

Montgomery County Planning Board

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED
MINUTES AND SUMMARY

SUMMARY

Thursday, May 25, 2023

2425 Reedie Drive
Wheaton, MD 20902
301-495-4605

The Montgomery County Planning Board met in regular session in the Wheaton Headquarters Building in Wheaton, Maryland, and via Microsoft Teams video conference on Thursday, May 25, 2023, beginning at 9:02 a.m. and adjourned at 2:32 p.m.

Present were Chair Jeff Zyontz, Vice Chair Roberto Piñero, and Commissioners Shawn Bartley, James Hedrick and Mitra Pedoeem.

Items 1 through 8 were discussed in that order and reported in the attached Minutes.

Vice Chair Pinero joined the meeting at 9:33 a.m. during Item 6.

The Planning Board recessed for lunch at 12:22 p.m. and reconvened in the auditorium and via video conference to return to open session at 1:20 p.m. to discuss Item 10 and Item 9 as reported in the attached Minutes.

Commissioner Bartley left the meeting after Item 8 and was necessarily absent for the remainder of the meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned 2:32 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Planning Board will be held on Thursday, June 1, 2023, in the Wheaton Headquarters Building in Wheaton, Maryland, and via video conference.

Rachel Roehrich

Rachel Roehrich
Technical Writer/Legal Assistant

MINUTES

Item 1. Preliminary Matters

A. Adoption of Resolutions

1. Sandy Spring Museum Preliminary Plan Amendment No. 11996032B – MCPB No. 23-043
2. Sandy Spring Museum Site Plan Amendment No. 81996010B – MCPB No. 23-044
3. Chick-fil-A Site Plan Amendment No. 82005002F – MCPB No. 23-057
4. Saul Centers Preliminary Plan Amendment No. 12016008A – MCPB No. 23-058
5. Broadmeadow Farm Preliminary Plan Amendment No. 12013015A – MCPB No. 23-059

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Hedrick/Pedoeem

Vote: 4-0

Other: Vice Chair Piñero absent.

Action: Adopted the Resolutions cited above, as submitted.

B. Approval of Minutes

1. Minutes of May 4, 2023

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Hedrick/Bartley

Vote: 3-0-1

Other: Commissioner Pedoeem abstained due to being absent. Vice Chair Piñero absent.

Action: Approved Planning Board Meeting Minutes of May 4, 2023, as submitted.

1. Minutes of May 11, 2023
2. Closed Session Minutes of May 11, 2023
3. Minutes of May 18, 2023

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Hedrick/Pedoeem

Vote: 4-0

Other: Vice Chair Piñero absent.

Action: Approved Open Session Planning Board Meeting Minutes of May 11, 2023 and May 18, 2023, as well as Closed Session Meeting Minutes of May 11, 2023, as submitted.

C. Other Preliminary Matters

BOARD ACTION

Motion:

Vote:

Other: Vice Chair Piñero absent.

Action: There were no Other Preliminary Items submitted for approval.

Item 3. Regulatory Extension Requests (Public Hearing)

Willerburn Acres: Administrative Subdivision Plan No. 620230040, Regulatory Extension Request No. 1 - Extend regulatory review period, from May 25, 2023 to July 27, 2023.

Application to create a two-lot subdivision for two single-family detached units; located at 11712 Gainsborough Road; R-90 zone; one acre; 2002 Potomac Subregion Master Plan.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the Extension

P. Estes

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Pedoeem/Hedrick

Vote: 4-0

Other: Vice Chair Piñero absent.

Action: Approved staff recommendation for approval of the Regulatory Extension Requests cited above.

Item 4. Roundtable Discussion

Parks Director's Report
M. Riley

BOARD ACTION

Motion:

Vote:

Other: Vice Chair Piñero absent.

Action: Received briefing.

Montgomery Parks Deputy Director of Administration Miti Figueredo offered a multi-media presentation regarding recent and upcoming Montgomery Parks events.

Ms. Figueredo highlighted the two-night Salsa in the Park event which took place on May 17, 2023 and May 19, 2023. May 17, 2023 was a workshop for the event and the actual event took place on May 19, 2023 at the Germantown Center Urban Park. The event had approximately 350 people in attendance.

Ms. Figueredo also noted the Acoustics and Ales event, which is one of Montgomery Parks most well attended events, will be taking place tonight May 25, 2023, at the Flower Avenue Urban Park from 5:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. The Flower Avenue Urban Park was one of the first parks the Long Branch Parks Initiative focused on, in which year-end funding was used to rehabilitate the park to provide much needed updates.

Ms. Figueredo then discussed the Hillandale Local Park Renovation that has been taking place. Hillandale Local Park, consisting of 24.5 acres, will benefit from renovations consisting of: the realignment/reconstruction of the main entrance, construction of a restroom/picnic shelter facility, multi-age playground, lighted basketball courts, a high-performance rectangular field with a softball diamond overlay, parking, an asphalt loop trail, accessible walkways, seating areas, installation of site furnishings, tree preservation, landscape planting and storm water management facilities.

Lastly, Ms. Figueredo highlighted the upcoming events during the month of June which include: the Gene Lynch Urban Park Opening, Mudfest, Scotland Juneteenth Heritage Festival, and the South Silver Spring Urban Park Demo Party. The Parks Playhouse Series and Brookside Twilight Concert Series also occur on reoccurring dates throughout June as well.

The Board offered comments regarding the many Parks events that were highlighted and requested a list of the events be provided to the Board members individually as well.

Item 5. FY23 Budget Adjustment for the Planning Department

Staff Recommendation: Approval of Request for FY23 Budget Transfers for the Planning Department.

T. Stern/K. Warnick

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Pedoeem/Hedrick

Vote: 4-0

Other: Vice Chair Piñero absent.

Action: Approved staff recommendation to approve the Budget Transfer Request cited above.

Karen Warnick offered comments regarding the FY23 Budget Adjustment. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated May 11, 2023.

Ms. Warnick stated the Planning Department estimates it will have personnel savings in FY23 and is requesting to reallocate these savings. The recommended transfers do not exceed 10 percent in any division and do not change the work program. The Planning Department is seeking the Planning Board's approval to transfer \$150,000.00 from the Personnel Services category to Other Services & Charges.

Ms. Warnick briefly discussed the specific funding requests detailed in the Staff Report.

The Board asked questions and offered comments regarding projected costs and services as well as calculations of expected bids.

Staff offered comments and responses to the Board's questions and comments.

Item 6. Bikeways Branding Project Briefing

J. Ryder

BOARD ACTION

Motion:

Vote:

Other:

Action: Receive briefing.

Dave Anspacher, Multimodal Transportation Supervisor, gave an introduction and brief overview of the Bikeways Branding Project.

Jon Ryder, Planner II, offered a multi-media presentation regarding the Bikeways Branding Project. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated May 18, 2023.

Mr. Ryder gave a brief history of bikeways and breezeway networks. Mr. Ryder explained the Bikeway Branding Project was undertaken based on guidance found in the Montgomery County Bicycle Master Plan, which calls for the creation of a new type of bikeway named Breezeways. Designed with bicycle commuters and longer utilitarian trips in mind, the Breezeway network is a subset of the County's more extensive low-stress bicycling network providing minimal delays and detours for cyclists. The Breezeway network will also provide direct and efficient routes between major activity centers.

Mr. Ryder stated the Bikeway Branding Project was a collaborative effort between Montgomery Planning, Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT), and the project consultant, Guide Studio with the goal of creating a cohesive brand identity for the bikeway and Breezeway networks in order to enhance awareness of the bikeway system, create a sense of place along the routes, and drive interest in cycling as an irresistible transportation option. The project also includes a wayfinding and signage system that will further create a connective experience for people traveling through the County via the extensive bikeway network.

At this time, Cathy Fromet of Guide Studio offered an overview of the branding for the project as well as a multi-media presentation. Ms. Fromet described the brand strategy, brand identity, wayfinding framework, kit of parts design, and standards and guidelines.

Ms. Fromet explained why branding was important, listed the branding goals, and stated the strategy vision for the Bikeway system is equitable, connective, and provides new perspectives to target audiences consisting of everyday users and recreational users.

Ms. Fromet discussed the route classification logos as well as the kit of parts for both Bikeways and Breezeways, which can also be found in the Brand Style Guide and Sign Standards Manual.

Lastly, Ms. Fromet listed and gave examples of the Implementation Recommendations consisting of both short and long-term recommendations including: creation of a Montgomery County Bikeways Coalition, development of a Communications Plan, establishing a brand champion program, building a brand management plan and process, creating content to tell the bikeways

Montgomery County Planning Board
Public Meeting Minutes of May 25, 2023

story, establishing a Montgomery County Bikeways website, social media policy and guidelines, sign system pilot installation, and Public art.

Mr. Dryer then discussed the next steps and implementation of signage and wayfinding for the pilot project taking place in North Bethesda, which was chosen due to the increased cyclists within the area.

The Board asked questions regarding current status or existence of Breezeways, reasoning for logo color choices, implementation, project funding, and potential top-line logos on signage.

Staff, including Chief of Countywide Planning and Policy Jason Sartori, offered comments and responses to the Board's questions.

Matt Johnson of MCDOT offered comments limitations on the color use for the logos and facilities.

Cathy Fromet of Guide Studio also offered comments regarding the color use for the logos and branding.

Item 7. Local Government Annual Reporting to Maryland Department of Planning

As per the requirements established by State legislation, each local jurisdiction must submit an annual land use report to the Maryland Department of Planning (MDP). The objective of this request is to monitor growth statewide and to determine if State smart growth policies are having beneficial or unanticipated effects. This report for Calendar Year 2022 has been prepared by the Montgomery County Planning Department for Board approval of transmission to the County Council President and the State of Maryland Department of Planning.

Staff Recommendation: Approve Report and Transmit to County Council President and the Director of the State Department of Planning

J. Mukherjee/ C. McNamara

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Hedrick/Bartley

Vote: 5-0

Other:

Action: Approved staff recommendation to approve the 2022 Annual Land Use Report and transmit to County Council President and the Director of the State Department of Planning, as stated in a transmittal letter to be prepared at a later date.

Jay Mukherjee, Principal GIS Specialist and Colin McNamara, Senior GIS Specialist, offered a multi-media presentation regarding the Local Government Annual Land Use Report. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated May 19, 2023.

Mr. Mukherjee stated since 2009, the Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) has been mandated by State law to collect land use and development data from all jurisdictions with planning or zoning authority in the State of Maryland. As per the requirements established recently by SB 280/HB 295, this is the eleventh such annual report prepared for approval by the Montgomery County Planning Board. The objective for this request is to monitor growth statewide and to determine if State Smart Growth policies are having beneficial or unanticipated effects.

Mr. Mukherjee explained the Planning Department's role is to collect data from various sources, analyze and map the data, and fill out a questionnaire. The data is collected from in-house data sources such as parcel files, the Hansen development tracking system and zoning maps, as well as data collected from external agencies like the Department of Permitting Services (DPS), Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS), Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT), State Highways Administration (SHA), and from *dataMontgomery*, the Counties open data portal.

Mr. McNamara then discussed some highlights included in the annual report for calendar year 2022, including the following categories: Master Plan status, new subdivisions, transportation improvements, and new schools, additions and improvements. MDP was also provided with the amounts of residential and commercial growth, within and outside the Priority Funding Areas as well as data about land preservation, including Transferable Development Rights, Building Lot Terminations, and Agricultural Easements.

Montgomery County Planning Board
Public Meeting Minutes of May 25, 2023

Lastly, Mr. McNamara stated the results of a generalized development capacity analysis were also provided to MDP. Compared to 2018, the number and acres of parcels with development capacity have gone down, while actual unit capacity has gone up. Mr. McNamara noted an explanation could be that the parcels that do have capacity, also have higher units per acre thresholds, or density, than the parcels did in 2018.

Mr. Mukherjee then discussed the next steps which included approval to submit the Report to MDP and the County Council by July 1, 2023. Subsequently, the data and maps will be uploaded to MDP's servers for Growth and Development Analysis, allowing the State to create their own end-of-the-year analysis and report for calendar year 2022.

The Board asked questions regarding advantages of MDP's final analysis, and Staff, including Acting Planning Director Tanya Stern offered responses and comments.

Item 8. Fairland and Briggs Chaney Master Plan Work Session No. 2

Staff Recommendation: Discuss testimony received on Fairland and Briggs Chaney Master Plan during the public comment period and at the Public Hearing and provide direction to staff for revisions to the plan. The Planning Board may choose to continue discussion of plan revisions at additional work sessions.

C. Larson/M. Jackson

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Hedrick/Pedoeem

Vote: 5-0

Other:

Action: Received briefing; and approved staff recommendation for approval of the Planning Board Draft of the Fairland and Briggs Chaney Master Plan, and transmittal of the Plan to the County Executive and County Council.

Clark Larson, Planner III and Molline Jackson, Planner III, offered a multi-media presentation regarding the Fairland and Briggs Chaney Master Plan Work Session Number 2. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated May 19, 2023.

In all, a total of 105 individual comments were received on the plan. Planning staff has identified a selection of these comments to discuss with the Planning Board and excluded those comments that met one of the following criteria that are not anticipated to be included in work session discussions:

1. Expressing overall support to the Fairland and Briggs Chaney Master Plan
2. Expressing support for a particular plan recommendation or statement
3. Asking a question about the plan that does not pertain to plan policy
4. Support or opposition to a specific issue that is beyond the scope of the Fairland and Briggs Chaney Master Plan

The May 25, 2023 Work Session Number 2 discussed the following topics:

Land Use and Design

Section Map 14, p. 33, 3.A.2.3, p. 39, and 4.A and 4.B, pp. 63-97

Comment: Several "Activity Centers" called out in the Master Plan are not consistent with Thrive 2050.

Staff response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.A.2.6, p. 39

Comment: Opposing elimination of Park-and-Ride lots.

Staff Response: Disagree.

The Board expressed concerns for potential elimination of a free Park-and-Ride lot if future development occurs, and Staff, including Chief of Upcounty Planning Patrick Butler and Acting Planning Director Tanya Stern offered comments and responses.

The Board held further discussion, and ultimately agreed with Staff's response.

Section 3.A.2.7, p. 39

Comment: Opposing a recommendation to discourage new drive-throughs

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.A.2.8, p. 39

Comment: Opposing discouraging vehicle or equipment sales, storage rental and service.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with staff

Section 3.A.2 and Map 18, pp. 38-39 and Map 31 and Table 9, pp. 77-78

Comment: Request to change the Plan's recommended residential zoning density for the properties at 13100 and 13101 Columbia Pike (Verizon West and East) from R-0.5 to R-1.5

Staff Response: Agree. The Board agreed with Staff.

The Board asked questions regarding the total FAR for the properties, potential requirement to provide mixed-use development, and re-zoning.

Section 3.A.2, p. 39 and 4.A.6, pp. 79-83

Comment: Opposing the recommended re-zoning of 2131 East Randolph Road from R-200 to CRT-1.0 C-0.25 R-1.0 H-75

Staff Response: Disagree. Staff supports re-zoning as recommended. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 4.B.4, p. 92-94

Comment: Request that the plan state that, "the recommendations applicable to comprehensive redevelopment at the Auto Park do not apply to targeted development projects," and that, "any requirements for near-term improvements must be commensurate to the scope and size of a proposed development"

Staff Response: Agree. Staff supports these reasonable changes to clarify the short-term and long-term expectations. Staff made changes to text for Sections 4.B.4.1, 4.B.4.2 and 4.B.4.2.d. The Board agreed with Staff.

The Board asked questions regarding the 3-acre contiguous Park and suggested additional language to the effect that if the development is not large enough to host the 3-acre Park, the Park location would then be located on the outside boundaries of the development to potentially connect to another Park.

Section 3.C.2.10, pp. 43-44 and 4.B.2.4, p. 86

Comment: Request that retrofit recommendations for Briggs Chaney Rd. and Automobile Blvd. recognize need for maintenance of existing driveway curb cuts and that modest improvements and redevelopment on Briggs Chaney Rd. do not trigger utility underground requirements to make them infeasible

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 4.B.4 and Map 37, pp. 92-97

Comment: Request that rezoning recommendations account for the permitted uses in the GR zone to avoid additional restrictions or approval processes on existing uses.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Comment: Concern that rezoning an adjacent County-owned property from GR to R-60 would impose new compatibility requirements on Auto Sales Park properties that are not currently present.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 4.B.4.1.d, p. 93

Comment: Concern that structured parking in the short-term is not viable in the Montgomery Auto Sales Park due to current construction costs and market conditions.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Transportation - Roadways

Section 3.C.2.4, p. 43

Comment: Request for revisions to the recommendation to eliminate planned interchanges on U.S. 29 to instead read, “SHA and/or MCDOT shall conduct a detailed traffic study to assess traffic capacity, accessibility, and safety, and prior to any decision regarding the removal of the grade separated interchanges. The study should include the build-out scenario, and urban interchange and BRT alternatives”

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

The Board held discussion and asked questions regarding interchanges and if the recommendation eliminates the multimodal intersections.

Staff offered comments and responses to the Board’s questions.

Comment: Concern that not recommending a joint interchange at Tech Road and Industrial Parkway may cause unintended consequences for traffic and properties not previously considered.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.2.4, p. 43 and Map 19, p. 46

Comment: Request for clarification between recommendation 3.C.2.4 and Map 19 regarding the improvement of U.S. 29 and Industrial Boulevard as a grade-separated interchange.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Comment: Inquiry about the possibility to expand the plan area, consider acquisition of a vacant property for construction of a new highway interchange at U.S. 29 and Greencastle Road.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Sections 3.C.2.6 and 3.C.2.8, p. 43

Comment: The lane width, number of lanes, and left-turn lanes of existing at-grade intersections should be retained for safety reasons and to avoid increasing congestion.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.2.9, p. 43

Comment: The recommendation to implement roundabouts in place of signalized intersections seems in conflict with the plan's goal of improving the environment for pedestrians and cyclists and enhancing BRT service

Staff Response: Disagree. There is not a blatant recommendation for a roundabout. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 4.A.5.5.b, p. 74 and Figure 5, p. 75

Comment: Recommendation 4.A.5.5.b appears to suggest the creation of frontage roads, much like Old Columbia Pike and Prosperity south of Randolph/Cherry Hill, that may be contradictory to the plan's vision to reduce travel lanes and crossing distance. Requests statement that any such frontage roads shall adhere to intersection spacing requirements

Staff Response: Disagree. Staff added additional modified language. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.2.1, p. 42, Table 5, p. 45, and Map 19, p. 46

Comment: Downtown street types should apply to downtown areas (i.e., Large Activity Centers), which are not part of this area. Town Center street types should apply only to the Briggs Chaney Activity Center

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 4.B.2.5, pp. 46-47 and Map 19, p. 46

Comment: Limit the Briggs Chaney Town Center area only to the CR- and CRT-zoned properties. Town Center designations are not intended for residential-only areas, such as those further north away from Briggs Chaney Road.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.2 and Table 5, pp. 45-46

Comment: Request to reduce posted speed limit on Greencastle Road and establish narrower travel lanes.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Comment: Request elimination of acceleration/deceleration lanes on Greencastle Road at Fairland Recreational Park entrance to improve bike and pedestrian operation and safety.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.2.11, p. 44

Comment: Electric Vehicle (EV) requirements for new developments are likely lower than they should be (while car share requirements are likely too high). Is a Zoning Text Amendment (ZTA) expected to adjust the EV requirements in the master plan area?

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Comment: Consider forecasting electrical use versus capacity for the area, particularly as the region shifts toward greater share of electric vehicles, and whether this necessitates additional investments in area electrical infrastructure or power generation.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Transportation- Bikeways

Map 21 and Table 6, pp. 49-50

Comment: Request to install protected bike lanes in both directions on Greencastle Road.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Map 23, p. 56

Comment: Elaborate on the types of paths or trails of the inner and outer active transportation loop.

Staff Response: Agree and suggested additional text to cross-reference. The Board agreed with Staff.

The Board offered comments suggesting potential cross-referencing with the Pedestrian Master Plan as well as potential map to include BiPPA areas.

Table 6, p. 50

Comment: Several bike segments in Table 6 label two of the same street section with two options: (1) and (2). Clarify whether both are intended to be built and, if so, on which side of the street.

Staff Response: Agree. Revise Table 6. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.3.5, Map 21, Table 6, p. 47-50 and Table 5, p. 45

Comment: While 3.C.3.5 references completing the Breezeways along US 29 and the ICC, neither Map 21 nor Table 6 reference any. Also, the public right-of-way indicated in Table 5 may not be able to accommodate one on East Randolph Road.

Staff Response: Agree. Breezeways can be added to Map 21. The Board agreed with Staff.

Map 21 and Table 6, pp. 49-50

Comment: Request for a continuous shared-use path and protected bike lane along Old Columbia Pike, between MD-198 (Spencerville Road) and East Randolph Road, along with an east-west breezeways along MD-200.

Staff Response: Disagree, in part. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.3.6

Comment: Replace 3.C.3.6 with text adapted from the 2022 Silver Spring Downtown and Adjacent Communities Plan.

Staff Response: Agree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Transportation – Transit

Map 21 and Table 6, pp. 49-50

Comment: Request to install 'floating bus stops' on Greencastle Road that allow protected bike lanes to continue.

Staff Response: Disagree. Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.4.1.f, p. 51

Comment: Recommendation for 'all-weather' BRT station shelters is too detailed for the master plan. Current station designs on U.S. 29 are already built and anticipated for future BRT routes. However, improved pedestrian facilities connecting to the stations is appropriate.

Staff Response: Disagree, in part. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.4.3, p. 51

Comment: Clarify the recommendation on the types of improvements sought at BRT stations versus park-and-ride lots.

Staff Response: Agree. Revised text. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.4.2, p. 51

Comment: In response to a recommendation to study a re-alignment of the Flash BRT Orange Line, testimony states that there is not sufficient demand on Robey Road and Greencastle Road to justify Flash BRT service and the station is already built.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.4.1.c and 3.C.4.1.e, p. 50-51 and Map 22, p. 52

Comment: The current county's vision for the Randolph Road BRT is to cross U.S. 29 at Tech Road, while the master plan shows a crossing at Cherry Hill Road. It may make sense to pick a single alignment for the future BRT line. Choosing only the Tech Rd route might slow trips to/from Viva and any potential extensions to Greenbelt Metro but would pick up the growing Tech/Industrial area.

Staff Response: Agree. Added additional text. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.2.8, p. 43

Comment: Consider recommending 'road diets' on Briggs Chaney Road and East Randolph Road to support creation of dedicated bus lanes.

Staff Response: Agree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.4.1.e, p. 51 and 4.B.2.2, p. 86

Comment: Clarify the purpose of a new BRT station at the Briggs Chaney Road bridge on U.S. 29.

Staff Response: Agree. Staff supports adding clarifying language. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.4, p. 50-51 and Map 22, p. 52

Comment: Recommends the modifications to the planned BRT system.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.4, pp. 50-51

Comment: There is no information establishing existing conditions for Local, Regional, Commuter, and Private Buses/Shuttles, or how these might either be supported, improved, expanded, etc.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Comment: MCDOT will not build the Flash BRT into Howard County. It will be up to Howard County and MDOT SHA to construct improvements north of the county line (Howard County is working on design and construction of three BRT stations). MCDOT may operate the service but will not construct the infrastructure for another County.

Staff Response: Agree. Clarification on the responsibilities for this recommendation should be added. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C, p. 41-43

Comment: There does not appear to be any reference to the transportation analyses, nor does this information appear to be available in an appendix.

Staff Response: Agree. The Board agreed with Staff.

At this time, Chris Van Alstyne, Planner III, discussed the Travel Analysis section as well as the following comments received regarding Ultra Montgomery, the County's broadband economic development program.

Section 3, p. 34-62

Comment: The plan should reference Ultra Montgomery.

Staff Response: Agree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.2, p. 42-43

Comment: The plan should include reference to freight, particularly given the centrality of a federal highway (U.S. 29) to the plan.

Staff Response: Agree. Staff suggests the addition of 3.C.2.13. The Board agreed with Staff.

Community Health and Culture

Section 3.D.2.1, p. 53 and Table 15, pp. 110-111

Comment: Request that the recommended food system study be listed as a short-term implementation item in Table 15 (CIP Priorities) as part of, or in addition to, the recommended Fairland Recreational Park Study.

Staff Response: Agree. Staff supports including this reference in the CIP table. The Board agreed with Staff.

Environment

Section 3.F, p. 59

Comment: Request that tree planting recommendations consider visibility needs for dealerships and allow alternative planting locations and flexibility in species selection to avoid damage to paved areas, sidewalks, and vehicles.

Staff Response: Disagree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.F.1, p. 59

Comment: Consider referencing the Montgomery County Climate Action Plan in the Environment Goals section and identifying any goals / metrics which should be included in this section.

Staff Response: Agree. Staff supports adding a mention of the Climate Action Plan in section 3.F.1. The Board agreed with Staff.

Implementation

Section 5.F, Table 15, p. 110-111

Comment: Consider adding a column that includes page references and/or Sections where the project is substantially referenced. Also make sure the CIP table includes all relevant CIP projects.

Staff Response: Agree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Section 3.C.3, p. 47

Comment: Bicycle and Pedestrian section is light on information considering the plan's stated vision of a more ped/bike focused area. Each of these needs should be reflected in the CIP Table.

Staff Response: Agree. The Board agreed with Staff.

Table 15, p. 111

Comment: Clarify whether inclusion of "Randolph Road BRT lanes" as a long-term implementation item in the CIP table is for the start of its service and if an alignment study should be listed as a short- or medium-term implementation item

Staff Response: Agree. The Board agreed with Staff

Ms. Jackson then discussed the next steps and upcoming schedule for the Plan.

The Board asked questions regarding what could be implemented in the short term to make the Master Plan economically viable, and Staff offered comments and responses.

Item 10. Pedestrian Master Plan Work Session No. 4

Staff Recommendation: Discuss master plan elements and provide direction. Approve the attached document as the Planning Board Draft of the Pedestrian Master Plan for transmittal to the County Council and the County Executive.

E. Glazier

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Hedrick/Pedoeem

Vote: 4-0

Other: Commissioner Bartley absent.

Action: Approved staff's recommendation to approve the Planning Board Draft of the Pedestrian Master Plan, with amendments made by staff, for transmittal to the County Council and the County Executive.

Eli Glazier, Project Lead, offered a multi-media presentation regarding. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated May 18, 2023.

The Pedestrian Master Plan provides detailed, actionable recommendations in line with national and international best practices to improve the pedestrian experience, from more and better places to cross the street to a data-driven, equity-focused approach to identifying the county's future pedestrian/bicycle capital investments.

The Plan vision is supported by four goals:

- Increase walking rates and pedestrian satisfaction
- Create a comfortable, connected, convenient pedestrian network
- Enhance pedestrian safety
- Build an equitable and just pedestrian network

Mr. Glazier presented proposed revisions to the following Key Actions or Objectives discussed during Work Session Number 3 and listed below:

- Key Action B-1a (page 69)
- Objective 4.1 ADA Accessibility (p.18)
- Key Action B-1b description (p.70)
- Key Action B-4h description (p.83)
- Key Action B-4h description (p.83)

The Board asked further questions regarding evidence included within the Master Plan Racial Equity and Social Justice, if automated traffic enforcement target minorities, and if pedestrian barriers are mainly located within areas with majority of non-white population.

Staff offered comments and responses to the Board's questions.

Montgomery County Planning Board
Public Meeting Minutes of May 25, 2023

Furthermore, the Board offered a suggestion regarding BiPPA geographies may be cross-referenced in other future Master Plans.

Staff offered a response with entering additional language into The Pedestrian Master Plan page 134 under the BiPPAs section second paragraph from the bottom stating “Furthermore, future Master Plans may recommend changes to the BiPPA geographies and prioritization.”

Lastly, Mr. Glazier gave an overview of the next steps for the Pedestrian Master Plan.

Item 9. Planning Board Annual Briefing on Updates to the Montgomery County Burial Sites Inventory

Staff Recommendation: Planning Board adopt the Updated Burial Sites Inventory
B. Crane

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Hedrick/Pedoeem

Vote: 4-0

Other: Commissioner Bartley absent.

Action: Approved staff's recommendation for the Planning Board to adopt the Updated Burial Sites Inventory.

Brian Crane, Cultural Resources Planner III, offered a multi-media presentation regarding the Burial Sites Inventory Update for 2023. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated May 5, 2023.

Mr. Crane stated the inventory was created by the Montgomery County Council in 2017, and Guidelines for its implementation were approved by the Planning Board in 2019 to provide for the inventory to be continuously updated as new information becomes available, and for the Planning Board to be briefed on these updates annually.

Mr. Crane explained the inventory includes 351 total records including: 256 known locations, 80 approximate locations, and 38 leads under investigation. There are also 17 redacted locations, which are those locations where there is concern about whether the site could be vulnerable to vandalism if its exact location were to be made known. These locations are shown as the boundaries of the parcel rather than a specific point.

Mr. Crane then discussed the 11 substantive changes to the inventory made this year, including sites that were revised or added, or where the location confidence was updated. Mr. Crane noted property owners were notified in writing by certified mail about substantive changes to Burial Sites Inventory records on their property, as required by the Burial Sites Guidelines.

Mr. Crane stated to better integrate burial sites data into a single system that is sustainable for the long term, Historic Preservation Staff worked with Information Technology and Innovation Division staff beginning in 2021 to migrate the Burial Sites Inventory to the Planning Department's Hansen information system, which maintains regulatory and development application data. Staff also worked on changing the way approximate sites are displayed to the public in MCATLAS.

Mr. Crane described the ongoing project consultation and the major categories of projects for which project related reviews have been conducted.

Lastly, Mr. Crane highlighted field visits, public inquiries and outreach, and other Master Plan and Research initiatives.

Montgomery County Planning Board
Public Meeting Minutes of May 25, 2023

Eileen McGuckian of the Coalition to Protect Maryland Burial Sites/Montgomery Preservation, Inc. offered comments regarding the importance of Historic Preservation within Montgomery County as well as numerous suggestions.

The Board offered a suggestion to contact Montgomery County Government with information to share with the Public as well.