

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
General Land Use						
1	Area-wide	Jobs-housing ratio imbalanced.	Proposed jobs-housing ratio 0.3:1. (pg. 21)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider a higher jobs-housing ratio. (Maryland Department of Transportation-MDOT) Bring more jobs to Glenmont. (M. McAteer) 	<p>Retain the target jobs-housing ratio. With the ongoing development of Wheaton as the next employment center along Georgia Avenue, Staff supports Plan’s vision of a predominately residential, mixed-use neighborhood and not an employment center. The Plan reflects County policy of channeling major commercial development into the Silver Spring and Wheaton CBDs. The Plan’s proposed CR Zones accommodate limited office uses with retail uses, including local professional offices in appropriate locations. Staff’s conclusion is also supported by the market analysis done for the Shopping Center properties. The market analysis did not foresee an office market over the life of the Plan.</p>	<p>Retain ratio. Replace “Proposed Sector Plan Buildout” with “<u>Projected</u> Sector Plan Buildout.” (03/14/13)</p>
2	Glenmont Core	The proposed growth in the Plan is too high and will cause traffic congestion and school capacity issues.	Total housing units would increase from 3,100 existing to 8,900. (pg. 19 and Table 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the increase in residential density. (Ossont, Shaw, Marville, Buchanan, Reglin, Eisenstadt, MDOT, Benjamin, T. Brown) Housing increase will overwhelm roads and schools. (Vergagni, Johnson, Saah) 	<p>Staff recommends retaining the proposed densities and the potential housing growth because it reflects the vision of a predominately residential, mixed-use community and location at a Metro Station. These densities are needed to support revitalization of the Shopping Center. In addition, the proposed buildout numbers were tested to ensure available capacity in the infrastructure including roads and schools, and were found to be within acceptable limits of a Metro station area.</p>	<p>Supports overall increase in residential density. (03/14/13)</p>
3	Glenmont Core	Redevelopment of multifamily properties will lose affordable housing in Glenmont.	Redevelopment at proposed densities will provide MPDUs to offset the loss of affordable units. (pg. 16-18)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Displacement of low to moderate income renters. (Johnson, Shaw, Stickle) Support Plan’s recommendations for affordable housing. (Berman) Current affordable units are not guaranteed, allowing redevelopment will create MPDUs. (T. Brown) Encouraging a higher percentage of MPDUs will significantly hinder redevelopment potential. Should not be a CR priority. (Wrenn) 	<p>Staff recommends retaining the proposed redevelopment of significant parcels in the core. Although there is significant number of market affordable housing units in Glenmont today, they are not “protected” and may be redeveloped or upgraded to higher rents or even converted to condos.</p> <p>Redevelopment of these multifamily properties will be required to provide a minimum of 12.5% MPDUs, which will replace a large portion of the existing market affordable units with MPDUs. The potential number of total MPDUs may be higher than 12.5 % since the Plan prioritizes Affordable Housing as a public benefit to encourage future redevelopment on these properties to provide up to 15% MPDUs for bonus density under the optional method.</p> <p>HOC is in the process of acquiring 199 apartment units in Woodberry and Westerly complexes abutting the Sector Plan</p>	<p>Supports the rezoning of the three multifamily properties, recognizing that the MPDUs provided with redevelopment at Projected Buildout will replace the existing market affordable units. (03/14/13)</p>

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
				boundary. Other multifamily properties in the immediate area outside the Plan boundary are assumed to remain and continue to provide their current stock of affordable housing.		
Property Specific Issues (Use, Zoning, Site Design)						
4	<p>Glenmont Shopping Center</p> <p>Current Zone: RMX-2C</p> <p>Site Area: 2 AC</p>	<p>How much FAR and height are needed to spur assemblage and redevelopment?</p>	<p>The Draft Plan recommends CR 2.0 C0.5 R1.75 H120.</p> <p>Maximum heights should be achieved in the interior of the property or near the intersection of Georgia Ave and Randolph Rd, and transition down to a maximum 45-foot building height along the Glenwaye Gardens community to the east. (pg. 22 and 23)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Max FAR should be 3.0. (T. Brown, Reglin, Buchanan). 2. More than 2.0 overall FAR could be a hurdle to redevelopment. (Gestl) 3. Provide more flexibility between commercial and residential uses. (Gestl, Buchanan) 4. Taller buildings should be placed away from Georgia Ave. (M. McAteer) 5. The maximum permitted 120-foot building height recommended on the Shopping Center property could cast shadows on the solar panels on the Glenwaye Garden roofs. (Vergagni) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff does not recommend additional FARs that we believe no one will build, which would raise additional concerns about increased traffic congestion and school capacity from the community. New development will be stick construction with structured parking, in line with the financial feasibility study commissioned by the Planning Department, which demonstrated that high-rise construction is not feasible in Glenmont in the foreseeable future. The study stated that, in the near future, even mid-rise stick construction may need to be subsidized. Currently, high-rise concrete construction, which can accommodate greater than 2 FAR densities, is not feasible in Glenmont without public subsidy. County Executive Staff has indicated that no funds or personnel can be devoted to any major intervention to encourage redevelopment in Glenmont in at least the next 10 years. 2. One of the developers working with the Shopping Center property owners testified that allowing additional, unbuildable FAR (above 2.0) could be become a hurdle to their efforts to assemble the Shopping Center properties because it would unduly raise property owners' expectation about the value of their property and therefore, hinder efforts to assemble and redevelop the Shopping Center. They support the overall 2.0 FAR recommended in the Draft Plan. 3. Staff recommends attaining the overall FAR max at 2.0 but modifying the C0.5 to C1.0 to allow flexibility to maximize residential or commercial floor area in later phases. 4. Staff recommends retaining the proposed maximum heights in the interior of the property or near the intersection of Georgia Ave and Randolph Rd. Confronting this site across Georgia Avenue is the Glenmont Greenway Urban Park. 5. The maximum 120-foot building height is recommended to be located away from the adjacent Glenwaye Gardens 	<p>Change proposed zoning to CR3.0 C1.0 R2.5 H120. Add language stating that the plan seeks to encourage assemblage of properties. Remove language recommending maximum height at the intersection of Georgia Avenue and Randolph Road and replace with language encouraging the greatest building heights in the interior of the site. (03/14/13)</p>

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
				<p>condo parcel. The Plan also recommends a transition height of 45-feet maximum along property line shared with Glenway Gardens. Buildings of this height will not be able to cast shadows on the roofs of the Glenway Garden buildings.</p>		
5	<p>Metro Station/ Layhill Triangle Block</p> <p>Current Zone: RMX-2C and R-90</p> <p>Site Area: 16.5 AC</p>	<p>How much redevelopment should occur on this block and what type?</p>	<p>CR 2.0 C0.25 R1.75 H120. (pg. 24 and 25)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase Commercial FAR similar to the Shopping Center; this site has better access to Metro than Shopping Center. (MDOT) 2. Taller buildings toward Glenallan. (M. McAteer) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retain commercial floor area recommended in the Plan. The Glenmont Shopping Center is envisioned as the town center for the area. The recommended FAR reflects the focus of non-residential development at the Shopping Center. This block is less suitable for a major commercial development node beyond 0.25 FAR. However, if parcels are developed under one Sketch Plan, CR Zone permits a “transfer” of Commercial density between parcels, which would provide enough floor area for a significant commercial component on this block. <p>The financial feasibility analysis suggested the lack of an office market in the foreseeable future. If office development is ever feasible, consideration should be given to the Shopping Center site first.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Retain height recommendation. Confronting this site across Georgia Avenue is the Glenmont Greenway Urban Park and the new WMATA Garage 82 feet tall. Maximum heights up to 120’ along Georgia Avenue are reasonable which will allow additional design flexibility for structured parking facilities, especially for Metro commuters. 	<p>Retain recommended density. Add language stating that “to ensure compatibility, taller buildings should be oriented toward Glenallan Avenue or across Georgia Avenue from the Metro garage and away from the confronting single-family houses across Georgia Avenue” (03/14/13)</p>
6	<p>Privacy World</p> <p>Current Zone: TS-R</p> <p>Site Area: 30.9 AC</p>	<p>The recommended zoning of CR 1.75 may create non-compliance issues for the Privacy Word property.</p>	<p>CR 1.75 C0.25 R1.75 H120. (pg. 25)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest CR 2.0 for consistency with approved development plan. (Roembke) 	<p>Staff concurs and recommends changing the proposed zone to CR2.0 C0.25 R2.0 H120.</p> <p>The approved Development Plan maximum residential floor area is 2.4 Million SF and maximum commercial floor area is 90,000 SF. This converts to R 1.79 and C 0.07.</p>	<p>Change proposed zone to CR2.0 C0.25 R2.0 H120. (03/14/13)</p>
7	<p>Winexburg Manor</p> <p>Current Zone: R-30, R-20</p>	<p>Split zoning of the property.</p>	<p>CR 1.75 C0.25 R1.5 H85. CRN 1.5 C0.25</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instead of split zoning, Plan should use CR zone and rely on compatibility finding during development review. (T. Brown, Wrenn) 	<p>Retain recommendation. CRN designation provides adjacent single-family property owners added protection from impacts of development while the density from the two zones can be averaged over the entire parcel providing flexibility in achieving the full permitted FAR.</p>	<p>Retain the split zones as proposed. Add language discouraging non-residential uses</p>

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
	Site Area: 33 AC		R1.5 H45. (pg. 26)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buffer zone is greatly appreciated. (Fracasso) 	Maximum building height at the adjoining property line must not exceed 35 feet in CRN zone versus 55 feet in CR zone and 45 feet in CRT zone. along the property line abutting the townhouse community to the north. (03/13/14)
8	Glenmont Forest Block Current Zone: R-30 Site Area: 32 AC	Split zoning of the property.	CR 1.75 C0.25 R1.5 H75. CRN 1.5 C0.25 R1.5 H45. (pg. 28)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instead of split zoning, Plan should use CR zone and rely on compatibility finding during development review. (T. Brown, Wrenn) 	Retain recommendation. CRN designation provides adjacent single-family property owners added protection from impacts of development while the density from the two zones can be averaged over the entire parcel providing flexibility in achieving the full permitted FAR. Maximum building height at the adjoining property line must not exceed 35 feet in CRN zone versus 55 feet in CR zone and 45 feet in CRT zone. Retain the split zones as proposed. Add language discouraging non-residential uses along the property line abutting the single-family neighborhood to the east. (03/14/13)
9	WMATA Triangle Current Zone: RT-12.5 Site Area: 2.5 AC	Future development of vacant area north of new Metro garage.	Retain existing RT-12.5; suitable for TS-R at 35 du/acre. (pg. 29) Site is suitable for public facilities that will enhance transit service. The Plan also encourages assemblage with privately owned public single-family parcels to develop multi-family housing. The site is appropriate for	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use another zoning approach than floating zone to avoid extensive rezoning process. (Berman) 2. The recommendation for senior/affordable housing is too vague and should be removed. (M. McAteer) 3. Consider site for a park. (L. McAteer) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retain recommendation. This portion of the site was originally slated for the relocated Fire Station 18. Although an alternate site was selected for the fire station, the County still has an option to purchase land. Staff anticipates the site will be under public ownership and used for public purpose. The Draft Plan gives first consideration to the development of transit-related infrastructure. Second consideration encourages assemblage with the privately owned single-family parcels for housing. Floating zone allows substantial opportunities for public input and discussion to ensure compatibility. Owners can elect to have the floating zone applied at Sector Plan SMA. Should the County not pursue the option to purchase, the recommendation as written gives WMATA added flexibility to develop their property to the east of Georgia Ave (e.g. by relocating the Kiss and Ride to the WMATA Triangle on the west side). It gives WMATA the option to shuffle transit infrastructure between its east and west properties to create the best redevelopment opportunity. Retain existing zone. Replace recommendation of TS-R with language finding the property suitable for a mixed-use floating zone with predominately residential uses. Remove recommendation for a specific density and allow it to be determined during the rezoning process. (3/14/13)

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
			senior or affordable housing units. (pg. 28)		<p>2. The recommendation provides an opportunity to provide housing less than 1000 feet from a Metro entrance. Designation of floating zone allows substantial opportunities for public input and discussion.</p> <p>3. The Glenmont Greenway Urban Park will continue along Georgia Ave to Denley Road. The Plan recommends acquisition of suitable sites within the neighborhood for additional park development.</p>	
10	Georgia Avenue West	Should the PD-15 floating zone from the 1997 Plan be retained?	Confirm R-60 Zone suitable for RT-15 and PD-15 for areas up to 2 acres. (pg. 29)	<p>No testimony; issue identified by staff.</p>	<p>Staff recommends removing the PD-15 floating zone recommendation and just recommending the RT-15 Zone. The 1997 Plan found this area appropriate for increased land use activity and recommended PD-15 Zone option to allow some office use on up to 2 acres.</p> <p>Parking requirements and trip generation for office is generally higher than residential uses. To that end, PD-15 was limited up to 2 acres to prevent major compatibility issues or traffic disruption.</p> <p>The Glenmont Core, which is east of Georgia Ave, should be the focus of any office development that would occur in the area. Unlike RT-15, no properties have applied for the PD-15 Zone. Staff believes the provision in the 1997 Plan for office uses was premature given the focus of commercial development on the east side of Georgia Avenue.</p>	<p>Remove PD-15 floating zone. Replace recommendation of RT-15 floating zone with language finding the area suitable for a townhouse-floating zone with approximately 15 du/ac. (03/14/13)</p>
11	First Assembly of God Church	Rezone for townhouse development.	Retain R-90 zone. (pg. 29)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suitable for RT 12.5 and RT 15. (Roembke) 	<p>Rezone approximately 6.8 acres on 7 properties to RT-15 Zone. The ownership pattern includes First Assembly (4.4 ac), PEPCO (0.2 ac), WMATA (0.43 ac.), private single-family lot (1.4 ac), private single-family lot (0.2 ac), private single-family lot (0.1 ac).</p> <p>These parcels are between two properties currently zoned RT 12.5. Townhouse development in this area would be compatible with the existing ones to the immediate north and west. Staff recommends rezoning the entire 6.4 acres for a consistent zoning pattern in this area.</p>	<p>Add language finding the area suitable for a townhouse-floating zone with a maximum density of 15 du/ac. (03/14/13)</p>

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
12	WMATA Maintenance Yard Property	Designate CR Zone for portion of the property between Privacy World and railyard.	Retain R-90. (pg. 31)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider the portion of WMATA railyard parcel between Privacy World and railyard for CR Zone. (Roembke) 	Staff recommends retaining the current R-90 Zone because this area is not suitable for intense development. It serves as a buffer between residential housing and the railyard.	Retain R-90 zone. (03/14/13)
Mobility Issues (Transit, Street Network, Pedestrians and Cyclists, and Parking)						
13	Area-wide	Sector Plan language supporting a BRT operation.	While BRT recommendations are subject to the ongoing update of the <i>Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan</i> , this Plan supports BRT operating in the peak direction only during peak periods and within the existing master planned right of way. (pg. 34)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove language pertaining to BRT operational issues. (Montgomery County Department of Transportation-MCDOT) BRT should occur in current ROW/Lane structure. (L. McAteer, M. McAteer) 	Delete operation language (pg. 34, third paragraph). Revise language to read, "this Plan supports BRT operating within the recommended Sector Plan right-of-way." Staff agrees that operational issues are beyond the scope of the Plan; however this issue has a direct effect on Sector Plan ROW which is within the scope of the Plan. The Plan should support, not recommend, alternatives that advance the Plan's goals.	Replace language with, "this Plan supports BRT operating within the <u>public</u> right-of-way."(03/14/13)
14	Glenallan Avenue extension	The extension of Glenallan Ave west beyond Georgia Ave. to Flack St was not continued from 1997 Plan.	This extension is not recommended in the Draft Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain/justify the deletion of Glenallan Ave from Georgia Ave to Flack St from the Sector Plan roadway system. (MCDOT) 	Do not recommend extension. This segment cannot be connected due to construction of the garage, stormwater management pond, and the forest conservation easement on site. The 1997 Plan also recognized the possibility of the road not connecting because of environmental concerns. (1997 Plan; pg. 53) The 1997 Plan anticipated a greater need for increasing local access alternatives in this area with the greater flexibility in zoning to allow development of the WMATA triangle parcel. That redevelopment potential has been significantly reduced due to the recent construction of	Add the language in Staff's response that explains the deletion to the Draft Plan. (03/14/13)

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
15	Denley Road extension (from Layhill Rd to Georgia Ave)	Denley Rd extended with Privacy World redevelopment as a master planned road was not continued from the 1997 Plan.	Recommends that the road proposed within the Privacy World redevelopment be private and not create a full intersection with Denley Rd at Georgia Avenue. (pg. 39)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain/justify the deletion of Denley Rd extended from Georgia Ave to Layhill Rd through Privacy World as a master planned roadway. (MCDOT) 	<p>the WMATA garage.</p> <p>Staff recommends no change. The 1997 Plan gave the option for this road to be private. (1997 Plan; pg. 32)</p> <p>The Draft Plan is recommending that this segment be private. Consequently, it should not be identified as a master planned road. Aligning it with Denley Road will not achieve anything because the median in Georgia Avenue precludes a full intersection at this location even if it was recommended.</p>	Continue 1997 Plan’s recommendation supporting its implementation as either a public or private road without identifying it as a master planned road. (03/14/13)
16	Layhill Road	Removal of the Layhill Rd bifurcation from the 1997 Plan.	Do not bifurcate Layhill Rd. Realign the section between Georgia Ave and Glenallan Ave to create a “T” intersection. (pg. 35-36)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain bifurcation. (Fisher, Shaw) Proposal does not fulfill stated Goals of the Plan or Meet the needs of stakeholders. Plan does not provide adequate justification for removing the bifurcation. Issues of cost and complication should be placed in the hands of the developer if and when the Shopping Center redevelops. (Shulman) Oppose bifurcation. (Benjamin, Vergagni) Support no bifurcation and a T-intersection for Layhill at Georgia Avenue. (L. McAteer, M. McAteer, Lee) Opposes T-intersection for Layhill Road at Georgia Avenue. (Benjamin) 	<p>Retain recommendation. The complications and cost of providing and operating the bifurcation outweigh the benefits. The bifurcation was trying to address: (a) Traffic Congestion along Georgia Ave, (b) Capacity constraints for future development, (c) Inadequate access into the Shopping Center, and (d) inefficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation. Bifurcation would require (a) modification of garage access along Layhill Rd., (b) traffic modification, (c) reduced stacking distance on northbound Georgia Ave (d) several properties must be acquired.</p> <p>The bifurcation design supported by the 1997 Plan does not provide access to the Shopping Center from southbound Layhill Rd. WMATA opposed 1997 recommendation citing difficulty of buses coming from southbound Layhill turning into the busbay. WMATA also noted that the complications of reconstructing access to the garage with the varying topography would be costly. This entry along Layhill Rd receives the most traffic in a.m. peak hours.</p> <p>Several properties must be acquired to effect the bifurcation in the 1997 Plan. In 1997 The WSSC water tower was being considered for relocation to an undefined site, potentially giving more room for the ROW of the realigned southbound Layhill Rd. WSSC has affirmed that there are no plans to relocate the water tower. \$1.5 Million restoration project</p>	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
				was recently completed in 2009.	
17	Layhill Road	Pedestrian crossing of Layhill Rd is difficult.	Investigate reduction in lane widths. (pg. 36)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose reduction. (Shaw, Benjamin, Vergagni) • Plan fails to meaningfully improve important pedestrian connection between Metro and Center. (Shulman) • Support reduction. (L. McAteer, M. McAteer) 	Retain recommendation. The Draft Plan calls for a study of lane reduction for better pedestrian access to and from Metro. SHA opposed an earlier recommendation to provide a mid-block pedestrian activated signal to facilitate for pedestrian crossings.
18	Shopping Center vehicular access	The redevelopment of the Shopping Center could benefit from a left turn from Southbound Layhill Rd into the Shopping Center.	The Plan supports improving vehicular access to the Shopping Center from all points to enhance its redevelopment potential. (pg. 36)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a left turn from Layhill Road into the Shopping Center. (Shaw, Fisher, Johnson, Shulman) • Access to the Shopping Center from all sides is critical to redevelopment (Reglin) 	<p>Staff can add stronger language to support improved access to the Shopping Center with the possibility of a new entrance from Layhill Road frontage into the Shopping Center.</p> <p>Detailed resolution of vehicular ingress/egress issues at the Shopping Center can be better addressed with development review of a proposed plan, since some of the operational issues can only be resolved through a detailed plan review, not in the Sector Plan development process.</p>
19	LOS Candidate site	The proposed bike path through the recommended Legacy Open Space parcels is not consistent with the goals of the Legacy program.	LB-2 is proposed through the LOS candidate site. (pg. 40-41)	No testimony; issue identified by staff.	<p>Retain recommendation for designation of the parcels as a Legacy Open Space Natural Resource Candidate Site and addition to Glenfield Local Park.</p> <p>Remove bikeway LB-2 from Acorn Hollow Lane and Layhill Road. Remove bikeway LB-16 on Acorn Hollow Lane. Change LB-9 from Lutes Drive to Layhill Road to a shared use path.</p> <p>This section of Briggs Road is narrow and lacks sidewalks. Staff supports better connectivity from the neighborhood north of Briggs Road as suggested by the community. The recommended change would extend the recently constructed path by the church at the corner of Briggs Road and Layhill Road. This might result in forest edge clearing to create the path, but would be the preferred alternative.</p>
Environment					
20	Glenmont Core	Encouraging a minimum of 25%	Redevelopment in the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove recommendation. To include this recommendation 	Retain recommendation. It is encouraged and not required.

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
	of tree canopy coverage could significantly hinder redevelopment.	commercial core should add to the tree canopy. Encourage a min of 25% tree canopy coverage on redevelopment projects. (pg. 43)	implies that Zoning Ordinance and Forest Conservation law are insufficient to deal with this issue. (Wrenn)		
Historic Preservation					
21	Glenmont Forest Should this property be designated for historic preservation, which may have impacts on its redevelopment potential?	Evaluate for designation in the Master Plan for Historic Preservation and addition to Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites. (pg. 48)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports designation in the Master Plan for Historic Preservation. (Gournay, Longstreth, French, Stickle) • Opposes designation to Master Plan for Historic Preservation. (T. Brown, Rotenstein, Miles) • Supports addition to Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites. (Miles) • Opposes addition to Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites. (T. Brown, Rotenstein) • Designation can inhibit redevelopment. (Saah, Gestl, Roembke) 	<p>HP Staff recommends designation in the Draft Sector Plan as a historic resource and addition to Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites for the interim. <i>(See Attachment 3, memo from HP Staff for full discussion.)</i></p> <p>Area 2 Planning staff believes that historic designation may hinder redevelopment of the parcel which is critical to adding density in the area to support mixed-use redevelopment of the Shopping Center.</p>	
22	Kensington Volunteer Fire Station 18 Should this fire station be designated as a historic resource?	Citizen nomination for evaluation for designation in the Master Plan for Historic Preservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports designation (Harris, French, M. McAteer, Miles) • Opposes designation because it will impact Georgia/Randolph interchange project. (Ossont, Reglin) • Designation can inhibit redevelopment. (Saah, Gestl, Roembke) 	<p>HP Staff does not recommend designation in the Draft Sector Plan as a historic resource and addition to Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites for the interim. <i>(See Attachment 3, memo from HP Staff for full discussion.)</i></p> <p>Area 2 Planning staff believes that the removal of the fire station is needed for the Georgia/Randolph interchange project. SHA has satisfied their requirement for the interchange project with the Maryland Historic Trust. They have deemed this property ineligible for designation to the</p>	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
			and addition to Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites.(pg. 48)		National Register. Planning Board approved the demolition of the building with the Mandatory Referral in December 2004. (<i>Letter from Maryland Historic Trust included in Attachment 3.</i>)
23	Montgomery County Police Station	Should this police station be designated as a historic resource?	Evaluate for designation in the Master Plan for Historic Preservation and addition to Locational Atlas. (pg. 47)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports designation. (Miles, French) • Opposes designation; It will impact interchange project. (Ossont, Reglin) • Designation can inhibit redevelopment. (Saah, Gestl, Roembke) 	<p>HP Staff recommends designation in the Draft Sector Plan as a historic resource and addition to Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites for the interim. (<i>See Attachment 3, memo from HP Staff for full discussion.</i>)</p> <p>Area 2 Planning staff believes that designation of the police station as a historic resource will not have any material impact on the revitalization of the area or the Shopping Center.</p>
24	Georgia Avenue Baptist Church	Should this property be designated as a historic resource?	Evaluate for designation in the Master Plan for Historic Preservation and addition to Locational Atlas. (pg. 47)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports designation. (Harris, Miles, French) • Opposes designation. (Shaw) • Designation can inhibit redevelopment. (Saah, Gestl, Roembke) 	<p>HP Staff recommends designation in the Draft Sector Plan as a historic resource and addition to Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites for the interim. (<i>See Attachment 3, memo from HP Staff for full discussion.</i>)</p> <p>Area 2 Planning staff believes that designating this property as a historic resource will not have a short-term impact on the revitalization of the area, but it may impact the long-term development options for the whole block.</p>
25	WSSC Water Tower	Should the water tower be designated as a historic resource?	Evaluate for designation in the Master Plan for Historic Preservation and addition to Locational Atlas. (pg. 47)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports designation. (Miles, French) • Opposes designation. (Reglin, Johnson) • There is no assurance that designation will not impair WSSC’s operation and maintenance of the facility. (Johnson) • Designation can inhibit redevelopment. (Saah, Gestl, Roembke) 	<p>HP Staff recommends designation in the Draft Sector Plan as a historic resource and addition to Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites for the interim. (<i>See Attachment 3, memo from HP Staff for full discussion.</i>)</p> <p>The tower is a community landmark and focal point. Area 2 Planning staff believes that designation of the water tower as a historic resource will not have any potential impact on the revitalization of the area, unless the Layhill Road bifurcation is recommended in the Sector Plan.</p>

