

From: [Olsen Salazar, Kara](#)
To: [Margolies, Atara](#)
Cc: [Hisel-McCoy, Elza](#); [Warner, Ronnie](#)
Subject: RE: DGS comments - SSDDAC Public Hearing Draft
Date: Monday, December 13, 2021 4:50:53 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Atara,

I am writing with one correction on the email I sent you on Friday. For the former Silver Spring Library site, DGS requests zoning of CRN-1.5 H-65' with equivalent C and R values for those two County-owned parcels.

The rest of the message is correct. I revised the original email below in red text.

Thank you, and I apologize for the confusion.

Kara Olsen Salazar
Planning Specialist
Department of General Services
Office of Planning and Development
101 Monroe Street, 9th Floor, Rockville, Maryland 20850
M: 202.360.8274 O: 240.777.6144
Kara.OlsenSalazar@montgomerycountymd.gov
www.montgomerycountymd.gov/DGS

From: Olsen Salazar, Kara
Sent: Friday, December 10, 2021 5:12 PM
To: Atara.Margolies@montgomeryplanning.org
Cc: elza.hisel-mccoy@montgomeryplanning.org; Warner, Ronnie
<Ronnie.Warner@montgomerycountymd.gov>
Subject: DGS comments - SSDDAC Public Hearing Draft

Hello Atara,

Montgomery County's Department of General Services has reviewed the Public Hearing Draft of the Silver Spring Downtown and Adjacent Communities Master Plan. We have two comments.

Our first comment is related to the two County-owned parcels that are the former Silver Spring Library (Tax IDs 13-00971462 and 13-00972821). Looking at Figure 13 on page 51 and Map 13 on page 52, it could be inferred that the County property and Ellsworth Park are under single ownership. We would like the two County parcels differentiated from the park so that it is clear that it is not an M-NCPPC property.

A redevelopment of the property as a child care center is planned, but the County purposefully retained ownership, not knowing what the future would bring. Therefore we would like zoning more aligned with the properties to the southwest. Our property can be the transition between the CR 3.0 100' property (Colesville Towers) and Ellsworth Park. For any future redevelopment of the property, height compatibility will be required. The abutting uses in zones with compatibility standards are non-residential, and the confronting uses across Colesville Road are non-residential. We request zoning of CRN ~~2.0 75'~~ 1.5 65' with equivalent C and R values.

The second comment relates to parks/open space that have been identified incorrectly as County owned. On page 70 of the draft, Map 18: Existing Parks and Open Space identifies five parks as "County-owned Parks," but three of these are not County-owned: South Region Aquatic & Recreation Center, Montgomery College Plaza, and Montgomery College Community Garden. Also, the name should be corrected to "South County Regional Recreation and Aquatic Center."

Thanks very much.

Kara Olsen Salazar
Planning Specialist
Department of General Services
Office of Planning and Development
101 Monroe Street, 9th Floor, Rockville, Maryland 20850
M: 202.360.8274 O: 240.777.6144
Kara.OlsenSalazar@montgomerycountymd.gov
www.montgomerycountymd.gov/DGS



For COVID-19 Information and resources, visit:
www.montgomerycountymd.gov/COVID19

Marc Elrich
County Executive



Christopher R. Conklin
Director

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

MEMORANDUM

December 10, 2021

TO: Casey Anderson, Chair
Planning Board

FROM: Hannah Henn, Deputy Director for Transportation Policy
Department of Transportation (MCDOT)

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Hannah Henn", is written over the printed name and title.

SUBJECT: Silver Spring Downtown and Adjacent Communities Plan
Public Hearing Draft – MCDOT Comments

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Fall 2021 Public Hearing Draft for the Silver Spring Downtown and Adjacent Communities Plan (“the Plan”). We strongly support the vision of the Plan and believe Silver Spring has the potential to become a renowned example of infrastructure centered on pedestrians, bicycling, and transit but are concerned that the Plan’s recommendations do not adequately support the intended vision.

The comments below summarize MCDOT’s most significant concerns related to the ability to achieve the Plan’s vision. Many of these comments have been made previously by our staff as they coordinated with Planning staff throughout the year. Footnotes in this memo are used to reference comments in our detailed technical comments which we plan to transmit to you on Monday, December 13. I will note there are a significant number of detailed comments, and our staff are, as always, available to assist in discussing these comments further as your staff considers modifications to the draft.

- 1) **Transportation Analysis:** We look forward to reviewing the transportation analysis when it becomes available. Our interests will be focused on how the Plan achieves the metrics defined by the Growth & Infrastructure Policy, including how the Plan furthers Vision Zero efforts.

- 2) **Transportation Vision:** During the scoping process MCDOT had suggested that the Plan incorporate a more widespread and systemic approach to shared streets. As a result, we were surprised to find that the Plan did not appear to include any shared streets at all and, in fact, appears to revert Ellsworth Drive into a more conventional street.¹¹⁰ Similarly, most of the new street connections proposed also appear to be proposed as conventional streets, as opposed to shared streets or pedestrian/bicycle connections.¹¹¹ The Plan would also benefit from additional connections, such as a pedestrian/bicycle promenade or shared street parallel to East-West Highway.⁵⁷

There does not appear to be a narrative addressing the existing reversible/dynamic lanes along Colesville Road,¹¹⁸ and conflicting information makes it unclear whether transit lanes are proposed in lieu of these reversible lanes.¹³⁰ A road diet appears to be proposed along most of 16th Street but stops short of including a road diet along the segment south of East-West Highway. MDOT SHA has previously demonstrated interest in reducing this other segment, and the Plan misses that potential opportunity.¹³⁶

- 3) **Thrive:** Several key components proposed as part of the parallel Thrive Montgomery 2050 effort are notably missing from the Plan. There does not appear to be any reference to Complete Communities. Are there important land use types that are not currently available to the Plan area? And how would the Plan propose to achieve these?⁶⁷

Thrive's Action List of Resources includes recommendations to develop an alley network, yet, apart from one proposed alley, the Plan does not appear to include any significant proposal on how to achieve a stronger alley network in Silver Spring, nor account for existing alleys and needs.¹¹²

The Plan also does not appear to include any information on the watersheds' drainage structures and the increasing frequency of Design-Year Storms, which would be a good fit for the "Resilient Downtown" section and align with Thrive's efforts toward climate resiliency.¹⁶²

- 4) **Parking & Freight:** With only one page covering both Parking and Loading, the Plan does not provide enough information on potentially important and transformative components of achieving the vision.

Instead of impediments to the urban vision, Parking Lot District assets should be used as tools that can enable this plan to push more apparent actions toward constraining the parking supply. Possible examples include site design requirements to screen parking or situate it below grade, or parking maximums.¹⁵⁶

The Plan should consider how curbside strategies might affect development design, as well as how development design might affect curbside strategies. It would be helpful to include additional guidance on how to optimally implement Urban Consolidation Centers / micro-distribution centers.¹⁵⁷

- 5) **Rights-of-Way:** MCDOT will need to work with the Planning team to identify which segments need to be considered more closely to ensure that they can accommodate all new infrastructure proposed since the 2000 Silver Spring CBD Plan, including new infrastructure proposed by this plan (such as green infrastructure and café seating), the Bicycle Master Plan, and any other plans can fit within the master planned rights-of-way under the guidance proposed by the Complete Street Design Guide.^{18,19,86,124,142,163} MCDOT's detailed comments include a number of suggestions on how to improve the specific cross-sections provided in the Plan to better reflect Complete Streets.^{109,124,146,148,149,151,152,154}

Additionally, there are several street segments that do not have rights-of-way assigned.^{143,145} A map of rights-of-way (as was included in the 2000 Plan) would be helpful to make this information easier to understand and access in a useful way.¹²⁵

- 6) **Transit:** Considering the opportunities of the Plan area, we believe the transit section should be expanded, ideally including a map focused on transit services serving Silver Spring.¹⁰³ It should include recommendations for increased MARC service as well as recommendations on how the Plan might make the best use of the Purple Line.¹⁰⁴ This section should provide more information on buses, particularly regional and commuter buses.¹⁰⁵ Information currently included about connections to Walter Reed is confusing, does not reflect past discussions MCDOT has had with Planning staff, and would benefit from greater clarity of the purpose and need for what is proposed. Improving Metrobus service may be a more effective means of connecting to Walter Reed than providing new County bus services.¹⁰⁸

- 7) **Infill Metrorail Station:** If an infill Metrorail Station is proposed by Jesup Blair Park, the Plan must make a more overt effort toward seeing this station realized. Right-of-way needs should be identified, and intention to substantially increase densities in the vicinity of the proposed station should be clarified.¹¹⁷ This proposal should also be mentioned in the Transit section instead of the Roadways section.¹¹⁶ Without a much stronger effort to justify this station, it is unlikely that it would ever be realized.
- 8) **Utilities:** There are few substantive references to utilities in the Plan. The Plan should establish a vision for utilities, such as whether they're envisioned to be above or below ground, where in a street cross-section they are envisioned, what conditions might be set upon new developments, and what the current and forecast needs are.⁶⁸
- 9) **Connectivity & Infrastructure Fund; UMP:** There are multiple references to a Connectivity & Infrastructure Fund without any apparent elaboration on what this fund is, who administers it, what specific projects it can be used for, etc. It is unclear whether this concept is complementary to, or if it replaces the Unified Mobility Program (UMP).¹⁷²

MCDOT reiterates our interest that the Plan concurrently establish an UMP for the project area to maximize potential funding resources to support implementation of the Plan. We believe the Plan will have identified all needed infrastructure for the Plan area, and it should be able to enact an UMP with the information already at-hand. Implementing this UMP concurrent with the master plan may avoid some of the implementation challenges previously experienced in White Oak and Bethesda.¹⁷³

- 10) **Conflicting Information:** The Plan includes conflicting information in a number of areas, perhaps most notably regarding transit lanes. While the narrative strongly establishes an interest in transit lanes, the Streets Table does not recommend any new transit lanes at all,¹³⁰ and the one cross-section showing transit lanes only shows a single non-reversible lane in one direction.¹⁰⁹

Similarly, a cross-section of East-West Highway shows a road diet but the Streets Table does not show any such road diets.¹³⁵ Inversely, the Plan appears to paint a vision for narrower streets, yet it appears to propose a widening of Spring Street from 2 to 4 lanes without any narrative supporting this recommendation.^{134,137}

The Bike Map and the Green Loop Map do not match.⁹¹ One street where they do not match is along Eastern Avenue NW. While it is a District-owned roadway, we feel a bikeway connection here has such potential benefits that the Plan might be justified in recommending a bikeway as a matter of advocacy for the District's consideration.^{17,92}

- 11) **Height Limits, FARs:** Please consider increasing or eliminating height and FAR restrictions, or perhaps do so in a limited capacity in areas more central to the downtown core.² We specifically urge that this change be considered for all public properties to speed implementing redevelopments and associated improvements on such sites.³
- 12) **Railway Crossings:** We strongly urge a connection linking Apple Avenue with North/East Falkland Lane.⁶⁴ This and the other new connection proposed across the railroad tracks should allow for construction either above or below the tracks²³ and should include language as to how these connections might be implemented as part of private developments.²⁴ Consider also an extension of the Silver Spring Metrorail's south mezzanine to cross over the railroad tracks to provide direct connectivity with the MARC platforms and improve any connections not included in the Purple Line project.²⁵
- 13) **ADA Accessibility:** The Plan should include more detailed information related to improving access for persons with disabilities.^{83,97,100}
- 14) **Blair Road:** The recommendations to close or restrict Blair Road need refinement. Our detailed comments include suggestions that may better achieve the Plan's apparent goals.¹¹⁵
- 15) **CIP Table:** The Capital Improvement Program table appears to be missing a substantial number of projects. MCDOT review identified most of the missing transportation projects, though there are many non-transportation projects that we did not include in our comments but also appear to be missing from the CIP Table.^{177,178,179,180}

Should you have any questions regarding our comments on the Plan, please feel free to contact me or Mr. Andrew Bossi, Senior Engineer, at andrew.bossi@montgomerycountymd.gov.

HH:AB

cc: Chris Conklin, MCDOT
Gary Erenrich, MCDOT
Andrew Bossi, MCDOT
Meredith Wellington, CEX

Email

Silver Spring Sector Plan

Owner

 Case...







Email

From

 Tim Eden

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  Casey Anderson;  Casey Anderson;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

 Gwen Wright;  Gwen Wright;  Gwen Wright;  Kominers, William;  Robert Kronenberg;  Robert.Kronenberg@montgomeryplanning.org

Bcc

Subject

Silver Spring Sector Plan

Date Sent

Date Received

12/20/2021 4:18 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Members of the Planning Board

The Staff Working Draft for the Silver Spring Sector Plan includes recommendations for height and density that are inconsistent and unequitable. Our site at 8600 Georgia is recommended for 200 feet and a 5.0 FAR when surrounding properties are recommended for 240 feet and a 8.0 FAR. It was noted in the hearing last week that our site is one of the few in the Metro District that is planned for redevelopment, yet we are not being treated equally with our neighbors and will be subject to additional fees or other requirements to gain the height and density we need for economic feasibility. Simply put, we cannot afford such additional costs and it appears that we are being subjected to additional fees because we are prepared to move forward with development.

For example, the most recent discussion shows our site at 200 feet, with 150% allowed (up to 300 feet) by meeting site plan conditions like capital improvements, affordable housing and infrastructure fees, all of which are undefined. For additional density, a fee of \$5-7/sf is being proposed. To build out the site, we would need another 165,000 sf for maybe \$6/sf that would be \$990,000 that our neighbor would not pay, and that is unfair. Another proposed extraction would be an increase from 15% to 25% mpdus in exchange for additional height that would be an enormous burden. Another 10% on 350 units would be 35 units at a loss of \$225,000 sf each for an extra cost burden (loss) of \$7,875,000!

We also note how the Board dramatically changed height for the WMATA site and the surrounding sites to 300 feet at the hearing for a variety of good reasons, and we are only 400 feet away at the prominent corner of Georgia and Colesville. We should be treated equally in the Metro District.

As stated in the Working Draft:

“The sector plan land use recommendations:

- **promote a diverse mix of housing types throughout the Plan area, with an estimated 11,000 new multifamily residential units in the downtown;**
- **incentivize approximately 44,000 jobs in downtown Silver Spring, a 50% increase from what is currently existing; and**
- **forecast up to 46,300 people, double the existing population within the Plan area.”**

This an ambitious growth plan that proposes incentives for developers to proceed with large, risky construction projects in the CBD. We are proposing to proceed immediately with construction, unlike any other site in the Metro District. We ask that you reconsider our request for a base density of 240 feet and 8.0 FAR consistent with neighboring properties, and not unfairly disincentivize our site that would further delay development.

We also note that WSSC is not referenced in the Working Draft that should state that WSSC has placed a moratorium on development in the Metro District, and that Council funding is required to upgrade infrastructure.


Thank you.

**Tim Eden
Starr Capital LLC
4800 Hampden Lane, Suite 200
Bethesda, MD 20814**

**240-842-1388 office
240-338-4836 cell**

www.starrcapital.com

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
		
There are no Attachments to show in this view. To get started, create one or more Attachments.		
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		Page 1

Email

SSDAC Plan - opposition to...

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 abrookhart

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  County Council;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

SSDAC Plan - opposition to proposed expanded boundary

Date Sent

Date Received

12/21/2021 1:28 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

To the Chair and Members of the Montgomery Planning Board:

I am writing as a resident of the Woodside neighborhood to express my strong opposition to the proposed expansion of the northern boundary of downtown Silver Spring into Woodside.

There is no persuasive reason to expand the downtown master plan boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside. Staff has made no findings of necessity or positive impact from the expansion and the objectives first outlined by Commissioner Verma for exploring an expansion of the downtown area will be addressed county-wide by the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative.

I therefore ask that the Commissioners remove from the plan any depiction of an expanded boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside and maintain the current plan boundary.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Best,

Amy Brookhart

8825 1st Ave

Silver Spring, MD 20910

Attachments

File Name

File Size (Bytes)





0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)

Page 1

Email

Woodside boundaries

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 Amy H

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Woodside boundaries

Date Sent

Date Received

12/19/2021 1:41 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear Planning Board Chair & Commissioners:

I write as a resident of Woodside to oppose to expansiin of the downtown master plan boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside. There has been no data or evidence of positive impact of this expansion and this is entirely separate from the changes to be addressed county-wide by the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative.


I respectfully request that the Commissioners remove from the plan any expanded boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside and maintain the current plan boundary.

Thank you,

Amy Harfeld

1714 Noyes Lane

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	

Email

IN FAVOR of Expansion of ...

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 [Anthony O Farrell](#)

To

 <[MCP-Chair MCP-Chair](#)>;  [MCP-Chair #](#);  [MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org](#)

Cc

 [County Council](#)

Bcc

Subject

IN FAVOR of Expansion of Downtown Silver Spring

Date Sent

Date Received

12/19/2021 11:02 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear Planning Board Chair & Commissioners


Please do proceed with the expansion of the Silver Spring town boundary into Woodside. There is no good reason to artificially limit denser development in a neighbourhood with walkable access to metro. If development is restricted here then it will simply happen elsewhere further out in the exurbs outside the beltway resulting in more traffic, more sprawl, and more pollution.

Please allow the upzoning to be mixed use CR and not just denser housing. Thriving walkable communities have corner shops, cafes, daycare, and other small businesses interspersed with housing.

--

Anthony O'Farrell
1611 Noyes Dr

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		
Page 1		

Email

Expansion of downtown m...

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 barbarasosnick@aol.com

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  County Council;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

 woodside@groups.io

Bcc

Subject

Expansion of downtown master plan boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside

Date Sent

Date Received

12/19/2021 10:11 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

My family and I have lived in Woodside for almost 30 years. We object very strongly to the downtown master plan boundary expanding 2 blocks north of Spring Street into Woodside.

(1) There is no concrete basis set forth in any of the planning documents to do so.

(2) If the County is to value diversity of housing, then single family residential neighborhoods should not be obliterated. Our neighborhoods are not "downtown," and should not be treated as such.

(3) Encroachment of urbanization is not "compatible" with single family residential neighborhoods. If folks desire urbanization, they need look no further than the other side of Spring Street, the thousands of high rises in the existing downtown, and the District of Columbia, which is adjacent to Silver Spring. Ironically, many of the DC neighborhoods that abut Silver Spring are less dense and less urban than downtown Silver Spring, despite DC being a city.

(4) The ramifications of moving towards greater density in the master plan seem to have not been well considered, including, but not limited to, increased traffic on already congested roads, and the burden upon already overcrowded schools.

(5) Woodside is a gem, and our lovely neighborhood streets are a joy to many, strolling, walking dogs, greeting neighbors, enjoyed by both residents and visitors who traverse our streets from adjoining areas.

(6) The Planning Board and the Council should respect the wishes of the majority of residents who oppose such an expansion of the master plan boundary north of Spring Street.

Thanks so much.

barbarasosnick@aol.com

Attachments

File Name

File Size (Bytes)



There are no Attachments to show in this view. To get started, create one or more Attachments.

0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)

Page 1

Email

Thursday Planning Board ...

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 LISA Bontempo

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  County Council;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Thursday Planning Board Meeting - no need to expand Downtown Silver Spring into Woodside

Date Sent

Date Received

12/21/2021 5:59 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Planning Commission/County Commissioners:

I've been a resident of Woodside since 1999. I have enjoyed watching the revival of downtown Silver Spring. It has made a huge difference for the businesses who hung in there through years of downturn, the new businesses who moved in, the lives of downtown residents, of adjacent neighborhoods and Montgomery County.

However, no persuasive reason to expand the downtown master plan boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside has ever been made by the Commission or any Council member. In fact, the more some try to make the case, the more absurd the idea seems. Given downtown Silver Spring is still undergoing growing pains brought on by the pandemic that appear far from resolved, high vacancy rates in both business and living space are clear signs this is an idea that is at best not ready for prime-times at worst is a disaster in the making.

Furthermore, staff has made no findings of necessity or positive impact from the expansion and the objectives first outlined by Commissioner Verma for exploring an expansion of the downtown area. So if staff does not think this is a good idea, what is it the Commission knows that they have not told the community? I am anxious to hear.

I therefore request that the Commissioners remove from the plan any depiction of an expanded boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside and maintain the current plan boundary.

Of note: if the staff and Commission and Council members have not read Jane Jacobs "The Death and Life of Great American Cities" they should as it makes a very persuasive argument against modern planning. Worth your time.

Thank you.

Bill Pierce

8910 1st Ave (Woodside)

Silver Spring, MD 20910

301-650-0045

Attachments

<div><div></div><div>File Name</div></div>		<div><div></div><div>File Size (Bytes)</div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div></div>
<div><div></div><div></div></div> <div>There are no Attachments to show in this view. To get started, create one or more Attachments.</div>			
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		Page 1	

Email

Why I am opposed to Woo...

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 Bruce Lawson

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Why I am opposed to Woodside being included in Silver Spring Downtown & Adjacent Communities (SSDAC) Plan Boundary Change

Date Sent

Date Received

12/21/2021 7:26 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear Planning Board Chair, Planning Board Commissioners, and County Council Members:

If approved and implemented, the proposed planned, forced annexation and zoning of the adjacent community of Woodside (north of Spring Street) as proposed in Silver Spring Adjacent Communities Plan (SSDAC) is an authoritarian abuse of power. Our community has been unjustly targeted, to be made an example, and experimented upon by younger, biased, urbanist planners, zoning activists, some aspiring politicians, and crony capitalist developers who have little regard for our community made up of racially diverse homeowners.

To succeed in their endeavor to forcefully rezone Woodside, the above-mentioned groups embraced a false, inaccurate narrative that used race-mongering, intimidation tactics that motivated activists and fomented racial and social division by demonizing Woodside single-family homeowners. Some zoning activists wrongly called Woodside a “gated community”, exclusive, white, rich and racist. Activist propaganda articles misused out-of-date data (8 to 12 + years old) that when researched carefully, warned that the database they used could not, and should not, be fairly applied to a small area like Woodside. Why? Because, it would not be accurate. This did not stop activists from pursuing their agenda. This race baiting campaign using a false narrative to demonize and socially intimidate single-family homeowners into submission is mean-spirited and despicable and should not be tolerated or sanctioned by government officials.

My mixed race family lives in Woodside on the edge of the Adjacent Community. Including my home, I count at least 16 families living within one block of my house that have owners or co-owners who are non-white minorities. My African American neighbor and friend to the left of my home, lived here for 55 years, and raised his family here. My African American neighbors behind my home have owned their

home for over 10 years. The neighbors diagonally across the street are African American. My neighbors to the right of my home include a multi-generational family originating from Pakistan and have lived in their home over 10 years. This fact and truth do not conveniently fit the false narrative created by zoning activists and Planning Board members justification for rezoning Woodside.

Our neighborhood is racially and socially diverse and has some of the most affordable small single-family homes inside the Beltway. Contrary to activist claims we have allowed 'missing middle' homes to be built in our community. There are also many affordable small single-family homes on small lots that many first-time homeowners aspire to.

The Planning Board and County Council should not allow the demonization of single-family homeowners to force an unwanted boundary and zoning change onto our neighborhood. Most families, regardless of race, particularly those with children and extended family members, prefer single family homes with safe space for their children to play. Contrary to the false narrative created by developer-financed zoning activists, my family installed a fence and gates to keep my children safe from getting run over by cars, and not to keep people out.

Many of us from Woodside believe that green cover with trees that produce oxygen, and consume carbon dioxide, are good for the environment, the climate and our families' health and well-being. The fact is that in-fill and densification will have negative unintended consequences being ignored by young activists. As a life-long environmentalist, I know that urbanization with reduced green cover creates climate hot spots that contribute to climate warming. Also, by 2050 most people will be driving electric vehicles which should alleviate some environmental concerns.

Forced zoning of our neighborhood is an abuse of our liberty and will only benefit the greedy, crony capitalist developers, real estate investors, opportunistic aspiring politicians, and self-aggrandizing activists. Contrary to the false narrative and misused out-of-date social data you may have heard from activists, there are a growing number of minority-owned homes in the Woodside neighborhood with children and extended family members and they should have the right to live in peace without the harassment of activists and misguided county officials. Activists need to stop punishing the wrong people. The people responsible for red lining died a long time ago. I have spoken with most of my minority neighbors and none of them or my family were prevented from buying homes or living in Woodside because of race.

There is no persuasive reason to expand the downtown master plan boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside. Staff has made no findings of necessity or positive impact from the expansion. The objectives first outlined by Commissioner Verma for exploring an expansion of the downtown area will be addressed county-wide by the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative.


I therefore request that the Commissioners remove from the plan any depiction of an expanded boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside and maintain the current plan boundary.

Sincerely,

Bruce Lawson
8800 2nd Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
---------------------------	-----------------------------------	---



There are no Attachments to show in this view. To get started, create one or more Attachments.

0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)

Page 1

Email

Don't break up Woodside

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 Christine Burgess

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  County Council;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Don't break up Woodside

Date Sent

Date Received

12/20/2021 9:03 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear Planning Board Chair & Commissioners:

There is no good reason to expand the downtown master plan boundary north of Spring Street into the Woodside neighborhood. Staff has made no findings of necessity or positive impact from the expansion and the objectives first outlined by Commissioner Verma for exploring an expansion of the downtown area will be addressed county-wide by the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative.

I therefore request that the Commissioners remove from the plan any depiction of an expanded boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside and maintain the current plan boundary.

Thank you,

Christine Burgess

1605 Wilson Place

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		
		Page 1

Email

SSDAC - Hearing Dec. 23

Owner

 MCP...




Email

From

 erobelen@aol.com

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  [County Council](#);  [MCP-Chair #](#);  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

SSDAC - Hearing Dec. 23

Date Sent

Date Received

12/22/2021 2:32 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear Planning Board Chair & Commissioners and Council Members:

There is no persuasive reason to expand the Silver Spring Downtown master plan boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside. Staff has made no findings of necessity or positive impact from the expansion. The objectives first outlined by Commissioner Verma for exploring an expansion of the downtown area will be addressed county-wide by the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative.

I therefore strongly urge the Commissioners to remove from the downtown master plan any depiction of an expanded boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside and maintain the current plan boundary.

Elizabeth Robelen
Silver Spring
erobelen@aol.com

Sent from the all new AOL app for Android

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		
		Page 1

Email

Expansion of the downtow...

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 [Ellen Sands](#)

To

 <[MCP-Chair MCP-Chair](#)>;  [County Council](#);  [Ellen Sands](#);  [MCP-Chair #](#);
 [MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org](#)

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Expansion of the downtown plan boundary into Woodside

Date Sent

Date Received

12/20/2021 12:43 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear Chair Anderson and the Commissioners of the Planning Board:

I am writing in advance of this Thursday's Planning Board meeting to request that the two-block portion of the Woodside community currently proposed for inclusion within an expanded "downtown" boundary be removed from the plan and that the boundary remain at Spring Street.

The housing goals stated as reason for the expansion will be addressed by Thrive 2050 and the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative. It is therefore unnecessary to expand the boundary. The Woodside community should remain intact and the boundary should remain at Spring Street. thank you for your time,

Respectfully,
Ellen Sands
1608 North Springwood Drive

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		
		Page 1

Email

Woodside

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 Evan Gordon

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Woodside

Date Sent

Date Received

12/20/2021 1:14 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear Planning Board Chair & Commissioners:


There is no persuasive reason to expand the downtown master plan boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside. Staff has made no findings of necessity or positive impact from the expansion and the objectives first outlined by Commissioner Verma for exploring an expansion of the downtown area will be addressed county-wide by the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative.

I therefore request that the Commissioners remove from the plan any depiction of an expanded boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside and maintain the current plan boundary.

Evan Gordon

585-469-1328

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		
		Page 1

Email

Adjacent Community Ann...

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 Janet Silva

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Adjacent Community Annexation into the Woodside Neighborhood - Dec. 23 Meeting

Date Sent

Date Received

12/20/2021 9:43 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

To the Planning Board:

As a resident effected by the Adjacent Community Annexation, I have been following reports on this topic since I first became aware of it in February 2021. It has never been shown that there is a tangible reason or benefit to expand downtown into Woodside. The 4 lane Spring Street is a clean boundary that distinguishes downtown from Woodside with associated vehicle and pedestrian traffic patterns to get from one place to another. As a practical matter, Ballard Street does not provide easier access to the amenities that people are walking/driving to. The boundary change simply would be a line on a map that makes no sense to residents or commuters. Many of the most affordable homes in Woodside are in the 2 block "Adjacent Community" designation and I would add, the home owners are diverse by race, age and religion. The annexation has the potential to impact property taxes based on what side of a residential street you live on. This annexation plan has no purpose and artificially breaks up the neighborhood.

The adjacent community annexation should be eliminated.


Sincerely,

Janet Silva

1502 Ballard Street

240-475-7551

Attachments

File Name		File Size (Bytes)	
<div></div> <div>There are no Attachments to show in this view. To get started, create one or more Attachments.</div>			
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		Page 1	

Email

Request to remove Adjace...

Owner

 MCP...




Email

From

 Joan Warren

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  County Council;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Request to remove Adjacent Communities from the Downtown Silver Spring Master Plan

Date Sent

Date Received

12/20/2021 9:49 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear County Council Members and Members of the Montgomery County Planning Board:

I am a longtime resident of Silver Spring. I am writing about the inclusion of a 2 block area residential area in the Woodside community into the Downtown Silver Spring. From the inception, there has been no clearly explained rationale for the inclusion of this fragment of Woodside into the downtown of Silver Spring. The Planning Board staff did not recommend such an expansion when the Master Plan was discussed in June 2020. The Planning Board members added plans to rezone parts of Woodside without any clear cut reason. In addition, the development of the Attainable Housing Strategies Initiative will include all of Woodside. This renders redundant plans to include a subset of Woodside in the SSDAC. Therefore I request that the Commissioners remove from the plan any depiction of an expanded boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside and maintain the current plan boundary.

Thank you.

Joan Warren

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		
		Page 1

Email

DTSS Boundary

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 Kerry Korpi

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

DTSS Boundary

Date Sent

Date Received

12/20/2021 2:11 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

I live in Woodside and ask that you reconsider the plan to redraw the DTSS boundary to include part of Woodside north of Spring Street. The original rationale, to expand missing middle housing, is now moot given AHSI and Thrive. Please leave the Woodside boundary intact

Thank you


Kerry Korpi

8913 First Avenue

Sent from my iPad

My name is Kerry. If this says Merry it's because gmail decided to rename me

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
		
There are no Attachments to show in this view. To get started, create one or more Attachments.		

Email

Expansion of boundary for...

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 Kristin SK

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Expansion of boundary for Downtown Silver Spring

Date Sent

Date Received

12/20/2021 8:47 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

I would like to start off by thanking you all for your hard work. Being on the Board can, no doubt, be challenging. There are many viewpoints to consider, often with valid points on all sides. I have generally supported the Board's work, even when it hit close to home with repeated submissions to the planning board for approval for work to our home. Alas, now is the time I am finding the need to be one of those voices with a strong viewpoint.


There is no persuasive reason to expand the downtown master plan boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside. Staff has made no findings of necessity or positive impact from this proposed expansion. Add to it that the objectives for doing this laser-focused annexation are going to be rendered virtually meaningless by the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative. At the presentation of the downtown plan on March 26, 2020, staff did not recommend expansion of the current downtown boundaries into the abutting residential neighborhoods, stating (at 5:58:00) "All of the observations that we've already mentioned have led the team to recommend that the boundary for this sector plan maintain the boundary from the 2000 CBD plan." [except for the St. Michael's parcel identified in the staff report]. The request to explore expanding the boundary came from Commissioner Verma, (at 6:33:28): "My proposal is that we review the boundaries to incorporate single family homes within a certain walking distance [to the metro] that we view has [sic] an impact on what we're trying to achieve with the Silver Spring plan". During the listening sessions, when asked why any expansion into Woodside was being considered, when a) there is a 20% office vacancy rate in the current downtown and b) the "opportunity zones" identified by staff just between Fenwick and Spring Streets are comparable in area to what the expansion into Woodside would capture, staff responded that "Plan boundary decisions... simply allow us to study and include certain areas within our plan recommendations..." (from the draft plan). Now the study is complete- and staff still is not recommending any zoning changes for the area within the proposed expanded boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside. There is just no compelling reason yet presented that makes a case for this annexation. This seems like a misguided attempt to respond to a suggestion made years ago that is no longer relevant given other initiatives proposed, current vacancy rates in the downtown area, and unknowns surrounding the pandemic. It also completely disregards the Board's own staff recommendations.

I request that the Commissioners heed staff recommendation and remove from the plan any depiction of an expanded boundary north of Spring Street. The much more expansive and relevant zoning objectives will be addressed county-wide by the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative. Time and resources would be much better spent focusing on making that the focus of your efforts.

Sincerely,

Kristin Kenausis

Attachments

File Name		File Size (Bytes)	
<div></div> <div>There are no Attachments to show in this view. To get started, create one or more Attachments.</div>			
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		Page 1	

Email

Downtown Master Plan

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 Leigh Lambert

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Downtown Master Plan

Date Sent

Date Received

12/19/2021 3:38 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear Planning Board Chair & Commissioners:

There is no persuasive reason to expand the downtown master plan boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside. Staff has made no findings of necessity or positive impact from the expansion and the objectives first outlined by Commissioner Verma for exploring an expansion of the downtown area will be addressed county-wide by the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative.

I therefore request that the Commissioners remove from the plan any depiction of an expanded boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside and maintain the current plan boundary.

Sincerely,
Leigh Lambert
8803 2nd Ave.
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		
		Page 1

Email

Expansion of downtown m...

Owner

 MCP...




Email

From

 marcieplusart@gmail.com

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  County Council;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Expansion of downtown master plan boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside

Date Sent

Date Received

12/19/2021 2:37 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

We have lived in Woodside since 1984 and have enjoyed a quiet, friendly neighborhood, along with the convenience of living close-in to an urban area along with easy access to the metro. The proposed expansion of the downtown master plan into the Woodside neighborhood, North of Spring St, where there are single family homes with modest land around the homes, seems like it would add to the density of the neighborhood with additional congestion.

There is no persuasive reason to expand the downtown master plan boundary North of Spring ST into Woodside. Staff has made no findings of necessity or positive impact from the expansion and the objectives first outlined by Commissioner Verma for exploring an expansion of the downtown area will be addressed county-wide by the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative.

I therefore request that the Commissioners remove from the plan any depiction of an expanded boundary North of Spring ST into Woodside and maintain the current plan boundary.

Thank you,

David Hubbard & Marcie Wolf-Hubbard

Marcie Wolf-Hubbard
Visual Artist & Teaching Artist
Art, Exhibits & Classes

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		
		Page 1

Email

SSDAC and AHSI

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 [Marlene Slatkin](#)

To

 <[MCP-Chair MCP-Chair](#)>;  [MCP-Chair #](#);  [MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org](#)

Cc

Bcc

Subject

SSDAC and AHSI

Date Sent

Date Received

12/21/2021 2:07 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Mr. Anderson:

Having been a resident of Silver Spring for over 50 years, almost 30 of them in Woodside, I have seen the slow but persistent evolution of downtown to its current desirable and expanding community. Of course, Metro has been one of the main driving forces in this vibrant area.


As the planning board is now looking to the future, with the tools for the downtown and adjacent communities plan, and the attainable housing strategies, my Woodside neighborhood is particularly concerned. There are issues of more traffic, storm water concerns, green spaces and developer driven zoning changes that will impact our neighborhood most significantly.

We are aware of hundreds of acres of available space in the CBD which could be used for housing and other attendant services to the community. Woodside is supporting the building of attainable housing on the present HHS site in our community, as well as the housing to be developed in conjunction with the purple line station, also connected to our neighborhood. At present, it is my hope that the planning board will take advantage of all of the above-mentioned space before deciding that it is necessary to extend into our neighborhood. I can certainly envision more missing middle housing in our community at some point, but hope you will not start there. As you are aware, we are already at 27% with two townhouse developments.

Thank you and the board members for your consideration.

Marlene Slatkin

Attachments

File Name		File Size (Bytes)	
<div></div> <div>There are no Attachments to show in this view. To get started, create one or more Attachments.</div>			
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)			Page 1

Email

Thrive Montgomery

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 Michael Bauer

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Thrive Montgomery

Date Sent

Date Received

12/19/2021 11:22 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear Planning Board Chair & Commissioners:

There is no persuasive reason to expand the downtown master plan boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside. Staff has made no findings of necessity or positive impact from the expansion and the objectives first outlined by Commissioner Verma for exploring an expansion of the downtown area will be addressed county-wide by the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative.

I therefore request that the Commissioners remove from the plan any depiction of an expanded boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside and maintain the current plan boundary.

Sincerely,

Michael C. Bauer, DDS

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		
		Page 1

Email

SS downtown boundary

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 dchristie@starpower.net

To

 <[MCP-Chair MCP-Chair](#)>;  [MCP-Chair #](#);  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

SS downtown boundary

Date Sent

Date Received

12/20/2021 10:54 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.


Dear Planning Board Chair & Commissioners:

There is no persuasive reason to expand the downtown master plan boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside. Staff has made no findings of necessity or positive impact from the expansion and the objectives first outlined by Commissioner Verma for exploring an expansion of the downtown area will be addressed county-wide by the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative.

I therefore request that the Commissioners remove from the plan any depiction of an expanded boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside and maintain the current plan boundary.

Mrs. Christie
1st Avenue
Silver Spring, MD

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		
		Page 1

Email

Woodside Community (reg...

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 Perry Gayaldo

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  County Council;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Woodside Community (regarding proposed expansion of Silver Spring)

Date Sent

Date Received

12/19/2021 10:06 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear Planning Board Chair & Commissioners:

Woodside Neighborhood is a very diverse and supportive community today. I have heard no persuasive reason to expand the downtown master plan boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside. Mont. Co. Staff has made no findings of necessity or positive impact from the expansion, and the objectives first outlined by Commissioner Verma for exploring an expansion of the downtown area will be addressed county-wide by the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative.

The proposed expansion of Silver Spring master plan boundary will eviscerate the The Woodside Community of diverse, supportive families. Please actually get to know us, and see (and enumerate if that helps) the type of individuals who live here and you'll find middle income families, minorities, LGBTQ+, religious/faith affiliations, and single parents who rely on this community to survive, just to name a few, I therefore request that the Commissioners remove from the plan any depiction of an expanded boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside and maintain the current plan boundary.

Perry Gayaldo

Woodside Community

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		
		Page 1

Email

SSDAC, ASHI and Thrive 20...

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 Rick LaRue

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

SSDAC, ASHI and Thrive 2050

Date Sent

Date Received

12/20/2021 10:44 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear Mr. Chairman, and members of the Montgomery County Planning Board:

Please find below my message to members of the County Council, which I submit as well for your consideration at this Thursday's public hearing (12.23.2021). Reasonable people can disagree about the content of various proposals, but timing matters; any boundary changes in the SSDAC should be deferred until the County acts on ASHI and Thrive 2050.

Thank you.
Rick LaRue

As the county tackles its housing challenges, a wide range of proposals are being considered. One component is the Silver Spring Downtown and Adjacent Communities Plan (SSDAC), which contains expansionist boundary changes affecting nearby residential communities, including a two-block incursion into Woodside, north of Spring Street. Logic and fair process would seem to dictate that any such boundary revisions only occur in conjunction with the creation of new countywide policies (ASHI and Thrive 2050). Simply because SSDAC's work began before ASHI and Thrive 2050 got started does not mean that its boundary changes should be permitted to advance without the benefit or context of countywide policy debate. For example, one need only look at the proposed map to see that its critics could be correct that the Woodside bump-out is arbitrary. Reconciling such arbitrariness after the fact is a planning nightmare easily avoided by better sequencing the steps.

Montgomery County is right to be considering ways to encourage more affordable and attainable housing. It would be astoundingly wrong, however, to proceed with the SSDAC boundary changes at the front end of this process.


Disclosure: I write as an individual, but previously served as the President of the Woodside Civic Association.

Sincerely,
Rick LaRue

--
Rick LaRue
301.922.5276



Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
<div></div> <div>There are no Attachments to show in this view. To get started, create one or more Attachments.</div>		
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		Page 1

Email

SSDAC Plan - opposition to...

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 sb16@verizon.net

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

SSDAC Plan - opposition to proposed expanded boundary

Date Sent

Date Received

12/21/2021 11:59 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

To the Chair and Members of the Montgomery Planning Board:

I am writing as a resident of the Woodside neighborhood to express my strong opposition to the proposed expansion of the northern boundary of downtown Silver Spring into Woodside.

There is no persuasive reason to expand the downtown master plan boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside. Staff has made no findings of necessity or positive impact from the expansion and the objectives first outlined by Commissioner Verma for exploring an expansion of the downtown area will be addressed county-wide by the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative.

I therefore ask that the Commissioners remove from the plan any depiction of an expanded boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside and maintain the current plan boundary.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sarah Brookhart

sb16@verizon.net

301-996-8988

8825 First Avenue

Silver Spring, MD 20910

Attachments

File Name		File Size (Bytes)	
<div><div></div><div>There are no Attachments to show in this view. To get started, create one or more Attachments.</div></div>			
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		Page 1	

Email

Boundary Email - Downto...

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 Sean Orban

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  County Council;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Boundary Email - Downtown Silver Spring/Woodside

Date Sent

Date Received

12/21/2021 4:33 PM


[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

As residents of Woodside, we request that the boundary of the downtown **not be expanded north of Spring Street into Woodside.**

--

Julie and Sean

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
		
There are no Attachments to show in this view. To get started, create one or more Attachments.		
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		Page 1

Email

Comments on the Silver Sp...

Owner

 MCP...








Email

From

 Susan Andrea

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  County Council;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org;  ocemail@montgomerycountymd.gov

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Comments on the Silver Spring Downtown and Adjacent Communities Plan

Date Sent

Date Received

12/19/2021 11:53 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

I have lived at 402 Dale Drive for more than thirty years and I am writing in defense of my community. We are a mature neighborhood of mostly single-family, modest-sized houses on modest-sized lots, with variety in the styles of houses. Because the houses are generally not large there is room on each lot for trees, lawns, and gardens. These elements contribute greatly to our quality of life. This is a desirable neighborhood because of those elements. It is certainly what attracted me to this area and my house in particular. I am invested in this neighborhood in more than a financial sense.


I am alarmed by the proposals that would change the character of my neighborhood, and not for the better. As I understand it, the proposed new plan would allow and even encourage non-single-family housing throughout the area. This would be upzoning by deed if not by word, and would mean the destruction of existing single-family houses and increased density--more people, larger buildings, and much less green, to the detriment of the quality of life. The loss of trees alone would be considerable, and the benefit of trees is well known.

This is a stable, desirable neighborhood and it works well as it is. I urge you not to downgrade it by allowing and encouraging greater density by means of allowing and encouraging non-single-family housing. Change doesn't necessarily mean improvement, and this would be the opposite of improvement.

Susan Andrea
402 Dale Drive
Silver Spring, MD 20910

County.Council@MontgomeryCountyMD.gov

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
<div></div> <div>There are no Attachments to show in this view. To get started, create one or more Attachments.</div>		
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		Page 1

Email

Please do not destroy Woo...

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 Suzanne Lawson

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Please do not destroy Woodside!

Date Sent

Date Received

12/19/2021 10:09 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear Planning Board Chair and Commissioners:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the SSDAC's proposed annexation of 2 blocks of the Woodside neighborhood where I have lived for over 20 years. Please revise the SSDAC Plan and keep the boundary at Spring Street. As a woman of color/minority home-owner, I intentionally chose to live in this very diverse neighborhood, with its verdant, peaceful character and to raise my children and care for our elderly in a single-family home. Please listen to the outcry from our neighborhood and other constituents and drop the annexation of Woodside from the SSDAC plan.

Yours sincerely,
Suzanne Lawson
8800 Second Avenue, Silver SpringDear Planning Boar

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
0 - 0 of 0 (0 selected)		
		Page 1

Email

Planning Board Hearing

Owner

 MCP...



Email

From

 baji

To

 <MCP-Chair MCP-Chair>;  MCP-Chair #;  MCP-Chair@mncppc-mc.org

Cc

Bcc

Subject

Planning Board Hearing

Date Sent

Date Received

12/19/2021 8:58 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.


Dear Planning Board Chair & Commissioners:

There is no persuasive reason to expand the downtown master plan boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside. Staff has made no findings of necessity or positive impact from the expansion and the objectives first outlined by Commissioner Verma for exploring an expansion of the downtown area will be addressed county-wide by the Affordable Housing Strategies Initiative.

I therefore request that the Commissioners remove from the plan any depiction of an expanded boundary north of Spring Street into Woodside and maintain the current plan boundary.

Tasneem Hussain
Woodside

Attachments

File Name	File Size (Bytes)	
		
There are no Attachments to show in this view. To get started, create one or more Attachments.		

