On North Stonestreet Avenue, the Bikeway Master Plan maintains the current Signed Shared Roadway designation that provides for signage and painted 'sharrows' for both travel directions. However, in 2018, the Stonestreet Corridor Study was completed, also with significant community input, and infrastructure improvements along North Stonestreet Ave were recommended. In 2019, the Mayor and Council directed staff to include these recommendations as a Capital Improvements Project (CIP) for design that includes enhanced sidewalks on both sides of the street, improved street lighting, landscaping and improved bicycle infrastructure. The design is almost completed and funding for construction will be added as a future CIP. Staff does not recommend adding new facilities to the new Comprehensive Plan or making changes to what was recently adopted into the Bikeway Master Plan without study and additional community input. Instead, staff recommends adding a new Action to Transportation Element Policy 18, which is "Improve infrastructure for bicyclists to increase bicycle riding as a transport mode." The new Action, which could be 18.2, would be "Update the Bikeway Master Plan on a regular basis, with the purpose of improving facilities and safety for bicyclists." No such Action is in the current draft.	Add a recommended action under Policy 18 of the Transportation Element for future updates to the Bicycle Master Plan to propose new routes for protected bicycle lanes throughout Rockville to connect major destinations (parks, schools, shopping, eating, transit, recreation trails, etc.).	Follow staff recommendation

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
4	John Papagni Division of Neighborhood Revitalization, MD Dept. of Housing and Community Development	X		<p>Suggests discussion on how planning area boundaries align with state and federal geographic designations that can support implementation (e.g., Sustainable Communities, Enterprise Zones, etc.).</p> <p>Recommends reviewing the needs and strategies of the Montgomery County Sustainable Community Action Plan for consistency with those in the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Also suggests that the Housing Element address the need for affordable and workforce housing in response to House Bill 1045 (2019), which amends Sections 1-406 (Charter Counties) and 3-102 (Non-Charter Counties and Municipalities) of the Land Use Article and adds sections 1-407.1 and 3-114.</p>	<p>Sustainable Community areas identify priority areas and areas of need for grants, funds, and financing from the many state programs associated with the Sustainable Communities program. Properties within a Sustainable Communities area receive higher ranking/priority when seeking assistance from the state programs with which the Sustainable Community Program is associated.</p> <p>Planning Areas define the city-as-a-whole by neighborhood affinity areas, major transportation corridors, and natural features in order to apply city policies and actions to these local areas. Several areas in the city are included in the Montgomery County's approved Sustainable Community Action Plan. However, these areas do not align with the proposed planning area boundaries, nor does staff believe they need to, since they serve different purposes and define different types of areas.</p> <p>However, there could be a benefit to adding mention of the various state and federal program boundaries mentioned in the testimony to the appropriate Element of Vol. I. For instance, Maryland's Jobs Creation Tax Credit could be discussed in the Economic Development Element, Maryland's Low Income Housing Credit could be discussed in the Housing Element, and Maryland's Sidewalk Retrofit Program could be discussed in the Transportation Element. The drawback is that funding programs and sources change and listing these programs could eventually outdate the plan.</p> <p>On the requirement to include a Housing Element as part of the Comprehensive Plan and to address affordable housing within the Housing Element, as required by House Bill 1045, staff believes that the Vol. I draft satisfies the testimony's suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * A Housing Element is included in the draft Comprehensive Plan. * Economic Development Element, Policy 15 - Improve workforce housing options for employees at a range of incomes. * Housing Element, Goal 2 (Affordable Housing Incentives and Programs), Policies 7-10 address the city's protection and expansion of affordable housing. 	<p>Maintain the planning area boundaries as proposed in the Rockville 2040 Comprehensive Plan draft.</p> <p>Include a discussion of state grants, funding, and financing programs in the relevant Elements of Vol. I, as well as a map and discussion of Sustainable Communities areas within the city.</p> <p>Maintain existing language in Vol. I as it relates to workforce and affordable housing.</p>	<p>Follow staff recommendation to include a discussion of state grants, funding, and financing programs in the relevant Elements of Vol. I and add a map and discussion of Sustainable Communities areas within the city.</p>
5a	Charles Boyd, AICP Maryland Department of Planning	X	1,5,8,9,17	<p>Compliments Vol. II organization, informative and focused analysis of planning areas, public engagement and accessibility.</p> <p>Recommends ensuring that the plan is in conformance with HB-1045 (Housing Element), which requires the inclusion of a Housing Element in the Comprehensive Plan that includes a housing needs analysis for low-income and workforce housing.</p> <p>Recommends clarifying "the authority that the planning areas will have in the decision-making process," such as in development review, including zoning and subdivision review, by explaining the relationship between the volumes if the planning area is not within an adopted master plan, neighborhood plan, or similar. Consider discussing the such intent of each planning area section. Also commends the city for incorporating planning area policies into the citywide Comprehensive Plan, but "cautions the city in holding its planning area plans to this higher level of legislative review and expectation of plan consistency."</p> <p>Recommends clarification of The Role of the Neighborhood Plan by, "clearly indicating that the neighborhood plan is a small area master plan and refinement of the comprehensive plan, and with an explanation of the local adoption process." Suggests clarifying that the I-270 Neighborhood Plan would be superseded by the Tower Oaks planning area (#12). Indicates that the discussion of the five neighborhood plans that are adopted by reference, except for conflicts that are superseded by the new plan, only mentions that these policies supersede previous policies; however, there is other valuable information including goals, strategies, and recommendations that could be carried forward.</p>	<p>A Housing Element is included in the draft Comprehensive Plan, Vol. I: Elements. The policies and actions proposed in the draft Housing Element were crafted considering the findings and recommendations of the city's Housing Market Analysis and Needs Assessment report, completed in Dec 2016 by Lisa Sturtevant & Associates. The assessment recommended housing strategies for the full range of household incomes, including low-income and workforce housing, and is referenced in the Housing Element. Staff believes that the Comprehensive Plan, in its current draft form, complies with the requirements of the Housing Element, including the required analysis.</p> <p>Staff agrees that additional clarification should be added to both Comprehensive Plan volumes to explain the authority that various aspects of the planning areas will have in the city's decision-making process, as well as that of adopted neighborhood plans. Since the policies of the Planning Areas volume carry the same weight and authority as that of the citywide Elements, staff does not believe there would be confusion between them in the future. Any recommendations adopted as part of the Planning Areas volume would not carry the force of law, but would serve as guidance for future projects, studies, or zoning regulations.</p> <p>Instead of adding details for implementation of Comprehensive Plan policies, as suggested by the testimony, staff recommends that a policy be added to the Plan stating that an immediate follow-up item after Plan adoption is to develop an implementation plan for every Plan policy and action.</p> <p>Staff agrees with the Referral Comments, with the following exceptions:</p> <p>(a) The draft Comprehensive Plan includes recommended transportation projects or studies in most planning areas, though without great detail or specific designs. More detailed transportation policies and recommendations</p>	<p>Add language to Elements and Planning Areas volumes providing greater clarification for the relationship between them, the regulatory authority of planning area policies, and the role of the neighborhood plan.</p> <p>Incorporate all suggested detailed edits and additions to improve the readability of the document</p> <p>Add a policy in the Plan, potentially in the Introduction, that says that an immediate follow-up item to the Plan is to develop an implementation plan for every Plan policy and action.</p> <p>(c) Include as part of the call for a Pedestrian Master Plan in Vol. I's Action Item 17.1 (Policy 17 of the Transportation Element) new or improved transit wayfinding in the areas surrounding the three Metro Stations serving Rockville (Twinbrook, Rockville, & Shady Grove).</p> <p>(f) Staff supports the addition of this reference to a study of a new interchange of W. Gude Dr. with I-270. It would be added as a reference within Planning Area 5 as an addition to its</p>	<p>Follow staff recommendations</p>

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
				<p>PLEASE NOTE: Testimony includes several suggested edits and additions to Vol. II. See original testimony for complete list under "Referral Comments". Some of the more significant comments are listed below.</p> <p>(a) Include more detailed transportation policies and recommendations in each planning area to assist in future coordination with governmental partners.</p> <p>(b) To help guide the plan implementation, consider specifying timeframes, priorities, and responsible entities or funding sources for these land use and transportation recommendations that help promote TOD and walkability.</p> <p>(c) PA 1 - Recommends a transit wayfinding recommendation to depict transit routes/stops and nearby popular destinations in the town center area.</p> <p>(d) Suggests enhancing affordable housing recommendations for all TOD areas.</p> <p>(e) Recommends estimating the amount of residential dwelling units based on the future zoning may provide a better understanding of public services and infrastructure needed to accommodate future growth within each planning area.</p> <p>(f) PA 5 - Include recommendation to study a new I-270 interchange with W. Gude Drive, as do PAs 4, 15, and 16</p> <p>(g) PA 8&9 - Include a recommendation to address congestion at the Veirs Mill Road (MD 586) and First Street intersection as a major issue to help coordination with the state.</p> <p>(h) PA 17 - Recommends addressing the need to preserve industrial land as a valuable freight and economic development resource while mitigating impacts on surrounding communities.</p>	<p>were intentionally not included in the draft Plan, since staff believes they should each be studied in detail after plan adoption, rather than specifically described in the Plan itself.</p> <p>(b) Staff does not believe that adding implementation details for draft transportation (or other) policies (such as priority, timing, cost, funding sources, etc.) is necessary for the Comprehensive Plan. Implementation details should be developed soon after the Rockville 2040 Comprehensive Plan update is ultimately approved and adopted by the Mayor and Council.</p> <p>(c) Instead of calling for transit wayfinding in Town Center alone (PA 1), these improvements should be considered in all areas within walking (or driving) distance of the three Metro Stations serving Rockville (Twinbrook, Rockville, and Shady Grove). It could be part of the Pedestrian Master Plan that is already called for in the Transportation Element of Vol. I.</p> <p>(d) Regarding enhancing affordable housing recommendations for all TOD areas, staff believes the draft Plan accomplishes this suggestion by identifying properties near the Rockville and Twinbrook Metro Stations that are currently occupied by single-unit residential dwellings for a zone that allows small-scale attached housing (i.e., the RA designation); housing that is expected to allow more people to afford living near transit stations. Furthermore, the greatest potential for redevelopment projects with a residential component is near the city's two transit stations: Rockville, and Twinbrook; projects that would have to meet the city's moderate-priced housing ratios. Housing Element policies address further affordability goals throughout the city.</p> <p>(e) The introduction to Vol. I includes citywide forecasts and estimates of the current number of residential dwelling units; and each Planning Area includes such current estimates. The draft does not project growth of those areas because there is so much variability in what could happen in these mixed-use areas.</p> <p>(f)(g)(h) Staff supports these recommendations. See staff recommendations to the right.</p>	<p>mention in the draft Plan in Planning Areas 4, 15, and 16.</p> <p>(g) PA 8&9 - Add a recommendation to advocate for the MDOT SHA to address congestion at the Veirs Mill Road (MD 586) and First Street intersection in the Transportation Element, Policy 8, and in Planning Area 8 (Twinbrook).</p> <p>(h) Bring in language from the testimony to the Land Use and Economic Development Elements and Planning Area 17 about recognizing the need to preserve light industrial uses. Needs a stronger affirmative statement about retention of light industrial land uses. Mention maker/creative/artisan uses as compatible.</p>	

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
5b	Heather Murphy Maryland Department of Transportation	X	All, except 5,10,11,1 7	<p>Testimony includes general recommendations and edits, as well as specific transportation recommendations for almost all planning areas. See April 13, 2020 testimony letter for details. Some of the more substantial recommendations are included below:</p> <p>PA 2 - Focus Area A4 (pg. 23) – Under Public Realm Improvements, consider changing “sharrows” to protected bike lanes on North Stonestreet Ave.</p> <p>PA 6 - Key Issues (pg. 67-68) – Regarding spill-over parking on residential streets from the Rockville Transit Station and future infill redevelopment, could this be addressed by implementing a residential parking permit system and increase transit or other mobility options to access the station?</p> <p>PA 8 - City Project 5, include bicycle access, as well as; City Project 10, the safety audit should drive/direct the bicycle and pedestrian plans as well.</p> <p>PA 12 - (pg. 110) - Include the consideration of the expansion of bicycle lanes throughout the entire Planning Area.</p>	<p>Most suggestions are for elaboration or greater explanation of existing policies or actions, which staff supports and is willing to undertake.</p> <p>A discussion of substantial recommendations called out in the summary is included below:</p> <p>PA 2 - Detailed planned bicycle infrastructure is not included in either Volumes I or II because the Bikeway Master Plan establishes the plan for future bicycle and pedestrian improvements and, as discussed in the Transportation Element, is adopted by reference into this updated plan. Regarding N. Stonestreet Ave., the Mayor and Council just recently adopted a plan amendment for that area and in 2018, recommended the inclusion of the proposed street improvement recommendations from the Stonestreet Corridor Study into the city's Capital Improvements Program. Both projects are incorporated into this updated plan. The Stonestreet Corridor Study includes a preferred cross-section for N. Stonestreet Ave., which went through an intensive community review process and is currently in the design phase. However, the Bikeway Master Plan should reflect all updates to bicycle infrastructure through more-recently adopted plans, such as that for Stonestreet.</p> <p>PA 6 - Adding a recommendation to study a new residential parking permit system in the Lincoln Park neighborhood, in consultation with neighborhood residents and businesses, would be most appropriate in the Comprehensive Plan, rather than a firm policy to enact such a program. While not mentioned specifically in this planning area, the draft Transportation Element of Vol. I includes policies to increase non-vehicular access and mobility throughout the city, including to transit stations (see Transportation Element Action 14.5, Policy 17, and Policy 18).</p> <p>PA 8 - Staff agrees with these recommendations.</p> <p>PA 12 - The expansion of bike lanes in PA 12 (Tower Oaks) should be recommended for study, but deferred to a future update to the Bikeway Master Plan.</p>	<p>Incorporate general text edits suggested by the testimony</p> <p>PA 2 & 12 - Do not include a call for protected bike lanes on N. Stonestreet Avenue or in the Tower Oaks PA at this time. Instead, include a recommendation to consider expanding the bikeway network throughout the city under Policy 18 of the Transportation Element as part of any future update to the Bikeways Master Plan.</p> <p>PA 6 - Add a recommendation to study a new residential parking permit system in the Lincoln Park planning area (PA 6) or, as an alternative, to portions of the Planning Area within a half-mile of the Rockville Metro Station, in consultation with neighborhood residents and businesses. <i>Potential language:</i> "Implement effective parking management and enforcement to ensure adequate on-street parking for area residents where off-street parking is not available. Study the possibility of adding or expanding residential permit parking, in consultation with neighborhood residents and businesses, within the neighborhood due to proximity to Metro and future infill development."</p> <p>PA 8 - Staff supports the suggested additions.</p>	<p>PA 2 & 12 - see PC direction in Exhibit 3</p> <p>PA 6 - follow staff recommendation</p> <p>PA 8 - follow staff recommendation</p>
5c	John Papagni Division of Neighborhood Revitalization, MD DHCD	X		[See Testimony Exhibit #4. Letter was provided by both submitters]	[See Testimony Exhibit #4. Letter was provided by both submitters]	[See Testimony Exhibit #4. Letter was provided by both submitters]	n/a
5d	Stephen Allan, AICP Local Assistance and Training Planning, Office of Planning, Education and Outreach, Maryland Department of Planning, Maryland Historical Trust	X		<p>Compliments the plan's description of historic assets and recognition of their value.</p> <p>Recommends including additional information about state and federal tax credit opportunities for historic properties, noting that, "eligibility for or listing in the National Register of Historic Places is helpful in qualifying properties for federal and state financial incentives." Also recommends mentioning the Heritage Structure Rehabilitation Tax Credit's Small Commercial program and recent Heritage Area Amendment.</p>	<p>Inclusion of references to existing state and federal tax credit opportunities for historic properties would not affect the existing policies in the draft Plan. They would be a useful addition for public information and staff coordination. However, the Historic Preservation Element would be a more appropriate location for these references rather than the Planning Areas volume. Additionally, the city has included tax credit, grant programs and other resources within its Historic Preservation webpages, where the information may be kept more regularly up to date. The Heritage Plan Amendment and its incorporation into the 2002 Comprehensive Plan as an amendment to the plan is described on page 222 of the Historic Preservation element in Vol. I.</p>	<p>Include additional information about state and federal tax credit opportunities for historic properties, the Heritage Structure Rehabilitation Tax Credit's Small Commercial program.</p>	Follow staff recommendation
5e	Jennifer Hopper Lands and Materials Administration	X		<p>Testimony was provided as a general response checklist noting the requirements for storage, disturbance, and disposal of solid waste and hazardous material for the City of Rockville.</p>	<p>Staff does not find any comments in this testimony that pertain to Comprehensive Plan policies.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>	Follow staff recommendation

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
6	Randy Alton 2309 Glenmore Terrace, Rockville, MD	x	14	<p>(a) Recommends that the Comprehensive Plan adoption timeline be "permanently tabled" and that an addendum be added to each planning area regarding COVID-19. Re-evaluate concept of a 20-year plan; the city should invest in data analytics and mathematical models in order to analyze immediate changes and forecast for the future.</p> <p>(b) Requests specific attention to the Rockshire Village Shopping Center including retaining the current zoning (instead of proposed change). If zoning change is retained, define "substantial" retail.</p> <p>(c) Asks city to address APFO, parking, ADA, safety and fire lane impacts before changes to land use or zoning; seek opportunities to recruit new retail to shopping center and parking conditions, and purchase or lease of the property by the city for community amenities.</p> <p>(d) Recommends sidewalk feasibility study near Wootton High School (Scott Drive); add public facility & bike enhancements to Wootton Mill Park and Watts Branch Stream (per BayLands report); support a farmer's market west of I-270; conduct safety study along Wootton Parkway Corridor; requests that City rotate the holding events geographically throughout the City; build a shelter/pavilion as a staging area for events on Karma property to promote east Rockville residents to visit west Rockville and leverage I-270 bike/ped bridge.</p>	<p>(a) Staff does not support delaying the Comprehensive Plan update process due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Further delay would not serve the interests of the Rockville public, who have spent many hours engaging in the process and providing feedback and are counting on various elements of the draft Plan to be adopted and implemented in the near term. Additionally, there is an established process by which the Comprehensive Plan may be amended in the future as circumstances or interests change.</p> <p>Staff recommends that the Planning Commission consider Comprehensive Plan policies and actions that address preparing and responding to public health emergencies, such as the COVID-19 pandemic. One example is the addition of a policy in the Environment Element, under Goal 4: Healthy Communities, that establishes the ways in which the city can be more prepared and responsive to natural and "human-centered" emergencies. Staff will bring forward, in a future work session, recommendations in this regard for potential inclusion in Vol. I.</p> <p>Staff has utilized advanced data analytics and forecasts to develop some of the policies and actions in the draft plan. There may be opportunities to explore additional techniques to "analyze immediate changes and forecasts for the future," in subsequent Plan updates, yet they should not serve as a reason to delay or "re-evaluate" the current draft Plan.</p> <p>While a more 'nimble' or 'responsive' Comprehensive Plan sounds reasonable, staff believes that the policies and projects adopted in the Comprehensive Plan should take a longer view than those that would respond to rapidly changing circumstances. The Rockville community should be able to expect a level of stability and consistency as the city grows and changes. Though the city has established a typical twenty-year planning horizon for its previous Comprehensive Plans, a ten-year review is required under the Maryland Land Use Article and Plan amendments can occur more frequently than that.</p> <p>(b) The recommendations for Rockshire Village Shopping Center, its land use designation and recommended zoning, stem from an extensive public outreach effort to find a solution that works both for the surrounding community and the property owners. Staff believes that the recommended land use is appropriate in that it reaches a compromise between differing views. However, greater clarification may be necessary.</p> <p>(c) Addressing site-specific APFO, ADA, safety, and fire lane impacts is not within the scope of the Comprehensive Plan, though broad policies support all these goals. These issues will be addressed at the time a redevelopment proposal is submitted. Similarly, staff does not believe recruiting new retail to the shopping center should be the purview of this Plan.</p> <p>(d) Staff supports the addition of a recommended sidewalk feasibility study on Scott Drive, though portions of the roadway are beyond the city limits and such a study should be coordinated with Montgomery County DOT. The remainder of the recommended additions are appropriate for the Planning Areas, as well.</p>	<p>(a) Do not postpone the Comprehensive Plan update process in response to the coronavirus pandemic or to re-evaluate the Plan through additional data analytics and mathematical models.</p> <p>Add a policy in the Environment Element, under Goal 4: Healthy Communities, that establishes the ways in which the city can be more prepared and responsive to natural and "human-centered" emergencies. Bring forward, in a future work session, a set of recommendations in this regard for potential inclusion in Vol. I.</p> <p>(b) Retain the PD zoning in the approved planned development for the Rockshire Village Shopping Center, but support an amendment that would permit, in addition to retail uses allowed by the current PD, residential uses (preferably single-unit detached housing or townhouses) if the proposed residential development includes community-serving retail and/or community amenity space. A discussion regarding the precise language is presented in the staff report and awaits Planning Commission decision. The Planning Commission should consider how to discuss the amount or significance of retail use and community amenity space as a part of residential redevelopment at the Rockshire Village Shopping Center.</p> <p>(c) See staff comments.</p> <p>(d) Incorporate the recommended bike and pedestrian safety and facility improvements into the appropriate location of the Planning Areas draft. Some may be best included as part of the citywide Elements, such as the support for a farmer's market west of I-270 and rotating city events geographically throughout the city.</p>	<p>Look through this testimony carefully to bring in anything worth adding, but not discussed by the Planning Commission.</p> <p>See also PC direction in Exhibit 21</p>

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
7	Michael Dutka 713 Shetland Street, Rockville, MD		8	<p>Compliments the recommendation to increase residential density, especially 'missing middle' housing, along Viers Mill Corridor and near Twinbrook Metro. Recommends it should extend to cover all Twinbrook and Twinbrook Forest to help address city and regional housing shortage.</p> <p>Recommends that additional attention should be paid to make residential areas away from main corridors more walkable within Planning Area 8 (i.e. allowing a small amount of commercial activity and limiting planning for cars), especially in the area near Rockville High School, Focus Area 7 of PA 8.</p>	<p>Staff agrees that a variety of housing types should be available throughout Rockville that address a variety of income levels. The Plan currently recommends several new areas to allow for a mix of housing types and more density. The scope of where ADUs would be allowed is also expanded. The draft Plan's recommendations are the result of extensive public outreach and comments, especially in Planning Area 8 (Twinbrook and Twinbrook Forest). Any further expansion of areas that allow higher residential density than single unit detached homes in the Comprehensive Plan should be carefully considered by the Planning Commission or considered as part of future small area plans that would involve their own public input process. Staff does not support expanding such areas at this time.</p> <p>As with allowing a diversity of residential density options, staff agrees that small-scale, walkable commercial destinations within residential neighborhoods are positive additions to the Rockville community, though is hesitant to add new areas without additional public input. If in the future, certain areas undergo unanticipated change, the city has the option to initiate a plan amendment process to closely analyze and appropriately respond to the changes.</p>	No changes recommended.	Follow staff recommendation
8	David Lorenzo-Botello 110 Monroe Street, Rockville, MD		1,2,7,8,9	Supportive of a variety of the proposed projects, recommends stronger involvement of the County DOT in planning for BRT [PA 1, P8], recommends additional economic development in Town Center to make it a destination for "young people to eat, drink and dance". Supports redevelopment of 255 Rockville Pike.	<p>PA 1 - The 2001 Town Center Master Plan and Rockville 2040 Planning Area 1 (Vol. II) both support economic development in Town Center. The Economic Development Element in Vol. I supports promoting "Rockville Town Center as a business and administrative center supported by a lively mix of restaurants, hotels, small shops, business headquarters and service providers (Policy 10, p. 182) and "Cultivating a richer arts, entertainment, and social scene in Rockville (Policy 11, p. 183).</p> <p>PA 1 - Montgomery County government was a major tenant at 255 Rockville Pike as staff from various county departments were housed in that building. The County has moved, or is moving, functions and staff from this building to a combination of a new County building in Wheaton and to the renovated Grey Courthouse building in Town Center. The result for 255 Rockville Pike is over 130,000 sf, or 80%, of vacant space at that building. City staff has spoken many times with the property owner to determine future plans and discuss development goals, consistent with the Town Center vision. To date, no viable plan has been proposed.</p> <p>PA 8 - The draft Plan currently advocates working with the County DOT for the implementation of the BRT and stations at relevant locations along the Viers Mill Corridor as noted as a recommended City project in that chapter. The draft Plan supports the implementation of BRT in the City (Vol. I, Policy 13, p. 73). Staff will continue to coordinate with the County on the BRT goals.</p>	No changes recommended.	Follow staff recommendation
9	Nancy McIntyre 4 Rosanne Lane, Rockville, MD	X		Recommends having benches to complement existing walkability -- in commercial, residential and recreation areas.	<p>The provision of benches and other public or private space "amenities" is typically addressed during the development review process for a specific project.</p> <p>The Transportation Element, Vol. I, Policy 17 states "Improve infrastructure for pedestrians to promote walking as a non-polluting, healthy, sociable mode of transportation". The policy recommends creating a pedestrian master plan for the City. The pedestrian master plan typically provides comprehensive details on needed infrastructure including seating areas as applicable and identifies issues and provides recommendations on best practices to improve the pedestrian environment.</p>	Since the pedestrian master plan is a recommendation and not a policy document, staff recommends another action item in the Transportation Element Policy 17 that emphasizes providing ADA compliant seating areas and other amenities at appropriate locations throughout the City to facilitate walking as a comfortable activity for people of all abilities and age groups.	Follow staff recommendation

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
10	Marc "Kap" Kapastin Chesapeake Plaza, Quantum Companies		9	Opposes extending Chapman Avenue through the properties, 1460-1488 Rockville Pike, as adopted by the 2016 Rockville Pike Neighborhood Plan, since it would limit redevelopment opportunities on the resulting small lots created by the extension. Asserts the proposed road extension would leave his property undevelopable and that the intersection of extended Chapman Avenue would not meet the MDOT SHA min. distances between intersections with state roads (between Congressional Ave. and Templeton Pl) nor for a new signalized intersection at Rockville Pike.	<p>The extension of Chapman Avenue through the subject properties is a component of the adopted 2016 Rockville Pike Plan (Figure 4.9: Street Master Plan, p. 4-14). Staff believes that the purpose and benefits of the extension, to expand the roadway network within the Rockville Pike corridor, remain valid. However, staff understands the concerns raised by the testimony and suggests that the graphical depiction of the future street extension may be overly prescriptive and definitive.</p> <p>The graphical depiction of the Chapman Avenue extension could be adjusted to be more general or conceptual. Caveats may be added in the Planning Area that would supersede the Rockville Pike Plan to explain that the extension of Chapman Avenue through the subject properties, or an alternative configuration that adequately addresses circulation in the area, should depend on whether the property owner seeks development on consolidated properties versus separate developments on individual properties. Furthermore, the Chapman Avenue extension was adopted as part of the Rockville Pike Plan prior to final layout and approval of the Twinbrook Quarter redevelopment project and its design and location was adjusted from the specific layout in the Rockville Pike Plan to accommodate the project.</p>	<p>Create an adjusted graphic of the Chapman Avenue extension that indicates a more general or conceptual location.</p> <p>Add caveats in the text of Planning Area 9 that makes the extension through the subject properties, or an alternative configuration that adequately addresses circulation in the area, dependent on whether the property owner seeks development on consolidated properties versus separate developments on individual properties</p>	<p>Do not add or adjust the graphic</p> <p>Add language in the Transportation heading of Other Policy Recommendations: "At the time of development review for the properties at 1460, 1470, or 1488 Rockville Pike, a determination should be made by staff whether or how Chapman Avenue is extended. The exact location of the extension, as depicted in the 2016 Rockville Pike Neighborhood Plan, should not be construed as its final alignment."</p>
11 & 11a	Joseph C. McClane Cambridge Walk II HOA Joshua Sturman Cambridge Walk I HOA		8	<p>(a) Halpine Road shouldn't be the boundary between Planning Area 8 & 9; Cambridge Walk townhomes should be considered part of Twinbrook planning area. Supported by a neighborhood petition containing 12 signatures (Exhibit 11a).</p> <p>(b) Opposes zoning change on south side of 5900 Halpine Rd, especially Focus Area A1 (R-60 to RMD-15) due to its inconsistency with the Key Issues of PA 8, such as: maintain residential character, reduce traffic congestion, add parkland and recreational facilities.</p> <p>(c) Requests a different photo on page 96 that better reflects their neighborhood.</p>	<p>(a) Staff agrees with the testimony requesting to revert the properties on the south side of the 5900 block of Halpine Road back to within the boundary of Planning Area 8 (Twinbrook and Twinbrook Forest).</p> <p>(b) Staff continues to support the draft Plan's land use designation of RF (Residential Flexible) for the property at 5906 Halpine Road, due to its large lot size on a street corner, adjacency to an existing townhome development, and transitional location between mixed-use, residential apartments near the Twinbrook Metro Station and single-unit detached homes. The draft Plan currently recommends a zone for the property that would allow a medium-density residential development, such as RMD-15, or one that also allowed ancillary ground-floor commercial uses, such as the MXNC (Mixed-Use Neighborhood Commercial) zone, but does not preclude continuing the existing institutional church use. In recognition of its sensitive location across the street from existing single-unit detached residential homes and adjacent to existing townhomes, staff suggests that language be added to guide the review of any future residential development, including a maximum building height of 50 feet if the property is zoned MXNC.</p> <p>(c) Staff will look for a better photo to represent the Twinbrook community, as requested by the testimony.</p>	<p>(a) Realign the planning area boundaries to revert the properties on the south side of the 5900 block of Halpine Road to Planning Area 8 (Twinbrook and Twinbrook Forest).</p> <p>(b) Retain the RF (Residential Flexible) land use designation at 5906 Halpine Road (Twinbrook Church) and recommendation for either the RMD-15 or MXNC zone. Amend the Focus Area A1 in PA 9 (moved to PA 8) to establish a maximum building height of 50 feet and include language to guide development review of any future development proposal to facilitate a sensitive transition between new and existing residential development.</p> <p>(c) Replace the photo on page 96 per testimony.</p>	<p>Follow staff recommendations</p>

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
12	Andrew Martin 722 Mapleton Road, Rockville, MD	X	2,8,9,17	<p>Recommends that zoning reform be more comprehensive and should guide more of the City's development; should be planning for the next 100 years. Asserts that, based on census data, Rockville isn't meeting the needs of Rockville's African American community; the city needs to avoid potential red lining through zoning. Consider the racial makeup of neighborhoods to encourage more diversity; avoid targeting areas for change with predominantly minority residents, including Hispanic residents. Recommends the city consider creating zoning classifications that utilize rental control (price controls) through a Rental Overlay Zone and enforce policies that require minorities first access rights to any housing for sale.</p> <p>PA 2, Area 12: Opposes the RA designation and rezoning near the proposed BRT station at Veirs Mill and First Street. Recommends a historic zone there.</p> <p>PA 8, Area 5: Recommends any development of First Street Park be only for transitional housing for the incarcerated.</p> <p>PA 8, Area 1: Supports rezoning but concerned about affordability after redevelopment and prefers commercial mixed-use projects that exclude national franchise businesses. Suggests small business restrictions and economic assistance to ensure small, minority-owned businesses are established to serve the community.</p> <p>PA 9: Redevelopment should be encouraged here before PA 2, A12 and PA 8, A1. City should encourage the County to build BRT on Rockville Pike before Veirs Mill.</p> <p>PA 17: RedGate should be developed in partnership with the County Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to expand the Model Learning Center.</p>	<p>Under Maryland Law, the scope of zoning does not permit differentiation by racial group and likely runs afoul of the law...</p> <p>PA 2 - [See staff response to the extent of RA in Planning Area 2 in Exhibit 47]</p> <p>PA 8, Area 5, First Street Park: The draft Plan recommends to allow a range of housing types at this location. Therefore, if approved and followed up with a zoning change, residential uses would be permitted, but the land use plan does not prescribe the exact type of use that would be permitted within a development.</p> <p>PA 8, Area 1, Viers Mill Corridor: The draft Plan emphasizes that one of the reasons for accommodating additional housing and housing types is to expand housing options to people and families of varying income levels. In addition, the city-wide housing element provides details about affordability, as well as existing and recommended future programs. Regarding small and minority-owned business assistance, the city-wide Economic Development Element addresses both concerns and provided several recommendations.</p> <p>PA 9: The timing of when developments occur is largely based on the private market; the draft Plan merely lays the foundation to allow different types of development to occur when feasible. Regarding the BRT project, the city is involved in BRT planning with Montgomery County agencies and will continue to participate in this process.</p> <p>PA 17: On March 30, 2020, the Mayor and Council discussed the process for determining the future of the RedGate Park property. The Mayor and Council unanimously voted to retain the entire property as a park, with elements of both active and passive recreation, including natural open areas. City staff is currently working to kick-off a RedGate planning process before the end of the year, and community participation will be a primary focus of the process.</p>	<p>Staff agrees that zoning should guide development, and that it should be based on the vision and policies outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. Staff also agrees that, for some matters, a very long-time horizon, such as 100 years (or more) is appropriate. Examples include environmental preservation, historic preservation and parks. Other areas require a shorter time horizon to be meaningful, as factors on which the relevant policies are based can change dramatically. Examples include housing, economic development, and community facilities. In all these areas, and others, preferences, habits, market trends and, most importantly, values can evolve so rapidly that having a horizon of more than 20-30 years would not provide workable guidance for implementation.</p> <p>With respect to considerations of diversity, staff strongly agrees that encouraging and welcoming diversity is an important goal, as has been communicated by public participants in the process to develop the plan. Staff also agrees that the City needs to avoid any sort of red lining that excludes anyone based on race, as doing so would not be consistent either with the city's values or the law. In general, the law does not permit land use and zoning classifications to be based on race.</p> <p>PA 2 - [see staff recommendation in Exhibit 47]</p> <p>PA 8, Area 5, First Street Park: Retain the existing recommendation from the draft Plan.</p> <p>PA 8, Area 1, Viers Mill Corridor: Retain the existing recommendations from the draft Plan.</p> <p>PA 9: No change recommended.</p> <p>PA 17: No change is recommended. A separate planning process, incorporating community engagement, will be kicked-off toward the end of the year to discuss in detail the RedGate property.</p>	<p>PA 2 – Follow PC direction in Exhibit 47</p> <p>All others - Follow staff recommendation</p>
13	Christopher Ruhlen Lerch, Early, Brewer	X		<p>Due to increasing future housing demand, the city needs to address the housing shortfall--at a range of price points--by planning for more housing supply.</p> <p>Supports how the Rockville 2040 plan promotes housing access and diversification in the land use pattern and plans for land use changes from commercial to residential uses; commends staff for having the policies in Vol I and how they were used in Vol II.</p>	<p>Testimony is supportive of the current draft Plan. No edits or recommendations were discussed.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>	<p>Follow staff recommendation</p>

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
14	Randy Alton 2309 Glenmore Terrace, Rockville, MD		14	[This emailed testimony to Planning Commission and others reiterates Mr. Alton's oral testimony on Sept. 9 and previous written testimony (Exhibit 6)] Additional discussion includes a call for a Neighborhood Plan for Planning Area 14 (Rockshire & Fallsmead)	Staff does not believe that a Neighborhood Plan is necessary for Planning Area 14. Issues related to the Rockshire Village shopping center site and other topics within the planning area can be addressed through the Comprehensive Plan's Vol. II planning area recommendations. If issues emerge after Plan adoption, an amendment to this Plan can be pursued.	A new neighborhood plan for Planning Area 14 is not recommended at this time.	See PC direction in Exhibit 21
15	Tara Dutka 713 Shetland Street, Rockville, MD		8	Supports the proposed zoning changes in Twinbrook, particularly more mixed use buildings along Veirs Mill Road to give more flexibility and walkability to the Twinbrook neighborhood areas along Viers Mill Road and to take more advantage of transit. Recommends expanding the residential upzoning to more of the Twinbrook area, particularly along Baltimore Road and Twinbrook Parkway. Recommends creating safe pedestrian corridors linking Twinbrook neighborhoods across Viers Mill Road and linking to the Town Center; address unsafe conditions at Viers Mill Road and Twinbrook Parkway, possibly through a pedestrian bridge.	Regarding the testimony suggestion for the creation of safe pedestrian corridors linking Twinbrook neighborhood across Veirs Mill Road and to Town Center, staff believes that, without a specific project location, such policies are best addressed in the citywide Transportation Element. Instead of the suggested pedestrian bridge at Twinbrook Parkway and Veirs Mill Road. Staff believes that ensuring a safe at-grade crossing is the best option for the intersection. [see also staff comments in Written Testimony Exhibit 7]	No changes recommended. [see also staff recommendations to Written Testimony Exhibit 7]	Follow staff recommendation

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
16	Steven VanGrack Rockville Associates		1	<p>(a) Comments on the need for more moderate-income housing in Rockville Town Center; wants to encourage and enhance the transition of development in the RTC to where people live (presumably in the West End neighborhood).</p> <p>(b) Requests zoning change to allow 110 N. Washington St. to redevelop to residential instead of office.</p> <p>(c) Recommends following ULI recommendations for Town Center.</p> <p>(d) Recommends considering how pandemic will affect office space market and makes additional recommendations for RTC</p>	<p>(a) Staff agrees with the testimony that moderate-income housing is needed in Rockville Town Center, as well as other areas throughout the city. The city's current Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) program is one way the city secures a portion of new residential units as affordable to residents at price points lower than what would typically be offered at market rates. Additionally, allowing a range of residential development housing types in the city, as the Comprehensive Plan seeks to expand, creates a greater supply of housing at a range of price points for existing and future Rockville residents. Staff believes that the city's current affordable housing standards and the land uses allowed by the draft Plan and resulting future Zoning Ordinance updates adequately address the city's need for housing affordability as recommended by the testimony.</p> <p>With regard to encouraging and enhancing the transition of land uses between Rockville Town Center and adjacent areas, particularly the West End neighborhood, staff notes that, while the draft Plan recommends a change in zoning for property on the west side of North Washington Street within Planning Area 1 (Rockville Town Center) from MXNC to MXCD, the resulting increase in maximum building height from 45 feet to 75 feet is accompanied by a recommendation to require building heights to step down to 45 feet on the west side of those properties where they are adjacent to the transition to Planning Area 4 (West End). This recommendation is included in the draft Plan specifically to maintain appropriate transitions in building massing and compatibility between the two planning areas. [See the Zoning Recommendations of Focus Area A1 in Planning Area 1] Similarly, Planning Area 4 incorporates a transitional land use designation along its eastern border with Planning Area 1 that will allow lower building heights and less intensive land uses between the urbanized Planning Area 1 and detached single-unit residential neighborhood of Planning Area 4. For the reasons cited above, staff believes the draft Plan addresses this aspect of the testimony.</p> <p>(b) The Planning Areas draft includes a recommendation to change the zoning district and maximum height limit for properties on the west side of N. Washington St. (Focus Area A1 in Planning Area 1), including 110 N. Washington St. referred to in the testimony. The current zoning on the subject property is MXNC, which permits mixed-use development, including residential use, with a maximum height limit of 45 feet. The ULI study of Town Center noted that the 45-foot height limit may be one reason there has been no development for decades along these blocks and recommended that the heights of buildings facing N. Washington St. be permitted to match the height on the east side of the street, which is 75 feet under the MXCD zone, and then be scaled down towards the residential area to the west. The draft Plan recommends that the properties within Focus Area A1 be rezoned to MXCD, which would allow buildings heights up to 75 feet. The MXCD zone would also allow residential uses to be developed in the focus area, as requested by the testimony.</p> <p>(c) Staff does not recommend following all suggestions from the ULI report, however, most recommendations are incorporated into the draft Plan's PA 1 chapter. City staff developed several options with a consultant on "Road Diet" as recommended by the ULI for N. Washington St. and E Middle Ln. to make the streets more pedestrian oriented, and desirable for residential development. The Mayor and Council voted on a preferred street design at their October 5 meeting and recommended that the project be proposed as a CIP for FY22.</p> <p>(d) City staff and REDI continue to work to attract anchor tenants and increase the promotion and presence of arts and culture activities and uses that will complement and strengthen the office market in the future. The declining office market was an issue prior to the pandemic, and the plan promotes flexibility to address current and future market changes.</p>	No changes recommended.	Follow staff recommendation

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
17	Chas Hausheer (address)		2	<p>Supports the "RA zone" along Viers Mill Rd, near the intersection of First Street and South Stonestreet Ave, and at Park Road, but in more limited areas that proposed in the draft. Is opposed, in particular, to including RA in the entire referenced area between S. Stonestreet and Grandin Avenues (see provided map), preferring instead for it to apply only to the first lot fronting S. Stonestreet.</p> <p>States that any multi-family building must conform with the East Rockville Design Guidelines.</p>	<p>Staff supports having a conversation with the Planning Commission about the extent of the RA (Residential Attached) land use designation within Planning Area 2, particularly Focus Area A5 south of Reading Terrace, and Focus Area A12 near First St and Veirs Mill Rd.</p> <p>For Focus Area A5, the draft plan currently recommends the RA (Residential Attached) land use category between S. Stonestreet Ave to the west (across from the Rockville Metro Station), Grandin Avenue to the east, Park Road to the north, and Croydon Avenue to the south. A plan amendment was recently adopted including the area between Park Road and Reading Terrace and will be incorporated into this plan. For the other areas, south of Reading Terrace, if adopted as part of this draft Plan, the RA land use would allow the potential for a modest increase in housing in this transit-adjacent area, on the edges of the East Rockville neighborhood. The challenge with applying the RA designation to only one or a few properties deep, from (east of) S. Stonestreet Ave, is establishing a reasonable extent that would realistically allow potential redevelopment, and there is no street or other right-of-way that logically divides the properties between South Stonestreet Avenue and Grandin Avenue.</p> <p>Rather than changing the extent of the RA in the area subject to this testimony, other options include the following:</p> <p>* Adding text to the plan that would indicate that for the first 2-3 lots east of South Stonestreet Avenue, between Reading Terrace and Croydon Avenue, the zoning could be implemented either as part of a comprehensive Sectional Map Amendment or through a "floating" zone. The floating zone option would mean that property would not be rezoned to permit higher density, with the broader zoning changes to implement the plan. Instead, the plan, and zoning, would enable a property owner to apply for the zoning change prior to redevelopment, and a separate review process would be required.</p> <p>* Adding text that would limit the RA land use to only duplexes or triplexes in mid-block locations, and fourplexes on corner properties if the corner property met certain defined lot-size requirements.</p> <p>Focus Area A12 is situated at the northwest corner of the intersection of Veirs Mill Road and First Street, where a high-frequency transit station is planned along the Veirs Mill BRT corridor. While this proximity to the planned BRT station would recommend the allowance for more housing types, staff appreciates that the properties are also situated much more closely within the East Rockville neighborhood, especially for traffic access and adjacency to existing detached single-unit residential homes.</p> <p>Staff suggests that the portion of Focus Area A12 north of Mapleton Alley could reasonably be reverted to RD (Residential Detached), while retaining the RA designation in the portion south of Mapleton Alley and closest to the proposed BRT stop and busy intersection of Veirs Mill Road and First Street.</p> <p>[Staff comments and recommendations to testimony in Exhibit 47]</p> <p>The East Rockville Design Guidelines only apply to new single-unit residential dwellings in East Rockville or additions to existing single-unit homes. It has been proposed that residential zones consistent with the RA land use would incorporate design guidelines into those zones.</p>	<p>For Focus Area A5 with the RA designation east of South Stonestreet Ave and South of Reading Terrace, discuss adding language that provides more guidance about implementing the zoning classifications consistent with the RA land use.</p> <p>For Focus Area A12, revert the land use north of Mapleton Alley to RD (Residential Detached) and maintain the RA designation south of Mapleton Alley.</p>	See PC direction in Exhibit 47
18	Jacques Gelin 701 King Farm Blvd, Rockville, MD		4	<p>Urges adoption of the neighborhood plan for PA 4 (West End and Woodley Gardens East-West); explains that PA 4 is particularly fragile because it is located near major traffic arteries that invite institutions to locate in the area and institutions threaten the residential quality of the community. As PA 4 does not have an HOA, adoption of the plan will provide the necessary protection. (Lived in West End from 1968 through 2019.)</p>	<p>Staff supports the testimony to adopt the PA 4 plan.</p>	No changes recommended.	Follow staff recommendation

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
19	Jamie and Joe Parker 812 Grandin Ave, Rockville, MD		2	Comments that the draft Plan is "an impressive body of work" Requests that the "zoning" (actually land use designation) on Mapleton Alley to Grandin Avenue (Focus Area A12) remain Residential Detached, not RA, because Grandin Avenue is "a beautiful street full of mature trees and old homes" and residential redevelopment would alter the established residential character of Grandin Ave.	After further review of Focus Area 12 at the corner of 1st Street and Veirs Mill, staff supports assigning the Residential Detached (RD) designation north of Mapleton Alley to Grandin Avenue. Staff also recommends maintaining the RA (Residential Attached) designation for the properties south of Mapleton Alley. [See also staff comments to testimony in Exhibit 47]	Change the land use designation on the properties within Focus Area 12 of Planning Area 2, from RA to RD, north of Mapleton Alley. Retain the draft designation of RA for properties within the Focus Area that are south of Mapleton Alley. [See also staff recommendations to testimony in Exhibit 47]	See PC direction in Exhibit 47
20	Andrew Sellman 411 W. Montgomery Ave, Rockville, MD		4	States that West End/Woodley Gardens (PA 4) should remain overwhelmingly residential. Provides images of communities in Falls Church, VA, Towson, MD, and Bethesda showing former single-unit residential buildings located next to larger commercial and institutional buildings.	The PA 4 plan retains an overwhelming majority of the residential properties in the neighborhood as designated for primarily residential uses through the Residential Detached (RD) land use designation. The only exceptions are existing non-residential uses in the planning area and those on the eastern edge of the planning area. On that eastern edge, properties that are currently zoned for residential, office and retail (in the MXT zone) are recommended in the draft Plan to be further limited by removing the option for retail (except for the single block of S. Adams Street, between W. Montgomery Ave. and W. Jefferson St., which retains retail as a possible use). Properties in this new Residential Office (RO) designation would still be limited to the scale of a single-family home, consistent with the current MXT zone. As a result, this plan should not result in large by-right buildings emerging next to detached single-unit homes in PA 4, as shown by the photos in the testimony. Furthermore, the Zoning Ordinance will continue to require development adjacent or confronting (i.e., across a street) from attached or detached single-unit residential uses to limit their building height to the geometric plane measured 30-degrees from the nearest property boundary of the residential use (i.e., the layback slope). Concerns about the scale of buildings of institutional uses, which could occur from a Special Exception process, might usefully be addressed through a review of the current development standards discussed in the section on Special Exceptions in the Zoning Ordinance.	Retain existing plan language but seek a way to highlight or strengthen the 4th policy "bullet" (p. 46), which recommends reviewing existing development standards within the Special Exceptions section of the Zoning Ordinance.	See PC direction on Exhibit 41b
21	Robert Harris Lerch, Early, Brewer		14	States that, in the current retail market, Rockshire Shopping Center cannot support the type of retail uses desired by some in the Rockshire neighborhood and should be redeveloped for housing. Explains that previous studies and analysis by the city do not support the need for a major recreation use on the site, but suggests a landscaped community gathering space at Wootton Parkway and Hurley Avenue might be most appropriate. States that the owners of the site will continue to provide existing pool parking.	Staff accepts the premise that, because of increased nearby competition and the changing nature of retail, major or solely retail uses on that site is unlikely to be supportable by the market. The language as presented in the draft Plan attempts to strike a balance between the wants of the community and the market realities as outlined by the property owner. Staff suggests that the Planning Commission could consider changing the land use designation from RRM to RF, which would have the effect of reducing the reliance on retail as part of a residential development project. The RF is intended to allow small scale retail as part of a residential project, while the RRM relies more on retail as a main component of a mixed-use development.	Discuss changing the land use designation of Rockshire Village from RRM to RF. Retain the language to require retail and/or a community amenity use as part of any residential development. Staff is open to amendments to the term "substantial" amount of retail, but believes that the plan should retain the concept that any community amenity provided as part of residential redevelopment should be more than a small area of open space. A longer discussion is provided in the body of the Nov 18 staff report.	Remove "substantial amount" before retail. Retain "and/or" Add "neighborhood-serving" to retail statement Change LU of Rockshire Village to RF; mention "small-scale retail" in Focus Area, per RF definition. Add "for" before statement about parking these other functions. Make it read well. Change "community amenity" to "community gathering space"

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
22	Mike Stein Twinbrook Community Association		8	<p>(a) Interested in more transit-oriented development near Twinbrook Metro Station and Rockville Pike. Strongly supports the improvement of bus routes, stops, and shelters in Twinbrook, including BRT. Seeks greater frequency of bus routes through neighborhood. Stresses importance of increased bicycle and pedestrian safety.</p> <p>(b) Requests the addition of a city project to connect Lewis Avenue with Fishers Lane, as long as traffic calming measures, including speed cameras, are added to Lewis Ave</p> <p>(c) Requests investment in Rockcrest Community Center to serve as a location for community meetings, programs, and sports.</p> <p>(d) Requests historic signage for Twinbrook neighborhood.</p> <p>(e) Supports block on southside of Halpine Road that includes Cambridge Walk HOA to remain part of PA 8.</p> <p>Thanks staff for their willingness to meet and outreach throughout process.</p> <p>Supports residential/retail nodes in Focus Areas A2 and A3 as "responsive to the community's request to be a more walkable neighborhood".</p> <p>Supports Project 6 (ped. crossing of railroad tracks at Halpine Rd) as a top priority; Strongly supports a BRT station at Atlantic Avenue (Project 1), as well as the extension of Atlantic Ave. through to McAuliffe Dr, should the shopping center redevelop (Project 5)</p> <p>Does not take a position on the appropriate density and potential redevelopment of the Halpine Rd properties, but supportive of townhomes and 'missing middle' housing.</p>	<p>(a) While the city does not have purview over the frequency or schedule of bus routes in Twinbrook, or elsewhere in the city, it can advocate and coordinate with Montgomery County Ride On and WMATA Metrobus to seek greater access to bus services. Introduction of the Flash BRT on Veirs Mill Road may provide an opportunity to redesign the bus network serving the Twinbrook neighborhood. Furthermore, the city can pursue installation of more bus shelters, where appropriate and as space allows, in coordination with the county and WMATA.</p> <p>(b) The Planning Area draft includes a recommended city project to study the feasibility of a vehicular connection between Lewis Avenue and Fishers Lane (P3), but does not mention any dependent traffic calming measures, such as speed cameras, speed bumps, narrow travel lanes, intersection neck-downs, etc., to facilitate safe vehicle traffic on Lewis Avenue. Staff supports the addition of such measures related to the new vehicular connection.</p> <p>(c) The Planning Area draft provides for a review of the demand for program space at the Rockcrest Ballet Center but relies on a future CIP project to initiate it. Staff supports adding a statement to the draft project (P8) making a study of the potential for enhancements and/or expansion of the Center more of a priority.</p> <p>(d) Staff supports a recommendation for the city to develop a plan to add historic signage for the Twinbrook neighborhood.</p> <p>(e) Staff agrees that the properties on the south side of the 5900 block of Halpine Road should remain within Planning Area 8 (Twinbrook and Twinbrook Forest) instead of Planning Area 9 (Rockville Pike).</p>	<p>(a) Add a recommendation to Planning Area 8 for the city to coordinate with Montgomery County Ride On and WMATA to increase bus service frequency and expand the number of bus shelters in the Twinbrook neighborhood.</p> <p>(b) Include a reference in PA 8 to the need for traffic calming as part of consideration for a new vehicular connection between Lewis Avenue and Fishers Lane (P3).</p> <p>(c) Modify the proposed city project in PA 8 to study the need to enhance and/or expand the Rockcrest Ballet Center in the near term (P8).</p> <p>(d) Add a recommended city project in PA 8 to determine where new historic signage could be added to identify the Twinbrook neighborhood.</p> <p>(e) Revise the boundary between PA 8 and 9 to return the properties on the south side of the 5900 block of Halpine Road back to PA 8.</p>	Follow staff recommendations
23	James Policaro Lerner Corporation		15	<p>Testimony concerns the site at the southwest quadrant of West Gude Drive and Research Boulevard (1800 Research Blvd, or Parcel 37), that is currently proposed for multi-family development. They concur with proposed ORRM designation but do not agree with the requirement for retail (R) frontage designation due to stated 'weak' retail market, especially in this location, and the presence of a regional gas transmission pipe and easement running under a corner of the parcel.</p>	<p>Staff recognizes the challenges of developing the portion of the subject property at the southwest corner of the intersection of Research Blvd and W. Gude Drive. In light of the concerns raised by Mr. Policaro, staff revisited the use of the mapped Retail frontage designations on the Land Use Policy map and determined that they it would introduce unnecessary confusion to development review applicants, development review staff, and the public's expectations for where future retail might be located.</p> <p>Staff recommends removing the Retail frontage at that site; and recommends revisiting this concept at other similar sites throughout the city, which will be covered when viewing other planning areas. Staff will recommend that, instead of mapping the location of planned Retail frontage areas at key intersection 'nodes' in the city, descriptive text should instead be added to Focus Areas in each planning area where Retail frontage is currently proposed that describes the general location and character where commercial, amenitized, pedestrian-oriented, and visually appealing development is desired. In addition, the text could be written to require such frontage characteristics, "only where feasible."</p>	<p>Replace the mapped Retail (R) frontage at the subject property with descriptive text added that describes the general location and character where commercial, amenitized, pedestrian-oriented, and visually appealing development is desired.</p>	<p>Replace R (Retail) frontage in PA 15 with language in the Focus Area: "Orient the primary facades of buildings and front doors parallel to the street or to a public open space to frame the edges of streets, parks and open spaces, and to activate pedestrian areas. Establish building frontages to include ground-floor uses that attract customers or visitors, enhanced pedestrian areas and amenities, landscaping, and bicycle infrastructure."</p>

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
24	Jennifer Timmick 4 West Argyle Street, Rockville, MD		4	<p>Glad the current boundary puts her side of the street in PA 4, grateful to the work of staff in development of plan for PA 4</p> <p>Opposes expansion of large institutions in the planning area. 4th bullet of Institutional Uses policies (pg. 46) should define the standards that would accomplish these goals, not just "seek standards"; Supports PA 4 (resident) Committee recommendations: no more than one institution per block; no more than one acre in total area; and no further expansion of total land used for institutions.</p> <p>Recommends a statement in Vol. I stating that the policies and recommended actions for the individual Planning Areas can be found in Vol. II, Planning Areas and a statement that policies and recommendations of Vol II carry as much weight as Vol I.</p>	<p>Staff appreciates the kind words regarding the collaborative effort that resulted in the development of the PA 4 draft. Staff shares this appreciation of the community volunteers who helped to craft this planning area draft.</p> <p>Staff believes that the most appropriate place to define standards for institutional uses is in the Zoning Ordinance. The draft plan appropriately sets the vision, which the Zoning Ordinance would then implement.</p> <p>[See also staff responses to Exhibits 41b]</p> <p>Staff agrees with the recommendation that both Volumes reference each other in the manner suggested.</p>	<p>Add language as follows: * Add in Vol. I that the policies and recommended actions for individual planning areas can be found in Vol. II * Add in Vol. II that policies and recommendations in Vol. II carry the same policy weight as those in Vol. I</p> <p>[See also staff recommendations for written testimony Exhibit 41b]</p>	Follow staff recommendations
25	George Liechti 221 Halpine Walk Court, Rockville, MD		8	<p>Supports Cambridge Walk I & II HOA letters; agrees with HOA request to keep the properties on the south side of the 5900 block of Halpine Road in PA 8</p> <p>Expresses concern about development of 5906 Halpine Road (Twinbrook Community Church and Daycare Center) -- high density residential shouldn't be encouraged, it should be duplexes and townhomes.</p>	[see staff comments to written testimony Exhibit 11]	[see staff recommendations to written testimony Exhibit 11]	Follow staff recommendations
26	Brian Shipley 211 South Washington St, Rockville, MD		4	<p>Supports maintaining residential character of Planning Area 4 (West End and Woodley Gardens East-West).</p> <p>Requests supporting the additional policies that are in the draft PA 4 plan to limit institutional land uses, protect open space in historic districts, and limit free-standing accessory dwelling units per comments from others in PA 4</p>	<p>Staff supports adopting the draft PA 4 plan as written.</p> <p>[See also staff responses to Exhibits 41b-d]</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p> <p>[See also staff recommendations for Exhibits 41b-d]</p>	See PC direction on Exhibits 41a-f
27	Bob Youngentob EYA, LLC		14	<p>Testimony consists of slides shown during Sept. 9 public hearing concerning preference for residential townhome development at former Rockshire Shopping Center rather than retail.</p>	<p>Staff appreciates the concern that retail is no longer viable as it once was on this site and, based on the community process and significant study of the site, recommends that housing should be permitted on the site. However, staff believes that the plan would not be sufficiently responsive to community concerns unless it retains the concept that there should be a significant amenity that would be an asset to the broader community.</p>	<p>Staff recommends that the existing language in the document be retained, with the removal of the term "substantial" as a modifier of retail.</p>	See PC direction in Exhibit 21
28	Noreen Bryan and Patrick Woodward Co-Chairs, Planning Area 4 Committee		4	TESTIMONY INCORPORATED AS PART OF EXHIBIT 41a	[See staff responses to Exhibit 41a]	[See staff recommendations for Exhibit 41a]	See PC direction on Exhibit 41a
29	William Kominers Lerch, Early & Brewer		8	<p>Requests a specific zone for 5946 Halpine Road to implement the RF (Residential Flexible) land use category recommendation for the property. Owner has previously attempted to rezone the property and asserts that the current R-60 zone is out of context. During planning sessions for the Pike Plan, owner was told a decision would be made during Rockville 2040 process.</p> <p>Requests a zoning recommendation that allows townhomes or multi-unit residential apartments with the ability for ground floor retail. Believes that the available zoning classifications don't work for this property: MXNC requires too much setback adjacent to residential uses (Cambridge Walk THs) and RMD-15 requires a min. 1 acre lot size (subject property is approx. 0.5 acres) and does not allow ancillary retail.</p> <p>Testimony makes specific recommendations about setbacks, height, uses, parking and density for the subject property.</p>	<p>Staff believes that the property at 5946 Halpine Road is not conducive to medium- to high-density residential apartments, as requested by the testimony. While it is immediately adjacent to the Twinbrook Metro Station and is, therefore, transit-oriented, its small size (0.5 acres) and immediate adjacency to residential townhomes of approximately 35 feet in height make it better suited for smaller-scale residential or mixed-use development. The site is currently zoned R-60 (Single-Unit Detached Dwelling Residential) and occupied by a single-unit residential dwelling.</p> <p>Staff suggests that the RA (Residential Attached) land use designation is more appropriate than the RF designation because of the small property size, its less visible and accessible location, and its adjacency to the existing Cambridge Walk townhomes to the east and single-unit detached residential homes across Halpine Road to the north. The Plan should recommend a new infill residential zone that is consistent with the RA designation, like other RA areas in the draft Plan.</p>	<p>Change the land use designation of 5946 Halpine Road to the RA (Residential Attached) land use designation, create a new Focus Area for the property, and recommend the compatible zone to be created, like other RAs in the draft Plan.</p>	Follow staff recommendations

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
30	Terry Tretter Woodmont Station Center		9	<p>The access lane proposed on the west side of Rockville Pike won't work because the property at 1319-1321 Rockville Pike (Woodmont Station center) is shallow, similar to properties fronting the Pike on the east side that were exempted from the access lane due to their shallow depth. The right-of-way necessary to construct the access lane would impact existing parking areas in front of the stores.</p> <p>Requests that any plans for the development of the Rockville Pike frontage of Woodmont Country Club consider the effect on this property.</p>	<p>The access lane was adopted in the Rockville Pike Neighborhood Plan (2016), which the draft Comprehensive Plan would adopt by reference. Staff understands the concerns of the property owner but offers that no access roads have been built other than through redevelopment. As such, properties owners have been able to successfully build such access into their plans to ensure that there is sufficient parking for the new uses.</p> <p>Any development of the Rockville Pike frontage of the Woodmont Country Club would require a thorough analysis as part of the development review process, to include traffic and circulation review.</p>	No changes recommended.	Follow staff recommendations
31	William Kominers Lerch, Early & Brewer		12	<p>Land use recommendation of ORRM is consistent with the Concept Plan for Tower Oaks and the PD-TO zone.</p> <p>Requests ORRM for the development areas 4 & 3 (see letter exhibits). Currently, the draft Plan assigns the O (Office) to the northern and southern parcels of development area 4 (ORRM in the middle) and ORRM on development area 3.</p> <p>Testimony supports RF for development area 1 (see letter exhibits), Vol. II - Planning Areas, Focus Area 1 recommendation.</p> <p>Requests that Vol. II incorporate policy statements from Vol. I - Elements: Allow offices in isolated areas to convert to other uses * Simplify and shorten the process for amending an approved Planned Development * Support a reduction in minimum parking requirements for office use to support economic development and more efficient use of land</p> <p>Requests that new land use designations be used to provide suggested direction for the equivalent zones in a Planned Development (PD) overlay zone and that Vol. II promote voluntary evolution of PDs and serve as additional guidance for PD zones instead of more restrictive policy.</p>	<p>The properties in question are either undeveloped or currently developed as office uses, and the testimony has indicated that they could be successful as other uses in the future. The vision for Tower Oaks was developed in the 1980s, when the most robust market for office space and development was in suburban settings. The vision was endorsed at that time through the approval of both a neighborhood plan and a Comprehensive Planned Development (CPD). During the more than 30 years since, only pieces of the vision have been implemented; and none has been implemented in recent years as the demand for suburban office space has weakened greatly. Staff does not anticipate that this location will be in demand for office development in the foreseeable future. At the same time, however, the demand for housing is strong. Staff supports the change in designation of these properties from the O (Office) designation to ORRM (Office Residential Retail Mix).</p> <p>In order to avoid confusion and repetition, staff does not support copying language or policies that apply citywide from Vol. I into particular planning areas in Vol. II, especially when such policies are not directed at particular sites or properties.</p> <p>Staff understands that the Planning Commission is concerned with the conversion of approved office uses to residential uses in the Tower Oaks planned development area. However, staff believes that the testimony concerning direction for equivalent zones under the Tower Oaks PD has merit and believes that additional language would help in providing guidance for the future evolution of the area from the original concept.</p>	<p>Change the land use designation of the properties identified by the testimony as "development area 4", 2000 and 2600 Tower Oaks Blvd, from O to ORRM.</p> <p>Staff recommends the following language as direction for equivalent zones under the Tower Oaks Planned Development (PD):</p> <p>"If the Tower Oaks area continues to evolve away from the 1980s vision of a suburban highway-oriented office park with hotels, and more towards a residential district, care must be given to seek cohesion among the various projects. Open space, infrastructure and other community amenities and features should be incorporated into new projects, helping to serve the entire area as was envisioned with the CPD. Though the CPD remains in force as the zoning designation, adjustments may be made to the original plan that would be consistent with an equivalent zone of MXCD."</p>	<p>Change all O to ORRM in PA 12</p> <p>Do not add text from Elements about office conversion, PD amendments, or min. parking requirements.</p> <p>Add reference to 'natural features' in new text about equivalent zones in PA 12.</p>
32	William Kominers Lerch, Early & Brewer		8	<p>Generally supportive of RRM (Retail and Residential Mix) land use designation at Twinbrook Shopping Center (1920 and 2000 Veirs Mill Road). Questions frontage strips of R (Retail) designation as duplicative and unduly limiting</p> <p>Asserts that Vol II should not preclude or prevent incremental and ongoing upgrades in the shopping center. Provides specific language to be added to Planning Area 8 stating the conditions by which interim modifications can be made to shopping centers and other businesses without triggering the need to implement parts of the Comprehensive Plan that will apply in the event of property redevelopment.</p> <p>Requests that City Project 1 (in PA 8) state that a new BRT station should be designed and located so that it does not impair or impede functionality, parking, or ingress/egress of the site.</p> <p>Requests that City Project 5 (PA 8) shouldn't be considered unless and until the shopping center is proposed for complete redevelopment.</p>	<p>As with staff's recommendation for the R (Retail) frontage at other locations in the city, staff recommends that the mapped frontage area at Twinbrook Shopping Center be removed and replaced with language within its Focus Area that describes what character any redevelopment within its boundaries should follow.</p> <p>Staff does not support the testimony's request to add language to the draft Plan to define how interim modifications might be made to shopping centers without triggering the policies and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. Renovations, minor improvements, and site alterations are often made to properties throughout the city without triggering Comprehensive Plan recommendations for major improvements.</p> <p>Staff supports clarifying that the implementation of City Project 5 of Planning Area 8 (i.e., the study of an extension of Atlantic Avenue through the shopping center, from Veirs Mills Drive to McAuliffe Drive) applies only if the shopping center is proposed for complete redevelopment. The change in language should state that the street extension should not be required, but that the city may study potential alignments and improvements should the site be proposed for complete redevelopment.</p>	<p>Replace the R (Retail) frontage with descriptive language that reaches the same outcome, such as for new development to support neighborhood-scale, walkable destinations with building and site designs that contribute to an appealing and comfortable pedestrian-oriented street environment.</p> <p>Do not incorporate requested thresholds to delaying shopping center improvements, short of complete redevelopment.</p> <p>Include language in P1 of Planning Area 8 to consider the implications of potential transit improvements on the functionality of the site.</p>	Follow staff recommendations

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
33	William Kominers Lerch, Early & Brewer		1	<p>Supports the proposed ORRM and MXTD designations at 255 Rockville Pike and 41 Maryland Avenue due to its flexibility. The Comprehensive Plan should make a recommendation that promotes flexible and responsive use of 255 Rockville Pike, both interim/short-term and long-term.</p> <p>Agrees with ULI study calling to enhance the landing plaza at 255 Rockville Pike and to establish a proper form and use for the terrace and street front presence.</p> <p>Support Projects 2 & 3 on pg. 13 of the draft Plan.</p> <p>Embraces Project 6 on page 13 as one option for 41 Maryland Ave. for which parking waivers is an important consideration.</p> <p>City should work on simplifying the process for amending existing planned developments (PDs).</p>	<p>Regarding the flexible/interim use of 255 Rockville Pike - The testimony supports the draft Plan's designations for the properties at 255 Rockville Pike and 41 Maryland Avenue and the recommended city projects to expand and redesign the Rockville Station pedestrian bridge and Promenade Park, respectively. Staff does not support adding specific language in the Comprehensive Plan that recommends flexible or interim use of a particular property, such as 255 Rockville Pike. The property should either continue to be occupied and utilized its current form or be considered for redevelopment.</p> <p>Regarding process for amending existing PDs - Actions under Land Use Element (Vol. I), Policy 23 include recommendations to amend the zoning ordinance to create a Planned Development approval process and to simplify and shorten the process for amending an approved PD.</p>	No changes recommended.	Follow staff recommendation.
34	Francoise Carrier BBS&G Attorneys		16	<p>Lidl USA plans to file for mixed use project at 15931 Frederick Rd, consisting of a grocery store and 200-250 affordable apartment units.</p> <p>Requests that the RM (Residential Multi-Unit) designation be revised to one with which MXTD would remain consistent</p>	Staff supports this request. The land use designation of RM was assigned on the land use map, given the exclusively multi-unit residential development (Silverwood) that had been approved for the site. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission consider changing the land use designation to ORRM (Office Residential Retail Mix), which would expand options at this prominent location in the vicinity of the Shady Grove Metro Station. The land use ORRM is also more consistent with the existing zoning, MXTD (Mixed-Use Transit District), as requested by the testimony.	Staff recommends that the land use designation be changed from RM (Residential Medium Density) to ORRM (Office Residential Retail Mix).	Change RM to ORRM for this property and the one across King Farm Blvd.

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
35	Nina Albert Real Estate & Parking, WMATA		1,9,16	<p>PA 1 (Rockville Town Center) - Supports the designation of ORRM for the west side of the Rockville Station property. Requests a clarification that ORRM include life science industry uses.</p> <p>PA 9 (Rockville Pike) - One of the properties on the west side of Twinbrook Metro that is designated as P (Public Parks) is owned by WMATA and under consideration for a joint development project. They ask that, instead of Park, it be changed to ORRM (Office Residential Retail Mix). While WMATA values open space, they suggest it instead in front of station as part of redevelopment of the site and potentially as a linear park along the west side of Chapman Avenue. Also, testimony requests that Project P3 discusses the need for a park in the area without designating a specific site.</p> <p>PA 16 (King Farm) - Requests that Project P4 be revised to include an enhanced at-grade crossing in addition to any bridge or tunnel solutions.</p>	<p>PA 1 - From various pieces of testimony, including WMATA's, staff has concluded that it would be helpful to improve the definitions of some of the draft Plan's land use designations, especially related to the office and retail designations. The testimony's request to add "life science industry" to list of allowable land uses within the ORRM (Office Residential Retail Mix) land use designation is one example that has informed staff's conclusion, as have prior discussions regarding hotels and other uses.</p> <p>The purpose of revising the definitions would be to be clearer regarding the range of possible uses that can be accommodated within each category. For example, it could be made clearer that locations designated for "office" uses could accommodate a fairly wide range of employment activities that do not create industrial-type impacts (e.g., noise, odors), which should be located in industrial areas of the city. As such, "life sciences" activities would be allowable if they are compatible with a mixed-use environment where there are also residences, hotels, offices and other urban activities nearby.</p> <p>Though not directly related to this testimony, staff also recommends that the Planning Commission consider changing the term "retail" to "commercial." This change, along with a refined definition, would clarify that areas so designated could include stores selling merchandise, restaurants, and a wide variety of street-level office uses. It might even include "maker" spaces that would, as with the updated definition of "office", be compatible (in terms of impacts) with other uses in a mixed-use environment where there are residents.</p> <p>PA 9 (Rockville Pike) - Staff supports the testimony request to change how the park land use designation is indicated in the Comprehensive Plan for the location described near the Twinbrook Metro Station, as well as other properties not owned by the city or already established as city parkland. Staff's recommendation is to apply an appropriate land use designation that matches the existing or planned development on the site while placing a green asterisk in the general location where city parkland is desired.</p> <p>PA 9 (Rockville Pike) - In response to the testimony and consistent with staff's support to generalize the land use map designation of a future park in this location, staff recommends that City Project P3 either be removed from the draft Plan or its description should be amended to generalize its intended location.</p> <p>PA 16 (King Farm) - Staff supports this recommendation and recommends an adjustment in accordance with the testimony.</p>	<p>PA 1 – Direct staff to return to the next work session, during discussions of citywide issues, with proposed language to update the Office definition to be more expansive about the allowable uses; and with a change from Retail to Commercial, and an updated definition.</p> <p>PA 9 - Replace the Public Parks land use designation as described by the testimony with a mixed use designation that reflects the planned future development of the site and replace it with a green asterisk on the land use policy map, indicating a "potential future park" area; amend related language throughout the draft Plan to reflect this change.</p> <p>PA 9 - Add language to City Project P3 to generalize location; relocate the point to be less associated with a particular property</p> <p>PA 16 - Incorporate recommendation about at-grade crossing at King Farm Blvd.</p>	<p>PA 1 – Revise the office definitions for ORRM, O, and OR to include a wider range of employment-related uses, so long as they don't create industrial-type impacts (e.g., noise, odors, visual blight, etc.). Include mention of appropriate life sciences industry.</p> <p>PA 9 - PC generally supports staff recommendation for an asterisk to replace the P designation but looks forward to further discussion during PA 1 testimony. Follow staff recommendation for City Project P3.</p> <p>PA 16 - Follow staff recommendations</p>
36	John Rhoad RMJ Development Group, LLC		14	<p>Requests that no retail space be required in the redevelopment of Rockshire Village Center. Includes a letter from the retail consulting firm, Streetsense, reiterating their findings that retail is not a viable land use at the site due to surrounding competition, limited visibility and vehicle traffic from Wootton Parkway</p>	<p>See staff comments to Written Testimony Exhibit 21 and 49</p>	<p>See staff recommendations to Written Testimony Exhibit 21. In addition, a longer discussion is provided in the Nov 16 staff report.</p>	<p>See PC direction in Exhibit 21</p>
37	Edmund Morris Bickford Ave, Rockville, MD		1,4	<p>Supports efforts to improve walkability, pedestrian and cyclist friendliness and ease of navigation. Excited about creative and maker spaces. Supports mixed-use development above and adjacent to Metro stations. Advocates for benches, wider sidewalks and better shade.</p> <p>Asserts that future development should be assessed on environmental impact and how green space is open to the public and its character. Overall, the city has too many zoning designations that should be simplified. The Comp. Plan should support home-based businesses and retail. Parking requirements should be more flexible.</p>	<p>Staff agrees that environmental impact and green space is a concern. New development projects are required to consider these issues and this plan recommends new green spaces in these areas. After adoption of the Comprehensive Plan update, the City will address its zoning and ensuring that zoning districts are consistent with any changes in the plan. Parking is an issue and there are recommendations in the land use element of Vol. I to review current parking requirements. Further, certain mixed-use zones, depending on their location, are qualified to apply for a waiver to certain parking requirements. Home-based businesses are allowed by special exception in many areas and retail is allowed in mixed-use zones.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>	<p>Follow staff recommendation.</p>

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
38	Rachel Spellman 504 Bickford Avenue, Rockville, MD	X		The city needs affordable housing options that are actually affordable; more dense housing near transit; need rent control; shouldn't be planning for cars as the main focus; need more shade and seating at bus stops.	These comments are targeted to larger policy questions rather than specific areas within Planning Areas, which are the focus of these work sessions. In general, however, staff believes that most of the testimony is addressed as part of the city-wide policies in Vol. I of the draft plan. Various policies are devoted to housing affordability, transit-oriented development, walkability, ADA accessibility, and amenity spaces. Upon further review of the policies, additional language could be added to recommend greater ADA accessibility at transit stops and prioritizing high-use stations.	Consider additional language in Vol. I to address ADA accessibility at transit stops and identify high use stations for priority interventions.	Follow staff recommendation
39	Edmund Magner 115 Forest Ave, Rockville, MD		4	Need to maintain single family status and green space and opportunities for wildlife, no free standing ADUs which would potentially lead to demolition of the more affordable housing and diminish the uniqueness of the historic PA 4 neighborhood (i.e., leads to destruction of affordable housing that exists)	Staff agrees with the goal of retaining the nature, wildlife, tree canopy and overall beautiful feel of PA 4. However, staff also believes that there are examples of how ADUs, even freestanding ones, can support, rather than diminish, the neighborhood, especially if the ADUs remain subordinate to the primary structure with strictly controlled design standards in the zoning ordinance. ADUs, both as part of the primary structure and freestanding, have traditionally provided a more reasonably priced option for the person who lives in the unit, including sometimes a free option for family members. [See also staff responses to Exhibits 41c-d]	[See staff recommendations to Exhibits 41c-d]	See PC direction to Exhibits 41c-d
40	Alexandra Dace Denito Lincoln Park Civic Association		6	Thanks staff for their work. PA 6, Project 1: Stresses its priority to community. PA 6, Project 2: Is almost completed, and the Lincoln Park Civic Association (LPCA) is very happy with how it was done.	Staff appreciates the community's continued involvement in planning efforts in the neighborhood.	No changes recommended.	Follow staff recommendation
41a	Noreen Bryan Co-Chair, Planning Area 4 Committee 207 S. Washington Street, Rockville, MD		4	OPENING COMMENTS Thanks staff for their work and outlines three remaining issues that are unresolved: (1) large institutions, (2) preservation of the land surrounding historic structures, and (3) accessory dwelling units. Main focus is maintaining the residential nature of the (West End) neighborhood and limiting cut-through traffic. Institutions - current draft Plan does not limit the number, height, or size of institutional uses in relation to residential buildings. Requests a cap on the number and size. Preservation of Land Surrounding Historic Structures - seeks to preserve the current setting of historic districts; does not want high-rise buildings next to historic structures ADUs - does not support freestanding ADUs since it would permit two homes per lot instead of existing single-family dwellings	Staff shares Ms. Bryan's appreciation for the collaborative effort and the result it achieved in producing the draft neighborhood plan for PA 4. The testimony identifies three specific areas of concern and references testimony with specific policy recommendations in 41b-e. Staff provides responses there.	[See staff recommendations to Exhibits 41b-e]	See PC direction to Exhibits 41b-e

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
41b	Kevin Zaletsky 101 North Street, Rockville, MD		4	<p>INSTITUTIONS States that the Comprehensive Plan needs to prevent encroachment of institutions into Planning Area 4; areas abutting I-270 at West Montgomery Avenue and Falls Road are particularly at risk. Institutions/commercial uses disrupt single-family housing and bring traffic. Any existing institutions should remain neighborhood-serving. Requests that the Comp. Plan include proposed policies for institutions that limit their size and number.</p> <p>(The following text is proposed by written testimony Exhibit 41f for inclusion as an additional bullet on p. 47 under INSTITUTIONAL USES) To preserve the residential character of the neighborhood, limit the number and size of institutions allowed within Planning Area 4. Amend the zoning ordinance such that institutional developments in Planning Area 4, whether new or the expansion of existing institutions, are required to meet the following standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no more than one institution per block, where a block is defined as the portion of a street between one public street and another. A block includes both sides of the street. • Individual institutions must be contained on one block and are not allowed to be distributed over multiple blocks. • The land occupied by an institution is not allowed to occupy more than 3 recorded lots OR be more than 1 acre in area. If an existing institution exceeds these standards, it is not allowed to expand further. • To prevent overwhelming the neighborhood with too many institutions, no further expansion of land used for institutions is allowed. This does not preclude new institutions from being constructed on existing institutional property if the standards above are met or if existing institutional land is converted to residential uses. 	<p>Staff appreciates the goal of limiting the amount and size of non-residential uses in PA 4. For that reason, the fourth policy in the section on Institutional Uses (p. 46 of the Planning Areas draft) states that standards should be sought within the zoning ordinance to establish maximum acreage for large institutions and prevent aggregations.</p> <p>Staff is not in favor of a policy to establish a limit of one institution per block within PA 4, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Blocks are of widely varying sizes in PA 4. As such, there would be unequal treatment, and making consistent and rational decisions based on such metrics would be difficult. 2) A "block" is not defined in the Zoning Ordinance and is less of a clear concept than the popular conception (e.g., does a "cul de sac" constitute a block?). 3) Religious institutions, which are institutional uses, are permitted in all zones in Rockville and protected by federal law. Currently, under the Zoning Ordinance, construction of structures for religious institutions are required to receive a thorough site plan approval process. Staff supports retaining this process for religious institutions because it allows a case-by-case approach, which staff believes is protective of both the neighborhood and consistent with federal law. However, staff would support a review of relevant standards within the Zoning Ordinance. 4) The draft neighborhood plan for PA 4 includes properties where the land use designations are RO and ORRM. In both areas, staff does not believe that institutional uses should be excluded, subject to their meeting the development standards. 5) Staff believes that there may be ways to address this concern, but that it should be done in the Zoning Ordinance after approving the updated Comprehensive Plan. 	<p>Staff recommends maintaining the existing language in the draft Plan that calls for unspecified zoning standards that establish maximum acreage for institutional uses and prevent lot aggregation of residential lots for institutional uses. Specific standards should be considered as part of future updates to the zoning ordinance instead of within the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>The Planning Commission might consider adding policy language that encourages the height of institutional uses to be compatible with the height of surrounding uses, without specifying specific building heights.</p>	<p>Add more specificity to a preamble of the INSTITUTIONAL policies (p. 44), including language about the cumulative nature of the impacts of institutional uses and the goal to preserve the residential character of the neighborhood.</p> <p>Cite avoidance of cumulative impacts of institutions as guidance for zoning standards listed under 4th bullet of INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES (p. 44) and specify that new standards for institutional uses should be incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance as guidance to the Board of Appeals (via Special Exceptions) and the Planning Commission</p> <p>Change "seek" to "establish" as the lead-in of the 4th bullet of INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES (p. 44)</p>
41c	Patricia Woodward Co-Chair, Planning Area 4 Committee 111 N. Van Buren Street, Rockville, MD		4	<p>HISTORIC DISTRICTS Requests that the Comprehensive Plan includes a policy to preserve the settings and landscaping of properties with historic districts in Planning Area 4. Testimony provides proposed policies for historic districts.</p> <p>(The following text is proposed by written testimony Exhibit 41f for inclusion as an additional bullet on p. 56 under HISTORIC PRESERVATION POLICIES) In order to preserve the setting, grounds and landscaping of historic districts and to prevent overly large or numerous new structures therein:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An addition to the existing main historic structure is allowed only if it is subservient thereto. • New stand-alone structures, including but not limited to accessory buildings, are allowed only if they are subservient to the existing main historic structure. • New multi-family structures including townhouses are not allowed in historic districts. • Develop regulations that protect historic districts such that any new buildings therein are subservient to the historic main structure, provide protections that prevent the loss of the setting, landscaping and grounds and prevent the encroachment of buildings and uses that are inconsistent with the history of the district. 	<p>Staff does not support specific language in Planning Area 4 that would limit additions to existing historic structures or new stand-alone structures on properties with an existing historic structure. The Rockville Zoning Ordinance currently regulates building setbacks and heights, lot coverages, accessory structures, etc. and the Rockville Historic District Commission has purview over projects that alter structures or properties within a historic district. In staff's view, the Comprehensive Plan should not include policies that would contradict or overlap with the development standards of the Zoning Ordinance, nor the responsibility of the Historic District Commission to approve compatible development within the city's historic districts.</p> <p>Staff does not support prohibiting new multi-unit (i.e., apartments) or single-unit attached (i.e., townhouses) residential structures within historic districts in Planning Area 4 in areas that are already zoned to allow those uses. Most of Planning Area 4 properties within an historic district are zoned only for detached single-unit residential homes (e.g., R-60, R-90) and would not allow apartments or townhouses. A small number of properties within an historic district in Planning Area 4, located along the eastern boundary of the planning area with Planning Area 1 (Rockville Town Center), are zoned to allow for small-scale mixed use development through the MXT (Mixed Use Transition) zone, including multi-unit and single-unit attached residential uses. The draft Plan would continue these land uses through the land use designation for these properties of RO (Residential Office) and, in limited cases, ORRM (Office Residential Retail Mix).</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>	<p>On the 4th bullet of HISTORIC PRESERVATION POLICIES (p. 53), replace the first sentence language such as, "Preserve the historical setting, environment, and residential character of the surrounding neighborhood by ensuring that expansions or additions to historic structures are appropriate in mass, scale, parking location and design, and environmental setting to the main historic structure and surrounding neighborhood."</p> <p>Add to the 8th bullet of HISTORIC PRESERVATION POLICIES (p. 53): "Update design guidelines for the historic districts in coordination with the Rockville Historic District Commission and Rockville community</p> <p>Add to the 1st bullet of HISTORIC PRESERVATION POLICIES (p. 53) a mention that preserving landscapes or the environmental setting of historic properties should not include invasive or non-native species.</p>

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
41d	Margaret Magner 115 Forest Avenue, Rockville, MD		4	<p>ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (ADUs) Need to preserve single family neighborhoods in Planning Area 4 by placing standards on ADUs. Concern that there won't be backyards/natural habitats, that they incentivize teardowns and mansionization, and won't increase affordability. Prefers ADUs allowed as accessory apartments. Testimony provides proposed policies for ADUs.</p> <p>(The following text is proposed by written testimony Exhibit 41f for inclusion as additional bullets on p. 40 under HOUSING ISSUES- Single-unit Detached Residential Housing) In order to preserve the historic character of the neighborhood and limit the number of residential structures on a residential lot to one, the main residence, the following standards for accessory dwelling units apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An accessory apartment, in or attached to an existing residential structure, is allowed only if, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * there is adequate parking provided, and * the existence of the accessory apartment is not visible from the street, thereby preserving the appearance of a single-family residence. • Only one accessory apartment is allowed per lot. • Accessory dwelling units are not allowed in any structure that does not share a common wall with the main residence. This includes structures that are connected to the main residence by a breezeway or similar structures. • A process for reviewing applications for accessory apartments needs to be established that assures that the accessory apartment will not degrade the character of the neighborhood. It could follow the current Special Exception process or be an alternative approach that assures that there is the opportunity for neighbors to be aware and involved in review and approval. 	<p>The Mayor and Council are currently in a very active process of deliberating on the topic of ADUs, including receiving public input. As a result, staff does not recommend adding this specific language at this time. The Mayor and Council will have the opportunity to take their process into account during its deliberations on this draft Comprehensive Plan. However, staff agrees that ADUs should be held to certain development standards and consider siting and landscape settings.</p> <p>By definition, ADUs are subordinate structures to the primary homes. Staff supports assuring that this remains the case within the Zoning Ordinance, through enforceable design and size/massing standards. In many places in the country, ADUs have been compatible with maintaining the single-family character of a neighborhood while at the same time providing a modest option for additional housing. ADUs by themselves do not address affordability, but, as a part of a suite of housing options, they contribute to a diverse housing stock in the city, ultimately leading to more reasonably priced housing options.</p> <p>Staff suggests the Planning Commission consider adding guidance for site and landscape standards for ADUs in the Land Use Element, Policy 2, which would apply as citywide Zoning Ordinance standards. If the Commission supports this approach, staff could return with language at the next session, as it would apply citywide, including in PA 4.</p>	Add guidance in under Policy 2 of the Land Use Element (Vol. I) for the Zoning Ordinance to contain site and landscape standards for properties that include an ADU.	Add language to, or make sure language already exists in, the Land Use element that emphasizes that we should move quickly to zoning code amendments once the Comp Plan is adopted. (esp. call for new standards in PA 4) Add an action in the Land Use Element, Policy 2: "Establish development standards for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in the Zoning Ordinance, such as compatible architectural design, use of pervious surface materials, and retention of established tree canopy. Standards should be developed in consultation with the Rockville community and take into consideration the unique character of different neighborhoods." Note the survey from PA4.
41e	Patrick Woodward- Closing Remarks 111 N. Van Buren Street, Rockville, MD		4	<p>CLOSING COMMENTS Preserve and protect single family neighborhood, no ADUs- will lead to higher tax assessments</p>	Staff acknowledges that an ADU could lead to a higher tax assessment. However, this potential increase would be an evaluation that a property owner would make, balanced against the rent that could be collected. Installing an ADU would not be required by the Plan or the Zoning Ordinance; it would be an option for the property owner and would be made based on individual circumstances.	No changes recommended.	See PC direction to Exhibits 41b-e
41f	Planning Area 4 - Proposed Policies		4	PROPOSED POLICY CHANGES [See Exhibits 41b through 41d for language]	This exhibit is a summary of the points made in Exhibits 41b-e. Staff Responses are provided in those locations of this matrix.	[See staff recommendations for Exhibits 41b-e]	See PC direction to Exhibits 41b-e
42	John Bayles Twinbrook Community Church		8	Supports rezoning recommendation of Twinbrook Community Church property (5906 Halpine Road) to MXNC, church is planning to relocate and plans for a potential multi-family, mid-rise housing development	[see staff comments to written testimony Exhibit 11]	[see staff recommendations to written testimony Exhibit 11]	Follow staff recommendations
43	David C. DeMarco Pulte Home Company		8	Supports the RF land use designation and the MXNC zoning rather than RMD-15 because of its proximity to the Twinbrook Metro Station. Would like additional flexibility regarding design, proposing two mid-rise buildings with podium parking, targeting empty nesters, as well as additional flexibility regarding height and massing	[see staff comments to written testimony Exhibit 11]	[see staff recommendations to written testimony Exhibit 11]	Follow staff recommendations
44	Christine McGuirl Federal Realty Investment Trust		1	Supports the rezoning of 12 N. Washington Street from MXNC to MXCD. Recommends additional language allowing flexible application of the 'Road Code' to N. Washington Street to avoid Class 1 Business District Road standards, hoping to redevelop as multi-unit residential.	Rockville 2040 Vol II recommends rezoning from MXNC to MXCD on the West side of N. Washington St. (p. 10-12). No action needed. City staff worked with a transportation consultant to develop street-level improvements along N. Washington Street to make the street more conducive to a pedestrian and bike-friendly environment that is attractive and both business and resident-friendly. The results of the consultant study were presented to the Mayor and Council at their Oct 5 meeting and the preferred option was to redesign N Washington with one travel lane in each direction, buffered bike lanes on the northbound and southbound sides of the road, and a parking lane in the northbound direction. The parking lane and the northbound bike lane will be separated with a buffer zone. The project will be proposed as a CIP for FY22.	No changes recommended.	Follow staff recommendations

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
45	Christine McGuirl Federal Realty Investment Trust		9	Points out that a portion of the shopping center building and former FRIT office space at Congressional Plaza (1626 E. Jefferson St.) is split zoned between MXCT and MXCD. Requests that the retail building be recommended to be zoned MXCD and the multifamily buildings and surface parking remain MXCT, therefore moving the boundary between the zones slightly to the southwest.	The delineation of the boundary between MXCD and MXCT was not intended to create leasing or use issues for the existing office and retail building, but to establish development standards under the MXCT zone along its frontage with E. Jefferson Street. Staff supports a recommendation to realign the boundary between these two zones to eliminate the issue identified in the testimony.	Recommends a change in the boundary between the MXCD and MXCT zone at the location identified by the testimony in Planning Area 9. The recommendation could be added under Land Use & Urban Design heading of "Other Policy Recommendations."	Follow staff recommendations
46	Soo Lee-Cho Miller, Miller & Canby		1	Testimony objects to the P (Public Parks) land use designation of the property at 200-A and 200-B Monroe Street, continued from letter sent May 2019; states that the P (Public Parks) designation will devalue the property and would result in de-facto downzoning of the property. Asserts that the appropriate land use designation for site is ORRM	<p>This topic was discussed by the Planning Commission during the work session on the Land Use Element and preliminary work sessions of the Planning Areas draft prior to its release for public comment. During these discussions, staff had recommended consideration that the specific parcel not be designated as a park, but instead that the general area be designated as needing parkland and that the language be strong in requiring such provision of public space. The Planning Commission elected to retain the designation as currently in the draft in order to consider public testimony on the designation of the property as a Public Park in the draft Land Use Policy Map.</p> <p>Based on this testimony received for the assignment of the P (Public Parks) land use designation at the subject property, and the uncertainty regarding the exact location where a park might be situated, staff recommends a change in how the city's desire for a future public park be communicated. Instead of applying the Public Parks designation to the entire property, staff recommends that an asterisk be placed in the general location where future park space is desired and that a land use designation be added to the site. To be consistent with surrounding properties, staff recommends the ORRM land use designation.</p>	Replace the P (Public Parks) land use designation at 200-A and 200-B Monroe Street with ORRM and place a green asterisk indicating the general location where a Future Potential Park is desired.	Follow staff recommendation. Return to PC with proposed language for Potential Park asterisk, where to add cross-references, and how to add analysis and recommendations for new parks citywide in R&P Element

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
47	Deborah Landau East Rockville Civic Association		2	<p>Appreciates the City's work and responsiveness to previous comments.</p> <p>Supports RA (Residential Attached) land use designation in East Rockville, though not along the full block defined by Reading Terrace, Highland Avenue, Croydon Avenue (east of Rockville Metro Station) and at the corner of 1st Street and Veirs Mill Road. Instead, RA should reach down 2 or 3 lots from S. Stonestreet Avenue, but no further.</p> <p>Requests a statement in the Plan that the East Rockville Design Guidelines will apply to a zone that implements the RA designation.</p> <p>Requests change to Urban Design section of Focus Area 5, 4th bullet (p. 23) - "Mature trees and tree canopy [must, not should] be preserved."</p> <p>Requests change to Building Form section of Focus Area 5 (p. 23) - say "must" instead of "should" for proportionality of height, mass, and scale of new residential attached buildings with adjacent residential home. Change "should" to "must" for gradual transitions to adjacent lower-scale structures. Change "should" to "must" for avoiding large blank walls.</p>	<p>Staff supports having a conversation with the Planning Commission about the extent of the RA (Residential Attached) land use designation within Planning Area 2, particularly Focus Area A5 south of Reading Terrace, and Focus Area A12 near First St and Veirs Mill Rd.</p> <p>For Focus Area A5, the draft plan currently recommends the RA (Residential Attached) land use category between S. Stonestreet Ave to the west (across from the Rockville Metro Station), Grandin Avenue to the east, Park Road to the north, and Croydon Avenue to the south. A plan amendment was recently adopted including the area between Park Road and Reading Terrace and will be incorporated into this plan. For the other areas, south of Reading Terrace, if adopted as part of this draft Plan, the RA land use would allow the potential for a modest increase in housing in this transit-adjacent area, on the edges of the East Rockville neighborhood. The challenge with applying the RA designation to only one or a few properties deep, from (east of) S. Stonestreet Ave, is establishing a reasonable extent that would realistically allow potential redevelopment, and there is no street or other right-of-way that logically divides the properties between South Stonestreet Avenue and Grandin Avenue.</p> <p>Rather than changing the extent of the RA in the area subject to this testimony, other options include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Adding text to the plan that would indicate that for the first 2-3 lots east of South Stonestreet Avenue, between Reading Terrace and Croydon Avenue, the zoning could be implemented either as part of a comprehensive Sectional Map Amendment or through a "floating" zone. The floating zone option would mean that property would not be rezoned to permit higher density, with the broader zoning changes to implement the plan. Instead, the plan, and zoning, would enable a property owner to apply for the zoning change prior to redevelopment, and a separate review process would be required. * Adding text that would limit the RA land use to only duplexes or triplexes in mid-block locations, and fourplexes on corner properties if the corner property met certain defined lot-size requirements. <p>Focus Area A12 is situated at the northwest corner of the intersection of Veirs Mill Road and First Street, where a high-frequency transit station is planned along the Veirs Mill BRT corridor. While this proximity to the planned BRT station would recommend the allowance for more housing types, staff appreciates that the properties are also situated much more closely within the East Rockville neighborhood, especially for traffic access and adjacency to existing detached single-unit residential homes.</p> <p>Staff suggests that the portion of Focus Area A12 north of Mapleton Alley could reasonably be reverted to RD (Residential Detached), while retaining the RA designation in the portion south of Mapleton Alley and closest to the proposed BRT stop and busy intersection of Veirs Mill Road and First Street.</p> <p>Regarding the Design Guidelines - Staff notes that they currently only apply to detached residential homes. Staff is working on a new zone for infill development, specifically for duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes. This new zone will include design standards for those structures.</p> <p>[Staff comments and recommendation here are the same as to testimony in Exhibit 17]</p> <p>Regarding changing "should" to "must" - Staff does not support this change since the Comprehensive Plan is intended for policy guidance, while the Zoning Ordinance serves as the city's regulatory standards. Therefore, the draft Plan uses recommending language instead of strict standards and requirements as described by the Zoning Ordinance.</p>	<p>For Focus Area A5 with the RA designation east of South Stonestreet Ave and South of Reading Terrace, discuss adding language that provides more guidance about implementing the zoning classifications consistent with the RA land use.</p> <p>For Focus Area A12, revert the land use north of Mapleton Alley to RD (Residential Detached) and maintain the RA designation south of Mapleton Alley.</p> <p>[See also staff recommendations for testimony in Exhibit 47]</p> <p>Do not change "should" to "must" where requested by the testimony. The use of "should" is appropriate for master plan guidance and "must" is used for regulatory zoning standards.</p>	<p>Focus Area A5 – Apply RA only to first three (3) lots east of S. Stonestreet Ave. with remainder changed to RD. Return to PC with specific recommendations.</p> <p>Focus Area A12 - Revert the land use north of Mapleton Alley to RD (Residential Detached) and maintain the RA designation south of Mapleton Alley.</p>

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
48	Nancy Pickard Peerless Rockville	X	1,4, Land Use Element	<p>Appreciates staff work and engagement; appreciates inclusion of plans and goal for significant historic properties.</p> <p>Concerned about policies that focus on increasing residential density in areas where preserving the residential character of neighborhoods are a priority concern.</p> <p>Concerned about effects of allowing ADUs on every residential property in the city (i.e., Land Use Element policy 2.3), particularly, "when resident feedback strongly states a preference to preserve the existing character of their single family residential housing."</p> <p>Concerned with the encroachment of high-density buildings into single-family housing areas, including the expansion of institutions and mixed-use retail, especially in Planning Area 4 and the North Side of Washington Street in Rockville Town Center.</p> <p>Requests a land-usage map and data for Planning Area 4 in the final document, as it is included for the other areas.</p> <p>Request a new survey of Rockville's historic structures.</p>	<p>Increasing residential density and maintaining residential character: Both can be accomplished with a context sensitive approach to new development. The Zoning Code incorporates language to address transitions between existing single-unit residential dwellings and new development of different land use types. Rockville has also traditionally been very conscious about the preservation of its single-unit residential neighborhoods and any new adjacent development. In the current plan, where development of other land use types is proposed adjacent to existing single-unit residential dwellings, appropriate transitions in scale, height and massing are recommended. The Zoning Code reinforces those recommendations with specific standards and the city incorporates a robust review process by the Historic District Commission, Planning Commission, and Mayor and Council, as applicable. Staff does not recommend changes in response to this aspect of the testimony.</p> <p>Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and residential character: One of the benefits of ADUs is that they maintain the residential character of a neighborhood while adding the potential for a very modest amount of housing supply to an area. ADUs are typically either built into the interior of an existing structure or built separately in the backyard as a subordinate structure. Both are generally hidden from view from the front of the property. In addition to their subordinate nature, they can be designed to blend into existing architecture and natural settings. Staff does not recommend changes in response to this aspect of the testimony.</p> <p>Encroachment of high-density uses into single-family areas: The land use plan recommends modest transitions between single unit uses and any mixed-use areas. In addition, any properties that redevelop under a mixed-use zoning classification that are adjacent to a single-unit or townhouse residential use must apply the 30-degree layback slope building height standard, in addition to overall maximum height limits for the applicable zone. Staff does not recommend changes in response to this aspect of the testimony.</p> <p>Staff will include a land usage graph and data in the Planning Commission's final draft of Planning Area 4. Because it was written as a complete Neighborhood Plan, the 'quick reference' sections added to all other planning areas was left out of PA 4, but can easily be added.</p> <p>Staff supports a policy for the city to conduct an update to the city's survey of historic structures. Policy 2 of the Historic Preservation Element already includes actions to undergo such work.</p>	<p>Include a land use graph in the Planning Area 4 (West End and Woodley Gardens East-West) Neighborhood Plan.</p> <p>Add a policy for the city to conduct an updated survey of Rockville historic structures.</p> <p>No changes recommended for other issues discussed by the testimony.</p>	TBD
49	Bob Youngentob EYA, LLC		14	<p>EYA is the contract purchaser of the Rockshire Giant. Would like to redevelop the site as a residential townhome community; believe retail is not viable at this location. Redevelopment would include MPDUs and community space at Hurley and Wootton Parkway. Request a rezoning to facilitate site redevelopment.</p>	<p>Staff appreciates the concern that retail is no longer viable as it once was on this site and, based on the community process and significant study of the site, recommends that housing should be permitted on the site. However, staff believes that the plan would not be sufficiently responsive to community concerns unless it retains the concept that there should be a significant amenity that would be an asset to the broader community. See staff comments for Exhibit 21.</p>	<p>See staff recommendations to Written Testimony Exhibit 21. A longer discussion is provided in the staff report.</p>	See PC direction in Exhibit 21
50	Randy Alton 2309 Glenmore Terrace, Rockville, MD		14	<p>Recommends a review of the 2018 Eureka Study in addressing the need for a civic amenity in Rockville, west of I-270</p> <p>Requests that the Planning Commission review the 2019 Rhodesside and Hartwell Summary Report for Rockshire Village.</p> <p>Asks that the existing Rockshire PRU zoning remain; that the draft Plan define the word 'substantial retail' in its zoning recommendation for the site; and that all of raised issues be resolved before draft Plan is forwarded to the Mayor and Council.</p> <p>States that Planning Area 14 needs a new neighborhood plan and the draft Plan should recommend funding the Scott Drive sidewalk project, from Hurley to Greenplace Terrace.</p>	<p>See staff comments to Written Testimony Exhibit 6</p>	<p>See staff recommendations to Written Testimony Exhibit 6</p>	See PC direction in Exhibit 21

#	Testimony Source	General Comment	Planning Area(s)	Summary of Testimony	Staff Comments	Staff Recommendations	Planning Commission Direction
50a	Randy Alton 2309 Glenmore Terrace, Rockville, MD		14	Attachment to Exhibit 50: Eureka Community Interest Survey	See staff comments to Written Testimony Exhibit 6	See staff recommendations to Written Testimony Exhibit 6	See PC direction in Exhibit 21