

From: [Bobbi Fulmer](#)
To: [Rob Robinson](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to Application X-7067-2015 Johnson Properties Annexation
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 12:42:36 PM

From: Kelvin Choi [mailto:kelvin.choi.tc@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 11:51 AM
To: Planning External Mailing
Subject: Opposition to Application X-7067-2015 Johnson Properties Annexation

Gaithersburg Planning Committee Members:

I notice that you will be discussing the Johnson Property Annexation petition X7067-2015 on the August 5 meeting. I am writing once again to reflect the strongest opposition to the annexation plan from me and the Willow Ridge CA. We have read the revised proposal submitted by the Johnsons and would like to address several points:

- 1) First and foremost, Johnson Property shows no sincerity and concern for the neighborhood that will be affected the annexation. They claimed to have held numerous meetings to get input from neighbors. In reality, this felt like lip service. All attendees repeatedly voiced the same concerns and they largely ignored our input. Their proposal implies that we agree with their current plan and we do not. No one in Willow Ridge or at the meetings that I have spoken with has any problem with the Johnsons developing under the current R-200 zoning (i.e., with 30 single family home). Everyone I have I spoken with oppose anything greater than 50% of the current zoning.
- 2) Our concerns are exacerbated by the City's new Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO) of 150% per school, particularly since this would permit overcrowding of schools that are outside city limits (e.g. Thurgood Marshall ES, Ridgeview MS, and Quince Orchard HS) due to development within the city limits. Having overcrowded classrooms is not acceptable. The annexation will have serious negative effects on our children and their ability to get a quality education. The schools cannot be properly served by the annexation plan.
- 3) Vehicular and pedestrian traffic is a major concern, and their proposals are grossly inadequate to address these issues. This area is currently a traffic disaster, with 3 lanes of traffic merging into 2 on Rt. 28 directly in front of this property, and then 1 lane at Riffle Ford Rd. The only road in our neighborhood, Copen Meadow Dr, which exits onto Rt. 28, is dangerous and almost unusable during the hours of 7am – 9am, and 4pm – 7pm due to the large volume of cars. Their proposed plan contributes significantly to the problem without offering any realistic mitigation. They also suggest to connect Nursery Lane to Rt. 28 through the existing commercial parcel. This will not solve the problem because traffic is already stuck at the outlet of the commercial parcel to Rt. 28. However, it adds traffic accident hazard to the neighborhood, particularly little children who walk to school, as cars run through our neighborhood

to Rt. 28 skipping the Quince Orchard Road intersection.

4) They claim to have reduced the number of housing units from 305 to 110. In reality, the original proposal had 180 residential units on the undeveloped parcel and 125 units on the current commercial parcel. In the updated proposal, they have chosen to exclude the existing commercial parcel; therefore, including it in the discussion is misleading. The original proposal of 180 homes on the undeveloped parcel has been reduced to 110. It is crucial to note that this parcel is currently zoned R-200, which permits 30 single-family homes. Thus, they have gone from 600% of current zoning limits to 367%, which is still far in excess of what is acceptable. While the Johnsons claim that their revised sketch plan is comparable to what could be done through the county, we do not believe this to be the case. The Johnsons were told by the county planning board last November that they cannot assume a Local Map Amendment would be approved. They have not gone through that process, so with the current R-200 zone, they cannot build townhouses. In addition, the 9-acre parcel that is currently commercial is still a concern. If they obtain Gaithersburg annexation and rezoning, we have no reason to expect anything less than the 125 residential units in their original proposal.

5) The issue is even more consider when considering the already approved annexation of the Mudgruder property at the southeast corner of Rt. 28 and Quince Orchard Road, which will allow development of 10-story building with very little input from the surrounding county residents since it is now part of the City of Gaithersburg. This is simply unfair to surrounding county residents.

In summary, this revised zoning plan is not appropriate and the public facilities cannot handle the increased population it would bring. The Johnson plan does not address the community concerns consistently voiced nor abide by the current zoning allowed by Montgomery County. I understand the City may wish to annex the Johnson property. I sincerely urge you NOT to put the surrounding non-Gaithersburg neighborhoods at higher risk for over-crowding schools, traffic accidents involving little children, and disabling traffic pattern. It is simply unfair and unjust that non-Gaithersburg neighborhoods suffer for the gain of the City of Gaitherburg.

Thank you for taking the time for incorporating the community's input when considering this application.

Kelvin Choi
12632 Carrington Hill Dr
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

From: [Bobbi Fulmer](#)
To: [Rob Robinson](#)
Subject: FW: JOHNSON PROPERTY
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 12:46:13 PM

From: Will Husted [mailto:willhusted@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 11:45 AM
To: Planning External Mailing
Subject: JOHNSON PROPERTY

I am writing to you as a concerned young resident of the North Potomac region. I am a student at Quince Orchard High School and I am educated on the problems associated with the Johnson Property annexation. It is the opinion of both myself and fellow students at Quince Orchard High School that this property not be over run with housing developments. This would only serve to congest the area and put a strain on the class sizes at Quince Orchard. In addition, the positives of of the plan will not outweigh the traffic congestion associated with this annexation. Every day during rush hour, Darnestown Road becomes extremely backed-up. With more cars and houses added to the road, commuters will become increasingly frustrated. Proposals for traffic congestion and a thorough plan for restructuring class sizes would need to be in place if this annexation were to go through. In conclusion, I hope you take into consideration the concerns of young residents such as myself when making the decision on the future of our town.

From: [Bobbi Fulmer](#)
To: [Rob Robinson](#)
Subject: FW: Johnson Property Annexation
Date: Monday, July 25, 2016 9:52:37 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: Brent Jamsa [<mailto:bcjamsa@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 8:31 AM
To: Planning External Mailing
Subject: Johnson Property Annexation

Dear Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

I am writing to you to express my continued opposition to the proposed annexation of the Johnson property into the City of Gaithersburg. If approved, the annexation would drastically change the community I have grown up in and loved. In addition, traffic and injuries associated with the already dangerous intersection of Rt. 28 and 124 continues to be an issue. More development would certainly add more traffic onto local roads and worsen the traffic situation. Moreover, continued overcrowding also plagues the community. As a student at Quince Orchard High School, I witness first hand the large class sizes and desks shortages among other issues. It is unfair that if the property is annexed and the Johnsons decide to develop on their land, that they will be able to follow the City of Gaithersburg's less strict policy regarding school capacity than Montgomery County's policy because a large portion of students who go to Quince Orchard High and its feeder schools are not Gaithersburg residents. In summation, I and my fellow QO Cougars ask that you recommend that the Gaithersburg City Council reject the annexation request.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter, Brent Jamsa

From: [Bobbi Fulmer](#)
To: [Rob Robinson](#)
Subject: FW: Stop Johnson Property Annexation
Date: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 8:53:51 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: John [<mailto:jgermuga@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2016 7:00 PM
To: Planning External Mailing
Subject: Stop Johnson Property Annexation

To whom it may concern.

Johnson Annexation

Mr. Russell Johnson has requested annexation of 23.5 acres of land at the corner of Darnestown and Quince Orchards Roads. This is the second attempt by Mr Johnson to cash out on his failing business by developing his land through annexation to the county.

In his original plan, Mr Johnson received a huge outcry of opposition to develop this property from local residents. He has claimed to rectify this by cutting back on the density of the property to 110 units and adding a scant amount of park space which will be relatively inaccessible to all but the residents of the proposed development he is planning.

This revised commitment to providing park space for the community is little consolation for the negative impact 110 new residences will have on the neighboring community.

Regarding traffic, this property is surrounded by two schools and the firehouse. Many students walk to school and the current traffic volume already poses a huge safety hazard. As it stands, a bicyclist was recently struck by a car and killed less than 500 yards from the proposed development. Adding 110 new housing units will make matters even worse.

Regarding schools, Rachael Carsen is already over capacity by nearly 60% and is projected to continue well into the future as estimated by the recent 2014-15 statistics (http://www2.montgomerycountymd.gov/CCL_ContactForms/ContactCouncil.aspx).

Again, adding 110 new units, especially townhouses popular with you families will add to the an already overburdened schools.

Mr Johnson claims to be our neighbor, but he does not live in our neighborhood and his plans to congest our streets and our schools is far from neighborly.

Please stop the annexation of the Johnson property and put an end to his opportunistic plans to cash out on the recent uptick in property value at a huge expense to the community, the City of Gaithersburg and the county.

Regards,
A Concerned Gaithersburg Resident

28 July 2016

Gaithersburg Planning Board

Gaithersburg, MD

RE: Hearing on Annexation of Johnson Property, Rt 28

Dear Planning Board and Gaithersburg Council:

I am writing in opposition to the proposed annexation of the Johnson/Three Amigos property by the City of Gaithersburg.

Basically, there is no benefit to the community in any way that I can see resulting from this proposed action. There are many likely negatives including:

- Increased school crowding at Thurgood Marshall and Quince Orchard High School, and middle schools.
- Increased road congestion all of the traffic signals in the area. I encourage all to travel Rt 28 to Riffle Ford between 4 and 5 PM weekdays to see the current bottleneck, labelled by commuter studies as one of the group of bad intersections in the area. This is a difficult situation now for commuter and emergency vehicles, and will only get worse.
- Increased pedestrian hazard as student and spectator traffic crosses Rt 28 to access QOHS.
- Significant likely property value impacts on the surrounding residential communities which will be within 50 feet or so of unanticipated high density development.
- Increased need for police, fire, water and sewer services.

In summary, **only the developer**, who lives out of cluster, **stands to benefit from this proposal**. The community that you represent appears to have the potential for significant impact, mental stress and harm. Why would you support such an annexation that provided no additional benefit or advantages for Gaithersburg or it's citizens?

For these reasons, I urge the planners to recommend against this submittal, and for the Council to vote no on this first step to ongoing high density development and further annexations in this area.

Sincerely,

Carol and Gordon Henley

12610 Native Dancer Place

North Potomac 20878

From: [Bobbi Fulmer](#)
To: [Rob Robinson](#)
Subject: FW: councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 2:37:55 PM

From: David Lee [mailto:david.soho.lee@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 2:34 PM
To: Planning External Mailing
Subject: councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov

Dear City of Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

My name is David Lee and I am a resident at 6 Bayswater Ct. in Gaithersburg, MD. I am also the PTA President for Thurgood Marshall Elementary School, going into my 3rd year of term. I have been involved in nearly every meeting and hearing for the Johnson Property Annexation in the past 2 years. I do not support the annexation of the Johnson Property to City of Gaithersburg. Furthermore, I do not feel that the high density of residential units on Parcel E will benefit Thurgood Marshall ES, which is already overcrowded. Plus with traffic and safety concerns with Quince Orchard High School directly across the street, and the 2-1 lane merge that takes place directly in front of the Johnson Property on Route 28, this represents a significant danger to pedestrians and traffic flow overall.

I was very disappointed to see that the Montgomery County Planning Board and PHED Committee approved this annexation request. But as it is currently in the process of being annexed to City of Gaithersburg, I would like to communicate my support of the binding restrictions that the Johnson team have testified to. Below is a list of binding restrictions I would like to be included:

- 1.) A maximum of 110 residential units on all parcels.
- 2.) A maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space. (currently 90,000 sq/ft, and adding 10,000 sq/ft)
- 3.) 1 acre of Park space
- 4.) An additional adequate dedicated Parking lot for Park space visitors (this is not listed as a binding restriction to my knowledge but should be considered and included given the density of residential on Parcel E and the already overcrowded parking that will exist there)

Although I am disappointed in the decisions by both the Montgomery County Planning Board and PHED Committee, I want to insure that there is accountability by the Johnsons and City of Gaithersburg to follow through with these binding restrictions as it moves to City of Gaithersburg hands. With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, I hope that you respect the opinions of those residents bordering this property and insure that the binding restrictions stay in effect -- now and in the long term future.

Sincerely,

--
David Lee
Thurgood Marshall ES PTA President

703-623-1721

The attached e-mails all include in the body of the text the following:

“I am against the annexation of the Johnson Property to City of Gaithersburg. But as the annexation is currently in process at this time, I would like to voice my strong support that the binding restrictions stated by the Johnsons are implemented once it is under review by Gaithersburg City Planning Board and City Council.

- 1.) Maximum of 110 residential units.
- 2.) Maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space.
- 3.) 1 acre of Park space
- 4.) Additional adequate dedicated Parking lot for Park space visitors (not listed as a binding restriction but should be considered and included)

Although I am disappointed in the decisions by both the Montgomery County Planning Board and PHED Committee, I want to insure that there is accountability by the Johnsons and City of Gaithersburg to follow through with these binding restrictions as it moves to City of Gaithersburg hands. With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, I hope that you respect the opinions of those residents bordering this property and insure that the binding restrictions stay in effect -- now and in the long term future.”

From: [Lily Andrade](#)
To: [Planning External Mailing](#)
Cc: councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Johnson Property annexation
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 2:04:27 PM

Dear City of Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

I am a resident at 16920 Horn Point Drive Gaithersburg and I am against the annexation of the Johnson Property to City of Gaithersburg. But as the annexation is currently in process at this time, I would like to voice my strong support that the binding restrictions stated by the Johnsons are implemented once it is under review by Gaithersburg City Planning Board and City Council.

- 1.) Maximum of 110 residential units.
- 2.) Maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space.
- 3.) 1 acre of Park space
- 4.) Additional adequate dedicated Parking lot for Park space visitors (not listed as a binding restriction but should be considered and included)

Although I am disappointed in the decisions by both the Montgomery County Planning Board and PHED Committee, I want to insure that there is accountability by the Johnsons and City of Gaithersburg to follow through with these binding restrictions as it moves to City of Gaithersburg hands. With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, I hope that you respect the opinions of those residents bordering this property and insure that the binding restrictions stay in effect -- now and in the long term future.

Sincerely,

Lily Andrade

From: [Bobbi Fulmer](mailto:Bobbi.Fulmer)
To: [Rob Robinson](mailto:Rob.Robinson)
Subject: FW: JOHNSON PROPERTY ANNEXATION
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 3:25:54 PM

From: Binh Do [mailto:binnynee@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 2:50 PM
To: Planning External Mailing
Cc: councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: JOHNSON PROPERTY ANNEXATION

Dear City of Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

We reside in the Willow Ridge development and we are against the annexation of the Johnson Property to City of Gaithersburg. But as the annexation is currently in process at this time, we would like to voice our strong support that the binding restrictions stated by the Johnsons are implemented once it is under review by Gaithersburg City Planning Board and City Council.

- 1.) Maximum of 110 residential units.
- 2.) Maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space.
- 3.) 1 acre of Park space
- 4.) Additional adequate dedicated Parking lot for Park space visitors (not listed as a binding restriction but should be considered and included)

Although we are disappointed in the decisions by both the Montgomery County Planning Board and PHED Committee, we want to insure that there is accountability by the Johnsons and City of Gaithersburg to follow through with these binding restrictions as it moves to City of Gaithersburg hands. With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, we hope that you respect the opinions of those residents bordering this property and insure that the binding restrictions stay in effect -- now and in the long term future.

Sincerely,
Tim and Binh Nee
12547 Carrington Hill Dr

From: [Corrin Ferber](#)
To: [Planning External Mailing](#)
Cc: councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Johnsons Property
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 1:03:21 PM

Dear City of Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

I am a resident in the Willow Ridge neighborhood adjacent to the Johnson Property. I am against the annexation of the Johnson Property to City of Gaithersburg. The planned development will overcrowd schools and create even more traffic at an already over-burdened thoroughfare. Dropping kids off in the morning at Quince Orchard High School is already quite difficult. Heading home weekdays between 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. is also near impossible as you head west of the intersection of Quince Orchard Road @ Route 28. Another dense housing development will only add to the traffic quagmire.

Since the annexation is currently in process at this time, I would like to voice my strong support that the binding restrictions stated by the Johnsons are implemented once it is under review by Gaithersburg City Planning Board and City Council.

- 1.) Maximum of 110 residential units.
- 2.) Maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space.
- 3.) 1 acre of Park space
- 4.) Additional adequate dedicated Parking lot for Park space visitors (not listed as a binding restriction but should be considered and included)

Although I am disappointed in the decisions by both the Montgomery County Planning Board and PHED Committee, I want to insure that there is accountability by the Johnsons and City of Gaithersburg to follow through with these binding restrictions as it moves to City of Gaithersburg hands. With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, I hope that you respect the opinions of those residents bordering this property and insure that the binding restrictions stay in effect -- now and in the long term future.

Sincerely,

Corrin Ferber
12546 Carrington Hill Road

From: [Rebecca Firoved](#)
To: [Planning External Mailing](#)
Cc: councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Johnson Property annexation
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 1:20:51 PM

Dear City of Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

I am a resident in Orchard Hills subdivision and I am against the annexation of the Johnson Property to City of Gaithersburg. But as the annexation is currently in process at this time, I would like to voice my strong support that the binding restrictions stated by the Johnsons are implemented once it is under review by Gaithersburg City Planning Board and City Council.

- 1.) Maximum of 110 residential units.
- 2.) Maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space.
- 3.) 1 acre of Park space
- 4.) Additional adequate dedicated Parking lot for Park space visitors (not listed as a binding restriction but should be considered and included)

Although I am disappointed in the decisions by both the Montgomery County Planning Board and PHED Committee, I want to insure that there is accountability by the Johnsons and City of Gaithersburg to follow through with these binding restrictions as it moves to City of Gaithersburg hands. With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, I hope that you respect the opinions of those residents bordering this property and insure that the binding restrictions stay in effect -- now and in the long term future.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Firoved

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Bobbi Fulmer](#)
To: [Rob Robinson](#)
Subject: FW: Johnson property
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 12:49:24 PM

From: Emily Bosco [mailto:emilybosco@rocketmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 12:49 PM
To: Planning External Mailing; councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Johnson property

Dear City of Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

I am a resident in Willow Ridge and I am STRONGLY AGAINST the annexation of the Johnson Property to City of Gaithersburg. But as the annexation is currently in process at this time, I would like to voice my strong support that the binding restrictions stated by the Johnsons are implemented once it is under review by Gaithersburg City Planning Board and City Council.

- 1.) Maximum of 110 residential units.
- 2.) Maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space.
- 3.) 1 acre of Park space
- 4.) Additional adequate dedicated Parking lot for Park space visitors (not listed as a binding restriction but should be considered and included)

Although I am disappointed in the decisions by both the Montgomery County Planning Board and PHED Committee, I want to insure that there is accountability by the Johnsons and City of Gaithersburg to follow through with these binding restrictions as it moves to City of Gaithersburg hands. With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, I hope that you respect the opinions of those residents bordering this property and insure that the binding restrictions stay in effect -- now and in the long term future.

Sincerely,
Dr. Emily Bosco

From: [Bobbi Fulmer](#)
To: [Rob Robinson](#)
Subject: FW: councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 12:42:19 PM

From: Wen Chen [mailto:wengracechen@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 12:42 PM
To: Planning External Mailing
Subject: councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov

Dear City of Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

I am a resident at 12215 Pissaro Drive, North Potomac, and I am against the annexation of the Johnson Property to City of Gaithersburg. But as the annexation is currently in process at this time, I would like to voice my strong support that the binding restrictions stated by the Johnsons are implemented once it is under review by Gaithersburg City Planning Board and City Council.

- 1.) Maximum of 110 residential units.
- 2.) Maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space.
- 3.) 1 acre of Park space
- 4.) Additional adequate dedicated Parking lot for Park space visitors (not listed as a binding restriction but should be considered and included)

Although I am disappointed in the decisions by both the Montgomery County Planning Board and PHED Committee, I want to insure that there is accountability by the Johnsons and City of Gaithersburg to follow through with these binding restrictions as it moves to City of Gaithersburg hands. With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, I hope that you respect the opinions of those residents bordering this property and insure that the binding restrictions stay in effect -- now and in the long term future.

Sincerely,
Wen Chen

From: [Bobbi Fulmer](#)
To: [Rob Robinson](#)
Subject: FW: Johnson Property Annexation- Concerned Resident
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 12:45:41 PM

From: Maribeth Foelber [mailto:maribeth.foelber@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 12:43 PM
To: Planning External Mailing
Cc: councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Johnson Property Annexation- Concerned Resident

Dear City of Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

I am a resident in Willow Ridge Neighborhood at 12527 Carrington Hill Dr. and I would like to voice my strong support that the binding restrictions stated by the Johnsons are implemented once it is under review by Gaithersburg City Planning Board and City Council.

Binding Restrictions:

- 1.) Maximum of 110 residential units.
- 2.) Maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space.
- 3.) 1 acre of Park space
- 4.) Additional adequate dedicated Parking lot for Park space visitors (not listed as a binding restriction but should be considered and included)

I want to insure that there is accountability by the Johnsons and City of Gaithersburg to follow through with these binding restrictions as it moves to City of Gaithersburg hands. With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, I hope that you respect the opinions of those residents bordering this property and insure that the binding restrictions stay in effect -- now and in the long term future.

Sincerely,

Maribeth Foelber
maribeth.foelber@gmail.com
301-802-0679

From: [Bobbi Fulmer](#)
To: [Rob Robinson](#)
Subject: FW: Johnson Property Public Comment
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 12:45:54 PM

From: Meredith Salita [mailto:msalita@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 12:45 PM
To: Planning External Mailing
Cc: councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Johnson Property Public Comment

Dear City of Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

I am a resident in the Quince Orchard Manor community at 12305 Pueblo Road. I have previously voiced my opinion against the annexation of the Johnson Property to City of Gaithersburg. I do not believe that massive development at this site is in the best interest of the surrounding neighborhoods and the schools that serve them.

At this time, I would like to urge the Gaithersburg Planning Commission to ensure that the binding restrictions stated by the Johnsons **are in fact implemented** once it is under review by Gaithersburg City Planning Board and City Council.

- 1.) Maximum of 110 residential units.**
- 2.) Maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space.**
- 3.) 1 acre of Park space on Parcel E**

In addition, planning for adequate parking should be among the priorities and implemented as well in a development like this.

With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, it is a concern that the opinions of these county neighbors will go unheard now and in the future.

Sincerely,
Meredith Salita

From: [Bobbi Fulmer](#)
To: [Rob Robinson](#)
Subject: FW: Johnson Annexation
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 12:50:03 PM

From: Kristen Steffens [mailto:hermitthrush2@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 12:49 PM
To: Planning External Mailing; councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Johnson Annexation

Dear City of Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

I am a resident at 12314 Galesville Drive, Gaithersburg, MD 20878, and I am against the annexation of the Johnson Property to City of Gaithersburg. But as the annexation is currently in process at this time, I would like to voice my strong support that the binding restrictions stated by the Johnsons are implemented once it is under review by Gaithersburg City Planning Board and City Council.

- 1.) Maximum of 110 residential units.
- 2.) Maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space.
- 3.) 1 acre of Park space
- 4.) Additional adequate dedicated Parking lot for Park space visitors (not listed as a binding restriction but should be considered and included)

Although I am disappointed in the decisions by both the Montgomery County Planning Board and PHED Committee, I want to insure that there is accountability by the Johnsons and City of Gaithersburg to follow through with these binding restrictions as it moves to City of Gaithersburg hands. With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, I hope that you respect the opinions of those residents bordering this property and insure that the binding restrictions stay in effect - now and in the long term future.

Sincerely,

Kristen Steffens

From: [Bobbi Fulmer](#)
To: [Rob Robinson](#)
Subject: FW: annexation
Date: Friday, July 29, 2016 8:48:59 AM

From: Jen [mailto:jgremba@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 4:34 PM
To: Planning External Mailing
Subject: annexation

Dear City of Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

I am a resident at [15809 Lautrec Court in North Potomac, Maryland](#), and I am against the annexation of the Johnson Property to the City of Gaithersburg. However, as the annexation is currently in process at this time, I would like to voice my strong support that the binding restrictions stated by the Johnsons are implemented once it is under review by Gaithersburg City Planning Board and City Council.

- 1) Maximum of 110 residential units.
- 2) Maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space.
- 3) 1 acre of Park space
- 4) Additional adequate dedicated Parking lot for Park space visitors (not listed as a binding restriction but should be considered and included)

Although I am disappointed in the decisions by both the Montgomery County Planning Board and PHED Committee, I want to insure that there is accountability by the Johnsons and City of Gaithersburg to follow through with these binding restrictions as it moves to City of Gaithersburg hands. With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, I hope that you respect the opinions of those residents bordering this property and insure that the binding restrictions stay in effect -- now and in the long term future.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jennifer Gremba-Cota

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Bobbi Fulmer](#)
To: [Rob Robinson](#)
Subject: FW: Important- building restrictions a MUST
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 3:26:02 PM

From: Debbie [mailto:debpeyser@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 2:50 PM
To: councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov; Planning External Mailing
Subject: Important- building restrictions a MUST

Dear City of Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

I am a resident of Willow Ridge at 16013 Daven Pine Ct. Gaithersburg, MD 20878 and I am against the annexation of the Johnson Property to City of Gaithersburg. But as the annexation is currently in process at this time, I would like to voice my strong support that the binding restrictions stated by the Johnsons are implemented once it is under review by Gaithersburg City Planning Board and City Council.

- 1.) Maximum of 110 residential units.
- 2.) Maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space.
- 3.) 1 acre of Park space
- 4.) Additional adequate dedicated Parking lot for Park space visitors (not listed as a binding restriction but should be considered and included)

Although I am disappointed in the decisions by both the Montgomery County Planning Board and PHED Committee, I want to insure that there is accountability by the Johnsons and City of Gaithersburg to follow through with these binding restrictions as it moves to City of Gaithersburg hands. With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, I hope that you respect the opinions of those residents bordering this property and insure that the binding restrictions stay in effect -- now and in the long term future.

Sincerely,
Brian D. Peyser, DDS
Debra F. Peyser, M.Ed.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Bobbi Fulmer](#)
To: [Rob Robinson](#)
Subject: FW: Support Johnson property annexation if it includes binding restrictions
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 3:27:34 PM

From: Scott Rose [mailto:cyclescott@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 3:11 PM
To: Planning External Mailing
Cc: councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Support Johnson property annexation if it includes binding restrictions

Dear City of Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

I am a resident in the Orchard Hills neighborhood and I am against the annexation of the Johnson Property to City of Gaithersburg. But as the annexation is currently in process at this time, I would like to voice my strong support that the binding restrictions stated by the Johnsons are implemented once it is under review by Gaithersburg City Planning Board and City Council.

- 1.) Maximum of 110 residential units.
- 2.) Maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space.
- 3.) 1 acre of Park space
- 4.) Additional adequate dedicated Parking lot for Park space visitors (not listed as a binding restriction but should be considered and included)

Although I am disappointed in the decisions by both the Montgomery County Planning Board and PHED Committee, I want to insure that there is accountability by the Johnsons and City of Gaithersburg to follow through with these binding restrictions as it moves to City of Gaithersburg hands. With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, I hope that you respect the opinions of those residents bordering this property and insure that the binding restrictions stay in effect -- now and in the long term future.

Also, any development on this property will impact the surrounding communities that are not currently part of the city, including schools and road use. Property planning is necessary to address the growth in the county in a way that limits negative impact to current and future residents.

Sincerely,

Scott Rose
16108 Howard Landing
Gaithersburg MD

From: [Guoli Wang](#)
To: [Planning External Mailing](#)
Cc: councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Public comment on the annexation of the Johnson Property to City of Gaithersburg
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 1:24:10 PM

Dear City of Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

I am a resident at _15201 Winesap Dr., North Potomac, MD 20878_ and I am against the annexation of the Johnson Property to City of Gaithersburg. But as the annexation is currently in process at this time, I would like to voice my strong support that the binding restrictions stated by the Johnsons are implemented once it is under review by Gaithersburg City Planning Board and City Council.

- 1.) Maximum of 110 residential units.
- 2.) Maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space.
- 3.) 1 acre of Park space
- 4.) Additional adequate dedicated Parking lot for Park space visitors (not listed as a binding restriction but should be considered and included)

Although I am disappointed in the decisions by both the Montgomery County Planning Board and PHED Committee, I want to insure that there is accountability by the Johnsons and City of Gaithersburg to follow through with these binding restrictions as it moves to City of Gaithersburg hands. With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, I hope that you respect the opinions of those residents bordering this property and insure that the binding restrictions stay in effect -- now and in the long term future.

Sincerely,

Guoli Wang

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: [Bobbi Fulmer](mailto:Bobbi.Fulmer)
To: [Rob Robinson](mailto:Rob.Robinson)
Subject: FW: Strongly against the annexation of the Johnsons Property to Gaithersburg
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 3:45:27 PM

From: yi zhang [mailto:zhangyi531@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 3:43 PM
To: Planning External Mailing
Cc: councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Strongly against the annexation of the Johnsons Property to Gaithersburg

Dear City of Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

I am a resident at Gaithersburg, my house is located near Quince Orchard High School. I am strongly against the annexation of the Johnson Property to City of Gaithersburg. But as the annexation is currently in process at this time, I would like to voice my strong support that the binding restrictions stated by the Johnsons are implemented once it is under review by Gaithersburg City Planning Board and City Council.

- 1.) Maximum of 110 residential units.
- 2.) Maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space.
- 3.) 1 acre of Park space
- 4.) Additional adequate dedicated Parking lot for Park space visitors (not listed as a binding restriction but should be considered and included)

Although I am disappointed in the decisions by both the Montgomery County Planning Board and PHED Committee, I want to insure that there is accountability by the Johnsons and City of Gaithersburg to follow through with these binding restrictions as it moves to City of Gaithersburg hands. With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, I hope that you respect the opinions of those residents bordering this property and insure that the binding restrictions stay in effect -- now and in the long term future.

Sincerely,

Yi Zhang

From: [yi zhang](#)
To: [Planning External Mailing](#)
Cc: councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: Strongly against the annexation of the Johnsons Property to Gaithersburg
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 3:44:27 PM

Dear City of Gaithersburg Planning Commission,

I am a resident at Gaithersburg, my house is located near Quince Orchard High School. I am strongly against the annexation of the Johnson Property to City of Gaithersburg. But as the annexation is currently in process at this time, I would like to voice my strong support that the binding restrictions stated by the Johnsons are implemented once it is under review by Gaithersburg City Planning Board and City Council.

- 1.) Maximum of 110 residential units.
- 2.) Maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial space.
- 3.) 1 acre of Park space
- 4.) Additional adequate dedicated Parking lot for Park space visitors (not listed as a binding restriction but should be considered and included)

Although I am disappointed in the decisions by both the Montgomery County Planning Board and PHED Committee, I want to insure that there is accountability by the Johnsons and City of Gaithersburg to follow through with these binding restrictions as it moves to City of Gaithersburg hands. With the Johnson Property being surrounded nearly 90% by Montgomery County, I hope that you respect the opinions of those residents bordering this property and insure that the binding restrictions stay in effect -- now and in the long term future.

Sincerely,

Yi Zhang