



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

**APPROVED  
MINUTES**

The Montgomery County Planning Board met in regular session via Microsoft Teams video conference on Thursday, October 15, 2020, at 9:08 a.m., and adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

Present were Chair Casey Anderson, Vice Chair Natali Fani-González, and Commissioners Gerald R. Cichy, Tina Patterson, and Partap Verma.

Items 1, 17, 4 through 7, and Items 9 and 15, discussed in that order, are reported on the attached agenda.

Items 2 and 8 were removed from the Planning Board agenda.

The Planning Board recessed for lunch at 12:40 p.m. and reconvened via video conference at 1:20 p.m.

Item 3, and Items 10, 11, 12, 14 and 16, are reported on the attached agenda.

Item 13 was removed from the Planning Board agenda.

Commissioner Verma left the meeting at 4:35 p.m. before discussion of Item 16, the last Item on the Planning Board agenda.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Planning Board will be held on Thursday, October 22, 2020, via video conference.

*M. Clara Moise*

M. Clara Moise  
Sr. Technical Writer/Editor

*James J. Parsons*

James J. Parsons  
Sr. Technical Writer/Editor

**Montgomery County Planning Board Meeting**  
**Thursday, October 15, 2020**  
2425 Reddie Drive  
Wheaton, MD 20902  
301-495-4600

**1. Consent Agenda**

**\*A. Adoption of Resolutions**

1. College View Campus Preliminary Plan 120200170 - MCPB No. 20-107
2. College View Campus Site Plan 820200140 – MCPB No. 20-108

**BOARD ACTION**

**Motion:** CICHY/VERMA

**Vote:**

**Yea:** 5-0

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action:** Adopted the Resolutions cited above, as submitted.

**\*B. Record Plats**

**Subdivision Plat No. 220200490, Bradley Farms** -- RE-2 zone; 1 lot; located on the west side of Harrington Drive, approximately 1,100 feet north of River Road (MD 190); Potomac Subregion Master Plan.

*Staff Recommendation: Approval*

**Subdivision Plat No. 220200560, Clarksburg Town Center** -- CRT zone; 4 parcels; located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of St. Clair Road and Stringtown Road; Clarksburg Master Plan.

*Staff Recommendation: Approval*

**BOARD ACTION**

**Motion:** CICHY/VERMA

**Vote:**

**Yea:** 5-0

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action:** Approved staff recommendation for approval of the Record Plats cited above, as submitted.

**\*C. Other Consent Items**

**1. Westwood Shopping Center, Preliminary Plan Amendment 12017017A and Kensington of Bethesda, Site Plan 820200200, Extension Request No. 1**---CRT 1.5 C 0.5 R 1.5 H 75’ zone; 2.92 acres; Request to extend the review period from October 15, 2020 through January 14, 2021; Located in the southern quadrant of the intersection of River Road and present-day Ridgefield Road (future realigned Westbard Avenue); Westbard Sector Plan.  
*Staff Recommendation: Approval of Extension Request*

**2. Snowdens Manor: Preliminary Plan No. 120200230, Regulatory Review Extension Request No. 1**---Request to extend the regulatory review period for an additional two months until December 18, 2020; Application to create one lot for a restaurant and associated outdoor dining area; 0.58 acre; NR-0.75 H-45 Zone; located approximately 800-feet north of the intersection of New Hampshire Avenue and Briggs Chaney Road; 1997 Cloverly Master Plan.  
*Staff Recommendation: Approval of the Extension Request*

**3. PSTA Site, Preliminary Plan 120200100 Regulatory Extension Request No. 3**---Request to extend the regulatory review period for three months, from November 6, 2020 through February 5, 2021. The Application will subdivide Montgomery County’s former Public Safety Training Academy site into 288 lots and approximately 25 parcels for the future construction of 645 residential units, public open space, HOA parcels, and roads; located east of Darnestown Road, west of Great Seneca Highway (MD 119) and south of Key West Highway (MD 28) within the Life Sciences Center West District of the 2010 Great Seneca Science Corridor Master Plan; on approximately 44.8-acres of land in the CR-1.0, C-0.5, R-1.0, H-150 Zone.  
*Staff Recommendation: Approve the Extension Request*

**BOARD ACTION**

**Motion: 1. through 3. CICHY/VERMA**

**Vote:**

**Yea: 1. through 3. 5-0**

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action: 1. Approved staff recommendation for approval of the Preliminary and Site Plan Amendment Extension requests cited above.**

**2. & 3. Approved staff recommendation for approval of the Preliminary Plan Extension requests cited above.**

**\*D. Approval of Minutes**

Planning Board Meeting Minutes of October 1, 2020

**BOARD ACTION**

**Motion:** CICHY/VERMA

**Vote:**

**Yea:** 5-0

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action:** Approved the Planning Board Meeting Minutes of October 1, 2020, as submitted.

**2. ~~Roundtable Discussion~~ — **REMOVED****

- ~~Planning Director's Report~~

**BOARD ACTION**

**Motion:**

**Vote:**

**Yea:**

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action:**      **This Item was removed from the Planning Board agenda.**

**17. Briefing on Fall 2020 Semiannual Presentation Outline**

**BOARD ACTION**

**Motion:**

**Vote:**

**Yea:**

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action:** Received briefing from Planning and Parks Departments staff on the proposed outlines for the upcoming Fall 2020 Semi-Annual Report, followed by a brief Board discussion, and provided guidance to staff.

**4. Adoption Session: FY22 Capital Budget and FY21-26 Capital Improvements Program (CIP)***Staff Recommendation: Tentative Approval***BOARD ACTION****Motion: PATERSON/VERMA****Vote:****Yea: 5-0****Nay:****Other:****Action: Approved staff recommendation for approval, and transmittal to the County Executive and County Council, of the amended FY22 Capital Budget and FY21-26 CIP.**

Parks Department staff offered a multi-media presentation and discussed the proposed biennial FY21-26 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and FY22 Capital Budget. According to staff, this is the final Planning Board review of the CIP and Capital Budget before it is transmitted to the County Executive and County Council. Being presented to the Board today are a revised set of project description forms (PDFs) with updated expenditure data for FY20, changes and feedback from the Board, technical adjustment, and a summary of the CIP. The current CIP is \$227,500,000, with the primary emphasis on renovating and maintaining the existing park system while allowing for some new development and acquisition to meet the demands of a growing county. Thirty-one percent of the current CIP expenditures are funded by Montgomery County Government Obligation (GO) bonds, 18 percent by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) bonds, 15 percent by current revenue, and 21 percent by the Maryland Program Open Space (POS), with 65 percent of the CIP used to fund renovation and maintenance, 11 percent for new parks and facilities, and 24 percent for land acquisition. The proposed amendments to the biennial CIP include the reduction of FY22 appropriation requests by \$528,0001 to reflect the FY21 Savings Plan; the Mid-County Park Benefit Payments PDF, which will allow \$2,500,000 of appropriation in FY22 through receipt of park benefit payments from developments in the White Flint, Grosvenor-Strathmore, and Rock Spring areas; a revised Stream Protection SVP appropriations request that will correct an over-appropriation of \$600,000 added in FY21 and align appropriations with expenditures through FY22; a revised funding schedule for the Enterprise Facilities Improvements PDF to incorporate the delay of the Ridge Road Ice Rink project beyond FY26; and the closeout of the Little Bennett Regional Park Trail Connector, Magruder Branch Trail Extension, and Seneca Crossing Local Park PDFs. These amendments will reduce the overall CIP from \$245,528,000 to \$227,500,000, or 7.3 percent, and reduce the FY22 Capital Budget from \$53,581,000 to \$34,953,000, or 35.8 percent.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE



**4. Adoption Session: FY22 Capital Budget and FY21-26 Capital Improvements Program (CIP)**

CONTINUED

Following Planning Board approval, the next steps for the CIP include transmittal to the County Executive and County Council, scheduled for no later than November 1; County Executive review of the CIP; transmittal of the CIP and the County Executive's recommendations to the County Council, scheduled for January 15, 2021; County Council review, a public hearing, committee meetings, and full Council worksessions scheduled throughout February and March; preparation of County Council CIP resolutions scheduled for May; and the availability of FY22 funds, scheduled for July 1.

There followed a brief Board discussion with questions to staff.

**\*5. 809 Easley Street, Preliminary Plan No. 120200010**---CRN 0.5 C 0.5 R 0.25 H35 zone, 0.17 acres, Request to create one lot for up to 3,748 square feet of total commercial development and a request for a parking waiver; located on the north side of Easley Street approximately 300 feet east of Fenton Street; 2000 Silver Spring Central Business District Sector Plan.

*Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions and Adoption of Resolution*

**BOARD ACTION**

**Motion:** CICHY/VERMA

**Vote:**

**Yea:** 5-0

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action:** Approved staff recommendation for approval of the Preliminary Plan cited above, subject to revised conditions discussed during the meeting, and adopted the attached Resolution.

Planning Department staff offered a multi-media presentation and discussed a proposed Preliminary Plan request to create one lot to accommodate a commercial development. The 0.17-acre property, identified as Lot 6, Block U, is located on the north side of Easley Street, approximately 300 feet east of its intersection with Fenton Street, and is zoned Commercial/Residential/Neighborhood within the Silver Spring Central Business District (CBD) Sector Plan area. The site is currently vacant, with no structures, buildings, curb cuts along the site frontage, or driveways on-site.

Staff noted that the applicant proposes to create and develop one lot with a 35-foot building for up to 3,748 square feet of commercial uses under the standard method of development. Parking will be provided offsite at a property on Sligo Avenue that is owned and used by the applicant as an office and film studio. Once developed, the new building will become the applicant’s new office space and studio. A joint parking agreement will be recorded and will run with the land if the applicant chooses to sell the Sligo Avenue property and move all operations to the Easley Street property. Staff noted that the existing Sligo Avenue office has 11 parking spaces with a minimum parking requirement of two spaces, and with the minimum parking requirement for the proposed office at Easley Street at seven spaces, the parking at the Sligo Avenue site has sufficient capacity for both sites. Because the offsite parking location is located 2,518 feet, or approximately 0.5 miles, from the property, the applicant is requesting a waiver from the quarter-mile minimum distance between locations and proposes a private shuttle van to transport employees and guests between the two locations. To accommodate the private shuttle and deliveries, the applicant is proposing a new curb cut for a proposed onsite loading space located on the eastern portion of the property. However, due to the constrained width of

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

**\*5. 809 Easley Street, Preliminary Plan No. 120200010**

CONTINUED

the site, a required eight-foot wide landscape buffer with canopy trees and understory plantings along the rear and eastern property lines that abut residential zones cannot continue alongside the off-street loading facility. To address this, the applicant is requesting alternate compliance and proposes a 6-foot tall privacy fence along the entire eastern boundary of the site with landscape screening beyond the loading facility.

Staff has received three emails from neighboring property owners expressing concerns regarding the design of the building's main entrance on Easley Street, the design of the secondary entrance, the amount of permeable surface, and the visual impact of the proposed off-street loading facility and privacy fence. Staff addressed each of these issues, as detailed in the October 2 technical staff report.

Mr. Russell Reese, consultant from Maddox Engineers & Surveyors representing the applicant, Mr. Brian Armstrong, also present, offered brief comments, and concurred with the staff recommendation.

Mr. Brian Armstrong, applicant, also offered brief comments.

There followed a brief Board discussion.

**\*6. Hampden Lane, Sketch Plan 320200070---CR 5.0 C 5.0 R 4.75 H 250’, BOZ, 1.06 acres, Request for up to 525,000 square feet of density for a multi-use development, including up to 165,000 square feet of residential density with 17.6% MPDUs and up to 360,000 square feet of non-residential density, including up to 293,440 square feet of BOZ density and associated PIP payment, located one block east of Wisconsin Avenue on East Lane; 2017 Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan.**

*Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions and Adoption of Resolution*

**BOARD ACTION**

**Motion: CICHY/VERMA**

**Vote:**

**Yea: 5-0**

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action: Approved staff recommendation for approval of the Sketch Plan cited above, subject to revised conditions discussed during the meeting, and adopted the attached Resolution.**

Planning Department staff offered a multi-media presentation and discussed a proposed Sketch Plan request for the construction of a mixed-use development. The 1.06-acre property, consisting of five existing lots and parcels, is located on the west side of East Lane, bounded by Montgomery Lane to the south, Hampden Lane to the north, and is zoned Commercial/Residential within the Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan area and the Bethesda Overlay Zone (BOZ). The site is currently developed with several single-story retail and restaurants, as well as a three-story office building at the corner of Hampden Lane and East Lane and a 110-foot office building at the corner of Montgomery Lane and East Lane. There are four existing curb cuts to the property, one from Montgomery Lane, and three on East Lane. Several street trees are located along the site at a range of sizes but are generally under 23” diameter at breast height (DBH).

Staff noted that the applicant proposes to redevelop the property with a new 262-foot mixed-use building for up to 525,000 square feet of density, comprised of up to 10,000 square feet of ground floor retail, up to 350,000 square feet of office uses, and up to 165,000 square feet of residential uses to accommodate up to 150 multi-family dwelling units with a minimum of 17.6 percent Moderately Priced Dwelling Units (MPDUs). Staff noted that the maximum density includes up to 293,440 square feet of density from the BOZ with a Park Impact Payment (PIP). The applicant proposes to provide underground parking, public open space, green roof, private amenities, and streetscape improvements along all three road frontages. A portion of the vehicular parking will be located onsite in a below-grade structured parking facility accessed via

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

**\*6. Hampden Lane, Sketch Plan 320200070**CONTINUED

Hampden Lane, with the remainder of spaces to be located offsite within 0.25 miles to the west. Vehicular access from Montgomery, East, and Hampden Lanes will be provided via two access points each. Loading access will also be provided from Hampden Lane. Pedestrian access is proposed directly from the existing sidewalks along East, Hampden, and Montgomery Lanes. Bicycle access will also be provided from East, Hampden, and Montgomery Lanes, with access from Montgomery Lane to be improved with new separate bicycle lanes upon the implementation of the Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) separated bicycle lanes project. Staff then briefly discussed minor corrections to the staff report and the draft Resolution.

Following posting of the October 5 technical staff report, staff received one letter from a neighboring property owner expressing concerns regarding traffic impacts and parking. Staff addressed these issues in the report, noting that traffic issues are addressed at Preliminary Plan review, with parking addressed at Site Plan review.

Mr. David Metzger representing the Hampden Square Condominium Association offered testimony.

Mr. Bob Dalrymple, attorney representing the applicant, offered comments and concurred with the staff recommendation.

Ms. Janel Kausner, member of the applicant's team, also offered comments.

There followed a brief Board discussion with questions to staff.

**7. Housing Opportunities Commission Headquarters Office Building (HOC HQ)**  
**Location Selection - Mandatory Referral No. 2021002**---Request by the Housing Opportunities Commission of Montgomery County Maryland (HOC) to locate a new office building, containing up to 82,356 square feet of commercial uses, on 0.47 acres of CR 5.0 C 4.0 R4.75 H145T zoned land located on the southeast corner of Second Avenue and Fenwick Lane; within the 2000 Silver Spring Central Business District Sector Plan.

*Staff Recommendation: Approval*

**BOARD ACTION**

**Motion:** CICHY/FANI-GONZÁLEZ

**Vote:**

**Yea:** 5-0

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action:** **Approved staff recommendation to transmit comments to the Housing Opportunities Commission of Montgomery County, as stated in the attached transmittal letter.**

Planning Department staff offered a multi-media presentation and discussed a proposed Mandatory Referral request by the Housing Opportunities Commission of Montgomery County (HOC) to select a site for a new headquarters building. The 0.47-acre property, consisting of parts of Lots 32, 33, 34, and 35, is located on the southeast quadrant of the intersection of Second Avenue and Fenwick Lane and is zoned Commercial/Residential in the Silver Spring Central Business District (CBD) Sector Plan area. The property is currently developed as a surface parking lot.

Staff noted that the applicant is seeking approval to locate the new 82,356-square foot HOC Headquarters office building on the site. No development is included with the application under review today. Building and site design, including development standards, will be reviewed as part of a subsequent Mandatory Referral application to be submitted for review at a later date.

Staff has received three letters from neighboring property owners raising concerns regarding a commercial building’s compatibility with the existing surrounding residential uses, the size of the building, the need for new office space in light of increased telework, and the potential of the building to make the entry to the adjacent Octave Condominium complex less safe by eliminating the clear line of sight present within the existing parking lot. Staff addressed each of these issues, as detailed in the October 2 technical staff report.

Ms. Shakia Baskerville of Fenwick Lane offered testimony.

Messrs. Stacy Spann and Scott Vieth, members of the applicant’s team, offered a multi-media presentation and discussed the project design elements.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

**7. Housing Opportunities Commission Headquarters Office Building (HOC HQ)  
Location Selection - Mandatory Referral No. 2021002**

CONTINUED

Mr. Bill Kominers, attorney representing the applicant, offered comments and concurred with the staff recommendation.

There followed a brief Board discussion with questions to staff.

**8. ~~Bethesda Downtown Design Advisory Panel, Renewal of Panel Member Term, Appointment of Panel Members~~—Bethesda Downtown Design Advisory Panel, Appointment of Panel Member. Appoint a new Design Advisory Panel member representing Academia, and re-appoint the Panel member representing the Development Community.—**REMOVED****

*Staff Recommendation: Approve Appointments*

**BOARD ACTION**

**Motion:**

**Vote:**

**Yea:**

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action:**        **This Item was removed from the Planning Board agenda.**



**\*9. Takoma Montessori School, Local Map Amendment No. H-138**---Request to rezone a portion of a split-zoned property from R-60 to NRF-0.75 H-50 to expand an existing Daycare ~~Private Educational Institution~~ use for up to 47 41 students; located at 7212 Carroll Avenue in the City of Takoma Park; on approximately 1,400 square feet within the 2000 Takoma Park Master Plan area.

*Staff Recommendation: Recommend approval with comments to the Hearing Examiner*

**(NOTE: Planning Board recommendation for hearing by Hearing Examiner on December 4, 2020)**

### **BOARD ACTION**

**Motion:** VERMA/CICHY

**Vote:**

**Yea:** 5-0

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action:** Approved staff recommendation to transmit comments to the Hearing Examiner, as stated in the attached transmittal letter.

Planning Department staff offered a multi-media presentation and discussed a proposed Local Map Amendment (LMA) request to rezone a portion of a property in order to modify an existing daycare facility. The 4,435-square foot property is located on the north side of Carroll Avenue, bounded by Philadelphia Avenue (MD410) to the west, Grant Avenue to the east, and split zoned Neighborhood Retail (NR), Residential, and Commercial Revitalization Overlay Zone (CROZ) within the Takoma Park Master Plan area. The property is currently developed with a 960-square-foot one-story shopfront building that houses the existing Takoma Montessori School, a surface driveway and parking area, and a fenced play area. Access to the site is provided through a driveway from Carroll Avenue.

Staff noted that the applicant proposes to rezone the 1,400-square foot Residential portion of the property to Neighborhood Retail-Floating (NRF) and construct a 1,200-square foot addition at the rear of an existing daycare facility. The addition will allow an increase in enrollment from 22 students to 47. Access will remain via the existing driveway from Carroll Avenue. Staff noted that at Site Plan review, the applicant will need to pursue Alternative Compliance for screening requirements, which staff supports because the proposed expansion will minimize the noise associated with the current playground on that portion of the site, and the one-story structure presents a reduced visual impact for the adjacent homeowner. Staff will continue to work with the applicant to finalize the treatment of that shared boundary at time of Site Plan review. Staff added that the applicant will be required to secure a Historic Area Work Permit (HAWP) approved by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), who has already given preliminary approval for the project.

There followed a brief Board discussion with questions to staff.

**15. US 29 Mobility and Reliability Study**

*Staff Recommendation: Provide Comments to Montgomery County Department of Transportation*

**BOARD ACTION**

**Motion:** VERMA/CICHY

**Vote:**

**Yea:** 5-0

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action:** Approved staff recommendation to transmit comments to Montgomery County Department of Transportation, as stated in the attached transmittal letter.

Planning Department staff and Mr. Corey Pitts of Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) offered a multi-media presentation and discussed the US29 Mobility and Reliability Study, which identifies improvements to complement the investment in the new FLASH bus rapid transit (BRT) service. Phase I of the project, identified as the Route 29 FLASH, began operations on October 14 and will serve the eastern section of the County with a 14-mile transit route along US29 and local streets from the Silver Spring Transit Center (SSTC) to the Burtonsville Park-and-Ride. According to staff, the study aims to improve transit, carpool, and overall vehicle corridor travel time and reliability performance, as well as pedestrian and bicycle access within the FLASH station area and adjacent neighborhoods between Silver Spring and Tech Road. Specifically, the focus of this study is to evaluate two bus priority alternatives, which include the Median Bus Lane alternative developed by two US29 Corridor Advisory Committee members, and the Managed Lanes alternative, with targeted intersection and segment improvements.

Mr. Pitts then discussed the two transitway alternatives, noting that the Median Bus Lane alternative consists of a dedicated median bus lane from Sligo Creek Parkway to Tech Road. The alternative includes a single, bi-directional lane busway that expands to two lanes at the stations to enable passing and to enable buses traveling in both directions to stop at the station at the same time. Existing conditions will be modified, including new traffic signals at Oak Leaf Drive, Northwest Drive, Hillwood Drive, Crestmoor Drive, Timberwood Avenue, Lanark Way and Hastings Drive; turn restrictions; and new crosswalks. Other modifications include lane width reductions, removal of travel lanes through Four Corners, and repurposing the median. The Managed Lanes alternative increases both transit and motor vehicle capacity with a combination of full-time bus/carpool lanes, peak period managed bus/carpool lanes, and hard shoulder running in multiple segments of the corridor. The managed lanes will be denoted through a mix of pavement markings and overhead dynamic signs. MCDOT recommendations include converting the inner lane from Musgrove to Road Stewart Lane to a bus/carpool lane in the southbound direction during AM peak travel time, with the outside shoulder hardened and converted to a general-purpose lane, and reversing the process northbound during PM peak travel

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

**15. US 29 Mobility and Reliability Study**CONTINUED

time; converting the inner lane from MD650 to Southwood Avenue to a bus/carpool lane in the southbound direction during AM peak travel time, and converting the northbound inner lane from Burnt Mills Avenue to MD650 to a bus/carpool lane during PM peak travel time; and implementing a reversible lane from Spring Street to Sligo Creek Parkway utilizing the existing reversible lane, and creating four southbound lanes during AM peak travel time, with the left lane serving as a bus/carpool lane, and reversing the process during PM peak travel time. Mr. Pitts discussed additional MCDOT recommendations, as detailed in the October 8 technical staff report.

Staff then discussed their recommendations, which include; 1) advancing the Managed Lanes alternative with the modification of either relocating the Tech Road station to the median or removing the segment between Musgrove Road and Stewart Lane; 2) continuing to advance the master-planned vision for dedicated bus lanes on the entire corridor between the Silver Spring Transit Center and Burtonsville; 3) not adding a second ramp to westbound I-495 prior to evaluating and resolving the pedestrian safety issues associated with the project; 4) evaluating station access and recommending bicycle and pedestrian improvements for the Briggs Chaney, Castle Boulevard, and Burtonsville station areas; 5) providing a complete cost estimate for all bicycle and pedestrian projects identified in this study as well as the cost estimate of projects to be identified in the Briggs Chaney, Castle Boulevard, and Burtonsville station areas; 6) evaluating the pedestrian improvements identified in the study, as well as the projects to be identified in the Briggs Chaney, Castle Boulevard, and Burtonsville station areas to determine the most critical and cost-effective projects that would improve station access; prioritizing bicycle projects; and prioritizing pedestrian projects using the Planning Department Pedestrian Level of Comfort (PLOC) tool; and 7) including Parks Department staff in any interagency coordination meetings regarding more detailed design of the proposed improvements.

Mr. Dan Wilhelm, representing the Greater Colesville Citizens Association, offered a multi-media presentation and testimony.

Mr. Paul Silberman, consultant from Mead & Hunt, Inc., engineering and architecture firm, offered comments and answered questions from the Planning Board.

Ms. Joana Conkilin of MCDOT also offered brief comments and answered questions from the Board.

There followed extensive Board discussion with questions to staff and Mr. Pitts.

**3. FY22 Operating Budget Discussion – Planning Department, Central Administrative Services (CAS) & the Commissioner’s Office****BOARD ACTION****Motion:****Vote:****Yea:****Nay:****Other:**

**Action:** Received briefing followed by Board discussion, and by consensus, agreed to give preliminary approval to the proposed FY22 Operating Budgets for the Central Administrative Services (CAS), the Commissioners’ Office and the Planning Department.

**Commissioners’ Office** – Chair Anderson noted that the proposed FY22 budget request for the Commissioners’ Office, which he prepared with assistance from Management Services Division Chief Karen Warnick, is basically the same as the FY21 budget with a \$4,967 addition for salaries and benefits, and a modest increase of \$1,075 for contracts and supplies, or 2 percent increase over the FY21 budget.

There followed a brief Board discussion.

**Planning Department** – In accordance with the October 8 memorandum to the Planning Board, Planning Department Director Gwen Wright and Management Services Division Chief Karen Warnick offered a multi-media presentation and discussed the Planning Department’s proposed FY22 budget, which represents an increase of 5.8 percent over the approved FY21 budget.

Ms. Wright then discussed the Master Plans that will carry over into FY22, as well as the new Master Plans that are being proposed to begin at the very end of FY22, which are being identified for the first time, i.e., University Boulevard Corridor Plan; Great Seneca Science Corridor Plan Amendment Phase 2; Silver Spring Communities Master Plan; and Clarksburg Master Plan Amendment. Ms. Wright also discussed a list of one-time major projects, existing and new major projects, and new initiatives, which are detailed in the attachments to the October 8 memorandum. The need for additional staffing was also discussed.

There followed extensive Board discussion with questions to Ms. Wright and Ms. Warnick.

**Department of Human Resources and Management (DHRM)** –Mr. John Kroll, the Commission’s Corporate Budget Director offered brief introductory comments, followed by Executive Director Asuntha Chiang-Smith who also offered brief comments. Ms. Katie Knaupe, Budget & Management Operations Officer briefly discussed the proposed FY22 DHRM budget,

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

**3. FY22 Budget Discussion Session #1 – Planning Department, Commissioner’s Office, and Central Administrative Services (CAS)**CONTINUED

which reflects a 0.4 percent decrease compared to the adopted FY21 budget. Ms. Knaupe also noted that, as discussed in detail in the October 8 memorandum to the Planning Board of Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties, DHRM is not proposing funding for new initiatives or changes in positions for FY22.

**Central Administrative Services (CAS)** proposed FY22 budget request reflects a 6.1 percent increase over the FY21 adopted budget, which is driven by personnel services and other operating charges. The main course driver for the budget is occupancy, which has increased 16 percent compared to FY21 levels due to tenant changes and COVID-19 response. There are no new proposed initiatives requests for FY22.

**The Merit System Board** is funded equally by Montgomery County and Prince George’s County and a decrease of 5.6 percent from the FY21 budget is proposed for FY22.

There followed a brief Board discussion.

**Finance Department** – Secretary-Treasurer Joseph Zimmerman briefly discussed the Finance Department proposed FY22 budget request. Mr. Zimmerman noted that the proposed FY22 base budget request, including major known commitments, will only increase by a modest 1.2 percent over the FY21 budget. Mr. Zimmerman noted that much of the increase is attributable to funding a Supplier Diversity position for a full year.

There followed a brief Board discussion with questions to Mr. Zimmerman.

**Legal Department** – General Counsel Adrian Gardner offered brief comments and noted that Deputy General Counsel Debra Boden will discuss the Legal Department proposed FY22 budget. In keeping with the October 9 memorandum to the Planning Board, Ms. Borden noted that the Legal Department is proposing a maintenance-level budget, which after providing for the combined fiscal impact of the personnel turnover, including expected increases in fringe benefits costs, the fiscal impact of the personnel budget results in a 0.9 percent increase for the Montgomery County Administrative Fund and a 0.4 percent decrease for the Prince George’s Administrative Fund over the FY22 budget.

**Office of the Inspector General (OIG)** – The Commission’s Inspector General Renee Kenney briefed the Board on the proposed FY22 budget for the Office of Internal Audit (OIA). Ms. Kenney noted that the proposed FY22 budget is slightly under by 0.9 percent from the FY21 budget. Ms. Kenney noted that the OIG is not requesting any new positions in FY22 and the increase in salary costs can be attributed to contracted increases, and the decrease in benefits costs can be attributed to overall decreases in Commission benefits rates. Ms. Kenney also added that the proposed FY22 budget also includes \$2,520 to cover the cost of analytical software proposed by the Office of the Chief Information Officer and does not reflect final pension and/or OPEB numbers.

There followed a brief Board discussion with questions to Ms. Kenney.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

**3. FY22 Budget Discussion Session #1 – Planning Department, Commissioner’s Office, and Central Administrative Services (CAS)**CONTINUED

**Office of the Chief Information Officer (CIO)** – Chief Information Officer Mazen Chilet briefed the Planning Board on the proposed FY22 budget request for the Office of the CIO. Mr. Chilet noted that the CIO budget consists of three parts: 1) Corporate IT funded by the two Administration Funds and charge backs from Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties. The proposed FY22 budget reflects a 2.6 percent decrease from the FY21 budget; 2) Office of the CIO, an Internal Service Fund (ISF), total FY22 budget would decrease by .09 percent with the shared portion of the Commission-Wide IT (CWIT) initiatives; and 3) the CWIT initiatives, also an ISF, funded by direct charges to using departments, would increase by \$1.2 million due to the growth in software license costs, new acquired license subscriptions, and funding request for an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) upgrade.

There followed a brief Board discussion with questions to Mr. Chilet.

**\*10. Strathmore Square, Preliminary Plan No. 12019018A**---Request to amend existing approval to remove the age-restriction from 408 dwelling units and approve an additional 909 dwelling units; update the parking calculations; clarify the APF Validity period and modify a timing trigger related to APF validity; located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Rockville Pike and Tuckerman Lane adjacent to the Grosvenor-Strathmore Metro Station, Rockville; on approximately 14.6 acres of land zoned CR-3.0 C-0.5 R-2.75 H-300 and R-60; within the 2017 Grosvenor-Strathmore Metro Area Minor Master Plan area.

*Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions and Adoption of Resolution*

**BOARD ACTION**

**Motion:** FANI-GONZÁLEZ/VERMA

**Vote:**

**Yea:** 5-0

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action:** Approved staff recommendation for approval of the Preliminary Plan request cited above, subject to conditions and adopted the attached Resolution.

In accordance with the October 2 technical staff report, Planning Department staff offered a multi-media presentation and discussed a Preliminary Plan request to amend an existing approval to remove the age-restriction from 408 restricted dwelling units, which does not include the Moderately Priced Dwelling Units (MPDUs), and approve an additional 909 dwelling units; update the parking calculations; clarify the Adequate Public Facilities (APF) validity period and modify a timing trigger related to APF validity. The 14.6-acre property located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Rockville Pike and Tuckerman Lane adjacent to the Grosvenor-Strathmore Metro Station in Rockville in the Grosvenor-Strathmore Metro Area Minor Master Plan area. The property is part of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) Grosvenor-Strathmore Metro Station located to the east of the intersection of Rockville Pike (MD355) and Tuckerman Lane. To the north of the WMATA property is the Music Center at Strathmore; to the east are Holy Cross Academy, townhouses and low-rise condominiums; to the south are low- and high-rise apartment buildings; and to the west is Rockville Pike (MD355).

Staff also noted that the property is also known as Parcel 428, with the portion south of Tuckerman Lane improved with a six-story WMATA garage, a surface parking lot, bus facilities, a Kiss & Ride lot, a covered Arts Walk, and a stormwater management pond. Approximately 2.47 acres of forest is located along the eastern side of the property. The portion of Parcel 428 located on the north side of Tuckerman Lane is approximately 0.3 acres, zoned Residential (R-60) and improved with a WMATA traction power substation (TPSS) that provides power to the

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

**\*10. Strathmore Square, Preliminary Plan No. 12019018A**CONTINUED

rail system. WMATA selected Fivesquares Development as its joint development partner to redevelop the property with a mixed-use project. On July 19, 2018, the Planning Board approved the transmission of comments to WMATA on the Mandatory Referral request for improvements to the public infrastructure on the property and the adjacent Metro Station site, which are necessary to accommodate the proposed redevelopment. The Mandatory Referral includes an expansion of the existing parking garage to accommodate the parking spaces that will be displaced by the removal of the surface parking lot in connection with this project. The applicant is also requesting a change to the APF requirement to obtain building permits for at least 300 dwelling units within five years of the original Preliminary Plan mailing date.

Staff then discussed the applicable school test, the calculation of student generation, and the individual School Adequacy Test for the proposed project, and noted that based on the school cluster and individual school capacity analysis performed by staff using the FY21 Annual School Test, there is adequate school capacity for the amount and type of development proposed. Staff also discussed revisions to the Conditions of Approval.

Ms. Linda Adler of Rockville Pike offered testimony.

Mr. Steve Robins, attorney representing the applicant introduced Messrs. Andy Altman and Ron Kaplan of Fivesquares Development, the applicant, and Sylke Knuppel of VIKA Maryland LLC, member of the applicant's team, offered brief comments and concurred with the staff recommendation.

Mr. Andy Altman offered comments and answered questions from the Planning Board.

There followed a brief Board discussion with questions to staff and Mr. Robins.



**\*11. Montgomery County Humane Society Campus, Preliminary Plan 120190100---**  
 Request to create one lot for a 13,000 square-foot building and associated parking; located at the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Georgia Avenue and Aspen Hill Road on approximately 7.79 acres of land zoned R-60; within the 1994 Aspen Hill Master Plan area.

*Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions and Adoption of Resolution*

**BOARD ACTION**

**Motion:** CICHY/VERMA

**Vote:**

**Yea:** 5-0

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action:** Approved staff recommendation for approval of the Preliminary Pan request cited above, subject to conditions, and adopted the attached Resolution.

In keeping with the October 5 technical staff report, Planning Department staff offered a multi-media presentation and discussed a Preliminary Plan request to create one lot for a 13,000 square-foot building and associated parking. The 7.79-acre property is located at the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Georgia Avenue and Aspen Hill Road within the Aspen Hill Master Plan area. Staff noted that the property fronts on Aspen Hill Road to the north and Georgia Avenue to the east. Loyola Street dead ends on the south property line and there are two curb cuts on Aspen Hill Road but no pedestrian or vehicular access from Georgia Avenue or Loyola Street. The property is an historic pet cemetery, currently owned by the Montgomery County Humane Society (MCHS). The property was designated in the *Master Plan for Historic Preservation* in 1994, with the entire site designated as the historic setting, The Maryland Historical Trust found the property eligible for the National Register of Historic Places in n1999. The property is predominantly flat with the burial grounds and elaborate gravestones and statuaries located primarily on the western half of the site. In addition to animal burials, there are 57 humans buried with or in proximity to their pets. The applicant has used extensive research and archaeological methods to determine the name and location of each human remain.

Staff also

noted that the applicant proposes to plat the subject property to allow for new construction and development of the property as the corporate headquarters and activity center for MCHS. The two-story brick house and the kennel will be rehabilitated and will become the anchors for the new MCHS headquarters campus. New structures will also be built to support the outreach, education, and adoption functions of MCHS. The proposed plan calls for the historic structures and new buildings to be arranged around an expansive and open courtyard. An arcade, both visually and physically, links the separate buildings around the courtyard and mediates floor

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

**\*11. Montgomery County Humane Society Campus, Preliminary Plan 120190100**CONTINUED

elevation changes. The two historic buildings, the house and the kennel will be fully rehabilitated on the exterior. The historic burial ground area will also be rehabilitated to enhance the historic nature of the cemetery, and the grounds, trees and bushes will be restored to healthy conditions. Natural surface pathways will be upgraded to provide for access and circulation while avoiding existing gravesites and monuments. The burial ground area will be enclosed by a metal fence that complements the historic aspect and directs access to specific locations. The proposed development has been designed to minimize disturbance on the property and no human burial locations will be disturbed, and the impact on the animal remains has been minimized. The applicant has developed a maintenance plan to protect remains during construction activities and maintaining and preserving the burial sites moving forward.

Staff added that the applicant has worked diligently with Historic Preservation staff and has consulted twice with the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), who supports the project goals and plan as presented and recommended that the applicant return to the HPC to obtain a Historic Area Work Permit (HAWP) after preliminary plan approval by the Planning Board. The applicant proposes to relocate the existing driveway on Aspen Hill Road slightly to the east. To improve pedestrian conditions and slow turning vehicles, staff recommended that the Planning Board condition the applicant to reduce the driveway width to be no greater than 22 inches wide and provide 15-foot curb radii at the driveway, subject to formal approval by the Department of Permitting Services (DPS), which will need to review a revised plan prior to acceptance.

Staff then discussed pedestrian facilities, bicycle parking, transit service and other public facilities. Staff also noted that the applicant has submitted a Preliminary/Final Forest Conservation Plan (FCP) and will meet the forest conservation requirements of 1.25 acres in an off-site mitigation bank. The applicant also submitted a variance request to remove 151 trees and impact but not remove 42 trees that are considered high priority for retention under Section 22A-12 (b)(3) of the County Forest Conservation Law. Staff has reviewed the variance request and concluded that the property could not be developed or maintained without impacting and removing the requested protected trees, which have been listed in the staff report.

Staff briefly discussed the conditions of approval and noted that it has received correspondence expressing concerns about the potential displacement of pet remains, which staff has addressed in the staff report.

Mr. Jody Kline, attorney representing the applicant, offered brief comments and concurred with the staff recommendation.

There followed a brief Board discussion with questions to staff and Mr. Kline.

**\*12. Chevy Chase Bank - White Oak Shopping Center (ATM), Site Plan No. 820200180--**  
 -Proposal to construct a freestanding, drive-thru automated teller machine (ATM) associated with an existing bank; located at 11297 New Hampshire Avenue; on approximately 0.1 acres of land zoned CR-2.5, C-1.5, R-1.5, H-200; within the 2014 White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan area.

*Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions and Adoption of Resolution*

**BOARD ACTION**

**Motion:** CICHY/VERMA

**Vote:**

**Yea:** 5-0

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action:** Approved staff recommendation for approval of the Site Plan request cited above, subject to conditions, and adopted the attached Resolution.

In accordance with the October 5 technical staff report, Planning Department staff offered a multi-media presentation and discussed a Site Plan request to construct a freestanding, drive-thru automated teller machine (ATM) associated with Chevy Chase bank. The site is located on New Hampshire Avenue on approximately 0.1 acres of land in the White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan area. The White Oak Shopping Center is located at the intersection of Columbia Pike and New Hampshire Avenue and the site is surrounded by a mix of commercial and residential uses separated by expansive roadways and parking lots. The property is currently developed as a Chase Bank, formerly a Boston Market, with an associated parking lot. There are no streams, forest or environmental features onsite.

Staff added that the freestanding ATM will feature a 9-foot, 61/4-inch high canopy which will incorporate Chevy Chase bank’s branding and signage and will provide protection from the elements for patrons using the ATM. To ensure the safety of customers and in conformance with the Maryland Minimum ATM lighting Requirements of the Maryland Code, Section 1-402, the applicant is proposing one additional light pole and canopy lighting, which will have no adverse impact on the any surrounding uses. Staff then briefly discussed the pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular facilities and the Master-Planned Roadways and Bikeways for the area. Staff also briefly discussed the conditions of approval.

Staff added that no correspondence was received regarding this Site Plan request.

Ms. Stacy Silber, attorney representing the applicant, offered brief comments and concurred with the staff recommendation.

There followed a brief Board discussion with questions to staff and Ms. Silber.

**13. ~~Great Seneca Science Corridor Minor Master Plan Amendment Scope of Work~~  
~~REMOVED~~**

*Staff Recommendation: Approve the Scope of Work for the Great Seneca Science Corridor Minor Master Plan Amendment*

**BOARD ACTION**

**Motion:**

**Vote:**

**Yea:**

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action:**      **This Item was removed from the Planning Board agenda.**

#### 14. Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment Worksession No. 6: Plan Implementation and Draft Mark-up.

*Staff Recommendation: Discussion, review and approval of the Planning Board Draft for transmittal to the County Executive and County Council.*

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**Motion:** VERMA/FANI-GONZÁLEZ

**Vote:**

**Yea:** 5-0

**Nay:**

**Other:**

**Action:** Received briefing on the Draft Mark-up of the Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment, followed by Board discussion and approved staff recommendation to approve changes to the Planning Board Draft for transmittal to the County Executive and the County Council, as stated in the attached transmittal letter.

Planning Department staff offered a multi-media presentation and briefed the Planning Board on the Draft Mark-up of the Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment. Staff noted that the purpose of this worksession is to describe and discuss the implementation recommendations in the Public Hearing Draft Plan. This memorandum also includes a discussion on the Unified Mobility Program (UMP), which is a transportation funding mechanism 2016-2020 Subdivision Staging Policy (SSP). The Public Hearing Draft did not address this topic, but the Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) expressed the desire to address this topic in the Draft Plan. This worksession will also illustrate the proposed changes to the Public Hearing Draft Plan.

In keeping with the October 9 staff report staff discussed rezoning the properties in the Metro West and Metro South neighborhoods and key properties, such as the Grove, to the Commercial Residential (CR) zone to promote a mixed-use environment and the provision of important public benefits, including affordable housing and building lot terminations (BLTs). The Draft Plan also recommends changing all Planned Development (PD) zoned properties to existing Euclidean zones that reflect the build development. The recommendations to rezone properties within the Plan will implemented through the Sectional Map Amendment process, following the approval and adoption of the Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment, consistent with Section 7.2.3 of the 2014 Zoning Ordinance.

Staff also discussed the public benefits, stating that the optional method of the \Commercial/Residential (CR) and Commercial/Residential Town (CRT) zones require public benefits from a minimum of two to four categories, based on the tract size or total floor area ratio proposed. The Draft Plan anticipates that property owners will take advantage of the increased

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

**14. Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment Worksession No. 6: Plan Implementation and Draft Mark-up.**CONTINUED

density opportunities available and provide the public benefits listed in the report, which are priorities for the Sector Plan area. Regarding staging, staff noted that the 2006 Sector Plan established a two-phased staging alternative that considered either the retention or redevelopment of the County Service Park (CSP). As the redevelopment of the CSP is underway with the implementation of the Shady Grove Station Westside and Jeremiah Park development, the Draft Plan does not recommend the staging of new development. The recommendation to remove staging is influenced by the redevelopment of the CSP as well as the completion of several mobility and public facilities requirements of the 2006 Plan.

Concerning equity, staff noted that the County Council in 2019, via Bill 27-19, required the Planning Board to consider racial equity and social justice in the preparation of Master Plans. The Planning Department has developed an Equity in Master Planning Framework which highlights eight action items to address the Council Bill, as listed in the staff report. As the Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment was underway when the Council adopted the Racial Equity and Social Justice Act and staff released the Equity in Master Planning Framework, the Public Hearing Draft does not specifically integrate the eight action items recommended by the Framework. However, the Draft Plan overall housing, environmental and mobility recommendations provide the framework to establish an intergenerational community that builds upon the County's commitment to racial equity and social justice.

Staff then discussed the urban district and financing noting that the 2006 Sector Plan recommended an urban district to provide "maintenance, promotion, and programmed activities for the properties in the Metro Neighborhoods and Jeremiah Park. The Draft Plan also supports a future urban district to provide public streetscape maintenance, improve pedestrian safety, as well as brand and promote the area. The Draft Plan recommends that the implementation of the Plan recommendations will require a combination of investments from the public sector, the private sector or a public-private partnership. The relocation of the Montgomery County Public Schools bus depot will require the County to utilize a variety of financing tools to implement the approved Jeremiah Park development.

Staff also discussed the UMP, noting that MCDOT suggested that the Draft Plan's recommended transportation improvements could be implemented by an UMP, which are included as a Local Area Transportation Review component of the 2016-2020 SSP. In concept, an UMP is a funding mechanism designed to distribute the costs of transportation improvements across property owners more equitably during the subdivision stage of development. While staff supports the general intent of UMPs as a solution, there have been challenges related to the execution of alternative systems. Staff does not recommend an UMP for the Shady Grove Sector Plan area due to concerns about program execution and municipal annexation. If the Planning Board recommend an UMP for the Plan area, staff would recommend that the recommendations listed in the staff report be taken into consideration.

There followed a brief Board discussion with questions to staff.

**16. Complete Streets Design Guidelines – Worksession #4---Worksession # 4 on the Draft Complete Streets Design Guidelines**

*Staff Recommendation: Comments on Draft Document*

**BOARD ACTION**

**Motion:**

**Vote:**

**Yea:**

**Nay:**

**Other: VERMA ABSENT**

**Action: Received briefing and offered comments and recommendations on the Draft Complete Streets Design Guidelines.**

Planning Department staff and Messrs. Andrew Bossi and Dan Sheridan of Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) offered a multi-media presentation and noted that this worksession will focus on a summary presentation of the prioritization, intersections, and green streets portions of the Complete Street Design Guidelines. Staff noted that there are 54 comments in these categories, which are listed in Attachment A to the October 8 staff memorandum, along with staff response to each comment. Staff has reviewed the comments and staff responses and requests the Planning Board’s review and feedback on these comments and staff responses, where necessary.

There followed a brief Board discussion with questions to staff and Mr. Bossi,