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Description
Request to make minor modifications to final locations of infrastructure and stormwater management facilities per permit review by county agencies and utility companies; increase the number of moderately priced dwelling units provided throughout the site plan area to 25 percent, including new MPDU locations in Area V; identify the conservation easement areas in Area VI to meet Phase 1 afforestation requirements; and make minor revisions to proposed landscape elements per updated architecture, permit review, and utility company requirements.

Location: Intersection of Montgomery Village Avenue and Stewartown Road, Montgomery Village.
Size: 147 acres.
Zone: TLD and CRN, within the Montgomery Village Overlay Zone.
Applicant: USL2MR Montgomery Village Business Trust LLC, c/o Monument Realty.
Application acceptance date: August 13, 2019.
Review Basis: Chapter 59, Zoning Ordinance.

Summary
- Staff recommends approval with conditions.
- Staff had accepted this application as a Minor Amendment, to be approved by the Director. However, Staff received community correspondence raising concerns about the number of MPDUs proposed for the property. Thus, Staff elevated the application to require Planning Board action.
- The proposed changes are minor in nature, meet all development standards, and do not modify the original conditions and/or findings of the approval.
- Increases to the amount of proposed MPDUs should typically be handled administratively.
SECTION 1: RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Staff recommends approval of Site Plan Amendment 82017013A, which does not alter any previous conditions of approval. All site development elements shown on the latest electronic version of Site Plan Amendment No. 82017013A submitted via ePlans as of the date of this staff report are required. All previously approved plans, findings, and conditions of approval remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 2: CONTEXT AND SITE DESCRIPTION

Vicinity

The Subject Property is surrounded by a variety of residential uses, including a mix of single-family detached houses, townhouses and condominiums, in various residential zones. Several shopping centers and an elementary, middle, and high school are also located in the vicinity (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Vicinity Map
**Existing Conditions**

The Property is approximately 147 acres and consists of five non-contiguous parcels. The Property is irregularly shaped and located roughly in the center of Montgomery Village, straddling Montgomery Village Avenue and extending generally north toward Arrowhead Road and west to Watkins Mill Road. A PEPCO/Exelon transmission line stretches across the Property on both sides of Montgomery Village Avenue (Figure 2). A portion of the Property, 26.7 acres, is in the Commercial Residential Neighborhood, CRN-0.5 C-0.0 R-0.5 H-65 Zone and the remaining 120.3 acres are in the Townhouse Low Density (TLD) Zone.

The Property contains a portion of the Cabin Branch Stream and 70.38 acres of stream buffer, large expanses of floodplain, and steep slopes that come down to meet the stream valley. It currently contains an abandoned golf course with associated fairways, cart paths, and irrigation ponds. Although most of the former golf course improvements remain in place, certain structures associated with the prior use (e.g. the clubhouse and maintenance buildings) have been removed.

The changes proposed in this amendment are contained to Areas IV, V and VI, highlighted in Figure 2. All three areas are on the eastern portion of the project, east of Montgomery Village Avenue, with Area IV north of the PEPCO right-of-way, Area V south of the PEPCO right-of-way and north of Stewarttown Road, and Area VI south of Stewarttown Road.

![Figure 2: Areas IV, V and VI, subject to this Amendment](image-url)
SECTION 3: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Previous Approvals

On November 16, 2017, the Planning Board concurrently approved Preliminary Plan No. 120170150 (Resolution MCPB 17-110) and Site Plan No. 820170130 (Resolution MCPB No. 17-111). The 147-acre site was approved for 494 lots (26 detached houses, 2 duplexes and 466 townhouses) as well as various stormwater management facilities, common open spaces, private roads and HOA parcels, and parcels for dedication to the Montgomery Village Foundation and potential dedication to M-NCPPC Parks. Sixty-eight of the 494 units were approved as MPDUs.

The applicant has filed sediment control permits with the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services for removal of various golf course elements. Record plat applications for Areas IV and V are under review by Park and Planning.

Proposal

The Applicant proposed to amend the prior Site Plan Under Section 59.7.3.4.J.2. Minor Amendment, of the Montgomery County Zoning Ordinance. This amendment to the approved Site Plan proposes the following:

- Minor infrastructure and stormwater modifications per permit review by County Agencies and Utility Companies in Areas IV and V.
- Identify the conservation easement areas in Area VI to meet Phase 1 (Areas IV and V) afforestation requirements.
- Make minor revisions to the proposed landscape elements per updated architecture, permit review, and utility company requirements in Areas IV and V.
- Increase the number of moderately priced dwelling units (“MPDUs”) to be provided to 25 percent in all areas. Twenty new MPDU locations are proposed in Area V. This amendment does not propose any new MPDUs in Area IV. In all other areas, tables have been updated to reflect the new minimum of 25% MPDUs.

While the applicant proposes to increase the provided number of MPDUs to 25% for the entire project, the new MPDU locations are subject to review and approval by Planning Staff and the Department of Housing and Community Affairs (DHCA) as part of subsequent Minor Amendments to be approved by the Planning Director.

Per the original conditions of approval, DHCA can amend their approval letter if the amended approval does not conflict with any other findings or conditions of approval. It is expected that DHCA will enforce the 25% MPDUs through a revised Agreement to Build with the applicant.

Stormwater management changes are contained to Areas IV and V. This application proposes slight changes to the placement and treatment of stormwater facilities. The Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services, Stormwater Management division issued their approval letter on October 9, 2017, and none of the stormwater changes proposed affect the validity of that concept approval.

The landscape changes included in this amendment are minor in nature, and limited to Areas IV and V. Tree locations and types, as well as the layout of sidewalks and home access points are slightly modified.
to accommodate utility and stormwater changes. The modified landscaping continues to provide a safe and pleasant streetscape.

Figure 3: New MPDU Locations in Area V

SECTION 4: COMMUNITY CORRESPONDENCE

The Applicant has met all noticing requirements for the Application. Since the submittal of this Site Plan Amendment, Staff received email correspondence from three residents (Attachment 2), who are concerned about the increase in MPDUs and the effect it will have on surrounding property values. This application was accepted as a Minor Amendment to be approved by the Planning Director. However, based on the correspondence received relevant to the increase in MPDUs, this item was deemed to require Planning Board approval, and thus, was placed on the Consent Agenda.
The Applicant made multiple efforts to notify and engage with the community about this Site Plan Amendment Application, particularly regarding the increase in MPDUs to 25%. These efforts included a community meeting held by a representative of the Applicant on October 16, 2018. The meeting was advertised in three different spaces in the print version of the Village News, as well as in Montgomery Village’s Vice President Report to the Montgomery Village Foundation. The meeting was attended by approximately 50 residents.

The Applicant’s presentation, which explicitly includes the intention of increasing the proportion of MPDUs to 25%, was included in the written materials provided at the Montgomery Village Board of Director’s meeting on October 18, 2018, where the proposal was discussed. This meeting, and the discussion of new MPDUs, was included in the Village News twice following the meeting, first summarized in the October 18, 2018 online version, and then in the November 2, 2018 print version of the Executive Vice President EVP Report. The applicant’s pre-submission outreach efforts are further documented in the memo attached (Attachment 3).

As outlined in the report, Staff has determined that the proposed development meets the standards of the TLD and CRN zones and adheres to the Montgomery Village Master Plan recommendations.

SECTION 5: SITE PLAN ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The proposed Site Plan Amendment slightly alters the findings of the previous approval as follows:

- **a. Satisfies any previous approval that applies to the site;**

  The Site Plan Amendment conforms to all binding elements of the previously approved Preliminary Plan 120170150 and Site Plan 820170130.

- **d. Satisfies applicable use standards, development standards, and general requirements under this Chapter;**

  The Site Plan Amendment includes changes to the number of MPDUs, which also changes the amount of parking provided. These changes are shown in the tables below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRN ZONE (Area I) Standard Method</th>
<th>Detached House</th>
<th>Duplex</th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
<th>Detached House</th>
<th>Duplex</th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
<th>Detached House</th>
<th>Duplex</th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Standard</td>
<td>Permitted/Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>Previously Approved 820170130</td>
<td>Proposed 82017013A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Detached House</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>Detached House</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>Detached House</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>Townhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPDUs</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common open space (min)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>&gt;10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot area (min)</td>
<td>1000 sf</td>
<td>500 sf</td>
<td>800 sf</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>800 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width (at front bldg line, min)</td>
<td>25’</td>
<td>12.5’</td>
<td>12’</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>12’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width (at front lot line, min)</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage (max)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density Max</td>
<td>0.5 FAR</td>
<td>0.23 FAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.23 FAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>Detached House</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>Detached House</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>Detached House</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>Townhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front (min)</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side street (min)</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Standard</td>
<td>Permitted/Required</td>
<td>Previously Approved 820170130</td>
<td>Proposed 82017013A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td>Detached House</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min 2 per unit</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spaces for Market Rate Units</strong></td>
<td>Detached House</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Detached House</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per unit</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Spaces</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>854 807</td>
<td>920 863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Parking data was calculated incorrectly in site plan 820170130*
e. satisfies the applicable requirements of:

i. *Chapter 19, Erosion, Sediment Control, and Stormwater Management; and*

This amendment includes minor stormwater management changes that do not affect the validity of the original concept approval. The Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services (DPS) Stormwater Management Section issued a letter accepting the stormwater management concept approval on October 9, 2017 for the original site plan. Stormwater treatment will continue to be accomplished using micro bioretention, drywells, green roof and structural practices.

ii. *Chapter 22A, Forest Conservation.*

This application includes amendments to FFCP 82017013A, which established forest conservation mitigation requirements for the entire Bloom Montgomery Village development, including specific planting requirements associated with development of each of the six phases of the Site Plan. Amendment 82017013A makes minor adjustments to the planting areas, and specifically identifies the planting areas that will be used to meet the planting requirements for Areas IV and V of the development.

The total forest conservation mitigation requirements for the Bloom Montgomery Village development total 26.12 acres. Area IV is supposed to provide 19% of the total mitigation requirement, or 4.96 acres. Area V must provide 17% of the total mitigation requirement, or 4.44 acres. The total forest mitigation planting that must be provided for the two areas is 9.40 acres.

FFCP amendment 82017013A proposes to fulfill the forest conservation requirement for Areas IV and V by planting the following planting areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planting Area</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5F</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6G</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6H</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.56 Acres</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This will leave a forest conservation mitigation requirement of 15.56 acres to be fulfilled by subsequent phases of the overall development as shown on the final forest conservation plan.

As shown in the list of planting areas, the required afforestation for Area IV and Area V development will occur in planting areas in Area V and Area VI. While Area VI is not being developed at this time, it was a priority of the Forest Conservation Plan to get the stream buffers afforested as early as possible in the development process in order to improve the water quality in the Cabin Branch stream. The planting areas in Area V are also in a stream buffer for a tributary of Cabin Branch. There were not similar high priority planting areas identified in Area IV.

There are some technical corrections that will be made prior to Certified Site Plan to ensure consistency of the mitigation and planting requirements in tables on different sheets of the Site Plan Amendment. The corrections will all reflect the information in this staff report. Additional notes and graphic improvements will be added to the plan to make certain this information is clearly depicted.

The Site Plan Amendment must continue to comply with all prior requirements of FFCP 820170130 not modified by this Amendment. This includes meeting the minimum
afforestation requirements for each Area as they come in for Site Plan approval. The minimum afforestation requirements for each Area, as specified in the Resolution for the original Site Plan approval (MCPB No. 17-111) are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% of Total Afforestation Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area I</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area II</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area III</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area IV</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area V</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area VI</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff concludes that the Site Plan Amendment continues to be in compliance with Chapter 22A, Forest Conservation, and in conformance with the *Environmental Guidelines*.

**CONCLUSION**

Site Plan Amendment No. 82017013A will not alter the overall character, or significantly impact the development with respect to the original findings of approval under Preliminary Plan 120170150 and Site Plan 820170130, and all other findings remain in full force and effect. The proposed project remains compatible with the existing and proposed development adjacent to the site and with respect to the surrounding neighborhood, in terms of efficiency, adequacy, safety, structures, uses, vehicular and pedestrian circulation, open space, landscaping and lighting. The proposed amendment remains in conformance with environmental regulations, the development standards of the zone and Master Plan. Therefore, Staff recommends approval with the modifications stated within this Staff Report.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Site Plan
2. Resident Correspondence (emails)
3. Applicant Outreach Memo
LA (AREAS 4 & 5) AFFORESTATION REQUIREMENTS.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR T-DO ZONE (AREA 4)

GENERAL NOTES
1. Map shown is approximate and does not locate site specific parcels. Site specific parcel location and dimensions are shown in the attached site plans.
2. Incorporate features shown on the map into the final survey and deed descriptions. The final survey and deed descriptions shall be reviewed and approved by the Montgomery County Planning Director and the Montgomery County Council.
3. Topographic information provided by Soltesz dated October 9/12/19.
4. Topographic features shown are revisions of Flood Plain Study #281949.
5. Flood Plain shown is a revision of Flood Plain Study #281949.
6. regulated resources (i.e., waters of the US, nontidal wetlands, riparian area, uplands) are shown on the map.
7. this site is located in the seneca creek - cabin branch watershed, MCDPS October 7, 2016 as is under concurrent approval by MCDPS.
8. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS).
9. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) with appropriate treatment facilities.
10. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
11. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) with appropriate treatment facilities.
12. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
13. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
14. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
15. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
16. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
17. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
18. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
19. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
20. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
21. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
22. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
23. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
24. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
25. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
26. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
27. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
28. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
29. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
30. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
31. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
32. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
33. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
34. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
35. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
36. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
37. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
38. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
39. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
40. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
41. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
42. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
43. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.
44. the project is proposed to be served by public water and sewer (PWS) and appropriate treatment facilities.

SP-15

SP-16

SP-17

AREA IV

SIGNAGE (TYP)
NOTE: ONLY AREAS 4 & 5 ARE BEING AMENDED BY SITE PLAN AMENDMENT 82017013A. ALL OTHER AREAS REFLECT THE 25% MPDU CHANGE PER THE 'A' AMENDMENT, BUT ARE SUBJECT TO FUTURE AMENDMENTS FOR FINAL LOCATIONS AND TOTALS. THE OVERALL TOTAL FOR ALL AREAS WILL MEET 25%.
Mr. Morford,

Thank you for reaching out to me with your concerns regarding Site Plan 82017013A: Bloom Montgomery Village Areas 4 & 5. The notice of this application was provided by the applicant to all adjacent and confronting property owners and all HOAs within a ½ mile of the property/site that are registered with the Planning Board.

This Site Plan will be placed on a future Planning Board agenda, and you will be notified of this Planning Board meeting, and will be able to testify at the meeting if you would like to. We will also include your August 30th email below in the public comments to be included in the Planning Board packet in advance of the meeting.

Please contact me if you have any questions. Parker Smith, Senior Planner, the lead reviewer for this project, is cc’d on this email and is also available for questions.

Thank you,
Carrie

Carrie Sanders, AICP
Chief
Area 2 Division
Montgomery County Planning Department
301-495-4653
carrie.sanders@montgomeryplanning.org

We are writing to register the strongest possible objection to the proposed changes to the current site plan. This plan provides for development of the former golf course in Montgomery Village. The proposal is to increase the number of MPDUs; specifically to double the currently approved percentage of 12.5% and 14% to 25%.
Memorandum

To: Gwen Wright, Planning Director
   Robert Kronenberg, Deputy Planning Director

From: Pat Harris

Date: September 9, 2019

Re: Montgomery Village Golf Course – Site Plan Amendment

We appreciate you taking the time to meet last week to discuss the Site Plan Amendment for the residential development of Montgomery Village Golf Course (Bloom MV). As detailed below, Monument’s decision to increase the number of moderately priced dwelling units (MPDUs) in the project to 25 percent, was not new information for the community; on the contrary, Monument has had detailed discussion with the community dating back at least as far as October 2018. Having spent the past six years diligently pursuing the approvals to make the Bloom MV project a reality, Monument is eager to bring desired new townhomes to the community.

You have asked about the notice that was provided to the residents of Montgomery Village regarding Monument’s proposal to increase the MPDUs to 25 percent. In addition, you have requested further explanation regarding the forest conservation easements (FCEs) and the determination that prior to the development of each residential area, a site plan amendment would be required to delineate the precise boundaries of the FCEs for the particular area.

I. Moderately Priced Dwelling Units

A representative of Monument Realty, Yovi Sever, met with the residents of Montgomery Village on October 16, 2018 at a community meeting held exclusively to provide Monument the opportunity to update community members on the status of the development, to provide details regarding the size and price points of the homes, and to explain Monument’s plan to increase the overall number of MPDUs to 25 percent. Approximately 50 residents attended the meeting.¹

¹ According to Dave Humpton, there was no sign-in sheet for the October 16, 2018 meeting.
The meeting was advertised in the print version of the Village News in three different locations, including on the front page; in the calendar of events on page 4; and in Dave Humpton’s EVP Report on page 6.

Following the meeting, Monument’s presentation, with specific reference to increasing the number of MPDUs, was presented in the written materials provided at the Montgomery Village Board of Director’s meeting on October 18, 2018 (see Attachment A). The proposal was also discussed at the Board meeting. More importantly, as it relates to providing notice to the broader community, a summary of the meeting, where again the increase in MPDUs was specifically mentioned, was provided in the October 18, 2018 on-line version of the Village News (see Attachment B). In addition, the meeting was referenced in Dave Humpton’s EVP Report in the November 2, 2018 print version of the Village News.

As evidenced, once Monument made a decision to increase the number of MPDUs, they made a deliberate effort to share this information with the Montgomery Village residents and the residents.

II. Forest Conservation Easement

Given the size and scope of the Bloom MV project, it was anticipated that the development of each area would require a Site Plan Amendment to define the forest conservation easement area for each particular area. Sheet 301 of the approved Final Forest Conservation Plan provides as follows “Acreage of the proposed category 1 Easements [per areas provided in a table on the same sheet] shown on the plan are estimated and will be determined by sketch and descriptions.” Monument and Staff agreed that Monument would reconcile the easements within each of the areas – and provide the requisite sketch and descriptions, by administrative amendment, given that the overall conservation areas were already approved by the Planning Board.

Attachments

cc: Mr. Russell Hines

---

2 According to Dave Humpton, only the print version of the Village News is archived, so the on-line version is only available in Word.
In brief, we believe that Montgomery Village already has more than its fair share of MPDUs. This area abuts some of the oldest and most expensive housing in the Village. Setting aside the fact that residents whose houses are along what was one a golf course paid a premium for their lots, additional MPDUs most likely will reduce property values further. The developer has already altered its "promises and plans" several times. Each time increasing density and reducing the cost of proposed structures. The fact is that this new development will literally be in the center of an established community. Structures and prices ought to be comparable with the surrounding community.

We also have major concerns about the process for commenting on this significant proposal. The letter announcing the proposal had a very limited distribution. It was apparently sent only to residents with homes along the golf course. We obtained a copy from a friend in that neighborhood. Our home is only about a block and a half away from the site and will also be affected by any decision about that site. Given the limited distribution, the brief time to respond to comments, and the fact that there is no public hearing scheduled "...unless the planning director finds that any comment is substantive enough to hold a public hearing," makes it appear that the developer is attempting a quick, favorable decision without the benefit of thorough public consideration.

We recommend that at a minimum this proposal be sent to a larger number of Montgomery Village residents with, obviously, the public comment period extended. Clearly the amount of time the old golf course has laid fallow with no upkeep, not even mowing, provides evidence that there should be no rush for the developer to get the proposal approved.

Thank you for your consideration.

Thomas G. & Gail B. Morford
9808 Dellcastle Road
Montgomery Village
Ms. Hoffman,

Thank you for reaching out to me with your concerns regarding Site Plan 82017013A: Bloom Montgomery Village Areas 4 & 5. The notice of this application was provided by the applicant to all adjacent and confronting property owners and all HOAs within a ½ mile of the property/site that are registered with the Planning Board.

This Site Plan will be placed on a future Planning Board agenda, and you will be notified of this Planning Board meeting, and will be able to testify at the meeting if you would like to. We will also include your August 30th email below in the public comments to be included in the Planning Board packet in advance of the meeting.

Please contact me if you have any questions. Parker Smith, Senior Planner, the lead reviewer for this project, is cc’d on this email and is also available for questions.

Thank you,

Carrie

Carrie Sanders, AICP
Chief
Area 2 Division
Montgomery County Planning Department
301-495-4653
carrie.sanders@montgomeryplanning.org

I received the email below from the Morfords. I want you to know that I am in absolute agreement with everything they said.

Please consider these my formal comments.
We are writing to register the strongest possible objection to the proposed changes to the current site plan. This plan provides for development of the former golf course in Montgomery Village. The proposal is to increase the number of MPDUs; specifically to double the currently approved percentage of 12.5% and 14% to 25%.

In brief, we believe that Montgomery Village already has more than its fair share of MPDUs. This area abuts some of the oldest and most expensive housing in the Village. Setting aside the fact that residents whose houses are along what was one a golf course paid a premium for their lots, additional MPDUs most likely will reduce property values further. The developer has already altered its "promises and plans" several times. Each time increasing density and reducing the cost of proposed structures. The fact is that this new development will literally be in the center of an established community. Structures and prices ought to be comparable with the surrounding community.

We also have major concerns about the process for commenting on this significant proposal. The letter announcing the proposal had a very limited distribution. It was apparently sent only to residents with homes along the golf course. We obtained a copy from a friend in that neighborhood. Our home is only about a block and a half away from the site and will also be affected by any decision about that site. Given the limited distribution, the brief time to respond to comments, and the fact that there is no public hearing scheduled "...unless the planning director finds that any comment is substantive enough to hold a public
hearing," makes it appear that the developer is attempting a quick, favorable decision without the benefit of thorough public consideration.

We recommend that at a minimum this proposal be sent to a larger number of Montgomery Village residents with, obviously, the public comment period extended. Clearly the amount of time the old golf course has laid fallow with no upkeep, not even mowing, provides evidence that there should be no rush for the developer to get the proposal approved.

Thank you for your consideration.

Thomas G. & Gail B. Morford
9808 Dellcastle Road
Montgomery Village
Hello Ms. Smith,

Based on opposition to additional MPDUs, the amendment is now scheduled to be heard by the Planning Board on 10/17/19. If you would like us to attach any correspondence to that report, please send that by COB Friday, October 4 (tomorrow). If you need more time, you can also send an email to the Chairs Office by 12-noon one day prior to the hearing.

Thank you,

Patrick Butler

---

From: Ann Smith <smith@itecksolutions.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 2, 2019 9:47:22 PM
To: Pfefferle, Mark <mark.pfefferle@montgomeryplanning.org>
Cc: Butler, Patrick <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: RE: Notice of application 82017013A

I see the regulatory checklist was signed July 29 & I received the notice to comment on Aug. 16, 2019. The 25% MPDU was not minor.

-----Original Message-----
From: Ann Smith
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2019 12:57 PM
To: mark.pfefferle@montgomeryplanning.org
Cc: patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org
Subject: Notice of application 82017013A

I would like to thank the law firm LerchEarlyBrewer for sending me notice of application for site plan 82017013A. The request asks for 25% mpdu. Chapter 50/59 were used where convenient, and resolutions werenot’. This subdivision plan application conflicts with MCPH 17-111, the MV master plan Validity, Resolutions 18-957,18-108,18-1095 and a proposed resolution to amend the SSP in association with “blighted” land & affordable housing. The application under the old codes, when we’ve updated to new codes has created nothin but internal changes. I ask for a regulatory review.
Sincerely
Ann Smith

Sent from my iPhone