






Approved Glenmont Sector Plan, Montgomery County Planning Board Resolution of Adoption

-  Michael Brown, Planner Coordinator, Area 2 Planning Division, Michael.Brown@montgomeryplanning.org, 301.495.4566
-  Khalid Afzal, Master Planner Supervisor, Area 2 Planning Division, Khalid.Afzal@montgomeryplanning.org, 301.495.4650
-  Glenn Kreger, Chief, Area 2 Planning Division, Glenn.Kreger@montgomeryplanning.org, 301.495.4653

Completed: 11/14/13

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends Approval of the Resolution of Adoption for Transmission to the Full Commission.

Summary

Attached for your review and approval is the Montgomery County Planning Board Resolution Number 13-159 to adopt the Glenmont Sector Plan. The County Council, sitting as the District Council, approved the Glenmont Sector Plan by Resolution Number 17-932 on November 5, 2013.

Attachments:

1. Montgomery County Planning Board Draft Resolution MCPB 13-159
2. Montgomery County Council Resolution Number 17-932, Approval of Planning Board Draft Glenmont Sector Plan

MCPB NO. 13-159
M-NCPPC NO. XX-XX

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, by virtue of the Land Use Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, is authorized and empowered, from time to time, to make and adopt, amend, extend and add to the *General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District Within Montgomery and Prince George's Counties*; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Planning Board of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, pursuant to the procedures set forth in the Montgomery County Code, Chapter 33A, held a duly advertised public hearing on Thursday, February 14, 2013, on the Public Hearing Draft *Glenmont Sector Plan*, being also an amendment to the *General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District Within Montgomery and Prince George's Counties*, as amended; the *Master Plan for Historic Preservation*, as amended; the *Master Plan of Highways within Montgomery County*, as amended; the *Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan*, as amended; and the *Master Plan for Legacy Open Space*, as amended; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Planning Board, after said public hearing and due deliberation and consideration, on May 30, 2013, approved the Planning Board Draft *Glenmont Sector Plan*, recommended that it be approved by the District Council, and on June 6, 2013, forwarded it the County Executive for recommendations and analysis; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Executive reviewed and made recommendations on the Planning Board Draft *Glenmont Sector Plan* and forwarded those recommendations and analysis to the District Council on September 10, 2013, and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Council sitting as the District Council for the portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District lying within Montgomery County, held a public hearing on July 30, 2013, wherein testimony was received concerning the Planning Board Draft *Glenmont Sector Plan*; and

WHEREAS, the District Council, on November 5, 2013 approved the Planning Board Draft *Glenmont Sector Plan* subject to the modifications and revisions set forth in Resolution No. 17-932

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Montgomery County Planning Board and the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission do hereby adopt the said *Glenmont Sector*

Plan, together with the General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District Within Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, as amended; the Master Plan for Historic Preservation, as amended; the Master Plan of Highways within Montgomery County, as amended; the Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan, as amended; and the Master Plan for Legacy Open Space, as amended, and as approved by the District Council in the attached Resolution No. 17-932 and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of said Amendment must be certified by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and filed with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of each of Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, as required by law.

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Montgomery County Planning Board of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission at its regular meeting held on Thursday, November 21, 2013, in Silver Spring, Maryland on motion of Commissioner _____, seconded by Commissioner _____, with a vote of _ to _ , Commissioners _____, _____, _____, _____, _____, voting in favor of the motion.

Françoise M. Carrier, Chair

Montgomery County Planning Board

ATTACHMENT 2

Resolution No.: 17-932
Introduced: November 5, 2013
Adopted: November 5, 2013

**COUNTY COUNCIL FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND
SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PORTION
OF THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTON REGIONAL DISTRICT
WITHIN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND**

By: County Council

SUBJECT: Approval of Planning Board Draft Glenmont Sector Plan

1. On June 6, 2013, the Montgomery County Planning Board transmitted to the County Executive and the County Council the Planning Board Draft Glenmont Sector Plan.
2. The Planning Board Draft Glenmont Sector Plan amends the Approved and Adopted 1997 Sector Plan for the Glenmont Transit Impact Area and Vicinity, as amended. It also amends the General Plan (on Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, as amended; the Master Plan for Historic Preservation, as amended; the Master Plan of Highways within Montgomery County, as amended; the Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan, as amended; and the Master Plan for Legacy Open Space, as amended.
3. On September 10, 2013, the County Executive transmitted to the County Council his fiscal impact analysis for the Glenmont Sector Plan.
4. On July 30, 2013, the County Council held a public hearing regarding the Planning Board Draft Glenmont Sector Plan. The Plan was referred to the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee for review and recommendation.
5. On September 16, 17, and 30, 2013, the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee held worksessions to review the issues raised in connection with the Planning Board Draft Glenmont Sector Plan.
6. On October 15, 2013, the County Council reviewed the Planning Board Draft Glenmont Sector Plan and the recommendations of the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee.

Action

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland, sitting as the District Council for that portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery County, Maryland, approves the following resolution:

The Planning Board Draft Glenmont Sector Plan, dated May 2013, is approved with revisions. County Council revisions to the Planning Board Draft Glenmont Sector Plan are identified below. Deletions to the text of the Plan are indicated by [brackets], additions by underscoring. All page references are to the May 2013 Planning Board Draft Plan.

Throughout the Sector Plan, replace “Privacy World” with “Glenmont Metrocenter”.

Page 12: Delete the “Market Demand and Property Assemblage” section as follows:

[Market Demand and Property Assemblage

The Planning Department engaged a consultant to study the financial feasibility of mixed-use development with structured parking on the shopping center property based on the recommended zoning in the Staff Draft Sector Plan (see Appendix A).

The study tested the feasibility of a mid-rise (four to six stories, stick construction) project and assumed that rents for new development in Glenmont will be lower than in Wheaton since Glenmont is farther out and is not an employment or retail center. It concluded that market rents “are not high enough to cover land acquisition, development costs, structured parking cost and an adequate investor return.” The study further concluded that a 14 percent subsidy of the project’s development cost would be necessary to support adequate private investment, but the project would still be “severely hampered by the complexity of land acquisition.”

The study looked at whether 8- to 10-story concrete buildings would enhance private investor interest, but concluded that allowing high-rise development on the site would not resolve feasibility issues due to additional cost of high-rise construction (approximately 20 percent higher than stick-built) and the lack of a market for higher rents in the area.

The study also looked at the challenges of property assemblage for a comprehensive development of the shopping center, and stated that land assembly “occurs when there is a higher and better use for the land than what exists today.” Under the assumption that redevelopment made investment sense, the study explored alternative approaches to land assembly: market-driven, eminent domain, private land pooling, and public/private venture. The study concluded that a public/private venture approach is the only option that could work in Glenmont since a subsidy is required to make redevelopment financially feasible.]

Page 15: Revise the second paragraph as follows:

As part of the housing analysis for this Plan, the Planning Department examined the impact of redevelopment on existing affordable housing stock if the three existing multifamily garden apartment complexes were redeveloped [under this Plan's recommended zoning].

Page 16: Revise the bullets as follows:

- [Redevelopment of the three garden apartment complexes within the Plan area at full recommended densities will] If the Winexburg Manor and Glenmont Forest apartment complexes are rezoned at a future date and redeveloped at the densities suggested in this Plan, they, together with the Glenmont Metrocenter Development, could replace the current 1,459 units with a total of 4,681 units[,] (the four other properties outside the Plan area with 661 units were assumed to remain), bringing the post redevelopment total (including future rezonings) to 5,342 units for the study area.
- Rents in the new buildings [would] could increase from the existing range of \$945 to \$2,070 per month to a new range of \$1,180 to \$2,090 per month.
- Redevelopment of the three major residential properties, if rezoned, would [will] initially result in the loss of a total of 86 rent-restricted units (74 Housing Choice Voucher, and 12 Shelter Plus Care units), which is four percent of the existing 2,120 units in the study area.
- [The] Complete redevelopment [will] would eliminate 284 low to moderate-income, unrestricted market affordable units available to households at 65 percent of AMI. But these units will be replaced by approximately 585 MPDUs [units] (65 percent of AMI) because new development will be required to build a minimum of 12.5 percent MPDUs. The number of MPDUs could be higher if new developments achieve incentive densities through the CR Zone's public benefit provisions under the optional method development process.
- Redevelopment of [the] these three properties [will] would remove 1,089 workforce housing units (affordable to households earning between 65 percent and 100 percent of AMI), but they will be replaced by 4,096 new units affordable to this segment of the population.

Page 16: Revise the first sentence of the last paragraph as follows:

This Plan recognizes that redevelopment of the [three] two remaining garden apartment properties (Glenmont Metrocenter redevelopment is underway on the property formerly known as Privacy World) will have an impact on the area's housing affordability, but in the long term, it [is] may be desirable to provide flexibility to redevelop them at the Plan's recommended densities, since the resulting increased supply of housing will offset the loss of some affordable units in the short term.

Page 17: Add the following sentence at the end of the third paragraph:

The Plan allows the flexibility of redeveloping the two garden apartment complexes in the core if it is desirable to create additional multifamily housing near the Metro Station.

Page 17: Delete the third sentence and revise the last sentence of the last paragraph as follows:

The Plan's recommended densities and building heights are designed to maximize realistic redevelopment potential and encourage assemblage of properties. With the maximum overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of up to 3.0, most new development will consist of four to six-story stick construction with structured parking. [This is consistent with the 2012 consultant financial feasibility study for the Glenmont Shopping Center (see Appendix A).] The residential FAR of 1.5 to 2.0 is appropriate for this building type. The maximum residential FAR of 2.5 on the

Shopping Center property is meant to encourage one or two high-rise buildings in later phases of development. The proposed commercial FAR [of 0.25 to 1.0] allows for expansion of the existing retail options to accommodate the growing needs of future residents, but does not anticipate Glenmont as a major office market.

Page 19: Revise the first sentence of the second paragraph as follows:

Table [4] 2 below has the existing and proposed development estimates of both Sector Plans.

Page 19: Revise Table 2 as follows:

Land Use	Existing	1997 Sector Plan Buildout¹	Projected Sector Plan Buildout²	Projected Sector Plan Buildout with Local Map Amendments³
Non-Residential floor area (sf)	402,000	508,500	743,000	813,000
Housing Units	3,100	4,600	6,335	8,900
Jobs	873	1,278	2,180	2,350
Jobs-Housing ratio	0.3:1	0.3:1	0.3:1	0.3:1

1. 30-year estimate of development in the 1997 Sector Plan
2. Buildout excluding potential redevelopment of Glenmont Forest and Winexburg Apartments
3. Buildout including potential redevelopment of Glenmont Forest and Winexburg Apartments if the properties are rezoned in a future Local Map Amendment. Used to test the capacity of infrastructure including road network and school enrollment

Page 21: Amend the first sentence of the first paragraph and insert a sentence after it as follows:

This Plan recommends the CR Zones (Commercial-residential) for the Glenmont Shopping Center, the Metro Station/Layhill Triangle Block area, and one of the [three] multifamily parcels that can accommodate significantly higher densities. The Plan also indicates that the other two multifamily parcels may be appropriate for a future local map amendment to change the zoning to CR.

Page 21: Amend the fifth paragraph as follows:

This Plan recommends an increase in residential density to incentivize mixed-use redevelopment with ground floor retail and multifamily residential above. The current zone, RMX-2C, does not have any building height limit. Although the current or near-term market projections do not support [mid-rise (up to six stories) or] high-rise development in Glenmont, the proposed maximum height of 120 feet is designed to encourage, over the long term, a compact building footprint with [up to two] one or more buildings higher than six stories. These taller buildings should be placed in the property's interior.

Page 21: Add the following after the fifth paragraph:

Given the size and configuration of the properties, it is unlikely that redevelopment in excess of 0.5 FAR (Standard Method) could occur without some assemblage. In addition to the small sizes and narrow shapes of the lots, the fragmented ownership pattern and existing cross-property easements necessitate coordination among the property owners to take advantage of the higher densities allowed under Optional Method development. Any significant redevelopment under the proposed CR zoning would require assemblage of some of the parcels.

The Plan anticipates a phased redevelopment of the shopping center over a long period of time. It is likely to start with the assemblage and redevelopment of some of the properties, followed by redevelopment of the remaining properties over time to achieve the comprehensive, long-term vision of a walkable, mixed-use town center with a central open space and a diversity of uses and activities. While this Plan recognizes the need to accommodate some near-term development, the overarching goal of a comprehensive redevelopment of the entire site is the priority and must not be compromised through interim redevelopment of additional pad sites, or strip retail under the Standard Method. Any Optional Method development on the property must achieve the following objectives:

- Create an assemblage of properties large enough to accommodate a mixed-use development, in one or more phases, that contributes to the ultimate vision for the shopping center over the long term. (An exclusively residential development located where ground floor retail would be desirable would not be consistent with the Sector Plan vision for development on this property unless a sufficient amount of commercial redevelopment has already occurred.)
- Facilitate redevelopment of the remaining properties consistent with the long-term vision of the Plan.
- Reduce the amount of surface parking and create a pleasant walkable pedestrian environment.
- Create connectivity among individual parcels, through early phases of redevelopment that would be desirable in a comprehensive plan for the property.

Pages 21 and 24: Amend the last sentence of the last paragraph on page 21 and the first four paragraphs on page 24 as follows:

[Although it] It is desirable that there should be one centrally located public open space[.]. However, it is possible that, initially, a single, central open space would not be possible if the property is developed in phases [there could be more than one public open space]. Every effort should be made to create one large, central public space on this property, even if there are additional open spaces due to phased development of the property. This central open space can be public (owned by the M-NCPPC Department of Parks as a Civic Green Urban Park) or private, and the responsibility for owning, managing, operating and programming the space should be determined during the development review process.

This central open space can be achieved through a combination of various CR mechanisms. [First, a] A CR Zone optional method development is required to provide a minimum amount of Public Use Space[, not to exceed 10 percent of the total site] (5 to 10 percent of the total

site, depending upon the area of the redevelopment site and the number of right-of-way frontages).

[Second, the] The CR Zone permits a project to earn [provides] incentive density under the Optional Method, allowing the property to go above the maximum Standard Method density of 0.5, for providing various public benefits. One category of such public benefits is major public facilities such as parks, schools, recreation centers, and other public infrastructure amenities. An optional method development on this property could provide [an] additional open space above the minimum required Public Use Space as a major public facility under this provision to achieve incentive density. [Lastly, the] The CR Zone also allows incentive density for public open space above the minimum required Public Use Space as part of the Quality Building and Site Design [density criterion] public benefit category.

Page 23: Update Map 5: Proposed Zoning to reflect the zoning changes made by the County Council.

Page 24: Revise the first bullet as follows:

- Rezone the entire site from RMX-2C to CR 3.0, C [1.0] 2.5, R 2.5, H 120.

Page 24: Revise the fourth bullet as follows:

- Use a compact building footprint to allow for landscape buffers, larger setback areas, and courtyards that create a green development with opportunities to achieve greater tree canopy and [a balance of hard and soft landscape] green space.

Page 24: Revised the ninth bullet as follows:

- Minimize surface parking to the extent feasible through structured and shared parking facilities.

Page 25: Amend the second paragraph as follows:

This Plan recommends [the water tower and] the Georgia Avenue Baptist Church for historic designation. The Georgia Avenue Baptist Church (1956, 1962) is an outstanding example of mid-century modern church design. [The 200-foot tall water tower was identified by the community as an iconic structure and it could become an identifying feature of Glenmont] ([see] See Historic Resources section for details)[.]

Page 25: Revise the second sentence of the third paragraph as follows:

It could use some of the development potential on the adjoining Georgia Avenue Baptist Church property at the corner of Georgia Avenue and Glenallan Avenue through a combined optional method development process, even [if] though the church is designated historic.

Page 25: Revise the first bullet as follows:

- Rezone the block from R-90 and RMX-2C to CR 2.0, C [0.25] 0.5, R 1.75, H 120.

Page 26: Amend the first paragraph as follows:

This 30.9-acre site is zoned TS-R Zone (Transit Station-Residential), and improved with 352 garden apartments. There is an existing stream valley buffer and forest on the property. The property [is currently going through the] has received subdivision [process] approval to allow up to 1,550 residential units and up to 90,000 square feet of retail. [The] Formerly referred to as “Privacy World”, the 1997 Plan [referred to this property as “Glenmont Metrocenter” and] deemed [it] the area suitable [a] for maximum residential density of 51 units per acre.

Page 26: Modify the last sentence of the second paragraph as follows:

This Plan also continues to recommend an east-west road through the property [but removes its designation from] and designates it as a new internal road on the Master Plan of Highways to allow for its implementation as either a public or private road.

Page 27: Amend the first two paragraphs (which begin at the end of page 26) as follows:

The existing R-30 and R-20 Zones do not permit retail uses but allow residential redevelopment at up to 17.69 and 26.47 units per acre, respectively, which could produce as many as 751 units (before MPDU bonus). This Plan recommends retaining the existing zoning. This property may be suitable for future rezoning through a Local Map Amendment to the CR Zone to encourage mixed-use development of multifamily units in four- to six-story buildings with structured parking and allow a small amount of retail. [A maximum height of 85 feet is proposed to accommodate the current nine-story building on site. A] If considered appropriate for rezoning in the future, a transition zone of CRN [is recommended] would be appropriate as a buffer along the property line abutting townhouses to the north. Redevelopment should provide an east-west road through the property connecting Layhill and Randolph Roads parallel to Glenallan Avenue; maintain the current spatial relationship with taller structures in the interior of the site; restore and preserve the environmental buffer; and offer space for outdoor public recreation. Non-residential uses should not be located in the transition zone.

[Redevelopment should maintain the current spatial relationship, with taller structures in the interior of the site. In addition to the environmental buffer that should be restore and preserved, the redeveloped site should offer space for outdoor public recreation to provide healthy activate for all ages.]

Page 27: Revise the first bullet and insert a sentence after it as follows:

- [Rezone the] Retain existing R-30 and R-20 Zones. The property may be suitable for rezoning via Local Map Amendment [from R-30 and R-20] to CR 1.75, C 0.25, R 1.5, H 85 and CRN 1.5, C 0.25, R 1.5, H 45 or similar zones, with the CRN Zone creating a 100-foot wide buffer along the property line abutting the existing townhouse community to the north.

If future rezoning of this property is deemed desirable, it should achieve the following objectives:

Page 28: Amend the first sentence as follows:

The police station is the oldest police station built in the County [and is recommended for historic designation].

Page 28: Revise the first and second full paragraphs as follows:

Because of the [The] property's location, within easy walking distance of the Metro, its proximity to the Glenmont Shopping Center, its single ownership, and its size [make], it may be suitable for future rezoning through a Local Map Amendment to CR Zone or an equivalent zone to encourage a multifamily redevelopment of four- to six-story buildings. [The Plan recommends a 100 foot-wide strip of CRN zoning with a maximum building height of 45 feet along the eastern edge] A transition zone of CRN would be appropriate as a buffer between redevelopment and the adjacent single-family detached houses. Non-residential uses should not be located in the transition zone.

[Redevelopment] If rezoned in the future, redevelopment should use a compact building footprint and structured parking to emulate the existing open space character. In addition to the environmental buffer that should be restored and preserved, the redeveloped site should offer space for outdoor recreation to provide healthy activities for all ages.

Page 28: Revise the first bullet and insert a sentence after it as follows:

- [Rezone] Retain existing R-30 Zone for Glenmont Forest, the fire station, the police station, and the Catholic Charities properties. These properties may be suitable for rezoning via Local Map Amendment to [from R-30 to] CR 1.75, C 0.25, R 1.5, H 75 and CRN 1.5, C 0.25, R 1.5, H 45 or similar zones, with the CRN Zone creating [for] a 100-foot wide buffer along the entire eastern property line of [the area] Glenmont Forest Apartments abutting single-family houses.

If future rezoning of this property is deemed desirable, it should achieve the following objectives:

Page 29: Insert the following sentence after the last sentence of the third full paragraph:

Pedestrian and bicycle access from Flack Street to Georgia Avenue should be maintained. If frontage along Georgia Avenue is not needed for construction of a senior housing development, the Glenmont Greenway should be extended to Denley Road. If the WMATA Triangle portion is developed alone as an affordable senior housing project, it should provide adequate transition to single-family houses along Denley Road and Flack Street.

Page 29: Amend the fourth full paragraph as follows:

The Plan recommends [retaining the existing RT-12.5 zoning] rezoning the northern tip of the WMATA property to CRN Zone and retaining the existing R-60 zoning of eight single-family parcels with the option to apply [a mixed-use] CRN floating zone with [predominately] predominantly residential uses. The floating zone should provide the flexibility in building design to achieve compatibility with the surrounding properties.

Page 29: Amend the second and third bullets and insert a new bullet as follows:

- Confirm the RT-12.5 Zone for the southern portion of the WMATA Triangle property [with the northern portion suitable for a mixed-use zone with predominately residential uses].
- Rezone the northern tip of the WMATA Triangle property from RT-12.5 Zone to CRN 1.5, C 0.25, R 1.5, H 65.
- Confirm the R-60 Zone for single-family parcels along the south side of Denley Road between Flack Street and Georgia Avenue and along the north side of Flack Street between Denley Road and the WMATA Triangle, and designate them as suitable for [a mixed-use zone with predominately residential uses] CRN 1.5, C 0.25, R 1.5, H 65.

Page 33: Insert the following after the first bullet:

- Construct a third approach lane exclusively for right turns on Glenallan Avenue heading south into the intersection with Randolph Road.

Page 34: Revise the third sentence of the second paragraph as follows:

[It] Instead of bifurcation, it recommends a slight realignment of Layhill Road to create a T-intersection with Georgia Avenue at the current location, which could be accomplished with little or no dedication from existing properties.

Page 34: Revise the first, second, and third bullets as follows:

- [Do not bifurcate Layhill Road unless other solutions do not achieve the Sector Plan goals such as, but not limited to, the redevelopment of the Glenmont Shopping Center.]
- [With or without the Layhill Road bifurcation, reconfigure] Reconfigure the southern portion of Layhill Road to create a T-intersection with Georgia Avenue to eliminate the current free rights at the northbound and southbound lanes of Layhill Road while retaining the exclusive right turn lane for northbound Georgia Avenue to northbound Layhill Road.
- [Investigate reductions in] Reduce the number of through lanes on Layhill Road between Glenallan Avenue and Georgia Avenue from six lanes to four lanes.

Page 36: Revise the following lane in Table 3:

	From	To	Master Plan of Highways No.	Minimum ROW	Number of Through Travel Lanes	Design Standard
Layhill Road (MD 182)	Glenallan Avenue	Georgia Avenue (MD 97)	M-16	140	[6] <u>4</u> - Divided	Mod. 2008.01

Page 36: Insert the following in Table 3, below Arterials and above Primary Residential Streets:

<u>Business District Streets</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Master Plan of Highways No.</u>	<u>Minimum ROW</u>	<u>Number of Through Travel Lanes</u>	<u>Design Standard</u>
<u>New Road (Glenmont Shopping Center)*</u>	<u>Layhill Road</u>	<u>Randolph Road</u>	<u>B-1</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2005.02</u>
<u>New Road (Glenmont Shopping Center)*</u>	<u>Georgia Avenue</u>	<u>Randolph Road</u>	<u>B-2</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2005.02</u>

Page 36: Insert in Table 3, in the list of Primary Residential Streets:

	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Master Plan of Highways No.</u>	<u>Minimum ROW</u>	<u>Number of Through Travel Lanes</u>	<u>Design Standard</u>
<u>New Street (Metrocenter Drive)*</u>	<u>Georgia Avenue</u>	<u>Layhill Road</u>	<u>P-26</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2003.12</u>
<u>New Street (Winexburg Manor)*</u>	<u>Layhill Road</u>	<u>Randolph Road</u>	<u>P-27</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Mod. 2003.11</u>

Page 36: Insert at the bottom of Table 3 the following footnotes:

- New streets B-1, B-2, P-26, and P-27 may be constructed as private streets subject to use easements meeting the requirements described in the Plan text.
- The target speed for all master planned roadways in the Plan is 25 m.p.h., except for the following road segments, where the target speed is 35 m.p.h.: Georgia Avenue north of Denley Road, Layhill Road north of P-27, and Randolph Road east of P-27 and west of Judson Road.

Page 37: In Map 6, designate B-1 and B-2 as “Business” and P-26, P-27, P-28, and P-29 as “Residential.” Delete the tan dashed lines referring to the extensions of Erskine and Wallace Avenues. Delete “Proposed Local Streets” and its footnote from the legend.

Page 41: Revise the fourth bullet under “Increase Tree canopy cover by:” as follows:

- encouraging [a minimum of 25 percent] maximum extent possible of tree canopy coverage on redevelopment projects

Page 43: Revise the second sentence as follows:

It also encourages [the following] strategies and mechanisms to achieve further energy savings.

Page 43: Delete the six bullets and add a new bullet as follows:

- [Encourage new buildings to meet the appropriate American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) advanced energy design guide.]
- [Encourage renovated buildings to meet the appropriate ASHRAE advanced energy design guide.]
- [Channel sunlight for daylighting through proper building orientation and use of light shelves, baffles, clerestories, and skylights.]
- [Integrate geothermal systems and passive solar to reduce energy consumption.]
- [Use solar photovoltaic cells on both horizontal and vertical surfaces.]
- [Encourage wind energy conversion systems and large district energy systems.]
- Encourage new buildings to reduce energy consumption and/or incorporate alternative energy sources, where possible.

Page 45: Amend the first paragraph as follows:

In the Glenmont Sector Plan area there are no historic sites currently designated in the Master Plan for Historic Preservation. This Plan recommends [three sites] one site in the Plan area for designation in the Master Plan for Historic Preservation and addition to the Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites. [The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) concurs with the Planning Board in this recommendation.]

Page 45: Delete the following paragraphs:

[1. Wheaton-Glenmont Police Station, Fourth District (1959), 2300 Randolph Road

The Glenmont Police Station is the oldest police station building in Montgomery County. This was the first station built exclusively to house police facilities. The brick Georgian Revival style building, designed in 1958 by Bagley-Soulé & Associates architects, reflects a civic image which draws on the traditional architecture of colonial Maryland. The complex features traditional details including denticulated cornices, brick laid in American bond course, molded brick surrounds, and double hung sash windows. (Historic Resource #31-45)

Criteria: 1d, 2a.

Environmental setting: The setting is parcel P641, being 1.83 acres (Tax ID 13-00971702), excluding the 140-foot Master Plan Right of Way for Randolph Road. This designation recognizes that an approved road interchange project anticipates a new turn lane and reconfiguration of the parking lot within the environmental setting. The garage and adjacent storage shed are contributing resources. Outbuildings immediately adjacent to the station are non-contributing.]

Page 46: Delete the following paragraphs:

[3. Glenmont Water Tower (1947), 12413 Georgia Avenue

The Glenmont Water Tower is one of the oldest extant elevated water tanks in Montgomery County. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission bought the water tower site in 1942 and built the tower in 1947. The water tower facilitated the phenomenal postwar suburban development of the Glenmont area that occurred within a five-year period after completion of the water tower. Prominently located at the Georgia Avenue-Layhill Road intersection, the 189-foot tall Glenmont Water Tower is a large-capacity, multi-columned, elevated water tank with a 500,000-gallon capacity. Established in 1917, WSSC was the first planning agency in Montgomery County, having State-granted authority to plan highways and review subdivisions before the creation of M-NCPPC. Alterations to the Glenmont Water Tower include removal of central spiral stairs in 2009, and installation of an array of telecommunication antennas. Despite these changes, the resource continues to convey its historic character. (Historic Resource #31-47)

Criteria: 1a, 2e

Environmental Setting: The setting is parcel P352, being 0.64 acres (Tax ID 13-00983106). The setting does not include non-contributing sheds, nor does it include the 145-foot Master Plan Right of Way for Georgia Avenue.]

Page 47: Add the following bullet after the second bullet:

- Extend the Glenmont Greenway north to Denley Road if the Department of Housing and Community Affairs determines that this area is not needed for an affordable housing project.

Page 49: Revise the second sentence of the first paragraph under “Forested Parcels adjacent to Glenfield Local Park” as follows:

It consists of five parcels, including two County-owned parcels and others owned by WMATA, a Homeowners Association, and [a private landowner] M-NCPPC Department of Parks.

Page 51: Revise the last sentence of the first paragraph under “Recreation Facilities” as follows:

This facility was planned to serve a population of over [100,000] 30,000 in the Mid-County region that includes portions of the Kensington/Wheaton and Aspen Hill Planning Areas.

General

All illustrations and tables included in the Plan are to be revised to reflect District Council changes to the May 2013 Planning Board Draft Plan. The text and graphics are to be revised as necessary to achieve clarity and consistency, to update factual information, and to convey the actions of the District Council. All identifying references pertain to the Planning Board Draft.

This is a correct copy of Council action.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Linda M. Lauer".

Linda M. Lauer, Clerk of the Council