Description
Pleasant Grove Community Church: Site Plan No. 820190010: Application for the construction of an 8,515 square foot religious institution with up to 200 seats; located 700 feet west of Johnson Drive; 4.02 acres; R-200 zone and Rural Village Overlay zone; 2006 Damascus Master Plan.

Applicant: Reverend Lawrence Bryant
Acceptance date: 8/29/2018
Review Basis: Chapter 59, Chapter 22A

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

Summary
- Staff recommends approval with conditions.
- Site Plan No. 820190010 implements approved Preliminary Plan No. 120130160.
- Pursuant to Section 59-7.7.1.B.1 of the Zoning Ordinance, the application is reviewed under the development standards and procedures of the property’s zoning on October 29, 2014.
- Site Plan is required because the Application is within the Rural Village Overlay Zone (Sec.59-C-18.23).
- The site distance evaluation for visibility at the proposed entrance has not been approved by MCDOT because the full analysis requires removing a number of trees that contribute to the rustic character of Mountain View Road, a rustic road. As identified in the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Service’s letter, prior to record plat, the Applicant must submit a revised site distance evaluation to verify adequate site distance exists.
- The Property is within the Purdum Locational Atlas Historic District (#10/24), which requires all trees with a DBH of one inch or greater to be located and any impacts to these trees, including impacts to the critical root zone, be subject to a tree variance.
- The Application satisfies the requirements of Chapter 22A, Forest Conservation Law, by meeting the entire afforestation requirements off-site at a forest mitigation bank.
- The Planning Board granted two regulatory review extensions, valid until July 25, 2019.
- Staff has not received any citizen correspondence on the Application.
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SECTION 1 – RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONDITIONS

SITE PLAN NO. 820190010: Staff recommends approval of the Site Plan with conditions.

All site development elements shown on the latest electronic version as of the date of this Staff Report submitted via ePlans to the M-NCPPC are required except as modified by the following conditions:¹

Preliminary Plan Conformance

1. The development must comply with the conditions of approval for Preliminary Plan No. 120130160 as listed in the MCPB Resolution No.17-025 dated May 1, 2017.

Density & Height

2. Density
   The Site Plan is limited to a religious institution with a maximum of 200 seats and a total of 8,515 square feet with no weekday child daycare or private educational institution.

3. Height
   The development is limited to a maximum height of feet, as measured from the average elevation of the finished ground surface along the front of the building to the mean height level between the eaves and ridge of the roof.

Site Plan

4. Site Design
   a) The exterior architectural character, proportion, materials, and articulation must be substantially similar to the schematic elevations shown on the submitted architectural drawings, as determined by M-NCPPC Staff.

5. Lighting
   a) Prior to certified Site Plan, the Applicant must provide certification to Staff from a qualified professional that the exterior lighting in this Site Plan conforms to the latest Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA) recommendations (Model Lighting Ordinance-MLO: June 15, 2011, or as superseded) for a development of this type. All onsite exterior area lighting must be in accordance with the latest IESNA outdoor lighting recommendations (Model Lighting Ordinance-MLO: June 15, 2011, or as superseded).
   b) All onsite down-lights must have full cut-off fixtures.
   c) Deflectors will be installed on proposed fixtures to prevent excess illumination and glare.
   d) Illumination levels generated from on-site lighting must not exceed 0.5 footcandles (fc) at any property line abutting public roads and residentially developed properties.
   e) Streetlights and other pole-mounted lights must not exceed the height illustrated on the Certified Site Plan.
   f) On the rooftop of the building, the light pole height must not exceed the height illustrated on the Certified Site Plan.
   g) Any change to the lighting plan, including modifications required by the Historic Preservation Commission will require a site plan amendment.

¹ For the purposes of these conditions, the term “Applicant” shall also mean the developer, the owner or any successor (s) in interest to the terms of this approval.
Environment

6. **Forest Conservation & Tree Save**
   The Applicant must comply with the conditions of approval for the Final Forest Conservation Plan No. 820190010, approved as part of this Site Plan, subject to the following conditions:

   a) Prior to any clearing, grading or construction on the project site, the Applicant must record an M-NCPPC approved Certificate of Compliance in an M-NCPPC approved off-site forest bank to satisfy the reforestation requirement for a total of 0.62 acres of mitigation credit.

   b) Within the first planting season following project completion, the Applicant, at the direction of the M-NCPPC Forest Conservation Inspector, must install the required variance tree mitigation plantings for the removal of the forty-three variance trees. Mitigation must be provided in the form of planting twenty-one (21) native canopy trees with a minimum planting stock size of three caliper inches. The planting locations of these trees and any substitution of species from what is shown on the approved Final Forest Conservation Plan (“FFCP”), excluding the eight (8) mitigation trees within the right-of-way of Mountain View Road, are subject to the approval of the M-NCPPC Forest Conservation Inspector.

   c) The limits of disturbance (LOD) on the Final Sediment and Erosion Control Plan must be consistent with the LOD shown on the approved Final Forest Conservation Plan.

   d) The Applicant must comply with all tree protection and tree save measures shown on the approved FFCP. Tree save measures not specified on the approved FFCP may be required by the M-NCPPC forest conservation inspector.

7. **Historic Preservation**
   Historic Preservation program staff and the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) application have the following conditions:

   a) Prior to issuance of any grading or land disturbance permits:
      a. The cemetery must be staked at the known corners, and safety/snow fencing should be installed and maintained until issuance of a Certificate of Use and Occupancy for the new building;
      b. If the limits of disturbance for the new path must be modified to accommodate unanticipated grave shafts, the path may be shifted by the M-NCPPC FCP site inspector and Historic Preservation staff to avoid disturbance;
      c. If any unanticipated finds are discovered while constructing the path, work must cease until the site can be evaluated by Historic Preservation staff.

   b) Prior to issuance of the demolition permit for the house and outbuildings:
      a. The Applicant must return to the HPC for the issuance of a Historic Area Work Permit (“HAWP”) to demolish the structures on site.
      b. Historic preservation staff must be allowed full access to the Subject Property and adjacent cemetery to document the house and outbuildings, and to create a list of salvageable architectural materials.


Transportation & Circulation/ Adequate Public Facilities (APF)

8. **Pedestrian & Bicycle Circulation**
   a) The Applicant must provide 4 short-term bicycle parking spaces.
   b) The short-term spaces must be inverted-U racks (or approved equal) installed along the building’s retail frontage/in a location convenient to the main entrance (weather protected preferred). The specific location(s) of the short-term bicycle rack(s) must be identified on the Certified Site Plan.
   c) The Applicant must construct a 5-foot-wide sidewalk connecting the proposed church to the adjacent church on Parcel 185, as shown on the Certified Site Plan, unless modified in coordination with Historic Preservation staff.

9. **Fire and Rescue**
   The Planning Board accepts the recommendations of the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services (MCDPS), Fire Department Access and Water Supply Section in its amended letter dated March 14, 2019, and hereby incorporates them as conditions of approval. The Applicant must comply with each of the recommendations as set forth in the letter, which MCDPS may amend if the amendments do not conflict with other conditions of Site Plan approval.

10. **Right-of-Way**
    The Planning Board accepts the recommendations of the MCDPS Right-of-Way Section in its amended letter dated March 25, 2019, and hereby incorporates them as conditions of approval. The Applicant must comply with each of the recommendations as set forth in the letter, which MCDPS may amend if the amendments do not conflict with other conditions of Site Plan approval.

11. **Site Plan Surety and Maintenance Agreement**
    Prior to issuance of any building permit, sediment control permit, or Use and Occupancy Certificate, the Applicant must enter into a Site Plan Surety and Maintenance Agreement with the Planning Board in a form approved by the M-NCPPC Office of General Counsel that outlines the responsibilities of the Applicant. The Agreement must include a performance bond(s) or other form of surety in accordance with Section 59-D-3.5(d) of the Montgomery County Zoning Ordinance, with the following provisions:

    a) A cost estimate of the materials and facilities, which, upon Staff approval, will establish the surety amount.
    b) The cost estimate must include applicable Site Plan elements, including, but not limited to plant material, on-site lighting, site furniture, mailbox pad sites, trash enclosures, retaining walls, fences, railings, private roads and sidewalks, private utilities, paths and associated improvements of development, including sidewalks, bikeways, storm drainage facilities, street trees and street lights. The surety must be posted before issuance of the any building permit of development and will be tied to the development program.
    c) The bond or surety must be tied to the development program, and completion of all improvements covered by the surety for each phase of development will be followed by a site plan completion inspection. The surety may be reduced based upon inspector recommendation and provided that the remaining surety is sufficient to cover completion of the remaining work.
12. Development Program
   The Applicant must construct the development in accordance with a development program table that will be reviewed and approved prior to the approval of the Certified Site Plan.

13. Certified Site Plan
   Before approval of the Certified Site Plan the following revisions must be made and/or information provided subject to Staff review and approval:
   a) Include the stormwater management concept approval letter, development program, and Site Plan resolution on the approval or cover sheet(s).
   b) Add a note to the Site Plan stating that “M-NCPPC Staff must inspect all tree-save areas and protection devices before clearing and grading.”
   c) Add a note stating that “Minor modifications to the limits of disturbance shown on the site plan within the public right-of-way for utility connections may be done during the review of the right-of-way permit drawings by the Department of Permitting Services.”
   d) Modify data table to reflect development standards approved by the Planning Board.
   e) Add an L-shaped 5-foot-wide sidewalk connection between the sidewalk which lead to the main entrance and the entrance on the southwest corner of the main building.
   f) Ensure consistency of all details and layout between Site and Landscape plans.

SECTION 2 – SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Site Analysis
The Subject Property is located on the north side of Mountain View Road (11307 Mountain View Road), approximately 700 feet west of Johnson Drive and consists of a 4.02 acre (P088 on Tax Map FX122) zoned R-200 and within the Rural Village Overlay Zone (“Property” or “Subject Property”). The Subject Property is located on the eastern edge of Purdum, one of the Rural Village Communities identified in the 2006 Damascus Master Plan (“Master Plan”). The Property is also within the Purdum Historic District, Site 10-24 on the Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites (Figure 1).
The Subject Property fronts on and has access to Mountain View Road, a rustic road, with an existing pavement width of approximately 20 feet. The southern half of the Subject Property is improved with a single-family detached home, barn and gravel driveway which has access to Mountain View Road. Tax records indicate that the residence was constructed in 1900. In the northernmost corner of the Property is a large deck/stage of unknown use and origin. The remaining land is kept in open field. The existing house is served by an on-site well and septic system.

Pleasant Grove Christian Community Church (“Applicant”) lead by Reverend Lawrence Bryant owns the abutting property to the east (Parcel P185) which contains an existing church and cemetery (Figure 2). The building has been utilized as a school and a church since 1869 and services the Pleasant Grove Community Church congregation.

Surrounding the Property is predominately comprised of one-family detached dwellings in the R-200 zone (within the Rural Village Overlay zone) and farmsteads in the Agricultural Reserve zone.
The Property is located within the Bennett Creek watershed; this portion of the watershed is classified by the State of Maryland as Use Class I-P waters. There are no streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplains, or environmental buffers located on or adjacent to the Property. Nor are there any steep slopes, highly erodible soils, specimen trees, or forests on the Property.

SECTION 3 – APPLICATIONS & PROPOSAL

Previous Approvals

Preliminary Plan No. 120130160
Preliminary Plan No. 120130160 ("Preliminary Plan") was approved on May 1, 2017, by Planning Board Resolution No. 17-025 to create one lot for one religious institution with no weekday school or weekday daycare (Figure 3 & Attachment A).
Figure 3 – Approved Preliminary Plan No. 120130160
Proposal

Site Plan No. 820190010 Pleasant Grove Community Church ("Application" or "Site Plan") was submitted on 8/29/2018 to allow construction of a 200 seat, 8,515 square foot religious institution, on 4.02 acres of land in the R-200 Zone (Figure 4 and Attachment B).

Site Plan review is required because the Property is within the Rural Village Overlay Zone. The Site Plan layout is generally consistent with the Certified Preliminary Plan, however, the parking lot and fire turnaround area (leg) have been revised to limit visibility from the road and improve vehicular circulation.
The Site Plan is also subject to review by the Historic Preservation Commission ("HPC") because the Property is within the Purdum Locational Atlas Historic District (#10-24). The HPC supports the Applicant’s proposal to demolish the existing structures and construct the new church, under the supervision of Historic Preservation Staff.

Construction will take place in two phases. Phase 1, the focal point of the Application, is the primary sanctuary which has a footprint of 6,915 square feet. A modest 1,600 square foot addition (multi-use room) to the main building is also proposed to illustrate how expansion could be accommodated in the future.

Phase 1 of the development includes demolition of the existing house and barn, grading, installation of the driveway, and construction of the 200-seat main sanctuary.

Phase 1 also includes construction of the parking lot, stormwater management facilities and installation of landscaping. All of the sidewalks will be installed during Phase 1 with the exception of two lead-in sidewalks connecting to the entrances of the addition which will be installed during Phase 2, when the addition is constructed. During Phase two, the door on the southwest corner of the main building will become the interior entrance to the addition and the sidewalk system within building footprint will be truncated to access the front door of the addition.

A well and new septic system will be installed to serve the new church. The required stormwater management goals will be met via two micro biofiltration facilities located north of the rear parking lot, on either side of the fire department access leg.
The building will feature a gable style roof with a copper/brown metal roof, brick faced water table and tan cement board siding, and white trim. The main entrance will be clearly identifiable with a pronounced brick face and large windows.

Figure 7 – Illustrative Rendering (Phase 1 & 2)

SECTION 4 – ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS - Site Plan No. 820190010

Findings – Chapter 59

1. *The site plan conforms to all non-illustrative elements of a development plan or diagrammatic plan, and all binding elements of a schematic development plan, certified by the Hearing Examiner under Section 59-D-1.64, or is consistent with an approved project plan for the optional method of development, if required, unless the Planning Board expressly modifies any element of the project plan.*

   Neither a development plan, diagrammatic plan, schematic development plan, nor a project plan were required for the subject site.

2. *The site plan meets all of the requirements of the zone in which it is located, and where applicable conforms to an urban renewal plan approved under Chapter 56.*

   The Site Plan satisfies the applicable use standards, development standards and general requirements of the Zoning Ordinance as established below.

   The Subject Property is zoned R-200 and within the Rural Village Overlay zone. The Site Plan meets all requirements of the R-200 Zone and the Rural Village Overlay zone and is not part of an urban renewal plan. The Subject Property is being developed as a religious institution which is a permitted use in the R-200 zone and the Rural Village Overlay zone. The Overlay zone doesn’t include any additional development standards that apply to this Application. However, Section 59-C-18.234 specifies two additional findings that need to be made (below).
Rural Village Overlay Zone

In properties with an underlying residential zone, such as the Subject Property, Section 59-C-18.232.(b) of the Overlay Zone regulations permit all uses allowed by the underlying residential zone, with the exception of the following prohibited uses: life care facility, child day care center, hospital, life science center, nursing home, and golf course or country club. The Site Plan proposed religious institution is within none of the prohibited uses listed above.

For properties within the Overlay zone, Section 59-C-18.234 specifies that the following findings must be made in addition to the standard Site Plan findings:

(a) The site plan is consistent with the recommendations and guidelines in the applicable Master Plan; and

The Site Plan is consistent with recommendations in the 2006 Damascus Master Plan and the 2004 Amendment to the Rustic Roads Functional Master Plan.

2006 Damascus Master Plan

This Master Plan recommends, “using a modified version of the Rural Village Overlay Zone to provide a mixed-use zone approach appropriate for rural communities to protect villages that may become subject to potential development pressures. The Rural Village Overlay Zone is designed to create attractive, cohesive, and pedestrian-friendly rural village centers and prohibits land uses otherwise allowed in the underlying zone that would be inappropriate in rural villages. Amendments to this zone are proposed to prohibit additional uses that would be inappropriate in these villages, allow certain uses only by special exception, and allow the Montgomery County Planning Board to modify setback and green area requirements if necessary, to better replicate existing development patterns. The purpose of this zoning is to maintain the existing scale of development. New development should be consistent with the historical character and community lifestyles” (p.40). The Master Plan also provides additional guidance for development within the Rural Village Overlay Zone (p.41). Much of the guidance in the Master Plan regarding the Rural Village Overlay zone is intended for commercial development which does not apply to this Application.
The Damascus Master Plan states that residents in the *Rural Village Communities* “often have historical ties to their communities. These communities feature local institutions like post offices, retail stores, or churches.” The Pleasant Grove Community Church congregation has been part of Purdum since 1869. The new church will accommodate the expansion of the congregation and continued connection to the community in the same general location. The scale and size of the proposed building, with only 200 seats, are compatible with the surrounding rural community.

The Site Plan conforms to Master Plan recommendations on compatibility with the surrounding community. Those recommendations were specifically taken into consideration when determining the building’s location, and parking lot design. The building is setback 81 feet from Mountain View Road, which provides a large, open, green area between the building and road. The green area provides ample area for landscaping and limits the visual impact of the building from the rustic road. Most of the parking for the church is behind the building, which limits visibility from the road. Only a single row of parking is proposed along the west side of the building and landscaping along the frontage will screen the parking from Mountain View Road.
Mountain View Road is a paved asphalt, two-lane public road running from King Valley Road for 0.7 mile, before changing into Price’s Distillery Road, also a Rustic Road. Mountain View Road is 22 feet wide from Johnson Drive to Purdum Road. Mountain View Road is not a master-planned road and because of its Rustic Road designation, there are no existing or recommended sidewalks or bikeways. The Rustic Roads Advisory Committee (“RRAC”) has reviewed the Application to determine if it has any effect on Mountain View Road.

In a letter dated September 2, 2016, the Applicant replied to the RRAC regarding its concerns and recommendation. On March 28, 2019 the RRAC reviewed the Site Plan, specifically the landscaping along Mountain View Road. In its letter dated May 16, 2019, (Attachment C) the RRAC reconfirmed their support for the Application, including the planting of eight White Oaks within the Mountain View right-of-way which the Applicant is providing to mitigate for the grading and removal of existing hedgerow which is obstructing adequate site-distance from the proposed church driveway looking west. The location, spacing, and species of the trees has been reviewed by the MCDPS Right-of-Way section who the locations and species for street trees being planted in the right-of-way (Attachment D).

Under Section 49-33(e)(1)(B) of the County code, “If a lot or lots front on a public road, the permittee must install sidewalks, master-planned bikeways, ramps, curbs, and gutters, except any sidewalk: …..(B) on any roadway classified as exceptional rustic, rustic, country arterial, or country road”. Based on the classification of Mountain View Road as Rustic Roads, no sidewalk or other frontage improvements are required. Therefore, no improvements are required as part of this Application. As shown on the Site Plan, transportation access is adequate to serve the proposed development by this Site Plan.
As proposed, the Site Plan is consistent with recommendations in the *Damascus Master Plan* and *Rustic Road Functional Master Plan*.

**(b)** *The site plan meets all of the requirements of this overlay zone as well as the applicable requirements of the underlying zone.*

Like the previously approved preliminary plan, the Site Plan is consistent with the 2006 *Damascus Master Plan*. The Master Plan recognizes the importance of rural villages to the character of this rural portion of Montgomery County and recommended a Rural Village Center Overlay Zone to reinforce that character. The existing church has been part of the Purdum Community for 150 years and the proposed church structure will “serve the needs of the local community…” as recommended in the Master Plan’s guidance for development in the Rural Village Overlay zone. The scale and massing are compatible with village character and, as recommended, the church building is set back a similar distance from the road as other village structures. The placement of parking to the side and rear of the church preserves views of the church from Mountain View Road. Review by the Historic Preservation Commission will help ensure that building facades and materials will be in keeping with the historic character of Purdum.

As part of the Site Plan, the Applicant has demonstrated, in detail, how the design of the proposed church meets the intent of the Rural Village Overlay Zone through site design and details such as building placement, building materials, façade and landscaping.

The Application meets the development standards of the R-200 Zone with respect to building height, setbacks, and the density of this development is under all the maximum standards allowed, as shown in Table 1 below:

**Table 1: Site Plan Data Table – R-200 Zone Standard Method of Development (Div. 59-C-1.32)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>Zoning Ordinance Permitted/Required</th>
<th>Proposed for Approval by the Site Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum lot area</td>
<td>20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>171,580 sq. ft. (3.94 AC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (units/acre)</td>
<td>7.8 DU/AC</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width at building line</td>
<td>100 ft. min.</td>
<td>411 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width at existing or proposed street line</td>
<td>50 ft. min.</td>
<td>404 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Front</td>
<td>40 ft. min.</td>
<td>82 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Side</td>
<td>12 ft. min./25 ft. total min.</td>
<td>41 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rear</td>
<td>30 ft. min.</td>
<td>154 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building height</td>
<td>50 ft. max.</td>
<td>26 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot coverage (Building)</td>
<td>25% or 42,895 sq. ft. max.</td>
<td>5.0% or 8,515 sq. ft. max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking (Sec. 59-E)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Facility Area</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,183 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Landscaping (shade trees)</td>
<td>5% or 960 sq. ft. min.</td>
<td>8% or 1,541 sq. ft. min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Development Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>Zoning Ordinance Permitted/Required</th>
<th>Proposed for Approval by the Site Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Setbacks from adjoining residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Front</td>
<td>40 ft.</td>
<td>55 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Side</td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
<td>31 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rear</td>
<td>30 ft.</td>
<td>39 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces (1 space per 4 seats)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Standard (8.5’x18’)</td>
<td>200 seats = 50 spaces min.</td>
<td>50 spaces min. (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accessible</td>
<td>47 spaces</td>
<td>47 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 spaces</td>
<td>3 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>Not required (&lt;50 spaces)</td>
<td>2 bicycle racks provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycles</td>
<td>Not required (&lt;50 spaces)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The locations of buildings and structures, open spaces, landscaping, recreation facilities, and pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems are adequate, safe, and efficient.

**Buildings and Structures**

The location of the building and structures are safe, adequate and efficient. The locations provide easy access to the building sidewalks that abut the parking lot and from the existing church via the inter-parcel path.

Despite the Subject Property being 4 acres, the location of the general building and parking layout was largely driven by the topography of the Property, location of the existing access point, and location of the septic fields. Because the church is being served by on-site septic, the building needed to be located at a higher elevation than the septic infiltration fields. Naturally, the building was adequately sited on the southeastern portion of the Property, the highest part of the Property, which happens to be in relatively close proximity to the existing church.

The building is setback from Mountain View Road and located towards the southeast side of the Property, providing separation from the abutting confronting residential property. The primary entrance to the building is located in the front, facing Mountain View Road and an additional three entrances are provided to the side and rear of the building providing convenient access from the parking lot.

To provide adequate parking, a proper fire truck turnaround, and minimize the visual impact from the rustic road, parking is provided in an L-shaped parking lot which wraps around the westside of the church and to the rear. The majority of the 50 parking spaces are located in the rear leg of the parking lot in addition to the approved fire truck turnaround. A limited number of parking spaces, including the accessible (ADA) spaces are provided in the side parking lot, west of the building, in close proximity to the main entrance of the sanctuary.

The limited parking that is being provided on the west side of the building is adequately screened from Mountain View Road by a landscape buffer.
A new driveway will be constructed on Mountain View Road at roughly the same location as the existing driveway because it is the location along the Property frontage on the road where safe site distance can be met, according the Applicant’s site distance grading and clearing exhibit (Attachment E). The Site Distance Study for the proposed entrance has not been approved by MCDOT because the full analysis requires regrading and removing a number of trees that contribute to the rustic character of Mountain View Road, and the Applicant feels that removing them now would be premature. As conditioned, prior to recording the plat, the Applicant will clear limited vegetation and grade a section of the shoulder along Mountain View Road that is needed to verify to MCDOT that adequate site distance is being met.

Since Mountain View Road is classified as a rustic road, the access has been reviewed by the Rustic Roads Advisory Committee in addition to MCDOT, MCDPS and M-NCPPC Staff, all of whom support the access elements of the Application, as conditioned.

![Figure 10 – Landscaping Plan](image)

**Open Space, Landscaping and Lighting**

The open space that is provided on site is a mix open lawn area, landscaped area and stormwater management. The western portion of the Property that is currently an open lawn will remain open because it is identified as septic reserve fields.
A mix of shrubs, evergreen trees and deciduous trees will be planted behind the and throughout the stormwater facilities in the rear of the parking lot. The new landscaping serves a mitigation planting and screenings for the parking lot.

The curved driveway design provides an open space between the road and the southern edge of the parking lot which will be landscaped with a mix of ornamental plants and shrubs to screen the smaller parking lot and create an aesthetically pleasing view from the rustic road. The landscaping will all also minimize potential headlight glare from vehicles facing south while leaving the church. The area designated for the Phase 2 addition is unprogrammed until the addition is constructed and can be used for outdoor activities and an additional gathering space for church activities. Section 59-E-2.73 requires at least 5 percent (960 sq. ft.) of the 19,183 square foot surface parking lot to be landscaped with shade trees. The Applicant has provided shade trees in planting islands and along the perimeter of the parking lot that shade 8 percent (1,541 sq. ft.) of the proposed surface. Landscape for screening purposes is discussed below, on page 21.

The lighting around the perimeter of the parking lot and along the pedestrian walkways will create enough visibility to provide safety but not so much as to cause glare on the adjacent roads or properties. A total of 21 light fixtures will be installed throughout the Subject Property. Seven pedestrian scale lights will be installed along the sidewalk connecting the two church buildings. The two and a half foot tall fixtures will adequately illuminate the pedestrian connection creating an easily navigable, safe pedestrian connection between the two buildings. Each of the entrances
will be lit by a wall mounted LED fixture, approximate 8 feet from the ground, clearly identifying the entrances/exits after dark. Additional sconces mounted at 12 feet will provide supplemental light to the western open area (including Phase II) and sidewalk between the building and parking lot. Twenty-foot-tall pole lights with a sleek, slow profile fixture head provide lighting in the parking lot and driveway. As conditioned, all down-lights have full cut-off fixtures and deflectors will be prevent excess illumination and glare. According to the photometrics plan submitted by the Applicant, the fixtures will not generate illumination levels over 0.5 footcandles (fc) at any property line abutting Mountain View Road and the abutting residentially developed properties.

Recreation Facilities

While there are no recreation facilities required for this Site Plan, and bicycle parking is not required, bicycle racks have been provided at the southwestern most corner of the sidewalk. The open spaces, landscaping, and site details adequately and efficiently address the needs of the use and the recommendations of the Master Plan, while providing a safe and comfortable environment.

Pedestrian and Vehicular Circulation

With respect to parking and vehicular circulation on and adjacent to the subject site, a parking lot with 50 parking spaces will provide adequate on-site parking to serve the church at a ratio of one space for every 4 seats in the sanctuary. Adequate width had been provided between parking stalls to allow safe two-way vehicular movement. Access to the Property is from Mountain View Road where the existing driveway is located. The entrance will be improved (24 feet wide) to meet MCDOT standards and ensure adequate access for emergency vehicles.

The Application has been reviewed by the RRAC which supports the access point in the proposed location. The Site Plan has been reviewed by the MCDPS, Fire Access and Water Supply Sections, which determined that the Property has adequate access for fire and rescue vehicles as shown on their approved (revised) Fire Department Access Plan dated March 14, 2019 (Attachment F).
Figure 11 – Circulation Plan

Pedestrian access between the parking lot, church and existing church adequately and efficiently integrates this site into the surrounding area. A 7-foot-wide sidewalk on the interior side of the parking lot and 5-foot-wide lead in sidewalks provide ample space for pedestrians to safely and efficiently access each of the building entrances.
Mountain View Road is classified as rustic, as such, sidewalks are not proposed along the Property frontage. To provide a safe connection for church members to move between the new church and the existing church to the east, a 5-foot-wide sidewalk connection is being constructed between the main entrances of both buildings. The sidewalk will curve around the boundary of the existing cemetery on Parcel 185 to avoid disturbing the area. As a cautionary measure, Historic Preservation Staff will be monitoring all land disturbance and construction in proximity to the cemetery.

Pedestrian safety is enhanced by several improvements including vehicle curb stops in the parking lot, between the parking spots the peripheral sidewalk, and pedestrian level lighting and a handrail along pedestrian path connecting the existing and proposed churches.

The vehicular circulation design efficiently directs traffic into and through the site with minimal impacts to pedestrian circulation. This balance of design with the site and the needs of the use is an efficient and adequate means to provide a safe atmosphere for pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles.
4. Each structure and use is compatible with other uses and other site plans and with existing and proposed adjacent development.

The building is compatible with the surrounding uses, with regard to location, height, setbacks and architectural design.

The church structure itself (Phase 1 & 2) is in scale with the nearby buildings and is located such that it will not adversely impact existing or proposed adjacent uses. The building is setback from Mountain View Road and located on the eastern portion of the Property, closest to the existing church and providing ample space between the abutting confronting residential property.

The closest residence to the church, which is directly across Mountain View Road, is 180 feet away. The remaining residences are a minimum of 250 feet away.

The new church is 26 feet tall at the midpoint of the gable, between the eve and the ridge and the existing church is approximately one and a half stories tall. The abutting and confronting residences are zoned R-200 and AR, which permit a maximum building height of 50 feet.

Parking is primarily located in the rear of the building and the limited parking on the west side of the building is screened in all directions by a substantial landscaped buffer area. Pursuant to Section 59-E-2.81, because the parking facility is within a residential zone and adjoins land in the residential zone the parking spaces and must be set back a distance not less than the applicable front, rear, or side yard setback of the adjoining residential zone. The parking facility is setback a minimum of 60 feet from the adjoining R-200 and AR zoned properties improved residential dwelling units, which is greater than the minimum side and rear setbacks of both the R-200 and AR zones.

In addition to the parking lot setback requirement, Section 59-E-2.83 requires landscape screening between the parking lot and adjoining residential properties to improve compatibility and alleviate adverse visual effects typically associated with parking facilities, such as headlight glare and noise. Together the ample landscaping and parking setbacks of the parking lot will result in a compatible relationship between the surrounding uses and the parking lot.

The development is compatible with the adjacent and confronting uses as well as pending development plans.

Historic Preservation

The Purdum Historic District (#10/24) is identified in the Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites in Montgomery County, Maryland. 11307 Mountain View Road was surveyed as part of the 1976 Locational Atlas Historic District MIHP form. The survey notes only that it is an “older home which has been extensively remodeled. The present structure, covered with siding and with two added side wings, now has the appearance of a modern, traditional style home. Only the two brick, older looking center chimneys suggest its possible age.” Historic Preservation staff conducted reconnaissance level field surveys in 2015 and again in 2017 as part of the background research for a preliminary plan of subdivision for this property. Staff concurred with the original survey assessment that this was a vernacular farmhouse dating to the first half of the twentieth
century, with no additional architectural or historical significance noted. There is also a small gambrel roofed garage/outbuilding with two enclosed, side flanking bays, located to the rear of the house. This outbuilding appears to date to the mid-late twentieth century and is of no particular significance individually, nor does it add significance to the historic district.

The adjacent property (owned by the Applicant) contains the Pleasant Grove Community church and cemetery. This historically African American congregation and church have worshipped at this site since the late 1860s. The church graveyard is located to the west of the existing church, on a shallow hillside, with a ridgeline at the western boundary. The Subject Property, and related new construction, would be located just to the west of the cemetery, on the western side of the ridge. When applications for permits for historic resources on the Locational Atlas are submitted, the application must be reviewed under the procedures in Section 24A-7 (Historic Area Work Permits) of Chapter 24A, if the Locational Atlas resource is not being considered either for consideration as a Master Plan District or for removal from the Locational Atlas. The Applicant is seeking review under Section 24A-7 and has been conditioned to seek this review by the previously approved Preliminary Plan No.120130160.

Proposed alterations to Locational Atlas Historic District are reviewed under Montgomery County Code Chapter 24A (Chapter 24A) and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards). Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features, which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.

The HPC is supportive of the proposed demolition of the single-family house and outbuilding located on the subject property. The HPC found that these structures are not historically associated with the adjacent Pleasant Grove Community church or the historically African American congregation. The demolition of these structures will not negatively impact the district, and should be approved with conditions on documentation and salvage. The HPC gave comments to the applicant on the proposed design of the church. The HPC agreed with the findings from the staff report dated October 3, 2018 (Attachment G); the HPC will need to hear a final HAWP case for demolition of the structures at a later time following Site Plan approval.

5. The site plan meets all applicable requirements of Chapter 22A regarding forest conservation, Chapter 19 regarding water resource protection, and any other applicable law.

Natural Resource Inventory/Forest Stand Delineation

The Natural Resource Inventory/Forest Stand Delineation (NRI/FSD) #420120390 for the Subject Property was approved on December 13, 2011. The NRI/FSD identifies the environmental features and forest resources on the Property. The Property straddles the Bennett Creek and Little Bennett Creek watersheds and does not contain any forest stands. There are no streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, stream buffers, highly erodible soils, or slopes greater than 25 percent located on or immediately adjacent to the Property. There are three trees greater than or equal to 24" Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) that were identified on or adjacent to the Subject Property, two of which are 30" DBH and greater. In addition, due to the historic nature of this site, all tree impacts, no matter the size of the tree, require a variance.
Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan

The Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan (“PFCP”) was submitted with the Preliminary Plan No. 120130160 (Attachment H). The Planning Board approved both the PFCP and the Preliminary Plan in a public hearing on April 20, 2017 with the Resolution being mailed on May 1, 2017.

Final Forest Conservation Plan

The Application meets the requirements of Chapter 22A of the Montgomery County Forest Conservation Law and is in substantial conformance to the Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan. As required by the County Forest Conservation Law (Chapter 22A of the County Code) and Planning Board Condition of Approval #2a for the PFCP, a Final Forest Conservation Plan (FFCP) for the Subject Property was submitted with this Site Plan Application (Attachment I). The net tract area for FFCP purposes is 4.10 acres which includes the 4.16 acres of total tract area minus right-of-way dedication of 0.06 acres. The Subject Property is zoned R-200 and is considered Institutional per the Trees Technical Manual. The Subject Property contains no forest. This results in an afforestation requirement of 0.62 acres. The Application proposes to meet the 0.62 acres of forest mitigation by taking the appropriate mitigation credits to an M-NCPPC approved off-site forest bank.

Forest Conservation Variance

Section 22A-12(b)(3) of the Montgomery County Forest Conservation Law provides criteria that identify certain individual trees and other vegetation as high priority for retention and protection (Protected Trees). The law requires that there be no impact to: trees that measure 30 inches or greater diameter breast height (DBH); are part of an historic site or designated with an historic structure; are designated as national, State, or County champion trees; are at least 75 percent of the diameter of the current State champion tree of that species; or trees, shrubs, or plants that are designated as Federal or State rare, threatened, or endangered species. Any impact to high priority vegetation, including disturbance to the critical root zone (CRZ) requires a variance. An applicant for a variance must provide certain written information in support of the required findings in accordance with Section 22A-21 of the County Forest Conservation Law. Development of the Subject Property requires impact to Protected Trees, therefore, the Applicant has submitted a variance request for these impacts.

Variance Request – Due to its location within the Purdum Road Historic District, all trees one inch and greater DBH on this site are considered protected and need a variance for proposed impacts. As part of the Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan approval, the Planning Board approved a variance to remove fifty-six (56) and to impact, but not remove, forty (40) Protected Trees.

Subsequently, site design changes were made as part of this Site Plan which altered the limits of disturbance (LOD) reducing the number of Protected Trees to be removed and slightly increasing the number of trees to be impacted, but not removed. To account for the trees not included in the approved variance associated with the PFCP, the Applicant was required to submit a new variance request. The Applicant submitted a variance request in a letter dated June 6, 2019 for impacts to or removal of Protected Trees (Attachment 8) not addressed in the previously approved variance.
The Applicant proposes to remove fourteen (14) new Protected Trees that were not part of the originally approved variance associated with the PFCP, but are considered high priority for retention under Section 22A-12(b)(3) of the County Forest Conservation Law. These trees are listed in Table 2 and shown in white. Table 2 includes 29 trees (highlighted in grey) which were included in the variance request as part of the approved PFCP. The current variance request does not include these trees, but they are shown in the Table for the purpose of calculating the total mitigation required. A net total of 43 trees will be removed between the originally approved variance and this request.

The Applicant also proposes to impact, but not remove, twenty-two (22) new Protected Trees that were not part of the originally approved variance associated with the PFCP, but are considered high priority for retention under Section 22A-12(b)(3) of the County Forest Conservation Law. The critical root zones of these trees will be impacted by necessary site grading and construction. These trees are listed in Table 3 and shown in white. Table 3 includes 23 trees (highlighted in grey) which were included in variance request as part of the approved PFCP. The current variance request does not include these trees. A net total of 45 trees will be impacted but retained between the original variance and this request.

**Table 2 - Protected Trees to be removed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree ID #</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>DBH</th>
<th>% Impacted</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>16-14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>14-10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>14-8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Flowering Dogwood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Silver Maple</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Eastern Red Cedar</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Eastern Red Cedar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Ailanthus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Ailanthus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree ID #</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH</td>
<td>% Impacted</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Flowering Dogwood</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Ailanthus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Ailanthus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Ailanthus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Ailanthus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Ailanthus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlighted rows indicate trees previously approved for removal that are not subject to this variance request, but have been included for total mitigation purposes.

Table 3 - Protected Trees to be affected but retained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree ID #</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>DBH</th>
<th>% Impacted</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sassafras</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chestnut Oak</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mulberry</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Silver Maple</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Norway Spruce</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mulberry</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ailanthus</td>
<td>13-19</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ailanthus</td>
<td>17-21</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pear</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mulberry</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td>10-6</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sweet Cherry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree ID #</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH</td>
<td>% Impacted</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Ailanthus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Ailanthus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Eastern Red Cedar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Virginia Pine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Eastern Red Cedar</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Eastern Red Cedar</td>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Pear</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Ailanthus</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Ailanthus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlighted rows indicate trees previously approved for impact that are not subject to this variance.

Unwarranted Hardship Basis — Per Section 22A-21, a variance may only be considered if the Planning Board finds that leaving the Protected Trees in an undisturbed state would result in an unwarranted hardship, denying an applicant reasonable and significant use of the Property. These findings are based only on the impacts or removal of the thirty-six (36) new Protected Trees for this Site Plan Application and do not involve any trees as part of the variance approval associated with the PFCP. The Applicant contends that an unwarranted hardship would be created due to existing conditions on the Property and the zoning and development requirements for the Property.

The Subject Property has a total tract area of 4.16 acres located on Mountain View Road in Damascus. Structures on the Property consist of a residence and a barn. No forest or specimen trees exist on the Property. The construction of the church building, associated parking, storm water facilities, and the septic fields will require construction disturbance to most of the property. The church itself is to be located toward Mountain View Road within approximately forty-five (45)
feet of the building restriction line with parking located to the side and behind the main building. The septic fields are located to the rear of the property beyond the parking area and the storm water facilities. These septic fields have been located according to soil conditions and topography, and are approximately sized for this use. One of the reasons for siting the church building as shown is to leave open the areas most appropriate for the septic fields. Due to the large septic area, the space available for development becomes limited and results in the tree removals and impacts along the eastern and southern property lines.

Another condition requiring the need for tree removal is with the new entrance to the Property, an appropriate sight distance must be acquired, as well as grading to allow access to the parking lot. Trees along the right of way on the property are being impacted and removed to allow vehicles to enter and exit the site safely and reduce visual obstructions. The project site is situated along a rustic road, with the driveway sited with intent to cause as little disturbance and tree removal as possible while maintaining the aesthetics and structure of the existing road.

Staff worked with the Applicant to revise the limits of disturbance to minimize the impacts to the Protected Trees as much as possible, particularly the offsite trees. The number and location of the Protected Trees, the existing shape and location of the Property and development requirements create an unwarranted hardship. If the variance were not considered, the development anticipated on this R-200 zoned Property would not occur. Staff has reviewed this Application and finds that there would be an unwarranted hardship if a variance were not considered.

Variance Findings – Section 22A-21 of the County Forest Conservation Law sets forth the findings that must be made by the Planning Board or Planning Director, as appropriate, for a variance to be granted. These findings are based only on the impacts or removal of the thirty-six (36) new Protected Trees for this Site Plan Application and do not involve any trees as part of the variance approval associated with the PFCP. Staff has made the following determination based on the required findings in the review of the variance request and the forest conservation plan.

Granting of the requested variance:

1. **Will not confer on the applicant a special privilege that would be denied to other applicants.**

Granting the variance will not confer a special privilege on the Applicant as the disturbance to the 36 new Protected Trees is due to the reasonable development of the Property. The Protected Trees are located within the developable area of the Property such as the septic field area, the buildable area for the church and for the entrance driveway. There is also a row of tightly clustered trees on a berm along Mountain View Road where the expanded entrance driveway is located and MCDOT is requiring their removal to provide an adequate and safe sight distance envelope from the driveway. Any church considered for this Property would be faced with the same considerations of locating the septic field, driveway entrance, building and parking lot. Granting a variance to allow land disturbance within the developable portion of the Property is not unique to this Applicant. Granting of this variance is not a special privilege that would be denied to other applicants.
2. **Is not based on conditions or circumstances which are the result of the actions by the applicant.**

The need for the variance is not based on conditions or circumstances which are the result of actions by the Applicant. The requested variance is based upon existing Property conditions, including the location of the Protected Trees within the developable area, the facilities required for this kind of institution and safety requirements from other governmental agencies.

3. **Is not based on a condition relating to land or building use, either permitted or non-conforming, on a neighboring property.**

The need for a variance is a result of the existing conditions and the proposed design and layout of the Property, and not a result of land or building use on a neighboring property.

4. **Will not violate State water quality standards or cause measurable degradation in water quality.**

The variance will not violate State water quality standards or cause measurable degradation in water quality. No trees located within a stream buffer, wetland, or Special Protection Area will be impacted or removed as part of this Application. The Applicant proposes to mitigate the removal of the Protected Trees by planting replacement trees onsite, that will ultimately replace the functions currently provided by the Protected Trees to be removed.

**Mitigation for Protected Trees** – The Protected Trees subject to the variance provision and proposed to be removed are not located within an existing forest. Mitigation for the removal of the 43 trees is recommended at a rate that approximates the form and function of the trees removed. Therefore, Staff is recommending that replacement occur at a ratio of approximately 1-inch caliper for every 4 inches removed, using trees that are a minimum of 3 caliper inches in size. This Application proposed to remove 252 caliper inches of trees, resulting in a mitigation requirement of 63 caliper inches of planted, native, canopy trees with a minimum size of 3-inch caliper. This results in the planting of 21, 3-inch caliper MD native trees. The FFCP includes the planting of 21 native, canopy trees on the Property as mitigation for the removal of the 43 variance trees. These trees will not be as large as most of the trees lost, but they will provide some immediate benefit and ultimately replace the canopy lost by the removal of these trees. Staff does not recommend mitigation for trees Impacted by construction, but not removed. The affected root systems will regenerate and the functions provided restored.

It has been standard M-NCPPC policy to require that the mitigation plantings must occur outside of any public rights-of-way and utility easements including storm water management easements. However, in this case Staff determined that it was appropriate to locate eight (8) of the mitigation trees within the right-of-way along Mountain View Road. The M-NCPPC standard policy was relaxed in this situation following numerous discussions with the property owner, the RRAC and MCDOT. The RRC required that this section of Mountain View Road be tree lined in keeping with an image of rustic roads. MCDOT had reviewed the landscape plan.
and approved the location, spacing, species and tree sizes of the mitigation plantings within the right-of-way of Mountain View Road.

County Arborist’s Recommendation on the Variance – In accordance with Montgomery County Code Section 22A-21(c), the Planning Department is required to refer a copy of the variance request to the County Arborist in the Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection for a recommendation prior to acting on the request. The request was forwarded to the County Arborist on June 10, 2019.

Variance Recommendation – Staff recommends that the variance be granted with mitigation described above.

SECTION 5 – CITIZEN CORRESPONDENCE AND ISSUES

The Applicant has met all proper signage, noticing and pre-submission meeting requirements for the submitted Applications. A pre-submission meeting for the Preliminary Plan was held at 7:00 pm on June 20, 2018 at 11225 Mountain View Road. Twelve people attended the meeting, where the Applicant provided a summary of the Site Plan process and fielded general questions regard site lighting, landscaping, and the location of other elements on the site. To date, Staff have not received any community correspondence regarding the Application.

SECTION 6 – CONCLUSION

The Application meets all development standards and findings established in the Zoning Ordinance. The Site Plan substantially conforms to the recommendations of the 2006 Damascus Master Plan. The Applications have been reviewed by other applicable county agencies, all of whom have recommended approval of the plan. Staff recommends approval of the Site Plan, with the conditions as enumerated in the Staff Report.
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Preliminary Plan Date: April 30, 2021

The Preliminary Plan is a tentative plan that is subject to approval by the Planning Board. It is intended to provide a blueprint for future development and should be reviewed by all interested parties before final approval.

The Preliminary Plan shall be reviewed by the Planning Board and any other interested parties, including but not limited to:

- The Department of Public Works
- The Department of Public Safety
- The Department of Public Utilities
- The Department of Public Health

The Preliminary Plan shall be presented to the Planning Board at a regular meeting, and the Planning Board shall make a recommendation to the County Planning Board.

If the Planning Board recommends approval of the Preliminary Plan, it shall be submitted to the County Planning Board for final approval.

The Preliminary Plan shall be reviewed by the Planning Board and any other interested parties, including but not limited to:

- The Department of Public Works
- The Department of Public Safety
- The Department of Public Utilities
- The Department of Public Health

The Preliminary Plan shall be presented to the Planning Board at a regular meeting, and the Planning Board shall make a recommendation to the County Planning Board.

If the Planning Board recommends approval of the Preliminary Plan, it shall be submitted to the County Planning Board for final approval.

The Preliminary Plan shall be reviewed by the Planning Board and any other interested parties, including but not limited to:

- The Department of Public Works
- The Department of Public Safety
- The Department of Public Utilities
- The Department of Public Health

The Preliminary Plan shall be presented to the Planning Board at a regular meeting, and the Planning Board shall make a recommendation to the County Planning Board.

If the Planning Board recommends approval of the Preliminary Plan, it shall be submitted to the County Planning Board for final approval.
MCPB No. 17-025
Preliminary Plan No. 120130160
Pleasant Grove Community Church
Date of Hearing: April 20, 2017

MAY 1 2017

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, under Montgomery County Code Chapter 50, the Montgomery County Planning Board is authorized to review preliminary plan applications; and

WHEREAS, on May 31, 2013, Pleasant Grove Christian Community Church c/o Reverend Lawrence Bryant ("Applicant") filed an application for approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision of property that would create one lot on 4.02 acres of land in the R-200 zone and Rural Village Overlay Zone, located at 11307 Mountain View Road, approximately 700 feet west of Johnson Drive ("Subject Property"), in the Rural East Policy Area and 2006 Damascus Master Plan ("Master Plan") area; and

WHEREAS, Applicant’s preliminary plan application was designated Preliminary Plan No. 120130160, Pleasant Grove Community Church, ("Preliminary Plan" or "Application"); and

WHEREAS, following review and analysis of the Application by Planning Board staff ("Staff") and other governmental agencies, Staff issued a memorandum to the Planning Board, dated April 7, 2017, setting forth its analysis and recommendation for approval of the Application, subject to certain conditions ("Staff Report"); and

WHEREAS, on April 20, 2017, the Planning Board held a public hearing on the Application at which it heard testimony and received evidence submitted for the record on the Application; and

WHEREAS, at the hearing the Planning Board voted to approve the Application subject to certain conditions by the vote certified below;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board APPROVES Preliminary Plan No. 120130160 to create one lot on the Subject Property, subject to the following conditions:

1 For the purpose of these conditions, the term "Applicant" shall also mean the developer, the owner or any successor(s) in interest to the terms of this approval.

Approved as to Legal Sufficiency: _______________________
8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20910 Chairman’s Office: 301.495.4605 Fax: 301.495.1320
www.MCParkandPlanning.org E-Mail: mcp-chairman@mncppc.org
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1. This Preliminary Plan is limited to one lot for one religious institution with no weekday school or weekday day care.

2. The Applicant must comply with Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan No. 120130160, approved as part of this Preliminary Plan, subject to the following conditions:
   a. A Final Forest Conservation Plan ("FFCP") must be approved by M-NCPCC Staff prior to the start of clearing and grading that is consistent with the approved Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan ("PFCP").
   b. Prior to the start of any clearing, grading, or demolition occurring on the Property, the Applicant must receive approval from the M-NCPCC Office of the General Counsel of a Certificate of Compliance to use an off-site forest mitigation bank for 0.61 acres of mitigation credit.
   c. The Certificate of Compliance must be recorded in the Land Records prior to any clearing, grading, or demolition occurring on the Property.
   d. Mitigation for the removal of 56 trees subject to the variance provision must be provided in the form of planting native canopy trees totaling 126 caliper inches, with a minimum planting stock size of three caliper inches. The trees must be planted on the Property, in locations to be shown on the Final Forest Conservation Plan, outside of any rights-of-way, or utility easements, including stormwater management easements. Adjustments to the planting locations of these trees is permitted with the approval of the M-NCPCC forest conservation inspector. The trees must be planted within one year of construction completion.
   e. The limits of disturbance ("LOD") on the Final Sediment and Erosion Control Plan must be consistent with the LOD shown on the approved Final Forest Conservation Plan.
   f. The Applicant must comply with all tree protection and tree save measures shown on the approved Final Forest Conservation Plan. Tree save measures not specified on the approved Forest Conservation Plan may be required by the M-NCPCC forest conservation inspector.

3. The Planning Board accepts the recommendations of the Montgomery County Department of Transportation ("MCDOT") in its letter dated August 20, 2014, and
hereby incorporates them as conditions of the Preliminary Plan approval. The Applicant must comply with each of the recommendations as set forth in the letter, which may be amended by MCDOT, provided the amendments do not conflict with other conditions of the Preliminary Plan approval.

4. Prior to recordation of the plat, the Applicant must satisfy the provisions for access and improvements as required by MCDOT.

5. No clearing or grading of the site, or recording of plats prior to Certified Site Plan approval.

6. The Planning Board accepts the recommendations of the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services ("MCDPS") Fire Code Enforcement Section in its letter dated November 8, 2016, and hereby incorporates them as conditions of approval. The Applicant must comply with each of the recommendations as set forth in the letter, which may be amended by MCDPS – Fire Code Enforcement Section, provided the amendments do not conflict with other conditions of Preliminary Plan approval.

7. The Planning Board accepts the recommendations of the MCDPS - Water Resources Section in its stormwater management concept letter dated November 13, 2012, and reconfirmed on July 12, 2016, and hereby incorporates them as conditions of the Preliminary Plan approval. The Applicant must comply with each of the recommendations as set forth in the letter, which may be amended by MCDPS – Water Resources Section, provided the amendments do not conflict with other conditions of the Preliminary Plan approval.

8. The Applicant must dedicate, and show on the record plat a dedication of, 35-feet of right-of-way from the centerline of Mountain View Road as shown on the Preliminary Plan.

9. Final approval of the location of (buildings, on-site parking, site circulation, and sidewalks) will be determined at Site Plan.

10. The Certified Preliminary Plan must contain the following note:

"Unless specifically noted on this plan drawing or in the Planning Board conditions of approval, the building footprints, building heights, on-site parking, site circulation, and sidewalks shown on the Preliminary Plan are illustrative. The final locations of buildings,
structures and hardscape will be determined at the time of site plan approval. Please refer to the zoning data table for development standards such as setbacks, building restriction lines, building height, and lot coverage for each lot. Other limitations for site development may also be included in the conditions of the Planning Board’s approval.”

11. The record plat must show necessary easements.

12. The Adequate Public Facility ("APF") review for the Preliminary Plan will remain valid for sixty-one (61) months from the date of mailing of the Planning Board Resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that having considered the recommendations and findings of its Staff as presented at the hearing and as set forth in the Staff Report, which the Board hereby adopts and incorporates by reference (except as modified herein), and upon consideration of the entire record, the Planning Board FINDS, with the conditions of approval, that:

1. The Preliminary Plan substantially conforms to the Master Plan.

The Preliminary Plan is consistent with recommendations in the 2006 Damascus Master Plan and the 2004 Amendment to the Rustic Roads Functional Master Plan.

2006 Damascus Master Plan

This Master Plan recommends, “using a modified version of the Rural Village Overlay Zone to provide a mixed-use zone approach appropriate for rural communities to protect villages that may become subject to potential development pressures. The Rural Village Overlay Zone is designed to create attractive, cohesive, and pedestrian-friendly rural village centers and prohibits land uses otherwise allowed in the underlying zone that would be inappropriate in rural villages. Amendments to this zone are proposed to prohibit additional uses that would be inappropriate in these villages, allow certain uses only by special exception, and allow the Montgomery County Planning Board to modify setback and green area requirements if necessary to better replicate existing development patterns. The purpose of this zoning is to maintain the existing scale of development. New development should be consistent with the historical character and community lifestyles” (p.40). The Master Plan also provides additional guidance for development within the Rural Village Overlay Zone (p.41). Much of the guidance in the Master Plan regarding the Rural Village
Overlay zone is intended for commercial development which does not apply to this Application.

The Damascus Master Plan states that residents in the Rural Village Communities “often have historical ties to their communities. These communities feature local institutions like post offices, retail stores, or churches.” The Pleasant Grove Community Church congregation has been part of Purdum since 1869. The new church will accommodate the expansion of the congregation and continued connection to the community in the same general location. The scale and size of the proposed building, with only 200 seats, are compatible with the surrounding rural community.

The Preliminary Plan conforms to Master Plan recommendations on compatibility with the surrounding community. Those recommendations were specifically taken into consideration when determining the building's location, and parking lot design. The building is setback 81 feet from Mountain View Road, which provides a large, open, green area between the building and road. The green area provides ample area for landscaping and limits the visual impact of the building from the rustic road. Most of the parking for the church is behind the building, which limits visibility from the road. Only a single row of parking will be along the west side of the building and landscaping along the frontage will screen the parking from Mountain View Road. Building massing and architecture was not reviewed as part of the Preliminary Plan, but based on the footprint of the building, parking lot design, and improvements shown on the Preliminary Plan, the Application conforms to the recommendations of the Master Plan.

After Preliminary Plan, a Site Plan is required because the Property is within the Rural Village Overlay Zone. As part of the Site Plan, the Applicant will be required to demonstrate, in detail, how the design of the church meets the intent of the zone through details such as building materials, façade and landscaping. The Site Plan will also be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission because the Property is within the Purdum historic district. The Preliminary Plan leaves sufficient flexibility make additional modifications that may be necessary to further achieve the goals of the Rural Village Overlay Zone and recommendations of the Historic Preservation Commission.

2004 Rustic Roads Functional Master Plan Amendment

Mountain View Road is a paved asphalt, two-lane public road running from King Valley Road for 0.7 mile, before changing into Price's Distillery Road, also a Rustic Road. Mountain View Road is 22 feet wide from Johnson Drive to Purdum Road. Mountain View Road is not a master-planned road and because of its Rustic Road designation, there are no existing or recommended sidewalks
or bikeways. The Rustic Roads Advisory Committee ("RRAC") has reviewed the Application to determine if it has any effect on Mountain View Road. In its letter dated July 14, 2016, the RRAC determined that the committee generally supports the proposal, but also outlined concerns regarding the proposed access point, specifically the clearing of trees in the right-of-way, and grading in the right-of-way. The RRAC also asked the Applicant to evaluate an inter-parcel connection between the existing and proposed church that would eliminate the need for a new driveway.

In a letter dated September 2, 2016, the Applicant replied to the RRAC regarding its concerns and recommendation. The Applicant will continue to work with the RRAC at the time of Site Plan to minimize impacts on the rustic road. As proposed, the Preliminary Plan is consistent with recommendations in the Damascus Master Plan and Rustic Road Functional Master Plan. The Application’s conformance with the applicable master plans will be reviewed in further detail as part of the Site Plan approval.

Historic Preservation

The Purdum Historic District (#10/24) is identified in the Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites in Montgomery County, Maryland. The Application is subject to historic preservation review pursuant to Chapter 24A-10 of the Montgomery County Code. The Historic Preservation Commission will need to review all aspects of this project, including demolition of existing structures and design of the church and hardscape features. This is most appropriately done at the time of Site Plan when the architecture/design of the new structures is refined.

The Subject Property is improved with a residence and barn. Tax records indicate that the residence was constructed in 1900. A survey of the district prepared for the Locational Atlas states: “This appears to be an older home which has been extensively remodeled. The present structure, covered with siding and with two added side wings, now has the appearance of a modern, traditional style home. Only the two brick, older looking center chimneys suggest its possible age.”

To achieve compatibility with the characteristics of this rural and linear historic district, Historic Preservation Staff recommends at the time of Site Plan, that hardscaped areas and parking surfaces be paved with tinted, exposed aggregate paving or permeable materials and that the church’s primary façade be oriented towards the street.

2. Public facilities will be adequate to support and service the area of the approved subdivision.
The Preliminary Plan application was submitted prior to January 1, 2017 and was therefore reviewed under the 2012-2016 Subdivision Staging Policy rules that were in effect on December 31, 2016.

Roads and Transportation Facilities

The Applicant is dedicating sufficient land to achieve 35-feet of total right-of-way from the centerline of Mountain View Road to meet the master planned right-of-way width along the Property frontage. Access to the Property is from Mountain View Road where the existing driveway is located. The entrance will be improved to meet MCDOT and RRAC standards and ensure adequate access for emergency vehicles. The Application has been reviewed by the MCDOT, which determined that the Property has adequate vehicular access in a transmittal letter dated, August 20, 2014. The Site Distance Study for the proposed entrance has not been approved by MCDOT because the full analysis requires removing a number of trees that contribute to the rustic character of Mountain View Road, and the Applicant feels that removing them now would be premature. For review purposes, the Applicant provided MCDOT with an engineered design demonstrating that adequate sight distance can be achieved at the time of Site Plan where tree removal, if necessary, can be addressed.

A parking lot with 52 parking spaces will provide adequate on-site parking to serve the church at a ratio of one space for every 4 seats in the sanctuary. An internal sidewalk within the parking lot will provide a safe connection for patrons entering the building. Given the Mountain View Road is classified as rustic sidewalks are not proposed along the Property frontage.

The proposed road, parking, circulation and access to the Subject Property, as shown on the Preliminary Plan, will be adequate to serve the proposed development conditioned upon achieving adequate sight distance.

Local Area Transportation Review (LATR) & Transportation Policy Area Review (TPAR)
The Applicant was not required to submit a traffic study to satisfy the LATR test or the TPAR test and, a transportation tax payment is not required because the County Subdivision Regulations Section 50-35(k)(6) on adequate public facilities does not apply to any place of worship, residence for religious staff, parish hall, or addition to a school associated with a place of worship. The Application does not include weekday day care service or weekday educational facilities that would generate new peak-hour trips during the weekday morning and evening peak periods, therefore it is exempt from the transportation elements of APF.

Other Public Facilities and Services
Other public facilities and services are available and adequate to serve the proposed lot. The use of an on-site well and septic system is consistent with the existing W-6 and S-6 services categories designated for the Property. The Application has been reviewed by MCDPS – Well and Septic Section, which determined the proposed well and septic locations are acceptable as shown on the approved well and septic plan dated July 10, 2014.

The Application has been reviewed by the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services, Fire Code Enforcement Section, which determined that the Property has adequate access for fire and rescue vehicles as shown on the approved Fire Department Access Plan dated November 8, 2016. As specified in the Fire Department approval documents and shown on the Preliminary Plan, the Applicant must install a 30,000-gallon underground water supply storage tank, within an easement, adjacent to the main building entrance.

Finally, police stations, and health services are currently operating within the standards set by the 2012-2016 Subdivision Staging Policy Resolution.

3. The size, width, shape, and orientation of the approved lots are appropriate for the location of the subdivision, taking into account the recommendations included in the applicable master plan, and for the type of development or use contemplated.

This Application has been reviewed for compliance with the Montgomery County Code, Chapter 50, the Subdivision Regulations. The proposed lot size, width, shape and orientation are appropriate for the location of the subdivision taking into account the recommendations included in the Damascus Master Plan, the Purdum Rural Village Overlay Zone and the Rustic Road Functional Master Plan. The construction of a religious institution is a permitted use in the R-200 zone and the Rural Village Overlay zone. The proposed lot, will accommodate the proposed church, parking, access lanes and all required infrastructure such as stormwater management, well, septic and other utilities.

The lot was reviewed for compliance with the dimensional requirements of the R-200 zone and additional regulations as specified in the Zoning Ordinance. The lot, as proposed, will meet all the dimensional requirements for area, frontage, width, and setbacks that allow a reasonable buildable area for the proposed structure in that zone. The Application has been reviewed by other applicable county agencies, all of whom have recommended approval of the Preliminary Plan.

4. The Application satisfies all the applicable requirements of the Forest Conservation Law, Montgomery County Code Chapter 22A.
A. Forest Conservation

The Natural Resource Inventory/Forest Stand Delineation ("NRI/FSD") #420120390 for the Property was approved on December 13, 2011. The NRI/FSD identifies the environmental features and forest resources on the Property. The Property straddles the Bennett Creek and Little Bennett Creek watersheds and does not contain any forest stands. There are no streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, stream buffers, highly erodible soils, or slopes greater than 25 percent located on or immediately adjacent to the Property. There are three trees greater than or equal to 24" Diameter at Breast Height ("DBH") that were identified on a property adjacent to the Subject Property, two of which are 30" DBH and greater. In addition, due to the historic nature of this site, impacts to any tree one inch or greater DBH require a variance.

Forest Conservation Plan

The net tract area for Forest Conservation purposes is 4.05 acres. Development for the church generates a 0.61 acre of forest planting requirement which will be met off-site. This is acceptable since there is no existing forest on the Property and the building, parking lot and septic field leave no room for forest planting.

The Board finds that as conditioned, the Forest Conservation Plan complies with the requirements of the Forest Conservation Law.

B. Forest Conservation Variance

Section 22A-12(b)(3) of the Forest Conservation Law identifies certain individual trees as high priority for retention and protection ("Protected Trees"). Any impact to these Protected Trees, including removal or any disturbance within a Protected Tree's critical root zone ("CRZ"), requires a variance under Section 22A-12(b)(3) ("Variance"). Otherwise such resources must be left in an undisturbed condition.

This Application will require the removal or CRZ impact to 96 Protected Trees as identified in the Staff Report. In accordance with Section 22A-21(a), the Applicant requested a Variance, and the Board agrees that the Applicant would suffer unwarranted hardship by being denied reasonable and significant use of the Subject Property without the Variance.

Development of the Property requires impact to trees identified as high priority for retention and protection (Protected Trees), therefore, the
Applicant has submitted a variance request for these impacts. Because the Property is within a Historic District, all trees with a DBH of one inch or greater were located and any impacts to these trees, including impacts to the critical root zone, are subject to a tree variance. For this Application, Staff recommends that a variance be granted and mitigation be required.

Variance Request – The Applicant submitted a variance request in a letter dated October 18, 2016, for impacts to or removal of trees. Due to its location within the Purdum Road Historic District, all trees one inch and greater DBH on this site are considered protected (“Protected Tree”) and need a variance for proposed impacts. The Applicant requests to remove fifty-six (56) Protected Trees. The Applicant also proposes to impact, but not remove, forty (40) Protected Trees. The critical root zones of these trees will be impacted by necessary site grading and construction but they will not be removed.

The Board makes the following findings necessary to grant the Variance:

1. Granting the Variance will not confer on the Applicant a special privilege that would be denied to other applicants.

   Granting the variance will not confer a special privilege on the Applicant as the disturbance to the Protected Trees is due to the reasonable development of the Property. The Protected Trees are located within the developable area of the Property and tightly clustered along a berm in Mountain View Road where the expanded entrance driveway is located. Any church considered for this Property would be faced with the same considerations of locating a septic field, driveway entrance, building and parking lot. Granting a variance to allow land disturbance within the developable portion of the Property is not unique to this Applicant. Granting of this variance is not a special privilege that would be denied to other applicants.

2. The need for the Variance is not based on conditions or circumstances which are the result of the actions by the Applicant.

   The need for the variance is not based on conditions or circumstances which are the result of actions by the Applicant. The requested variance is based upon existing Property conditions, including the location of the Protected Trees within the developable area and the facilities required for this kind of institution.
3. The need for the Variance is not based on a condition related to land or building use, either permitted or non-conforming, on a neighboring property.

The need for a variance is a result of the existing conditions and the proposed design and layout of the Property, and not a result of land or building use on a neighboring Property.

4. Granting the Variance will not violate State water quality standards or cause measurable degradation in water quality.

The variance will not violate State water quality standards or cause measurable degradation in water quality. No trees located within a stream buffer, wetland, or Special Protection Area will be impacted or removed as part of this Application. In addition, the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services (MCDPS) has found the stormwater management concept for the proposed development to be acceptable as stated in a letter dated November 13, 2012. The Applicant proposes to mitigate the removal of the Protected Trees by planting replacement trees onsite, that will ultimately replace the functions currently provided by the Protected Trees to be removed.

Mitigation for the Variance is at a rate that approximates the form and function of the Protected Trees removed. The Board approved replacement of Protected Trees at a ratio of approximately 1-inch caliper for every 4 inches removed, using trees that are a minimum of 3 caliper inches in size. This Application proposed to remove 503 inches in DBH, resulting in a mitigation requirement of 126 caliper inches of planted, native, canopy trees with a minimum size of 3-inch caliper. The FCP includes the planting of 42 native, canopy trees on the Property as mitigation for the removal of the 56 variance trees. These trees will not be as large as most of the trees lost, but they will provide some immediate benefit and ultimately replace the canopy lost by the removal of these trees. No mitigation is required for Protected Trees impacted but retained.

5. All stormwater management requirements shall be met as provided in Montgomery County Code Chapter 19, Article II, titled “Storm Water Management,” Sections 19-20 through 19-35.

The MCDPS Stormwater Management Section approved the stormwater management concept for the project on November 13, 2012, and
The MCDPS Stormwater Management Section approved the stormwater management concept for the project on November 13, 2012, and reconfirmed on July 12, 2016. The approved concept proposes to meet the required stormwater management goals via micro biofiltration.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Preliminary Plan will remain valid for 36 months from its initiation date (as defined in Montgomery County Code Section 50-35(h)), and that prior to the expiration of this validity period, a final record plat for all property delineated on the approved Preliminary Plan must be recorded in the Montgomery County Land Records, or a request for an extension must be filed; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution constitutes the written opinion of the Board in this matter, and the date of this Resolution is MAY 1, 2017 (which is the date that this Resolution is mailed to all parties of record); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that any party authorized by law to take an administrative appeal must initiate such an appeal within thirty days of the date of this Resolution, consistent with the procedural rules for the judicial review of administrative agency decisions in Circuit Court (Rule 7-203, Maryland Rules).

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Montgomery County Planning Board of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on motion of Commissioner Cichy, seconded by Vice Chair Wells-Harley, with Chair Anderson, Vice Chair Wells-Harley, and Commissioners Dreyfuss, Fani-González, and Cichy voting in favor at its regular meeting held on Thursday, April 20, 2017, in Silver Spring, Maryland.

[Signature]
Casey Anderson, Chair
Montgomery County Planning Board
May 16, 2019

Lauren Wirth, Project Manager
MHG
9220 Wightman Road, Suite 120
Montgomery Village, MD 20886

RE: Pleasant Grove Community Church, Mountain View Road, rustic and LA Purdum Historic District

Dear Ms. Wirth,

Pleasant Grove Community Church is located on rustic Mountain View Road in the Locational Atlas Purdum Historic District. In the past, you worked with our committee on the church’s preliminary plan, and the project is now in the site plan stage 820190010.

At our March 28, 2019 committee meeting, we reviewed the Pleasant Community Church right-of-way planting proposal with the site plan. The plan proposes planting eight White oak trees within the Mountain View Road right-of-way as mitigation for the hedgerow removed to create adequate sight distance for the new church driveway. We are pleased with the tree selection and support the proposed plantings. Because of the overhead utilities, we recommend that the trees be planted as far away as feasible from the overhead wires. If the utilities need to be buried for any reason, we would support that also.

Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to review this proposal, and for the care shown in the design of this church property. We look forward to seeing the project come to fruition.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert J. Tworkowski, Chair Rustic Roads Advisory Committee

Committee members: Sarah Navid (Vice Chair), Todd Greenstone, Laura Van Etten, Dan Seamans, Lonnie Luther, Robert Wilbur, Leslie Saville (M-NCPPC)

cc: Jonathan Casey, Lead reviewer, M-NCPPC
    Rebeccah Ballo, Historic preservation supervisor, M-NCPPC
We have reviewed site and landscape plans files:

“07-SITE-820190010.003.pdf V4” uploaded on/ dated “3/19/2019”,
“08-LL-820190010.001.pdf V4” uploaded on/ dated “3/19/2019”.

The followings need to be addressed prior to the certification of site plan:

1. Provide truck turning movements for the proposed access point.
2. Per preliminary plan 120130160 resolution coordinate with Rustic Roads Advisory Committee about the proposed impacts on Mountain View Road ROW (including proposed street trees).

And, the following needs to be a condition of the certified site plan:

1. Please see condition 5 of the MCDOT preliminary plan approval letter for 120130160 dated 8/20/14 as adopted by the Planning Board with respect to minimum required sight distance.
   If this condition cannot be satisfied, the applicant needs to amend the site plan (and preliminary plan, if needed) to achieve that.
Preliminary Consultation
MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Address: 11307 Mountain View Road  
Meeting Date: 10/10/2018

Resource: Purdum Locational Atlas Historic District (#10-24)  
Report Date: 10/3/2018

Applicant: Pleasant Grove Community Church  
Public Notice: 9/26/2018

(Rev. Lawrence Bryant, Agent)

Review: Preliminary Consultation  
Staff: Rebeccah Ballo, Brian Crane

PROPOSAL: Building Demolition, new building construction, associated hardscape construction and site grading.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the applicant make any revisions based on the HPC’s recommendations and return for a Historic Area Work Permit.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

SIGNIFICANCE: Purdum Locational Atlas Historic District (#10-24)

STYLE: Rural Vernacular

DATE: c.1800-1900

Purdum is significant as representative of the rural communities that sprang up amidst the Damascus farmlands during the late nineteenth-early twentieth centuries. This was a collection of tobacco farms during the nineteenth century. The early community includes a school and church, but no commercial enterprises until close to the turn of the twentieth century. The Purdum Locational Atlas Historic District consists of a collection of rural vernacular structures typical of those built in rural Montgomery County during this time period including Victorian influenced farm houses, agricultural buildings, bungalow style houses, and small community churches with associated graveyards.

11307 Mountain View Road was surveyed as part of the 1976 Locational Atlas Historic District MIHP form. The survey notes only that it is an “older home which has been extensively remodeled. The present structure, covered with siding and with two added side wings, now has the appearance of a modern, traditional style home. Only the two brick, older looking center chimneys suggest its possible age.” Historic Preservation staff conducted reconnaissance level field surveys in 2015 and again in 2017 as part of the background research for a preliminary plan of subdivision for this property. Staff concurred with the original survey assessment that this was a vernacular farmhouse dating to the first half of the twentieth century, with no additional architectural or historical significance noted. There is also a small gambrel roofed garage/outbuilding with two enclosed, side flanking bays, located to the rear of the house. This outbuilding appears to date to the mid-late twentieth century and is of no particular significance.
individually, nor does it add significance to the historic district.

The adjacent property (owned by the applicant) contains the Pleasant Grove Community church and cemetery. This historically African American congregation and church have worshipped at this site since the late 1860s. The church graveyard is located to the west of the existing church, on a shallow hillside, with a ridgeline at the western boundary. The subject parcel, and related new construction, would be located just to the west of the cemetery, on the western side of the ridge.

Figure 1: 11307 Mountain View Road is located in the center of the Purdum LA District, adjacent to Pleasant Grove Community Church.

Figure 2: 11307 Mountain View Road aerial view of the parcel. Pleasant Grove Church is adjacent.
PROPOSAL
This proposal has come in for review under a condition of the approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision No.120130160 dated April 20, 2017. The adjacent Pleasant Grove Community Church has purchased the property and has proposed to demolish the house and outbuilding, and construct a new church on this parcel. The project requires Site Plan review in addition to the approved Preliminary Plan due to the Rural Village Overlay Zone on the parcel. The parcel is also located on Mountain View Road, a designated Rustic Road, with an existing 50’ wide right of way and a pavement width of approximately 20’. Since Mountain View Road is classified as a rustic road, the proposed access has been reviewed by the Rustic Roads Advisory Committee in addition to MCDOT, and M-NCPCC Staff. The Preliminary Plan from 2017 allowed for the construction of a 200 seat, 8,600 square foot religious institution on this site. All other Master Plan, Rustic Roads, and Zoning requirements are being met through the Site Plan review process.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES
When applications for permits for historic resources on the Locational Atlas are submitted, the application must be reviewed under the procedures in Section 24A-7 (Historic Area Work Permits) of Chapter 24A, if the Locational Atlas resource is not being considered either for consideration as a Master Plan District or for removal from the Locational Atlas. This applicant is seeking review under Section 24A-7 and has been conditioned to seek this review by the previously approved Preliminary Plan No.120130160.

Proposed alterations to Locational Atlas Historic District are reviewed under Montgomery County Code Chapter 24A (Chapter 24A) and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards). Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features, which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.

Montgomery County Code; Chapter 24A-8
(b) The commission shall instruct the director to issue a permit, or issue a permit subject to such conditions as are found to be necessary to insure conformity with the purposes and requirements of this chapter, if it finds that:
(1) The proposal will not substantially alter the exterior features of an historic site or historic resource within an historic district; or
(2) The proposal is compatible in character and nature with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural features of the historic site or the historic district in which an historic resource is located and would not be detrimental thereto or to the achievement of the purposes of this chapter; or
(3) The proposal would enhance or aid in the protection, preservation and public or private utilization of the historic site or historic resource located within an historic district in a manner compatible with the historical, archeological, architectural or cultural value of the historic site or historic district in which an historic resource is located; or
(4) The proposal is necessary in order that unsafe conditions or health hazards be remedied; or
(5) The proposal is necessary in order that the owner of the subject property not be deprived of reasonable use of the property or suffer undue hardship.

**Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation**

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

**STAFF DISCUSSION**

In the Preliminary Plan No.120130160 staff report dated April 20, 2017, Historic Preservation staff made the following suggestions concerning design of the new construction:

- To achieve compatibility with the characteristics of this rural and linear historic district, Historic Preservation Staff recommends at the time of Site Plan, that hardscaped areas and parking surfaces be paved with tinted, exposed aggregate paving or permeable materials and that the church’s primary façade be oriented towards the street.

Additional comments were provided by Planning staff regarding appropriate setbacks and compatibility with the adjacent Rustic Road and with the Village Overlay Zone, as follows:

- This Master Plan recommends, “using a modified version of the Rural Village Overlay Zone to provide a mixed-use zone approach appropriate for rural communities to protect villages that may become subject to potential development pressures. The Rural Village Overlay Zone is designed to create attractive, cohesive, and pedestrian-friendly rural village centers and prohibits land uses otherwise allowed in the underlying zone that would be inappropriate in rural villages. Amendments to this zone are proposed to prohibit additional uses that would be inappropriate in these villages, allow certain uses only by special exception, and allow the Montgomery County Planning Board to modify setback and green area requirements if necessary to better replicate existing development patterns. The purpose of this zoning is to maintain the existing scale of development. New development should be consistent with the historical character and community lifestyles” (p.40). The Master Plan also provides additional guidance for development within the Rural Village Overlay Zone (p.41). Much of the guidance in the Master Plan regarding the Rural Village Overlay zone is intended for commercial development which does not apply to this Application.
• The Damascus Master Plan states that residents in the Rural Village Communities “often have historical ties to their communities. These communities feature local institutions like post offices, retail stores, or churches.” The Pleasant Grove Community Church congregation has been part of Purdum since 1869. The new church will accommodate the expansion of the congregation and continued connection to the community in the same general location. The scale and size of the proposed building, with only 200 seats, are compatible with the surrounding rural community.

• The Preliminary Plan conforms to Master Plan recommendations on compatibility with the surrounding community. Those recommendations were specifically taken into consideration when determining the building’s location, and parking lot design. The building is setback 81 feet from Mountain View Road, which provides a large, open, green area between the building and road. The green area provides ample area for landscaping and limits the visual impact of the building from the rustic road. Most of the parking for the church is behind the building, which limits visibility from the road. Only a single row of parking is proposed along the west side of the building and landscaping along the frontage will screen the parking from Mountain View Road. Building massing and architecture was not reviewed as part of the Preliminary Plan, but based on the footprint of the building, parking lot design, and improvements shown on the Preliminary Plan, the Application conforms to the recommendations of the Master Plan.

Demolition

Staff does not have issues with the proposed demolition of the house and outbuilding at 11307 Mountain View Road. Research of primary source materials including maps, a limited title search, and a field survey do not indicate that this house is of any particular or noteworthy significance to the Purdum Historic District. It is not historically associated with the adjacent Pleasant Grove Community church or the historically African American congregation. The demolition of these structures will not negatively impact the district, and should be approved with conditions on documentation and salvage.

New Construction

The applicant is proposing to construct a new religious assembly building on this parcel. The new building would have a footprint of approximately 8,500 square feet, and would measure 33.5’ tall at the ridgeline of the gable over the main sanctuary space. The sanctuary is proposed as a three-bay structure, with a brick-faced watertable, pronounced brick faced center bay with quoining and a returned cornice at the eaveline. Further material details and specifications are not available at the time, but can be reviewed at the HAWP stage. A small, side addition, measuring approximately 12’ high at the ridgeline is proposed to the west of the sanctuary space. The new building is set back approximately 75’ from the rustic road. The new structure has two associated parking lots, one for handicapped accessibility and loading to the west, and an additional lot to the north. The western and northern portions of the property will contain the proposed septic field.

A small path is proposed to connect the new church with the existing historic sanctuary to the
The path would be handicapped accessible, with handrails, to allow parishioners access to both buildings without needing to traverse either the hillside containing the historic graveyard, or the road. The path would be located outside the known boundaries of the historic cemetery.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff finds that both the proposal for demolition and new construction are largely compatible with the historic district. The size, scale, and massing of the new church are modest for a modern building. The proposed location of the church—well back from the rustic road, and over the small ridgeline at the rear of the historic cemetery—will mitigate any potential disruption to the viewshed or historic setting. The parking lots are proposed to be sited almost entirely at the rear of the property, where they will not be visible from other locations within the historic district. The new building will buffer the majority of potential disruptions to the viewshed of the historic cemetery. The small number of handicapped spaces adjacent to the side elevation of the church are also placed at least 60’ back from the road, and will not have an adverse impact on the viewshed of the historic district.

The architecture of the church itself fits well within the rural, vernacular character of the Purdum historic district. The spare use of siding, with select elevation and details in brick, the use of simplified Roman-arched window openings, and other details with the cornice, cornerboards, and quoins, add visual interest without ostentation. The new building will complement its immediate neighbors, and will not adversely affect the rural nature of this district.

Considerations should be given to the potential for adverse effects to the adjacent historic cemetery. Historic Preservation staff recommend that the following to help protect the cemetery during ground disturbance and construction:

- The cemetery should be staked at the known corners, and snow fencing should be installed prior to ground disturbance and maintained until issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the new building;
- Limits of disturbance should be broadly shown for the new path to accommodate for the potential that unanticipated finds of grave shafts during construction may necessitate that the path be shifted to avoid disturbing human remains;
- The limits of disturbance for the path within the present church lot or within 50 feet of the lot line should be investigated by a qualified archaeologist according to a workplan approved by Historic Preservation staff to verify that no unmarked graves are present, or other significant archaeological features associated with the early church community;
- If any unanticipated finds are discovered while constructing the path, work should cease until the site can be evaluated by Historic Preservation staff;
- New tree plantings should be placed far enough away from known burials so that the root systems will not displace grave markers or damage graves.

Staff would also recommend the following conditions for the site:

- Prior to demolition of the house and garage, historic preservation staff should be allowed full access to both properties to document the buildings, and to create a list of salvageable architectural materials;
- The applicant should work to make these items available for salvage or donation to a
charitable organization, prior to the issuance of demolition permits for the property.

- The applicant should review the lighting plan with historic preservation staff and the HPC to ensure that light levels are adequate without impacting the rural character of the district.

Staff recommends the applicant make revisions based on the guidance and feedback provided by the HPC and staff and return for a second preliminary consultation or HAWP as recommend.
APPLICATION FOR
HISTORIC AREA WORK PERMIT

Contact Email: lwbya52@gmail.com
Contact Person: Rev. Lawrence Bryant

Tax Account #: 12-00933911

Name of Property Owner: Pleasant Grove Christ. Comm Church

Address: 11225 Mountain View Rd, Damascus, MD 20872

Contractor: Dominion Construction Group c/o Phil Clark
Contractor Registration #: Contractor License: 02306335, Registered Agent: 132384
Agent for Owner: MHG c/o Lauren Wirth
Agent for Owner: lwirth@mhgpa.com

LOCATION OF BUILDING PERMIT

House Number: 11307
Street: Mountain View Rd
Town/City: Damascus
Nearest Cross Street: Johnson Drive
Lot: 12345
Block: 6789
Subdivision: ABC

LIBER: 13917 FOLIO: 221 Parcel: 088

PART ONE: TYPE OF PERMIT, ACTION AND USE

1A. CHECK ALL APPLICABLE:
- [x] Construct
- [x] Alter/Renovate
- [ ] Extant
- [ ] Move
- [ ] Revision
- [ ] Repair
- [ ] Wreck/Raze
- [x] Solar
- [ ] Fireplace
- [ ] Woodburning Stove
- [ ] Single Family
- [ ] Religious Assembly
- [ ] AC
- [ ] Slab
- [ ] Room Addition
- [ ] Porch
- [ ] Deck
- [ ] Shed
- [ ] Fence/Wall (complete Section 4)

1B. Construction cost estimate: $ 1.5 million

1C. If this is a revision of a previously approved active permit, see Permit # ________________________________

PART TWO: COMPLETION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND EXTENSION ADDITIONS

2A. Type of sewage disposal: 01 [x] WSSC 02 [ ] Septic 03 [ ] Other: __________________________

2B. Type of water supply: 01 [x] WSSC 02 [ ] Well 03 [ ] Other: __________________________

PART THREE: COMPLETE ONLY FOR FENCE/RETAINING WALL

3A. Height ______ feet ______ inches

3B. Indicate whether the fence or retaining wall is to be constructed on one of the following locations:
- [ ] On party line/property line
- [ ] Entirely on land of owner
- [ ] On public right of way/ easement

I hereby certify that I have the authority to make the foregoing application, that the application is correct, and that the construction will comply with plans approved by all agencies listed and I hereby acknowledge and accept this to be a condition for the issuance of this permit.

Signature of owner or authorized agent

DATE

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR INSTRUCTIONS
THE FOLLOWING ITEMS MUST BE COMPLETED AND THE REQUIRED DOCUMENTS MUST ACCOMPANY THIS APPLICATION.

1. WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

   a. Description of existing structure(s) and environmental setting, including their historical features and significance:

   The subject property is located in the Purdum Historic District (#10-24) per the Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites in Montgomery County, MD. The property is improved with a residence which was constructed in 1900 according to tax records and a barn. A survey of the property for the Locational Atlas states: "This appears to be an older home which has been extensively remodeled. The present structure, covered with siding and with two added side wings, now has the appearance of a modern, traditional style home. Only the two brick, older looking chimneys suggest its possible age."

   b. General description of project and its effect on the historic resource(s), the environmental setting, and, where applicable, the historic district.

Pleasant Grove Community Church (PGCC) proposes the demolition of the existing single family home and barn and construction of an 8,600 SF church. The existing PGCC is currently located on the adjacent property and was constructed in 1869 as a school. Almost 150 years later, the congregation is inadequately served by the existing church building, and in order to maintain this historical church community, additional space is necessary to allow the younger families to grow. Historic Preservation staff conducted a preliminary review of the site during the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision process and did not object to the demolition of the existing structures. Per the staff report dated 4/20/17, "Historic Preservation staff recommends at the time of Site Plan, that hardscaped areas and parking surfaces be paved with tinted, exposed aggregate paving or permeable materials and that the church's primary facade be oriented towards the street.

2. SITE PLAN

   Site and environmental setting, drawn to scale. You may use your plot. Your site plan must include:

   a. the scale, north arrow, and data;
   b. dimensions of all existing and proposed structures; and
   c. site features such as walkways, driveways, fences, ponds, streams, trash dumpsters, mechanical equipment, and landscaping.

3. PLANS AND ELEVATIONS

   You must submit 2 copies of plans and elevations in a format no larger than 11" x 17". Plans on 8 1/2" x 11" paper are preferred.

   a. Schematic construction plans, with marked dimensions, indicating location, size and general type of walls, window and door openings, and other fixed features of both the existing resource(s) and the proposed work.

   b. Elevations (facades), with marked dimensions, clearly indicating proposed work in relation to existing construction and, when appropriate, context. All materials and fixtures proposed for the exterior must be noted on the elevations drawings. An existing and a proposed elevation drawing of each facade affected by the proposed work is required.

4. MATERIALS SPECIFICATIONS

   General description of materials and manufactured items proposed for incorporation in the work of the project. This information may be included on your design drawings.

   - Concrete slab on grade, wood frame structure and engineered wood trusses. Exterior finishes be masonry veneer and siding. Roof to be asphalt shingles with aluminum gutters.

5. PHOTOGRAPHS

   a. Clearly labeled photographic prints of each facade of existing resource, including details of the affected portions. All labels should be placed on the front of photographs.

   b. Clearly label photographic prints of the resource as viewed from the public right-of-way and of the adjoining properties. All labels should be placed on the front of photographs.

6. TREE SURVEY

   If you are proposing construction adjacent to or within the dripline of any tree 6" or larger in diameter (at approximately 4 feet above the ground), you must file an accurate tree survey identifying the size, location, and species of each tree of at least that dimension.

7. ADDRESSES OF ADJACENT AND CONFRONTING PROPERTY OWNERS

   For all projects, provide an accurate list of adjacent and confronting property owners (net tenants), including names, addresses, and zip codes. This list should include the owners of all lots or parcels which adjoin the parcel in question, as well as the owner(s) of lots(s) or parcel(s) which lie directly across the street/highway from the parcel in question.

PLEASE PRINT (IN BLUE OR BLACK INK) OR TYPE THIS INFORMATION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE.
PLEASE STAY WITHIN THE GUIDES OF THE TEMPLATE, AS THIS WILL BE PHOTOCOPIED DIRECTLY ONTO MAILING LABELS.
**HAWP APPLICATION: MAILING ADDRESSES FOR NOTIFYING**
[Owner, Owner’s Agent, Adjacent and Confronting Property Owners]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner’s mailing address</th>
<th>Owner’s Agent’s mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Bryant</td>
<td>Lauren Wirth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Grove Community Church</td>
<td>MHG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11225 Mountain View Rd</td>
<td>9220 Wightman Rd, Suite 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus, MD 20872</td>
<td>Montgomery Village, MD 20886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjacent and confronting Property Owners mailing addresses**

- See attached
Existing Property Condition Photographs (duplicate as needed)

Detail: Aerial View - Structures to be removed

Detail: House - to be removed

Applicant: ________________________________
Site Plan

See attached

Shade portion to indicate North

Applicant:________________________
Site Plan

See attached

Shade portion to indicate North
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

To: Department of Permitting Services  
255 Rockville Pike, 2nd Floor  
Rockville, MD 20850

Attn: Historic Work Commission

From: Lauren Wirth
Email: lwirth@mhgpa.com

Project: Pleasant Grove Community Church
MHG #: 97.305.33
MNCPPC# 820190010
Date: 9/7/2018

Subject: Site Plan - Application and Fee

We are sending you the attached items via: Maryland Delivery Consultant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copies</th>
<th>Dwg/Doc Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Submission Package</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THese ITEMS ARE TRANSMITTED as checked below:

- [ ] For Approval  
- [ ] Approval As Submitted  
- [✓] For Your Records  
- [ ] For Your Information  
- [ ] For Your Use  
- [✓] For Review and Comment  
- [ ] As Requested  
- [ ] Returned After Use

CC:

Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Thank you,

Lauren Wirth
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name 2</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>St</th>
<th>zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STILES DUEAN</td>
<td>STILES KEVIN LEE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1123 SPRING RUN CT</td>
<td>FREDERICK</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>21702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPPEON ROBERT R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11220 MOUNTAIN VIEW RD</td>
<td>DAMASCUS</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWRENCE AMY</td>
<td>STILES KRISS LEE</td>
<td></td>
<td>11259 MOUNTAIN VIEW RD</td>
<td>DAMASCUS</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEASANT GROVE CHRISTIAN</td>
<td>COMM CHURCH</td>
<td></td>
<td>11225 MOUNTAIN VIEW RD</td>
<td>DAMASCUS</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOODY JOHN R &amp; M M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11300 MOUNTAIN VIEW RD</td>
<td>DAMASCUS</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAINES LEWIS E &amp; J E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11160 MOUNTAIN VIEW ROAD</td>
<td>DAMASCUS</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WODOSLAWSKY FRANK S &amp; T K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11401 MT VIEW RD</td>
<td>DAMASCUS</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOPEZ JOSE M</td>
<td>LOPEZ YANIRA</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONFIDENCE TITLE &amp; ESCROW</td>
<td>ROCKVILLE</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAINES LEWIS E &amp; JANET E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11110 MOUNTAIN VIEW ROAD</td>
<td>DAMASCUS</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOPEZ JOSE M</td>
<td>LOPEZ YANIRA</td>
<td></td>
<td>702 RISSELS AV SUITE 303</td>
<td>GAITHERSBURG</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEATHERMAN JOANNE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11308 MOUNTAIN VIEW RD</td>
<td>DAMASCUS</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEASANT GROVE CHRISTIAN</td>
<td>COMM CHURCH</td>
<td></td>
<td>11225 MOUNTAIN VIEW RD</td>
<td>DAMASCUS</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus Community Alliance</td>
<td>Treasurer Gary Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td>2619 Ridge Road</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus Community Alliance</td>
<td>Chairman Randy Scotchfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>Montgomery Financial 26005 Ridge Road #201</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County Citizens Advisory Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3300 Briggs Chaney Road</td>
<td>Silver Spring</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County Civic Federation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1002 Lockridge Drive</td>
<td>Silver Spring</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County Renters Alliance Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 7773</td>
<td>Silver Spring</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County Renters Alliance Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11001 Spring Street #316</td>
<td>Silver Spring</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County Taxpayers League</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7400 Pyle Road</td>
<td>Bethesda</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Preservation, Inc.</td>
<td>Director Judith Christensen</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 Walker Avenue</td>
<td>Gaithersburg</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Montgomery County Alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22200 Stillwell Road</td>
<td>Boyds</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Metro Area Transit Authority</td>
<td>Managing Director Office of Planning</td>
<td>Shyam Kannan 600 Fifth Street NW</td>
<td>Washington DC</td>
<td>20001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus Elementary School</td>
<td>Mr. Bill Collins</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>10201 Bethesda Church Rd.</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John T. Baker Middle School</td>
<td>Dr. Louise Worthington</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>25400 Old Dr.</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus High School</td>
<td>Ms. Casey Crouse</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>25001 Ridge Road</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Damascus Library</td>
<td>Intake</td>
<td>9701 Main Street</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MNCPPC</td>
<td></td>
<td>8707 Georgia Ave.</td>
<td>Silver Spring</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>20910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sequence of Events for Properties Required To Comply With Forest Conservation Plans:

1. Property owner is responsible for ensuring all tree protection measures are performed in accordance with the approved plan. No land disturbance shall begin before tree protection and stress-reduction measures have been implemented and approved by the Planning Department Forest Conservation Inspector.

2. The property owner must arrange for the meeting and the following people must participate at the preconstruction meeting: the property owner or their representative, construction contractor, Planning Department Forest Conservation Inspector, and Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services (DPS) Sediment Control Inspector. The purpose of this meeting is verify compliance with the preconstruction meeting.

3. The property owner must immediately notify the Forest Conservation Inspector of any proposed changes to the approved plan.

4. Temporary protection devices must be installed per the approved Forest Conservation Plan. Additional tree protection devices may be required when the approved plan has not been followed.

5. Tree protection fencing must be installed and maintained by the property owner for the duration of the construction process and must not be removed until the plant approval from the Forest Conservation Inspector has been obtained.

6. Fencing and typical stress-reduction measures may include:
   - Chain link fence (four feet high) with high visibility flagging.
   - Super silt fence with wire strung between the support poles (minimum 4 feet high)
   - 14 gauge 2 inch x 4 inch welded wire fencing supported by steel T-bar posts (minimum 4 feet high) with high visibility flagging.

7. Property owner must immediately notify the Forest Conservation Inspector of any proposed changes to the approved plan.

8. The property owner must immediately notify the Forest Conservation Inspector of any proposed changes to the approved plan.

9. Property owner must immediately notify the Forest Conservation Inspector of any proposed changes to the approved plan.

10. After the final inspection and completion of all corrective measures the Forest Conservation Inspector may require additional corrective measures which may include:

   a. Parking or driving equipment, machinery, or vehicles of any type.
   b. Felling of trees into a protected area.
   c. Soil aeration
   d. Fertilization
   e. Trenching or grading for utilities, irrigation, drainage, etc.

11. Long-term protection measures, including permanent signage, must be installed per the approved plan.

12. Inspector. No additional grading, sodding, or burial may take place after the tree protection measures have been implemented and approved by the Planning Department Forest Conservation Inspector. Additional tree protection devices may be required when the approved plan has not been followed.
MINIMAL GRADING IN ROW. LIMITS OF DISTURBANCE IN MAJORITY OF ROW FOR TREE REMOVAL FOR SIGHT DISTANCE. LIMIT ROOT DISTURBANCE. GRIND STUMPS. ROOT PRUNE ONLY FROM TREE #66 TO #71.