



Greater Olney Civic Association

Post Office Box 212 Olney, Maryland 20830

Our Website Address: <http://www.goca.org>

GOCA MEETING - July 11, 2000

The meeting was called to order by President Mike Kelley. Following introductions, the agenda was approved with 1 addition and the minutes were approved with one correction under the topic of the Norbeck Park and Ride Lot, that the problem is not just that it is poorly lit, but also that it is poorly maintained with lots of trash and debris which discourages people from using it. The floor was opened to Public Comments.

Ron Berger noted that Community Concerts of Olney's first MusicFest was scheduled to take place the following weekend, July 14-16th. There is a weekend of music planned all around the Olney/Sandy Spring area. One of the highlights will be the US Army Concert Band performing in concert Saturday evening at Sherwood High School for free and a rock concert that afternoon.

OFFICERS/COMMITTEE REPORTS

PRESIDENT'S COMMENTS:

Mike reported that:

- We had sent a follow-up letter to the response we received from the County Dept. of Liquor Control and to the County's Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) concerning the signage on the County liquor store. He noted that he walked around to the side of Olney Elementary and near the classroom windows facing Georgia Ave and the Liquor/Wine sign in question was clearly visible. We ask them to reconsider their decision to leave the sign on the basis of it being visible from the school, particularly in light of the County's Children First initiative last year. He also sent Nancy Dacek a copy of both letters. To date, we had not heard from either Mr. Cook of the Liquor Control Dept or from Bruce Romer, the CAO, but hoped to hear from them soon.

There were no *CORRESPONDING SECRETARY'S REPORT* (position currently vacant) or *TREASURER'S REPORT* (not at meeting). However, Mike noted that because we will be receiving funds from the County for the operation of the Olney Days Festival, we would like to switch our budget cycle to match that of the County. So, at the next meeting, we will present a revised July 1, 2000/June 30, 2001 budget.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE :

Dave Eskenazi reported that there was another meeting of the Georgia Ave/Norbeck Rd Focus Group where they are going through the alternatives. There are concerns among the residents in that area about the impact on the neighborhood as it currently exists and there is resistance to having the road elevated there, with having an above grade intersection unless the lower road is dug down fairly deeply which would be a problem because of the Metro line running along Georgia Ave and under Randolph Rd. We will see similar kinds of solutions being proposed at Georgia and Norbeck Rd, and even at Georgia and Rte. 108, once they get that far.

Also, as a part of the proposed expansion of the Olney Village Mart being proposed by Carl Freeman Associates, and of the Olney House property, the developers are being required to make improvements to the Georgia Ave/Rte. 108 intersection. Freeman Associates did a study of the traffic impact from their shopping center improvements that showed that several intersections would be impacted: Rte 108 at Georgia Ave, Olney Village Mart Dr, Spartan Rd, and Prince Philip Dr, plus Georgia Ave at Spartan Rd and Prince Philip Dr. The only two they found that would be over capacity soon are the Georgia/Rte. 108 and Georgia Ave/Spartan Rd intersections. They are proposing restriping the northbound Georgia Ave lanes south of Rte. 108. Now we have 1 straight, 1 left and straight, 1 left, and 1 right turn lane; and, without adding any new pavement change to 2 lanes left, 2 straight, and 1 right turn lane. At Spartan and Georgia they are proposing changing from 1 left and 1 left, straight, and right lane to 1 left and 1 straight and right turn. He did not find it convincing, but it was a typical of these kinds of reports commissioned by the developers that provides a solution to traffic mitigation problems that may in fact really not be solutions.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Public Libraries and the Internet - Art Brodsky introduced Elliott Minsburg, counsel with the People for the American Way (People for). Mr. Minsburg is an attorney well known in constitutional law areas dealing with free speech and the Internet. He has been involved with all the landmark cases nationally and his particular interest is access to the Internet through public libraries, having participated in the precedent setting case in Loudoun County, VA.; a decision that realigned their policy on blocking and filtering Internet access in their libraries. Because of a problem at the Olney Library that was brought to our attention recently and because the County is beginning to look at their policies in this area as a result of State legislation passed at the end of the last legislative session, we thought it would be helpful to have Mr. Minsburg address us.

Mr. Minsburg noted that People for cares a lot about people's rights in a whole range of ways and the libraries is an important one. He indicated that he did not have to stress the critical importance of the Internet in the 21st Century, and, in particular in the libraries for people who do not have access to computers and the Internet in their homes. On the other hand, there are legitimate concerns about what you do when there are "bad stuff" on the Internet and how you deal with them in a way that is consistent with the mission of the libraries which is to provide information to the public and let the library patrons, users, and families make the decision on what to view on the Internet. He brought several documents for us to look at, including (1) a pamphlet done by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science on kids and the Internet - the promise and perils, (2) a copy of the public access/Internet policy of the Wausau County Library System in Nevada city developed a few years ago which, while not being perfect has a number of interesting proposals we might want to look at, and (3) a copy of the policy statement of the American Library Association on Internet access and the responsibilities of libraries in which they strongly state that they are against the use of mandatory filtering by libraries.

He wanted to discuss the wrong and some right ways to balance these issues in the context of a library. The approach taken by Loudoun County, VA was the wrong way and the reason their association felt they had to take them to court. In a very split vote, even though there were no problems noted in the libraries such as those he had read about in our local paper, required mandatory filtering (blocking) of all Internet terminals in their libraries used by adults and children alike that was designed to prevent "pornography" and materials that is harmful for minors. The problem is that it is difficult to determine what that is. The people writing the software that does this are not generally lawyers, but, typically, are 21 year old software engineers that try to figure out how to market this kind of software. While it may work when used in the home, but there is a problem of a one size fits all solution when put in the libraries. This software usually work in a combination of ways. One is to automatically block out sites that have key words in them such as sex or breast. The problem is that is will block out things about Middlesex County, breast cancer, etc. that are acceptable. The other way is for the people working for the software companies to actually visit sites and try to decide if it is appropriate in terms of it sexual explicitness, violence, etc - whatever the category would be. Then again, you are relying on software engineers in their early 20s making these kinds of decisions. Also, they may not get to all the sites, and the Internet is a very fluid medium that can change overnight - so currency is always an issue. It doesn't mean they are totally ineffective, but they are inherently somewhat ineffective.

The initial problem in Loudoun County was major overblocking - blocking of legitimate, important information - not only for children, but for adults as well. While they did an excellent job of trying to find effective software, it blocked sites on the Quaker Society of Friends, the American Association of University Women, the Heritage Foundation, and even, a beanie baby site. Librarians for the County using the computers as patrons would found that over 60% of the sites that were blocked shouldn't have been blocked, even according to Library's own policies. The second problem was underblocking because of the speed with which the Internet changes. What the software engineers decide to block one day, may not apply to sites put up or changed the next day or the day after that. Even one of the strongest advocates for filtering in libraries found that a significant number of undesirable sites were not blocked. The third, and most serious for the Library was that what they were doing, particularly with respect to their adult patrons was in violation of their First Amendment rights to access information on the Internet. What the court pointed out was that what the library was doing was like subscribing to a large magazine and ripping out some of the pages; and not even having the librarians do the ripping, but it was being delegated to the software engineers. The Federal District Court that heard the case, did decide that the filtering did infringe on peoples first amendment rights. The Library System then adopted a policy their client had wanted them to adopt originally which was a voluntary policy. Adults could elect to have the filters and, for minors, the parents had to sign a form giving permission for their child to use the computers on which they indicated whether the filters should be used or not. He is not aware of any problems in that County since the policy was changed. While their organization was not 100 % satisfied with this policy, their client - Mainstream Loudoun, was satisfied; and, the ACLU, that was also a party to the case on behalf of a number of the website companies, has not filed any appeals of that decision.

Mr. Minsburg went on to present three categories of things that can work for libraries:

(1) Rules of Conduct - rules that do not necessarily related to the Internet specifically, but for behavior in a library in general. For example, conduct of a group of teenage boys hanging around National Geographics or books on anatomy. Libraries generally have rules about not disturbing other patrons, not harassing them or showing them things they do not want to see. These would

apply to adults that might want to download something from the Internet that others might find objectionable and would not want to be shown. All of these types of rules should apply to use of the Internet and would give the librarians some discretion in responding to the behavior of the users and to decide when someone is going out of their way to be a nuisance.

(2) Content-Neutral Computer Use Rules - rules that don't relate directly to what people are pulling up on the screen, but can have a real impact on how that use affects other users, such as where you put the computers. Computers that will provide Internet access can be placed near a wall with the user's back to the wall, so that people passing by will not feel that they are being bombarded by this material rather than placing them in the center of a room. Doing things like putting privacy screens or quick acting screen savers so that the screen savers pop up if nothing is done with the computer within a few seconds. You can limit the use to library card holders that must present their identification to use the computers. You can limit the amount of time a person is on the computer. If you have individuals that people feel are making a nuisance of themselves by what they are viewing or downloading, you can have a rule that limits the use by individuals to 2 or 3 half hour sessions a week without special permission from the library, for example, for a particular research project. You can limit the use of printers and what is downloaded. Charging fees for printing, for example a fee after the first 10 pages are printed for free. Not providing access to chat rooms or prohibiting the downloading of any games or even limiting the size of files that can be downloaded or the amount of time these take because of the amount of space they take up on hard drives or the amount of time people spend playing or chatting. It would probably be legal to exclude all games as long as it was done fairly. And, deciding that someone is playing a game is a much easier decision than whether that game is educational. These are all content-neutral and apply to everyone. Designing a library web page that comes up when the user first logs on that suggests web sites to visit. This is particularly useful for computers in the children's sections of the libraries. That would do what librarians have traditionally done which is to direct users to the information they are looking for. It will not preclude or prevent someone from going somewhere else, but, for the most part, it will guide their users in the correct direction. Libraries can adopt policies that say, for example that you cannot view or download materials that are illegal, such as child pornography. These rules can state that users will be denied future use for a duration or permanently, if they are found guilty of such actions.

(3) Voluntary Screening - (He looked at some of the things our library is proposing and much of it is consistent with this type of solution.) One possibility is to say that computers in the children's area will have filters on it and possibly pages that direct the users to good Internet sites. But, parents should indicate when their children sign up whether they have permission to view computers with no filters, for example for the 17 year old that is still a minor. This is much like the fact that children might be directed to a children's section to look for age-appropriate books, but would not be prevented from getting books from the adult section of the library. It is possible to program computers to identify particular minor users and when they login the filter is turned on or off automatically based on the permission given by the parents. This avoids the one-size-fits all solutions originally adopted by Loudoun County. He noted, though, that these voluntary screening policies are not free of problems. It is not impossible that some 17 year old whose use of the computer is being limited by the permissions given by his parents or by the filtering software being used might claim that their first amendment rights are being violated. However, it is much less likely to happen with the one-size-fits-all policy.

Use of these kinds of policies would satisfy the intent of the legislation passed by the Maryland State Legislature. He noted that Senator John McCain has introduced a bill that would mandate all libraries and all schools use filters on at least some of their computers. One of the groups that opposed this is the association that represents Catholic schools because sometimes for some grades, they might want to use filters. But, for some of their older students, they want to teach what they call ethical use of the Internet. What they do is say to their students is what they expect students to do when using the Internet and if you do not adhere to these expectations you will lose your privileges to use their computers to access the Internet. They feel that is an important teaching tool and to mandate that filters be used for all children at all times will interfere with their ability as educators to teach their students about ethical behavior. None of these are magic bullets, but you can look at them with respect to the situation in Olney. The key thing is that all of them avoid the policy of mandatory blocking for all people at all times using computers in the library which is inconsistent with what libraries are for and how the Internet works.

The following points were made during the question and answer period that followed:

- The main idea of Internet access at libraries is to make it available to their patrons to use as a resource for anything they want to use it for just as they do with books, magazines, and other resources.

- You could try using the kind of web page he suggested and only permit users to go to the sites you have identified. This would be a positive affirmation rather than a negative, blacklist kind of approach. It would not be dissimilar to the action libraries take in deciding which books, magazines, videos, tapes, CDS, etc to purchase. This approach has not been tested in court but an acceptable argument might be made for this versus universal blocking using filtering software. Having the software make the decisions removes the librarians from the decision process of selecting what to make available. While that is probably more defensible is that that policy would be inconsistent with the nature of the Internet. It would be nearly impossible to keep up with all the new sites that come online every day and with changes to existing sites. Also, the whole purpose of Internet access in the libraries is to let the users do that kind of exploring.

- Once the libraries try to control on the basis of content, they become libel for interference with first amendment rights, whereas when they do not get involved with content they are not libel.
- Rules relating to not being a nuisance to other patrons isn't limited to sexual explicit materials, but to any material. The issue is not what you are bothering the patron with, but that you are bothering the patron at all and being a nuisance.
- A very useful site for libraries and, even more at home, is called Getnetwise, a site his organization put together. It provides information about filtering and other mechanisms to use in guiding your children's use of the Internet. With his children, rather than blocking sites, he found a way of monitoring the sites his children went to. He would check that and if he found they were going to sites he felt were unacceptable, he would talk with them about it. There is even software now that assists with this type of monitoring. It would probably be difficult to do this in a library setting.
- There is an expectation of privacy in your use of any materials in a library. There should be a similar expectation with Internet use as well. Even if you are not looking at sexually explicit material, you may not want people to see what sites you are going to. So the computers should be arranged in a way or have devices such as privacy screen that provide users privacy and minimizes the ability of other library patrons or staff to see what you are viewing as they walk by. If there is a concern that users will come in feel they can go to these types of sites because no one will bother them, this will only happen in a very small percentage of cases and there are other ways to address that problem. For example, having rules about the amount of time a person can stay on the computer addresses the problem of someone spending too much time visiting these sites. If you are concerned about them downloading materials and showing to other patrons; that ought to be against any libraries rules about not being a nuisance to other patrons. If the issue that materials are visible to others when they are being printed, locate the printer in a place where others cannot view it, regardless of what it is. So there are other ways to deal with that type of user that keeps in mind the mission of the library to serve all their patrons and let the patrons make those kinds of decisions about what they will look at.
- It is possible to designate certain computers filtered and some unfiltered, as long as you don't make it impossible to get access to unfiltered machines because of the disproportionate amount of unfiltered computers, but that has not been tested in the courts.

OLD BUSINESS

St. Andrew Kim Senior Housing (Victory Housing) - Mike Kelley introduced Bonnie Thompson from Victory Housing to give a brief update on their agencies response to criticism of the size of the building they were proposing initially. They have reduced the size of the building to 3 stories. They did this by making the halls narrower and by extending the footprint of the building at the end furthest from Rte. 108. If you stand in front of the building, Rte. 108 will be to your left with the end of the building facing Rte. 108. There will be a hearing before the Park and Planning Commission's (P&P) Planning Board on Thursday, July 13th at 1:30 pm and before the Board of Appeals on July 26th.

The property is 10' above Rte. 108 and the building is 200' from Rte. 108, with a 150' setback to the property line. The staff report indicated that this use was consistent with the goals and objectives of the Olney Master Plan; and there is no specific guidance for this property, but the Plan did propose providing a full-life cycle community that includes elderly housing. In response to concerns by SEROCA, about the impact of constructing all the realigned Batchellors Forest within this property, they will ask for permission to only build the portion from the housing project to Rte. 108. Dave Eskenazi suggested that this was not the type of housing that had been envisioned for this site. The Master Plan anticipated this type of housing in the town center area. So, he suggested that we needed to think of how to mitigate the size of the building. The process with HUD is what is pushing this project forward at the speed Victory Housing is moving and doesn't really allow them to do much more than they have already proposed. They have to have all of the necessary approvals to HUD by Sept. 30th, but they could get an extension if they were interested in requesting one. The question of using a different portion of the property for the building so it could have a larger footprint. In the current location, there is not more that can be done. John Lyons of SEROCA indicated that they were not very sympathetic to these deadline issues because they had just come to the community at a point that left us with few options and with an unwillingness to attempt to get any of the deadlines extended, even though we will be stuck with whatever product comes out of this process for many years.

Dave suggested that we write to Victory Housing, with copies to P&P and the Board of Appeals outlining some of the additional measures we think they should consider for mitigating the impact of this project at this location such as realigning Batchellors Forest Rd to give them additional acreage to use, splitting the design into multiple buildings that straddle the Batchellors Forest, adding a basement for utilities and some of the communal space such as their meeting rooms so the building could be lower. Mike Kay suggested, however, that the real issue is that they have given a set of restrictions with this 5 acre site and with the time frames they say they are locked into -take it or leave it. They gave us no forewarning and came to us in the 12th hour of this process to ask about our opinions and concerns, with no real opportunity to try to work out other alternatives in a design that truly addressed our concerns. He did not feel that we needed to back away from our concerns just because of their unwillingness to go back to HUD for an adjustment in the timetable, which they could do,

Helene Rosenheim added her concerns that, while understanding their desire to build the maximum number of units the grant would allow because of the need for this type of housing in the County, Victory Housing had started this process by deciding to go for the full amount, even though they could have gone for less, before really considering what size project was appropriate for the site. Instead they went for the maximum amount of money and are now force fitting the project onto the site with a building design that is out of scale for the location, a design decision that has implications for the development for other properties in that area that are meant to be lower density developments. Khalid indicated that from P&P's they have to consider whether the impact of this project reaches the level of recommending denial when weighed against the benefit derived from providing this type of sorely needed housing in the County.

John Lyons suggested, however, that our Master Plan clearly recognizes the need for this type of housing, but anticipated it being located within the town center area, close to the services the residents in this type of development might need, west of Old Baltimore Rd, not in the buffer that was to exist between the higher density development in the town center area and the lower density rings of development outside of the town center area. Even though this site is just outside that boundary, it is still outside that boundary and if this type of housing is going to be introduced here, the scale of the development is key to the acceptability of such a project. While he understands the idea of weighing this project against the benefits of providing this type of housing, he does not agree that it is consistent with the intent of the Master Plan. Khalid indicated that the definition of density of an elderly housing project is different than the density associated with a regular apartment development. An elderly project, for example, does not have the traffic impacts of a regular apartment, and so the benefits associated with them by filling a significant need for this type of housing - especially subsidized housing, offset or mitigate the fact that the size of the structure may be larger than would be acceptable if it were a regular apartment project. He also questioned where this would go in the town center area. Dave noted that a site that had been intended for a 250+ elderly housing project immediately behind the Olney Town Shopping Center was recently converted to a townhouse project because the property owner argued that there was no market for that type of housing.

Khalid noted, too, that this project will be surrounded by the St. Andrew Kim Church, later their retreat facility and the Olney Theatre complex. It is not surrounded by single-family homes. The closest developments are Arden Woods, a substantial distance, separated by a berm on Rte. 108 that masks the view of this building from the street, and the homes on Batchellors Forest Rd, also a substantial distance from this site. The alignment of the building with the short side to Rte. 108, it will only be visible from the road and only for a short time. The full length of the building will only be visible to the church, and along Batchellors Forest Rd when it is realigned. Dave E. suggested that it would only be visible as Khalid suggested if you were heading west, but if you are heading east, the whole building would be visible, not just from a distance, but close up. He suggested that if the same number of units were divided up into 2 or 3 pods, that would be more acceptable. Khalid suggested that Victory Housing staff had indicated that would be too expensive and reiterated that there is no other fully subsidized elderly housing in the County. From their perspective, the trade offs in this case were acceptable. John Lyons noted that they are building a similar project in Cloverly. Several people felt that if it was acceptable for Victory Housing to go back to HUD with a lowered request that did not run the risk of them losing all the funding, they should do so.

Ron Berger also suggested that he was concerned that staff felt this was consistent with the Master Plan and added that a criteria that is looked at in deciding whether a special exceptions should be granted is whether it is consistent with the intent of master plans, but inconsistent. It does not have to be a single-family development to be an acceptable special exception use on this site. But, as designed this will be a very massive structure and will be very visible in a place that it was not envisioned to be. The fact that this is a politically correct project because of the nature of the project does not change the fact that it is not what is suppose to be there. He felt we need to strongly state those concerns to P&P and they are going to decide what they are going to decide and they are going to have the staff recommendation to use in making that decision. But, this absolutely inconsistent with what people worked hard to come up with 20 some odd years ago, and, it, basically tears at the very fabric of the Olney town center satellite concept.

Mike noted that the motion passed at the last meeting stated that GOCA opposed the Victory Housing project for the St. Andrew Kim Korean Catholic Church property because of the height, mass, and density of the building and because of traffic and safety concerns at the proposed location. He noted, also, that in the most recent P&P staff report they state that, "the proposed project will provide elderly housing for the very low to low income segment of the population, addressing a need unmet by the standard, market-rate elderly housing project. It will fulfill the objectives of the local area master plan and the general plan of the County. It will have no adverse impact on the local vehicular and pedestrian traffic. It will be properly screened and landscape and the building is sited to minimize the overall mass of the proposed structure as viewed from MD Rte. 108. There are no existing houses or other structures adjacent to the property that could be impacted by the proposed structure and the future developments nearby can be adequately screened and protected from view of this development as the RC zone allows clustering of houses with more open space which could be used to buffer this use from other future uses, if so desired." Based on that conclusion, they recommend the approval of the special exception applications with conditions other than those we were discussing. There was also some discussion about the impact of other changes such as the changes to the Olney Theatre site and the church, and the context of this area may make this more acceptable and may be a change in character that must be considered when the master plan review begins.

Dave Eskenazi moved that:

GOCA AFFIRM ITS MOTION FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING WITH RECOGNITION THAT THE CHANGES PROPOSED BY VICTORY HOUSING STILL DO NOT SUFFICIENTLY MITIGATE GOCA'S CONCERNS ABOUT THE MASS OF THE BUILDING AND THE INCONSISTENCY OF THE PROPOSED USE WITH THE MASTER PLAN.

The motion was seconded by John Lyons and passed.

Post Office Expansion - Mike Kelley noted that when we heard that the Postal Service was considering not using the Maddox site because of construction costs being higher than anticipated, we wrote to the Postal Service strongly requesting that they move ahead with this project on the Maddox property in spite of the added costs. He then introduced John Turpin, the real estate specialist for the US Postal Service to give an update on the project, who, in turn, introduced Jerry Lane, Alan Grimes, and Keith Kendricks, all also of the Postal Service. John reported that they had hired a consultant to do a study of the Maddox property. They found that there is a change in the topography as you move to the east, and there is a stream forming the east boundary of the property. To deal with this they would have to build an underground parking lot and lots of retaining walls. It would cost about \$1 million to prepare the site before even beginning construction of the building. This brought the cost up to \$5+ million and the Postal Service management felt that this site was no longer cost effective. So they are looking for other options in the community.

Approximately 30 days ago they began reassessing the situation. They have not canceled the project, but are back to the drawing board. They will be reannouncing their needs and seeking solicitations for other sites, but they do not expect any substantial difference in the results of that. So, they are also considering relocating the retail portion of the operation to a commercial area, probably in one of the existing shopping centers. This would include the retail windows and the post office boxes and would be similar to the operation they have at Leisureworld Plaza. They are looking at the possibility of putting parking on the gas lines next to the existing site, but even with that they may not have enough room to make the facility big enough on that site. They will keep us informed of their progress.

Development Plans for Olney House Site - Mike introduced Bette Buffington to give an update on their dealings with the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) which is that the building facade is too over decorated, has too many Chippendale railings. They also do not like the idea of relocating the spring house. The Buffingtons, the developers, are planing to lower the apparent height of the building by using the slope of the land. They originally had the building closer to the Bank of America property, but they put the building there is they want to keep to the grade of the land. Because of the elevation, the new building will actually appear to be shorter than the Olney House. They have moved it back, and made it smaller. From the Olney House, the building will appear to be 2 stories. The community room will be on the level with the parking lot. The spring house will remain in its present location and they will restore it through partial or complete dismantling and reassembling. There is less pavement between the new building and the Olney House. They have modified the design so that it is simpler and will compete less with the Olney House. They found an old photograph of the Olney House and they plan to restore the front porch as it is shown in that photograph in place of the small, existing residential porch. In response to a request from Khalid Afzal, P&P, they will be providing a pedestrian path from Rte. 108 to the private road at the rear of the property. They meet again with the HPC on July 26th and should have their final meeting on August 16th. The Buffingtons are concerned that HPC may ask them to eliminate the community room to eliminate some of the parking spaces, and may ask our support for retaining it.

Olney Village Mart Development Plans - Helene Rosenheim reported that the Olney Village Mart's preliminary plan was approved. They are not doing the rear entrance, but are being required by the Planning Board to do the ramp as we have proposed it, near the front of the property. They are also being made to put the opening at the northwest corner of that strip of stores for a pedestrian access from the corner of Spartan and Appomattox. They are still doing to the building in the rear, but she did not know if the specific location of the building had been set. The Board indicated that they will also make the same requirement of the owners of the Olney Town Shopping Center when they submit their preliminary plans.

Mike Kay noted that their traffic plan still calls for a Rte 91/108 improvement north of Rte. 108 that we do not really want and mentions improvements to Spartan Rd at Rte. 108 as a possible alternative. It doesn't appear that they are looking at the larger issue. He understands that they agree to form a road club with other developers such as the Buffingtons and would work with the Dept. of Public Works and Transportation to work out a more unified plan. But, there is no way to require them to do that and that would take more time than the developers may want to wait. Mike also noted that Freeman Associates development staff never met with the Towns Homeowners Association, as they had promised they would. It seems unreasonable that they would not meet with the most affected group of homeowners/ residents. They also told GOCA they would come back as their plans got further developed, but they had not done that either. The Appomattox access is still the major contention with the Towns. They are concerned that an access to the rear with Hillcrest would draw a lot of cut-through traffic. They had asked for no truck access through the rear, but no timetable was set. They would also like a physical restriction so that cars cannot exit onto Marksman Circle. Mike noted that they did not move or rotate the 2-story building in the rear parking lot. They would like it moved closer to Rte. 108 and would like to eliminate the cul-de-sac at the rear of the center.

Staff recommended approval with conditions. Mike Kay moved that:

GOCA SUPPORT THE CONDITIONS PLACED ON THE PRELIMINARY PLAN BY PARK AND PLANNING STAFF, BUT NOTE THE ISSUES RAISED BY THE TOWNS OF ENVIRON.

The motion was seconded by John Lyons, and passed.

Election of Recording Secretary - Mike Kelley reported that we are looking for someone to fill the position of Recording Secretary vacated by Lori Wilen's resignation. No one present at the meeting volunteered, so Mike asked everyone to check with people in their associations to see if anyone would be interested. The position is responsible for picking up the mail from our PO box regularly and distributing items that need to go to other officers or committee chairs, reporting on incoming and outgoing mail at each regular meeting, plus attending the officers meeting, as much as possible. He asked that anyone interested contact him prior to the September meeting.

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment for the Alzheimer's Care Facility on the Silo Inn Property - Mike Kelley noted that Nancy Dacek's office is preparing a zoning text amendment that would permit the development of an Alzheimer's patient care facility on this site because the zoning must be changed to permit a lower density use than the current zoning calls for. This property is zoned commercial and this use is not one that is permitted outright or as a special exception use in this zone. He was concerned that the portrayal made by Steve Smet of GOCA's position may have been overstated as active support rather than a lack of opposition. The consensus was that, we had no objections to the concept of such a facility on this site, but that we had not formed a firm position because we had not seen any proposed development plans to react to. Mike indicated that he would convey that to Nancy Dacek's staff, so that they understood that our lack of opposition was not the same as actively supporting this use. There was some concern about voting to support a zoning text amendment without actually seeing the language of the amendment; and without ever seeing any plans for the facility; since it could have unintended applicability to other parts of County if it is not worded correctly. Unless we feel this is an acceptable use in other places and understand the implications that may have on other areas, we need to be sure the language makes it clear this zoning text amendment, which is a change to zoning law in the County, only applies to this site.

Following this discussion, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Helene Rosenheim
Recording Secretary

People in Attendance:

Ron Berger, Mike Kelley, Walter M. Lee, Joe Hess, Dudley Finneyfrock, Mary Couch, Janet Terry, Renate Stably, Dave Eskenazi, Michael Kay, Gary Lieber, Tom and Cornelia Maddox, Peggy Vaughn (Gazette), Bill Thewes, Christie Berman, Ellen Bogage, Ed Weisel, Art Brodsky, Elliott Minsburg, Bonnie Thompson, Rich Kopanda, Sharon Elswick, John Lyons, Leslie Cronin, John Turpin, Jerry Lane, Alan Grimes, Keith Kendricks, Khalid Afzal, Steven Vergo, and Helene Rosenheim.