



**MCPB**  
**Item No. 7**  
**Date: 7/8/2021**

## Resolution of Adoption of the Approved Ashton Village Center Sector Plan

---



Jamey Pratt, Senior Planner, Upcounty Planning, [jamey.pratt@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:jamey.pratt@montgomeryplanning.org), 301-495-4588



Patrick Butler, Division Chief, Upcounty Planning, [patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org), 301-495-4561

**Completed 6/30/2021**

---

### Recommendation

Approve the Resolution of Adoption for transmission to the Full Commission.

### Summary

Attached for your review and approval is Montgomery County Planning Board Resolution Number 21-057 to adopt the *Ashton Village Center Sector Plan*. The Montgomery County Council, sitting as the District Council, approved the *Ashton Village Center Sector Plan* by Resolution Number 19-904 on June 15, 2021.

### Attachments:

1. Montgomery County Planning Board Resolution No. 21-057; M-NCPPC Resolution No. 21-18
2. Montgomery County Council Resolution No. 19-904



DRAFT RESOLUTION NOT ADOPTED

**MCPB NO. 21-057**

**M-NCPPC NO. 21-18**

**RESOLUTION**

WHEREAS, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, by virtue of the Land Use Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, is authorized and empowered, from time to time, to make and adopt, amend, extend and add to *The General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District Within Montgomery and Prince George's Counties*; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, pursuant to procedures set forth in the Montgomery County Code, Chapter 33A, held a duly advertised public hearing on September 17, 2020 on the Public Hearing Draft *Ashton Village Center Sector Plan*, being also an amendment to portions of the approved and adopted 1998 *Sandy Spring/Ashton Master Plan; The General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District Within Montgomery and Prince George's Counties*, as amended; the *Master Plan of Highways and Transitways*, as amended; and the *Bicycle Master Plan*, as amended; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Planning Board, after said public hearing and due deliberation and consideration, on December 3, 2020, approved the Planning Board Draft *Ashton Village Center Sector Plan*, recommended that it be approved by the District Council, and forwarded it to the County Executive for recommendations and analysis; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Executive reviewed and made recommendations on the Planning Board Draft *Ashton Village Center Sector Plan* and forwarded those recommendations to the District Council on March 1, 2021; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Executive provided a Fiscal Impact Analysis on the Planning Board Draft *Ashton Village Center Sector Plan* and forwarded that analysis to the District Council on March 26, 2021; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Council sitting as the District Council for the portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District lying within Montgomery County, held a public hearing on March 2, 2021, wherein testimony was received concerning the Planning Board Draft *Ashton Village Center Sector Plan*; and

WHEREAS, the District Council, on June 15, 2021 approved the Planning Board Draft *Ashton Village Center Sector Plan* subject to the modifications and revisions set forth in Resolution No. 19-904.

/s/ Delisa Coleman

Approved for legal sufficiency  
MNCPPC Office of the General  
Counsel



Resolution No.:	<u>19-904</u>
Introduced:	<u>June 15, 2021</u>
Adopted:	<u>June 15, 2021</u>

**COUNTY COUNCIL FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND  
SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PORTION  
OF THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTON REGIONAL DISTRICT  
WITHIN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND**

---

Lead Sponsor: County Council

---

**SUBJECT:** Approval of December 2020 Ashton Village Center Sector Plan

1. On January 11, 2021, the Montgomery County Planning Board transmitted to the County Executive and the County Council the December 2020 Planning Board Draft of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan.
2. The December 2020 Planning Board Draft of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan contains the text and supporting maps for an amendment to portions of the approved and adopted 1998 Sandy Spring/Ashton Master Plan, as amended. It also amends The General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, as amended; the Master Plan of Highways and Transitways, and the Bicycle Master Plan, as amended.
3. On March 2, 2021, the County Council held a virtual public hearing on the December 2020 Planning Board Draft of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan, which was referred to the Council's Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee for review and recommendations.
4. On March 26, 2021, the Office of Management and Budget transmitted to the County Council the County Executive's Fiscal Impact Statement for the December 2020 Planning Board Draft of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan.
5. On April 5, 2021 and April 19, 2021, the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee held work sessions to review the issues raised in connection with the December 2020 Planning Board Draft of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan.
6. On May 4, 2021, the County Council reviewed the December 2020 Planning Board Draft of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan and the recommendations of the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee.

### Action

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland, sitting as the District Council for that portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery County, Maryland, approves the following resolution:

The Ashton Village Center Sector Plan, dated December 2020, is approved with revisions. County Council revisions to the Planning Board Draft of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan are identified below. Deletions to the text of the Plan are indicated by [brackets], additions by underscoring. All page references are to the December 2020 Planning Board Draft of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan.

Page 37: Revise the eighth recommendation under “Community Design Recommendations” as follows:

8. 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. Taller buildings may also be located interior to a site to take advantage of natural grade and screening from other buildings, limiting their visibility from the main roads [(see Figure 4)].

Page 39: Delete the right half of Figure 4 and revise the Figure 4 caption as follows:

Figure 4. Existing building heights [(left) and maximum proposed building heights (right)] in the Village Core neighborhood and [surroundings, including suggested building heights for buildings in the southeast quadrant showing the tallest buildings in the interior of the quadrant and maintaining a transition along the state highways] surrounding areas. The building heights shown along Porter Road are for the approved Ashton Market development (M-NCPPC Site Plan No. 820180160).

Page 41: Revise “Table 1: Road Classifications” as follows:

Add a “Target Speed” column and assign each road in the table a target speed of 25 mph.

Include a footnote to the “ROW Width” column that states: “Reflects minimum right-of-way and may not include right-of-way needed for on-street parking and pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and stormwater management facilities.”

Page 56: Revise the first and second paragraphs under “Public Schools” as follows:

Ashton is served by Sherwood High School, William H. Farquhar Middle School, and Sherwood Elementary School. [A school cluster adequacy test for 2024] The most recent Growth and Infrastructure Preliminary FY2022 School Test shows that at the elementary, middle, and high school levels [in the Sherwood High School Cluster], an additional [142, 159, and 222] 50, 203, and 235 students, respectively, could be accommodated before

exceeding the [current program capacity] Tier 1 Utilization Premium Payment requirement.

[At an individual school level, Sherwood Elementary School would require an additional 120 students to reach the utilization rate that would trigger a residential building moratorium in the school's service area. William H. Farquhar Middle School is 238 students away from reaching a moratorium utilization rate.] Given the modest residential density increases included in this plan and analyzed in the Plan appendix, all school levels have sufficient capacity to accommodate the number of students that would be generated by the zoning recommended in this Plan.

Page 57: Revise the ninth recommendation under "Open Space Recommendations" as follows:

9. [Designate the] Consider the designation of proposed [public] open spaces [within] for inclusion in the Legacy Open Space Functional Master Plan.

Page 74: Revise the last paragraph as follows:

The southeast quadrant also presents the best opportunity for creating a new, meaningful public open space and gathering place. During the time of development, the open space requirements mandated by zoning should be clustered to create a publicly accessible green, ideally located to take advantage of the on-site environmental features while remaining accessible to the public. Woodlands and wetlands have been previously identified in the eastern part of the quadrant and should be protected during any development application. At the corner in front of the existing bank, large canopy trees serve as a landmark in Ashton and should be protected if possible. [Designation within] Potential designation for inclusion in the Legacy Open Space Functional Master Plan as important open spaces [will] would provide an additional [tools] tool to support the creation of these spaces.

Page 75: Revise the first full paragraph as follows:

In the southeast quadrant, the proposed zoning should be consistent with the other three quadrants at CRN-0.5 total FAR, but [the] with a maximum allowable height [is] of 45 feet instead of 35 feet. The additional 45-foot height [should] must be limited to buildings that [are interior to the site (to take advantage of the natural grade) and to buildings where the additional height helps to define a focal point that stands out from the rest of the block] do not front on MD 108 or MD 650. [In any event, the] The 45-foot maximum building height [should] must be applied selectively; this], taking advantage of natural grade where possible (see Figure 10). This maximum is not intended to apply across all new buildings in the quadrant [(see Figure 10)]. The BG&E property is an exception that should remain under its current zone, R-60.

Page 76: Modify Figure 10 to primarily show properties in the southeast quadrant and revise the text of the Figure 10 caption as follows:

Figure 10. [Maximum proposed building heights in the Village Core neighborhood and surroundings, including suggested] Suggested building heights for buildings in the southeast quadrant [showing the tallest buildings in the interior of the quadrant and maintaining a transition along the state highways], where the tallest buildings must not front on MD 108 or MD 650, and where building heights maintain a transition along MD 108 and MD 650 starting from the edge of the Village Core to the intersection of these roadways.

Page 89: Delete the third and fourth paragraphs under section “5.2.2.1 Building Types” as follows:

[With the exception of multi-use or general building types, new buildings along the two state roadways should be 80 feet or less in width to maintain a building massing that replicates the building forms found along MD 108 and MD 650. Multi-use and general buildings may be up to 120 feet wide along the state roads to accommodate mixed-use tenants, but if they are wider than 80 feet, they may only be built to the maximum allowed height for two thirds of the total building width, with the remainder of the building having a readily apparent transition in roofline or number of actual stories to reflect a change in scale to the structure. On non-state road street frontages, buildings should be no wider than 120 feet to remain compatible with the vision for Ashton.]

[Buildings may be deeper than their road frontage if the depth is not highly visible. Buildings at the recommended maximum width, or that are deeper than wide, should be carefully located to ensure that they are dispersed throughout the Village Core and not clustered in one area.]

Page 92: Insert the deleted third and fourth paragraphs under section “5.2.2.1 Building Types” after the first paragraph of section “5.2.2.3 Building Massing and Composition” as follows:

With the exception of multi-use or general building types, new buildings along the two state roadways should be 80 feet or less in width to maintain a building massing that replicates the building forms found along MD 108 and MD 650. Multi-use and general buildings may be up to 120 feet wide along the state roads to accommodate mixed-use tenants, but if they are wider than 80 feet, they may only be built to the maximum allowed height for two thirds of the total building width, with the remainder of the building having a readily apparent transition in roofline or number of actual stories to reflect a change in scale to the structure. On non-state road street frontages, buildings should be no wider than 120 feet to remain compatible with the vision for Ashton.

Buildings may be deeper than their road frontage if the depth is not highly visible. Buildings at the recommended maximum width, or that are deeper than wide, should be carefully located to ensure that they are dispersed throughout the Village Core and not clustered in one area.

Page 98: Revise the first sentence of the first guideline under section “5.4.1.1 Connection Elements” as follows:

1. Public/Private Streets - [The size of existing public rights-of-way] Existing pavement widths should not be expanded (except to provide on-street parking and in-road bikeways), ensuring that crossing distances are minimized for pedestrians and that drivers do not speed.

Page 103: Revise the first and second paragraphs under section “6.5 Implementation Advisory Committee” as follows:

This Plan supports the creation of an advisory group to address its implementation. The formation of any new advisory group should be staffed by the Planning Department in close coordination with the [Ashton Alliance] civic/neighborhood groups within the Ashton area.

This advisory group would work in coordination with [the Ashton Alliance (or successor group) and] the Regional Services Center that covers the area of a project by providing specific community and redevelopment expertise. It would also serve as an interface between community members, county agencies, and developers in implementing recommendations of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan. This new group should be structured to include representatives from the various constituencies interested in successful implementation of the Plan. Notification and participation in the development review process should occur at the earliest stage of the process.

Page 105: Revise “Lead Agency” in row seventeen of “Table 3. Capital Improvements Program” by replacing “MCDGS” with “M-NCPPC”.

### General

All illustrations and tables included in the Plan will be revised to reflect the District Council changes to the Planning Board Draft of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan (December 2020). The text and graphics will be revised as necessary to achieve and improve clarity and consistency, to update factual information, and to convey the actions of the District Council. Graphics and tables will be revised and re-numbered, where necessary, to be consistent with the text and titles.

This is a correct copy of Council action.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Selena Mendy Singleton, Esq.  
Clerk of the Council