

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
Comments that apply generally to the entire Plan area or to more than one Plan neighborhood are covered in this section, but any neighborhood- or property-specific comments are discussed in the Plan Neighborhood section below.					
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.2.5 Land Use and Zoning	5. Revise the Sandy Spring/Ashton Rural Village Overlay zone to: a. Remove the limitations on land uses. b. Remove or update the residential development standards. c. Remove the development standards for the Commercial/Residential or Employment zones. d. Remove the sewer requirement. e. Remove the use of properties in a residential zone for off-street parking. f. Retain the site plan requirements but remove the requirement for direct accessibility from a sidewalk, plaza or other public space. g. Allow a drive-thru as a Limited Use if associated with a bank. Do not allow the drive-thru lane to be adjacent to MD 108 or MD 650 under any condition. h. Revise the purpose statement to reflect these proposed changes. i. Revise the boundary of the SSA Overlay zone to only cover the CRN-Zoned properties.	In subitem g, change from "adjacent to" to "located between the building edge and" to be consistent with page 53.	Françoise Carrier	Staff supports the suggested change. Staff also suggests an edit to subitem g to include the recommendation from the Plan text that also specifies filling stations and vehicle repair services to be considered conforming uses and be allowed to continue or be altered, repaired or replaced.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	General Land Use and Zoning Comments	The following comments are not directly responding to recommendations in the Plan, but generally relate to land use and zoning issues otherwise discussed in Section 3.2 of the Plan.	With several recently built and approved projects in the Sandy Spring/Ashton area, we have done our part to ease the housing crisis in Montgomery County. The Planning Board's report says that missing middle housing should be located close to transit and jobs. On a percentage basis, the amount of new housing stock proposed in the village center is significant. I don't dispute that the county needs housing for a projected 200,000 new residents, but rural areas like Ashton are not the place for them.	Elaine Gillen / Walt Fennell / Charles Glendinning / Bob Taylor / Elizabeth Comisarow Taylor / Elizabeth Thornton	The Plan only recommends a modest increase in residential density in a very small part of the overall Sandy Spring/Ashton area. While locating missing middle housing close to transit and jobs is a priority, it is also appropriate elsewhere in the county, especially in a village center like Ashton as opposed to in the countryside surrounding Ashton. See 4.1.5 Southeast Quadrant below for more on the recommended zone there.
			In light of the pandemic and how home buyers are once again seeking rural communities that offer large lots like our community, the proposed plan runs contrary to what most families are looking for.	Mona Zhe	This Plan looks forward several decades and is trying to at least alleviate a very small part of the current and projected housing shortage in Montgomery County. In a village center, more compact forms of housing are more appropriate. There is simply not enough room to accommodate everyone who needs the space with large lot development, and the countryside surrounding Ashton is primarily large lots.
			Once the southeast quadrant has been allowed to redevelop at a high density, the farms and larger properties in the areas surrounding Ashton will inevitably be similarly developed.	Avenshire HOA	This Plan does not recommend any zoning changes outside the Plan area, so any area outside the Plan area can only develop according to the zone it has today.
			Good zoning is going to lead to good architecture is going to lead to good development, and all of that has an underlying economic component to it. And the economics do need to work.	Jeff Schwartz	Noted.

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
			<p>I see benefits of bringing new retail. I am not against development to the southeast quadrant, as I would very much like to see a upscale restaurant, another bank, pizza carryout, barber shop, some "missing middle housing", a classy sports bar/tavern/pub (talk about a community gathering spot), and housing fitting our rural setting.</p>	Gene Chytakh / James Meehan	The recommended CRN zone and commercial density will allow for these types of establishments.
			<p>There is a concern that the overlay zone could be used to usurp the conceptual vision outlined in the Plan. The advisory board could ensure that future development throughout Ashton--not just the Village Core--would be completed in a manner consistent with the Plan. As part of the new overlay zone, community comments should be included throughout implementation and development.</p>	Walt Fennell / Robin Ziek	The revised overlay zone is intended to help implement the vision of the plan, not counter it, and does not itself call for review from a citizens' advisory group. Creation of this group is recommended in the Plan's implementation chapter as a group that provides input during implementation of any improvements or development in Ashton, independent of the overlay zone itself.
			<p>The objective for the village center in the 1998 Plan was to maintain the existing scale of the Ashton village center and encourage improvements to its character. This is still very much the desire of the community. There appears to be the notion that Ashton somehow needs to be "fixed" and that additional residential and commercial development will somehow make it better, but most of us like it the way it is.</p>	Spring Lawn Farm HOA	<p>The 1998 Plan raised the idea in several places that the village centers need to be revitalized, including on pages 29, 31, 38 and 39. The 1998 Plan encouraged new commercial uses built with traditional village design. Very little has happened in Ashton since 1998, although a few businesses have closed since then and the CVS and Alloway buildings were built. This Plan attempts to build on the 2015 Sandy Spring plan to make recommended changes to zoning and land uses that still meet the intent of the rural villages envisioned in the 1998 Plan. The recommended CRN zone limits uses similar to the existing overlay to those more appropriate at a neighborhood scale than the CRT zoning in Olney. Keeping the overlay zone's use controls with the CRN zone becomes redundant. The reduction from 0.75 to 0.5 FAR for commercial density will also help prevent a proliferation of businesses in Ashton.</p>
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.3.2 Community Design Recommendations	<p>1. Building height, massing and placement should create a transition between the single-family detached dwelling units outside the Village Core neighborhood, and potential commercial, mixed-use, or multifamily buildings clustered around the intersection of MD 108/650.</p>	<p>The proposed zoning includes a height of 40 feet in the southeast quadrant. It destroys the concept of a transition from large rural farms and fields to a dense village center to allow all buildings to be 40 feet tall. The Plan needs to prevent Ashton from being overrun with multi-story apartment buildings and towering townhomes ill-suited for our small village. What we don't want is what we got with the Thomas Village development in Sandy Spring, where there was supposed to be compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood but the townhouses tower over the surrounding neighborhood. We would like to see single-family homes at the edges with porches facing the streets.</p>	Sandy Spring Civic Association / Robin Ziek / Walt Fennell / Linda Smoling Moore / SSARPC	<p>This Plan recommendation specifically calls for a transition from areas outside the Village Core and buildings at the MD 108/650 intersection. The 40 foot height is intended to only be used in some buildings, and they need to be closer to the main intersection. Staff recommends retaining the Plan's recommendation.</p>

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
			<p>The Thomas Village development brought diversity to our community: people that couldn't afford single-family houses; people that want to live in this area but couldn't afford it. The fact that the homes sold and are resold so quickly illustrates that this product is, in fact, what the community and the marketplace want.</p>	<p>Jeff Schwartz</p>	<p>It is our intent with this Plan to bring an even larger range of product types, sizes, and price points to provide attainable housing for multiple economic levels.</p>
<p>3 - Area-Wide Recommendations</p>	<p>3.3.2 Community Design Recommendations</p>	<p>2. Entirely residential buildings with front or side elevations along MD 108 or MD 650 should be designed so that the building width, building massing and façade treatment fronting to these roads suggests a single-family detached or duplex building form, regardless of actual housing type. The depth of these buildings should be flexible to accommodate various building types and building densities.</p>	<p>A great deal of the site is along those two road frontages so that's a very significant restriction. Delete the recommendation that all residential buildings on the main roads should "suggest" a single-family detached house or duplex building. This recommendation undercuts the ability to create a community with a variety of building types, rooflines and architectural details and would lead to buildings with their side façades facing the main roads rather than their front façades.</p>	<p>Françoise Carrier</p>	<p>The Plan leaves open the idea that mixed use buildings can be placed along the state roads without following this design recommendation, which is only for entirely residential buildings. But this recommendation plays an important role in providing the transition from the single-family detached homes outside the Plan area to the village center. This transition is desired by the community and has been called for in the previous plans. Staff recommends retaining the Plan's recommendation.</p>
			<p>3.3.2.2 would significantly depress achievable density and would make it extremely difficult (a) to locate a multi-family building along MD 108 or MD 650, and (b) to create the desirable transition described in 3.3.2.1.</p>	<p>Françoise Carrier</p>	<p>The goal of this Plan is to modestly increase what is possible under current zoning while building a development within the character of a rural village. Other than using stacked flats, an apartment buildign type wouldn't be in character with a rural village. A transition would only be difficult if one were attempting to develop using a single building type and not following the recommendation for a transition from Plan edge to center.</p>
<p>3 - Area-Wide Recommendations</p>	<p>3.3.2 Community Design Recommendations</p>	<p>5. Parking should be located behind or to the side of buildings to avoid visibility from the street. Parking potentially visible from the street shall be screened with walls and/or landscaping to maintain the street wall. Parking shall not be located at a street corner.</p>	<p>We support development that has no structured parking.</p>	<p>Donna & Chuck Selden</p>	<p>This plan does not ban structured parking, but does require any parking to be screened. The plan approved in 2008 for the southeast quadrant took advantage of the terrain to tuck under a level of parking below the street grade which could be a creative way to hide parking and maximize open space and circulation at grade.</p>
<p>3 - Area-Wide Recommendations</p>	<p>3.3.2 Community Design Recommendations</p>	<p>7. Building heights should vary between adjacent buildings, with lower heights closer to the edge of the Village Core neighborhood and higher heights closer to the MD 108/650 intersection.</p>	<p>It destroys the concept of a transition from large rural farms and fields to a dense village center to allow all buildings to be 40 feet tall. Filling the southeast quadrant with rows of tall townhouses would kill its viewshed, and along with it much of the feeling of history in our area. We have been promised in the past that there would be significant variations in building height, but what we've seen is the erection of townhouses that have no variation in building height, or variation in building height only because of the grade but all of them being four-story buildings.</p>	<p>Sandy Spring Civic Association / Charles Glendinning / SSARPC</p>	<p>This Plan recommendation specifically calls for varied building heights between adjacent buildings. The part of this recommendation regarding the transition from edge to center is duplicative of 3.3.2.1. above, so could be removed from this recommendation or could add language to specify how the building heights should vary between adjacent buildings while simultaneously lowering the heights as one proceed outward from the intersection.</p>
			<p>There must be a method of enforcement for varying building heights.</p>	<p>Rachel Hickson</p>	<p>Master plan conformance requirements of development applications will enforce this recommendation. Additionally the implementation advisory committee would also step in during development review.</p>

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.3.2 Community Design Recommendations	9. A majority of buildings should contain pitched roofs. If flat roofs are used, the façade should introduce a cornice along the roof edge.	Change to specify that a majority of residential buildings should contain pitched roofs, and if flat roofs are used in residential, mixed use or commercial buildings, then a cornice should be used.	Françoise Carrier	To achieve the rural village look, it's preferable to have some pitched roofs in commercial buildings as well as residential. The current language allows any building type to have a flat roof with the cornice. Staff recommends retaining the Plan's recommendation.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.3.2 Community Design Recommendations	11. Incorporate architectural elements in the façades, such as front and side-turned gables, front and side porches, covered stoops, recess entries, bay windows, dormer windows and cupolas.	There must be a method of enforcement for adding architectural details such as porches, stoops and dormers.	Rachel Hickson	Master plan conformance requirements of development applications and an advisory committee will enforce this recommendation.
			We support architectural details that blend in with the surrounding area, including porches, dormers and traditional materials/siding. You only need to look at the Wyndcrest neighborhood to see design that's in keeping with the vision of Ashton. We have porches, dormers, picket fences, rear-entry garages that back up to alleys, and most importantly, a common green space for the residents which I think is going to be extremely important for that southeast quadrant to ensure that there is some large green space that's secured so that residents from all over in Ashton can come and share in this space.	Donna & Chuck Selden / Amy Medd / SSARPC	The design guidelines as written attempt to require the architectural elements being requested.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.3.2 Community Design Recommendations	12. All sides of building should be designed and built with the same exterior architecture and building materials in mind.	Add word "each": "all sides of each building..."	Françoise Carrier	Staff has no objection to this request to make it clear that we do not intend for all buildings to be built from the same materials.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.3.2 Community Design Recommendations	13. Buildings should be clad in materials and patterns authentic to rural village character, such as brick, stone, wood shingles, and wood cladding.	We support traditional materials/siding.	Donna & Chuck Selden	Noted.
			Add to end: "and cement fiber siding imitating wood cladding".	Françoise Carrier	Staff has no objection to this request, which is consistent with design guideline 5.2.2.5 Building Materials.
	General Community Design Comments	The following comments are not directly responding to recommendations in the Plan, but generally relate to community design issues otherwise discussed in Section 3.3 of the Plan.	I want to keep Ashton rural. It is imperative that development in Ashton be in accordance with the rural character and history of the area. We are not against development; we are against over-development. It is its openness that makes Ashton unique and keeps it from looking like Olney or Clarksville.	Mary Van Denk / Steven & Jody Hursh / Eric Lynch / Kevin & Anne O'Neil / Anne Marie Stepping / Cassandra Heagy / Elizabeth Comisarow Taylor / Elizabeth Thornton / Joe Hart / Elaine Gillen / Stephen Faehner / SSARPC / Amy Medd	The scale of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan area is only 127 acres out of approximately 6,000 acres in the greater Sandy Spring/Ashton community. The land use and zoning changes are recommended for an even smaller 28 acres right at the existing commercial crossroads. 10 of these 28 acres are a rezoning of the PD-5 zone to TLD for the houses behind the shopping center, leaving only 18 acres being rezoned CRN. This plan's goal is to keep 99% of Sandy Spring/Ashton unchanged, and is intended to allow modest development on a smaller scale than Olney or development in Howard County.

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
			<p>Ashton is a rural village. This should not have to be debated again. The county has given much thought to rural villages and distinguishes between communities in urban centers and rural villages. Rural is not subjective. There are fields of corn and wheat, sheep farms, organic farms, pick-your-own farms. As supported by Nadine Mort's testimony, if you want rural - sheep, horses, chickens, goats, open fields and farming activities - Sandy Spring/Ashton, from the Hawlings River to the Olney Theatre, has it all. Rural villages are permeable, and Ashton's development should reflect this.</p>	<p>Nadine Mort / Robin Ziek</p>	<p>According to the 1998 Plan and reiterated in this Plan, rural character is made up of five elements: rural open space, rural traditions, rural neighborhoods, rural roads and rural villages. This comment speaks more to the first four elements which are contained in the vast majority of Ashton, while our Plan addresses the fifth, limited to 18 acres right at the corners of the existing crossroads. A rural village is described as a place where residents can meet informally while attending to the business of daily life. There are very few opportunities to conduct any of the business of daily life in Ashton. This Plan's recommendations create a framework to allow for the creation of a place where people can come together either by appointment or serendipitously.</p>
			<p>Rural character is a subjective term. If you brought someone to Ashton from the Ag Reserve, they'd have trouble saying this a rural community we're trying to preserve.</p>	<p>Jeff Schwartz</p>	<p>Noted. Low intensity development in the rural surroundings of Ashton has always been allowed in previous plans. It is not in the Ag Reserve, but it is of a much lower intensity than communities like Olney.</p>
			<p>The Plan should contain a clear statement that Ashton should retain the rural character that has defined it since the founding of the county. It is important that we maintain a rural village character that embraces the heritage and uniqueness of Ashton. Planning Staff have incorporated many ideas from the Design Workshop into the Plan, which is very good to see. We need the Planning Board to put some strong design regulations in place for Ashton to protect us from profit for the builders being the priority for future development. Based on past experiences, most recently with Thomas Village in Sandy Spring and now with new renderings for Ashton Market, the community is suspicious that design criteria will be met. Master plan design guidelines are nice in concept but have not been sufficient to influence what gets built in the Sandy Spring/Ashton Area. The overlay zone and an advisory committee are essential to securing the vision of a rural town center. The Plan language doesn't have the teeth that are necessary in order to maintain the rural character of our area. It seems more like guidance or recommendations.</p>	<p>Sandy Spring Civic Association / Amy Medd / Robin Ziek / Charles Glendinning / Walt Fennell / Nadine Mort / Paula Glendinning / Bob Taylor / Avenshire HOA / Donna & Chuck Selden / Linda Smoling Moore / SSARPC</p>	<p>The combination of the site plan requirement, the recommended Implementation Advisory Committee and the design guidelines along with the requirement for master plan compliance should lead to better conformance with the Plan's vision. The renderings of the Ashton Market townhouses taken from the builder's website have not been approved by the Planning Board, so it should not be assumed that this is what the final product will look like, especially since the builder shows the exact same rendering for a different development on their website. See implementation section below for more on the advisory committee.</p>
			<p>Extract the design guidelines from the Sector Plan to create a separate document. This would allow the Planning Board to review and approve the guidelines and any necessary changes to them rather than requiring a sector plan amendment. This would also avoid elevating extremely specific provisions to master plan recommendations and would allow some flexibility in their implementation when making the finding of substantial conformance with the master plan during development review.</p>	<p>Françoise Carrier</p>	<p>Any development project needs to be in substantial conformance to the master plan and we want there to be strong conformance to the design guidelines with this Plan. Removing design guidelines into a separate document seems to have the effect of softening this requirement just a little, and we don't want to see that happen here. The guidelines chapter was deliberately written to provide opportunities of flexibility and would have to become more verbose if broken out into their own document.</p>

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
			<p>The Plan confirms the five elements of rural character that were identified in the 1998 Plan but makes the important distinction that only the "rural villages" element of rural character is relevant within the Plan boundary and that the other four elements apply to the larger area surrounding Sandy Spring and Ashton. This crucial distinction acknowledges that the land covered by this Sector Plan needs to be regulated differently from the surrounding area. The Ashton village center needs to be regulated in a way that will promote the viable, vibrant development that will help Ashton thrive, whereas past master plans have not created conditions that led to the desired development.</p>	<p>Françoise Carrier</p>	<p>Noted, Staff agrees with the concept and believes the put forth recommendations achieve the village element</p>
			<p>Olney is our local town center and is prized as a town with facilities such as an outstanding hospital and easy access to the Metro and Park-and-Ride along Georgia Avenue. Ashton has zero infrastructure by design in order to keep it "rural" in accordance with the Wedges and Corridors plan. The Planning Board should ensure that the changes to Ashton are not so dramatic as to transform Ashton to look like any other part of the county. We cannot make our village what MD 108 and Georgia Avenue has become.</p>	<p>Robin Ziek / Walt Fennell / Avenshire HOA / Amy Medd</p>	<p>Ashton is located in a transition area between the residential and agricultural wedges, as noted by available water and sewer from the plan boundary and to points south and west. The size of the village core, coupled with the design guidelines would ensure Ashton never comes close to the size of Olney.</p>
			<p>The development along the 108 that is nice is where the Ashton Hardware was developed and that kind of architecture, versus the gas station and strip center that are at the intersection in Ashton. (Note that Ashton Hardware was a Nichols Company development.)</p>	<p>Dan Synder</p>	<p>This plan does encourage new development which would follow the guidelines bringing more quality architecture to the community.</p>
<p>Roadway recommendations</p>					
<p>3 - Area-Wide Recommendations</p>	<p>3.4.4 Connectivity Recommendations</p>	<p>1. Reconfirm the two-lane road policy for MD 108 and MD 650 from the 1998 <i>Sandy Spring/Ashton Master Plan</i>.</p>	<p>There is a dependence on MD 108 for those needing to reach points East for their jobs. New commercial development allowed by this Plan will add further congestion with people struggling to enter and exit a commercial space already packed with residential and rural community home developments. The level of traffic we see now is not usually associated with rural villages and detracts from the quality of life of current and future residents.</p>	<p>Justin Fishbein / Spring Lawn Farm HOA</p>	<p>This Plan recommends a reduction of commercial densities in the Plan area in favor of a slight increase in residential densities. Our transportation analysis shows that this Plan's recommendations would lead to less traffic than would be possible if developed according to current zoning.</p>
<p>3 - Area-Wide Recommendations</p>	<p>3.4.4 Connectivity Recommendations</p>	<p>2. Maintain the pavement width at the approaches to the MD 108/650 intersection except for necessary geometric improvements that serve to increase safety.</p>	<p>MDOT/SHA was on record in 2008 stating that no development could take place in the southeast quadrant without major road improvements. MD 108 continues to be among the most dangerous roads in Maryland. Why has this not been addressed?</p>	<p>James Meehan</p>	<p>SHA made intersection improvement requirements in 2008 as part of the earlier plan approval in the southeast quadrant based on observed traffic conditions at the time. Any new application would be required to conduct a new transportation study based on whatever may have changed in the past 12 years, including the opening of the ICC or based on the change in anticipated land use. This plan prioritizes bicycle and pedestrian safety and makes numerous recommendations that should improve the transportation experience for all users. See 4.1.4 Northeast Quadrant for more comments.</p>

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
			Without a major reconstruction of the intersection and further widening the crossroads, there will not be adequate facilities and infrastructure to accommodate the density increases sought by the developer in the southeast corner. And if that should happen, it further erodes any notion of rural or unique character. Moving a telephone pole, while necessary, also will not achieve any true transportation tranquility.	Joe Hart	Staff believes that the recommendations of the Plan can help alleviate some of the traffic problems and create a safer pedestrian realm without actually widening the road. Transportation priorities have evolved putting a higher focus on Vision Zero strategies.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.4.4 Connectivity Recommendations	3. Prioritize signal retiming, lane movement reconfiguration and new bicycle and pedestrian facilities before considering any road widening to address roadway capacity issues.	The parking lot of the Ashton Village Center shopping center is a logjam/gridlock adventure every weekday morning at the MD 108/650 intersection. The Planning Board needs to remember that there are three rush hours on MD 108: AM, PM and school dismissal. The lack of left turn signals from MD 108 onto both northbound and southbound MD 650 is part of the problem and related safety issues. Southbound cars on MD 650 zoom right and then pass left cars turning west onto MD 108. Cars back up at Crystal Spring Drive (just south of the Plan area) as far as the eye can see, and it can take two to three light cycles to turn left onto westbound MD 108. Because this project relies on state funding, it is unlikely to happen in the foreseeable future, especially given revenue losses due to the pandemic.	James Meehan / Spring Lawn Farm HOA / Steven & Jody Hursh / Avenshire HOA / Kevin & Anne O'Neill / Cassandra Heagy / Elizabeth Gregory-Hosler / Elizabeth Thornton / Stephen Faehner	This Plan supports improvements to the MD 108/650 intersection to help alleviate some of the traffic problems there, including those entering and exiting the shopping center. Development in the southeast corner could implement some of the improvements if required based on the results of any traffic studies during the time of development.
Pedestrian and bicycle recommendations					
			The HPC is supportive of this Plan and finds that it balances the need for expanded housing and community amenities, including increased bikeability and walkability, with the preservation of Ashton's rural and historic character. We support safe sidewalks and sidepaths where they are missing and the expansion of the hiking and biking network in the area.	Historic Preservation Commission / Spring Lawn Farm HOA / Brandi Tippery / Avenshire HOA / Cassandra Heagy / Donna & Chuck Selden / Joe Hart	Noted.
			The highly desired safe, walkable, bikeable community-friendly town center, with greenspace and services people need and want are not represented in the current Plan.	Elizabeth Thornton	Staff believes the plan does provide adequate recommendations for improved walkability, bikeability, new green spaces and creating a town center.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.4.4 Connectivity Recommendations	5. Implement Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant signalized crossings at all approaches to the MD 108/650 intersection.	We support crosswalks and pedestrian signals across all parts of the intersection of Route 108 and New Hampshire at the village center. We support the recommendations to improve pedestrian safety at the intersection of MD 108/650.	Sandy Spring Civic Association / Spring Lawn Farm HOA / Dan Snyder	Noted. The state is currently studying improvements and this plan supports their implementation.
			Walkability will not be possible without major improvements to the MD 108/650 intersection, even with dedicated crosswalks, unless there are pedestrian signals (and/or skywalks) over both roads. And the walk signals will create even more traffic congestion. Sherwood High School students will continue to cross when and where they find convenient.	James Meehan	This plan supports Vision Zero which has as its number one goal the elimination of traffic fatalities. Staff believes that many, perhaps most, students would utilize a crosswalk if it were conveniently located and connected to a pedestrian-friendly side path. Widening roads to increase vehicle throughput would make crossings less safe, and less convenient and would run counter to creating a safe way to walk.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.4.4 Connectivity Recommendations	6. Continue to support reconstruction of the signalized entrance to Sherwood High School to improve pedestrian crossings.	We still don't have crosswalks at that dangerous intersection near Sherwood High School, and no time at all ever when the lights stop traffic for pedestrians.	Paula Glendinning	Noted. This plan calls for improvements to the intersection and crossings at the school.

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.4.4 Connectivity Recommendations	7. Support future capital funding to construct the <i>Bicycle Master Plan</i> recommended sidepaths along the north side of MD 108 from the western Plan boundary to MD 650 and on the west side of MD 650 from MD 108 to the southern Plan boundary.	A sidewalk or sidepath along MD 650 south of MD 108 is long overdue. Expand sidewalks and/or bike lanes from Ashton all the way south to Ednor Road.	Spring Lawn Farm HOA / Avenshire HOA / Cassandra Heagy	Noted. This Plan explicitly supports the recommendations from past master plans and the Bicycle Master Plan for a shared-use trail all the way to where it would join the existing trail at Ednor Road.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.4.4 Connectivity Recommendations	11. Install decorative pedestrian scale lighting along all public and private roadways within the Village Core neighborhood for safety and aesthetics.	All lighting should be full, rather than partial, cutoff. The Dark Sky experience is iconic for any rural area, and residents in the Ashton-Sandy Spring Master Plan area value that highly. Use downward-pointing lights and no bright or neon signs.	Robin Ziek / Donna & Chuck Selden	Section 59.6.4.4.B.1 of the Zoning Ordinance states "To direct light downward and minimize the amount of light spill, any outdoor lighting fixture must be a full or partial cutoff fixture." This Plan supports the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and does not support the recommendation that only full cutoff fixtures be allowed.
Public transportation recommendations					
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.4.4 Connectivity Recommendations	12. Provide expanded bus service during off-peak hours including adding weekend service. 13. Encourage one or more new Ride On routes that provide more regular local service to Olney and/or Glenmont.	Earlier this year, WMATA proposed eliminating the single bus route that serves Ashton only at rush hours during the week, although this proposal was dropped in the final budget. Given the current state of ridership on Ride On buses and the county resources, expansion of Ride On bus service is highly unlikely in the near future. New residents will be primarily dependent on cars for transportation.	Spring Lawn Farm HOA / Charles Glendinning / Elizabeth Comisarow Taylor / Elizabeth Thornton / Stephen Faehner	Staff believe that it is essential that bus service continue and that it be expanded to reduce dependence on cars for transportation. Current events may call this into question but the Plan is a vision for decades into the future.
	General Connectivity Comments	The following comments are not directly responding to recommendations in the Plan, but generally relate to connectivity issues otherwise discussed in Section 3.4 of the Plan.	MD 108 and MD 650 both already have a lot of traffic and are unsafe for cars, pedestrians and cyclists. Any new development in the Village Core will just make it worse. An additional 150 units will produce at least 300 more cars on our roads. The increased traffic will have a detrimental impact on the quality of life in Ashton.	Brandi Tippery / Elaine Gillen / Nadine Mort / Spring Lawn Farm HOA / Brandi Tippery / Mary Van Denk / Steven & Jody Hursh / Eric Lynch / Gene Chytakh / Avenshire HOA / Kevin & Anne O'Neil / Cassandra Heagy / Elizabeth Comisarow Taylor / Joe Hart / Stephen	Recommendations in this plan for maintaining lane widths, lane markings, sidewalks, side paths, lighting and crosswalks address this issue. Any future development will need to provide adequate public facilities if the roads and intersection cannot handle the expected increase in traffic. The actual development proposal is unknown, as is the number of vehicles or parking spaces that would come with the development.
			More drivers will divert from MD 108 to Tucker Lane to avoid going through the MD 108/650 intersection. Tucker Lane is a narrow, winding "rollercoaster of a road" that wasn't built to accommodate as much traffic as it currently sees.	Nadine Mort / Avenshire HOA	Tucker Lane is outside the Plan area. Recommendations in this Plan should help alleviate some of the traffic concerns at the MD 108/650 intersection.
			A detailed and realistic plan for traffic and mass transportation needs to be included.	Linda Smoling Moore	Our transportation plan is respectful of the rural village character of Ashton and attempts to provide a safe experience for pedestrians, bicyclists and all other modes of travel.
			"Fear of inadequate infrastructure (see CVS Pharmacy Road/Culvert/Storm Water Mgmt.)".	Stephen Faehner	Development must follow the approved county codes and guidelines for providing infrastructure and adhering to sound engineering and safety practices. Unsure the specific concerns being raised.

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.5.3 Community Facilities, Open Space and Trail Recommendations	1. Encourage new open spaces to provide amenities that accommodate social interaction, such as picnic areas, playgrounds, community gardens and dog parks.	We support gathering spaces for the community, with benches and possibly a bandstand.	Donna & Chuck Selden	The Plan does not specifically mention a bandstand but that could be implemented and requested by the implementation advisory committee. Any new open space should contain some seating options.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.5.3 Community Facilities, Open Space and Trail Recommendations	3. Consider options to make the Ashton Village HOA's common area more accessible and usable to the public.	The Ashton Village HOA proposed specific changes to the plan text on pages 36 and 56 regarding the use of their open space area as a public gathering space.	Ashton Village HOA / Jason Allnutt	See section 4.2 Residential Edge Neighborhood item 6 for more on these comments and Staff's response.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.5.3 Community Facilities, Open Space and Trail Recommendations	4. New development in the southeast quadrant of the MD 108/650 intersection should provide a publicly accessible public green space large enough to act as a civic gathering space. This space is encouraged to be adjacent to the environmental features to help the space feel larger. Any green space in this area should have direct frontage to a public or private road.	We support the provision of publicly accessible open space, ideally adjacent to the environmental features at the eastern edge of the southeast corner.	Sandy Spring Civic Association	Noted.
			There must be a method of enforcement for open space to be public, inviting, accessible and at least 10,000 square feet of contiguous space.	Rachel Hickson	The design guidelines and development standards dictate the size of this public space and master plan conformance requirements provide an enforcement mechanism.
			What rural village has its public space in the back of village buildings? And it's disingenuous for the county to give away the community need for a public green by designating the not-able-to-be-built-upon wetlands as the public green space.	Robin Ziek	Older Plan drafts showed a public gathering space next to MD 650, but many residents expressed fears that children could easily run out into the busy state highway and be injured or worse. Staff relocated the recommended larger public gathering space to the interior of the site to provide a safer space and to take advantage of adjacency to the environmental buffer as a way of creating a larger space instead of a smaller space hemmed in on every direction by buildings. We believe the environmental buffer will enhance the more usable portions of the open space. See the next recommendation for a linear green that will connect the protected open space with MD 650.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.5.3 Community Facilities, Open Space and Trail Recommendations	5. Consider using a linear neighborhood green or other similar open space that would connect a new public green in the southeast quadrant to MD 650.	See comment above in 3.5.3.4.	Robin Ziek	See comment above from about the recommended public space being behind buildings.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.5.3 Community Facilities, Open Space and Trail Recommendations	6. Designate a small open space area adjacent to the southeast corner of the intersection of MD 650 and MD 108 to protect the existing large shade.	We support preservation of the green space in front of the existing Sandy Spring Bank Ashton branch.	Sandy Spring Civic Association	Noted. Staff notes that the word "trees" is missing from the end of this recommendation and should be added.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.5.3 Community Facilities, Open Space and Trail Recommendations	8. Do not enclose open spaces with fencing unless it is for safety, such as for a tot lot or dog park, in which case context-sensitive fencing should be provided.	Replace the word "it" with "the open space is intended only for private use, or the fence" after "unless".	Françoise Carrier	This is a reasonable suggestion given the developer's desire to provide private open spaces. Alternatively, the Plan could specify "Do not enclose public open spaces..."

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.5.3 Community Facilities, Open Space and Trail Recommendations	<p>9. Coordinate with Montgomery Count Public Schools (MCPS) and Shewood High School to construct a multiuse natural surface trail on either the east or west side of the school (or both) connecting the sidewalk along MD 108 with Park property to the south.</p>	<p>Ensure that multi-use trails are appropriately designed for equestrian use (including natural surface components). It is important that the Plan acknowledge equestrian trails and state that they are to be protected and expanded, if at all possible. Modify the Plan to add "equestrian" to text referencing non-vehicle travel so that the document specifies that trails and the area in general remain equestrian friendly. Keeping this area horse friendly also helps support agriculture in the area, something which is beneficial in protecting the drinking water supply in the Patuxent Reservoirs Watershed.</p>	<p>Chris Milner / Susan Gray / Elizabeth Alcoba / Beth Walshe / Catherine Moy</p>	<p>The AVC Plan shows offsite trail connections south of the high school that include the Underground Railroad Experience Trail, which is shown as a recommended equestrian trail on the 1998 map (a combination of what the 1998 Plan referred to as a "Rural Legacy Trail" and the "Northwest Branch Trail"). The AVC Plan only explicitly mentions equestrian trails in the technical appendix where it specifies that the Underground Railroad Experience Trail is limited to hikers and equestrians. The Plan text could be revised to more explicitly show support for an equestrian trail on the school property since there does not appear to be a suitable alternative route other than up Meetinghouse Road and along MD 108.</p> <p>The section on trails could also acknowledge the 1998 equestrian trails recommendations and explicitly carry them forward. The text describing the Underground Railroad Experience Trail and the recommendations for the completion of that trail could also include language about how it is a hiker/equestrian-only trail.</p>
			<p>To ensure that the Master Plan's vision of building connections among the community and contributing to the rural character of the community through equestrian trails, I suggest incorporation of the following language into the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan: The Sector Plan incorporates and reiterates the 1998 Master Plan's recommendations of ensuring an equestrian trail system through easements to equestrians at the time of subdivision review or through the dedication of parkland.</p>	<p>Chris Milner / Elizabeth Alcoba / Beth Walshe / Catherine Moy</p>	<p>Staff does not foresee any subdivision review or parkland dedication within the AVC Plan area that were recommended for equestrian trails in the 1998 Plan. But language could be added to the plan to reiterate support for the 1998 Plan's recommendations or include the appropriate modifications where necessary.</p>
	General Community Facilities, Open Space and Trail Recommendations	<p>The following comments are not directly responding to recommendations in the Plan, but generally relate to community facility, open space and trail issues otherwise discussed in Section 3.5 of the Plan.</p>			

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
		<p>Plan text from pages 36-37: The other major opportunity for open space, a public green and new amenities exists with any potential development of the properties on the southeast quadrant of the main intersection where the Sandy Spring Bank now sits. The easternmost portion of this collection of properties is a complex of wetlands and woodlands. The wetlands surround a spring that is the beginning of a tributary to the Patuxent River. These sensitive areas should be protected through Forest Conservation and remain in a natural condition. If feasible, a publicly accessible green should be located adjacent to the environmental features to provide visual access to the natural amenities and to make the usable portion of the space feel larger and more accessible to the public. Any green space in this area should also directly access a public or private road to make the area welcoming to the greater Ashton community.</p>	<p>On page 37 when discussing open space opportunities in the southeast quadrant, add text "This green may be in private or public ownership, to be determined at the time of development" between the final two sentences of the first paragraph.</p>	<p>Françoise Carrier</p>	<p>Staff does not object to the requested addition. We are only concerned with how the open space is used, not with its ownership.</p>
			<p>On page 37 when discussing open space opportunities in the southeast quadrant, add text "that is intended to be open to the general public" after "Any green space in this area..." in the last sentence of the first paragraph.</p>	<p>Françoise Carrier</p>	<p>Staff does not object to the requested addition, which would allow the developer to locate private green spaces wherever desired.</p>
		<p>Plan text from final bullet point on page 37: Ensure that open spaces remain publicly accessible by avoiding fencing unless it is for safety, such as a tot lot or dog park, in which case context-sensitive fencing should be provided.</p>	<p>On page 37 when discussing open space opportunities in the southeast quadrant, add text "that are intended to be open to the general public" after "Ensure that open spaces..." in final bullet point on the page.</p>	<p>Françoise Carrier</p>	<p>Staff does not object to this addition, which goes along with developer's request to also include private open spaces.</p>
			<p>Add "Potential" to legend for "Green Linear Connection".</p>	<p>Françoise Carrier</p>	<p>It is a map of Recommended Open Spaces, so the word "potential" is redundant; the map does not need to be changed.</p>
			<p>Nichols is willing to entertain the possibility of a village green that will be open to the general public, but wishes to reserve the flexibility to have additional, smaller open spaces that are open only to residents of the new development.</p>	<p>Françoise Carrier</p>	<p>The plan is not intended to require the only open space to be public, but that a sizable public space be provided. If the developer desires additional private space that should not be prohibited by this plan.</p>
<p>3 - Area-Wide Recommendations</p>	<p>3.6.4 Environmental Recommendations</p>	<p>1. Retain the existing RC zoning in the Rural Buffer neighborhood for continued water quality protection in the PMA.</p>	<p>The owner of the historic Cloverly property desires a change in zoning to allow him to build a small cluster of houses on his property.</p>		<p>See Cloverly property discussion under 4.4 Rural Buffer Neighborhood below.</p>

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.6.4 Environmental Recommendations	a. Including large canopy tree species in its landscaping,	The proposed housing units versus open space currently shown in the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan appears to be out of balance and out of touch with concerns for Global Warming. Currently, the southeast corner hosts a large number of old-growth trees that would be destroyed under the proposed plan.	Nadine Mort	The Plan proposes retaining the shade trees at the corner of MD 108/650, would protect most of the existing forest in the environmental areas, and proposes significant new trees with any development/redevelopment.
			The southeast quadrant can be developed in an environmentally sensitive way and it will be. There are many examples throughout the County, and throughout Ashton/Sandy Spring. The regulations in place do just that.	Jeff Schwartz	Noted.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.6.4 Environmental Recommendations	3. Maintain existing and plant new shade trees in strategic locations that will eventually overarch MD 108 and MD 650, including at the entry points to the Village.	Add text "to the extent feasible" at the end of this recommendation.	Françoise Carrier	The Sector Plan doesn't designate strategic locations, so this will be addressed at development review. Staff does not support the additional language.
	General Environmental Comments	The following comment is not directly responding to recommendations in the Plan, but generally relates to environmental issues otherwise discussed in Section 3.6 of the Plan.	Dense residential development in rural areas flies in the face of our county's policy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. (Our one sporadic Metro bus line will not help.)	Bob Taylor	If the existing or new residents in Ashton live in houses near a vibrant village center, they will be able to walk to run errands or go to a restaurant, for example, instead of having to drive everywhere. Also, housing needs have been identified in all parts of the County and the lack of housing is a contributor to sprawl in surrounding counties, which worsens the situation.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.7.2 Historic Preservation Recommendations	1. Provide pedestrian and bicycle scale wayfinding signage that connects the village center to the abundant historic and cultural resources of the greater Sandy Spring/Ashton community.	While the Plan boundary includes only one designated historic resource, the greater area is rich with cultural resources and historic sites designated to the county's Master Plan for Historic Preservation. By connecting residents and visitors to these nearby resources, this Plan builds on Ashton's history as a rural crossroads community. We support the Plan's emphasis on the preservation of the village's rural buffer, a hallmark of Ashton's unique character.	Historic Preservation Commission / Spring Lawn Farm HOA	Noted.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.7.2 Historic Preservation Recommendations	3. During future development or major redevelopment, consider opportunities to integrate interpretative signage, markers or public art that commemorate Ashton's origins as a rural commercial crossroads and home to free black settlers.	We support the recommended inclusion of interpretive signage, historic markers, or public art as future development and redevelopment occurs near the crossroads. These measures offer an opportunity to commemorate Ashton's Quaker and African American heritage even where historic structures have been lost.	Historic Preservation Commission	Noted.
	General Historic Preservation Comments	The following comments are not directly responding to recommendations in the Plan, but generally relate to historic preservation issues otherwise discussed in Section 3.7 of the Plan.	There are hidden gems in Ashton/Sandy Spring that were important in Women's History, Abolitionist History, in the progress of civil rights, and in world history. MD 108 is the gateway to the important Montgomery County Heritage Area that includes Ashton (see map). Many of the homes in our area were part of the Underground Railroad network. This has been an important community for centuries, and it's worth our time to get the current decisions right.	Paula Glendinning	The Implementation chapter suggests a wayfinding master plan or similar research project to identify these resources, design signage and determine the best place to locate these signs.

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
			The sense of history is sometimes just a feeling. And because of that, it can be a bit fragile. The look of a stand of old-growth trees, an old house across a field, a stone barn with a pasture of horses or sheep. The term for this is viewshed and it should carry a comparable weight for the Planning Board as the term watershed.	Charles Glendinning / Joe Hart	This plan intends to protect viewsheds into the rural areas around Ashton, and has language seeking to protect things such as existing large trees in the village.
4 - Neighborhoods	4.1 Village Core Neighborhood	Requested change is to the caption of the Village Core Framework illustration at the beginning of the chapter.	Added "All features shown are illustrative only" to caption.	Françoise Carrier	Staff does not object to this addition.
4 - Neighborhoods	4.1.1 Overall Zoning Recommendations	Requested change is to the Village Core Neighborhood Proposed Zoning map.	Update Map 16 - Village Core Neighborhood Proposed Zoning to match our zoning change requests elsewhere.	Françoise Carrier	Noted. Staff will update any maps with any approved Plan changes.
4 - Neighborhoods	4.1.2 Southwest Quadrant	1. Rezone all Village Core properties in the southwest quadrant from CRT-0.75 C-0.75 R-0.25 H-35 and R-90 to CRN-0.5 C-0.5 R-0.5 H-35.	The draft plan recommends downzoning property Nichols owns in the Residential Edge district, which is currently under construction with a modest mixed-use building, from CRT 0.75, C-0.75, R-0.25, H-35 to CRN 0.5, C-0.5, R-0.5, H-35. There is no justification for this downzoning. Changing from the CRT zone to CRN is not objectionable, but the overall density should remain at .75 FAR. Text change request: "with the exception of the mixed-use portion of the Ashton Market property, which should be rezoned to CRN-0.75, C-0.5, R-0.5, H-35 to conform to the CRN zoning in the Village Core while retaining its current density. "	Françoise Carrier	Staff notes that the mixed-use building approved as part of the Ashton Market development is in the Village Core neighborhood, not the Residential Edge neighborhood. This Plan is attempting to "right-size" the zoning in Ashton to be more in keeping with a rural village center rather than keeping the zones that were assigned based on a formula during the Zoning Ordinance update in 2014. The recommended zone can accommodate the approved building (the under-construction mixed-use portion of Ashton Market is about 0.34 FAR) and is consistent with the zoning recommendations elsewhere in the Village Core. Staff does not support this change.
4 - Neighborhoods	4.1.3 Northwest Quadrant	6. If the Ashton Village Center redevelops, encourage a mix of uses with ground floor commercial activity activating the street and with parking behind.			Staff note: This should be revised to "Ashton Village Shopping Center" per Plan convention to distinguish the shopping center from the overall Plan area.
4 - Neighborhoods	4.1.4 Northeast Quadrant	2. Relocate the utility pole at the corner to and modify the curve to enable easier vehicle turning without negatively impacting pedestrian safety.	We support intersection improvements, including moving the pole at the corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Route 108, without expanding the overall size of the intersection. This would also allow the stop bar on southbound MD 108 to be moved forward to be closer to the intersection.	Spring Lawn Farm HOA / Avenshire HOA / Dan Synder	Noted.
4 - Neighborhoods	4.1.4 Northeast Quadrant	4. If the property on the northeast quadrant redevelops, move the building to be adjacent to the street and improve the open space with shading and buffering.	It would be funny if it weren't so sad to see a proposal to designate the bench on the corner of the CVS a green space.	Elizabeth Thornton	Staff agrees that the existing space is underwhelming, but as a designated public open space, the Plan can support working with the owner to make this space better.

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
4 - Neighborhoods	4.1.5 Southeast Quadrant	2. Rezone all other properties in the southeast quadrant from CRT-0.75 C-0.75 R-0.25 H-35 to CRN-0.5 C-0.5 R-0.5 H-40.			Staff notes that not all of the SE corner is zoned CRT 0.75 (some is zoned R-60 and some RC), and this recommendation should be revised to indicate that the whole SE corner within the plan boundary, except the BG&E property, should be rezoned CRN.
			<p>The Technical Appendix (Table I-5) shows up to 159 dwelling units could be built in the southeast quadrant with a residential FAR of 0.5. Because no dwellings can be built in the environmental buffer, all of the density would be even more concentrated near the corner of the MD 108/650 intersection. Any MPDUs would be in addition to this density. The final density would be grossly out of character for what had been characterized as a "rural village". The local infrastructure wouldn't be able to handle the number of cars that would be generated by these units. Each unit would require at least two cars this far from Metro stations and employment centers.</p> <p>Planners say the recommended residential FAR of 0.5 would allow for a "modest increase" in residential density, but this is not true. We are okay with 0.5 residential FAR for the parcels near the intersection, but the outlying parcels should be limited to an FAR of 0.25 with a maximum height of 35 feet. This would allow for a "modest increase" in housing from the current potential yield of about 23 units to as many as 38 units in these outlying parcels and also allow for a transition from the more rural surrounding properties to the village center.</p> <p>The development plan approved in 2008 included 6 or 7 homes; under the new Plan the potential number of units could be 20-25 times that number with height limits that exceed those of the surrounding development. The plan approved in 2008 is still appropriate for this site. However, as a compromise, we support the proposal from the SSARPC for a better transition from the Plan boundary to the intersection.</p>	<p>Sandy Spring Civic Association / Spring Lawn Farm HOA / Paula Glendinning / Brandi Tippery / Steven & Jody Hursh / Eric Lynch / Gene Chytakh / Bob Taylor / Avenshire HOA / Kevin & Anne O'Neil / Nadine Mort / Anne Marie Stepling / Cassandra Heagy / Charles Glendinning / Daniel Bachenheimer / Donna & Chuck Selden / Elizabeth Comisarow Taylor / Elizabeth Gregory-Hosler / Elizabeth Thornton / Joe Hart / Elaine Gillen / Kristine & Kevin Gannon / Linda Smoling Moore / Stephen Faehner / William Tate / Mona Zhe / SSARPC</p>	<p>The calculations in the technical appendix take a worst-case-scenario approach by assuming 1,250 square feet per unit, which is typical for a multi-family unit in the upcounty area. This Plan recommends that most of the housing would be townhouses and possibly duplexes with perhaps a few multi-family units in stacked flats, not the types of apartment buildings necessary for nothing but 1,250-square-foot apartments. This also assumes no commercial FAR is utilized. Staff is working on other alternative development scenarios if all units were typical townhomes, and also what the existing zoning allows as far as both residential and commercial density.</p> <p>The Plan does not want to outright exclude providing some multi-family units because of a need to provide attainable housing for all economic levels. Various site constraints, especially parking and open space requirements, will further limit the total number of units that can be provided.</p> <p>The transition from the Plan edge to the village center is addressed under Community Design Recommendations. Height limits are discussed in several areas above. Staff recommends retaining the recommendation.</p>
			<p>The current residential FAR of 0.25 is more appropriate for the village center in order to retain Ashton's rural character. Please adhere to the current zoning (mix of CRT-0.25/R-60/RC) which would only allow about 23 homes. Any significant increase in density will be a devastating blow to the rural ubiquity envisioned by the 1998 Masterplan.</p>	<p>Elaine Gillen / Avenshire HOA / Cassandra Heagy / Joe Hart</p>	<p>A residential FAR of 0.25 does not provide enough density to create a viable village center. The village center is the only part of Ashton where we are recommending this much density, leaving the thousands of acres surrounding Ashton zoned at very low densities to preserve the rural character. Existing zoning also permits 155,000 square feet of commercial space, which would generate a lot of traffic, and is far in excess of what the Plan recommends.</p>
			<p>How about some green space and businesses with housing above, single-family detached houses and duplexes?</p>	<p>Elizabeth Thornton</p>	<p>This Plan would allow for all of these building types and explicitly supports businesses with housing above and duplexes. However, we feel that single-family detached houses would not create the kind of density necessary for a vibrant, walkable village center and that single-family detached houses already make up the vast majority of homes in the Sandy Spring/Ashton area.</p>

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
			Only support slightly more density than current zoning if site developed with meaningful involvement by the Implementation Advisory Committee and overwhelming majority support by persons testifying at the Public Hearing.	Cassandra Heagy	Noted. Staff believes that to achieve the vibrant village center, the zoning recommended is most appropriate. The Plan does support an implementation advisory committee or group, but can't bind the Planning Board on community consensus with testimony received at a public meeting.
			Development in the southeast quadrant must not be allowed to be overrun by commercial interests and the small town setting of Ashton must be preserved. I heard (in the developer's testimony) commercialism and selfishness of a business whose only goal is to make as much revenue as they can, even to the detriment of the community. A corollary of this frequently mentioned is that the government wants to approve as much development as possible to increase tax revenues.	Rachel Hickson / Brandi Tippery / Steven & Jody Hursh / Eric Lynch / Nadine Mort / Elizabeth Thornton / Elaine Gillen / Justin Fishbein	Staff cannot speculate on the motivations of developers or those who speak in support of them. However, the Plan's design guidelines were crafted to ensure that whatever gets built in Ashton use traditional design elements to reflect the rural village setting of Ashton.
			Anyone supporting the Nichols Company's plan must be employed by Fred Nichols or a "toady"/friend obligated to back him up with spurious arguments. Nichols offers the county and state more taxes in return for you to let him run roughshod over the community and retire with a pot full of money. I've watched Fred Nichols abuse the neighborhood with lies and subterfuge with his Thomas Village in Sandy Spring and Ashton Market in Ashton. While a competent builder, he has proven that he is not to be trusted and needs to be restrained and monitored. A government's duty is to protect and serve. Do your job.	Peter Austin	Staff can't presume why individuals provide the comments they do. Staff is focused on providing a plan that provides for modest growth in a way compatible with a vibrant rural village and that includes appropriate design recommendations.
			We have fought other developments in our area and Nichols just gets what he wants. But we will never stop fighting for sensible, attractive development. The developer is still looking for "flexibility" after 2+ years of Planning Board meetings, presentations, testimony, etc. The Planning Board cannot open the door for this developer to create his own guidelines while construction is underway (such as he did at Thomas Village).	Charles Glendinning / James Meehan	Noted. The intent of this Plan is to nail down density and design as part of the Sector Plan to minimize uncertainty during regulatory review.

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
			<p>A few short years after the community spent years helping shape the 1998 Plan, a developer thumbed his nose at the Plan and built an office building in the village center that ignored the master plan and its height limitations. This shows that a master plan has no teeth.</p> <p>After all the work that was done to come to a consensus on a plan intended to protect rural character only to have it immediately ignored makes it even more important this time that we don't let this happen again. The 1998 Plan found agreement that preserving the rural nature of the roads and maintaining lower skylines, or "viewsheds," were critical for protecting the openness that provides the rural character of Ashton.</p> <p>The changes we are being asked to swallow in this instance are not about providing flexibility around the master plan to a developer--this is a complete rewrite of the master plan and its vision for the village center. The proposed zoning changes are excessive, an insensitive slap in the face to the residents of Ashton and all those who faithfully and honorably authored and shaped the 1998 master plan and the 2008 "negotiated accords."</p>	<p>Joe Hart</p>	<p>Our records indicate the Alloway building was built within the height limitations that were in place at the time of that development (30 feet in the overlay zone). The 1998 Plan specifically rezoned this property from residential to commercial and recommended it for commercial land use, which the 1998 Plan also notes was recommended in 1980. The 1998 Plan has met its goals in limited development and preserving the open spaces that help create the rural character of the area covered by that plan, including many rural cluster neighborhoods immediately surrounding the AVC Plan area.</p> <p>The current AVC Plan is intended to help implement the 1998 plan, which has failed to create a viable, walkable village center in Ashton. A fresh look at zoning and design guidelines were determined to be necessary to achieve this vision.</p>
			<p>Commercial spaces developed as part of the project must be in accordance with input from local residents.</p> <p>Consider the proposed number of residential units (~150) with the previously approved number (~75) and that a rural village is mostly a commercial opportunity for the surrounding residential community and not a town center.</p>	<p>Rachel Hickson / Robin Ziek</p>	<p>The Plan recommends a slight reduction of commercial densities from 0.75 to 0.5 FAR and recommends a change from CRT to CRN in order to only allow more neighborhood-appropriate businesses.</p> <p>The Plan does not propose any specific number of units and Staff does not expect densities anywhere near that number of units given the types of dwelling units that are most likely to be built in Ashton or would be in keeping with other Plan recommendations.</p> <p>Staff believes a mostly residential development with some commercial development near the MD 108/650 intersection would help create a viable rural village center and most people we heard from do not want to see a large commercial development in that corner. Such a development would lead to far more traffic than a mostly residential development and we are already being told by many that the residential development will create too much traffic.</p>
			<p>It is a travesty that you are going to permit the developer to build thousands and thousands of square feet of commercial space along an already choked rural roadway (MD 108) that many people in Olney and Sandy Spring rely upon to get to Baltimore, Columbia and other points east where jobs can be found.</p>	<p>Justin Fishbein</p>	<p>Small village centers are the ideal spot to put a modest amount of neighborhood-serving shops and restaurants. This will eliminate the need for longer trips for some everyday errands and will be especially convenient for those people commuting through Ashton for jobs to the east. In addition, the Plan recommends a reduction in commercial densities in Ashton and a change of zones to one that only allows more neighborhood-serving businesses as opposed to those with a more regional draw.</p>

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
			Residents of Ashton regret not being able to walk to a very commercial opportunity where we have the retail and the restaurant options and stuff that's desirable. It obviously needs to be done in a way that's tasteful and that complements the site. But I feel strongly that staff's recommendation with the plan with the 0.5 FAR is required to get that quality architecture and to get the quality product and to make it feasible. Without this, we may end up with another CVS in that corner.	Dan Snyder	Noted.
			Given the proposed addition of up to 150 new housing units, we are not only alarmed by the significant amount of additional traffic, but we are also very concerned that there will be insufficient onsite parking to accommodate the cars for residents and visitors. Overflow parking could very easily end up across MD 650 in our neighborhood because it is the closest place that would be available.	Spring Lawn Farm HOA / Brandi Tippery	The number of new housing units is unknown at this point, and Montgomery County's Zoning Ordinance contains parking standards that must be met with any new development or redevelopment. Several of the design guidelines also dictate where parking should be located. If parking becomes a problem in your neighborhood, the county's Department of Transportation can be contacted to discuss potential remedies.
			In January, when the draft plan was shown, every single speaker in the full room spoke against it, and the planning board staff assured us they were listening. One of the only significant changes I've seen is that planners have removed the drawing showing how many buildings could be allowed with an FAR of 0.5 across the property.	Paula Glendinning / Elizabeth Thornton / Kristine & Kevin Gannon / Linda Smoling Moore	Staff listens very carefully to what everyone has to say and we have tried very hard to create a Plan that will build the best community possible, including striking a balance among competing interests. Staff showed a drawing at the January meeting that was not included in the Plan drafts because it was intended to be illustrative to help visualize density, and is not appropriate for a master plan because this process is not intended to advocate for any one design for any developable site.
			The rendering of the proposed town home units are sterile, provide no character that is rural in nature and have the appearance of low-income housing that would cram too many new residents in to an already crowded intersection. We should limit the number of townhouses and maximize the number of single-family detached houses. These units are overwhelming monolithic monstrosities that create higher skylines, a significant reduction of the entryway's viewshed to the east and the north and for sure will darken the intersection of our town center.	Eric Lynch / Joe Hart	Design guidelines in this Plan were crafted to preserve the rural character of Ashton. Staff has seen no renderings of units proposed for the southeast corner so cannot comment on them and believe this may be referring to an image for the development along Porter Road and not the southeast quadrant. Ashton is already surrounded on all sides by single-family detached houses. Such houses do not create the density necessary to create a viable village center and are typically priced much higher than the types of housing we are hoping will be constructed in Ashton.
			The combination of height limits and design guidelines is inconsistent with the vision of a vibrant and viable village center. It is unlikely a project could be built in the southeast quadrant consistent with the height and design recommendations of the Plan that would reach the recommended density of 0.5 FAR, let alone create a viable development with a vibrant streetscape.	Françoise Carrier	The recommended height and design standards are intended to create new structures that are compatible with existing development or with other rural villages found in other parts of Maryland, which are mostly 2-3 stories and are primarily smaller structures. The overall 0.5 FAR should accommodate a viable mix of commercial and residential development, and a variety of building types and rooflines can still be accommodated within a 40-foot height limit.

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
			Ms. Carrier's frequent use of the word "viable" in reference to the developer's need for increased heights, density and building lengths in the southeast quadrant seems like an attempt to make over-the-top requests seem reasonable or appropriate. The requested density of 0.75 and height of 45 feet suggest suburban-style development rather than a rural village crossroads.	Nadine Mort / Charles Glendinning	Staff believes the Plan's proposed density and height limits are appropriate for the development of the southeast quadrant in a rural village like Ashton and are not currently recommending changes higher or lower than proposed.
			The additional density and height requested by the developer would allow 5-story buildings and up to 240 units. Going from 40 to 45 feet in height is a 12.5% increase. (And this is on top of the Plan's already 33.3% increase to what is allowed today. Going from 30 to 45 feet is a 50% increase.) The Plan's recommended zoning would yield 280 new dwelling units while developer's proposal would allow 453 new units. I request that the Planning Board reject the requested changes offered by Nichols Development and that the Planning Board adopt the building size and zoning recommendations outlined in the Plan.	Cassandra Heagy / Sharon Vandegriff / Walt Fennell	The developer is requesting more density and more height than Staff is recommending. Staff is not sure where 280 units comes from except as a representation of if all the CRN zone recommended for the entire sector plan were to build out at maximum density as apartments, which is an unrealistic worst-case scenario. The developer's proposed increase from 0.50 to 0.75 residential FAR would go from 159 to 240 possible units only on the SE corner and only if 100% of the density were apartments. Staff believes it would be difficult to provide parking or open space and the plan does not recommend apartments as the dominant residential type. Staff does not support the developer's request for additional density.
			The proposed additional height in the southeast quadrant is inconsistent with the approved building height across the street and in the remaining quadrants of the Village Center. This was a contested point in the past and should not be revisited.	Robin Ziek	The proposed height limit of 40 feet in the southeast quadrant is only slightly higher than the 35-foot limit in the other quadrants. The plan recommends limiting the number and location of buildings that could be built to 40 feet to provide a transition from the village center to the Plan edges also helps maintain compatibility with existing and future structures.
			Put a height limit of 45 feet for one single anchor building of the site and a cap of 35 feet for the rest.	Charles Glendinning	This is difficult to do with zoning. Staff believes the design guideline's recommendations for varying heights and the maximum of 40 feet, preferred closest to the core, will lead to a better end product. With no context, Staff is hesitant to try to predict where some unknown tall building *should* go on the site.
			The height limit should be 35 feet. We do not support Ms. Carrier's proposal of a 45-foot height limit.	Donna & Chuck Selden / Spring Lawn Farm HOA / Stephen Faehner	Staff believes a 40-foot height limit would not be out of character in the area as long as the building heights vary as recommended so that not all buildings are 40 feet high. Staff does not support this requested change.
			I echo the points raised by Mr. Farquhar (SSARPC testimony), Ms. Wheeler (Spring Lawn Farm HOA) and others raising concerns about the Plan, including relating to the size and placement of buildings and the design elements proposed by the developer in the September hearing and incorporate them by reference in my comments.	Avenshire HOA	Noted. See direct responses to the referenced comments elsewhere in the matrix.
			There should be a moratorium on any future development until all parties can see the effects of the Ashton Market development.	James Meehan / Steven & Jody Hursh	The county's Adequate Public Facilities ordinance takes into account all current and approved developments when new developments are proposed.

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
			If you want to know what the community wants, look at the community-presented scenario at https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Development-Scenarios-Handout-2020-01-29-1.pdf . Could we use this plan or a compromise that leans heavily toward it? The other scenarios would overwhelm the scope of that intersection. This is not Georgia Avenue at Randolph Road.	Sharon Vandegriff	The presented design has several shortcomings with meeting county codes, but in looking at the spirit of the open spaces and building types it represents a substantial decrease in FAR over what is allowed today under current zoning. The dominance of detached housing limits product types and likely reduces attainability to lower and moderate income earners. The density staff proposed is also intended to entice the limited retail that the community wants.
			I would 100 percent support the plan for the tasteful development of that corner.	Dan Snyder	Noted.
4 - Neighborhoods	4.1.5 Southeast Quadrant	3. Ensure a variety of building widths, building heights and the number of building floors to achieve compatibility with existing surrounding development and maintenance of the rural village character.			See 3.3.2 Community Design Recommendations above for comments.
4 - Neighborhoods	4.1.5 Southeast Quadrant	5. Interconnected vehicle access to both MD 108 and MD 650 should be provided through streets built to a public standard, including sidewalks, street trees and street parking were feasible. The circulation shall be designed to discourage cut-through traffic.	Adding at least three more entrances and exits, without lights, on MD 108 and MD 650 is unacceptable without the MDOT/SHA recommended improvements to that intersection.	James Meehan	And development built in Montgomery County must provide adequate public facilities to support that development. It is possible that the developer would need to implement some or all of the state's recommendations for improvements to that intersection.
			Replace "shall" with "should".	Françoise Carrier	Staff cannot envision a scenario where we would want cut-through traffic here. Staff recommends retaining the recommendation.
4 - Neighborhoods	4.1.5 Southeast Quadrant	7. Provide a publicly accessible open space, ideally adjacent to the environmental features at the eastern edge of the quadrant.	Add "This space may be in public or private ownership, to be determined at the time of development" to the end of this recommendation.	Françoise Carrier	Staff does not see how this additional language changes anything and has no preference for who owns it as long as it's publicly accessible. Staff does not support this request.
					See also 3.5.3 Community Facilities, Open Space and Trail Recommendations above.
4 - Neighborhoods	4.1.5 Southeast Quadrant	8. Provide a linear green space to connect to the primary public open space to the sidewalk along MD 650.			See 3.5.3 Community Facilities, Open Space and Trail Recommendations above.
4 - Neighborhoods	4.1.5 Southeast Quadrant	9. Retain a small green area near the MD 108/650 intersection to protect the mature shade trees there to the extent feasible.			See 3.5.3 Community Facilities, Open Space and Trail Recommendations above.
	General Southeast Quadrant Comments	The following comments are not directly responding to recommendations in the Plan, but generally relate to issues otherwise discussed in Section 4.1.5 of the Plan.			

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
		Plan text from 1st full paragraph, page 53: In the southeast corner, the proposed zoning should be consistent with the other three corners at CRN-0.5 total FAR, but the maximum allowable height is 40 feet instead of 35 feet. The additional height should be limited to certain buildings and not applied consistently across all new buildings in the quadrant. The BG&E property is an exception that should remain under its current zone, R-60.	Replace "consistent with the other three corners at CRN-0.5 total FAR, but the" in the first full paragraph on page 53 with "slightly higher than the other three corners, at CRN-0.75 total FAR, to provide adequate flexibility for this key site. The commercial and residential FAR should be consistent with the other three corners at 0.5 FAR. The..." Also change allowable height to 45 feet.	Françoise Carrier	See 4.1.5 Southeast Quadrant recommendation 2 above for a discussion of the request for more density in this quadrant. Staff does not support this requested change.
			Replace "certain buildings and not" in the first full paragraph on page 53 with "a small number of mixed-use buildings located near the intersection of MD 650 and MD 108, and should not be."	Françoise Carrier	Staff doesn't want to dictate precisely where slightly taller buildings should go, so does not support this requested change. Other Plan recommendations already indicate there should be a transition from the Plan edges to the main intersection.
			Add text "Other buildings should be a mix of heights at 40 feet and below." in the first full paragraph on page 53 between the two last sentences.	Françoise Carrier	This request is wrapped in with a request for a 45-foot height limit in the zone. Since Staff recommends retaining the Plan's 40-foot height limit, there is already language to recommend that the other buildings be a mix of heights at 40 feet and below. Staff does not support this requested change.
		Plan text from 2nd full paragraph, page 53: Because the community and the landowner have a strong desire to continue a bank use on the southeast corner, the SSA Overlay zone, which is being retained in an altered form, should contain language allowing this use to be continued with any redevelopment. The revised overlay allows a drive-thru in the CRN zone but with Limited Use standards requiring the vehicular circulation associated with the drive-thru to be screened from the state roads.	Add text "drive-thru" after "bank" in the first sentence of the second paragraph on page 53.	Françoise Carrier	Staff supports this request.
			Add text "and to be part of a new bank building located on any contiguous property within close proximity to the intersection of MD 650 and MD 108, not just at the location of the current bank." after the word "redevelopment" at the end of the first sentence of the second paragraph on page 53.	Françoise Carrier	Staff supports this request, which would allow the bank to be relocated with any redevelopment of the site.
4 - Neighborhoods	4.2 Residential Edge Neighborhood	1. Retain the R-90 and TF-10 Zones for all properties south of MD 108 currently in those zones.	The Ashton Market housing project on Porter Road will in all likelihood be expanded in the near future.	Walt Fennell / Spring Lawn Farm HOA	This plan recommends retaining the R-90 zone for the part of Porter Road south of the Ashton Market development. For development other than the detached houses the zone allows, a public rezoning process would be needed, and the development plan would need to go before the proposed implementation advisory committee.

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
			<p>I was dismayed to see the final designs of the townhouses for Ashton Market. Our community was misled with the initial plans for that development. This is a classic case of "bait and switch." How can our community trust any plans set forth by the Planning Board? The county should step in and require the builder to change the plans of the townhouses that have yet to be built in Ashton Market.</p> <p>I don't think that this really evokes the feeling of a rural village center. Where are the porches? Why is there just this sad overhang to protect the owner from rain when they're entering into their homes? Where are the gardens? Where are the architectural details that make this feel homey and remind you that you're in a town with significant history.</p>	<p>Brandi Tippery / Anne Marie Stepling / Elaine Gillen / SSARPC / Amy Medd / Nadine Mort</p>	<p>At the public hearing, a rendering from the Dan Ryan Homes website was presented by a member of the community. Staff noticed another townhouse community on the website showed the exact same rendering, so it is unknown at this time how generic it might be. The builder has been in contact with our regulatory review staff to discuss the design of the townhouses and was told that they would need to submit a site plan amendment to make such changes. This development was not approved with any design guidelines in place which highlights the importance of these guidelines.</p>
			<p>I have seen the big hole in the earth where the Sole d'Italia restaurant once stood. You have certainly allowed your developer friends to create quite a huge mess in such a tiny area. I am tired of driving by it and seeing what a disaster you have allowed them to make it into.</p>	<p>Justin Fishbein</p>	<p>Planning Staff does not control how the public views construction sites. The approved site plan includes a village scale two-story building along the road in this location.</p>
			<p>The Ashton Market development will dramatically improve water quality in that area. The level of onsite runoff treatment to control erosion is going to be fantastically improved to what it was when that site was sitting there for many, many years.</p>	<p>Jeff Schwartz</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>4 - Neighborhoods</p>	<p>4.2 Residential Edge Neighborhood</p>	<p>6. Pursue options including a future public/private partnership to provide an enhanced community gathering space in the open space adjacent to the stormwater retention pond in the Ashton Village Development.</p>	<p>Randy Nittoli, president of the Ashton Village HOA, presented testimony at the Public Hearing regarding the Plan's recommendations of using their open space parcel as a community gathering space. The HOA finds the language in the Plan to be "aggressive" and has "caused alarm" amongst HOA residents. Many believed the Plan was proposing that the county would simply annex their land for public use. The HOA is firmly against any transfer of land for public use or for the establishment of a public park. The HOA also objects to annexing their private playground for public use. The playground is seen as a selling point for houses there.</p>	<p>Ashton Village HOA / Jason Allnutt</p>	<p>The Plan envisions a gathering space in Ashton for two purposes: a general meeting place for members of the community as they go about their day and as a place where occasional small community-wide events could take place. Staff can consider adding clarity to the language that the pursuit of a partnership is not intended to be a taking of the land through some sort of eminent domain action, but either a voluntary transfer if in the future the HOA ever saw fit, or acknowledgement of respectful use of the existing open space. See staff report for a discussion of this issue.</p>
			<p>Parking is already at a premium for both residents and visitors in the Ashton Village neighborhood behind the shopping center. Visitors to use a new common area here would flood the neighborhood with additional traffic and create significant parking problems. This would also take away from the "rural feel" of Ashton and the neighborhood.</p>	<p>Ashton Village HOA / Jason Allnutt</p>	<p>The vision was to acknowledge an existing passive green space exists and the intent is not to invite large numbers of non-Ashton village center residents to the area. The Plan's goals of better bike and pedestrian infrastructure is intended to be the primary way anyone would ever visit this location, not drive and park in resident parking spaces.</p>

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
4 - Neighborhoods	4.4 Rural Buffer Neighborhood	3. Coordinate with MCPS and Sherwood High School to provide a natural surface trail connection through the school property connecting the sidewalk along MD 108 with parkland to the south.	To the extent that the trails in the 1998 Master Plan's "Plan of Existing and Proposed Equestrian Trails" (depicted in Exhibit 28 of the 1998 Plan) are within the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan, the Sector Plan should incorporate the 1998 Plan's intention and desire to maintain existing and establish new trails in the Rural Buffer Neighborhood.	Chris Milner / Elizabeth Alcoba / Beth Walshe / Catherine Moy	The Plan proposes coordinating with MCPS as to whether horses would be appropriate on school property. The equestrian trail system map on page 74 of the 1998 Plan shows an equestrian connection from the Sandy Spring (the actual spring) to Bentley Road (just west of the Plan area) that appears to cross through the high school property. See 3.5.3 Community Facilities, Open Space and Trail Recommendations above for Staff's response.
3 - Area-Wide Recommendations	3.2.5 Land Use and Zoning	4. Confirm the existing zoning for the properties in the Rural Buffer neighborhood and the remainder of the Residential Edge neighborhoods.	We support maintaining the rural buffer between the village centers of Sandy Spring and Ashton.	Sandy Spring Civic Association	Noted.
			When I bought the Cloverly property in 1976, it was not designated as historic and was zoned "straight agriculture". Without my knowledge or consent, the government changed my property to a 5-acre cluster zone and put my house on the historic register. Someone taking pictures of the house in 2000, when asked what he was doing on my property, said I'd need to write to Park and Planning if I object to the historic designation and I did just that but never received a response. I didn't find out until 2019 that my property had been added to the historic register in 2002. I've been trying to sell the property for 6 years running with 6 brokers and only got one offer at \$300,000 below the \$1,500,000 asking price and would also have had to vacate in one month's time. One other person expressed interest but wanted to build another house on the property and said he'd check with the authorities but he never called back. There have been many others but they have all just disappeared. At the meeting at the fire house in early 2020, I suggested a warm, inviting Bavarian village style of development on my property and Mr. Weaver responded "that sounds like a good idea." It is close to public transportation, shopping, schools, the post office and banks and would help increase the tax base and ease the housing dearth. It is a large tract of land surrounded by a "necklace" of 1/2- to 2-acre lots, about 10 of which are contiguous to my property. I would like to get some development rights for some houses or townhouses with a European flavor (think Tyrol, Tuscany, Flanders, Bavaria or England's Lake District)--something like Williamsburg in Olney or Hidden Garden Lane in Ashton.	Richard Edsall / Tina Brown	The property was in the county's "Rural" zone according to the existing zoning map in the 1980 Plan. This zone was already a 5-acre zone. The current zone is Rural Cluster (RC), which requires 5 acres per lot but does allow for lots smaller than 5 acres as long as the average is one house per 5 acres. The property is 12 acres and would allow for one new lot to be created from the property. There are 10 adjacent or confronting properties surrounding Mr. Edsall's property that are between 1/2 and about 3 acres in a variety of zones, many on properties created back when zoning allowed smaller lots even in rural parts of the County. The 1980 and 1997 Master Plans both recommended keeping a rural buffer between Sandy Spring and Ashton which is where this property is located. The property is also in the Patuxent Watershed, which combined with the historic designation and previous planning recommendations make it undesirable for additional development intensity. See Staff's response in section 4.4 Rural Buffer Neighborhood.
			The Cloverly property, formerly named "Sherwood," was the meeting place for possibly the oldest women's association in the U.S. that is still meeting. There are minutes of the Mutual Improvement Association that are available from 1857 to today. This same house was used as a recuperation center for nurses during the Civil War.	Paula Glendinning	Staff is open to the idea of incorporating additional property history into the Plan text and will revisit.

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
5 - Design Guidelines	5.2.2.1 Building Types	4. Stacked Flats – Stacked flats are a type of building with multifamily dwelling units separated vertically by floor. A stacked flat building may be two or more stories and contain dwelling unit(s) on each floor. Stacked flats may be either one dwelling unit wide with multiple units stacked vertically, or may be attached similar to townhouses with multiple stacks composed as one building.			Staff notes that this definition should be updated to specify that stacked flats are a type of "apartment building" to match the building types defined in Section 4.1.4 of the Zoning Ordinance.
5 - Design Guidelines	5.2.2.1 Building Types	5. Multiplex – A multiplex is a small apartment building type with multifamily dwellings of between four and 12 dwelling units. Units can be either stacked and/or side-by-side and are connected by a common hallway and main entrance.	There should be no apartment buildings. In order to preserve the rural nature of the eastern entrance to the Sandy Spring/Ashton area, we believe that apartment buildings would be completely incompatible with a rural feel for the Ashton community. There are no apartment buildings within miles of Ashton--until you get to Olney--and we do not want Ashton to become another Olney. We don't oppose accessory apartments, apartments in stacked flats, apartments above commercial spaces. It's not apartments that we oppose. It's the massive apartment building structures that could be built under the proposed plan if there are not appropriate design elements, and these kind of apartment buildings would never have been located in rural towns.	SSARPC	Staff agrees this is not the location for a massive apartment building, and does not believe with the current limits on building massing that a large apartment building could be constructed. The most that would be allowed would be a small structure that may contain 4-6 units and would resemble a large single-family house on the outside.
5 - Design Guidelines	5.2.2.1 Building Types	6. Multi Use and General Buildings – A multi use building contains retail/service uses on the ground floor with residential or nonresidential uses above. A general building contains nonresidential uses. Multi use buildings with varying storefronts should be designed to let each storefront have unique architecture, ideally carrying that uniqueness up the façade, giving the impression of multiple attached buildings rather than one large building.	For the commercial spaces near the crossroads we would wholeheartedly endorse residential over commercial space with the kinds of design elements that are listed here and that would match what looks like a rural hometown village: * all signs lit by gooseneck overhead lights * some hanging signs projecting from storefronts * varying building heights, exterior colors and styles * varying design elements: canopies, pediments on top of façades, size and number of street-facing windows.	SSARPC	The mentioned details on lighting and embellishments are noted. This would be more appropriate for discussion with the implementation advisory group during a regulatory review process.
	General Building Types Comments	The following comments are not directly responding to recommendations in the Plan, but generally relate to issues otherwise discussed in Section 5.2.2.1 of the Plan.	Increase the recommended maximum length for residential buildings along the main roads from 80 feet to 90 feet to allow more variety in building types and unit types.	Françoise Carrier	The 80-foot length allows for a 4-unit building with 20-foot-wide units or 3 units with larger façades. 80 feet is sufficiently long for the types of residential buildings envisioned along the main road. Staff does not support the requested change. (See also 3.3.2 Community Design Recommendations above.)

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
			<p>Increase the recommended maximum length for multi use and general buildings along the main roads from "slightly longer" than 80 feet to allow for such buildings to be 120 feet wide and up to 150 feet on non-state road frontages. This would permit viable mixed-use buildings that have an appropriate presence on the main travel routes. We don't know what kind of commercial uses might be attracted to this site in the future, and limiting the buildings to 120 feet in length also limits the size of the spaces that can be rented to different tenants and can really be quite constraining.</p>	Françoise Carrier	<p>If a building needs to be 120 feet long to be viable, the building can be 120 feet "deep" instead of 120 feet "wide". One of the major concerns of this Plan is to retain the existing character of Ashton as much as is practical and buildings longer than 120 feet are not typical of the area. No buildings exist of such size except the suburban designed Ashton Village Center shopping center, which this Plan would like to see redeveloped in the future, and the recently approved Ashton Market mixed-use building, which is planned at just under 110 feet. See below where another suggestion is to allow buildings to exceed the recommended lengths if they are of exceptional design. Staff does not support the requested change.</p>
			<p>We support a village style, with no long buildings lining MD 108 or MD 650. We reject the proposal by Ms. Carrier to allow longer mixed-use buildings. Ms. Carrier's proposals are a 12.5-50% increase over the Plan's recommendations, depending on building type.</p>	Donna & Chuck Selden / Spring Lawn Farm HOA / Walt Fennell	<p>The Plan text states in the Design Guidelines chapter that no buildings along the two state roadways should be longer than 80 feet in order to replicate the building forms along those roads; the limit is 120 feet on other streets. Staff does not support the requested change.</p>
			<p>Authorize the Planning Board to approve buildings that exceed the recommended lengths if the Board finds that an alternative design offers a superior way of serving master plan objectives and the public interest.</p>	Françoise Carrier	<p>The current plan does not intend to provide for such an avenue. If any sort of alternatives were to be proposed Staff would prefer them built into the guidelines.</p>
			<p>Some of the images in the Plan would not be allowed based on the Plan's guidelines and recommendations. Nichols has provided some precedent images of the kinds of buildings he would like to include in his project, but many would not be allowed but are in keeping with the character of a rural village center. With the restrictions of the height limits in the guideline, the struggle to reach a viable level of density would make it impossible to also use a variety in the roof lines and the building types and the architectural features that will give this project vibrancy.</p>	Françoise Carrier	<p>Staff will review precedent images for incompatibility with the design guidelines.</p>

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
5 - Design Guidelines	5.2.2.2 Building Placement	<p>2. Build-to area – The build-to area is the area from the lot line or right-of-way (minimum setback) to the maximum setback where a certain percentage of a front or side building façade must be located. The minimum and maximum setbacks may vary depending on the type of building use and the location of the Public Utility Easement (PUE). Multi use or general buildings may be placed closer to the rights-of-way than residential uses to provide for active storefronts that give vibrancy to village streetscapes. Residential uses may have an open space between the sidewalk or shared-use path and the building that serves as a semiprivate transition between the public and private realms. With new development, a consistent line needs to be established within the build-to area along a street frontage where all façades should be placed, regardless of use, in order to create a consistent street wall. With infill development, the front façade line should be consistent with the placement of the front façades of existing buildings. (continued in next cell)</p>	We support buildings with active fronts set back from the street.	Donna & Chuck Selden	Noted.
		(Continued) Ensure the build-to line considers any necessary PUEs so that building embellishments such as stoops and porches can be an integral part of new buildings.			
5 - Design Guidelines	5.2.2.3 Building Massing and Composition	<p>1. General – Townhomes and Stacked Flats may be attached to form a composition within a larger building. Multiplex and general buildings should stand alone and not be attached to other building types, may be designed to appear as a series of smaller buildings that are attached. Additionally, no two buildings next to one another along a streetscape should have the same elevation. While the general geometry of the massing may be the same with each building, architectural embellishments, color and/or materials should provide a difference between structures.</p>	As opposed to the monolithic block that we saw that's being prepared by Dan Ryan for Ashton Market, townhouses should have small front yards, varying and limited heights in a variety of architectures, staggered façades and a variety of colors.	SSARPC	Staff agrees, and believes the proposed design guidelines would require development going forward to provide agreed upon design elements.

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
5 - Design Guidelines	5.2.2.3 Building Massing and Composition	b. Multi use and general buildings should have a base, middle and top in their composition with the cornice or eave being the top. The façades of a building greater than 60 feet in width along the public realm should be designed to look like more than one building that has been attached. The façade should be designed so that the first floor appears taller than the floors above.	Stacked flats should have key elements like looking like duplexes, ample porches, small front yards, broad stairways leading to side-by-side doorways to each apartment which almost could be mistaken as a double door to a traditional attached single-family home.	SSARPC	Noted.
5 - Design Guidelines	5.2.2.3 Building Massing and Composition	3. Rooflines – Buildings should have simple rooflines that reflect traditional architectural styles. Rooflines should be similar to the architecture in the surrounding area, which features primarily pitched roofs. Attached units, multi use buildings and general buildings should also have pitched roofs or provide a strong cornice element.	Add word "Residential" in front of "Rooflines" in the second sentence here.	Françoise Carrier	As stated in the recommendation, the rooflines of any building type should reflect traditional architectural styles, which in the Ashton area contain primary pitched roofs. Staff does not support this change.
			Change "should also" to "may" have pitched roofs and replace "or" with "or flat roofs, and if flat roofs are used, should".	Françoise Carrier	Both wordings seem to say the same thing. Staff does not support this change.
5 - Design Guidelines	5.2.2.5 Building Materials	1. Building Elevations – Façades should be composed of durable materials that are indicative of a rural village such as brick, stone, wood or cement fiber, and should be clad in a way that clearly convey a particular architectural style. All facades should be composed of the same building materials.	Add text "of each individual building" after "All façades".	Françoise Carrier	Staff supports this change, which clarifies that not all buildings are intended to have the same façades.
5 - Design Guidelines	5.3 Open Space	Plan text from fourth sentence from section 5.3, page 67: New open spaces shall be well-designed, appropriately scaled and publicly accessible to all.	Add text "where practical" to the fourth sentence of the paragraph in section 5.3 to read "New open spaces shall be well designed, appropriately scaled and, where practical, publicly accessible to all."	Françoise Carrier	Staff does not have an issue with smaller private open spaces being included in a development, but wants to make sure that spaces that really should be public remain so. Staff has a counter-proposal to just add the word "public" between "New" and "open": "New public open spaces shall be well-designed, appropriately scaled and accessible to all."
5 - Design Guidelines	5.3.1 Open Space Guidelines	Plat text from second sentence from section 5.3.1, page 67: Open spaces need to have an appropriate location and adequate size so that they are perceived as public, inviting and visually accessible to the immediate residents and the surrounding community.	Add word "Public" to the beginning of the second sentence under 5.3.1 to read "Public open spaces need to have an appropriate location and adequate size so that they are perceived as public, inviting and visually accessible to the immediate residents and the surrounding community."	Françoise Carrier	Staff does not object to the proposed change, which clarifies that private open spaces would not be treated the same way.

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
5 - Design Guidelines	5.4.1.1 Connection Elements	<p>2. Alleys – On sites with smaller lots, alleys help maintain the streetscape fabric of the community by separating cars from pedestrians and bicyclists. Alleys provide vehicular and parking access to the rear of properties, service access and easy deliveries while enhancing streetscapes in front of properties with no curb cuts or driveways. Alleys are smaller in width than streets. Any parking not in garages or parking pads off alleys should be accommodated on-street, unless excess space in the alley allows for a small separate parking area with shade trees.</p>	<p>Include "driveways" in last sentence as places where parking can be accommodated off-street.</p>	Françoise Carrier	Staff supports this request.
5 - Design Guidelines	5.4.1.1 Connection Elements	<p>a. Alleys are used for service purposes, such as access to garages, parking pads and trash pickup. Alleys do not need to be oversized and compete with streets, which are a primary organizing element in neighborhoods. The width of alleys should be narrow enough to be safe for service vehicles. Additional residential parking should occur on streets in the form of parallel parking.</p>	<p>Change the first sentence to "Alleys are used for service purposes, such as parking, access to garages and parking pads and trash pickup."</p>	Françoise Carrier	<p>This change would appear to enable parking directly in the alleys themselves instead of the alleys simply serving to access other parking opportunities. As long as there is no other code or fire access conflict, Staff does not object to this request.</p>
6 - Implementation	6.3 Zoning Text Amendment	Overlay zone.	<p>We propose that language be added to the revised overlay zone so that the design elements are required, not optional, and that an advisory committee be implemented. It would specifically require that there would be mixed-use buildings with residential over commercial, that there would be architectural elements such as real porches, varying setbacks, stoops, front gardens, sidewalks, and a village green. There should also be rural village elements which would include brickwork, arched windows, dormers, and significant variations in building height.</p>	SSARPC	<p>Substantial master plan conformance at the time of development review is the mechanism that enforces the design elements, not the overlay zone. Staff does not support the requested change.</p>

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
6 - Implementation	6.5 Implementation Advisory Committee	This Plan supports the creation of an advisory group to address its implementation. The new group should be structured to include representatives from the various constituencies interested in successful implementation of the Plan.	<p>We support creation of an advisory citizens' group to address the Plan's implementation. Unless there is an advisory committee that provides input into any final designs, we may end up with something very different than what people envisioned when reading the Plan and imagining a rural village center.</p> <p>A formal channel of communication could help alleviate problems with confusion and suspicion regarding the developer's plans, especially since Ashton is not well-served by media sources.</p> <p>Residents in the Sandy Spring/Ashton area feel like they have been "burned" by past developments that they do not believe followed guidelines in the master plan and did not help preserve the rural character of the area.</p> <p>There has never been a "town plan" for Ashton, so developers have been allowed to build without any regard to a cohesive design. A neighborhood advisory board is essential to help shape the community sensibly.</p> <p>There is a slow erosion over time of what is envisioned in the Plan and what ultimately gets built.</p>	<p>Sandy Spring Civic Association / Rachel Hickson / Amy Medd / Robin Ziek / Charles Glendinning / Walt Fennell / James Meehan / Nadine Mort / Spring Lawn Farm HOA / Paula Glendinning / Brandi Tippery / Bob Taylor / Anne Marie Steppling / Avenshire HOA / Elizabeth Comisarow Taylor / Elizabeth Thornton / Joe Hart / Elaine Gillen / Linda Smoling Moore / SSARPC</p>	This is related to similar notions discussed above in the Community Design Recommendations. The Implementation Advisory Committee (IAC) is recommended to give the residents of Ashton more say in what gets developed in their community.
			<p>There are rumors that the owner of the Ashton Village Shopping Center may redevelop the shopping center once it is clearer what will happen to the southeast corner. It would be helpful to have a group with specific responsibility for advising on the implementation of the Plan as it pertains to all the properties covered by the Plan.</p>	Spring Lawn Farm HOA	Any such redevelopment would certainly be required to go before an implementation advisory committee.
			<p>In addition to reviewing development design proposals, the implementation advisory committee could also address other development issues such as parking.</p>	Spring Lawn Farm HOA	The advisory committee would be able to comment on all development review aspects of a project.
			<p>We request consideration of allowing the advisory citizens' group to exercise a veto over plans that propose overdevelopment in Ashton, if the overdevelopment threatens rural character.</p>	Sandy Spring Civic Association	<p>Similar committees in other areas of the County do not have such veto power, as it would remove authority from the Planning Board, County Council or other governmental body which would consider the group's advice when making decisions.</p> <p>Staff does not support the requested change.</p>
			<p>Infrastructure is a major component of this Plan. The provisions for intersection improvements, crosswalks, sidewalks and side paths, green space and recreation and trails rely on entities not under the purview of the Planning Department. An advisory committee could coordinate and provide community input with other entities involved in evaluating and implementing improvements in the Plan area. It will be important to establish local community participation in planning and implementation discussions.</p>	Robin Ziek / Walt Fennell / Spring Lawn Farm HOA	Staff agrees this could be part of the committee role which will be decided once the plan is adopted.
			<p>Builders, architects and their representatives attend Planning Board meetings on a regular basis as part of their jobs, which provides them the opportunity to establish contacts and relationships with Planning Staff. The residents of Ashton should have the same opportunity.</p>	Nadine Mort	This would indeed be a benefit of an advisory group.

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
			<p>Eliminate the recommendation for an Implementation Advisory Committee. In a small town like Ashton with only one main developer there is no need for a formal committee to provide community dialogue and feedback since the site plan process already provides ample opportunities for community input on development plans. An advisory committee would only serve to increase delays and procedural hurdles and therefore the cost of development. The hope for a viable village center is already difficult to achieve profitably and cannot afford extra layers of cost.</p>	<p>Françoise Carrier</p>	<p>The advisory committee is intended to bring any interested developer together with members of the Ashton community to work out major areas of disagreement between any proposed development and the elements of community design proposed by this Plan. The idea is for the developer to work with the community and not against the community. It should not cause unreasonable costs or delays if a reasonable development is proposed that fits within the community design recommendations and design guidelines in this Plan. While there is one major property with development potential, the opportunity for modification or redevelopment exists throughout the Village Core and would apply equally to those sites as well. Staff does not support the requested change.</p>
			<p>The developer's opposition to a community advisory group shows that he believes it is to his benefit to limit contact with the community. An advisory group would hinder the developer from cutting corners, getting forgiveness before permission, complying with standards and being held accountable.</p>	<p>Nadine Mort / Elizabeth Taylor / James Meehan</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
			<p>If an Implementation Advisory Committee is formed, the Planning Board should appoint a well-rounded cross-section of the community, including representatives of the southeastern quadrant property developer. The committee can be a forum for planning staff to keep residents informed and get their feedback, and the committee should provide advisory recommendations to planning staff at the time of DRC (Development Review Committee) review for any proposed development in the plan area. Any presentations to the Implementation Advisory Committee can be made at the same time as a project's pre-submission community meeting.</p>	<p>Françoise Carrier</p>	<p>Generally the nature of the committee is not dictated by the Plan, but a discussion could be had to include some of these suggestions.</p>
					<p>General Staff note: The Plan specifically proposes the Ashton Area Community Association Alliance as part of the advisory group and specifies it should work with the Mid-County Regional Services Center. It turns out that the eastern half of the Plan area is within the East County Regional Services Center area while the other half is in the Mid-County area, and it is the eastern part of the Plan area that is most likely to be developed. This may need to be changed to recommend the committee work with the East County RSC, although ideally the lines would be redrawn so that all of Sandy Spring and Ashton fall within the territory of a single Regional Services Center. Since the Mid-County Regional Services Center covers neighboring Sandy Spring and part of the plan area, the line between the Mid- and East-County areas could possibly be redrawn to include both communities in the Mid-County region.</p>

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
Technical Appendix			Add text to language allowing continuing uses that would be made non-conforming to specify "on the same site or a contiguous property" and to specify "not associated with a restaurant" with the drive-thru use.	Françoise Carrier	Staff does not object to this request, which clarifies that the current bank could be rebuilt elsewhere on the site and still continue its drive-thru use.
General comments			I understand that you're doing the best you can to adapt to the public health crisis, but these virtual hearings are a big obstacle to many people in our community. For example, people with hearing impairments may not be able to participate fully. The closed caption option on Microsoft Teams does not work when watching the meeting in full screen. You have to keep the meeting screen small, meaning that the text on presentations is too small to read. The closed captions don't work at all when you are in the group testifying. Your IT staff is exceptionally kind and helpful, and I hope they might be able to advise on other software possibilities. The value of direct human interaction in this part of the planning process cannot be overstated. With online meetings, you do not have the opportunity to see the personal reflection of the communities we live in, the residents, their needs and the challenges they face.	Paula Glendinning / Joe Hart	Noted. This has been a challenge for everyone, and we're continuing to evolve to ensure as equitable and accessible an outreach process as possible.
			Thank you for providing a video-on-demand of the Public Hearing. Given the Covid climate, it is most helpful for the wider community to have this access.	Robin Ziek	Videos are available to watch every Planning Board meeting starting in 2008 on our website. During the current pandemic, when the meetings themselves are only "virtual", we have heard from many people that it has made it much easier to attend a meeting.
			The meeting on September 17 was in conflict with Back-to-School Night for local public and private schools.	Paula Glendinning	Although it was unfortunate timing, it was only the local middle school (Farquhar) that was holding a back-to-school night the evening of our public hearing. It was not included on the MCPS website's calendar when we scheduled our hearing, and the information page on back-to-school night leads to a dead link when you try to see the back-to-school night schedule. Residents have had the opportunity to testify for over a month, including a full week after the hearing including time after the video of the hearing was released.
			Several members of Planning Staff warmly greeted their former colleague, Françoise Carrier and thanked her for her role as their former Chair and boss for facilitating the building of the new Park and Planning headquarters. While Ms. Carrier deserves this heartfelt reception, another time and place would have been more appropriate. It was extremely uncomfortable and disconcerting for some of us attending or watching the meeting. Since I was preparing to present opposing views to Ms. Carrier, it made it seem like her testimony might hold more weight than mine or others with differing views.	Nadine Mort / Charles Glendinning	Noted. We can assure the community we are not playing favoritism because of Françoise's former role, as may be noted by Staff not agreeing with the requested increases in density or flexibility in design guidelines.

Chapter	Section	Recommendation	Testimony or Comments	Commenters	Staff Response
			Thank you to the Planning Staff for their outstanding and creative efforts. They joined together with the community in good faith for over a year to design a welcoming and environmentally sound rural village crossroads.	Spring Lawn Farm HOA / Nadine Mort	You are welcome.
			Any change to the master plan betrays the original intent and agreement between the county and residents.	Kevin & Anne O'Neil	Master Plans are typically updated either as the community changes, or as the recommendations become out of date, and are never intended to remain static for eternity. The current master plan is from 1998, but it replaced one from 1980, which was also a replacement for an even earlier plan from the 1960s. Most of the residents of the Ashton area have expressed a desire for Ashton to be improved, though how to achieve that remains in question. This requires a new plan.
			All these people that are longtime residents of this area sound a lot like NIMBYs: we're here now, nobody else can come. And a component of that is making housing units cost a certain amount of money which changes when you get into single-family.	Jeff Schwartz	Noted
			I took great exception to the comment of "NIMBY" by one of the call-ins. We want a more diverse population, but from Nichols' previous building projects, we don't find homes that cost well over half a million dollars to be establishing a proper "back yard" to attract the very people the community wants to see. I take exception to Jeff Schwartz referring to those who have been engaged for years if not decades in shaping the future of Ashton as NIMBYs. The Ashton residents have not adopted a NIMBY attitude toward development--most testifying acknowledged that change is inevitable and that development within Ashton cannot, nor should not, be stopped.	Charles Glendinning / Joe Hart / Robin Ziek / Walt Fennell	Noted.
			I embrace the hearing comments made by Doug Farquhar, Spring Lawn Farm HOA, Amy Medd, Paula and Charlie Glendinning and Nadine Mort.	Joe Hart	Noted.
			I couldn't disagree more with comments made by Jeff Schwartz, who doesn't like that Ashton and Sandy Spring have any value outside of being an economic engine for more development. Dan Snyder's comments supporting the proposed plan in its current form, as do his neighbors, may reflect some of his neighbors but it's not an accurate reflection of his neighborhood.	Joe Hart	Noted.
			I encourage the MNCPP to require that those of us who provide testimony in the future, either in writing or by verbal declaration at the point of testifying, declare whether they are an investor, or have any financial or other vested interest in the development or proposed plans that they are testifying on.	Joe Hart	Noted.
			You should all be ashamed of yourselves - Sell outs!	Justin Fishbein	Noted.
			Staff's Plan is wrong-headed and appears destined to create expensive and intractable problems for Montgomery County greater than any problems it purports to solve.	Linda Smoling Moore	Noted.