

**GLENMONT FOREST
LOCAL MAP AMENDMENT NO. H-149
SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT**

Description

Adequate Public Facilities Schools Analysis for 250 townhouses units and 2,275 multi-unit dwellings.

COMPLETED: 8/8/2025

Planning Staff

ET

Emily Tettelbaum, Planner III, Eastcounty Planning, Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org, 301-495-4569

Carrie Sanders, Chief, Eastcounty Planning, Carrie.Sanders@montgomeryplanning.org, 301-495-4653

R&K

Robert Kronenberg, Deputy Director, Planning Department, Robert.Kronenberg@montgomeryplanning.org, 301-495-2187

LOCATION/ADDRESS

2300 Glenmont Circle, Silver Spring

MASTER PLAN

2013 Glenmont Sector Plan

ZONE

R-30

PROPERTY SIZE

34.87-acre tract

APPLICANT

Glenmont Forest Investors, LP c/o Grady Management, Inc

Summary:

- The public school analysis in this supplemental report, prepared at the request of the Hearing Examiner, demonstrates that there is adequate public school capacity to serve the residential development proposed by Local Map Amendment No. H-149.
- School capacity analysis and adequate public facilities (APFO) review will also be conducted at the time of Preliminary Plan.
- The most conservative assumptions, with the highest number of students generated for the Project, show that the middle and high schools will have capacity and no payment is needed, and that the Tier 1 adequacy ceiling at the elementary school level would be exceeded by five seats which would require a Utilization Premium Payment for elementary schools if the calculations remain the same at the time of Preliminary Plan.
- No new capital projects would be triggered at this time and if necessary, MCPS would make operational decisions to accommodate any additional students generally through program changes or relocatable classrooms.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND..... 3

SECTION 2: LMA H-149 PUBLIC SCHOOL ANALYSIS 4

ANNUAL SCHOOL TEST RESULTS 4

ENROLLMENT IMPACT ESTIMATE 5

SECTION 3: CONCLUSION 7

ATTACHMENTS 7

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND

At the request of the Hearing Examiner, Planning Staff have prepared a preliminary Schools Adequacy Analysis for Local Map Amendment No H-149, Glenmont Forest (“LMA” or “Application”). Although an adequate public facilities (“APF”) review will be conducted again at the Preliminary Plan stage of development when more details of the actual development are available, this Supplemental Report uses the most conservative approach to estimate students and provide an analysis based on the applicable provisions of Chapter 50, Section 4.3.J, and the 2024-2028 Growth and Infrastructure Policy with applicable guidelines.

Before proceeding with the analysis related to the LMA, it may be helpful to review the process and guidelines used to determine school capacity and calculate development impacts. Under the 2024-2028 Growth and Infrastructure Policy (“GIP”), the Planning Board reviews and certifies the results of an Annual School Test each year, no later than July 1, to establish the adequacy status of all of the County’s public schools. The Annual School Test is based on MCPS’ projections and the MCPS Educational Facilities Master Plan and Capital Improvements Program (CIP). There are also Annual School Test Guidelines (Attachment A) which explain in detail the procedures, methodologies, and standards used for the Annual School Test and school adequacy analysis.

The Montgomery County Council, several years ago by adoption of the 2020-2024 Growth and Infrastructure Policy (and continuing in the 2024-2028 GIP), recognized that stopping development, or building moratoriums, in certain areas because of school impacts was not actually addressing capacity or funding issues because most of the student generation was coming from resident turnover in existing single-family areas not new development. Accordingly, the County instead requires that development applications in overutilized school service areas, as identified in the Annual School Test, be charged a Utilization Premium Payment (UPP) in addition to development impact taxes to supplement funding for school capacity projects. Therefore, the public-school adequacy for a new development project is established by looking at the Annual School Test to determine capacity of the school, calculating the generation rates of the development, and applying the appropriate UPP and development impact tax before issuance of a building permit.

Although the school adequacy analysis in this Report uses the same methodology as an analysis associated with a Preliminary Plan of subdivision, it must make certain assumptions because the detail of the actual development is not known at the zoning stage. In this case, this Report is more conservative or rather is over estimating student generation as part of this APF review. However, school adequacy for the proposed development will be evaluated again at the time of Preliminary Plan, based upon the Annual School Test projections and adequacy ceilings at that time. In addition, at Preliminary Plan, the appropriate level of mitigation in the form of Utilization Premium Payments (UPP) will be assessed.

SECTION 2: LMA H-149 PUBLIC SCHOOL ANALYSIS

ANNUAL SCHOOL TEST RESULTS

The Glenmont Forest property, the subject of Local Map Amendment Application No. H-149 (the “Property”) is served by Glenallan Elementary School, Odessa Shannon Middle School, and John F. Kennedy High School¹. Table 1 shows the enrollment and capacity projections of these schools reflected in the FY2026 Annual School Test, and the Utilization Premium Payment (UPP) tier placements (Attachments B and C). The FY2026 Annual School Test, approved by the Planning Board on June 26, 2025, and effective as of July 1, 2025, evaluates the adequacy of public-school capacity for development applications reviewed through the fiscal year based on projections for the 2029-2030 school year.

Table 1. FY2026 Annual School Test Projections (2029-2030 School Year) & UPP Tier Placements

	Program Capacity	Enrollment	Utilization Rate	Seat Surplus or Deficit	UPP Tier Placement
Glenallan ES	772	692	89.6%	+80	No UPP
Odessa Shannon MS	881	796	90.4%	+85	No UPP
John F. Kennedy HS ²	2,173	2,059	94.8%	+114	No UPP

Based on the FY2026 Annual School Test results in Table 1, each of the area schools for the Property have capacity and there is no automatic UPP required. However, if the Project’s estimated enrollment impact at any school level exceeds the applicable adequacy ceilings shown in Table 2, a partial UPP payment may be triggered. The Tiers represent the payment amount such that a Tier 1 payment is lower than a Tier 2 which is lower than a Tier 3 based upon the level of deficit created.

¹ Kennedy High School is part of the Downcounty Consortium, which allows students to request to attend one of five area high schools. Each high school offers unique academy programs focused on specific career or academic interests.

² Projected enrollment is modified to estimate the impact of the Charles W. Woodward High School Reopening (CIP P651908) and the Northwood HS Addition/Facility Upgrades (CIP P651907), reflecting the scope of the boundary study approved by the Board of Education on March 28, 2023.

Table 2. FY2026 Annual School Test Adequacy Ceilings

	Tier 1 Adequacy Ceiling	Tier 2 Adequacy Ceiling	Tier 3 Adequacy Ceiling
Glenallan ES	154	235	351
Odessa Shannon MS	205	262	394
John F. Kennedy HS	274	549	875

ENROLLMENT IMPACT ESTIMATE

The Property is located within the Glenmont Policy Area, which is categorized as an Infill Impact Area by the 2024-2028 Growth and Infrastructure Policy. To estimate the LMA's enrollment impact during an average year throughout its life, the FY26-27 Student Generation Rates for Infill Impact Areas are applied to the net number of units proposed by unit type.

For the Subject LMA, the data table on the Floating Zone Plan (FZP) proposes up to 250 townhouse (single family attached) units and up to 2,275 multi-unit dwellings that will replace 482 existing multifamily low-rise units. The relevant information from the FZP Data Table is provided below (Table 3). Planning Staff has used the most conservative assumptions in this analysis, with the maximum number of units possible based on the FZP data table (2,275 multifamily units and 250 townhouses).

Table 3. Excerpt from FZP Data Table: Article 59-3, Uses and Use Standards, Division 3.1 Use Table

3.1.6 Use Table	Permitted/Required	Proposed
Multi-Unit (3.3.1.E)	Permitted Use	Up to 2,275 du
Townhouse (3.3.1.D)	Permitted Use	Up to 250 du
Retail/Service Establishment (up to 5,000 sqft) (3.5.11.B)	Permitted Use	Up to 5,000 sqft

The distribution of proposed multifamily units between high-rise (defined as 5 stories or more for the purpose of school adequacy analysis) and low-rise buildings has also not been determined at this time. Again, for this analysis, Staff made the conservative assumption that all the multifamily units would be in low-rise buildings because low-rise units have a higher student generation rate than high-rise units. Accordingly, Table 4 below shows an enrollment impact estimate for 250 single-family attached (townhouse) and 2,275 low-rise multifamily units (including removal of the existing 482 low-rise units).

It should be noted that the conservative assumptions used in this analysis likely overestimates the potential impact of this Project on the public schools. Some of the multifamily units would need to be within high-rise buildings to achieve the maximum residential density proposed given the size of the Property and other site constraints.

Table 4. Enrollment Impact Estimate (reflects FY2026-2027 Student Generation Rates)

Type of Unit	Net Number of Units	Infill ES Student Generation Rate	ES Student Estimate	Infill MS Student Generation Rate	MS Student Estimate	Infill HS Student Generation Rate	HS Student Estimate
SF Attached	250	x 0.165	= 41.250	x 0.088	= 22.000	x 0.137	= 34.250
MF Low-rise	2,275	x 0.066	=150.150	x 0.034	= 77.350	x 0.049	=111.475
(Existing MFL)	-482	x 0.066	= -31.812	x 0.034	= -16.388	x 0.049	= -23.618
TOTAL (rounded down)			159		82		122

Based on the above calculations, the Project's enrollment impact estimate is 159 elementary school students, 83 middle school students, and 122 high school students. (Note: This is over the life of the project and does not mean that these numbers of students would be added to the school system at any one time.) This exceeds the Tier 1 adequacy ceiling only at the elementary school level shown in Table 2 by five seats (159 - 154 = 5). Therefore, at the time of Preliminary Plan, if these numbers remain the same, a partial Tier 1 UPP payment would be triggered as 5/159th of the elementary school rate for an Infill Impact Area. Although the actual amount is calculated and paid at building permit, if this was calculated based on the current FY2026-2027 school impact tax rates, the payment amount would be \$136 for each market rate single family attached (townhouse) unit and \$41 for each market rate multifamily low-rise unit.

In any event, the result of the APF analysis for school adequacy is that the public schools are adequate based on the most conservative assumption of the LMA development (using the highest student generation rates) with a Tier 1 payment required to address the elementary school adequacy ceiling. Again, with the caveat that another school analysis will be performed at the time of Preliminary Plan of subdivision based on the rates and guidance at that time. The analysis does not trigger consideration of additional classroom space or a new school to accommodate the estimated enrollment impact of the Project at any school level. If the enrollment exceeds capacity, MCPS would

make operational modifications as necessary to accommodate the additional students, including the use of program changes or relocatable classrooms.

SECTION 3: CONCLUSION

Based on Chapter 50 and the 2024-2028 Growth and Infrastructure Policy, with associated policies and guidelines, there is adequate capacity in the public school system to serve the residential development proposed by Local Map Amendment Application No. H-149, using a conservative estimate of the number and type of units, with the payment of an applicable UPP which will be reassessed at the time of Preliminary Plan of subdivision and paid at the time of building permit.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Annual School Test Guidelines

Attachment B: FY2026 Annual School Test

Attachment C: School Utilization Report

Attachment D: Public School Utilization Premium Payments