

Testimony from the Planning Area 4 Neighborhood Con.....
2040 Comprehensive Master Plan
12 April 2021

Building Heights on the West Side of North Washington Street

Good evening Madam Mayor and Members of the Council. My name is Noreen Bryan and I live at 207 South Washington Street.

My testimony addresses the maximum height of buildings on the west side of North Washington Street. The West End neighborhood opposes increasing the maximum height from 45 feet to 75 feet. This position is based on a survey that was sent last week to more than 500 residents on the WECA listserv. We received responses from 96 people. Nearly three-quarters (74%) of respondents, an overwhelming majority, oppose increasing the maximum height to 75 feet.

At the same time, residents place great importance on the vitality of Town Center. It was the number one issue of importance from a survey of WECA Block Captains in January 2021.

These are not contradictory values. West End neighbors want to preserve the original vision of Town Center such that it is a pedestrian-friendly business and living area with a smooth transition into the residential homes and yards of the West End. In the 2016 survey, Planning Area 4 residents said that walkability was the second most important reason that they continue to live here. Town Center is a go-to location for walkers and families in our neighborhood.

In addition to the views of survey respondents, there are other factors to consider.

- Increasing the number of residents living near Town Center, as recommended by the Urban Institute, is questionable as a way to revitalize Town Center. Since its opening in 2006, many new housing units have been constructed in and around Town Center. When Duball 2 is occupied it will mark a threefold increase in units. Yet as the number of housing units has increased, more businesses have closed and the vitality of Town Center has declined, strongly suggesting that a lack of residents is not the root cause of Town Center's problems.

- Increasing the building heights will decrease the property values of West End residences and historic buildings near North Washington Street trading these losses into increased property values of owners who would build seven-story apartments.
- The oldest portions of Rockville are centered along Washington Street and Montgomery Avenue. It is here that Rockville began. In the 1960s and 1970s, following the nation-wide urban renewal trend, much of Rockville's historic center was razed. That was a great loss which shouldn't be repeated. A sense of place still exists because of the historic buildings that remain. These include the old Post Office, the historic houses along North Adams and South Washington Streets, the historic Black Jerusalem Mt. Pleasant United Methodist Church, the Hebron Print shop and the Beall Dawson house. These buildings, located on or just behind North Washington Street are remarkable and vulnerable. As a group, they preserve the scale and composition of what is left of early Rockville.

The PA 4 Neighborhood Committee and WECA request that you preserve the current maximum height of 45 feet for buildings on the west side of North Washington Street. This would be a great location for row houses that would compliment Rockville's historic buildings and the West End neighborhood while transitioning into the urbanity of Town Center. We want to work with you to help revitalize Town Center. Thank you for this opportunity to provide testimony.

Judy Penny

From: College Gardens <collegedgardenscivicassociation@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2021 3:16 PM
To: mayorcouncil
Cc: David Levy; Ken Hoffman; Mark Pierzchala; Chaula Butterworth; Fran Miller; Tom Miner
Subject: CGCA Membership Voted/Approved Comp Master Plan Recommendations
Attachments: CGCA_Comments_CMP_12MAY2021.pdf

Dear Rockville Mayor and Council,

Please review and modify the Rockville 2040 Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) based on the **attached** College Gardens Civic Association (CGCA) Memberships' 12 May 2021 voted on and approved recommendations (summarized below) and allow me to give testimony at the upcoming CMP meetings.

- 1. Change CMP's proposed Area Planning Area 5 and 7 boundaries (see more details below and suggested revised wording), in a manner that supports the creation of Planning Area 7 with a western boundary along Rutgers Ave (not Yale Place) and the property line between Scarborough Square, retaining Yale Village and Scarborough Square within Planning Area 5.**
- 2. Change CMP's proposed Area Planning Area 7 and 16 boundaries (see more details below and suggested revised wording), in a manner that creates a zoned designation of OCRM (Office Commercial Residential Mix) on both sides of the intersection West Gude Drive and Route 355. This would facilitate a potential environmentally and community-friendly state-of-the-art business/residential/transit corridor that would alleviate the traffic congestion across the four intersections from Mannakee Street through Gude Drive and enhance the quality of life for City residents and both College employees and students.**
- 3. CGCA strongly supports fully reopening the existing public pedestrian-bike walkway between Princeton Place and Montgomery College.**
- 4. CGCA appreciates there has been no mention of any plan to connect Gude Drive to Yale Place, and would strongly oppose any future plan for this connection. This would greatly increase the traffic hazards and noise in the College Gardens neighborhood and in front of the elementary school.**
- 5. DO NOT connect Gude Drive to 270 (see page 306), as this would greatly increase the traffic and noise on Gude and not be welcomed by any of the neighborhoods (King Farm, College Gardens, Woodley Gardens) that back to Gude.**
- 6. Any proposed changes to the current path structure of the Watts Branch Nature Preserve will be designed in consultation with College Gardens and Woodley Gardens neighborhoods.**
- 7. DO install a sound-wall that will decrease 270 traffic noise in the West End of the Woodley Gardens neighborhood.**

Respectfully submitted for your consideration,
John Mosely Hayes, CGCA President
Email: collegedardenscivicassociation@gmail.com

Dear Rockville Mayor and Council,

Please review and modify the Rockville 2040 Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) based on the College Gardens Civic Association (CGCA) Memberships' 12 May 2021 voted on and approved recommendations provided below and allow me to give testimony at the upcoming CMP meetings.

- 1. Change CMP's proposed Area Planning Area 5 and 7 boundaries (see more details below and suggested revised wording), in a manner that supports the creation of Planning Area 7 with a western boundary along Rutgers Ave (not Yale Place) and the property line between Scarborough Square, retaining Yale Village and Scarborough Square within Planning Area 5.**
- 2. Change CMP's proposed Area Planning Area 7 and 16 boundaries (see more details below and suggested revised wording), in a manner that creates a zoned designation of OCRM (Office Commercial Residential Mix) on both sides of the intersection West Gude Drive and Route 355. This would facilitate a potential environmentally and community-friendly state-of-the-art business/residential/transit corridor that would alleviate the traffic congestion across the four intersections from Mannakee Street through Gude Drive and enhance the quality of life for City residents and both College employees and students.**
- 3. CGCA strongly supports fully reopening the existing public pedestrian-bike walkway between Princeton Place and Montgomery College.**
- 4. CGCA appreciates there has been no mention of any plan to connect Gude Drive to Yale Place, and would strongly oppose any future plan for this connection. This would greatly increase the traffic hazards and noise in the College Gardens neighborhood and in front of the elementary school.**
- 5. DO NOT connect Gude Drive to 270 (see page 306), as this would greatly increase the traffic and noise on Gude and not be welcomed by**

any of the neighborhoods (King Farm, College Gardens, Woodley Gardens) that back to Gude.

- 6. Any proposed changes to the current path structure of the Watts Branch Nature Preserve will be designed in consultation with College Gardens and Woodley Gardens neighborhoods.**
- 7. DO install a sound-wall that will decrease 270 traffic noise in the West End of the Woodley Gardens neighborhood.**

Below is more background and input regarding changing language concerning the proposed CMP Area Planning Area 5, 7, and 16 boundaries:

Currently the draft CMP creates a new Planning Area 7 for the area around Montgomery Area that reaches from the northern boundary of Town Center, along Route 355, to its intersection with West Gude Drive. The western most boundary along Yale Ave, in planning area 5, would incorporate the rental units of Yale Village and Scarborough Square into Planning Area 7.

The creation of Planning Area 7 is innovative and visionary, demonstrating how well the City has taken input from City residents, College employees, and College students. Supportive comments will be provided in a separate document.

These comments are focused on Planning Area 5 as it would relate to Planning Area 7; intended to 1) provide Background, and 2) Recommend CMP changes that support the creation of Planning Area 7 with a western boundary along Rutgers Ave and the property line between Scarborough Square, retaining Yale Village and Scarborough Square within Planning Area 5.

Background: In the 1960s, Rockville experimented with a new zoning concept to promote the creation of entire neighborhoods. Planned Residential Units (PRUs) encouraged variation in types of housing, shopping facilities nearby residential neighborhoods, open park areas, and buried utilities. College Gardens (along with Woodley Gardens, Rockshire, and others nearby) was one of the early Planned Residential Units in Rockville. As a pre-planned community, potential buyers could find affordable entry-level to move-up housing within a middle-class income.

Since that time, this vision for College Gardens has not been lost. Since their construction, both Yale Village and Scarborough Square have been invaluable to the original zoning concept that increases the numbers of affordable housing units for a diversified population for whom purchasing a home might not be either desirable or affordable.

The draft 2040 CMP currently has this wording in Planning Area 5 Area Introduction and Characteristics, page 304.

Planning Area 5 comprises the residential neighborhoods of Woodley Gardens, College Gardens, Regents Square, and Plymouth Woods.

The planning area contains a mix of single-unit detached houses on fee simple lots and townhouses and apartments on parcels held in common by homeowners associations.

Figure 61 (page 304): Table documents 310 Attached and 272 Multi-unit Residential Dwelling Units that exclude Yale Village and Scarborough Square Dwelling Units.

The draft 2040 CMP currently has this wording regarding the boundaries of Planning area that would incorporate both Yale Village and Scarborough Square in Planning Area 7, page 320.

The plan establishes this new planning area on the west side of MD-355, from the north edge of Town Center to its intersection with West Gude Drive. The Rockville campus of Montgomery College is the largest and most active site in the planning area; also important are the headquarters of Montgomery County Public Schools, office and commercial developments, and the residential communities of Yale Village and Scarborough Square. Boundaries of the planning area are shown in detail on Figure 69.

Figure 68 (page 320): Table documents 331 Attached Residential Dwelling Units, that includes Yale Village, Scarborough Square.

Recommended CMP changes and wording to Planning Area 5, Introduction and Area Characteristics, Page 304.

“Planning Area 5 comprises the residential neighborhoods of Woodley Gardens, College Gardens, Regents Square, Plymouth Woods, Yale Village, and Scarborough Square.

Area Characteristics: The planning area contains a mix of single-unit detached houses on fee simple lots, townhouses, and apartments on parcels held in common by homeowners associations and by rental companies.

Change Figure 61 to add the total number of dwelling units in Yale Village and Scarborough Square with appropriate change in Land Use by Land Area.

Change Figure 62 (page 307) Land Use Policy Map of Planning Area 5 border to include both Yale Village and Scarborough Square, with border shifted from Yale Place to Rutgers Street and to run along the property line separating Scarborough Square from Montgomery College.”

Recommended CMP changes and wording to Planning Area 7, Introduction and Area Characteristics, Page 320.

“The plan establishes this new planning area on the west side of MD-355, from the north edge of Town Center to its intersection with West Gude Drive. The Rockville campus of Montgomery College is the largest and most active site in the planning area; also important are the headquarters of Montgomery County Public Schools, with three office and commercial developments zoned for Office, Commercial, and Residential Mix (OCRM). Boundaries of the planning area are shown in detail on Figure 69.

Change Figure 68 to subtract the total number of dwelling units in Yale Village and Scarborough Square with appropriate change in Land Use by Land Area.

Change Figure 69 (page 323) Land Use Policy Map of Planning Area 7 border to exclude both Yale Village and Scarborough Square, with border shifted from Yale Place to Rutgers Street, and to run along the property line separating Scarborough Square from Montgomery College.”

Rockville 2040 CMP Comments regarding Planning Area 7 Montgomery College area – perhaps to be branded “Collegetown District”

These comments provide background and recommendation to:

- 1) Change the boundary for Planning Area 7 and 16, and
- 2) Changes in wording supporting the boundary change recommendation.

- 1) **Currently the draft Rockville 2040 Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) creates a new Planning Area 7 for the area around Montgomery Area that reaches from the northern boundary of Town Center, along Route 355, to its intersection with West Gude Drive. The western most boundary along Yale Ave, in planning area 5, would incorporate the rental units of Yale Village and Scarborough Square into Planning Area 7, but excludes a logical land area currently zoned for Office, Commercial, and Residential Mix (OCRM) bordering on King Farm between Route 355 and West Gude Drive.**

A significant traffic problem is identified in Figure 10, page 62 “Traffic as Measured by Level of Service and Average Daily Vehicles within Rockville, with “E” intersections equaling 28,700 daily vehicles. Of 12 “E” and “F” intersections, four intersections are on Route 355 in front of the College, from Mannakee Street to Gude Drive. These numbers reflect traffic prior to the pandemic in 2020, before the College rapidly transitioned to on-line learning and closure of most Campus buildings for on-site learning, with very little utilization of Campus parking lots, with much less traffic on Route 355.

Both OCRM zoned areas bordering on Route 355 and Gude Drive have access ‘driveways’ that bypass the Route 355-Gude Drive intersection, leading into their parking lots. This already creates potential for a more robust connection to the Community Nodes envisioned throughout the Route 355 Corridor from King Farm through Town Center; an accessory road and path bypass to the “E” intersection of Route 355 and West Gude Drive.

Recommendations for Boundary Changes between Planning area 5 and 7 are submitted in comments specific to Planning Area 5.

Recommendation for boundary Changes between Planning Area 16 and 7: Change Figure 87 (page 375) Land Use Policy Map of Planning Area 16 border to place the OCRM zoned area between West Gude Drive and Route 355 within Planning Area 7.

- 2) **The creation of Planning Area 7 is innovative and visionary, demonstrating how well the City has taken input from City residents, College employees, and College students.** The draft CMP defines a potential Community Node at Montgomery College to be contiguous with existing Community Nodes that incorporate shopping areas north and south of the College. (Figure 6, page 38)

The introduction to planning area 7 includes the residential communities of Yale Village and Scarborough Square. (Page 320) Both have been part of the College Gardens Planning 5 area since their construction and have been important for individuals and families seeking to be part of planned community, with attendance at College Gardens elementary school. Of value has been

community proximity and access to Montgomery College, with many residents of all ages having been students or employees at the College.

Critical for Planning Area 7 is the zoning and concept of “Office Commercial Residential Mix” (OCRM).

OCRM is defined for Planning Area 16 Page 374: the Land Use designation of OCRM: “Land Use Policy Map: The land use designation of OCRM (Office Commercial Residential Mix) anticipates a gradual redevelopment of existing office developments in order to reinvent Piccard Drive as a place to live, work and play through improved walkability and neighborhood amenities.”

This is equally applicable to the Rockville Corporate Center at the corner of West Gude Drive and Route 355.

Recommendations:

Opening paragraph to read (Top page 320):

The plan establishes this new planning area on the west side of MD-355, from the north edge of Town Center across its intersection with West Gude Drive. The Rockville campus of Montgomery College is the largest and most active site in the planning area; also important are the headquarters of Montgomery County Public Schools, office, and commercial developments, currently zoned for OCRM (Office Commercial Residential Mix). This anticipates a gradual redevelopment of existing office developments, reinventing these areas as for affordable, environmentally state of the art housing, as place to live, work and play through improved walkability and neighborhood amenities. With potential to be a national model for a neighborhood built to be affordable within the lower income range earned by College students, certificate and degree graduates, and employees. Boundaries of the planning area are shown in detail on Figure 69.

Delete “Residential Use” paragraph (Page 321) and replace with:

The Rockville Corporate Center, at the northwest corner of MD-355 and West Gude Drive, includes two office buildings with a combined total of approximately 233,500 square feet. The

Center is isolated from the rest of the planning area, with vehicle access from West Gude Drive and MD-355.

Planning area 7 Page 321 has this paragraph that should be deleted (or parts placed back into Planning Area 5):

“Residential Uses The planning area includes two residential communities: the 210-unit Yale Village rental townhomes; and the 121-unit Scarborough Square rental townhomes and

apartments. Both communities are fairly self-contained within the planning area with limited integration with the larger neighborhood, yet their proximity to College Gardens Elementary School, College Gardens Park, and Montgomery College makes them good locations for young families and College students.”

Planning area 16 Page 373 has this paragraph that should be deleted from Planning Area 16 and moved to Planning Area 7

Finally, the Rockville Corporate Center, at the northwest corner of MD-355 and West Gude Drive, includes two office buildings with a combined total of approximately 233,500 square feet. The Center is isolated from the rest of the planning area, with vehicle access from West Gude Drive and north of the MD-355 intersection. This is across from a similar driveway connecting the OCRM office park south of the 355 intersection, leading into College Plaza.

Respectfully submitted for your consideration,

John Mosely Hayes, CGCA President

Email: collegedgardenscivicassociation@gmail.com

Judy Penny

From: Leo Wagner <leopw62@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2021 1:52 PM
To: mayorcouncil
Subject: Rockville 2040 Written Testimony

Esteemed Mayor and Council,

I did not think I would need to write an additional letter in support of frankly minor planned zoning changes to East Rockville, but given a recent East Rockville Civic Association email it seems I do. Contrary to what that email suggests, I *do* live in the neighborhood, and *do* support the proposed zoning changes. Once again, I would like to see these proposed upzonings extend even further into the neighborhood. Home teardowns are happening left and right in East Rockville, and while anti-displacement measures (like an extension of the city's mortgage/home improvement assistance program) are also needed to help keep existing residents in their homes, a surefire way to improve marginal affordability of new construction is to allow more than one unit to be built in the place of a torn down home, in the form of a duplex, townhouse, or three/four flat.

I cannot pretend to speak for all of East Rockville, but I do know that I am likely one of the only young people (I am a junior in college) to be writing in regards to this bill--and yes, I am from the neighborhood. Having worked as a Census enumerator throughout the summer of 2020 going door to door at about a hundred households throughout East Rockville and living here since 2015, I can say with complete certainty that the racial, socioeconomic, homeownership status, and age composition of ERCA is *far* from representative of the neighborhood. While I am so happy that my neighbors care about where they live, a potential influx of testimony from ERCA members coming in response to a dog whistle email decrying potential "apartments & high density in East Rockville" (the plan calls for up to four/six flats in these areas, far from high density) should not be taken to be representative of general neighborhood opinion. The neighborhood is already home to a significant percentage of renters, and the diversity this homeowner-renter mix brings is part of what gives the neighborhood its eclectic, quirky nature--that being said much of the potential missing middle addition, contrary to what some public testimony reflects, would come largely in the form of owner-occupied units (i.e. townhouses, duplexes, even three/four flats in many cases). Concerns over neighborhood character (itself a loaded term with a questionable history) seem to have taken precedence over the fact that East Rockville is steps from a key transit center and Rockville Town Center, and that more people should be able to enjoy this privilege. Having lived in a society which has banned missing middle for so long, it may be hard for some residents to envision how density can be added to a neighborhood in a way that does not consist of building six-seven story midrise apartments next to a single-family house. We are not living in 1975. The suburbs have *already* significantly diversified, it's time their built form does too to better reflect their current use. Let the Rockville 2040 plan be a document of the 21st century, reflecting local and regional trends and needs to best serve the diverse array of citizens that make the city great.

On an unrelated note, I would like to see the addition of more anti-displacement language, including for businesses. Steps should be taken to preserve the retail diversity at existing car-oriented shopping centers in the city's east (e.g. Twinbrook Center) and along Rockville Pike (e.g. Ritchie Plaza) as those areas redevelop and become more walkable. For example, working with developers to redevelop the parking lots that divide the retail buildings from the streets as mixed-use blocks, while preserving the original retail where possible to encourage lower rents and minimize displacement, particularly of small, immigrant-owned businesses. Many of these shopping centers, especially that at Atlantic/Veirs Mill, contain a retail diversity and mode share of access (i.e. lots of transit riders, bikers, walkers) that purpose-built "town centers" fail to achieve. Ensuring that as they are redeveloped to serve as better centers of the community, negative effects to existing retail diversity and usage patterns are minimized is essential. In the interim, the owners of these shopping centers need to take steps (ideally promoted by language in the Plan) to improve their walking, cycling, and transit infrastructure, even in their current car-oriented built form.

Once again, I urge adoption of the Rockville 2040 plan, with additional, more robust pro-transit, housing, and tenant language.

Sincerely,

Leo Wagner
104 Charles Street
Rockville, MD 20850

Judy Penny

From: jklima1936@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2021 7:15 PM
To: mayorcouncil
Subject: 2040 Plan

Dear Mayor and Council,

For many years the citizens of East Rockville have been working with city planning officials regarding development and population density in the East Rockville area.

The Stonestreet Plan and WMATA planning both include increased density in East Rockville. Those two planning processes are the appropriate places to address this, not the 2040 Plan.

Those of us who actually live in East Rockville spent years developing and fine-tuning our East Rockville Design Guidelines. Please don't override or undo all that effort by introducing apartments into our community through the 2040 Plan.

Respectfully yours

John Klima

jklima1936@aol.com

Judy Penny

From: Chas Hausheer <hausheerccs@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2021 9:24 PM
To: mayorcouncil
Subject: Comments of 2040 plan

RE: 2040 Plan

Dear Mayor and Council;

The residents of East Rockville spent **years** developing and fine-tuning the East Rockville Design Guidelines and the Stonestreet Plan. Please don't override or undo all that effort by introducing apartments or other high-density housing into our community through the 2040 Plan that does not comply with the wishes of the inhabitants of East Rockville as written into those plans.

Cordially,

Chas Hausheer
Vice President East Rockville Civic Association

Judy Penny

From: Jonathan Muller <jpmuller76@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 1:07 AM
To: mayorcouncil
Subject: The 2040 Comprehensive Plan

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I am writing to attest to the vital importance of the Tree Protection Area planned and planted by the Cambridge Walk II landscape committee over the last two decades at the boundary of their community and the property of the Twinbrook Community Church. Much more than a row of trees, it is an exemplar of growing calls to remake the landscape with diverse communities of native plants that help to restore vibrant populations of insect pollinators, birds, and other species that make up a healthy food web. To boot, the trees themselves also provide utility to human residents—offering attractive shading and screening to the surrounding area.

Stewardship of native trees is increasingly celebrated, and this Tree Protection Area shows what is possible in a landscape already dominated by manmade structures, streets, and parking lots. The thought and care put into site preparation and species selection has come to fruition over a generation. The abstract need for density of human settlement around the Twinbrook metro station (a laudable goal!) should not wipe out the valuable contribution to urban horticulture and environmentally-minded urbanism in evidence at Cambridge Walk II.

Let the City of Rockville's planning and permitting decisions reflect a deference to the forward-thinking hard work that has resulted in this Tree Protection Area. Let decisions be made that balance these trees' existing ecological value with the principle of density, a principle that would not be nearly so relevant without its downstream effects on environmental outcomes. Let the proposed redevelopment of the Twinbrook Community Church property accommodate what City residents of Cambridge Walk II have accomplished, a blueprint for ecological design that other Rockville residents, communities, and neighborhoods can look to for inspiration.

Sincerely,

Jonathan P. Muller
812 New Mark Esplanade
608.444.0323

Judy Penny

From: Michael Sparks <mespar1@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 2:22 PM
To: mayorcouncil
Cc: Wendy Sparks
Subject: 2040 Plan, reject high-density housing

Dear Mayor Newton and City Council,

We are writing to voice our opposition to the City allowing for yet more high density housing--including apartments--in East Rockville under its 2040 plan than is already included in the Stonestreet and WMATA plans. In particular, given the considerable time and effort already spent in preparing the East Rockville Design Guidelines, introducing apartments into this community via a 2040 plan "end run" is inappropriate. (It is also most likely the wishes of profit-seeking real estate developers who do not actually reside in East Rockville.)

We have owned and occupied our home in Rockdale for over 12 years. It is a charming community, and introducing additional high density housing beyond what has already been negotiated in other planning processes is inconsistent with preserving the character of our close-knit and mutually respectful neighborhood.

We would encourage you to instead consider repurposing various commercial real estate properties in Rockville for high density housing: after COVID, many such properties are unoccupied, and given the extent that businesses are embracing telework to save on operating expenses, these properties are likely to remain vacant for the foreseeable future. In any case, we would also like to mention that our neighborhoods' public schools are already straining their capacity, and the school expansion and building projects underway were developed to meet growth projections for Rockville's current housing composition.

We sincerely thank you for taking the time to consider our thoughts in this matter.

Respectfully,
Michael and Wendy Sparks
701 Mapleton Rd
Rockville, MD 20850

Judy Penny

From: janet mccool <mollyhuntm@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 3:34 PM
To: mayorcouncil
Subject: Apartments in East Rockville

Dear Mayor and Council:

It has come to our attention that the city is considering the addition of apartment buildings to East Rockville. As long-term residents of East Rockville and the Historic Neighborhood of Rockville Park, we are opposed to this plan. Rockville Park is a Nationally Designated Historic Neighborhood dating from the 19th century; the Glenview Civic Center is perhaps the premier historic public structure and park in our city; and Twinbrook is an established, iconic neighborhood of midcentury architecture. We feel that the addition of apartment buildings will change the appearance and nature of our area for the worse: it will add to density, and alter the physical landscape. Apartment dwellers also tend to be more transient and less invested in their neighborhoods.

As long-time residents of Rockville, we have been pleased that the Mayor and Council listen to the concerns of its citizens. In reviewing such proposals, please take into account that those promoting such projects may not be living in East Rockville or be motivated by profit rather than neighborhood pride. Nor should East Rockville be a dumping ground for needed housing that is not desirable elsewhere.

We ask you to consider alternatives to apartment buildings such as small additional dwelling units that will have less impact on neighborhoods and can be spread more equitably throughout the city.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Janet and Tom McCool
709 Grandin Ave.
Rockville MD

Judy Penny

From: Alice Sobsey <alicesobsey@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 5:31 PM
To: mayorcouncil
Subject: The 2040 Comprehensive Plan - Please preserve the Tree Protection Area (TPA)

Dear Rockville Mayor and Council,

We are residents of Rockville, Maryland have lived in the Gaerhardt's Addition to Twinbrook Forest for 23 years.

We love this community and want to spare the trees as much as possible.

We would like to preserve the Tree Protection Area (TPA).

Please let us know if you need any additional information from us.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Alice and Robert Sobsey
502 Marcia Lane
Rockville, MD 20851

301-294-7309

alicesobsey@yahoo.com

Judy Penny

From: joan garg <kjrgarg@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 7:50 PM
To: mayorcouncil
Subject: Apartments & high density in East Rockville in the 2040 plan

Hello Mayor Newton & city council members,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the city allowing yet more high density housing in east Rockville through the 2040 plan.

The Stonestreet Plan and WMATA planning both include increased density in East Rockville; those two planning processes are the appropriate place to address this, not the 2040 Plan.

Years have been spent developing and fine-tuning our East Rockville Design Guidelines, please don't override/undo all that effort by introducing apartments into our community through the 2040 Plan.

I have lived in East Rockville since 1984, at my current residence since 1986. This is a close knit community where we all know each other & look out for each other. Adding additional density to East Rockville from what has already been planned through the East Rockville Design Guidelines, Stonestreet Plan, & WMATA planning would destroy the character of this neighborhood.

In addition, considering the number of commercial properties that have been vacant due to the pandemic, & with telework becoming more & more prevalent, chances are more commercial buildings will be underutilized which could be converted to apartments & condominiums.

Sincerely
Joan Garg
Mapleton Rd
Rockville, md