From:	Lynn Board
To:	Mayor and Council
Cc:	Angel Jones; Tony Tomasello; Trudy Schwarz; Thomas Lonergan
Subject:	Sears Annexation
Date:	Monday, June 11, 2012 4:08:11 PM

The PHED Committee met today to consider the waiver of zoning consistency for the proposed MXD zoning of the Sears property as part of its annexation into the City. City staff, along with Cathy Drzyzgula, attended as did counsel for the applicant, Mayor Marcucci, Greg Ossont and the Planning Board staff. Once all of the issues were aired, the Committee's primary concern was the potential for residential use under the MXD zone. The applicant did proffer that they were willing to place a restrictive covenant on the property to prohibit residential use. The Committee members tabled action on the consideration of zoning consistency to allow the applicant to develop a solution to the residential use issue.

Staff will work with the applicant to address this issue and get this back before the PHED Committee for formal action.

Lynn

Mayor and City Council
X-184
Exhibit #67

X-184

Posted Signs May 1, 2012 for Mayor & City Council Public Hearing

West side of Shady Grove Road

Mayor and City Council
X-184
Exhibit #068

East side of Shady Grove Road

City of Rockville
Get Into It

111 Maryland Avenue | Rockville, Maryland 20850-2364 | 240-314-5000
www.rockvillemd.gov

July 2, 2012

The Honorable Mayor Sidney A. Katz and Gaithersburg City Councilmembers
City of Gaithersburg
31 South Summit Avenue
Gaithersburg, MD 20877-2098

Re: Proposed Sears Site Annexation – 16331 and 16401 Shady Grove Road

Dear Mayor Katz and City Councilmembers:

The members of the City of Rockville Planning Commission offer the following testimony in regard to the City of Gaithersburg's proposed annexation of 16331 and 16401 Shady Grove Road:

We join with the Mayor and Council of the City of Rockville, the Maryland Department of Planning, the Montgomery County Planning Board, and the County Executive, and respectfully but firmly request that the City of Gaithersburg denies this annexation petition.

Historically, the City of Rockville's borders and expansion limits have been conservative, based primarily on logical, "natural" boundaries predicated first on the limits of the city's water and sewer systems, and later (after the expansion of the WSSC service area) on streets and other demarcations that an average individual could reasonably infer as a practical city limit. As a compromise boundary with our neighbor Gaithersburg, Shady Grove Road appeared to be a reasonable choice. The road serves as a clean, visible, intuitive, and logical boundary between two growing cities. This position is consistent with the 1992 Memorandum of Understanding between Rockville, Gaithersburg, and Montgomery County, which emphasizes the importance of "logical and efficient operating service areas"; and is further supported both by the letter from Montgomery County of July 9, 2010 and the letter from the City of Rockville of March 23, 2011. So, while at times we have looked across the Shady Grove Road border, we have always come back to what we thought was our mutual understanding that what was north of Shady Grove Road fell within the Expansion Limits of Gaithersburg, and what was south of Shady Grove Road fell within the Expansion Limits of Rockville.

Gaithersburg's view of Expansion Limits seems to be more aggressive. While this makes sense looking towards large unincorporated areas of the central county, it does not work as well when dealing with the borders of incorporated city neighbors. Gaithersburg's Maximum Expansion Limits cross Shady Grove Road, while Rockville's do not. This is an area which should be revisited and we would welcome and encourage a dialogue between Rockville and Gaithersburg where we can reach and record a mutual understanding of our borders and expansion limits as both cities move into the future.

We strongly believe that it is not good planning practice to expand to a property that has no direct access to it within the city. In this case, the only access to the property from other parts of Gaithersburg is to leave the city, cross an interstate highway, and then traverse a portion of a major county road that is not in Gaithersburg's

Mayor and City Council
X-184
Exhibit #69

Mayor Phyllis Marcuccio | Councilmembers John F. Hall, Jr., Tom Moore, Bridget Donnell Newton, Mark Pierzchala
Acting City Manager Jennifer Kimball | City Clerk Doug Barber | City Attorney Debra Yerg Daniel

municipal limits. Good city planning asserts that neighborhoods and districts targeted for municipal expansion should reasonably connect to the existing jurisdictions. Your proposed action to annex 16331 and 16401 Shady Grove Road violates this tenet.

Should Gaithersburg carry out this annexation and cross Shady Grove Road, it would break a long-held understanding between our municipalities, damage the cordial relationship our cities have enjoyed, and actually harm the City of Rockville's ability to grow northeast towards the Shady Grove sector area (but still south of Shady Grove Road.) This is an area certainly within our natural limits, and one we expect to grow into in the predictable future. If we cannot be allowed to expand in this natural way, we will be forced to look in other directions for growth, which could lead to further discord between our cities.

Both of our cities must continue to grow and change in order to thrive. We would like to view this current situation as an opportunity for both municipalities to come to a better understanding of our mutual borders and expansion limits, reinforce the idea that "good fences make good neighbors," and show that cooperation between cities can be to all of our benefit.

We ask that you deny this annexation petition, and we look forward to productive discussions on practical expansion limits for both our cities.

Very truly yours,

David Hill

David Hill, Chair
City of Rockville Planning Commission

On Behalf of Commissioners:

Jerry Callistein
Don Hadley
Jack Leiderman
Kate Ostell
Dion Trahan
John Tyner II

Cc: Mayor Phyllis Marcuccio
Councilmember John Hall
Councilmember Tom Moore
Councilmember Bridget Donnell Newton
Councilmember Mark Pierzchala
Jenny Kimball, Acting City Manager
Tony Tomasella, Acting City Manager, City of Gaithersburg
Susan Swift, Director, Community Planning and Development Services Department
Andy Gunning, Assistant Director, Community Planning and Development Services
David Levy, Chief, Long-Range Planning

From:	AGunning@rockvillemd.gov
To:	Sidney Katz; CityHall External Mail
Cc:	mayorcouncil@rockvillemd.gov; jkimball@rockvillemd.gov; SSwift@rockvillemd.gov; DLevy@rockvillemd.gov; Tony Tomasello; Trudy Schwarz; Permitting External Mailing; Planning.Commission@rockvillemd.gov
Subject:	Proposed Annexation - Sears Property
Date:	Monday, July 02, 2012 5:45:56 PM
Attachments:	City of Gaithersburg Sears Annexation Planning Cmsn Response 7-02-12.pdf

---

The Honorable Mayor Katz and Gaithersburg City Councilmembers,

On behalf of the City of Rockville Planning Commission, attached is a letter for the record regarding the City of Gaithersburg's proposed annexation of the Sears property at 16331 and 16401 Shady Grove Road. Thank you for your consideration, and let me know if you have any questions.

Andy

Andrew Gunning
Assistant Director, Dept. of Community Planning & Development Services
City of Rockville
111 Maryland Avenue
Rockville, Maryland 20850
Phone: (240) 314-8206 (direct)
Phone: (240) 314-8200 (main)
Fax: (240) 314-8210
www.rockvillemd.gov

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

All parties to this Memorandum of Understanding share the conviction that the area's quality of life is dependent upon the maintenance of economic vitality. It is the economic base that helps provide the resources to support the services which make living in this area so attractive.

In order for Rockville, Gaithersburg, and Montgomery County to continue to enjoy the quality of life people have come to expect, it is essential that all jurisdictions support well-managed economic development and housing initiatives which will be mutually advantageous to all parties, and agree to the goals and principles of the General Plan.

Therefore, the Montgomery County Executive and the County Council of Montgomery County, sitting as the District Council, the Mayor and Council of the City of Rockville, and the Mayor and Council of the City of Gaithersburg agree to the following:

1. The City Councils, the County Council, and the Executive agree to work cooperatively to determine logical urban growth areas and to establish boundaries which will serve as guidelines for a twenty-year planning horizon regarding:
    1) Land use and required community facilities,
    2) Capital investment responsibilities, and
    3) Logical and efficient operating service areas.

2. Montgomery County will base its position of support on annexations upon the above three considerations and the designation of logical urban growth areas by Rockville and Gaithersburg. The Cities and the County will develop procedural guidelines for handling annexation agreements.

Mayor and City Council
X-184
Exhibit #70

3. Rockville and Gaithersburg recognize the County's goal of requiring adequate public facilities in order to assure managed growth and acknowledge their accountability for the cooperative achievement of such goals. Within its boundaries each City will, however, assume responsibility for and determine how those goals should be measured and attained. It is the mutual intent of all parties that project funding and staging will relate to the timing of public facility availability and to that end will consult with each other as necessary to assure attainment of desired goals.

4. The County recognizes the ability of the two Cities to develop and implement public interest solutions to growth management concerns. City or County development plans for land located within the urban growth areas and on adjacent areas should seek to achieve the land use, transportation, and staging objectives of each of the affected jurisdictions, as defined in duly Approved and Adopted Master, Sector, or Neighborhood Plans. Every effort should be made by all parties to reconcile any differences in those objectives.

5. The City Councils, the County Council, the Executive, and the Montgomery County Planning Board agree to work on a cooperative basis in the development of plans and programs, including development districts, that affect parcels within the urban growth areas. Changes in land uses, staging, or zoning proposals for parcels within the urban growth areas will only be undertaken after the participation and consultation of the other parties. Any land annexed by either Gaithersburg or Rockville should include a staging component in the annexation agreement.

6. Rockville and Gaithersburg endorse the R & D Village concept outlined in the Shady Grove Study Area Adopted Plan as being in the best interest of both the Cities and the County.

7. Rockville and Gaithersburg recognize the importance of creative development initiatives such as Moderately Priced Dwelling Units (MPDU) and Transferable Development Rights (TDR). The Cities will continue to utilize these and other appropriate innovative concepts to further the common development goals for the area.

8. The Cities will cooperate in a master traffic control plan and transportation (including transit) system for the County.

9. The principles contained within this Memorandum are meant to apply to all future actions pertaining to land in the Cities or on or near the Cities' borders.

10. We recognize the importance of moving ahead on an early basis to establish a schedule of action and agree to meet frequently on these important issues.

Dated this 23rd day of July in the year 1992.

Neal Potter
County Executive

Douglas M. Duncan, Mayor
City of Rockville

W. Edward Bohrer, Mayor
City of Gaithersburg

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

December 1, 2008

The Honorable Sidney A. Katz
Mayor, City of Gaithersburg
31 South Summit Avenue
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20877

Dear Mayor Katz: / Sidney

I am writing in regard to the September 24th draft of the "City of Gaithersburg Municipal Growth: A Master Plan Element," which I understand you and the Gaithersburg City Council will be reviewing tonight.

The Master Plan Element, once approved, will pave the way for the City to annex properties in the Maximum Expansion Limits (MEL) shown throughout the document. Some properties depicted in the MEL represent enclaves of development, which for a variety of reasons, may make sense for the City to want to annex. However, I remain extremely concerned about the inclusion of prime commercial and institutional assets in the MEL which comprise the heart of the County's technology corridor, most notably, the Shady Grove Life Sciences Center, the Belward campus, the campuses of the University of Maryland and The John Hopkins University, the Center for Advanced Research in Biotechnology, the Maryland Technology Development Center, the Human Genome Sciences headquarters complex, and the Public Services Training Academy site.

Some 30 years ago, Montgomery County set out to establish itself as a global hub for biotechnology research and development, related technological advancements and higher education academic excellence. Through perseverance, capital investment, advocacy at the State level, and partnerships with the private and academic sectors, the vision developed for the Shady Grove Life Sciences Center, the properties surrounding this core area, and the entire 270 technology corridor has become reality. Enhancing the life sciences industry and emerging forms of technology has been a key component of the County's economic development strategy for over three decades, and today remains at the core of our business development plan. By including the aforementioned properties in the MEL, you will be undercutting the County's ability to fully cultivate the industry and land which have for years been driving our economic vision.

Mayor and City Council
X-184
Exhibit #71

JOINT
EXHIBIT
16
MP-2-08

While the 270 technology corridor – and developments such as the Life Sciences Center – has been blessed with an abundance of skilled professionals, an entrepreneurial spirit, and coveted Federal and private centers of excellence, it is important to acknowledge the huge capital investment the County has made in establishing this life sciences hub. Specifically, Montgomery County has:

- purchased close to 300 acres for the world-renowned Shady Grove Life Sciences Center, whose land value today approximates $150 million;

- donated 85 acres of land to the University of Maryland and The Johns Hopkins University for their academic campuses and for the Center for Advanced Research in Biotechnology (CARB);

- infused over $17 million in infrastructure for the Life Sciences Center and for Hopkins' Belward Campus;

- constructed Hopkins' first academic building (a $12 million capital outlay), and financed the construction of CARB;

- developed and continues to operate the $10 million Maryland Technology Development Center, a business incubator for life sciences companies; and

- advocated at the State level for major capital investments in the University of Maryland, Johns Hopkins and CARB by continually highlighting these assets in the County's state legislative priorities.

As we look toward the future, it is important to keep in mind Montgomery County's vested interest in the southernmost properties delineated in the Maximum Expansion Limits area in the draft Master Plan Element. The County continues to own strategic properties in the Life Sciences Center. Our Department of Economic Development markets the Life Sciences Center and adjacent commercial properties to companies wishing to relocate to this biosciences hub. Our successful life sciences incubator has been expanded once, and potential expansions remain on the horizon.

We will continue to advocate for funding for the Corridor Cities Transitway, or CCT, whose alignment and transit stops will be contained within the parcels discussed in this letter. The CCT is critically important to the County and any decisions that could impact it are of significant interest. The County is continuing to invest in this area. The County will be relocating the functions currently at our Public Services Training Academy site and will be making this valuable tract of land available for more appropriate uses that will build on the economic strength of this area.

The decisions that are made as to the City's Maximum Expansion Limits could have significant impacts upon the County. These impacts include loss of control of a significant element of our economic development strategy as described above, service delivery impacts and irretrievable losses of revenues. For example, as a result of large developments within the City, the County has nearly doubled the size of its 6th District Police Station. There are similar impacts upon the delivery of fire and rescue services. In fact, on October 13, 2008, the Department of Fire and Rescue Services provided City Planning Department staff with some suggestions for inclusion in the draft plan.

For all of these reasons, I strongly encourage the City of Gaithersburg, at a minimum, to remove the following tracts of land from the Maximum Expansion Limits in the draft Master Plan Element: the Shady Grove Life Sciences Center, the Belward campus, the campuses of the University of Maryland and The John Hopkins University, the Center for Advanced Research in Biotechnology, the Maryland Technology Development Center, the Human Genome Sciences headquarters complex and the Public Services Training Academy site. The investment we have, and will continue to make in these properties and the enhancement of this life sciences hub dictates that these parcels remain within the County's boundaries.

In addition to this important matter, the County has indicated with respect to previously proposed maximum expansion areas that it is concerned about the loss of moderately priced dwelling units (MPDUs) as a result of possible annexations into the City. The City requires both fewer MPDUs and for shorter durations. Therefore, even for the Maximum Expansion Limit areas to which the County has not specifically objected, the County would like to see the requirements of the County MPDU law applied to any area that ends up being annexed into the City.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my views on this important matter.

Sincerely,

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

cc: Henry F. Marraffa, Jr., Vice President, Gaithersburg City Council
Jud Ashman, Gaithersburg City Council
Cathy C. Drzyzgula, Gaithersburg City Council
Michael A. Sesma, Gaithersburg City Council
Ryan Spiegel, Gaithersburg City Council
Angel L. Jones, City Manager, City of Gaithersburg
Greg Ossont, Director, Planning and Code Administration, City of Gaithersburg
Mike Knapp, President, Montgomery County Council
Timothy Firestine, Chief Administrative Officer, Montgomery County

MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

December 22, 2008

RECEIVED
DEC 24 2008
PLANNING & CODE ADMINISTRATION

The Honorable Sidney A. Katz
Mayor, City of Gaithersburg
31 South Summit Avenue
Gaithersburg, MD 20760

SUBJECT: Draft Municipal Growth Element

Dear Mayor Katz:

At its regular meeting on December 18, 2009, the Montgomery County Planning Board discussed the City of Gaithersburg 2003 Master Plan: Municipal Growth Element. Through a motion by Commissioner Alfandre and seconded by Commissioner Cryor, the Planning Board agreed to transmit the following comments to the City of Gaithersburg:

1. The future annexation of the enclave areas is consistent with the City's adopted 1997 Maximum Expansion Limits (MEL) Map. These areas include NIST, Hoyle's Addition, Londonderry, Oakmont, Walnut Hill, Rosemont, Washingtonian Residential, and Washingtonian Industrial Park and are totally surrounded by the City of Gaithersburg. The future annexation of the enclaves by the City of Gaithersburg is appropriate and consistent with forthcoming recommendations of the Gaithersburg West Master Plan.

2. The City should refer all annexation requests to the Planning Board and County Council for review prior to City action on the request. This provides an opportunity to address any proposed rezoning as well as other concerns, such as, the removal of the property from Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) requirements, the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program, and the constraints of the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO). The 1992 Memorandum of Understanding between Montgomery County and the Cities of Rockville and Gaithersburg may need to be amended to include this requirement.

3. The City of Gaithersburg should include language in future annexation agreements that ensure the continuity of payment of Metropolitan District (Park) taxes after annexation. Despite the Planning Board's repeated request for the City to include this language in its annexation petitions, to date the City has yet to implement this recommendation.

4. The MEL should not include the Traville property which includes the Human Genome Sciences Headquarters complex and a portion of the Traville residential development. This area is an important element to the life science community.

Mayor and City Council
X-184
Exhibit #72

Joint Hearing - MCC & PC
MP-2-08
21

8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910 Phone: 301.495.4605 Fax: 301.495.1320
www.MCParkandPlanning.org E-Mail: mcp-chairman@mncppc.org

100% recycled paper

5. MD 28 would be a better boundary between the City of Gaithersburg and the *Potomac Subregion Master Plan* area than private property lines as shown on the proposed MEL Map. MD 28 is physically identifiable and would not split properties in the *Potomac Subregion Master Plan* area. This recommendation is consistent with Draft Municipal Growth Plan objectives.

6. Parcels in the Shady Grove Life Sciences Center (LSC) should remain outside Gaithersburg limits and under the planning and zoning jurisdiction of the County because the County has made a substantial investment in this area as a cornerstone of County economic activity. This includes the Belward property which was shown in the 1997 MEL.

7. There is an overlap between the City of Gaithersburg and the Town of Washington Grove's proposed MEL. Shady Grove Road, I-370, and the CSX railroad tracks are logical boundaries between the two municipalities. Further, there is a deed of dedication conveying the 12.4-acre Casey Mill Property legacy open space to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission; therefore, it should not be included within the MEL of any municipality. The Oakmont Industrial Park is the only property in the 2006 *Shady Grove Sector Plan* that should be included in Gaithersburg's proposed MEL.

8. The annexation of the 65-acre McGown property is likely because of the adjacent Watkins Mill Town Center and Casey East projects in the City. The Planning Department staff would like to coordinate planning of this property with the City of Gaithersburg's Planning Department staff.

9. Emory Grove Road should be the boundary of the MEL east of Goshen Road. The annexation of a portion of Montgomery Village is not appropriate because it will split portions of the Montgomery Village Town Sector Zone.

10. The Draft Municipal Growth Plan designates a portion of the Quince Orchard area including the 14-acre vacant Johnson property in the proposed MEL. The annexation of this area does not have a physically identifiable boundary for the City. We are concerned about the possible loss of the potential park site on the Johnson property and recommends this area be excluded from the MEL.

11. The Longdraft Road area should be included within the City's MEL. When development occurs, however, we hope that the City will strive to protect mature trees and provide the environmental safeguards recommended in the 1985 Gaithersburg Vicinity Master Plan.

12. The Planning Department Staff look forward to a more in-depth discussion of each of the key properties identified for annexation as the City's review of the Draft Municipal Growth Plan continues.

During the meeting the Planning Board emphasized its concern over the inclusion of the Life Sciences Center and part of the Montgomery Village community in its proposed MEL. Finally, the Planning Board would like to thank Greg Ossont, Director, City of Gaithersburg's Planning and Code Administration for his participation in the discussion of the Municipal Growth Element. We look forward to discussing the issues in more detail with you during the City's Municipal Growth Plan work session.

Sincerely,

Royce Hanson
Chairman

cc: Greg Ossont

RH:cm:nm:ha

Maryland Department of Planning

Martin O'Malley
Governor
Anthony G. Brown
Lt. Governor

Richard Eberhart Hall
Secretary
Matthew J. Power
Deputy Secretary

January 20, 2009

RECEIVED
JAN 22 2009
PLANNING & CODE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Greg Ossont, Director
Planning and Code Administration
City of Gaithersburg
31 S. Summit Avenue
Gaithersburg, MD 20877-2098

Dear Mr. Ossont:

Thank you for sending us your draft copy of the *City of Gaithersburg Municipal Growth Element-A Master Plan Element, Draft September 24, 2008.* This draft was also sent to state agencies for their review and comment, and as comments are received, they will be forwarded to you.

The Maryland Department of Planning staff members reviewed the document, and we have enclosed our comments.

We appreciated the opportunity to comment on this latest element to your *Master Plan*. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at 410-767-4500 or Steve Allan at (410) 767-4572.

Sincerely,

Peter Conrad, AICP
Director, Local Government Assistance

Enclosure:
cc: Steve Allan

Mayor and City Council
X-184
Exhibit #73

Joint Hearing - MCC & PC
MP-2-08
28

301 West Preston Street • Suite 1101 • Baltimore, Maryland 21201-2305
Telephone: 410.767.4500 • Fax: 410.767.4480 • Toll Free: 1.877.767.6272 • TTY Users: Maryland Relay
Internet: www.MDP.state.md.us

Maryland Department of Planning
Comments on the 2008 City of Gaithersburg
Municipal Growth Element - A Master Plan Element

Overall

Thank you for providing the Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) with the opportunity to review the 2008 Town City of Gaithersburg Municipal Growth Element.

Past Growth Patterns

The element includes a complete, well researched and thorough analysis of past growth patterns and the distribution of dominant housing types, but only since 1960. Although perhaps lacking a more in depth analysis of historical trends and issues, this approach seems to be nonetheless appropriate because the population was so small then (3,847), and it is obvious that the main driver of Gaithersburg's growth has been its proximity to Washington DC and its location along the rapidly suburbanizing I-270 corridor. We note that the existing population for the city does not take into account the growth from 2000 through 2008. However, this information appears in Section 3 in Table 4.

Population Projections/Future Land Use Needs

This section uses an analysis appropriate for an older urban area that will experience growth through a combination of greenfields, vacant properties and properties with a redevelopment potential. Additional explanation and examples of types of development that constitute the low ratio of improved value to land values would be helpful.

The City has done a good job incorporating a development capacity/build out analysis in the draft MGE. The draft element provides a detailed methodology, estimated population, housing unit and jobs capacity for areas within the Baseline, Pipeline and Growth Areas. However, the absence of population projections make it difficult to determine if there is the proper balance between available land capacity (supply) and the City's anticipated population growth (demand). It does not appear that the City intends for the total land capacity to serve as the projected population; stating that the capacity analysis represents the City's future for the purpose of infrastructure planning. However, if this is the City's intention it should be stated and an explanation provided as to this decision.

Table 9 on page 24 estimates that there is capacity within the City's current corporate limits for an additional 29,492 to 51,986 people or 12,545 to 22,017 housing units; this capacity does not assume that any areas from the MEL (Maximum Expansion Limits) would be annexed. Including these areas would add an additional capacity of 30,785 to 52,838 people and 19,818 to 29,104 housing units. There is a total capacity within the City and MEL for 104,824 people or 43,886 housing units. MDP projections indicate that Montgomery County is projected to grow by 211,900 between 2005 and 2030; therefore the City of Gaithersburg has capacity for nearly half of the projected County growth. It is should be noted that historically the City of Gaithersburg has comprised about 6 percent of the County's total population.

The element suggests a dramatic increase in the jobs to housing ratio. This is to be accomplished through mixed use redevelopment and annexation. Some analysis of the impact of this on the tax base and services would be informative. Some Countywide context, perhaps using county control totals, would provide a perspective on this projected job growth. This chapter also discusses the use of a population factor (person per housing unit at 2.37) but does not indicate whether that factor would be expected to change during the period 2008 – 2030.

Public Services and Infrastructure

The element does estimate the public school impact of forecast growth at both 20 and 32 units/acre density. This section should speak to whether trends would support the same yield of students from housing types and also what the size of type of schools would be need to meet this population growth.

The recreation section suggests that it is unreasonable for the City to meet the State standard recommendation of 30 areas of parkland per 1000 person. Gaithersburg, being located in a rapidly growing region, should include a consideration of facilities that are adjacent to but not operated by the jurisdiction.

Resource Lands

The discussion of the preservation and use of resource lands in the Element is lacking regarding rural buffers and transition areas, but the city has determined that it is an urban, state designated growth area surrounded by built up suburbia. Such determination is consistent with MDP models and guidelines publication #25 (p.18). Major watercourses are mentioned, and natural resource regulations are referred to generally, but not specifically. Map 5 illustrates environmentally sensitive areas, but does not specify the amount of undevelopable acreage affected by steep slopes, wetlands buffers or 100 year floodplains. The Critical Area regulations do not apply.

Future Annexations

Gaithersburg is influenced by the growth and development of Montgomery County. The areas recommended for future growth and annexation (MEL) should have additional explanation as to the benefits of annexation and the impact on the provision of public services to those areas.