

MEMORANDUM

March 15, 2010

TO: Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee  
FROM: <sup>GO</sup> Glenn Orlin, Deputy Council Staff Director  
SUBJECT: Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan—fiscal impact and transportation elements

**Please bring your copies of the Draft Sector Plan and the Appendix to this worksession.**

This memorandum addresses the transportation elements in the Planning Board Draft Plan. Appendix 4 describes the Planning staff's transportation analysis leading to the Plan's recommendations (pp. 31-58 of the Appendix). Most of the elements discussed in this memo are those about which there is some disagreement with the Final Draft expressed by the Executive (©1-2) and Department of Transportation (©3-7), public testimony, or Council staff. Some purely technical corrections will be made to the final document, but they are not identified in this memorandum.

*1. Fiscal impact.* The Executive's Fiscal Impact Statement (©8) estimates that the development called for in the Plan would generate a positive cash flow to the County between \$278,621 to \$828,789/year; the reason for the wide range is the wide range of possibilities that could occur under the proposed zoning. As is usually the case, commercial development generates a large surplus for the County, while residential development produces a large net cost, since most County services are to residents (most particularly school costs).

The costs on ©8 do not include debt service on capital improvements called for in the plan: the Summit Avenue and Lexington Street extensions and a full-service community recreation center, totaling \$47.4 million which would cost an estimated \$732,000 annually to operate (©9) (Note that the \$47.4 million estimate does not include design or land acquisition, and that since no engineering work has been completed on these projects, their costs could vary +/- 50%.) However, the Summit Avenue extension would help address an existing congestion problem which is not associated with Kensington development, and the recreation center would serve a much broader base than the new residential development proposed, so it is correct not to ascribe these costs in the fiscal impact. Furthermore, it is unclear whether the Summit Avenue or Lexington Street extensions would be built by the County; they are ultimately the responsibility of the Town of Kensington (they would be Town streets, under its jurisdiction), or they may be built as a result of subdivision approval conditions placed on new development.

**2. Land use/transportation balance.** The analysis of master-planned land use/transportation balance is conducted using the same technique as is used under the policy area review test in the most recent Growth Policy. Therefore, a Policy Area Mobility Review (PAMR)-type analysis was conducted for this plan, calculating Relative Transit Mobility (RTM) and Relative Arterial Mobility (RAM) and comparing the result to the standard. The difference between the Growth Policy analysis and this sector plan analysis, however, is that RTM and RAM are not calculated at a point 6 years out, but at build-out (2030).

Since PAMR is conducted at the policy area level, the results are reported in terms of the wider Kensington/Wheaton Policy Area. Based on the highest scenario of development proposed in the Plan—as well the high scenario for growth in White Flint and the Round 7.1 forecast for 2010 elsewhere—Kensington/Wheaton’s RAM would be 42% (Level of Service ‘D’) and its RTM would be 85% (LOS ‘B’ – not LOS ‘E’ as stated in the Appendix on p. 49).

Local Area Transportation Review (LATR) was also conducted with the build-out land use and transportation network. The results (Appendix, p. 53) show that two intersections would fail the current LATR standard of 1600 Critical Lane Volume (CLV): Connecticut Avenue/Plyers Mill Road and Connecticut Avenue/Knowles Avenue. Both intersections can be brought very close to the 1600 CLV threshold by: (1) constructing the extension of Summit Avenue to Dupont Avenue or Farragut Avenue, allowing traffic to enter Connecticut Avenue northbound at points other than Knowles Avenue and Plyers Mill Road; and (2) introducing dynamic lane assignment at the Connecticut/Plyers Mill: allowing, for example, a left-through lane in one peak period to be an exclusive left turn lane in the other. The chart below shows the forecast CLV for each intersection today, in Year 2030 with no improvements, in Year 2030 with the Summit Avenue extension, and Year 2030 with both the Summit Avenue extension and dynamic lane assignment:

<b>Volume/Capacity (V/C) Ratio (Capacity=1600 CLV)</b>	<b>Connecticut/ Plyers Mill</b>	<b>Connecticut/ Knowles</b>
Today	1.14 (PM)	0.90 (AM)
2030 w/ no improvements	1.40 (PM)	1.10 (AM)
2030 w/ Summit Ave. Ext.	1.21 (PM)	1.04 (AM)
2030 w/ Summit Ave. Ext. + dynamic lane assignment	1.07 (PM)	1.04 (AM)

In other plans, intersections that are projected to operate this close to capacity are deemed to be sufficient for land use/transportation balance. This is because build-out land use is never realized, and because it does not take into account all potential improvements to transit operations, particularly the scope and frequency of bus service, as well as TDM measures. There are also long-term plans to greatly increase the scope and frequency of MARC service that could make a dent in congestion.

**Council staff recommendation: Find that the Plan is in land use/transportation balance.** In the next section Council staff will have a suggestion that may further improve the Connecticut Avenue/Plyers Mill Road intersection.

**3. Summit Avenue extension.** The Plan recommends extending Summit Avenue north of Plyers Mill Road as a 2-lane Business District Street in a 60’ right-of-way, either one block to Dupont Avenue or two blocks to Farragut Avenue. An extension would provide a wider bypass for traffic from the west

(White Flint and Garrett Park via Knowles Avenue) or southwest (NIH and NNMC via Cedar Lane/Summit Avenue) to the north (via Connecticut Avenue) or east (via University Boulevard) to avoid the two problem intersections.

The extension would require several business relocations and, if extended to Farragut Avenue, would also necessitate relocating the Town's Public Works Department depot and the parking of still more businesses. The Council received testimony from Stanley Abrams, representing William Calomiris Company, Incorporated, in favor of extending Summit Avenue only to Dupont Avenue, citing the lower cost, less disruption to businesses, and difficult topography between Dupont and Farragut Avenues (©10). Although not mentioned in its written comments, DOT staff prefers extending Summit Avenue to Farragut Avenue because they believe a full-movement signalized intersection on Connecticut at Dupont would be too close to the signalized intersection at Plyers Mill.

**Council staff recommendation: Extend Summit Avenue to Farragut Avenue.** The longer extension would allow a safer—and one-block longer—bypass, and would still provide better access for properties on Dupont, since it would intersect with the new Summit extension as well.

**Furthermore, the Plan should recommend that, as part of project planning for the Connecticut/University/Farragut intersection, the State Highway Administration and DOT should explore diverting left-turning traffic from southbound Connecticut Avenue to eastbound Plyers Mill Road (and Metropolitan Avenue) away from that intersection and onto Concord Street, a one-block Business District Street east of Connecticut Avenue.** According to the CLV analysis performed by Planning staff, if this southbound-to-eastbound movement were relocated away from the Connecticut/Plyers Mill intersection, it would function very well in the evening peak, when it currently breaks down. Concord Street is sufficiently wide to carry this traffic, and only businesses front it. Vehicular traffic would not seep into the neighborhood just to the east, as the Town has already blocked off access.

**4. Lexington Street extension.** A large triangle of land in eastern Kensington is bounded by Metropolitan Avenue, Plyers Mill Road, and Saint Paul Street. The Plan calls for improving circulation in the area by extending Lexington Street through the middle of it, thus breaking up this super-block. Initially it was to be part of a one-way pair with Metropolitan Avenue—with Lexington 1-lane (plus parking) northbound and Metropolitan southbound. The Planning Board rejected the one-way concept, but the roadway table still shows it having only 1 travel lane. **Council staff recommendation: Show 2 travel lanes for Lexington Street extension on page 38.**

**5. Road rights-of-way.** The Planning Board recommends reducing the planned right-of-way from 80' to 70' for Plyers Mill Road between Summit and Connecticut Avenues (B-1), for Concord Street between Plyers Mill Road and University Boulevard (B-8), and Dupont Avenue between Connecticut Avenue and Nash Place (B-9), and from 80' to 60' for Howard Avenue between Connecticut and Knowles Avenues (B-6). DOT recommends retaining the right-of-way widths. **Council staff recommendation: Concur with the Planning Board.** The somewhat narrower rights-of-way are sufficient to provide the necessary lanes, parking, and streetscaping.

The table on page 38 also shows Howard Avenue between Kensington Parkway and Connecticut Avenue (B-7) and Kensington Parkway between Howard and Frederick Avenues (B-10) recommended

to have 60' rights-of-way, but DOT notes that page 20 of Plan recommends 70', and that these references on page 38 should be corrected. **Council staff recommendation: Concur with DOT.**

**6. Bikeways.** The Plan identifies a number of routes as bikeways, mostly as signed shared roadways (also known as Class III bikeways). The map of proposed bikeways is on page 34 and the bikeway table is on pp. 35-36.

DOT recommends several additional routes, with which Council staff substantively agrees. **Specifically Council staff recommends:**

- **Extending LB (Local Bikeway)-2 as a signed shared roadway on Farragut Avenue between Connecticut Avenue and Saint Paul Street.**
- **Extend LB-4 as a signed shared roadway west on Calvert Place to Washington Street, then west on Washington Street across its protected crossing at Connecticut Avenue, then west to Prospect Street, then west to Summit Avenue.**
- **Add a local bikeway as a signed shared roadway on Howard Avenue between Summit and Connecticut Avenues.**

Jack Cochrane of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates also has several recommendations (©11-12). He recommends designating a shared use path on Metropolitan Avenue not just from the Plan's eastern boundary to Saint Paul Street, but continuing to Plyers Mill Road. Within the last decade the State Highway Administration rebuilt Metropolitan Avenue to a narrow cross-section, with two 12' travel lanes, curb-and-gutter, and brick sidewalks abutting the curbs. Therefore, for the roadway to be widened enough to accommodate a signed shared roadway—to 14.5'-wide lanes—the entire roadway would have to be rebuilt. However, if the roadway would have to be re-built in the southeast segment where the Plan already recommends a signed shared roadway, then the same should apply to the northwest segment. **Council staff recommendation: Concur with Montgomery Bicycle Advocates.** This comes with the caveat, however, that such an improvement would be in the distant future.

Mr. Cochrane also recommends designating a shared use path on Summit Avenue south to Cedar Lane and from there south to Rock Creek Park, and also along Kensington Parkway south to Beach Drive in Rock Creek Park. But both these trails would lie mostly outside the Sector Plan area, so they are not appropriate to be included in this plan. These concepts should wait until the Kensington/Wheaton Master Plan is updated.



053138

mm  
have - CC  
SGF  
LJ

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

MEMORANDUM

December 14, 2009

To: Nancy Floreen, Council President  
From: Isiah Leggett, County Executive   
Subject: Planning Board Draft Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan

RECEIVED  
MONTGOMERY COUNTY  
COUNCIL  
2009 DEC 15 PM 12:16

I am pleased to provide Executive Branch comments on the Planning Board Draft Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan. I support the overall vision of the plan to preserve the unique assets of Kensington while creating a mixed-use, pedestrian friendly town center with pedestrian and bicycle connections to surrounding neighborhoods. I commend the Planning Board and its staff for its sensitivity to preservation of the culturally rich and historic assets of Kensington.

This draft plan utilizes the proposed Commercial Residential Zone that is being developed by the Council and the Planning Board. This zone holds promise as an incentive based mixed-use zone that will encourage developers to address important policy areas in connection with proposed developments. However, I remain concerned that we are once again reviewing a plan for adoption that is predicated on a zone that does not yet exist. My staff will continue to work with M-NCPPC and Council staff on this new zone to ensure that it is effective in accomplishing its objectives to foster quality mixed-use development.

Attached to these comments is an appendix of the detailed technical comments from the Executive Branch departments that we hope your staff will find helpful in making this plan an effective tool for the future development in Kensington. The projected costs of this plan and a fiscal impact summary based on a range of development projected by Planning Board staff are also attached. The complexities of the area make it more difficult to predict the amount of redevelopment that this area will actually experience. For that reason staff has stated the potential fiscal impacts as a range.

The Sector Plan encourages the broadening of housing choices for all income levels by applying the proposed CR zone to the Town Center, both within and near the Town of Kensington. The Plan assumes that the CR zone will promote the development of more multifamily housing to achieve a better balance of single and multi-family housing options. I fully support the housing objective of the Plan. I am concerned though that the Town of Kensington has not adopted Montgomery County Code Chapter 25A which provides for

Nancy Floreen, Council President  
December 14, 2009  
Page 2 of 2

moderately priced housing and enables the Department of Housing and Community Affairs to administer the marketing, sale, rental, resale, and control of MPDUs. Without this authority the goal of broadening housing choices for an array of incomes may not be achieved.

Depending on the amount of residential development that actually occurs, the area could realize a growth in the student population ranging between 57 and 171 additional school children. The Plan does not recommend an additional school for students arising out of development in the Plan area, but mentions that Kensington Elementary may be needed to accommodate White Flint Sector Plan development. Montgomery County Public Schools should address the validity of these assumptions.

The Kensington Plan Area is sandwiched between the White Flint Sector Plan area and the Wheaton Central Business District. While the draft Plan assumes that improvements to MARC rail will reduce vehicle trips, there is no discussion of what these improvements may be. The Plan also identifies that the intersections of Connecticut Avenue and Plyers Mill and Connecticut Avenue and Knowles Avenue will be out of balance for local area review. Given the trips that will be generated by redevelopment in the adjoining sectors, there needs to be an understanding of what transportation impacts there will be and a better vision of how MARC and other measures will reduce vehicle trips.

The Plan recommends re-evaluating the boundaries of the Historic District and identifies some key areas for inclusion in the Historic District. I am pleased that the Plan is sensitive to these areas and I encourage greater attention to Historic Preservation in the draft Plan.

I hope these comments and the attached technical comments are helpful to the Council as it considers the draft Town of Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan. The Executive Branch is committed to working with the Council, the Town of Kensington, and the Planning Board on the Kensington Sector Plan and its future implementation.

Attachments: Technical Comments  
Summary of Fiscal Impact Scenarios  
Operating Cost Estimates

**Montgomery County Department of Transportation Comments on  
Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan – Planning Board Draft  
(MNCPPC, October 2009)**

The Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) has the following concerns and comments regarding the subject draft plan.

General Concerns

1. The planning area covered by this draft contains territory for both an incorporated municipality (Town of Kensington) and several unincorporated areas (Montgomery County). The text should differentiate between incorporated and unincorporated areas, particularly where implementation of plan recommendations will be done by different governmental bodies.
2. Kensington is located midway between White Flint and the Wheaton CBD, two other areas currently undergoing plan amendments. East-west travel between these three areas will increase and the plan draft acknowledges that Kensington is already a bottleneck between the other two but it does not recommend any comprehensive solutions supported by transportation analysis. Intersections along the two major arterials in the plan area (MD 185 and MD 193) should be reviewed for existing and future (build-out) conditions in terms of a Critical Lane Volume analysis. If failing levels of service are indicated, some form of remedy consistent with land use/transportation balance should be proposed. It is unacceptable to state, “Refrain from widening intersections to accommodate through vehicle traffic” (p. 14) without proposing another specific solution.
3. More emphasis needs to be given to the MARC station within the planning area. The station has played a major role in the development of Kensington and the plan should recognize this role and project how the commuter service can be used to help accomplish the plan vision. There is no discussion as to how the presence of the station, and commuter train service, can leverage development and aid in achieving transit modal shares. There also needs to be an analysis of how much commuter parking is existing (the station currently has 125 – 150 daily boardings) and how much additional parking might be needed to support higher ridership.
4. The extension of Summit Avenue is shown as going through (taking) the current Town of Kensington public works facility. This plan must propose an alternative site for the relocation of this facility and must include text that the Town will relocate this facility at its own cost and in advance of the implementation of the road.
5. Bikeway M-M’ (as shown in the Kensington Wheaton Master Plan) is not shown on this plan draft; either show it on the map on p. 38 and add it to the bikeway table, or add some text formally deleting it so there is no future confusion as to its status.

6. A bikeway should be proposed for University Boulevard (MD 193) within the planning area.
7. A discussion of the jobs to housing ratio is missing from this plan and needs to be addressed so that there is a clear understanding of how this sector will compare with the countywide ratio of 1.6 to 1.
8. The historic preservation sections are insufficient and incomplete. Since this is a comprehensive amendment, a full historic preservation analysis of each candidate site or district needs to be done as part of this plan update, including a determination as to whether the site or district should be added to the Master Plan for Historic Preservation, retained on the Locational Atlas, or deleted from the Locational Atlas. It is insufficient to simply identify potential candidates for future evaluation.
9. It is unclear to MCDOT whether this Plan should be evaluated solely subject to the provisions of Article 66B of the Maryland Code (since it is a plan predominantly for a municipality) or subject to the provisions of Article 66B and Article 28 (since the plan includes a minor amount of unincorporated Montgomery County territory as well). The Plan needs to contain at least a brief description of the legal roles of the Park and Planning Commission, the Town of Kensington Council, and the Montgomery County Council for the approval and adoption process of the plan and zoning authority during implementation.

Specific Comments

- p. i change the lower case “diversity” (page 19) to **districts**
- p. 1 under “Vision”, the plan should not be recommending additional areas and sites for historic preservation evaluation; as a comprehensive amendment it should include complete evaluations and determinations for all candidate sites or districts
- p. 3 the first paragraph states that “The east-west crossing requires many travelers to use Connecticut Avenue . . .”. This is incorrect since travelers may use Summit Avenue instead.
- the third paragraph states that “. . . the track crossing is inconvenient and inhospitable”; this is incorrect since the track crossing is not a pedestrian connection; it is only for use by MARC passengers within the station area
- the fourth paragraph states “. . . businesses and [sic] well as plumbers, . . .”, change “and” to “as”
- p. 4 clarify whether this is the local, or National Register, historic district in the figure title and legend
- show all proposed streets

- p. 9 revise the sixth bullet by adding “at appropriate locations” after “pedestrian crosswalks”
- p. 10 this figure needs a legend to explain what the different colors mean  
- show Kensington town boundary
- p. 12 this Historic Preservation section needs to be completely rewritten to include evaluations of all candidate historic sites and districts and determinations as to whether they should be designated as historic or not
- p. 13 delete the third bullet symbol at the bottom of the page; it is superfluous
- p. 14 the second bullet under Stormwater Management is proposing a section that is not in the County’s design standards and is therefore invalid in the unincorporated areas of the plan  
- the third bullet under Stormwater Management is proposing permeable paving for roads which is not currently permitted by the County and is therefore invalid in the unincorporated areas of the plan
- p. 15 change all references from Lexington Avenue to Lexington Street  
- delete “County” from the third (Plyers Mill Road) line in the Table; this is a Town street not operated by the County
- p. 18 why is this page blank?
- p. 19 the heading “diversity” should be changed to **districts**
- p. 20 the third bullet at the top of the page is proposing a median design that is not in the County’s design standards and is therefore invalid in the unincorporated areas of the plan  
- clarify in the “Concept” section the meaning of “continuous pedestrian street” so that there is no confusion that it is a Business District Street open to vehicular travel  
- in the third bullet under “Connectivity” add the limits of “from Connecticut Avenue to Nash Place” after Dupont Avenue for consistency with the figure on page 37 and the table on page 38
- p. 22 show all proposed streets
- p. 27 Ken-Gar should be evaluated as a historic site or district as part of this plan, and a determination made as to whether to designate it or not
- p. 29 under Capital Improvements, any transportation projects in the unincorporated areas of the plan need to be coordinated with MCDOT

- p. 30 show all proposed streets
- p. 32 show all proposed streets
- p. 34 show all proposed streets
- "LB-5" is inconsistent with the table on p. 36
  - "SR-17" is inconsistent with the Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan, which shows it going via Dupont and Nash
  - Bikeway "SR-24" should be extended to bikeway "SR-16" for transportation interconnectivity
  - "LB-2" should be continued easterly to "LB-6" and should only be shown on one alignment (either A or B) with no asterisk
  - "LB-4" should be continued westerly to "SR-54" via Calvert Place and Prospect Street
  - add a bikeway on Howard Avenue from Summit Avenue to Connecticut Avenue
  - what are BL-100 and BL-101? They do not appear in the Countywide Bikeways Master Plan, nor are they shown on the table on page 35 of this plan draft
- p. 35 Bikeway "SR-16" should be referenced in the table since it is shown on the figure on p. 38 and a portion of it is within the Sector Plan Area
- an additional separate bridge for pedestrians and bicyclists is recommended over the CSX along the west side of Connecticut Avenue as part of Bikeway SR-17
- p. 36 redesignate all route numbers as "LB-xx"
- an additional segment of "LB-1" is recommended from Knowles Avenue to Howard Avenue
  - "LB-5" is inconsistent with the figure on p. 34
  - Bikeway M-M' (as shown in the Kensington Wheaton Master Plan) is not shown on this plan draft; either show it on the map on p. 34 and add it to this table, or add some text formally deleting it so there is no future confusion as to its status
  - "LB-2" should extend to St. Paul Street rather than Connecticut Avenue
  - "LB-4" should extend to Summit Avenue rather than Kensington Parkway
  - add a bikeway on Howard Avenue from Summit Avenue to Connecticut Avenue
- p. 37 only show one alignment for B-3 (either A or B) and delete the asterisk and footnote; the latter is superfluous
- p. 38 all of Arterial A-62 should have a R-O-W of 100' to be consistent with the previous plan

- Arterial A-67 should have 4 travel lanes to be consistent with the previous plan
- additional right-of-way is recommended for MD 185 so it can accommodate Proposed Bikeways B-1 and SR-17
- B-1 should have a R-O-W of 80' to be consistent with the previous plan
- B-4 should only go to the Plan Boundary (not to Capitol View Ave) to be internally consistent
- B-5 should be named Lexington Street (not Ave) extension; also the one travel lane is internally inconsistent with the on road bikeway
- B-6 should have a R-O-W of 80' to be consistent with the previous plan
- B-7 should have a R-O-W of 70' to be consistent with the text on p. 20
- B-8 should have a R-O-W of 80' to be consistent with the previous plan
- B-9 should have a R-O-W of 80' to be consistent with the previous plan
- B-10 should have a R-O-W of 70' to be consistent with the text on p. 20
- Primary Residential Street P-2 needs proper and accurate Limits
- Primary Residential Street P-4 needs proper and accurate Limits
- the second bullet under "Notes" should state Lexington Street (not Avenue) extension
- the third bullet under "Notes" is inconsistent with the historic district boundary shown in the figure on p. 4
- it would be helpful to document the existing right-of-way widths in this table

**Fiscal Impact Analysis for the Kensington Sector Plan  
Summary of Fiscal Impact Scenarios**

Summary: Below are 6 fiscal impact scenarios that attempt to show the range of development possibilities that could follow from the enactment of the Kensington and Vicinity Master Plan. They are based on the County's Economic Development Fund Fiscal Impact Model, and represent a broad-brush look at the higher level revenues and expenditures, rather than being all-inclusive. The figures do not include additional CIP expenditures, which will follow in a separate document. These scenarios represent the relative extremes of the fiscal impact spectrum, based on there being at least some minimal amount of new development.

Scenarios					
Residential and Commercial Development		Commercial Development Only		Residential Development Only	
New Residential and Commercial FAR is Minimal	New Residential and Commercial FAR is Maximal	New Commercial FAR is Minimal	New Commercial FAR is Maximal	New Residential FAR is Minimal	New Residential FAR is Maximal

**THE NEW DEVELOPMENT**

Estimated New Commercial FAR Assessed Value	\$41,755,000	\$124,650,500	\$41,755,000	\$124,650,500		
Estimated Value of Personal Property	\$4,175,500	\$12,465,050	\$4,175,500	\$12,465,050		
Real Property Tax rate at location	\$0.91	\$0.91	\$0.91	\$0.91		
Personal Property Tax rate at location	\$2.28	\$2.28	\$2.28	\$2.28		
Number of Jobs in New Commercial Space	2,088	6,233	2,088	6,233		
Average Salary per New Job	\$72,012	\$72,012	\$72,012	\$72,012		
Income Tax per new job	\$1,728	\$1,728	\$1,728	\$1,728		
Estimated New Residential FAR Assessed Value	\$75,800,000	\$227,300,909			\$75,800,000	\$227,300,909
Real Property Tax Rate	\$0.91	\$0.91			\$0.91	\$0.91

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

Net new households	379	1,137			379	1,137
New Population	963	2,888			963	2,888
Additional Schoolchildren	57	171			57	171
Additional College Students	8	23			8	23
Number of new jobs	2,088	6,233	2,088	6,233		
% of Jobs County Residents	60%	60%	60%	60%		
Net new jobs are County residents	1,253	3,740	1,253	3,740		

**REVENUES**

<b>Property Tax Revenues</b>						
From Primary Investment	\$476,466	\$1,422,387	\$476,466	\$1,422,387		
From Secondary Investment	\$692,054	\$2,075,257			\$692,054	\$2,075,257
<b>Income Tax Revenues</b>						
From Primary Income	\$655,021	\$1,965,063			\$655,021	\$1,965,063
From Secondary Income	\$210,331	\$630,992			\$210,331	\$630,992
Energy & Telephone Taxes	\$396,733	\$1,186,795	\$231,264	\$690,388	\$165,469	\$496,407
Other Job Related Revenues	\$104,387	\$311,935	\$83,216	\$248,424	\$21,170	\$63,511
Other Population Related Revenues	\$221,755	\$665,265			\$221,755	\$665,265
<b>Total County Revenues</b>	<b>\$2,756,746</b>	<b>\$8,257,694</b>	<b>\$790,946</b>	<b>\$2,361,199</b>	<b>\$1,965,800</b>	<b>\$5,896,495</b>

**COSTS OF COUNTY SERVICE**

Population related costs	\$920,757	\$2,762,270	\$0	\$0	\$920,757	\$2,762,270
Job related costs	\$673,808	\$2,015,955	\$371,745	\$1,109,763	\$302,064	\$906,191
Schoolchildren costs	\$817,377	\$2,452,131	\$0	\$0	\$817,377	\$2,452,131
College student costs	\$66,184	\$198,551	\$0	\$0	\$66,184	\$198,551
<b>Total County Service Costs</b>	<b>\$2,478,125</b>	<b>\$7,428,906</b>	<b>\$371,745</b>	<b>\$1,109,763</b>	<b>\$2,106,381</b>	<b>\$6,319,142</b>

**TOTAL FISCAL IMPACT of the COMPANY**

<b>(Revenues Less Costs)</b>	<b>\$278,621</b>	<b>\$828,789</b>	<b>\$419,202</b>	<b>\$1,251,436</b>	<b>(\$140,581)</b>	<b>(\$422,647)</b>
------------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

**Assumptions**

1. New Commercial Development based on data from Planning staff.
2. Assessed value of new commercial development is based on \$100 per square foot of valuation.
3. New residential development based on data from Planning staff.
4. Assessed value of new residential development is based on \$200,000 per unit valuation.
  - because the Planning Board Draft notes that most of the new units will be in multi-family housing.
  - current countywide average for condominium units is nearly \$250,000 (these typically have higher assessed values than non-cond multifamily housing)
5. Revenues and Service Costs are based on FY10 Approved Budget figures calculated on a unit of population basis

**County Capital and Operating Cost Estimates  
Assumed to be Incurred as a Result of the  
Kensington and Vicinity Sector Plan**

Capital Improvement Projects			
Project	Description	Cost Estimate	Implem. Dept.
<b>Business District Streets</b>			
Summit Avenue Extension	Plyers Mill Rd. to Farragut Ave. (to Connecticut Ave.)	\$10,000,000	DOT
Lexington Street Extension	Metropolitan Ave. to Plyers Mill Rd.	\$6,000,000	DOT
<b>Public Facilities</b>			
Full Service Community Recreation Center	Utilizing the complete program of requirements (33,000 nsf, 4 athletic fields, playcourt, playground, 190 car parking)	\$31,400,000	DGS
<b>Subtotal – Capital Improvement Projects</b>		<b>\$47,400,000</b>	
<b>Operating Budget Impacts</b>			
Additional staffing and operating expenses for new Recreation Center	Cost estimate includes personnel (\$328,000, 6.5WYs); operating (\$404,000)	\$732,000	REC
<b>Subtotal – Operating Budget Impacts</b>		<b>\$732,000</b>	
<b>Total Cost Estimate</b>		<b>\$48,132,000</b>	

Notes and assumptions:

Business District Streets:

- Cost estimates were prepared using master plan level of information, no engineering has been done;
- Costs represent 2009 dollars with a +/- 50% level of accuracy.
- Since Kensington is a separate municipality with its own public works capability, there is uncertainty as to who would construct and who would fund the proposed improvements (State, County or Town).

Stormwater Management:

- Kensington accepted the storm drain system from WSSC in the 1960s and has not been paying the storm drain property tax. Kensington is responsible for repair or replacement of the culvert under Oberon Street.
- Kensington residents pay the Water Quality Protection Charge (WQPC). Therefore, projects in Kensington can be funded out of the Water Quality Protection Fund (WQPF) and would be prioritized along with other needs Countywide and implemented based on the priority list.

Libraries:

- The White Flint Sector Plan calls for a public transportation oriented Express Library to be built in the vicinity of the Metro station with the understanding that residents needing a “full service” library would use the Kensington Park or Rockville Libraries. In the event there is an increase in use at Kensington Park, the future renovation of the Kensington Park Library might require expansion of the building and parking.

1

Public Hearing Testimony  
of  
Stanley D. Abrams, Attorney for  
William Calomiris Co., Inc.

Good Evening President Floreen and Members of the County Council:

I am Stan Abrams of the law firm Abrams & West, P.C., attorney for William Calomiris Co., Inc. who are involved in the ownership of properties located in the northwest quadrant of Connecticut Avenue and Dupont Avenue in Kensington, Maryland. The properties are improved with Savannah's Restaurant and Parking area fronting on Connecticut Avenue and the Mr. Wash Car Wash and Jiffy Lube operation fronting on Dupont Avenue. These are key properties in any future redevelopment of the Kensington CBD.

These properties are recommended to be rezoned to the new CR Zone, but due to the status of that Zone we are unprepared to provide any meaningful comments on the proposed zoning of the property.

We are however prepared to address another recommendation in the proposed sector plan. The sector plan proposes the extension of Summit Avenue with two alternatives proposed. One extending Summit Avenue to Dupont Avenue and the second alternative extends Summit Avenue, a somewhat greater distance to Farragut Street.

My clients support the extension of Summit Avenue to Dupont Avenue. Dupont Avenue is further from the congested intersection of Connecticut Avenue and University Boulevard and would promote less potential congestion and relieve some of the pressure on that intersection. The shorter extension of Summit Avenue to Dupont Avenue would disrupt fewer existing property owners and be less costly in property acquisition and road construction costs. We also believe this route would be more feasible due to topographic elevational considerations on Farragut Street.

This extension would further encourage redevelopment of my clients properties by providing superior access on Dupont Avenue which is currently populated by automobile repair and service establishments.

For reasons expressed tonight, we request that you designate the extension of Summit Avenue to Dupont Avenue as opposed to Farragut Street in the amendments to the Kensington Sector Plan.

Thank you,

Stanley D. Abrams, Esq.  
Abrams & West, P.C.  
4550 Montgomery Avenue, #760N  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
(301) 951-1540

10

# Montgomery Bicycle Advocates

## Montgomery County, Maryland

February 12, 2010

Montgomery County Council  
100 Maryland Ave.  
Rockville, MD 20817

To the County Council,

The Kensington Sector Plan is a solid plan that reflects a desire by planners to support bicycle use within the sector. It is a big step towards making all streets bikeable. It has avoided the pitfalls of some recent plans, by planning many streets as on-road bikeways rather than merely calling for shared use paths. Almost every road that we would suggest as a bikeway is designated as one in the plan.

### Design of Signed Shared Roadway Routes

It's important that the "signed shared roadway" (SSR) bikeways provide enough lane width for bicyclists to comfortably share the road with cars, except on truly calm, low volume streets where width may not be required. As noted in our testimony to the Planning Board, the devil is in the details when it comes to SSRs. Few roads in the plan will have bike lanes or paths, so the SSR routes must carry the load and should be appealing to more than just experienced road bicyclists. Footnotes should be provided for each SSR route indicating rough width, especially since the road code standards cited provide limited or no width. If shoulders are not present, 15' outside lanes should be provided on the arterials designated as bikeways, and 14.5' outside lanes should be provided on the major business district streets identified as bikeways. If parking is permitted, more space is required (24' if parking utilization is high). Standards 2004.01 and 2004.05 for arterials in the plan call for 14' outside lanes (or 14.5' in the "Introduction and Application" (010.01) section of the Road Code). But 15' is much more appropriate given their role in the bikeway network.

Given these widths, it's may be preferable to just provide bike lanes instead. Implementers should be able to substitute bike lanes for SSRs without a plan amendment. An optimal network of bike lanes (all designated as bikeways in the plan already) would consist of 1) Plyers Mill Rd. east of Summit, 2) Summit Ave. at least from Knowles to Plyers Mill, 3) Knowles Ave./Armory Ave., 4) Kensington Parkway/Howard Ave., at least where designated a business district street, and 5) possibly University Blvd. in coordination with the Wheaton CBD sector plan.

### Street by Street Specifics

The following SSRs justify 15' outside lanes or rideable shoulders:

- Plyers Mill Rd. east of Summit – (A-62/B-1) – Part of the "cross-county bikeway" linking Potomac to Metro stations to Rt. 29.
- Summit Ave. from Cedar Lane to Knowles Ave. (A-67) – Route from Kensington to NIH, etc.
- Knowles Ave./Armory Ave. (A-66; just one block of Armory) – Most of Knowles is part of the cross-county bikeway.

The following SSRs require preferably 14.5' outside lanes or rideable shoulders:

- Howard Ave. east of Connecticut Ave. (B-6, B-7) – A portion of this is part of the Connecticut corridor bikeway.
- Kensington Parkway (B-10, P-2, P-4) - Part of the Connecticut corridor bikeway
- Summit Ave. from Knowles to Plyers Mill – Part of the cross-county bikeway. Also route from Kensington to NIH, etc.
- Metropolitan Ave. (B-4) – Also, *extend as a bikeway to Plyers Mill Rd.*
- Newport Mill Rd. – If rebuilt.

The following streets are already identified in the sector plan as getting bike lanes. Feasibility is questionable.

- Connecticut Ave. – The sidewalk on the bridge over the railroad tracks must be improved.
- University Blvd. – Bikeway type should be left "TBD" if possible pending development of the Wheaton CBD sector plan.

The SSR bikeways not named above are generally acceptable as built. These streets are:

- Lexington St.
- Saint Paul St.
- Dupont Ave.
- Farrugut Ave.
- Kent St.

#### **Other Changes**

As we recommended to the Planning Board, the SSR designation on Metropolitan Ave. (B-4) should be extended all the way to Plyers Mill Rd.

#### **Shared Use Paths**

The plan features almost no shared use paths, even though paths surround Kensington. We recommended to the Planning Department the following additions:

- Along Summit Ave./Cedar Lane, from Knowles Ave. southward. Would connect to path along Cedar to NIH, etc.
- Possibly along Kensington Parkway from of the proposed St. Paul railroad crossing to Rock Creek Park. A path was once planned there.
- Possibly along University Blvd., depending on whether bike lanes stay in the plan.

#### **Crossings**

- Improve the Connecticut Ave. sidewalk over the railroad tracks.
- Build the proposed bike/ped crossing of the railroad tracks at Saint Paul St.
- Provide better pedestrian crossings of Connecticut Ave., maybe even a grade-separated crossing. The walkability of Kensington depends on it.

Thank you for considering our comments. Sincerely,

Jack Cochrane  
Chair, Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MoBike)  
7121 Thomas Branch Drive  
Bethesda, Md. 20817