

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University corridor plan
Date: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 7:20:28 PM

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

To Whom it May Concern:

Please consider the impact of the university corridor plan on the local community. Traffic is already extremely congested - and with more people returning to the office (particularly federal employees), it will only get worse. The lowered speed limits, removal of merge areas, lack of right turn on red, and further limitations on traffic lanes is going to make the area much more difficult and congested.

So many people are navigating an extremely difficult and uncertain time with the new administration. Please don't add to the stress by making the day to day life, errands, and commuting much more challenging.

Thank you for considering this,

[REDACTED]
708 Lambertson Dr, Silver Spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Boulevard
Date: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 7:32:00 PM

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

Dear Mr. Harris:

I write with regard to the University Boulevard Corridor Plan, which will affect my daily commute dramatically. For the last 18 years, I have commuted daily from my home in Kemp Mill to my law firm in downtown Washington, DC. Unfortunately, my commute has always been difficult, and regularly has taken more time than it ought to have. In fact, it has taken me more longer to get to and from my workplace—whether by subway or car—than it did to get to downtown Baltimore, where I used to work. For years, I took the subway, but service was, regrettably, poor. Often I encountered “single tracking” and even faced several months in which there was no red-line service. During COVID, conditions on the Metro deteriorated and I concluded that it was no longer safe to travel via subway.

I then began to drive. There is no highway connecting my neighborhood to downtown D.C., and traffic is a constant. University Boulevard is key to my trip—it is the major artery to get to 16th Street or Georgia Avenue. I know that the plan is well-intended, but for me and thousands of others, it will add precious time to my already terrible commute.

I know that the trend is to push bicycles and walking, but please consider the much more numerous drivers, who rely on University Boulevard. Please don’t lower the speed limit or take away lanes.

Thanks!

[REDACTED]
12007 Brookhaven Drive
Silver Spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: RE: University Boulevard
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 8:28:17 PM

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

I would like to add a couple of further thoughts after hearing a presentation about the plan from my civic association.

1. Many of the people in my area are over 60 (I will be 60 in a few months as well), and rely on cars to get to work. Not only is there no practicable way for them to access public transportation, but many of them are unable to walk long distances or ride bicycles. They live in this community too, and should be able to enjoy their lives here. Making transportation by car difficult—which seems to be either the end goal or the inevitable result of the plan—will make their lives more difficult.
2. I was struck by how few people at the meeting thought that impeding traffic was a good idea. If that is representative of the neighborhood as a whole, shouldn't you all—our elected officials or their appointees—pay attention to what they want?

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 7:32 PM
To: 'mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org' <mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org>
Subject: University Boulevard

Dear Mr. Harris:

I write with regard to the University Boulevard Corridor Plan, which will affect my daily commute dramatically. For the last 18 years, I have commuted daily from my home in Kemp Mill to my law firm in downtown Washington, DC. Unfortunately, my commute has always been difficult, and regularly has taken more time than it ought to have. In fact, it has taken me more longer to get to and from my workplace—whether by subway or car—than it did to get to downtown Baltimore, where I used to work. For years, I took the subway, but service was, regrettably, poor. Often I encountered “single tracking” and even faced several months in which there was no red-line service. During COVID, conditions on the Metro deteriorated and I concluded that it was no longer safe to travel via subway.

I then began to drive. There is no highway connecting my neighborhood to downtown D.C., and traffic is a constant. University Boulevard is key to my trip—it is the major artery to get to 16th Street or Georgia Avenue. I know that the plan is well-intended, but for me and thousands of others, it will add precious time to my already terrible commute.

I know that the trend is to push bicycles and walking, but please consider the much more numerous drivers, who rely on University Boulevard. Please don't lower the speed limit or take away lanes.

Thanks!



12007 Brookhaven Drive
Silver Spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 9:45:48 PM

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

Dear Mr. Harris,

Thank you for all of the work that you put into developing our beautiful county!

I am writing to you regarding the University Boulevard Corridor Plan. As a resident of Kemp Mill Estates, I perused the plan with a great amount of concern.

I am sure that you are aware of the suburban nature of Kemp Mill. Consequently, most residents of our neighborhood are wholly reliant on their personal vehicles for transportation. For many residents, the nearest bus stop is a twenty minute walk (or more) from their home. The nature of Montgomery County shopping and medical facilities also make private transportation a necessity.

My understanding of the UBCP is that it intends to bring a more urban feel along the University Boulevard corridor. This would help the county hit its benchmarks for increased housing in the future years.

A great concern though, is the impact that this would have on current residents of the area. The plan does not provide ability for them to change their current lifestyle. They will not be able to divest themselves of their private vehicles. The increased population along University Boulevard combined with the narrowing of the roadway has the potential to negatively impact the day-to-day living of the current residents in a significant way. The neighborhood may change from idyllic suburbia to bottlenecked urbania.

A further point to consider is the greater traffic patterns of the county. Every morning during rush hour, hundreds of cars make their way from Randolph Road via Kemp Mill Road to Arcola Avenue and from there to University Boulevard. Thus, University Boulevard services not only the adjacent neighborhoods, but rather the entire south county. Any narrowing of the roadway has potential to create tremendous havoc.

I strongly feel that most, if not all, of the current residents of the area stand only to lose from this proposed plan. I think that many residents are actually very content with the current state of the neighborhood and do not really want any changes made at all. I understand that the county has a need to create a growth plan that allows for more residences, but I do not feel that it is morally appropriate to impact the current residents in such a drastic manner.

I understand that many thousands of hours and dollars have gone into the drafting of the current UBCP, but I respectfully request that it not be implemented with its current intentions. Thank you so much for reading this letter. I very much appreciate all of the hard work that has been put into making this county a wonderful place to live!

[REDACTED]
Kemp Mill Estates

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: UBCP
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 6:02:37 AM

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

Mr. Harris,

Thank you for taking the time to read this email. I just wanted to share as a resident of Kemp Mill that I am absolutely frustrated with the UBCP. I never see bikers in those red painted lanes, rarely see busses, and they slow down traffic so much so that I mostly don't leave the neighborhood in that direction anymore. It causes more congestion on Arcola which makes our neighborhood more noisy and takes away lanes on a heavily used road (University). I have spoken with many people in my neighborhood (over 100 at least) and have only found 1-2 that seem happy with the plan. This has created tremendous frustration at our county elected officials and made us feel unheard. Please consider removing those red bud lanes and not slowing the speed limit further on University Blvd. Thank you again for reading this,

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: New 3 mile stretch Univ Blvd.
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 8:06:32 AM

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

We are opposed to the proposed plan along the 3 mile stretch of University Bld. in Silver Spring and Wheaton. The new proposals will create tremendous traffic backups along University Blvd. It is already a heavy traffic area and your proposals, which will reduce the lanes available for cars is a terrible idea. The number of bike riders along this route is minimal at best, whereas the number of actual cars traveling along this road is significant. You tried this on University Blvd. and Arcola and it was a disaster for traffic. You should have learned from that experience.

[REDACTED]

705 Kersey Road

Wheaton, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Blvd Corridor plan
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 11:57:02 AM

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

Please do not change the Kemp Mill shopping center. The Orthodox Jewish community needs its kosher supermarket and having it within the community is not only convenient, it is economically beneficial. Forcing it to move somewhere else will be a financial burden not just on the business, but the whole community.

Additionally, there are numerous kosher restaurants in the shopping center which would also suffer huge financial setbacks if force to move. The synagogue is also next to the shopping center, making the area an important part of the whole community.

Why not use the empty lot on the corner of University and Viers Mill for high density housing? It was torn down years ago and has been unused ever since. That's the perfect place for it - close to the Wheaton shopping center and the Metro

The Orthodox community is an important tax-paying, voting part of the community. We appreciate when the county takes our needs and opinions into account. Please do not change this part of our community. We need it.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Boulevard proposal
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 12:25:36 PM

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

Traffic is already horribly congested during rush-hour and at other times on the segment of University Boulevard you are proposing to narrow. People are not getting out of their cars, no matter what you do. And, building more housing will bring more people. Please do not keep narrowing roadways. It might be worthwhile to calculate the pollution that results from roads that have already been narrowed, as well as the lost productivity time for workers who have a dramatically increased commute on those narrowed roads. Start with Piney Branch Road, perhaps?

[REDACTED]
130 Hilltop Road
Silver Spring

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Proposal for University Boulevard corridor
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 12:31:10 PM

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

Good afternoon,

I am writing to you as a resident of the Kemp Mill region of Silver Spring for the past 25 years. I have seen the county's proposal for the University Boulevard corridor and I cannot fully express my dislike for this plan. As it is, the changes which have been made to University Avenue and to Georgia Avenue with the establishment of bus lanes have adversely affected my daily commutes, as well as my daughter's weekly transit from UM College Park to go to her local job. Further restricting the flow of traffic along the roads in our neighborhood is a significant imposition to those of us who already live in the area and is a large disservice to the community you are supposed to represent and serve. The reasons you give for the proposed changes are not in line with the thinking of many of the people in the community, including me and my entire family, and I fully disapprove of the proposed plan.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [Thompkins, Melissa](#) on behalf of [MCP-Chair](#)
To: [Thompkins, Melissa](#)
Subject: FW: UBCP plan for Kemp Mill
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 12:39:33 PM

NOTE: Separate email was sent with mailing address: I see that you need my mailing address.
717 N Belgrade Rd, Silver Spring, MD 20902.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2025 12:35 PM
To: MCP-Chair <mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org>
Subject: UBCP plan for Kemp Mill

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

My taxes keep going up. Crime has gone up also and directly affected me.
I can't take a bus to work or bike. The bus and Metro is also very sketchy and has crime.
I have seen maybe a handful of bikes on University blvd in years. You can't bike except
for maybe 3 months of the year as it is. My drive on University blvd is more congested
since the speed is lower and has cameras and you take 2 lanes away for the buses that
can't be used and never come on time anyway. More people in the area? Make my long
commute longer?

Put this up for vote and let the people speak!

If this passes you don't have to worry about land for new housing since most people will
just leave and you'll have all the land you want. I will for sure leave so my quality of life
doesn't become worse.

-- A concerned citizen

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Blvd Corridor Plan
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 1:33:02 PM

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

Good afternoon,

As a Kemp Mill resident who travels up and down University Blvd multiple times a day, I respectfully request that you reconsider the plan that will reduce speed limits and reduce car lanes.

There's already a lot of traffic when I'm taking my children to school, and it would make my schedule more difficult if each trip takes even more time out of my day when I'm trying to balance work and family responsibilities.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
Hyde Road

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: feedback on University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 3:19:16 PM

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

Dear Mr. Harris,

After reviewing the details of the plan I am indifferent/supportive of some parts but against other parts.

The parts to which I can agree:

- ensure handicap access where needed, such as widening the sidewalks, better shelter at bus stops, etc.
- Increase public transportation for students in particular that need it; having said this is should be done a in a thoughtful and deliberate manner as this is not needed at all times of the day

Some of the other parts of the plan I am against are as follows:

- Adding crosswalks is not nearly as necessary as adding overhead lighting to existing crosswalks, in particular on Arcola where is can be impossible to see those crossing
- Adding bike lanes if this isn't part of the existing bus lane
- Any taxpayer dollars to private builders and/or purchasers of any new property; if it is profitable to do so, builder will construct high-density housing and the market will determine the price
- Rezoning of what is now commercial property at the end of Lamberton or other residential area; saying that this does not require someone to sell means little if there is money to be made. And, this will destroy the neighborhood fee.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
11624 Le Baron Ter
Silver Spring, MD. 20902

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



Virus-free 

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: UNIVERSITY BLVD CORRIDOR PLAN
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 4:00:50 PM

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

Dear Sir,

I would like to express my opposition to the proposed University Blvd Corridor Plan. Execution of such a plan would cause serious quality of life issues for the people in my Kemp Mill community as well as other surrounding communities. Please do not implement this proposed plan!

Sincerely,

Concerned Montgomery County Resident,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Fw: University Blvd Corridor Master Plan for Kemp Mill
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 4:36:51 PM

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

Earlier I wrote to you regarding my comments about the University Blvd Corridor Master Plan. Others, including the Kemp Mill Civic Association, have already stated their objections to the proposed lane changes to University Blvd. My additional comments follow:


The Master Plan excludes the Kemp Mill Estates neighborhood from consideration, only including the Kemp Mill Shopping Center and surrounding condos/apartments, schools, park, and a few of the houses along Arcola Ave near the intersection with University Blvd. Yet the residents in this neighborhood will be negatively impacted by the not-so-well thought-out proposals and plans. The neighborhood needs unencumbered private vehicle (i.e., cars) access to University Blvd to go "westbound" to Wheaton and beyond, and "eastbound" to the Beltway and College Park. The proposed changes will isolate Kemp Mill, adversely affecting property values.

My wife and I are both retired, with two of our children living in the neighborhood within walking distance. Our physicians are outside the "15 minute living" area, and as we age, certainly not within walking distance. The shopping center is within the "15 minute walking" area, but is impractical and infeasible when carrying home several bags of groceries.


The homes in the neighborhood, built in the late 1950s - 1960s, have driveways for one or two cars, maximum. The streets are congested with cars and trucks parked on both sides of the street. Two cars coming from opposite directions typically result in an exciting game of "chicken" unless one of the cars finds a space to pull over to let the other car pass by. School buses have to navigate the narrowed streets with great care. Additional modifications (e.g., the "Access Road" from University Blvd through the shopping center) will only create additional stress on the already overburdened neighborhood streets.

I oppose the Master Plan, not because some changes are required, but the Plan is not well thought out when it comes to the secondary and tertiary effects on the Kemp Mill neighborhood.

Respectfully,

 (a home owner since July 1987)
605 Winona CT
Silver Spring, MD 20902

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: 
To: mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org <mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 at 03:12:03 PM EST
Subject: University Blvd Corridor Master Plan for Kemp Mill

The available information in the Master Plan documents do not address the additional required infrastructure to support the Kemp Mill community. For example:

- 1) Additional families residing in the new apartments or

townhomes will have additional children at the different public and private schools in the neighborhood (e.g., Kemp Mill Elementary, Shannon Middle School, [new] Northwood High School, Yeshiva High School).

Does the Master Plan include additional schools to be built or existing schools to be expanded? If so, where? Will they be bussing the children to other schools nearby?

2) Traffic modifications (e.g., Univ Blvd connector through Towers and Kemp Mill Plaza) will mean additional traffic on Arcola Ave and through the neighborhood streets.

Does the Master Plan include widening Arcola Avenue? If so, how? Will property owners along Arcola Avenue be forced to sell?

3) Modifications to Kemp Mill Plaza stores will require the store owners to close temporarily while the modifications take place.


Shalom's Kosher Market is one of the few kosher markets serving the entire DC metro area, including Northern VA and Richmond VA. How will this demographic be served?

4) The concept of living and working in the same vicinity or commuting by mass transit is nice in theory, but in many cases infeasible. During my decades-long career living here, I worked in Northern VA (Tysons Corner, Reston, and Baileys Crossroads), DC, and Maryland (Columbia, Laurel, Greenbelt, and Landover). Rarely was mass transit available for these commutes. In the few cases where bus or train connectivity

existed, it took twice as long door-to-door (close to 2 1/2 hours each way) than driving.

5) A dedicated bus-only lane on University Blvd was a pilot project tried a few years ago. It led to increased congestion and traffic jams during rush-hour, especially when the right turn only lane from Arcola Ave to University Blvd was closed. Forcing the three lanes of traffic into two made the commute slow and painful, especially this changes to the traffic light patterns remain unchanged. The new Master Plan proposes widening University Blvd to accommodate pedestrian traffic better. Will that force the home owners and businesses to sell? The car lanes will be reduced from 12 feet to 11 (middle lane) and 10 (inner lane). Are those widths safe enough to avoid close-call accidents, especially during inclement weather?

Respectfully,

 (a home owner since July 1987)
605 Winona CT
Silver Spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: opposition to University Blvd Plan
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 4:54:09 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members,

As a Montgomery County resident and someone who frequently uses University Boulevard and the surround streets as part of my daily commute, I'd like to express my concerns with the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan.

In general, the plan prioritizes the needs of the minority of University Boulevard users who use buses, sidewalks, or bike over the needs of the vast majority who drive. This is impractical and inequitable.

In particular, I oppose any plan to:

- Make the currently-underutilized bus lanes on University Blvd permanent, narrowing the lanes available to drivers.
- Eliminate designated lanes for right-turning vehicles to turn without a signal.
- Make University and Colesville two-lane roads at Four Corners, with no designated turnaround.
- Set speed limits along all of University between Four Corners and Wheaton of either 25mph or 30mph.

While each of these proposals has issues, the combined effect of all of them will be unmanageable traffic congestion and gridlock for drivers, with serious consequences for the environment and quality of life.

I encourage the Planning Board to reconsider the plan to better account for the tens of thousands of taxpaying Montgomery County families who drive on University Boulevard as part of their commute and daily life and who are voters.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
11517 Monticello Ave
Silver Spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: UBCP
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 5:32:49 PM

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

I am writing to express my disappointment with the proposed University Blvd Corridor plan, which would significantly diminish the neighborhood and quality of life the entire area covered by this ill-conceived plan.

In addition to the potential loss of the Kemp Mill Shopping Center, an anchor of the orthodox Jewish community in Kemp Mill, the various other schemes to force people out of their cars and into mass transit will not work.

This area is suburban, not a city, and the distances and commute times are too great for most people to bicycle, walk, or use mass transit. Blocking another lane on University Blvd is also ridiculous, since virtually no one uses the (supposedly temporary) bike lanes that have become permanent. In addition, adding "affordable" housing units to an already crowded area will just make traffic congestion even worse.

Please reconsider this terrible plan. Thank you.

[REDACTED]
914 Brentwood Ln
Wheaton 20902

--

[REDACTED]
Police and Public Safety Psychology
[REDACTED]



Secured by [REDACTED] - HITRUST certified

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: serious problems with the University Blvd Plan
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 7:41:06 PM

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

:As a resident of Montgomery County for fifty-three years and a resident of Kemp Mill for most of that time. I object to much of the University Boulevard Corridor Plan (UBCP). I am cognizant of the realities of the Planning Department goals, and yet know that they are contrary to the interests of residents and are detrimental to our quality of life.

A bus lane is acceptable, bike lanes that very few use and that worsen traffic are not acceptable. Further reduction of speed limits on a six lane major highway are detrimental, as ZERO speed would insure that no accidents occur. Many senior citizens are not able to bike or even walk to mass transportation. Trying to prevent accidents and come up with a "good speed" is not easy. Its a balancing equation and for those of us who must drive, the new proposal is much more than an inconvenience. It is over regulation and poor planning!

Permitting denser development in single family home communities harms our communities and engenders more traffic, less parking space, more need for public schools, more need for policing, and higher taxes and fees to pay for this. We have a beautiful community. Do not undermine it.

If you want more housing lessen the the cost and amount of regulation required by Montgomery County. The high cost and extreme amount of regulation our County has promulgated has contributed to making the cost of homes high. Those county costs are passed on to home buyers. Make the process simpler, quicker, and less expensive.

Thank you in advance for carefully considering my comments.
Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
11517 Monticello Ave
silver Spring, MD 20902
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Written comments for public hearing - University Boulevard Corridor Plan - Quick and reliable automobile transit to and from 495
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 7:50:27 PM

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

How does the University Boulevard Corridor Plan address the need for unincumbered automobile transit from the University Boulevard corridor to and from 495?

As planners aim "to transition Four Corners from an auto-dominant center into a mixed-use, people-oriented center", and consider ideas such as potentially narrowing University Boulevard, or narrowing Route 29 lanes for dedicated BRT lanes, what part of the plan acknowledges and provisions for the everyday need for people in Four Corners and beyond to access the beltway via car? This legitimate need might not be in-style or mesh neatly with a vision of a more people-oriented center, but it is still a real need and will continue to be a need for decades to come and as such should be central to the plan.

Pedestrian safety is critical, and I am grateful that it will be improved, but we need a careful planning touch in Four Corners so while needed improvements are considered, let's be careful not to exacerbate already snarled automobile traffic.

While it's tempting to look at car driver needs and pedestrian needs as mutually exclusive, or overemphasize the hypothetical impact of solutions like BRT, I look forward to seeing how the plan will not overlook or de-emphasize quick and reliable automobile transit to and from 495. For many, it's the reason why we live here.

Four Corners resident

10402 Brookmoor Drive, Silver Spring, MD 20901

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Re: Comments on University Boulevard Corridor Plan (Working Draft)
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 9:46:52 PM

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

My address is 12427 Kemp Mill Rd, Silver Spring, MD 20902.

On Sun, Feb 9, 2025, 3:10 PM [REDACTED] wrote:

To whom it may concern:

I live in the Kemp Mill neighborhood, and am deeply upset by the University Boulevard Corridor Plan (Working Draft). The plan calls for several changes that will have a significant negative impact on Kemp Mill, and the surrounding area, yet I feel that the Kemp Mill community was not consulted at all about these proposals until recently. (Indeed, the Kemp Mill Civic Association seems to have been taken by surprise when the plan was released on January, and its request for an extension to provide feedback was only partially granted.) At a minimum, I would encourage these plans to be put on hold until you can meet with community members to hear their concerns, as well as what they would like to see.

There are so many problems with the plan that I am not sure where to start. But let me begin by discussing proposed changes in the Kemp Mill neighborhood itself, specifically to the Kemp Mill Shopping Center and Arcola Ave. The Kemp Mill neighborhood has only two outlets: via Kemp Mill Rd to Randolph Rd, and via Arcola Ave. to University Blvd on one end and Georgia Ave. on the other end, Traffic on Arcola already backs up during the morning and evening commutes. The current plan would make this traffic much worse by:

- Adding additional housing at the Kemp Mill Shopping Center and along Arcola.
- Reducing the speed limit on Arcola.
- Eliminating the merge from Arcola to University Blvd. East.
- Eliminating right turn on red from University Blvd. East onto Arcola.

Many Jewish families live in the Kemp Mill neighborhood. While I was glad to see the report mention Jewish residents of Montgomery County, I did not get the sense that the writing of the report actually spoke with any current Jewish residents in the major Jewish communities (including Kemp Mill). The Kemp Mill Shopping Center is a lifeblood of the community, providing kosher shopping and dining options for residents of the neighborhood. Any disruptions to that would be hugely harmful to the existing community.

I don't understand the reasoning for reducing speed limits on University Blvd, Arcole Ave., and Lambertson Dr. Driving in Montgomery County is already bad enough -- not due to traffic volume, but due to poorly timed traffic signals, exceedingly low speed limits, poorly placed bus stops, and a reduction in car lanes on several key routes (including University Blvd. and Georgia Ave.).

Other comments:

- The repeated focus on "walking, biking, and rolling" is completely impractical. (And I say this as someone who walks my dog on the trails in Kemp Mill every day.) I never see bikers

or walkers (or rollers!) on University Blvd. Where would they be going? Most people cannot walk/bike/roll to work or even the Metro. A car is a necessity for the majority of professionals living here.

- Have you taken into account the likely reduction in the Federal workforce (including contractors) as a result of the current Trump administration?

Thank you for your consideration,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Blvd Corridor Plan
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 9:58:50 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members,

As a Montgomery County resident and someone who frequently uses University Boulevard and the surround streets as part of my daily commute, I'd like to express my concerns with the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan.

In general, the plan prioritizes the needs of the minority of University Boulevard users who use buses, sidewalks, or bike over the needs of the vast majority who drive. This is impractical and inequitable.

In particular, I oppose any plan to:

- Make the currently-underutilized bus lanes on University Blvd permanent, narrowing the lanes available to drivers.
- Eliminate designated lanes for right-turning vehicles to turn without a signal.
- Make University and Colesville two-lane roads at Four Corners, with no designated turnaround.
- Set speed limits along all of University between Four Corners and Wheaton of either 25mph or 30mph.

While each of these proposals has issues, the combined effect of all of them will be unmanageable traffic congestion and gridlock for drivers, with serious consequences for the environment and quality of life.

I encourage the Planning Board to reconsider the plan to better account for the tens of thousands of taxpaying Montgomery County families who drive on University Boulevard as part of their commute and daily life.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

619 Hyde road
Silver Spring, MD, 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Blvd Corridor Plan
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2025 11:26:30 PM

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

Hi,

I have been a resident of the Kemp Mill neighborhood in Silver Spring now for about 25 years. It is a very special place to live and I am happy with the community and the environment.

I was very upset to hear the details of this plan. We are a family of 10. We rely upon the roadways to transport our kids and do not feel that bike lanes, limited streets, or additional access to public transportation will benefit our family. Rather, it will create more stress upon us and the community as we go about our daily activities. Additionally, we rely upon the Kemp Mill shopping center for so much of our shopping. If this is impacted, it will have a detrimental effect on our lives.

We cannot rely on public transportation and will be extremely upset if our roads are closed, narrowed, or limited in any way. Getting our kids to our local private school in the mornings and bringing home in the afternoon will become even more stressful.

Thank you for your consideration,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Blvd Corridor
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 10:13:14 AM

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

To Chairman Harris and the Planning Board:

First I want to say, I get it. I understand that the county would like to reduce vehicle traffic and encourage greater use of public transportation. It is a wonderful concept and has worked well in cities like New York and London.

It has not worked so well, however, in suburbia. It could perhaps if there were innumerable buses, trains, subway routes, etc in and out of every neighborhood in the county. But there are not.

And even if people living in the suburbs could be persuaded to take public transportation to work, there is still grocery shopping, doctor visits, family visits....all over the county. One might live in Olney and have family in Bethesda or Rockville ... you get it, I know.... and doctors in Silver Spring, Rockville, Fairfax!

In NYC one would take a taxi, a bus or a subway for all of this. But not in Westchester. And not in suburban Maryland.


The population of the lower county is already enormous. PLEASE, consider building housing in the less populated northern areas of the county.

Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Silver Spring
and a native of Montgomery County since almost forever....1966 graduate of Northwood HS

From: 
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Univesity Corridor Master Plan
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 11:36:22 AM

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

Esteemed planning commission

As a resident of Kemp Mill neighborhood, an area directly impacted by the University Corridor Master Plan I would like to voice the following objections:

1.
There were previous "Master Plans" to revitalize different areas in Wheaton that were never implemented. If the goal of the University Corridor Master Plan is to increase housing density and to expand the economic base in the county, the already existing central districts would seem to be ideal areas to do so. Instead, nothing really happened. Although the board claims there is no market for Wheaton redevelopment, it partly due the abandonment of any efforts to revitalize the area. Instead, Wheaton has seen a proliferation of down scale business and empty storefronts. Similarly, the County failed to maintain the vibrancy of the Downtown Silver Spring, allowing for proliferation of "lounges" along the Georgia avenue. The solution that the University Corridor Master Plan seems to offer is to tear up existing thriving business locations: Kemp Mill and Four Corners Shopping Centers.
2.
The push to increase higher density housing in previous low density neighborhoods appears to be centered on the South East part of the county. Due to community outcry and support of the County Executive, similar plans were abandoned in more affluent communities like Bethesda, Rockville and Potomac. This is an outrage. Since the goal is to increase the volume of affordable housing, the Planning Board is intended to essentially concentrate poverty downcounty, sparing the more affluent areas. This in term would adversely affect the property values of the existing residents, many of who lived in the area for generations. You are essentially taking our opportunity to pass on generational wealth to our children for the sake of an ill conceived social experiment that spared the wealthier parts of the county.
3.
The war on vehicular traffic waged by the Planning Commission to restrict access to local neighborhoods from the University Boulevard seems to simply to inconvenience the residents of the affected areas. Despite what the Planning Commission thinks, there is simply no walkable destination along University Boulevard. Moreover, residents rely on University Boulevard to access critical services, such as grocery stores. I sincerely doubt that the elderly residents of the affected neighborhoods are

willing to walk or bike with a week worth of groceries.

4.

The whole notion of if we build it, they will come is absurd. There is simply no demand for bikeable, rollable, walkable space along University Avenue. The ill fated bike lane pilot should have taught you that lesson: nobody used it. Improving recreational biking infrastructure, like updating existing bike paths to accommodate both walkers and bikers better is probably a better strategy to meet the needs of the community.

In summary, the University Corridor Master Plan is an ill conceived idea foisted on the community by two elected officials and few special interest groups that hardly represent the will or needs of the community.

Sincerely

[REDACTED]

Kemp Mill

--

[REDACTED]

11304 Cloverhill Drive, Silver Spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Vote Against the University Blvd Corridor Plan
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 2:04:04 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members,

As a Montgomery County resident and someone who frequently uses University Boulevard and the surrounding streets as part of my daily commute, I'd like to express my concerns with the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan.

In general, the plan prioritizes the needs of the minority of University Boulevard users who use buses, sidewalks, or bikes over the needs of the vast majority who drive. This is impractical and inequitable. In fact, during COVID, when the county used state funds to turn the University Blvd right lanes from the Four Corners areas to Amherst Ave into permanent bike and pedestrian lanes, it was a disaster. I took University Blvd every day during that time period and can count on one hand the amount of times I saw any bicyclists or pedestrians using those lanes. And the result of removing one lane from that major road and cutting off the right turn from Arcola Ave onto University turned a smooth traffic pattern into a congestion disaster. This also caused an increase in environmental Co2 emissions due to the increase in congestion and stopping and starting of cars, which this proposed plan will exacerbate.

In particular, I oppose any plan to:

- Make the currently-underutilized bus lanes on University Blvd permanent, narrowing the lanes available to drivers.
- Eliminate designated lanes for right-turning vehicles to turn without a signal.
- Make University and Colesville two-lane roads at Four Corners, with no designated turnaround.
- Set speed limits along all of University between Four Corners and Wheaton of either 25mph or 30 mph.
- Rezone the Kemp Mill Shopping Center for high-density "affordable" housing. This will necessarily increase congestion along Arcola Ave, increase crime, eliminate a vital commercial area for the community, and decrease the quality of life in the Kemp Mill area.

While each of these proposals has issues, the combined effect of all of them will be unmanageable traffic congestion and gridlock for drivers, with serious consequences for the environment and quality of life.

I encourage the Planning Board to reconsider the plan to better account for the tens of thousands of taxpaying Montgomery County families who drive on University Boulevard as part of their commute and daily life.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
623 Kenbrook Dr, Silver Spring 20902

--



From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Opposed to University Blvd Plan
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 2:59:54 PM

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

I am writing as a resident of Kemp Mill to state that I am opposed to this plan as it stands now. You do not appear to have taken the community's needs into consideration on several levels-including both cultural and traffic related.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University blvd corridor opposition letter. PLEASE READ ALL
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 3:39:02 PM

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

To Whom This May Concern,

I have looked through the 150 page proposal and come to the conclusion that your planners do not have any grasp of my community or it's needs. It seems there is an agenda to decrease cars and inconvenience car drivers. This is your overall theme of your proposal - it is not about beautifying, offering services , or improving our lives.

Regarding your bus lanes, I commute up and down Georgia and University every day and my commute time has nearly doubled because of the bus lanes. If you checked ridership I suspect it would be much lower than your prior numbers because of the Northwood High School closure. The majority of the bus traffic has always been the high school twice daily. I do not think you understand your bus ridership and more specifically the Kemp Mill Estates community.

Do you expect residents who live in Kemp mill Estates to walk 2 or more miles to the few bus stops on Arcola (which by the way have no protection from the weather!) No buses run through our the neighborhood. My house is nearly 1 mile to a bus stop.

Furthermore, we are a carpool community. Many of us have multiple children and send to private school. The county does not provide school buses, thus we drive large vans and minivans. Many in the community also work for the government so after driving carpool they drive into DC. This is the community we have. This will not change without school busing regardless of how many bus lanes you install. We all will still have to drive.

Regarding your proposal for higher density housing, eventually it may be a benefit but so far the higher density housing we have has brought increased crime and poor living conditions. The Warwick has weekly evictions - furniture strewn out in the grass, disabled residents are left for days in the lobby because the elevator is broken, and the Towers and Warwick have the highest crime rates in the neighborhood. Do not add more until you fix what is wrong.

Furthermore, major construction near the Kemp Mill shopping center will put the ONLY LOCAL KOSHER GROCERY and 3 local kosher restaurants out of business.

Regarding your insane speed limit proposals.

University Boulevard: Lowered to 30 mph throughout and 25 mph in Wheaton

Colesville Road: Lowered to 30 mph

Arcola Avenue: Lowered to 20 mph

Dennis Avenue: Lowered to 20 mph

Lamberton Drive: Lowered to 20 mph

I cannot even comprehend what you are thinking. Arcola and University are already way too slow. 20 mph is slower than ANY residential road. ARCOLA is a single lane road that allows us to get from University to Georgia to Veirs Mill. You want to slow us to a single lane crawl for what reason? Colesville is an actual highway - I take it until to get to 70 and Baltimore. Why would you lower the speed limit to barely residential? University should be at minimum 40 and Arcola 35 mph. Why, it's almost as if you want to discourage this neighborhood from driving?

Regarding the complete ban on right turns on red at every signalized intersection within the University Boulevard Corridor area, why? We have one example already (the light at right hand turn from University to Arcola) and everyone knows it is timed incorrectly. I have lived here 14 years and no one has fixed the timing. You could get double the cars through by just fixing that light. Has anyone in your commission actually sat at that light and noticed the problem? Red light right hand turns help traffic move! Our county does not know how to time them for efficiency.

Regarding the elimination of Merge Areas: Removes merge zones, including the 'yield area' from Arcola Avenue on University Boulevard. You did this when you had put in the disastrous bike lanes and it led to massive traffic back up on Arcola.

In summary, you seem keen on stressing your desire to preserve the Jewish community and it's history and yet it disregards EVERY NEED of this small centrally located community.

In fact, your proposal clearly shows that you have not done your research, do not understand the special nuances or needs of this community, nor have any desire to learn them.

If you actually want to discuss, please reach out to me.

With absolute disappointment,

[REDACTED]

709 Horton Drive

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Montgomery County Planning
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 3:59:11 PM

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

- > Dear Chairman Harris
- > As an active member of the Kemp
- > Mill community I am writing in opposition to the plan proposal as is. In an effort to manage traffic and increase density of “affordable “ housing the plan destroys
- > in tact communities such as Kemp Mill. And the thought of building a road and housing through an active shopping center Kemp Mill shopping center that has a DMV and other longstanding businesses is simply appalling to me.
- > This area has what the plan addresses. It has walkable businesses that service two high rise apartments and condos as well as a wide area of homes where residents can and DO walk to. Destroying an intact business area for more housing and a road is simply abusive of scarce resources.
- > Yes managing traffic better on University Blvd has some merit but not at the expense of destroying the good that’s there
- > The current approach to bus lanes is confusing and people use the red lined lanes to pass the crowded vehicles going slower. Dangerous at best.
- > I cannot support county leaders who are so myopic in thinking that destroying the good that exists for something not well envisioned could possibly serve Montgomery County taxpayers well. Taxes are already too high here.
- > How much more housing are we going to subsidize
- > Thank you for your attention to this matter
- >

[REDACTED]
Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Boulevard Corridor Plan (UBCP)
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 4:21:33 PM

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

Dear Mr Artie Harris,

I am opposed to the UBCP as outlined in the published proposal as follows:

1. Reducing travel lanes on Univ Blvd will cause traffic delays to become unbearable and cause increased hardship to already slow traffic movement.
2. Rezoning the Kemp Mill Shopping area to allow affordable high-density housing will add unnecessary increased traffic in the area and have a significant negative effect on the special character of the current neighborhood. Furthermore, adding additional access to the shopping center will undoubtedly cause an increase in crime in the area. My experience as an insurance professional can attest to whenever there is easy access to main roads and ultimately to interstate highways, crime increases as an easy "getaway" route is created. The low crime rate now experienced in the Kemp Mill is a result of the inaccessibility to high speed gateway routes.
- 3 More attention should be given to the needed updating and development of "downtown" Wheaton which is already having a negative impact on the Univ Blvd area.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

[REDACTED]
601 Bromley St
Silver Spring MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: No to the University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Saturday, February 22, 2025 8:23:55 PM

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

I strongly oppose the University Boulevard Corridor Plan. The Board's lack of transparency and short notice for public review demonstrate disregard for residents' concerns.

The proposed rezoning and traffic changes will harm organic community growth and development by making the area less attractive to existing and future residents and businesses. The plan will displace long-term residents, strain local infrastructure, reduce access to community resources and local businesses, and undermine existing neighborhoods. The plan will increase congestion and make travel more burdensome and dangerous for drivers, pedestrians, bicyclists, and emergency responders. The plan also fails to assure that security measures will be implemented to address increased safety concerns associated with greater urban density and public transportation.

I urge the Board to postpone approval, allow more public input, and choose market-driven alternatives.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Opposition to the University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Saturday, February 22, 2025 8:45:06 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members:

I strongly oppose the University Boulevard Corridor Plan. The Board's lack of transparency and short notice for public review demonstrate disregard for residents' concerns.

The proposed rezoning and traffic changes will harm organic community growth and development by making the area less attractive to existing and future residents and businesses. The plan will displace long-term residents, strain local infrastructure, reduce access to community resources and local businesses, and undermine existing neighborhoods. The plan will increase congestion and make travel more burdensome and dangerous for drivers, pedestrians, and emergency responders. The plan also fails to assure that security measures will be implemented to address increased safety concerns associated with greater urban density and public transportation.

I urge the Board to postpone approval, allow more public input, and consider market-driven alternatives.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

605 Bromley St, Silver Spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: opposition to University Blvd Plan
Date: Saturday, February 22, 2025 8:47:58 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members:

I strongly oppose the University Boulevard Corridor Plan. The Board's lack of transparency and short notice for public review demonstrate disregard for residents' concerns.

The proposed rezoning and traffic changes will harm organic community growth and development by making the area less attractive to existing and future residents and businesses. The plan will displace long-term residents, strain local infrastructure, reduce access to community resources and local businesses, and undermine existing neighborhoods. The plan will increase congestion and make travel more burdensome and dangerous for drivers, pedestrians, and emergency responders. The plan also fails to assure that security measures will be implemented to address increased safety concerns associated with greater urban density and public transportation.

I urge the Board to postpone approval, allow more public input, and consider market-driven alternatives.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
11517 Monticello Ave
Silver Spring, MD 20902
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: opposition to University Blvd plan
Date: Saturday, February 22, 2025 8:59:47 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members:

I strongly oppose the University Boulevard Corridor Plan. The Board's lack of transparency and short notice for public review demonstrate disregard for residents' concerns.

The proposed rezoning and traffic changes will harm organic community growth and development by making the area less attractive to existing and future residents and businesses. The plan will displace long-term residents, strain local infrastructure, reduce access to community resources and local businesses, and undermine existing neighborhoods. The plan will increase congestion and make travel more burdensome and dangerous for drivers, pedestrians, and emergency responders. The plan also fails to assure that security measures will be implemented to address increased safety concerns associated with greater urban density and public transportation.

I urge the Board to postpone approval, allow more public input, and consider market-driven alternatives.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
1121 University Blvd West-Apt 211
silver spring, MD 20902
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: oppose UBC plan
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 3:31:23 AM

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

As a resident of Kemp Mill for the past 20 years, I am very much opposed to the proposed UBC plan. I rely on University Blvd for my drive to work in Bethesda - an area that is not easy to access by public transport from our area. The current bus lanes are already slowing traffic, and also therefore making it take longer to turn against traffic to connecting roads, so that there are longer build ups of left turning cars. There are almost never buses in these lanes, and it seems like their existence is not benefiting many. Therefore the benefit / detriment balance is very much in favor of harming traffic and the majority of residents.

Taking away right turn lanes out of the neighborhood in Kemp Mill onto UBC will also have a very bad effect on traffic in Kemp Mill as was seen in the first trial of these bus lanes.

As for the proposed zoning changes in the Kemp Mill shopping centre. Why would you want to change something that is working well, and is a successful neighborhood shopping centre, with access to Sligo Creek, and many shops and the DMV that many people also use from outside the neighborhood. Our kids grew up in this neighborhood and were able to walk alone to the shopping centre, from the age of 10 or so, giving them a wonderful sense of independence and we were secure in the knowledge that the community was safe and supportive.

For all these reasons and many more I oppose the UBC

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: UMC plan
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 9:47:06 AM

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

Dear Planning Board Members:

I strongly oppose the University Boulevard Corridor Plan. The Board's lack of transparency and short notice for public review demonstrate disregard for residents' concerns.

This plan affects the entire local, Baltimore, DC, northern Virginia, and Maryland Jewish communities. This local community has shops and restaurants that are visited regularly by Jews in all parts of the above mentioned areas. This is a vital source for basic needs of the Jewish community. People regularly travel from far distances just to access this community and the resources available.

Without proper outreach to the Jewish communities this shows a clear and obvious bias and disregard for the very constituents you should be supporting in your work!

The proposed changes will have a regional negative effect and this was not at all considered in this process.

The proposed rezoning and traffic changes will harm the existing community fabric of this area with a significant negative impact on the surrounding Jewish communities. The plan will displace long-term residents, reduce access to community resources and local businesses, and undermine existing neighborhoods.

I urge the Board to postpone approval, allow more public input, and consider market-driven alternatives.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
3016 Vandever St.
Brookeville, Md. 20833
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: public comment for University Blvd Corridor Plan
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 1:45:27 PM

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

Hello, I live on Dallas Ave close to Renfrew/Dennis, so I am directly impacted by the county's plan.

I do NOT support the county's proposal to rezone this area for multi-unit dwellings. As a resident, I do not support multi-unit dwellings or additional commercial properties in the currently-residential areas that are located away from Colesville (such as Dennis Ave at University Blvd). I am against the rezoning proposition for the following reasons:

1. the County has not even addressed the needs of current residents and therefore cannot accommodate additional residents: crime has spiked in our area (there are even home invasions now), there have been multiple water main breaks resulting in 24+ hours without water, it already takes weeks for roads to be paved or repaired, and police routinely do not respond to residents' calls regarding illegal activity (the most blatant being the illegal fireworks on December 24). Adding additional residents without addressing the current needs will only tax our resources and systems more. We are told there aren't enough police to respond to resident calls or patrol the neighborhood now. We are told that the water pipes are very old and need to be replaced. We are told that police are underfunded and understaffed. The county should address these worsening issues before overtaxing the area with more residents, more commercial buildings, and more use. My representative (Mink) already doesn't respond to my emails - the County needs to respond to current residents and our concerns and needs before adding more population and density.
2. The noise in the area has increased dramatically over the past few years. I am woken up throughout the night every night from noise along university blvd - cars without mufflers (since the County decriminalized this), cars drag racing, cars speeding, planes flying overhead (we were never on the flight path before and now they start at 6am everyday), helicopters, barking dogs that are left outside all night, the beltway noise, lawnmowers, construction noise, leafblowers. The county does not even enforce the current noise ordinance or the gas-powered leafblower (when residents call or email, we're simply ignored). Changing the zoning to multi-unit dwellings will only further increase the noise, since the County refuses to enforce current laws. Many of us pay high property taxes here so we can enjoy some peace and quiet and nature, and now you're taking that away from us while increasing taxes. This will impact the housing market in the area, as people will leave the area due to worsening crime, noise, and unresponsive county reps/police.
3. The County should concentrate the growth in downtown silver spring or at the woodmoor area instead of adding sprawl to the residential areas.
4. The county should require nicer, higher-caliber businesses in the area. Woodmoor is full of fast food, corporate chains, and ugly storefronts. The area looks increasingly more run down and chintzy each year. Why add more traffic, trash, and noise before addressing these issues? there isn't a single nice restaurant or store in that area. Every new business is more fast food, which is not only an eyesore but also unhealthy for residents.

I DO support the following components of the plan:

5. adding more tree canopy - this will make the area look nicer, provide shade for pedestrians,

mitigate climate change impact, and increase property values. PLEASE make sure to include a budget and system for maintaining the trees after planting! they need consistent care for at least 2 years after planting so we're not stuck with dead trees along the streets.

6. landscaped buffers - I always support native plantings in the area to help with stormwater management and blight. Please have a system for dealing with trash. all the fast food chains contribute to more trash on the streets at woodmoor. there's no use in paying for landscaping if it will just be covered in trash. the county needs to include upkeep and trash removal on a regular basis.

[REDACTED]

10127 Dallas Ave

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Input for University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 3:07:43 PM

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

To Whom it May Concern:

I am against the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan. It will increase traffic in Kemp Mill and the surrounding areas where there is already significant traffic. I already have an hour plus commute to work in DC and the last thing this area needs is more traffic. Furthermore, your plans would make grocery shopping difficult during your reconstruction of the Kemp Mill shopping center which we rely to efficiently purchase groceries.

This plan would drive the current community out of Kemp Mill, plummeting real estate prices and forcing this area into a recession and crime.

I hope you will take the input from our community when making a decision about this area. The area that would most benefit from this plan would be downtown Wheaton.

Best,

[REDACTED]

--

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Opposing plan for UBC
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 5:09:16 PM

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

Good afternoon,

i am a resident of Montgomery County and Kemp Mill. I am writing to express my opposition to the UBC. I am concerned it will make driving in the neighborhood difficult and overwhelm our infrastructure and institutions. It will negatively impact many of our Kosher establishments in the Kemp Mill shopping Center. It will negatively impact our Jewish community as a whole and is not sensitive to the cultural needs of our ethnic minority community. Also, as stated in the plan "Montgomery County lacks a comprehensive understanding of architectural and cultural resources associated with Jewish history. Synagogues, schools, institutions and businesses in the Plan area should be studied as part of a larger effort to evaluate this integral part of Montgomery County.: This also doesn't mention our Kosher establishments. Also, there a number of things unclear in the plan.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
703 Hyde Road
Silver Spring MD 20902.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Blvd Corridor Plan Concerns
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 5:28:41 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members,

As a Montgomery County resident and someone who frequently uses University Boulevard and the surround streets as part of my daily commute, I'd like to express my concerns with the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan.

In general, the plan prioritizes the needs of the minority of University Boulevard users who use buses, sidewalks, or bike over the needs of the vast majority who drive. This is impractical and inequitable.

In particular, I oppose any plan to:

- Make the currently-underutilized bus lanes on University Blvd permanent, narrowing the lanes available to drivers.
- Eliminate designated lanes for right-turning vehicles to turn without a signal.
- Make University and Colesville two-lane roads at Four Corners, with no designated turnaround.
- Set speed limits along all of University between Four Corners and Wheaton of either 25mph or 30mph.

While each of these proposals has issues, the combined effect of all of them will be unmanageable traffic congestion and gridlock for drivers, with serious consequences for the environment and quality of life.

I encourage the Planning Board to reconsider the plan to better account for the tens of thousands of taxpaying Montgomery County families who drive on University Boulevard as part of their commute and daily life.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
117 Claybrook Drive
Silver Spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Blvd Corridor Plan Concerns
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 5:28:41 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members,

As a Montgomery County resident and someone who frequently uses University Boulevard and the surround streets as part of my daily commute, I'd like to express my concerns with the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan.

In general, the plan prioritizes the needs of the minority of University Boulevard users who use buses, sidewalks, or bike over the needs of the vast majority who drive. This is impractical and inequitable.

In particular, I oppose any plan to:

- Make the currently-underutilized bus lanes on University Blvd permanent, narrowing the lanes available to drivers.
- Eliminate designated lanes for right-turning vehicles to turn without a signal.
- Make University and Colesville two-lane roads at Four Corners, with no designated turnaround.
- Set speed limits along all of University between Four Corners and Wheaton of either 25mph or 30mph.

While each of these proposals has issues, the combined effect of all of them will be unmanageable traffic congestion and gridlock for drivers, with serious consequences for the environment and quality of life.

I encourage the Planning Board to reconsider the plan to better account for the tens of thousands of taxpaying Montgomery County families who drive on University Boulevard as part of their commute and daily life.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
117 Claybrook Drive
Silver Spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Corridor Plan
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 10:22:09 PM

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

I am ADAMANTLY opposed to "urbanizing" my neighborhood. The narrowing of Arcola and then the narrowing of University has made travel a frustrating nightmare. Our quality of life is being destroyed. The plan is not serving the Kemp Mill community. It is designed for a population that should be served in urbanized areas. We are not zoned as URBAN, we are zoned as , RESIDENTIAL. As a taxpayer, I do not want to change the status of the community that I love.

I spoke at the last meeting about the changes on (bike lanes and now bus lanes) that impacted our community without and the lack of directly notifying us about the proposals and meetings. If Montgomery County can send out fliers for recycling and for HIV medical clinics, SURELY they can notify us about road changes that affect our DAILY commutes, shopping, recreation and carepool. When I brought this up at the last meeting, the committee concurred that they could do better notifying us in the future. Once again, they did not! We received NO notification.

The area that you are targeting to urbanize, is outside of the map for metro urbanization. Who gave you the right to "amend" it? Why haven't you met with our civic association? How will you compensate us when the value of our properties drop significantly? How will you compensate us for the frustration of CAUSING traffic, for not allowing us to live the suburban life that we chose, which is being taken away without our consent?

One of the PAID consulting reports that the county paid for and received specifically said NOT to ruin this treasure of a community. You are taking away a lifestyle that we have invested in and DESTROYING IT.

Roads were built for travel and commerce. This is the ONLY county in Maryland that is taking away travel freedom from its citizens and FORCING traffic. YOU ARE NOT REPRESENTING YOUR TAX PAYERS...

Certainly this would not be imposed on Chevy Chase or Potomac...

[REDACTED]
11750 Lovejoy Street - Silver Spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Comment on University Blvd corridor plan
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 10:57:14 PM

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

I'd like to focus my comments on the proposed reduction in speed limits and elimination of traffic lanes (merge and bus lanes). These will make traffic worse than it already is to almost no benefit in terms of increased public transit use. The proposed speed limits are preposterously low and will not be adhered to as they are completely unrealistic. This will inevitably lead to the county bleeding people dry through more speed camera tickets, which of course impact lower income drivers the most. I'd like to see the data for the Georgia Ave bus lanes-have they increased public transit use? If not, why double down on policies that make people's lives more stressful, cost taxpayer money, and are not effective?

One other comment: if the county wishes to encourage public transit, it should not charge ridiculous parking rates at the Amherst garage. I can park in downtown DC for around the same price as a daily spot at the Amherst garage of over \$10 (not to mention the metro fare) which is insane. I'd prefer to take public transit but it is more economical to drive. This is a public policy fail.

The area subject to this plan is suburban, and the reality is that most people rely on cars to get to their jobs, school, shopping, and medical appointments. Imposing an urban framework on a suburban model is magical thinking. Please focus on improving the quality of life for residents, and not on promoting the latest urban development fads, laden with buzzwords.

Thank you for your consideration,

[REDACTED]
11702 Saddlerock Rd, Silver Spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: University Boulevard Corridor Plan - Comments from a Kemp Mill Resident
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 12:47:23 AM

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

I am Barry Silvermetz, a resident of Kemp Mill for over 25 years. I have seen the growth of our community with many wonderful, active people residing in Kemp Mill. We are a caring, giving community that enjoys diversity of thought and diversity of people.

The University Boulevard plan is a very detailed and well-meaning plan that re-thinks the possibilities of our area. I commend you on such thinking. I do, however, have major concerns with the draft proposal.

Regarding the Kemp Mill community, we have limited access to the main streets of Wheaton, including most notably University Boulevard. Our only access is via Arcola Avenue.

We have experienced a decrease in the accessibility to get in and out of our community. This began with the narrowing of Arcola Avenue to limit it to two lanes. This has been further limited with the removal of a car lane on University due to the ongoing Pilot Bus program.

We are further constrained in our transit by an encirclement of bus lanes on University Avenue and Georgia Avenue and the continued reduction in speed limits on these roads.

The draft plans as envision will only worsen the travel limitation to and from Kemp Mill by further restricting car travel on University Avenue and by adding additional housing units along the University corridor, including perhaps additional housing units within the Kemp Mill Shopping Center area.

While I can applaud the desire to improve access for biking, walking and rolling, there does not seem to be enough usage of those transportation methods to justify the enormity of the changes being proposed. I would like to see the data and analysis on the actual benefits derived from the pilot bus program, including time savings, increased bus usage, and bike traffic.

Regarding making the roads safer for all users, I would like to see the data of the accidents reported in the draft plan along with their causes. Going slower may help reduce accidents, but the addition of all of the bike lanes, speed cameras and crosswalks may actually increase the rate of accidents.

And while every life is precious, it is a fact that as you cause people to lose time due to increased traffic or slower traffic, you also impact the quality of life and may in fact impact the speed of access to life-saving services, resulting in unnecessary deaths. These considerations are not included in the overall draft. The goals of the plans are lofty, but the negative impact is great to many.

I strongly recommend a pause in the process and a re-engagement of the larger community that is impacted by this lofty plan.

As a recommendation, a more simple and cost effective plan to improve safety and to

assist bike riders, walker and rollers could involve adding attractive fencing along University Boulevard. And rather than adding crosswalks and slowing traffic, more palatable plan could involve building overpasses for crossing the road.

Another though that is much less expensive is to implement a local shuttle service. This could target areas that need a means of travel.


What I recall is a plan that involved expanding the business growth in Wheaton. That plan never too hold. If such a plan was truly implemented, then there would be more reason to enhance the public transportation, as the local business booms and people would seek to go to Wheaton.

At this time, there is not much reason for usage of bikes and rollers. There is not much need for walking along University Boulevard.

So at the upcoming meeting, please share and justify the expected increase in usage of these enhancements that are proposed in the plan. Please explain how slower traffic and crosswalks are a better approach to safety than my suggestions. Please consider the negative impact of the proposed changes to the quality of life of those that live in Kemp Mill.

I am open to a discussion on the draft plan and look forward to hearing more about the plan at the upcoming meeting.

Regards,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Concerned Resident Opposed to the University Blvd Corridor Plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:53:14 AM

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

Dear Chair Harris,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Montgomery County who deeply cares about the future of our community. While I appreciate the intent behind the University Boulevard Corridor Plan (UBCP), I strongly believe that the proposed changes will do more harm than good—particularly in terms of traffic congestion, pollution, and overall quality of life.

University Boulevard is a major road that thousands of people rely on every day. Reducing lanes and lowering speed limits to 25-30 mph will cause serious traffic backups, forcing cars onto side streets and increasing commute times. More idling traffic means more pollution, and congestion doesn't just go away—it spreads into surrounding neighborhoods, making them less safe for both drivers and pedestrians.

I'm also very concerned about the proposed rezoning of areas like the Kemp Mill Shopping Center for high-density housing. Our community is already struggling with crowded schools, limited parking, and aging infrastructure. While affordable housing is important, adding large residential developments without expanding our roadways and public transit options will only make these problems worse.

We all want a walkable, safe, and sustainable community, but this plan feels rushed and one-sided. Instead of drastic lane reductions, why not invest in targeted improvements like better crosswalks, pedestrian signals, and protected bike lanes that don't choke traffic flow? A more balanced approach would allow for safer streets without causing unnecessary frustration and disruption.

I urge you and the Planning Board to reconsider the UBCP as it stands. The residents of Montgomery County deserve a plan that truly works for everyone—not one that forces congestion and pollution onto our daily lives. Please listen to the voices of the community before moving forward with such impactful changes.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Significant concerns about the Montgomery County university Boulevard plan and 2050 vision
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:57:31 AM

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

I am a resident of Kemp Mill and am extremely concerned about your university Boulevard plan and 2050 vision. Both struck me as extremely unwise with significant negative side effects.

Further, I am very hesitant to say this, but they both come across as attacks on the Jewish community, significantly affecting our ability to attend synagogue and access kosher food. While I am loathe to attribute antisemitism, in an age where antisemitism has become rampant across this country, an unprecedented attack of this magnitude on the Jewish community feels very suspicious.

I sincerely hope the county reconsiders and put this entire plan in the garbage where it belongs.

I would be very happy to discuss at any time.

Sent from my iPhone

Montgomery County Planning Board

Public Hearing on the
University Boulevard Corridor Plan

February 27, 2025

Testimony of [REDACTED]

Silver Spring, Maryland

Good evening members of the Montgomery Planning Board ("Board") and fellow residents. My name is [REDACTED] and I am a resident of Silver Spring, in the South Four Corners neighborhood. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on the proposed Public Hearing Draft of the University Boulevard Corridor Plan ("Plan"). I testify tonight in strong opposition to the Plan.

I appreciate that you and the staff at the Montgomery County Planning Department have worked hard on the Plan, but as a resident of South Four Corners, I oppose it for several reasons. First, the Plan reaches too far into our neighborhood. Given that the District Council is now considering the More Housing N.O.W. Zoning Text Amendments (particularly ZTA 25-02), consideration of the University Boulevard Plan is largely moot regarding proposed zoning changes to housing density in our neighborhood. It is neither appropriate nor equitable for the Four Corners neighborhoods to be subjected to a plan that is different or more intrusive than anything that the Council is considering county-wide. Given that ZTA 25-02 addresses zoning along the University Blvd. corridor, the Plan being discussed tonight should be removed from further consideration at this time.

I also strongly oppose the proposed dedicated bus lanes bus along University Boulevard or Colesville Road. Respectfully, I do not accept the premise of the Planning Department that eliminating a lane for vehicles will entice people to walk, bike, or increase bus use. That is simply not how our community was designed or how people generally live their lives in our neighborhood. Bikes, buses, and walking sound wonderful in theory, but in reality, people need vehicles to get around our suburban neighborhood and to their jobs. We are not a 15-minute community and never will be.

Experience of dedicated bus lanes has been overwhelmingly negative in Montgomery County. Along Georgia Avenue, the bus lanes have made traffic grind to a halt at certain points beyond anything seen before and pushed traffic jams into surrounding streets. This has only gotten worse as federal teleworking policies come to an end. Traffic sits at a standstill while an entire lane is left virtually empty with no buses in sight. The Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) has never

released the complete dataset or study along this corridor. They have only released a very carefully worded two-page summary document without any underlying information to support their claims. And even the SHA admits vehicular traffic is far worse along the road, adding upwards of 20 minutes of commuting time a day for drivers along that road.

Similarly, residents have seen with their own eyes what happened along Old Georgetown Road when a vehicular lane was removed for a bike lane. On any given day of the workweek, the bike lane sits empty while cars idle in traffic in the remaining lanes. Our taxes pay for the entirety of those roads, not 2/3's of the road. The Planning Department has produced no clear in-depth study, data, or analysis to show how vehicular traffic will be improved under this plan, but rather, it misdirects the public with unfounded assumptions about the attractiveness of multi-modal transit to residents.

Further, as noted in the South Four Corners Citizens Association (SFCCA) Resolution regarding the Plan, I am opposed to any effort by the Planning Board to reinsert a "Street Grid" option in any form that will result in extensive traffic cut throughs into our neighborhood to avoid the traffic gridlock you are creating through the Plan. The Planning Department, as a matter of policy, must abandon plans that purposefully induce traffic gridlock that negatively impacts the quality of life for people living along these corridors.

Finally, I oppose the increase in proposed Commercial zoning in our neighborhood. Office vacancy rates and the county's economic climate do not necessitate an increase in commercial spaces. Our neighborhood also does not have the parking infrastructure to support an increase in commercial as envisioned by the Plan. The intrusion of unneeded commercial space into a longstanding residential neighborhood should be rejected by the Board.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony and thank you for your service to Montgomery County.

██████████ 10001 Tenbrook Drive, Silver Spring, MD

February 20, 2025

Chair, Montgomery
County Planning Board
2425 Reddie Drive
Wheaton, MD 20902

Re: UBC MNPPC Wheaton Plan Statement-UBC Project Meeting 2-27-2025

My name is [REDACTED]. I have lived at three different Wheaton addresses over 63 years. The current residence, where my family has been for 29 years, is right in the bullseye of this proposal, which I feel is a misguided and unnecessary project.

I have been opposed to this since the initial “pilot plan” for bus and bike lanes, and in spite of the community overwhelmingly opposing that first plan, you have bought it back on steroids. I have followed this since its inception and have attended the hearings. I have talked to my neighbors, and encouraged them, for or against, to provide their opinions. My concerns are listed below and follow the order of your plan as shown on the website. For clarity, I am only making my statement on the Amherst to Dennis portion of the plan, because that is where I section that would most impact me, and where I see the lack of need for this.

1. Economic Impact of this plan. Where will the money come from? With Federal and State funding seeing drastic cuts, who and how will you pay for this? Not only the infrastructure for the roads and utilities, but the necessary expansion of the schools in the cluster. The required upkeep, seeing as how this is currently minimal at best? What about a plan for an expanded police and fire department presence as your plan looks to explode, and thus dwarf, the already strained resources?

Overcrowding impact. Many of the schools within the boundaries are already utilizing portable class rooms. The impact on learning, especially at a school with a large ESOL population, will be affected by overcrowded class rooms.

“Establish an overlay zone to define neighborhood residential building types, prioritize development standards that further compact growth and transportation safety, and explore modifications, as necessary, to achieve transitions from larger to smaller buildings. The overlay zone will apply to properties recommended for rezoning in the plan.”

“Locate higher building densities and mixed uses at locations near BRT stations with existing commercial properties, including the WTOP property, the Kemp Mill Shopping Center, and Four Corners, and ensure new development transitions from larger to smaller buildings to adjacent residential properties.”

2. *A plan that calls for buildings between 3-4 stories high along University Boulevard between Easecrest and Nicholas Drive is going to drive the current residents in single family homes out. Rezoning to allow for the McMansioning of the neighborhood will do little for affordability. Houses in this neighborhood now are selling for an average of \$650,000. Creating density does nothing to improve quality of life.*

Have you also considered the impact that endless construction to both the corridor to create these lanes and new buildings will have? Creating more delays in traffic does not increase the quality of life for those of us here, who have to drive. The specter of another major infrastructure project coming on the heels of a yet completed Purple Line does not thrill me.

Sure, it's easy for the MNCPPC to say “Nothing's mandatory. Nobody has to change anything.” Well, if I came in and overdeveloped your neighborhood, I'll bet you would make a change. I have no desire to live in a “Pike and Rose” type of environment and I am confident that many of my neighbors feel the same way. So, yes, by approving and moving forward with this, I believe you will force folks to make a change that aligns with the same reason that they originally moved to this area.

“Implement a connected network of streets, comfortable walkways, and low-stress bicycle facilities, and right-size roadways and intersections to create a safer and more comfortable environment for people who are walking, rolling, bicycling, riding transit, and driving.”

3 Again, speaking for the Amherst to Arcola area, there is already newly paved walking, bike, rolling path in the park that connects these two roads through the park, and provides access to Sligo Creek Parkway. What could be more low stress than the park, not to mention the cost effectiveness. And, it appears from your plans that you intend to connect University Boulevard to Arcola by cutting through the park by extending Inwood Avenue and/or adding a connecting street on the planned WTOP Tower site? How would that impact, on the side north of University Blvd, the folks in that neighborhood?

The “bike-only lane” usage has been minimal. I use this route every day, twice a day at a minimum, and bike traffic has not been noticeable.

For the past two years, I have implored whomever was responsible to find a way to edge the existing sidewalks to return them to their original width, to no avail, and to have overgrowth that was blocking traffic control signs and crosswalk signal boxes to be trimmed back; which was accomplished after more than a year

of, for lack of a better word, complaining. This includes the Inwood House area, where the intersection of University/Inwood was so overgrown that folks could not access one of the corners. If you can't maintain what is in place now, what is the strategy for a more complex route? A decent snow could render University Boulevard into a single lane road.

“Provide dedicated transit lanes along University Boulevard and Colesville Road.”

4. Again, this proposal, under the guise of a “pilot program” has already failed once, yet you decided that maybe, if you painted the lanes, (at an estimated cost of around \$250,000.00), it would make them more acceptable. The majority of the folks polled the first time around overwhelmingly rejected this. It has, despite what your statements, created longer waits in traffic. I believe that the quoted time is “15 seconds”, but I am guessing that is a “middle of the day” survey, and not an evening or morning rush hour. This time matters to folks shuffling kids back and forth to schools, events, practices, etc. and should not be minimized to suit your needs. And, the lack of enforcement for the “bus only” lanes has created what is essentially a passing lane for those with no regard for the restrictions. As much as I oppose these lanes, I still respect the law. Anyone who lives in this corridor, and I am aware that none of the planners do, will tell you, the pinch point for traffic is from Dennis Avenue to Colesville Road. Dedicated lanes are not necessary on University Boulevard between Amherst and Dennis. This is not the problem you allege it to be.

“Make University Boulevard more resilient to climate change by incorporating tree canopy, shaded bus stops, improved stormwater management, and landscaped buffers.”

5. The lack of available funding to maintain these bus stops and landscaped buffers will render them “eyesores” within a year. Snowplows bend the reflector poles, storms blow debris around them and no one, except for the exceptional neighbors, ever cleans them up. I’ve seen this on Plyers Mill Road and Arcola Avenue, and this will be no different. Again, I go back to the point of limited funding for maintenance and ask, how will this be different?

I appreciate the opportunity to present my questions and concerns, and to steadfastly state my opposition. It is my hope that the parties involved (MNPPC and the County Council) will listen to the majority on this and not ignore us in this dubious pursuit of “progress”.

[REDACTED]
11111 Eascrest Drive
Wheaton, MD 20902
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: MCP-Chair
Subject: Re: Concern
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 4:15:09 PM

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

Correct. Thank you!

On Mon, Feb 24, 2025 at 3:48 PM MCP-Chair <mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Thank you for your email! I would like to confirm that you are sending the email below in regard to the University Blvd Corridor Plan.

Melissa

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2025 2:56 PM
To: MCP-Chair <mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org>
Subject: Concern

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

To whom it may concern

Thank you for your commitment to improving our community.

I believe that removing lanes and lowering speed limits in already congested areas is counterproductive.

I appreciate your consideration of our concerns regarding the current bus lanes and the plans for any future construction of bus lanes.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



1213 Arcola Ave.

Silver Spring

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: rezoning plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 4:25:07 PM

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

Dear Chairperson,

I am a Montgomery County Resident and will be affected by the rezoning of the Kemp Mill Corridor. I do NOT support the plan as it stands today.

- Thus far, there has been very limited public input on such an important matter.
- The plan needs to take adequate consideration of the impact on existing, self-sufficient communities, including apparent internal inconsistencies in its goals.
- The plan needs to take adequate consideration of economic considerations and recent societal events, such as “back to work” programs.

Consequently, the plan needs refinement.

To elaborate on each of these points:

- While the Planning Board staff has been working on this plan for quite some time, it has only recently been released, in final draft form, for public comment.
- The Plan will have a negative impact on the existing Kemp Mill community, by
 - Reducing and slowing traffic, yet
 - Encouraging a significant increase in population requiring transportation, while many transportation needs within and to/from the community will still only be met by driving
 - It will also stress and possibly overwhelm other neighborhood infrastructure and institutions, such as public (and non-public) schools
 - Redevelopment of the shopping center has a high probability of destroying the current retail establishments located in that center, which the report describes as “the only retail use in this neighborhood.” At least four of those establishments support the cultural needs of a specific minority, and they will probably not survive during a redevelopment period.
 - This will materially impact the viability of a well-established ethnic group within the existing community, severely damaged in the interest of building a new self-sufficient community.
- The Plan is not, by its own admission, sufficiently comprehensive.
 - Under the rubric of Historic Preservation, the plan states: “Montgomery County lacks a comprehensive understanding of architectural and cultural resources associated with Jewish history. Synagogues, schools, institutions and businesses in the Plan area should be studied as part of a larger effort to evaluate this integral part of Montgomery County.” (p. 132).
 - The report then identifies 4 Synagogues (one converted to a Baptist Church) and one school (Yeshiva of Greater Washington).

- No other institutions or businesses are identified, despite there being 4 kosher food establishments - several with long histories in Montgomery County - prominently located in the Kemp Mill Shopping Center.
- This suggests a lack of sufficient understanding of the current demographics and dynamics of the Arcola Avenue District and its ethnic composition, which could be severely impacted by the current plan.
- The Plan is relatively silent on the development of additional employment opportunities within the Arcola Avenue District, which is a cornerstone of the concept of developing self-sufficient communities
 - There is no discussion of what types of businesses might wish to locate or relocate to the area
 - It is not clear that any might wish to do so – especially when the trend of office location has shifted from “work from home” and decentralization to “back to the office” and centralization to permit what has been found to be essential in-person, face-to-face interaction among co-workers.

For all these reasons, we think the plan needs to be further researched and modified accordingly before action is taken.

Best regards,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact a signature.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Blvd. Corridor
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 4:30:05 PM

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

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of the Montgomery County community. I am a resident of the county, specifically Kemp Mill, and I have concerns about the University Blvd. Corridor plan.

Specifically, I am an Orthodox Jew and I benefit from various establishments in the Kemp Mill Shopping Center that cater to my needs and interests. If these businesses had to relocate they quite possibly would not survive.

Please do not pass the University Blvd. Corridor plan. Thanks very much.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Concern for new Kemp mill plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 4:34:57 PM

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

Unfortunately, I do not see the needs of the entire community including long term needs to have been addressed in your plan. Many people use the Kemp mill shopping center and your plan would not address these concerns. I highly doubt the new plan will ensure success in a time when so many work from home. Please allow for more public discourse.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MC-Voice-BCAST-ChairmanOffice](#)
Subject: Shared Voicemail (MC Main Chairman's Office)
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:43:17 AM
Attachments: [audio.mp3](#)
Importance: High

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

Hi, my name is [REDACTED]. I'm a resident of Montgomery County. I was just calling to register my significant concern about the University Blvd. corridor plan and the Thrive 2050 Master plan. Both of them struck me as extremely unwise and damaging to the community and also and I very hesitantly, but also very anti-Semitic. I mean, it was kind of like an attack on the Jewish community in a way that is I hopefully unintentional. But in the rising anti-Semitism of the country, it's very hard to read in a positive way. Anyway, my number is [REDACTED]. I would be very happy to discuss, but I am very concerned about it and I hope that the county takes this plan and throws it in the garbage where it belongs. Thank you very much. I hope you have a great day.

You received a voice mail from [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: UNIVERSITY BLVD CORRIDOR PLAN
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 5:35:25 PM

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

I left a voicemail message earlier today (2/21/25) but haven't heard back

I want to have entered my comments for the upcoming Hearing if I am referencing the correct area

From the article in the 2/19/25 Bethesda Magazine "5 things to know about the University Boulevard corridor plan", it appears the area may not be where I experience issues and the Hearing is the Montgomery County Planning Board, I think the area of my concern is Prince George's County but I'm not sure

University Blvd from about beginning University Blvd and New Hampshire Avenue on the way to i.e., University of Maryland, i.e., traveling on University Blvd from Wheaton

There is no traffic/pedestrian control or redesign or reconfiguration that can correct this problem, it's pedestrian behavior

There has never been a time when I've traveled this route that multiple people aren't darting out unexpectedly into oncoming traffic, crossing against the light, not crossing in crosswalks, even with children and babies, each time my heart is in my throat and I'm saying to myself "oh God please don't hit anyone"

Another issue in this area there has never been when traveling this area that I haven't seen one - three car crashes

If this is the wrong area for your Hearing please give me a referral where I can forward this email

Thank you
[REDACTED]

1401 Grosvenor Place #1222
Rockville, MD 20852

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 5:41:35 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members,

I am writing as a Montgomery County resident and a frequent user of University Boulevard and the surrounding streets. I have serious concerns about the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan, which prioritizes the needs of a small minority of users—those who travel by bus, bike, or foot—over the vast majority who rely on personal vehicles. This approach is impractical and inequitable.

I strongly oppose elements of the plan that would:

Make the underutilized bus lanes on University Boulevard permanent, further reducing the space available for drivers.

Eliminate dedicated right-turn lanes, forcing vehicles to wait for a signal and increasing congestion.

Reduce University Boulevard and Colesville Road to two lanes at Four Corners, without a designated turnaround, creating a bottleneck.

Lower speed limits to 25-30 mph throughout University Boulevard between Four Corners and Wheaton, further slowing traffic and adding to commuter delays.

Beyond these concerns, it is important to recognize that Arcola Avenue and this section of University Boulevard serve as critical emergency routes. The proposed changes will significantly increase congestion and slow emergency response times, particularly for ambulances traveling from Kemp Mill and neighboring communities to Holy Cross Hospital. This is a serious public safety issue. Just as speed bumps were avoided on Arcola for this reason, similar consideration must be given here to ensure emergency vehicles can reach those in need without unnecessary delays.

Additionally, with the reopening of Northwood High School and the enforcement of return-to-office policies, traffic on this already highly traveled route will only increase. Reducing lane capacity and lowering speed limits at a time when more commuters, students, and families will be relying on University Boulevard is shortsighted and will lead to even greater gridlock and possible traffic injuries and fatalities. Rather than restricting the flow of traffic, the county should be seeking solutions that accommodate the growing number of drivers and improve road efficiency.

While each of these proposals is problematic on its own, their combined effect will be severe traffic congestion, increased commute times, and gridlock. This will not only frustrate drivers

but also have environmental and economic consequences, as idling cars contribute more pollution and lost productivity.

I urge the Planning Board to reconsider this plan and develop a more balanced approach—one that acknowledges the needs of the tens of thousands of taxpaying Montgomery County families who rely on University Boulevard for their daily commutes and essential travel while also preserving the existing communities and the ability of emergency services to operate effectively.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

11518 Monticello Ave
Silver Spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Re University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 5:10:26 PM

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

Good afternoon

I'm writing to share my concern with the proposed plans to make significant changes to the Kemp mill / silver spring area. Please do not move forward with this program without getting clarity of the overwhelming negative impact it will likely have on the current community and the existing establishments.

More housing units will increase congestion in this already packed area. The stores in the shopping plaza will likely take a hit from the rezoning and building plans, which is significant because thousands of kosher keeping Jews rely on the super market and kosher establishments which are the only ones available in the area.

From what the plan describes it seems you do not have all of the data about the existing infrastructure in that immediate vicinity. There are several synagogues of significant size in the area that you do not acknowledge the existence of.

Additionally, the increase in population will definitely strain the existing schools in the area. Please halt until you address these important issues that will impact thousands of families in the area, including my own.

Thank you for your service,

[REDACTED]

18318 Georgia Avenue, Olney MD 20832

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Blvd Corridor Plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 7:45:38 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members,

I am writing as a Montgomery County resident and a frequent user of University Boulevard and the surrounding streets. I have serious concerns about the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan, which prioritizes the needs of a small minority of users—those who travel by bus, bike, or foot—over the vast majority who rely on personal vehicles. This approach is impractical and inequitable.

I strongly oppose elements of the plan that would:

Make the underutilized bus lanes on University Boulevard permanent, further reducing the space available for drivers.

Eliminate dedicated right-turn lanes, forcing vehicles to wait for a signal and increasing congestion.

Reduce University Boulevard and Colesville Road to two lanes at Four Corners, without a designated turnaround, creating a bottleneck.

Lower speed limits to 25-30 mph throughout University Boulevard between Four Corners and Wheaton, further slowing traffic and adding to commuter delays.

Beyond these concerns, it is important to recognize that Arcola Avenue and this section of University Boulevard serve as critical emergency routes. The proposed changes will significantly increase congestion and slow emergency response times, particularly for ambulances traveling from Kemp Mill and neighboring communities to Holy Cross Hospital. This is a serious public safety issue. Just as speed bumps were avoided on Arcola for this reason, similar consideration must be given here to ensure emergency vehicles can reach those in need without unnecessary delays.

Additionally, with the reopening of Northwood High School and the enforcement of return-to-office policies, traffic on this already highly traveled route will only increase. Reducing lane capacity and lowering speed limits at a time when more commuters, students, and families will be relying on University Boulevard is shortsighted and will lead to even greater gridlock and possible traffic injuries and fatalities. Rather than restricting the flow of traffic, the county should be seeking solutions that accommodate the growing number of drivers and improve road efficiency.

While each of these proposals is problematic on its own, their combined effect will be severe traffic congestion, increased commute times, and gridlock. This will not only frustrate drivers

but also have environmental and economic consequences, as idling cars contribute more pollution and lost productivity.

I urge the Planning Board to reconsider this plan and develop a more balanced approach—one that acknowledges the needs of the tens of thousands of taxpaying Montgomery County families who rely on University Boulevard for their daily commutes and essential travel while also preserving the existing communities and the ability of emergency services to operate effectively.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Opposition to University Blvd Corridor Plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 8:15:44 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members,

As a Kemp Mill, Montgomery County resident and someone who frequently uses University Boulevard and the surround streets as part of my daily commute, I'd like to express my concerns with the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan.

In general, the plan prioritizes the needs of the minority of University Boulevard users who use buses, sidewalks, or bike over the needs of the vast majority who drive. This is impractical and inequitable.

In particular, I oppose any plan to:

- Make the currently-underutilized bus lanes on University Blvd permanent, narrowing the lanes available to drivers.
- Eliminate designated lanes for right-turning vehicles to turn without a signal.
- Make University and Colesville two-lane roads at Four Corners, with no designated turnaround.
- Set speed limits along all of University between Four Corners and Wheaton of either 25mph or 30mph.

While each of these proposals has issues, the combined effect of all of them will be unmanageable traffic congestion and gridlock for drivers, with serious consequences for the environment and quality of life.

I encourage the Planning Board to reconsider the plan to better account for the tens of thousands of taxpaying Montgomery County families who drive on University Boulevard as part of their commute and daily life.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Opposition to the University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 8:19:36 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members:

I strongly oppose the University Boulevard Corridor Plan. The Board's lack of transparency and short notice for public review demonstrate disregard for residents' concerns.

The proposed rezoning and traffic changes will harm organic community growth and development by making the area less attractive to existing and future residents and businesses. The plan will displace long-term residents, strain local infrastructure, reduce access to community resources and local businesses, and undermine existing neighborhoods. The plan will increase congestion and make travel more burdensome and dangerous for drivers, pedestrians, and emergency responders. The plan also fails to assure that security measures will be implemented to address increased safety concerns associated with greater urban density and public transportation.

I urge the Board to postpone approval, allow more public input, and consider market-driven alternatives.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
11613 Le Baron Terrace
Silver Spring, MD 20902
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Opposition to the University Blvd corridor plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 8:20:04 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members,

As a Montgomery County resident and someone who frequently uses University Boulevard and the surround streets as part of my daily commute, I'd like to express my concerns with the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan.

In general, the plan prioritizes the needs of the minority of University Boulevard users who use buses, sidewalks, or bike over the needs of the vast majority who drive. This is impractical and inequitable.

In particular, I oppose any plan to:

- Make the currently-underutilized bus lanes on University Blvd permanent, narrowing the lanes available to drivers.
- Eliminate designated lanes for right-turning vehicles to turn without a signal.
- Make University and Colesville two-lane roads at Four Corners, with no designated turnaround.
- Set speed limits along all of University between Four Corners and Wheaton of either 25mph or 30mph.

While each of these proposals has issues, the combined effect of all of them will be unmanageable traffic congestion and gridlock for drivers, with serious consequences for the environment and quality of life.

I encourage the Planning Board to reconsider the plan to better account for the tens of thousands of taxpaying Montgomery County families who drive on University Boulevard as part of their commute and daily life.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Oppose ENTIRE Corridor plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 8:24:53 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members:

I strongly oppose the University Boulevard Corridor Plan. The Board's lack of transparency and short notice for public review demonstrate disregard for residents' concerns.

The proposed rezoning and traffic changes will harm organic community growth and development by making the area less attractive to existing and future residents and businesses. The plan will displace long-term residents, strain local infrastructure, reduce access to community resources and local businesses, and undermine existing neighborhoods. The plan will increase congestion and make travel more burdensome and dangerous for drivers, pedestrians, and emergency responders. The plan also fails to assure that security measures will be implemented to address increased safety concerns associated with greater urban density and public transportation.

I urge the Board to postpone approval, allow more public input, and consider market-driven alternatives.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
716 Kersey Rd
Silver Spring MD, 20902

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Blvd corridor
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 8:26:49 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members:

I strongly oppose the University Boulevard Corridor Plan. The Board's lack of transparency and short notice for public review demonstrate disregard for residents' concerns.

The proposed rezoning and traffic changes will harm organic community growth and development by making the area less attractive to existing and future residents and businesses. The plan will displace long-term residents, strain local infrastructure, reduce access to community resources and local businesses, and undermine existing neighborhoods. The plan will increase congestion and make travel more burdensome and dangerous for drivers, pedestrians, and emergency responders. The plan also fails to assure that security measures will be implemented to address increased safety concerns associated with greater urban density and public transportation.

I urge the Board to postpone approval, allow more public input, and consider market-driven alternatives.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
903 Kersey Rd
Silver Spring 20902
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Cc: [Adrianvala, Zubin](#); president@yise.org
Subject: February 27 Hearing on University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 8:26:54 PM

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

Dear Madam/Sir:

I represent Young Israel Shomrai Emunah of Greater Washington (YISE), a congregation with locations at Arcola Avenue and Lamberton Drive in Kemp Mill and a satellite location on University Boulevard between Route 29 and Arcola Avenue.

I registered to testify on behalf on of YISE at the February 27 Planning Board meeting. However, upon not receiving confirmation of my registration, I registered again this evening, but found that now (unlike when registering previously) that there is a wait-list to testify. What provisions will be made for institutions as well as individuals to testify if the February 27 schedule is filled; when will those alternative arrangements be publicized; and will the Planning Board make provisions for accommodating representatives of groups or organizations?

I look forward to hearing from you and to working with the Planning Board on this important matter.

Very truly yours,

Joshua Seidemann, President
Young Israel Shomrai Emunah of Greater Washington

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Oppose University Blvd corridor
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 8:29:19 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members:

I strongly oppose the University Boulevard Corridor Plan. The Board's lack of transparency and short notice for public review demonstrate disregard for residents' concerns.

The proposed rezoning and traffic changes will harm organic community growth and development by making the area less attractive to existing and future residents and businesses. The plan will displace long-term residents, strain local infrastructure, reduce access to community resources and local businesses, and undermine existing neighborhoods. The plan will increase congestion and make travel more burdensome and dangerous for drivers, pedestrians, and emergency responders. The plan also fails to assure that security measures will be implemented to address increased safety concerns associated with greater urban density and public transportation.

I urge the Board to postpone approval, allow more public input, and consider market-driven alternatives.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[903 Kersey Rd](#)
[Silver Spring 20902](#)
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: I Oppose the University Blvd Plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 8:49:23 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members,

As a Montgomery County resident and someone who frequently uses University Boulevard and the surround streets as part of my daily commute, I'd like to express my concerns with the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan.

In general, the plan prioritizes the needs of the minority of University Boulevard users who use buses, sidewalks, or bike over the needs of the vast majority who drive. This is impractical and inequitable.

In particular, I oppose any plan to:

- Make the currently-underutilized bus lanes on University Blvd permanent, narrowing the lanes available to drivers.
- Eliminate designated lanes for right-turning vehicles to turn without a signal.
- Make University and Colesville two-lane roads at Four Corners, with no designated turnaround.
- Set speed limits along all of University between Four Corners and Wheaton of either 25mph or 30mph.

While each of these proposals has issues, the combined effect of all of them will be unmanageable traffic congestion and gridlock for drivers, with serious consequences for the environment and quality of life.

I encourage the Planning Board to reconsider the plan to better account for the tens of thousands of taxpaying Montgomery County families who drive on University Boulevard as part of their commute and daily life.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
South Belgrade Road

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Opposition to the University boulevard corridor plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 8:53:59 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members and Council Members,

I am writing as a Montgomery County resident and a frequent user of University Boulevard and the surrounding streets. I have serious concerns about the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan, which prioritizes the needs of a small minority of users—those who travel by bus, bike, or foot—over the vast majority who rely on personal vehicles. This approach is impractical and inequitable.

I strongly oppose elements of the plan that would:

Make the underutilized bus lanes on University Boulevard permanent, further reducing the space available for drivers.

Eliminate dedicated right-turn lanes, forcing vehicles to wait for a signal and increasing congestion.

Reduce University Boulevard and Colesville Road to two lanes at Four Corners, without a designated turnaround, creating a bottleneck.

Lower speed limits to 25-30 mph throughout University Boulevard between Four Corners and Wheaton, further slowing traffic and adding to commuter delays.

Beyond these concerns, it is important to recognize that Arcola Avenue and this section of University Boulevard serve as critical emergency routes. The proposed changes will significantly increase congestion and slow emergency response times, particularly for ambulances traveling from Kemp Mill and neighboring communities to Holy Cross Hospital. This is a serious public safety issue. Just as speed bumps were avoided on Arcola for this reason, similar consideration must be given here to ensure emergency vehicles can reach those in need without unnecessary delays.

Additionally, with the reopening of Northwood High School and the enforcement of return-to-office policies, traffic on this already highly traveled route will only increase. Reducing lane capacity and lowering speed limits at a time when more commuters, students, and families will be relying on University Boulevard is shortsighted and will lead to even greater gridlock and possible traffic injuries and fatalities. Rather than restricting the flow of traffic, the county should be seeking solutions that accommodate the growing number of drivers and improve road efficiency.

While each of these proposals is problematic on its own, their combined effect will be severe

traffic congestion, increased commute times, and gridlock. This will not only frustrate drivers but also have environmental and economic consequences, as idling cars contribute more pollution and lost productivity.

I urge the Planning Board to reconsider this plan and develop a more balanced approach—one that acknowledges the needs of the tens of thousands of taxpaying Montgomery County families who rely on University Boulevard for their daily commutes and essential travel while also preserving the existing communities and the ability of emergency services to operate effectively.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,



1304 Heather Crest Terr
Silver spring MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Opposition to the University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 8:57:46 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members:

I strongly oppose the University Boulevard Corridor Plan. The Board's lack of transparency and short notice for public review demonstrate disregard for residents' concerns.

The proposed rezoning and traffic changes will harm organic community growth and development by making the area less attractive to existing and future residents and businesses. The plan will displace long-term residents, strain local infrastructure, reduce access to community resources and local businesses, and undermine existing neighborhoods. The plan will increase congestion and make travel more burdensome and dangerous for drivers, pedestrians, and emergency responders. The plan also fails to assure that security measures will be implemented to address increased safety concerns associated with greater urban density and public transportation.

I urge the Board to postpone approval, allow more public input, and consider market-driven alternatives.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
11711 Fulham St.
Silver Spring, MD 20902
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Boulevard Corridor Plan - detrimental for current residents of Kemp mill, Montgomery county
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 8:59:01 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members and Council Members,

I am writing as a Montgomery County resident and a frequent user of University Boulevard and the surrounding streets. I have serious concerns about the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan, which prioritizes the needs of a small minority of users—those who travel by bus, bike, or foot—over the vast majority who rely on personal vehicles. This approach is impractical and inequitable.

I strongly oppose elements of the plan that would:

Make the underutilized bus lanes on University Boulevard permanent, further reducing the space available for drivers.

Eliminate dedicated right-turn lanes, forcing vehicles to wait for a signal and increasing congestion.

Reduce University Boulevard and Colesville Road to two lanes at Four Corners, without a designated turnaround, creating a bottleneck.

Lower speed limits to 25-30 mph throughout University Boulevard between Four Corners and Wheaton, further slowing traffic and adding to commuter delays.

Beyond these concerns, it is important to recognize that Arcola Avenue and this section of University Boulevard serve as critical emergency routes. The proposed changes will significantly increase congestion and slow emergency response times, particularly for ambulances traveling from Kemp Mill and neighboring communities to Holy Cross Hospital. This is a serious public safety issue. Just as speed bumps were avoided on Arcola for this reason, similar consideration must be given here to ensure emergency vehicles can reach those in need without unnecessary delays.

Additionally, with the reopening of Northwood High School and the enforcement of return-to-office policies, traffic on this already highly traveled route will only increase. Reducing lane capacity and lowering speed limits at a time when more commuters, students, and families will be relying on University Boulevard is shortsighted and will lead to even greater gridlock and possible traffic injuries and fatalities. Rather than restricting the flow of traffic, the county should be seeking solutions that accommodate the growing number of drivers and improve road efficiency.

While each of these proposals is problematic on its own, their combined effect will be severe traffic congestion, increased commute times, and gridlock. This will not only frustrate drivers

but also have environmental and economic consequences, as idling cars contribute more pollution and lost productivity.

I urge the Planning Board to reconsider this plan and develop a more balanced approach—one that acknowledges the needs of the tens of thousands of taxpaying Montgomery County families who rely on University Boulevard for their daily commutes and essential travel while also preserving the existing communities and the ability of emergency services to operate effectively.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,



1111 university Blvd w, silver spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Blv Plan- opposed!!
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 9:05:58 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members:

I strongly oppose the University Boulevard Corridor Plan. The Board's lack of transparency and short notice for public review demonstrate disregard for residents' concerns.

The proposed rezoning and traffic changes will harm organic community growth and development by making the area less attractive to existing and future residents and businesses. The plan will displace long-term residents, strain local infrastructure, reduce access to community resources and local businesses, and undermine existing neighborhoods. The plan will increase congestion and make travel more burdensome and dangerous for drivers, pedestrians, and emergency responders. The plan also fails to assure that security measures will be implemented to address increased safety concerns associated with greater urban density and public transportation.

I urge the Board to postpone approval, allow more public input, and consider market-driven alternatives.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
11709 Fulham St, Silver Spring, MD 20902
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Opposed to University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 9:25:27 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members and Council Members,

I am writing as a Montgomery County resident and a frequent user of University Boulevard and the surrounding streets. I have serious concerns about the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan, which prioritizes the needs of a small minority of users—those who travel by bus, bike, or foot—over the vast majority who rely on personal vehicles. This approach is impractical and inequitable.

I strongly oppose elements of the plan that would:

- Make the underutilized bus lanes on University Boulevard permanent, further reducing the space available for drivers.
- Eliminate dedicated right-turn lanes, forcing vehicles to wait for a signal and increasing congestion.
- Reduce University Boulevard and Colesville Road to two lanes at Four Corners, without a designated turnaround, creating a bottleneck.
- Lower speed limits to 25-30 mph throughout University Boulevard between Four Corners and Wheaton, further slowing traffic and adding to commuter delays.

Beyond these concerns, it is important to recognize that Arcola Avenue and this section of University Boulevard serve as critical emergency routes. The proposed changes will significantly increase congestion and slow emergency response times, particularly for ambulances traveling from Kemp Mill and neighboring communities to Holy Cross Hospital. This is a serious public safety issue. Just as speed bumps were avoided on Arcola for this reason, similar consideration must be given here to ensure emergency vehicles can reach those in need without unnecessary delays.

Additionally, with the reopening of Northwood High School and the enforcement of return-to-office policies, traffic on this already highly traveled route will only increase. Reducing lane capacity and lowering speed limits at a time when more commuters, students, and families will be relying on University Boulevard is shortsighted and will lead to even greater gridlock and possible traffic injuries and fatalities. Rather than restricting the flow of traffic, the county should be seeking solutions that accommodate the growing number of drivers and improve road efficiency.

While each of these proposals is problematic on its own, their combined effect will be severe traffic congestion, increased commute times, and gridlock. This will not only frustrate drivers but also have environmental and economic consequences, as idling cars contribute more pollution and lost productivity.

I urge the Planning Board to reconsider this plan and develop a more balanced approach—one

that acknowledges the needs of the tens of thousands of taxpaying Montgomery County families who rely on University Boulevard for their daily commutes and essential travel while also preserving the existing communities and the ability of emergency services to operate effectively.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,



Kemp Mill Resident

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 9:47:12 PM

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

Dear MoCo Planning Board,

I am a resident of the Kemp Mill neighborhood, and I have profound concerns about the proposed changes to my neighborhood.

First of all, I am appalled that the zoning changes are proposed for an already-dense neighborhood, as opposed to other MoCo areas where there is much more open space (e.g., Bethesda, Potomac).

The fact that the Board proposes zoning changes does NOT in any way guarantee that the developers who take advantage of the changes will build low-to-moderate income housing. They will still be free to build luxury housing, while profiting handsomely from the Board's changes.

The fact that the Board is proposing dense residential housing within the Kemp Mill Shopping Center makes no sense. The Shopping Center has exactly one entrance and exit, and is already a very busy place. The addition of dense housing would have an enormous impact on traffic, both vehicular and pedestrian. The resulting congestion would lead to longer traffic jams, extended commutes, and increased air pollution caused by cars standing in line, waiting to move forward.

Kemp Mill is a community uniquely set up to meet the needs of the Jewish population that resides in its midst. The proposed changes would create multiple challenges for that community, including potentially choking off the resources currently available to us in the Shopping Center and the surrounding area -- synagogues, kosher restaurants, Jewish schools and a kosher grocery store. If those institutions experience failures because of these proposals, the entire community would be affected. The changes would also degrade the quality of life in the whole neighborhood through road limitations affecting our ability to travel freely to wherever we need to go.

The fact that the Board is proposing to increase the number of people who live here, even while making the streets of Kemp Mill a greater challenge to navigate, is outrageous. Small actions, such as removing the merge lane from Arcola onto westbound University Boulevard, result in enormous traffic jams that stretch back miles into Kemp Mill. That is not conducive to eliminating a source of climate change,

These proposals do not make Kemp Mill a safer, more pleasant place to live. The changes would destroy the local Jewish community, make driving more here even more dangerous, and degrade our quality of life. I am a voter, and I strenuously object to this plan.

Thank you for your attention.

[REDACTED]

611 Bromley St.

Kemp Mill

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Kemp Mill Resident Feedback on the University Blvd Corridor Plan and Thrive 2050 Master Plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:16:02 PM

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

Dear Planning Board Members:

I am a resident of Kemp Mill and travel almost daily by car on Arcola Ave and University Blvd. I also frequently use the Metro to travel to work in the Pentagon and Crystal City.

Bottom Line

Both the University Blvd Corridor Plan and the Thrive 2050 Master Plan have not been developed considering the best interests of current residents of Kemp Mill and surrounding neighborhoods; therefore, I am strongly against the implementation of these plans as currently conceived.

Key Points:

1. University Blvd is a major arterial road between Wheaton and the University of Maryland. Any further reduction in the lanes of travel or reduced speed limits for vehicles will significantly impact traffic for the 40,000-50,000 vehicles utilizing the road daily.
2. Bus travel on University is not helpful for many commuting residents and biking is even less realistic for most residents.
3. If the bus lanes were transitioned into HOV3+ lanes, the county could support both the rapid movement of buses and high occupancy vehicles (e.g. carpools) on University Blvd.
4. Current speed limits should be maintained on University Blvd. The county should increase the number of speed control cameras in order to reduce unsafe driving.
5. Pedestrian overpasses at key intersections would make the road safer for pedestrians; particularly at the University and Colesville Four Corners intersection.
6. The speed limit on Arcola Ave between Georgia Ave and University Blvd is appropriate, but speeding and reckless driving must be checked through the installation of additional speed control cameras at the Arcola and Kemp Mill Rd. intersection and the intersection of Arcola and Lamberton.
7. The Arcola and University Blvd intersection is consistently backed up onto Arcola during rush hour. Removing the right-hand turn merge lane onto University would create

additional back-ups and would impede emergency vehicle access to University from Arcola.

8. The Kemp Mill neighborhood is largely suburban with some high-density apartment towers adjoining University Blvd. Adjustments to zoning in Kemp Mill and the addition of more high-density housing would negatively affect the area, particularly if it was developed at the expense of the shopping and restaurants in the Kemp Mill Shopping Center or the churches, synagogues, and religious institutions on Arcola. Kemp Mill is already a “model community” with high levels of pedestrian sidewalk use to schools, shopping, and places of worship.

Additional Considerations

- Although University Blvd connects with metro service via bus or vehicle, it will remain a highly used arterial road connecting neighborhoods with the Beltway and suburban shopping establishments. Families with 2-6 children living in Kemp Mill and the surrounding neighborhoods are not going to use the bus instead of carpools to get to after-school activities, go grocery shopping, go to medical appointments, or the hospital. The University Blvd plan should be realistic and benefit the maximum number of residents, with safety and sustainability in mind.
- Similar to the HOV3+ access on the Beltway and I-95 EZ-Pass lanes, it would be reasonable to allow HOV3+ vehicles to utilize the bus lane on University. This would reduce traffic during rush hour and support carpools.
- Reckless driving and speeding on both Arcola and University Blvd is an ongoing issue. Unfortunately, there are not enough police to effectively control these heavily used roads. Therefore, in order to support public safety, the county should install additional speed monitoring cameras at key intersections.
- Pedestrian safety is a significant concern during the whole day, but particularly during rush hour. The county should build pedestrian overpasses on University Blvd.

Finally, both the University Blvd Corridor Plan and the Thrive 2050 Master Plan seem to target the suburban lifestyle and the privately owned vehicles as problems impacting the development and flourishing of the county. Opinions vary on these topics, but the reality is that Kemp Mill and the surrounding area is mostly suburban with some high-density housing. The Planning Board should accept these realities and develop reasonable solutions that will enable the residents of the county to flourish.

I look forward to playing a role in thoughtful discussions regarding the future of the University Blvd corridor and changes to zoning in Kemp Mill.

Respectfully,



Address: 1301 Heather Crest Ter., Silver Spring, MD 20902



From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Blvd Corridor Plan Comments/Testimony
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:57:54 PM
Attachments: [2025-02 UBCP Statement.pdf](#)
[UBCP Appendix F-Transportation excerpts.pdf](#)

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

To the Montgomery Planning Board – I am a Montgomery County/South Four Corners resident for 9 years submitting written comments on the University Blvd Corridor Plan. I signed up to testify at Thursday's Master Plan Public Hearing, but it appears it is a waitlist only, so for the record please find my comments below in text form, and attached as a .pdf with excerpts from the UBCP Appendix F - Transportation.

[REDACTED]
10005 Sutherland Rd
Silver Spring, MD 20901

Statment below:

Thank you to the Planning Board, the UBC Planning Team, and all the time and effort on the University Blvd Corridor Plan. There are a lot of area improvements in this plan that, as a resident, I like and can be excited about.

I am a resident of South Four Corners, where we have lived for almost a decade. I live on the first street off of Colesville - about as close to the Four Corners intersection as anyone. I'm taking this opportunity to register opposition to one element of the plan - that of the reworking of Four Corners into the "Street Grid" design. I acknowledge the partial removal of the street grid proposal from the UBC working draft, though I and many residents *remain* concerned about "connected streets" recommended in the long-term vision, and *more concerned* by public comments by Planning Board commissioners pushing for Street Grid implementation.

My dead-end street would get connected to University for vehicle traffic to flow through. Throughout the UBC planning process, it has been stressed time and again that this plan is prioritizing walkability / bikeability / accessibility over vehicular transportation, and is guided by Montgomery County's Vision Zero - my rhetorical question is: 'Do all of those goals stop at the border of University Blvd? Do they not extend into the neighborhoods along University? Do they not apply to our neighborhood streets where we live, walk, bike, and play with our families?'

We walk along University and to Woodmoor multiple times a week and I commute through it daily. As a father of a little one, I hope to one day feel safe walking with my child along University or going over to Woodmoor. But I also, *and more importantly*, want to feel safe from high volume cut-through traffic stepping out my front door with him, down my street with him, and around our neighborhood. If the Street Grid moves forward in the UBC Plan, it ends us working to live in Montgomery County and starts us working to leave it – it would be a sad ending to somewhere we have loved calling home.

Many of South Four Corner Neighborhood streets are narrow and without sidewalks (including mine) - the load of vehicle traffic diffused and dispersed onto these roads is a **danger to us as**

residents and danger to the wider South Four Corners neighborhood. It is in direct opposition to priorities like Vision Zero and making the neighborhood streets less safe damages the walkability / bikeability / accessibility goals of the UBC Plan.

In the UBCP's own analysis – *Appendix F: Transportation section* – it shows a *significant* increase of traffic flowing into and out of neighborhood streets with the Street Grid in place. **Tables 3 & 4** shows the closer to the Four Corners intersection, the greater increase of traffic with the closest streets of Lorain & Lanark seeing **a doubling or more of traffic flowing into/out of our neighborhood**, and that is *after* all of the 2045 assumptions of reduced vehicular travel. At peak times, the traffic tables and modeling maps (**Figures 14 - 17**) show more peak vehicles per hour per lane cutting through South Four Corners than it does on some stretches of University Blvd. The neighborhood traffic analysis concludes on page 23 stating (emphasis added):

*Estimated neighborhood traffic volumes in the 2045 US29 BRT + Limited Changes scenario are lower than or generally consistent with 2023 existing volumes. **Estimated neighborhood traffic volumes in the 2045 US29 BRT + Street Grid ("Street Grid") scenario are notably higher** than comparable 2023 Existing and 2045 US29 BRT Only volumes in several locations.*

As a resident, I am strongly opposed to the Street Grid and continued push for its inclusion; neighbors on my street are strongly opposed to it; the South Four Corners neighborhood Citizen's Association is strongly opposed to it.


Sutherland Rd

Table 3 and Table 4 present AM and PM peak hour volumes, respectively, for only four scenarios: 2023 Existing, 2045 US29 BRT Only, 2045 US29 BRT + Limited Changes, and 2045 US29 BRT + Street Grid.

Table 3 - AM Peak Hour Entering and Exiting Neighborhood Street Volumes

Segment	2023 Existing	2045 US29 BRT Only	2045 US29 BRT + Limited Changes	2045 US29 BRT + Street Grid
Brunett Ave West of University Blvd (Entering)	224	193	173	161
Brunett Ave West of University Blvd (Exiting)	76	69	60	121
Lorain Ave West of University Blvd (Entering)	89	84	74	143
Lorain Ave West of University Blvd (Exiting)	33	42	36	100
Lorain Ave East of University Blvd (Entering)	75	77	54	106
Lorain Ave East of University Blvd (Exiting)	62	60	51	33
Timberwood Ave West of Colesville Rd (Entering)	175	171	156	177
Timberwood Ave West of Colesville Rd (Exiting)	11	11	10	10
Timberwood Ave East of Colesville Rd (Entering)	87	99	89	213
Timberwood Ave East of Colesville Rd (Exiting)	67	72	62	63
Lexington Dr East of University Blvd (Entering)	72	66	56	55
Lexington Dr East of University Blvd (Exiting)	139	139	106	291
Lanark Way West of Colesville Rd (Entering)	188	277	187	333
Lanark Way West of Colesville Rd (Exiting)	195	262	187	187

Note: shaded cells indicate an increase of more than 50 peak hour trips relative to 2023 Existing.

Table 4 - PM Peak Hour Entering and Exiting Neighborhood Street Volumes

Segment	2023 Existing	2045 US29 BRT Only	2045 US29 BRT + Limited Changes	2045 US29 BRT + Street Grid
Brunett Ave West of University Blvd (Entering)	100	88	76	76
Brunett Ave West of University Blvd (Exiting)	91	77	69	135
Lorain Ave West of University Blvd (Entering)	33	30	25	143
Lorain Ave West of University Blvd (Exiting)	76	96	61	162
Lorain Ave East of University Blvd (Entering)	83	100	53	150
Lorain Ave East of University Blvd (Exiting)	46	40	61	33
Timberwood Ave West of Colesville Rd (Entering)	166	169	146	168
Timberwood Ave West of Colesville Rd (Exiting)	28	28	25	26
Timberwood Ave East of Colesville Rd (Entering)	176	188	167	282
Timberwood Ave East of Colesville Rd (Exiting)	104	102	92	93
Lexington Dr East of University Blvd (Entering)	98	88	68	71
Lexington Dr East of University Blvd (Exiting)	185	173	141	272
Lanark Way West of Colesville Rd (Entering)	277	277	288	468
Lanark Way West of Colesville Rd (Exiting)	262	262	230	230

Note: shaded cells indicate an increase of more than 50 peak hour trips relative to 2023 Existing.

As noted above, estimated volumes are subject to substantial variability, but can be compared to provide a general sense of anticipated changes under each scenario. It is also important to note that this analysis does not differentiate traffic using neighborhood streets to bypass the intersection of University Boulevard and Colesville Road from traffic accessing the neighborhoods themselves; additional origin-destination study with license plate surveys, mobile device data, or other data-intensive approaches would be needed to provide information on the relative proportion of local- and longer-distance traffic using the segments.

Estimated neighborhood traffic volumes in the 2045 US29 BRT + Limited Changes scenario are lower than or generally consistent with 2023 existing volumes. Estimated neighborhood traffic volumes in the 2045 US29 BRT + Street Grid (“Street Grid”) scenario are notably higher than comparable 2023 Existing and 2045 US29 BRT Only volumes in several locations. The Street Grid scenario as analyzed removes the jughandle configuration for left turns from Colesville Road onto University Boulevard in both directions and does not accommodate these left turning movements with additional left-turn lanes at the main intersection of University Boulevard and Colesville Road. As a result, left-turning vehicles re-route through local streets including Brunett Avenue, Lorain Avenue, Timberwood Avenue, Lexington Drive, and Lanark Way in the Street Grid scenario, increasing the volumes on those roadways. As noted in the Four Corners Long-Term Vision section of the Plan, addressing vehicular left turn movements from Colesville Road to University Boulevard would be a key step to advancing the Street Grid concept as part of a long-term vision for Four Corners.

TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS

TRAVEL DEMAND FORECASTING PROCESS AND ASSUMPTIONS

An enhanced version of Montgomery Planning’s regional travel demand forecasting model, TRAVEL/4, was used to develop traffic forecast results for weekday travel during AM and PM peak periods. TRAVEL/4 is a Montgomery County-focused adaptation of the regional travel demand model developed by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOC). This tool is a four-step model, consisting of:

- Trip generation: predicts the number of person trips by trip purpose that are generated by and attracted to each Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) based on given types and densities of land uses.
- Trip distribution: predicts the spatial pattern of flows between origins and destinations to indicate to which TAZs the person trips from each TAZ will travel. This step is also known as destination choice.
- Mode split: estimates the shares of travel modes the person trips will use, including single occupant auto, multiple occupant auto (including HOV2 and HOV3+), and transit. This step is also known as mode choice. Nonmotorized trips, such as walking and biking, are estimated separately as part of the trip generation step and are not included in the trip distribution, mode split, or traffic assignment steps.
- Traffic assignment: allocates trips to a transportation network to estimate traffic flows and loads on each network segment.

The TRAVEL/4 model incorporates land use and transportation assumptions for the metropolitan Washington region, using the same algorithms as applied by the Metropolitan Washington Council of

Plan scenario and have vphpl values within approximately 2% (fewer than 20 vehicles) of the Year 2045 Proposed Plan Recommendations scenario values.




Figure 14 - AM Peak Hour Vehicles per Lane - Year 2045 Proposed Plan Recommendations




Figure 15 - PM Peak Hour Vehicles per Lane - Year 2045 Proposed Plan Recommendations




Figure 16 - AM Peak Hour Vehicles per Lane - Year 2045 Adopted Plan




Figure 17 - PM Peak Hour Vehicles per Lane - Year 2045 Adopted Plan

Several caveats apply to the interpretation of the results presented in Figure 14 through Figure 17:

- **In Montgomery County, values significantly exceeding 1,000 vphpl have been observed during routine studies.** Data collected for analysis of vehicle lane capacities in the 2013 *Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan* indicate that numerous road segments operate with volumes above 1,000 vphpl (the highest forecasted volume of any segment in the University Boulevard Corridor Plan area under the Year 2045 Proposed Plan Recommendations scenario), including:
 - Colesville Road from the Northwest Branch to University Boulevard (1,525 vphpl)
 - Colesville Road from University Boulevard to Franklin Avenue (1,325 vphpl)
 - Georgia Avenue from Windham Lane to Dennis Avenue (1,425 vphpl)
 - Georgia Avenue from Dennis Avenue to Forest Glen Road (1,200 vphpl)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Comments regarding the University Corridor Plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:07:51 PM

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

To Whom It May Concern,

As a pedestrian residing in Kemp Mill I initially I expected to be a strong supporter of the University Corridor Plan (the Plan) due to its emphasis on the development of mass transit and its focus on assuring the region develops into the future while addressing the counties need for increased density. I support the increased use of mass transit such as the BRT, promoting the development of the WTOP site, the addition of a new entry street into Kemp Mill and beautification of University Boulevard. However, as I have come to view the plan I believe there needs to be further changes to the plan before it can be accepted by the county. I am concerned in particular about the risks to the strong and vibrant community of Kemp Mill and the intention to create a dangerous stroad:

- What the Plan refers to as the Arcola Avenue District is a core part of the area also included in the Kemp Mill Master Plan -last updated in 2001. For instance, the Kemp Mill Shopping Center is the sole area for shopping in the community of Kemp Mill. It was a key part of the Kemp Mill plan. However, while the shopping center was included in the Plan, the majority of Kemp Mill was not. Its needs were not considered. The next Kemp Mill Master Plan will be meaningless if the zoning for the shopping center is addressed here. As an example, there is inadequate mass transit and micro transit in Kemp Mill and we would be unable to partake of the planned MRT along the University Corridor. The Plan should recommend that the Kemp Mill Master Plan – last revised in 2021 - be an immediate focus of the county and the recommendations of the Plan particularly in the Arcola Avenue District should be referred for consideration in the new Kemp Mill Master Plan and NOT adopted at this time. Only when the surrounding neighborhoods are considered should the plan, as modified, be adopted. We don't need a Robert Moses situation where grand plans don't actually consider the surrounding neighborhoods and end up harming those they allegedly are trying to help.
- Similarly, the needs of the large Jewish community in Kemp Mill were not well understood in the development of the Plan, even as a synagogue on University Boulevard is to be torn down to make way for additional housing. For instance, a little under half of the kosher store in the DMV are in the Kemp Mill Shopping Center and it is vital infrastructure for Jews who keep kosher not only in Kemp Mill but the entire region. This includes the Shaloms Supermarket - 1 of 2 kosher supermarkets in the region and the only source for me for many things I need in walking distance – and three restaurants. Without these resources, many in Kemp Mill would be worse off. But the Plan seemed unaware of any of this even as it recognized the synagogue and yeshiva adjoining the shopping center.

Beyond that I have some basic concerns with the plan:

- Even though the purpose of University Boulevard is to be a road transporting persons from point A to point B, the plan is designed to create traffic in the area of the plan and undermine the primary purpose of University Boulevard – as a road to get from place to place.
 - For instance, persons in the communities that abut the University Boulevard corridor get on the Beltway using Four Corners. But the plan specifically calls for Four Corners to become less vehicle friendly and to throttle cars. This will

lead to more traffic, longer commutes and more vehicles on side streets around Four Corners -such as Lanark Way, Lorain Ave and Brunett Ave to the detriment of the people living there.

- Further up University Boulevard, the plan will lead to perpetual traffic and force cars onto Dennis Avenue even if that is longer for some; again impacting more residential streets including Tenbroek Drive, Gabel Street and Inwood Avenue.
- The plan makes many changes to the corridor to promote additional density and turn University Boulevard into a stroad but in fact University Boulevard will continue to lack a real shopping area for those that reside in this additional density and really will just provide perpetual traffic. All of this relies on the success of a mass transit solution (BRT) that has been long mentioned but never heretofore provided and can easily be removed at any point if it proves unprofitable – as it may well because the plans will still not get the area to the level of density in which mass transit is typically not operated at a loss
- Turning University Boulevard into a stroad probably makes it more dangerous to pedestrians contrary to what was written See this recent article from the Washington Post about the increase in pedestrian fatalities in the region during the same period that Montgomery County has been promoting stroads:
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-vi/2025/02/23/pedestrian-deaths-dc-region/> The bike lanes and any additional building guarantees that there will be more people alongside the cars and create more opportunities for risk. Wouldn't it make more sense to increase the capacity of University Boulevard to accommodate both mass transit and additional vehicles if you are going to add density to the area?
- The traffic assumptions behind the study did not factor in the return to the office or the additional traffic when the new and larger Northwood High School reopens.
- Turning University Boulevard into a perpetual traffic jam will add to the difficulties that have come in developing Wheaton. This is particularly unfortunate because Wheaton has the most areas available for build up here (including the WTOP site in the corridor... where I agree with the Plan is an area ripe for buildup. Other areas include the Wheaton Mall itself. It seems to me that you have one county plan undermining another. (And Wheaton itself needs additional resources to make it safer and more appealing as a place to live).

Turning back to Kemp Mill, the neighborhood where I live only has three access points -to University Boulevard (Arcola), Georgia (Arcola) and Randolph Road (Kemp Mill Road). Two of these access points (University, Georgia) now have speed restrictions and other measures to discourage commuters. Our neighborhood is in danger of being locked in place.

Finally, I feel the county did not adequately attempt to work with the communities adjoining the Corridor including Kemp Mill.

I urge the designers of the plan to revisit their assumptions and to better justify the steps they are planning that will harm Kemp Mill and other communities abutting the Plan. Forcing people to live in dense housing with perpetual traffic in the Silver Spring area so that other communities elsewhere in the county don't do their share in addressing the housing shortages is unjust and NIMBYism.

Best regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Corridor
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:10:35 PM

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

Dear Chairperson of the Planning Board,

My name is [REDACTED], and I live in Kemp Mill and work in the Kemp Mill Shopping Center. I am a clinical psychologist, licensed in the state of Maryland, and work primarily with kids and adolescents. My office is located in 1370 Lamberton Drive, in the Kemp Mill Shopping Center. I have been working there for over 10 years.

I recently learned that there are plans in the works to possibly change the properties located in the Kemp Mill Shopping Center. I ask that you please reconsider changes to this area. I serve many people in the community, and the convenience is an incredible asset to families. I (and my family and friends) also frequent many of the restaurants, stores, and services in the shopping center. Businesses are busy and lucrative, and serve my family and many others well. We frequent Shalom's, CVS, the cleaners, SunTrust bank, Bright Star Nails, Ben Yehuda pizza, Edwin's hair cut salon, the Pastry Oven, and Holy Chow. I beg you to please allow these services and companies, along with my office (!), to continue to serve our community residents.

All the best,

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University blvd Corridor plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:14:41 PM

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

Here's the one I sent personally with more detail.

Dear Planning Board Members and Council Members,

I am writing as a Montgomery County resident and a frequent user of University Boulevard and the surrounding streets. I have serious concerns about the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan, which prioritizes the needs of a small minority of users—those who travel by bus, bike, or foot—over the vast majority who rely on personal vehicles. This approach is impractical and inequitable.

I strongly oppose elements of the plan that would:

Make the underutilized bus lanes on University Boulevard permanent, further reducing the space available for drivers.

Eliminate dedicated right-turn lanes, forcing vehicles to wait for a signal and increasing congestion.

Reduce University Boulevard and Colesville Road to two lanes at Four Corners, without a designated turnaround, creating a bottleneck.

Lower speed limits to 25-30 mph throughout University Boulevard between Four Corners and Wheaton, further slowing traffic and adding to commuter delays.

Beyond these concerns, it is important to recognize that Arcola Avenue and this section of University Boulevard serve as critical emergency routes. The proposed changes will significantly increase congestion and slow emergency response times, particularly for ambulances traveling from Kemp Mill and neighboring communities to Holy Cross Hospital. This is a serious public safety issue. Just as speed bumps were avoided on Arcola for this reason, similar consideration must be given here to ensure emergency vehicles can reach those in need without unnecessary delays.

Additionally, with the reopening of Northwood High School and the enforcement of return-to-office policies, traffic on this already highly traveled route will only increase. Reducing lane capacity and lowering speed limits at a time when more commuters, students, and families will be relying on University Boulevard is shortsighted and will lead to even greater gridlock and possible traffic injuries and fatalities. Rather than restricting the flow of traffic, the county should be seeking solutions that accommodate the growing number of drivers and improve road efficiency.

While each of these proposals is problematic on its own, their combined effect will be severe

traffic congestion, increased commute times, and gridlock. This will not only frustrate drivers but also have environmental and economic consequences, as idling cars contribute more pollution and lost productivity.

I urge the Planning Board to reconsider this plan and develop a more balanced approach—one that acknowledges the needs of the tens of thousands of taxpaying Montgomery County families who rely on University Boulevard for their daily commutes and essential travel while also preserving the existing communities and the ability of emergency services to operate effectively.

Finally, I have extreme concerns regarding the development of the Arcola shopping center. This shopping center has no fewer than four establishments that directly serve an important population within this area. These establishments will likely not survive this overhaul.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Opposition to University Boulevard Corridor Proposal for Kemp Mill
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:18:00 PM

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

This proposal, both taken as whole and broken down into its component parts, wreaks of malice, discriminatory intent, and cover for a large host of potential illegalities. By whom precisely has it been proposed, for whose benefit is it meant to inure, and what benefit-cost analyses have been conducted either within or outside of this community to suggest that this is even remotely a good idea to inflict upon us?

The proposal seeks to significantly add to our current population, and to concentrate that addition into a locale that seems to have been particularly and maliciously selected to dramatically alter the current socioeconomic demographic of the community. This in turn will predictably, and apparently intentionally, drive property values down. Appallingly, you might also even attempt to seize and repurpose private property via rezoning to accomplish your goals, destroying businesses integral to and highly valued by the community.

You apparently want to force happy residents out of the community, hitting them as hard as you possibly can in the pocketbook in the process, and replace them with some unknown (at least to us) needy population who will forgo commuting via automobile. In turn, those of us already living in the community, and either choosing or being forced by the financial circumstances you create to remain here, will be made as miserable as possible by the proposed changes to the roadways, new automobile-unfriendly traffic patterns and newly imposed traffic laws. The new bus/bicycle lanes already built have already proven ill-advised, unfriendly to automobile drivers and unsafe for the current population.

[REDACTED]
11703 Fulham Street
Silver Spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Blvd corridor plan
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 11:40:08 PM

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

I live in Kemp Mill and am vehemently opposed to the UBCP plan. Both the parts regarding University Blvd and regarding land uses in many areas of Silver Spring, including the Kemp Mill Shopping Center. This plan would greatly reduce our community's quality of life, greatly increase traffic congestion within the affected areas of Silver Spring, and all along University Blvd, from the Four Corners until the Wheaton shopping area. And I have to add that this plan is completely disregarding both the reality of the current use of University Blvd and the reality and needs of the Orthodox Jewish population of Kemp Mill, as well as the current residents of Kemp Mill.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]
11713 Fulham St
Wheaton, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 12:00:54 AM

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

Hello

My name Is [REDACTED]. I Am A resident on Lamberton Drive as well as a Student at the Yeshiva College of the Nation's Capitol on Arcola Avenue. I am extremely anti the proposed "University Boulevard Corridor Plan" as it will increase traffic on Arcola Avenue. Anyone who has ever driven on Arcola will testify that traffic is bad enough as it is. Decreasing lanes will make the situation unbearable, and will cause issues for people needing to commute to work and school. The plan will also restrict access to the shopping center located at the corner of Arcola and Lamberton. That shopping center contains many mom and pop businesses. I strongly hope that this plan is cancelled.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: UBC plan
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 7:48:36 AM

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

Dear Chairperson,

I am unequivocally opposed to the University Boulevard Corridor Plan as it is written.

It promises to disrupt life to the residents of Kemp Mill in a way that will force us to leave this neighborhood.

You have proposed a plan and have not solicited public input on such an important matter.

The impact on the Jewish community here will be devastating. You propose to eliminate the Kemp Mill shopping center which provides most of the kosher infrastructure for this community—in easy walking distance—by the way. There are no less than four kosher establishments there that service the neighborhood and the multi-family dwellings of the high-rise apartments on Arcola Avenue.

Other negative impacts will be the slowing of traffic, and hence congestion and pollution.

You will destroy a neighborhood that served as home for a cultural minority that has been here for well over a half a century.

I ask that you revoke this plan and seek input from the stakeholders before you destroy our homes and neighborhood.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Kenbrook Drive

624 Kenbrook Drive, Silver Spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Written testimony for the Feb 27, 2025 Planning Board Meeting
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 8:03:59 AM
Attachments: [Response to the University Blvd Corridor Plan - Final.pdf](#)

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

Dear Mr. Harris,

I'm writing on behalf of a group of neighbors in South Four Corners to submit written testimony for the upcoming Planning Board meeting scheduled for February 27, 2025, specifically in regard to the *Master Plan Public Hearing for the University Blvd Corridor Plan*.

This statement demonstrates some areas of key concerns with the plan (which complements concerns raised by the official South Four Corners Civic Association) while also - importantly - demonstrating strong support for a number of recommendations. We hope this balanced, and thorough, response to the UBCP is welcomed and demonstrates that there are members of the community who are very supportive of many aspects of the plan and want to engage in good faith discussions around what implementation could look like.

Please find our full statement attached, including names and addresses representing 14 households in South Four Corners. We welcome engagement and further discussion as well from the Planning Board.

Thank you for your time,

[REDACTED]
10111 Kinross Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20901

University Blvd Corridor Plan – Response from constituents in South Four Corners

The below statements of support and concern represent the opinions of a group of neighbors in the South Four Corners community. We recognize the amount of work and engagement the Planning Department has put into the University Blvd Corridor Plan (UBCP) and welcome many of the recommendations. We appreciate that this is a long-term vision, to be implemented incrementally over a 20-year period. However, we also have several ongoing and serious concerns with aspects of the plan. The document below details our responses to each of the core sections in the working draft, in the order in which they appear in the draft.

Improved Land Use, Zoning, & Urban Design

Support:

- We support the rezoning elements of the UBCP that promote modern, environmentally-conscious, mixed use redevelopment *if and when* private property owners choose to opt in to property and lot redesign.
 - The shopping and commercial center at Four Corners, built in the 1940s, is outdated and no longer meets the needs and aspirations of the surrounding neighborhoods. The proposed rezoning would enable redevelopment that could bring in a diverse range of additional small businesses and amenities that would benefit the entire Four Corners and broader plan area, reinvigorating the corridor and creating opportunities for local business owners and entrepreneurs to occupy commercial spaces in the neighborhood.
 - Relatedly, **we expect to see a concerted effort to prioritize and support small and locally-owned business development in the plan area as part of any future redevelopment.**
 - New zoning regulations would also enable more efficient and creative use of the existing land by introducing mixed use development and allowing for the construction of housing units on land owned by faith-based organizations.
 - Upzoning along the corridor would enable the eventual construction of much-needed new housing in the plan area, *should private property owners choose to redevelop*. By enabling duplexes, triplexes, and other configurations on University Blvd, we could welcome new neighbors to the community through new homes that meet the needs and price points for a wider range of households, including housing options that address the “missing middle” between high-rise apartment complexes and single family homes.
- We support development standards that require new construction to gradually blend in to existing neighborhood heights and character.
- We support locating structured parking, either above or below grade, that minimizes street exposures (and keeping the language about improving parking availability in Four Corners).
- We support the guidance to incorporate public art or visual landmarks if properties redevelop.

Concerns:

- We remain concerned about neighborhood traffic and parking which could become more difficult as potential redevelopment increases in the plan area.
- Many neighborhood streets are already at capacity for on-street parking, and without parking requirements for new commercial and residential development, parking could become more difficult for neighborhood residents.

Response:

- **Redevelopment plans that do *not* incorporate parking solutions or that otherwise put a burden on neighborhood streets, including via increased commercial traffic (delivery vehicles, etc.) will face opposition.**
- Neighborhood streets should prioritize local resident parking (implemented through permitting or other measures such as ticketing non-registered vehicles) and efforts must be made to address parking needs and mitigate parking concerns on neighborhood streets as part of any new development on University Blvd.
- Rezoning efforts should begin with the lots in the plan area that are currently being either underutilized or being used for commercial and institutional purposes and that are located closest to planned or existing transit hubs.
- Rezoning residential lots should be done at a later date to ensure that any traffic and parking increases and infrastructure demands from increased commercial and mixed used development can be accommodated first.

Affordable Housing Commitments

Support:

- Between 2020 and 2024 homelessness in Montgomery County increased by 71%.¹ During the same period, the average home price jumped 42.6% and average rent has increased 21.4%, all while average income has only risen by 12%.² In addition to this, as of 2022, Montgomery County was on pace to continue a multi-year downward trend in building new homes.³ All of this points to a serious need for new homes in Montgomery County. We support all efforts to increase housing supply throughout the County and, specifically for this proposal, in the plan area.
- We support the proposal to set aside at least 30% of new homes as Moderately Priced Dwelling Units (compared to the current county-wide requirement of 15%)⁴. Equitable inclusionary housing policies such as the MPDU program allows households earning a range of incomes to enjoy the benefits of new development.
- We support the development of permanent and temporary supportive housing in the plan area to serve elderly and disabled residents, as well as those who are transitioning out of homelessness.

¹ Washington Council of Governments' (COG) [Point in Time Survey](#)

² Zillow, U.S. Census Bureau

³ U.S. Census Bureau,

<https://montgomeryplanning.org/blog-design/2024/08/century-of-change-where-we-are-after-100-years-of-homebuilding-in-montgomery-county/>

⁴ See the County's website on the MPDU program:

<https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/DHCA/MPDU/mpdu-program.html>

- We support replacing any loss of naturally occurring affordable housing⁵ with income-restricted affordable housing in the plan area to ensure there is no net-loss of affordable housing.
- We support the proposed rezoning to encourage the development of mixed-use properties and to allow the creation of new housing units on land owned by religious institutions. Mixed-use development is essential in creating more vibrant and financially viable districts, allowing for the development of new housing, a built-in consumer base for commercial enterprises, and the stability that comes with anchor retail. Faith-based organizations often own land they cannot develop under current zoning; changing these restrictions would allow them to use this land to provide more housing options to serve the surrounding community.

Concerns:

- While we strongly support the affordable housing recommendations in the UBCP, we recognize that these are *recommendations* and not guarantees or commitments. We are concerned that, should the UBCP be approved, the affordable housing recommendations will not become reality.

Response:

- We ask that any new affordable housing is sufficiently protected as affordable via deed restrictions of at least 30 years, with a preference for permanent affordability.
- The UBCP should be amended to require MPDUs in all new residential buildings in the plan area with more than 4 units at the recommended level of 30% of units set aside as affordable. This would reduce the current County guidance that MPDUs are required for any buildings with 20 or more units.
- Specific guidance should be given on how naturally occurring affordable housing will be defined in the plan area so a clear 1:1 replacement and no net-loss of affordable housing can be measured.

Parks & Open Spaces

Support:

- With specific attention to the Four Corners area, we strongly support the recommendations put forward (p. 83) for improving access to North Four Corners Park, improving shade cover at the park, finding a long-term tenant for the building on the park grounds, and other improvements.
- We support the proposed guidelines to incorporate new public green spaces if certain large parcels of land are redeveloped.

Environmental Sustainability

Support:

- We strongly support all elements of the environmental recommendations included in the UBCP working draft (listed on p. 87-89), including:

⁵ We recognize that existing naturally occurring affordable housing is currently not income-restricted nor protected affordable housing – it is simply market-rate housing that sits at a lower-than-average price point.

- Developing University Blvd into a “cool corridor”
 - We remain concerned about the impact to property owners on University Blvd and the practicality of adding green buffer zones, etc., as detailed in the “concerns” under Transportation and Safety. These concerns should be addressed before route re-designs of University Blvd are finalized.
- Protecting and increasing tree canopy
- Mitigating excess runoff and protecting stream water quality
- Promoting public health
- Strengthening environmental guidance of new buildings/ development
 - We strongly insist that any new residential and/or commercial development in the area as a result of rezoning be held to high sustainability standards (i.e. passive house, LEED certified, etc.)
- Promoting native species

Transportation and Safety

Support:

- Safety improvements along University Blvd are long overdue and should begin immediately in coordination with existing Maryland DOT efforts. Even without additional changes envisioned in the UBCP, these safety improvements in Four Corners (as described on p. 100 - 122 of the working draft) would have an immediate positive impact on neighborhood walkability and accessibility.
 - Specifically we support increased protected crossings, reduced lane numbers and widths, expanded sidewalks, buffers, reduced curb radii, improved access to bikeshare, improved crosswalks that are visible and ADA compliant, and the implementation of “no right turn on red” on new signalized intersections, among other ideas.
- We support the exploration and swift implementation of neighborhood street safety measures which should be prioritized as part of the overall traffic safety improvements. Residents should be engaged in the study and introduction of some combination of the traffic calming measures for neighborhood streets described on p. 108 of the working draft.
- We support efforts to improve street connectivity for *pedestrian and bicyclist use*. See below opposition and concerns to increased vehicle connectivity to neighborhood streets.

Concerns - Connecting Neighborhood Streets to University Blvd, or in parallel

- While we appreciate the Planning Dept’s removal of the “street grid” proposal from the working draft, we remain concerned about “connected streets” included in the long-term vision of this plan and the “near-term studies” that will be undertaken.
- We also remain opposed to efforts to extend or connect neighborhood streets in parallel to University (i.e. Gilmore) and efforts to extend neighborhood streets directly to University (i.e. Greenock, Rogart, Sutherland, etc.) in ways that would enable increased vehicular travel.

- We are concerned that it would be impossible to avoid increases in traffic, noise, and pollution on the affected neighborhood streets through the street grid and other connected road designs.

Response:

- Near-term and future studies should directly engage all nearby residents before solution(s) that enable better connectivity are determined.
- Study findings and future design options should be made publicly available and should seek to determine:
 - Change in traffic volume on neighborhood streets (both via cut-through and local traffic) for a variety of potential scenarios including existing traffic being re-routed to these new connected streets and traffic resulting from increased population due to rezoning
 - Most appropriate mitigation efforts to reduce any increases in traffic (and associated noise and pollution) through various “connected street” design options
 - The benefits of increased “connectivity” for pedestrian and bike travel, instead of vehicular traffic
- **Any future long-term connectivity should not decrease safety on affected neighborhood streets or remove any residential properties.**
- Any future proposed changes should prioritize improved connectivity for neighborhood residents, not to accommodate increased cut-through traffic or diversions from University Blvd or Colesville Rd.
- Future proposed “connected streets” designs that do not include adequate protections against increased cut-through traffic or otherwise decrease safety on neighborhood streets will face opposition.

Concerns - Existing University Blvd Residents

- While we support the concept of wider sidewalks, the addition of green buffer zones, and added bike lanes on University Blvd, we remain concerned about the practicality of implementing these features without harming the quality of life for existing residents on University Blvd.

Response

- Property owners should be engaged directly so they understand the specific boundaries of the Right of Way (ROW) that runs through their property and the impact it would have. Planners and appropriate County departments and representatives must reach out to all affected residents to discuss future scenarios.
- Any improvements on University Blvd should include steps to mitigate impacts to property owners on University Blvd and ensure appropriate access to existing properties. This should be done prior to securing project funding, as part of the engineering and design phases.

Community Facilities

Support:

- We support all efforts to maintain existing public facilities and co-locate new facilities, if needed, in the future to provide public benefit to the plan area.

- We support the recommendations for new child daycare and senior service centers in the plan area.
- We support efforts to improve food security in the plan area, including through the introduction of community gardens and farmers markets. While these are recommended to be located in future “privately owned public spaces,” we strongly encourage the County in the near-term to explore existing facilities where these could be co-located – including existing parks and schools in the plan area. Any siting of community garden spaces should prioritize access by areas with high levels of food insecurity.
- We support the recommendations to undertake a comprehensive school capacity study to determine current and future capacity needs of elementary, middle, and high schools in the plan area.

Historic Resources

Support:


- We support the protection of historic sites across the Plan Area. Of particular relevance to the Four Corners area, we support the exploration and evaluation of the Nichiren Shoshu Myosenji Temple for possible future listing in the *Master Plan for Historic Preservation*. We also support the preservation of certain elements of the Woodmoor shopping center — should any redevelopment occur — such as the facade and the sign.


Racial Equity & Social Justice


Support:

- We appreciate the Planning Dept’s emphasis on developing the UBCP through a racial equity and social justice lens and affirm our support for the “equity implications of the key recommendations” as described.


Signed,


10106 Portland Place, Silver Spring, MD 20901


10111 Kinross Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20901


10006 Tenbrook Dr, Silver Spring, MD 20901


9930 Markham St, Silver Spring, MD 20901


10116 Hereford Pl., Silver Spring MD 20901

[REDACTED]
9918 Grayson Ave, Silver Spring, MD 20901

[REDACTED]
10017 Sidney Rd., Silver Spring, MD 20901

[REDACTED]
10119 Dallas Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20901

[REDACTED]
9929 Markham St. Silver Spring, MD 20901

[REDACTED]
10008 Tenbrook Dr. Silver Spring, MD 20901

[REDACTED]
10102 Portland Rd, Silver Spring, MD 20901

[REDACTED]
10018 Tenbrook Dr, Silver Spring, MD 20901

[REDACTED]
403 Lanark Way, Silver Spring, MD 20901

[REDACTED]
10108 Tenbrook Dr, Silver Spring, MD 20901

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: We disagree
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 9:05:58 AM

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

Dear Chairperson,

We who live in the Kemp mill area strongly disagree with the new community plans.

We Do NOT want slower speed limits.

We Do NOT want people living in the shopping center area.

We Do NOT want less car lanes.

What would be helpful are speed bumps on lamberton. This would actually add to safety.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Support for the University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 9:06:12 AM

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

Good morning!

I live in the Woodmoor neighborhood in Silver Spring, and I strongly support the University Boulevard Corridor Plan. This plan will be transformative for our community. I want to be able to walk and bike safely through Four Corners and to Wheaton and am currently not able to do it because of narrow sidewalks and dangerous infrastructure. Creating complete streets that welcome people walking, biking, and rolling would drastically improve our quality of life. We could feel safer and be more likely to walk to stores and restaurants and not feel we need to rely on cars for our daily needs.

More housing would help address the housing crisis and give opportunities for people to live in a transit corridor as well as diversify the housing stock here for those that want to rent or downsize.

I look forward to a University Blvd that is focused on livability and quality of life as opposed to being an environment people avoid or barely tolerate as they walk to a bus or the store.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: UBC Plan
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 9:08:58 AM

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

Dear Chairperson,

I am unequivocally opposed to the University Boulevard Corridor Plan as it is written.

It promises to disrupt life to the residents of Kemp Mill in a way that will force us to leave this neighborhood.

You have proposed a plan and have not solicited public input on such an important matter.

The impact on the Jewish community here will be devastating. You propose to eliminate the Kemp Mill shopping center which provides most of the kosher infrastructure for this community—in easy walking distance—by the way. There are no less than four kosher establishments there that service the neighborhood and the multi-family dwellings of the high-rise apartments on Arcola Avenue.

Other negative impacts will be the slowing of traffic, and hence congestion and pollution.

You will destroy a neighborhood that served as home for a cultural minority that has been here for well over a half a century.

I ask that you revoke this plan and seek input from the stakeholders before you destroy our homes and neighborhood.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Hyde Road

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 9:13:04 AM

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

Dear Chairperson,

I am unequivocally opposed to the University Boulevard Corridor Plan as it is written.

It promises to disrupt life to the residents of Kemp Mill in a way that will force us to leave this neighborhood.

You have proposed a plan and have not solicited public input on such an important matter.

The impact on the Jewish community here will be devastating. You propose to eliminate the Kemp Mill shopping center which provides most of the kosher infrastructure for this community—in easy walking distance—by the way. There are no less than four kosher establishments there that service the neighborhood and the multi-family dwellings of the high-rise apartments on Arcola Avenue.

Other negative impacts will be the slowing of traffic, and hence congestion and pollution.

You will destroy a neighborhood that served as home for a cultural minority that has been here for well over a half a century.

I ask that you revoke this plan and seek input from the stakeholders before you destroy our homes and neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Chana Biberfeld

Mrs. Chana Biberfeld
Director of Educational Support
Yeshiva of Greater Washington

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Opposition to the University Blvd corridor plan
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 9:19:19 AM

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

Dear Planning Board Members,

As a Montgomery County resident and someone who frequently uses University Boulevard and the surround streets as part of my daily commute, I'd like to express my concerns with the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan.

In general, the plan prioritizes the needs of the minority of University Boulevard users who use buses, sidewalks, or bike over the needs of the vast majority who drive. This is impractical and inequitable.

In particular, I oppose any plan to:

- Make the currently-underutilized bus lanes on University Blvd permanent, narrowing the lanes available to drivers.
- Eliminate designated lanes for right-turning vehicles to turn without a signal.
- Make University and Colesville two-lane roads at Four Corners, with no designated turnaround.
- Set speed limits along all of University between Four Corners and Wheaton of either 25mph or 30mph.

While each of these proposals has issues, the combined effect of all of them will be unmanageable traffic congestion and gridlock for drivers, with serious consequences for the environment and quality of life.

I encourage the Planning Board to reconsider the plan to better account for the tens of thousands of taxpaying Montgomery County families who drive on University Boulevard as part of their commute and daily life.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
11513 Lovejoy Street, Silver Spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Written testimony to support University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 9:47:22 AM

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

Please accept this testimony in support of the University Boulevard Corridor Plan.

I fully support the University Boulevard Corridor Plan. This is a once in a generation opportunity to transform University Blvd into a complete street, in other words, a place that serves the entire community.

I live in the Woodmoor neighborhood of Four Corners. I want to walk and bike with my family to places that are within walking and biking distance, but with narrow sidewalks and car-centric infrastructure, we don't always feel comfortable. Shared use paths and a sensible street grid with right-size roadways would help transform our community into a place where we can move around in safety and comfort. Safe and welcoming bicycle and pedestrian facilities the length of University that fully connects neighborhoods like Four Corners and Wheaton would allow and encourage more people to walk and bike.

Allowing for more small-scale retail along the corridor, for example, cafes, restaurants, and small shops on the first floor of apartment buildings would help create fifteen minute neighborhoods and provide an alternative to driving.

We are in a housing crisis. Upzoning along this transit and growth corridor would allow people to use their property to create more housing types while still maintaining relatively low density. It is important to create housing where people want to live. Currently there is almost nothing but single family homes here. As I get older and think of downsizing I hope to stay in my neighborhood. I would like to see more housing types (even further into neighborhoods) that would allow people to live here instead of more far flung developments that contribute to sprawl.

A big part of the transformation is improved transit. We are a high use transit corridor and world class BRT can make it even more so. Changing a car lane to a bus lane between Four Corners and Wheaton has shown that we don't need three lanes for cars. We can make room for transit and enable it to be even more efficient. Narrowing lanes creates more room for bike and pedestrian infrastructure, and helps calm car traffic which makes the streets safer and results in less noise and particulate pollution from brakes.

It's important that we develop and plan our communities in agreement with Thrive 2050, The Pedestrian Master Plan, VisionZero, and other guidelines. I am grateful that the University Boulevard Corridor Plan is visionary and truly attempts to transform our communities with livable, complete streets.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Testimony to be Included In Public Record
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 10:28:05 AM

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

Dear Chair of Planning Board,

I am signed up to testify on Thursday at the Planning Board's Hearing and would like my testimony to be included in the Public Record.

[REDACTED]
816 Lamberto Drive
Silver Spring, MD 20902

Testimony:

My name is [REDACTED] and I have been a Kemp Mill resident for the past 12 years. Every single weekday of those 12 years, without fail, I have driven at least 4 times a day on University Blvd, whether it is going and coming from dropping off my 5 children and preschool, driving to Wheaton to access the Costco or UPS Store in Wheaton, or any number of other locations. The truth is, the really only way out of our Kemp Mill neighborhood is out onto University Blvd. There is no question about it, University Blvd is a main artery, a connector. The plan in front of us today ignores this fact. How you ask? In so many many ways, and as you are hearing from many of them today, but I will choose to focus on just one point of this incredibly detrimental and not well researched plan.

This plan completely ignores the fact that people leaving in Kemp Mill exit our community out of the Arcola and University junction. All of them.. By taking away turning lanes, specifically the right on red, you are completely debilitating our abilities to easily access our main artery out to the schools, preschools, shopping and other resources we use every day. And no, public transit it not feasible for families such as mine with a multitude of young children.

In fact, when you did the pilot biking program, you also took away our right hand turn lane. It was an epic disaster for our community. During morning rush hours, it would take 2-3 lights for the lanes to empty, backing up almost to Lamberton Drive each morning. It added a huge amount of stress and anxiety to our morning commutes, with all families with multiple kids who cannot and will not be taking public transportation to get their multiple children to school. Besides being incredibly inefficient and frustrating, with all those cars idling and waiting to make your right on red, you are now responsible for adding tons of additional car exhaust and pollution to the atmosphere. Just what you were trying to avoid

with this plan in the first place.

One more point about this one small aspect of your 150 page plan that you've laid forward, the rezoning would cause that many more people to be in the neighborhood, looking to get out to the places they need to go. Using the same intersection to get out to the same schools and the same stores and the same multiple children so they are not taking public transit. If that was the backup with the current population with Kemp Mill, now you are adding many new families with your rezoning and at this point, we will be looking at adding even more time to make that right out onto University. And no, one small one lane road out the back of the shopping center will not be enough for the hundreds of people you will be bringing in with your rezoning. You are creating a massive influx of people before you've built the infrastructure in order to support those people, and have no plans in which to create the infrastructure needed to make it work. Instead you are hoping to push us all to be using mass transit, which, as stated above, is completely unfeasible for families with multiple children.

For this and so many of the reasons my fellow neighbors have shared, I strongly and vehemently oppose the University Blvd Corridor plan and am strongly encouraging this board to engage with the community and feedback process so that they can develop a plan that can address these very important and concerning points.

--

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and name of the speaker.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Written testimony for UBC Plan Public Hearing on 2/27/2025
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 10:55:16 AM
Attachments: [University Blvd Corridor Plan Draft Meeting Letter.pdf](#)

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

Dear Chair Harris,

I have attached my written testimony for the upcoming public hearing on the University Boulevard Corridor (UBC) Plan, on Thursday, February 27, 2025.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]
11709 Auth Lane, Silver Spring, MD 20902

Chair Artie Harris
Montgomery County Planning Board
2425 Reedie Drive
Wheaton, MD 20902

RE: Public hearing on the University Boulevard Corridor (UBC) Plan for Thursday, Feb 27

Dear Chair Harris and Members of the Planning Board,

I am a resident of Kemp Mill, writing in opposition to most of the recommendations in the Public Hearing Draft of the University Boulevard Corridor Plan.

The opening sentence of the Executive Summary for the plan (page 6 of the public hearing draft, Introduction) says:

“The University Boulevard Corridor Plan (Plan) envisions **transforming** approximately 3.5 miles of University Boulevard West and East (MD 193) into a **pedestrian-oriented** and multimodal corridor that supports safe movement for all people, **especially those walking, biking, and rolling.**” (emphasis mine).

Noticeably missing from this introduction are the words ‘driving’ or ‘car’.

Furthermore, on page 7 of the plan under Key Plan Recommendations, the first section is titled Urban Design. This phrase Urban Design is used throughout the plan. University Boulevard between Amherst Avenue and Four Corners is not urban, it is suburban. The various “places” along this corridor are too far apart from each other to be walkable. A more suitable area to transform would be downtown Wheaton, which is already a more urban environment. That should be the area to focus on, not the suburban communities between Amherst Avenue and Four Corners.

My wife and I and our three kids live in Kemp Mill. We walk and ride bikes as often as we can, but most of the places we need to get to are not within walking distance, such as school, work, grocery shopping, after-school activities, team sports, friends, etc. Driving for us is not a choice we make. It is a necessity. It is how we get around in this suburban area.

Prior to the creation of dedicated bus lanes, which were implemented against the wishes of most residents and which eliminated 1/3 of available car travel lanes, University Boulevard was always the quickest way to get from my home in Kemp Mill to either downtown Silver Spring or DC. Now, traffic congestion on University Blvd between Arcola Ave and Dennis Ave can get so bad during morning rush hour that I often take Sligo Creek Parkway just to avoid sitting in long backups on University. The University Boulevard bus/bike lane - nearly always empty of buses and bikes - are inadvertently incentivizing drivers to take winding parkways and other

neighborhood streets to avoid this newly created congestion. These dedicated bus/bike lanes should be removed.

The following recommendations SHOULD NOT be implemented:

- Implement “No Right Turn on Red” restrictions at signalized intersections.
- Right-size roadways and intersections to create a safer and more comfortable environment for people who are walking, rolling, bicycling, riding transit, and driving, as shown in Table 1.
 - Repurpose general-purpose travel lanes to provide dedicated transit lanes and improved facilities for people walking, biking, and rolling that are separated from vehicular traffic by street trees and planted green space.
 - Make travel lanes narrower and reduce roadway design speeds to targets identified in the CSDG.
 - Remove channelized right-turn lanes from all intersections.
 - Avoid the use of multiple dedicated left- and right-turn lanes such as, dual right-turn lanes.
- Rezone the Kemp Mill Shopping Center properties, including 1370 Lamberton Drive and 1398 Lamberton Drive, from the Neighborhood Retail (NR) Zone to CRT 1.5 C-0.75 R-1.25 H-70 Zone to promote the Plan’s recommended public benefits.

There are some parts of this plan that I agree with, and I think would greatly improve our communities.

I am in favor of widening the sidewalks along University Boulevard. I would like to see safer intersections and crossings, better pedestrian access, and convenient and reliable bus routes.

I support the idea of creating an access road that connects University Boulevard West with the Kemp Mill Shopping Center, as this would alleviate some traffic along Arcola Avenue and allow for easier access to the shopping center.

The following recommendations SHOULD be implemented:

- Implement 10-foot sidepaths and 8-foot street buffers along both sides of University Boulevard between Amherst Avenue and Lorain Avenue and between Lexington Avenue and the I-495 interchange.
- Ensure ADA accessibility on all public pathways, including sidewalks, trails, and street crossings, in accordance with current best practices.
- Improve and extend the existing access road from University Boulevard West through University Towers as a pedestrian friendly street with street-facing buildings and enhanced streetscape that connects with new internal streets in the redeveloped

shopping center cluster, to provide an alternative vehicular connection north and east of Arcola Avenue.

The problem that I see with most of this plan is that it will - explicitly and by design - create even more traffic congestion on University Boulevard, Arcola Avenue, and Kemp Mill Road - the only routes in and out of our neighborhood. These roads are already very congested every day during rush hour, and I do not see how implementing this plan does anything but make the problem worse. This would adversely impact the climate and the quality of life in our communities. More traffic congestion means poorer fuel economy, greater commuting costs, higher emissions, and dirtier air. More traffic congestion leads to anger. Anger leads to hate. Hate leads to suffering from road rage incidents and accidents.

In this plan, safe movement is supported for only some people - specifically those walking, biking, and rolling - to the exclusion of most of the residents in this suburban area. Let's instead create an inclusive plan that supports all people - walkers, bikers, rollers, and yes, also drivers.

Respectfully Submitted,



11709 Auth Lane
Silver Spring, MD 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: NFCCA statement for Feb 27 public hearing
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 11:02:31 AM
Attachments: [Feb 27 PB letter- FINAL.docx](#)

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

Please accept the attached statement on behalf of the Northwood Four Corners Civic Association for the February 27th hearing on the Public Hearing Draft of the University Boulevard Corridor Plan.



February 25, 2025

Dear Chairman Harris and Commissioners on the Montgomery County Planning Board:

Thank you for the opportunity to express the views of the Northwood-Four Corners Civic Association (NFCCA) regarding the Public Hearing Draft of the University Boulevard Corridor Plan (UBCP). NFCCA would like to acknowledge that the planning agency staff have put a great deal of thought and work into developing the UBCP; likewise, staff have made themselves available for meetings and have been responsive to the many questions that arose as this draft plan evolved.

University Boulevard and Colesville Road each lie along a boundary of the NFCCA, with the Northwest Branch and Northwood High School bordering the other two sides. There are approximately 1486 single family households in the NFCCA community. Although the community's views on the UBCP recommendations are not unanimous, there is clearly strong concern among many residents that the Commercial Residential Neighborhood (CRN) and Commercial Residential Town (CRT) upzoning recommendations affect far too many properties and that the transportation recommendations to reduce travel lanes will exacerbate congestion and increase cut-through traffic in our neighborhood.

The pace of Planning Board consideration of the UBCP is concerning. The initial upzoning recommendations were made public just two weeks before the Planning Board hearing in late October. This hearing comes just six weeks after the Public Hearing Draft was released. The rushed process for consideration of this complex document has left insufficient time for civic associations to communicate with residents and prepare for formal consideration of resolutions in compliance with bylaws. Indeed, the in-person NFCCA General Meeting when this proposal was to be discussed was cancelled without an opportunity to reschedule. The meeting venue was closed due to snow; we had to rely on Zoom, which is an imperfect medium for the full discussion that was planned that evening. Fortunately, NFCCA had a survey of residents in process.

Adding to the confusion—and moving on a similarly fast track—ZTA 25-02, which proposes upzoning for properties directly fronting corridors, has been introduced in the County Council. Ultimately, it would be fairer for the UBCP's housing proposals for increasing housing density to mirror the Council's final determination, once adopted.

To gather more granular detail regarding our positioning on the UBCP recommendations, NFCCA developed and circulated an in-depth survey for residents to fill out in order to drill down on various aspects of the UBCP. The opinions and concerns outlined in this statement reflect the responses NFCCA received to this survey. A copy of the survey results is included with this letter.

Although important patterns of majority opinion emerge from the 78 survey responses that residents submitted, the responses also highlight the diversity of experiences and opinions pertaining to what makes a neighborhood great and how the UBCP could potentially influence that. For example, in response to what residents like about the community *today*, 52 percent of the respondents cited “convenient access to retail, dining, parks, houses of worship” and 47 percent liked “lower home prices compared to the rest of the county.”

Responses to the question of matters the community dislikes were “Traffic congestion on University Boulevard” (58 percent), “cut-through traffic and speeding, and “not enough shopping and dining” at 64 percent and 40 percent, respectively, with “On-street parking is limited” coming in at 29 percent. Other responses indicated a desire for more tree canopy and less concrete. These and other such answers certainly show the range of needs the UBCP could address. We know these competing interests are difficult to balance.

There is strong support for amenities that will transform University Boulevard into a “Cool Corridor” with added tree canopy, shaded transit stops, landscaped buffers, and appropriate stormwater management (particularly in the last instance given the proximity of this neighborhood to the Northwest Branch).

The balance of this statement addresses neighborhood opinions regarding density and form, first, and then addresses transportation-related issues.

Some NFCCA residents are open to greater housing density on a less intensive scale than recommended in the UBCP, such as redevelopment as duplex or triplex townhomes. Duplexes were supported by 42 percent of the survey respondents, while support for triplexes or stacked flats ranged from 19 to 22 percent, respectively. This contrasts with the views of respondents who oppose any higher density at all (33 percent.)

Although 50-foot height limits for the recommended CRN zone and even higher in the CRT zones are concerning, there is some openness to height limits that more closely match the current R-60 limits of 35 to 40 feet that presently apply throughout the neighborhood. NFCCA residents’ support for higher-density mixed-use and multifamily redevelopment is limited to 19 percent for multifamily and 13 percent for taller, mixed-use redevelopment near the Four Corners Town Center.


The UBCP recommendations recognize the important role that religious institutions along the University Boulevard Corridor can play by increasing the supply of affordable housing. Targeted zoning easing the regulatory process for these properties could reduce redevelopment cost.

Acceptance of limited additional density in the neighborhood is tempered by the assurance in the UBCP that “Changes to the zoning code should reflect the nearby existing housing by appropriately managing the transition in height, mass, and scale.”

One of the rationales in the UBCP for upzoning this area is locating additional housing near Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) stations. Yet, a decision to move forward on the University Boulevard BRT route lies far in the future; this route is listed at the end of the list of anticipated BRT routes in the county.

The NFCCA community is a diverse neighborhood with many homes that could be characterized as naturally occurring affordable single-family housing. Currently, Zillow valuation estimates for most properties in the Dennis Avenue District range from mid-\$400,000 to mid-\$500,000 (except for a small number of larger infill and substantially renovated units). One often-heard concern is whether future redevelopment could replace single-family starter homes that are relatively affordable with more expensive housing. Although multi-unit property redevelopment would certainly add to the overall number of housing units in the county, the new homes may be as or more expensive than the housing stock they replace. Today under the current zoning rubric, however, we do acknowledge that redevelopment is limited to market-driven proliferation of McMansions, home additions, or accessory dwellings.

The community has expressed very strong concerns about changing zoning from R-60 to CRN (multiplex and up to 19-unit multifamily) in the large area drawn by the UBCP applicable to the NFCCA community. The UBCP contemplates CRN upzoning for more than 200 single-family properties in the NFCCA community, of which only 62 properties directly front onto University Boulevard. Assuming 200 properties are rezoned as CRN, this could potentially increase the number of households in the NFCCA community by up to 13 percent (duplex), 26 percent (triplex), or 40 percent (quadplex). This degree of upzoning will impact the NFCCA community more significantly than the upzoning recommendations applicable to other neighborhoods along the plan’s corridor.



The rationale planners have given us for designating so many properties in the NFCCA community as CRN is that the affected areas capture entire “blocks.” As you can see in this illustration, short street/courts are interspersed along Belton, Kerwin, Dennis, and Royalton, which makes the “block” much larger, penetrating to the middle of the NFCCA neighborhood. Some of these homes lie up to 1200 feet away from the boulevard. Indeed, the houses on Dennis Avenue and Royalton Road are numbered as two blocks—a 500 block (first block from University) and a separate 400 block (closer to Edgewood). The consequence is that

these pleasant courts set back from the main streets and well away from University Boulevard are swept into this upzoning proposal.

Homes in the Dennis Avenue and Arcola Avenue Districts, are quite modest in scale. Most are single-story or split-level homes less than 20 feet tall and these residences will be dwarfed by the 50-foot height proposed for the CRN zone. Houses on Timberwood

Avenue are also small; adjoining commercial development on University Boulevard is recommended for heights ranging from 50 to 70 feet, which will tower above adjacent homes on Timberwood Avenue.

In the median between the University Boulevard couplet, the CRT designation will allow 60- to 70-foot high residential/commercial buildings. Adding such a significant amount of density at this complex intersection will further complicate navigation for pedestrians, multimodal users, and vehicles alike.

There is strong support for maintaining current setback requirements, with 43 of our 78 survey respondents indicating that they disagree with eliminating or reducing the existing R-60 setback requirements. Lot sizes are small in this neighborhood, particularly near University Boulevard, so nearby building height could overshadow yards and homes. Residents are concerned that towering buildings adjacent to their properties will decrease their property value and limit their enjoyment of outdoor space. The smaller size lots prevalent in the neighborhood also mean there could be limited space for the off-corridor driveways proposed for alleyways or driveways behind the current homes.

In conversations with planning board staff, they have indicated that issues such as height limits and setback requirements may be addressed when the Planning Board develops an Overlay Zone. NFCCA looks forward to reviewing this information once it is made public.

Finally, after denser redevelopment occurs, NFCCA is concerned that County agencies and public utilities could be forced to play catch up to fund and construct adequate infrastructure, such as schools, upgraded roads, utilities, etc. Due to over-crowding our local elementary school boundaries were redrawn several years ago, and younger students in half our community now attend school in neighboring communities instead of the elementary school that formerly served our entire community (which incidentally we have been told is not suitable for expansion). One-hundred-year-old water and sewer lines are already needing replacement; greater density could place greater strain on these facilities. The County's Growth and Infrastructure planning process is slow moving. This process may not capably respond in a timely manner to public needs as future ad hoc housing redevelopment occurs.

It should come as no surprise that the potential elimination or reduction in parking requirements applicable to redeveloped properties is particularly unpopular. ZTA 23-10 exempts redeveloped properties from baseline parking minimums if the property is located within ¼ mile of a Bus Rapid Transit station; this already applies to potential redevelopment near the Colesville Road BRT stop.

The UBCP recommends CRN and CRT zoning with potentially denser housing and commercial redevelopment near the Four Corners intersection where ZTA 23-10 currently applies. Although on-street parking is permissible on nearby streets (Timberland, Sutherland, Lorain), parked cars on these narrow streets *already* reduce passage to a single lane, forcing drivers to find a curb lane space to move into in order to avoid oncoming traffic. Adding greater housing density, without requiring parking, will place further demands on scarce parking availability.

Although BRT on University Boulevard is unlikely to become a reality for many years, once that route is funded for construction, the nearby neighborhood in the CRN-zoned areas in the Dennis Avenue and Arcola Avenue districts could suffer the same fate on their narrow streets.

NFCCA residents overwhelmingly believe redeveloped multi-unit properties should be required to include parking spaces because there is insufficient on-street parking available in the areas recommended as CRN and CRT zones. A visit today to the NFCCA neighborhood would show that many of the streets near University Boulevard already have few if any parking spots available, particularly where homeowners do not have driveways. At the expense of congested, unnavigable streets, the minimal savings of approximately \$5000 per parking space¹ will do little to increase housing affordability.

The recreation center in North Four Corners Local Park is no longer in use. Rehabilitation of this community asset would provide an important social gathering spot for use by the entire community. Nearby communities enjoy the benefit of having a recreation center in their local parks (e.g., Woodmoor/Pinecrest, South Four Corners, Long Branch). The UBCP merely proposes to work with residents to identify a long-term lease that will complement the park and address community needs and interests. Even public access to an electrical outlet would allow the community to host movie nights or bands to foster important social connections communitywide.

The vision of a tree-lined boulevard filled with pedestrians and bicyclists enjoying a pleasant trip to local stores and restaurants is alluring. But we have to face the potential for significant additional traffic congestion if the current BRT stops are relocated to the center of the Four Corners intersection. This station is proposed to take away up to two travel lanes in the area just shy of the ramp where 30 percent of the southbound traffic volume on Colesville Road turns onto the Beltway. Furthermore, at least one traffic lane is eliminated in each direction on University Boulevard, and there is a lack of clarity in the presentations on how turning lanes on University Boulevard will be affected. We call on agency staff to engage with affected communities in much more detail about the assumptions and design of these major transportation changes.

The NFCCA neighborhood *already* bears the burden of cut-through traffic when frustrated drivers look for ways to avoid traffic congestion at Four Corners. Although there have been repeated requests at various public meetings, we are unaware of any traffic study to evaluate the impact of these transportation-related recommendations on the potential increase in vehicle volume traveling our streets.

Indeed, the UBCP concedes that, “The Four Corners street network, which includes a one-way couplet where University Boulevard (MD 193) is split into eastbound and

¹ [Attainable Housing Strategies Report](#), 2024, at page 42 observed that, “A recent American Planning Association article noted that various studies indicate that surface parking lot spaces cost upwards of \$5,000 each, while above-ground parking garages average around \$25,000 per space and below-ground garages average around \$35,000 per space.”

westbound sections and intersects with Colesville Road (U.S. 29), is one of the most complex at-grade intersection configurations in Montgomery County.”

Despite what is clearly a troublesome Four Corners intersection today, the UBCP makes only short-term recommendations for “limited change to the street network,” punting the decision to address the problematic challenges that currently affect pedestrians, bicyclists, and cars. Instead, the UBCP calls for achieving the “long-term vision” in the future once there is a more detailed design for BRT (this is many years from now) and there is further study of additional street connections.

With the potential addition of as many as 4000 new residential units along the University Boulevard Corridor, it seems unwise for this plan to implement a significant reduction in traffic lane capacity. In the face of the current transportation scenario, NFCCA believes upzoning changes should be paused until adoption of a viable transportation plan on University Boulevard that can address local traffic congestion and deal with vehicle circulation challenges through the Four Corners intersection.

The University Boulevard area between Georgia Avenue and Colesville Road is included in the top 5 roadways in the High Injury Network. Between 2015 and late 2024, there were 49 severe injuries and 4 fatalities in the Corridor area of University Boulevard. It is true that bicyclists and other multimodal users cannot safely ride on University Boulevard. Eventually, a dedicated sidepath running the length of both sides of the corridor could give these riders a safe and efficient travel lane. In the meantime, wider sidewalks would be a big step toward improving pedestrian and bicyclist mobility and safety.

Along the University Boulevard Corridor, improvements are recommended in the UBCP that can enhance safety. NFCCA strongly supports shortening intervals for protected crossings to minimize the distance pedestrians must walk to safely get to the other side of University Boulevard. Further, incorporating safety measures such as additional traffic lights at certain intersections, warning signals, restricted turns, and leading pedestrian intervals are important steps to improve safety.

Although NFCCA residents support wider sidewalks and sidepaths to make walking, biking, rolling safer, there is strong concern that these improvements will affect many of the homeowners whose property directly fronts onto University Boulevard, particularly where there is already very limited space between their homes and the road. As redevelopment of properties along University Boulevard occurs, however, there will be future opportunities for the county to use its existing right-of-way or negotiate for concessions in order to widen the sidewalk and add a broader space for shared walk/bike paths.

Nonetheless, residents are worried that eminent domain will be necessary in order to construct a wider sidepath along University Boulevard. The existing right-of-way varies along the corridor, but it is generally narrower than 124 feet. Also, a number of small businesses located along University Boulevard have small parking areas for their clients. Changes in the size of abutting sidewalks and right-of-way could imperil the livelihoods of these families whose home businesses front onto University Boulevard.

In conclusion, NFCCA is concerned that the UBCP prioritizes high-density development without making the necessary critical recommendations to address infrastructure limitations, traffic congestion, and parking shortages. Yet there is no assurance that the redeveloped housing stock will be more affordable than the homes that are replaced.

The CRN and CRT zoning recommendations in the UBCP focus on areas of the community where many of the charming, solidly built homes along Timberwood and Sutherland Avenues are nearing the historic 100-year mark, while other starter homes in the so-called Dennis Avenue and Arcola Districts are some of the most affordable single family housing stock in the county.

There has been little- to no-analysis of the potential increase in traffic congestion, loss of available parking on neighborhood streets (many of which do not have driveways and/or lack adequate off-street parking), or loss of single-family housing stock priced significantly below other areas of the county.

A home is many families' greatest investment and source of potential wealth growth. If a resident decides against selling to a redeveloper, there is nothing to protect them from construction of a large building over-shadowing their single-family home when a nearby property is redeveloped. This could impact their quality of life and the value of their home may suffer as well.

The recommendation to transition the Four Corners intersection into a people-oriented Town Center, while admirable, will not be achieved by subtracting traffic lanes, restricting left or right turns (forcing more drivers into the unwieldy jug handles), and adding a mid-intersection BRT station. Many of the transportation recommendations will extend vehicle idling and travel time adding to poor air quality.

These "improvements" will only add to the frustration that pedestrians, multimodal users, and drivers alike currently experience in navigating this convoluted intersection. The end result could be less not more safety: impatient drivers are more likely to cut through neighborhood streets, run red lights, turn before giving pedestrians the right of way, and engage in other impatient driving behaviors. A more workable, long-term solution needs to be in place. Indeed, incremental changes to lanes and sidewalks in the "interim" plan will only add to the frustration and complexity at this intersection.

Thank you for reviewing these comments and concerns. The NFCCA requests that this statement be included in the hearing record.

Respectfully,

Sharon Canavan
President
Northwood Four Corners Civic Association

cc: Zubin Adrianvala
Carrie Sanders

Jessica McVary
Lisa Govoni
Alex Rixey

SURVEY RESULTS ON UNIVERSITY BOULEVARD CORRIDOR PLAN

What is your housing arrangement?

Own	Rent	Live with family or friends
75		3

What do you like most about our neighborhood as it is right now? Please select up to five.

37	Lower home prices compared to the rest of the county
36	Convenient access to work and school
41	Convenient access to retail businesses, dining, parks, libraries, houses of worship, etc
33	Available parking in residential areas
6	Available parking in commercial areas
21	Good public transit availability
0	Multi-mobility options such as on-demand neighborhood minibusses being piloted now in the NFCCA area, rental scooters, bikes
23	Walkability and pedestrian improvements already made on University Boulevard to sidewalks and crossings)
53	Tree canopy
64	Nearby access to well-maintained parks or nature (trails, woods, wildlife)
17	Social gathering places in the community
65	Friendly interactions in the neighborhood and sense of community

What do you dislike about our neighborhood as it is right now? Please select up to five.

15	Housing is unaffordable to newcomers
8	Not convenient to transportation choices, work, shopping, etc.
31	Not enough shopping and dining choices right in the neighborhood (walking distance)
4	No choice of housing options (single family, townhouse, multifamily)
15	People can't age in place (housing not suited to aging/disabilities; transportation limitations)
12	Public transit stops are too far from home
45	Traffic congestion (on University Boulevard or other major routes)
50	Cut-through traffic and speeding in neighborhood
22	On-street parking is limited
19	Schools are over-crowded
14	Too much concrete
14	No facility for social gathering in Four Corners Local Park

Your Values: What are the top three values you would like to see our neighborhood respond to? Select three only, even though you might agree with all.

32	Environmental care and resilience: being water-smart, green, non-polluting
55	Safety and connection: a safe neighborhood for all
34	Livability: choices for housing, shopping, dining, services, & green space
11	Ease of Mobility: Connected to the road system with choices to bike, walk, roll or drive
48	Retain character: Maintain the feeling of our neighborhood as it is designed now
21	Affordability: People of all incomes and stages of life can find a home here
26	Walkability: Make walkability and "rollability" (wheelchairs) the hub of our vision and design

This section is about your knowledge of and preferences for the [University Boulevard Corridor Plan \(UBCP\)](#), proposed by the Montgomery County Planning Board. Most questions use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being complete disagreement or 'no' and 5 become complete agreement or 'yes'. In this scale, 3 means neutral or don't know.

This is a sometimes technical section, but please answer as many questions as you are comfortable with, and make sure to submit your survey even if you don't answer everything.

How much would you say you know about the UBCP? "1" is the least and "5" is the most.

Know nothing about UBCP	Know a little bit about UBCP	Familiar with UBCP	Familiar with most of UBCP	Familiar in detail with UBCP
0	15	22	28	10

Zoning

This section addresses issues related to zoning. Zoning is how a county determines what uses are allowed on land. There are numerous types of zoning for housing, commercial uses, agriculture, and special uses such as for religious institutions, medical facilities, or government buildings. Zoning also includes the use of a property, and its height and dimensions. In the NFCCA area, the majority of land is **single-family zoning and low-height, low-density buildings**. A focus of the UBCP is zoning changes to allow different kinds of zoning for multiple-family and multi-unit housing as well as commercial and retail uses. Please indicate your opinions on aspects of the plan, to the best of your understanding.

The UBCP proposes changing current single-family zoning to increase multi-family or attached multi-unit housing options near Bus Rapid Transit stops that are anticipated at Arcola, Dennis, and Colesville. Do you agree with this change?

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
34	10	11	6	14

The UBCP proposes changing current single-family zoning to allow a range of housing types for people with different income levels or at different life stages. Do you agree?

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
30	10	11	10	14

Please check all the specific types of housing redevelopment that you support for the NFCCA community, as described in the UBCP.

7	Multifamily Rental Apartment (up to 19 units)
8	Condominiums (up to 19 units)
10	Tall (60-70 feet) mixed use residential/commercial nearer to Four Corners intersection
17	Stacked Flats (one-level living in multifamily structure)
33	Duplex Townhome
15	Triplex Townhome
10	Quadplex Townhome
16	All of the above
26	None of the above

How much do you agree or disagree with this statement: "There should be no change to the current zoning. Our community should remain primarily single-family homes."

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
17	8	9	6	35

How much do you agree or disagree with this statement? "The UBCP's proposed zoning changes to allow denser housing redevelopment should only apply to properties directly fronting University Boulevard. This includes redevelopment of a single property, or when multiple properties are redeveloped together."

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
19	5	20	13	13

How much do you agree or disagree with this statement? "Changes to the zoning code should reflect the nearby existing housing by appropriately managing the transition in height, mass, and scale."

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
10	4	7	14	37

Here are options in UBCP's proposal to increase allowable height for redevelopment of multi-unit housing in portions of the neighborhood near to University Boulevard. Please indicate what you would agree with.

31	Retain current height limits (35-40 feet depending on roof style)
10	Strict limit of 40 feet throughout
7	Limit of 50 feet throughout
25	Heights of 60-70 feet for mixed-use properties that include residential/commercial (office or retail) near Four Corners at University Blvd/Colesville Rd and at religious institution properties along University Boulevard

How much do you agree or disagree with the UBCP proposal to encourage redevelopment with mixed use residential/commercial (office or retail) for properties directly fronting onto University Boulevard"

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
25	8	8	16	17

How much do you agree or disagree with the UBCP proposal to reduce or eliminate setback requirements if property that directly fronts onto University Boulevard is redeveloped. (A setback is a measure of the required distance of a building front from the property line or street)

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
32	11	13	10	8

How much do you agree or disagree: "Retain setback limits that are currently applicable in our community, whenever properties are redeveloped as multi-unit buildings."

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
6	8	15	16	27

How much do you agree or disagree: "To keep housing more affordable, UBCP should eliminate any requirement to provide a parking space."

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
49	11	8	4	2

How much do you agree or disagree: "The UBCP recommendations should include at least one parking space for each unit when property is redeveloped"

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
6	3	8	14	42

How much do you agree or disagree: "If on-street parking is allowed nearby, the UBCP plan should recommend eliminating the requirement to have parking when property is redeveloped."

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
46	12	11	2	2

Transportation

The next questions ask your opinion about transportation changes proposed for the NFCCA. You may note some repetition and variation in the questions. Please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement, with “1” being strongly disagree and “5” being strongly agree.

The county should delay zoning changes intended to add density to the area until adoption of a transportation plan on University Boulevard to deal with local traffic congestion and address vehicle circulation challenges through the Four Corners intersection.

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
7	7	5	8	46

Adopt measures to slow traffic speed on University Boulevard, for example, narrowing travel lanes and reducing vehicle speeds on University Boulevard.

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
17	11	15	15	15

Additional traffic enforcement cameras should be installed to ensure traffic compliance.

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
17	10	16	12	18

In each direction (east and west) University Boulevard should be "right-sized" by reducing the auto travel lanes to two lanes and restrict a third lane as a dedicated bus lane.

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
25	7	14	14	14

Intervals for protected crossings should be shortened to minimize distance for safe pedestrian crossing points along University Boulevard.

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
6	3	15	16	33

At median breaks along University Boulevard, incorporate safety measures, such as traffic lights, warning signals, restricted turns, or reduce the number of median breaks

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
5	5	17	21	24

Driveways on University Boulevard should be relocated to side streets or alleys, when a property is redeveloped.

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
22	3	17	15	14

Sidewalks should be widened and a green “buffer” should be added between the sidewalk and auto lanes for pedestrians and bicycles along University Boulevard.

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
10	5	7	26	26

Sidewalks on University Boulevard should be widened, even if that would reduce the front yards of homes that face University Boulevard (This may require the county to purchase a portion of the lot or make agreements with a redeveloper).

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
16	8	16	19	14

University Boulevard should be developed as a “Cool Corridor” with tree canopy, shaded transit stops, stormwater management and landscaped buffers.

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree

7	1	14	14	38
----------	----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

More options for micro-mobility, bike or scooter share, should be located throughout the neighborhood.

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
13	10	24	16	9

An on-demand neighborhood minibus should be offered to increase public transportation use for residents beyond a ¼ mile "walkshed."

Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree
17	9	21	15	9

Based on what you have learned and have answered in this survey, do you believe the UBCP fulfills your vision of how the University Boulevard Corridor of the future should look? You'll have a chance to give a more complete answer below.

Yes, generally	No, not at all	I'm not sure
18	38	21

If you could assign a proportion to your feeling about the UBCP, what would you generally say?

I'm mostly positive about the plan	I'm on the fence, 50-50	I am mostly negative about the plan
16	13	37

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

I have many concerns about the University Boulevard Corridor Plan, including (but not exclusively, as I don't have time to write a 10 page thesis):

- These 2022 numbers, showing a complete recovery from pre-pandemic numbers. While public bus usage has NOT fully recovered from the pandemic drop, private car usage has recovered - which is in itself an indication of preference for private cars over public transit.

These numbers also indicate that a significant amount of traffic uses University + Arcola as a path from Four Corners (and likely much of that going to/from the Capital Beltway 495) through to Georgia Ave and beyond. Such traffic can't be easily replaced by bus rapid transit (BRT) as BRT would only cover a portion of that route.

THERE IS NO PLACE ELSE FOR THIS TRAFFIC TO GO!

Arcola Ave. and Kemp Mill Rd. already see huge amounts of through traffic due to the lack of alternate routes through this section of Montgomery County, and mass transit can't solve that with anything close to the proposed BRT solution.

- * Many people can't, due to physical limitations
 - o walk or hike or do any significant distance
 - o many people are not used to walking, but realistically, unless middle-aged and younger people as well as older people are able to walk, there is no transit for the rest of their trip, there is a person who can't walk how far they need to go
 - o the non-transit distance on either end of the journey is more than 12 miles, the vast majority of people are not used to walking that distance
- * Even for those who can walk, walking is not an option
 - o "Even for those who can walk, walking is not an option because of the weather, the terrain, the insects, including:
 - Freshwater wetter - rain, snow, very hot, very cold
 - Insects - carrying them from the forest to the camp, (e.g. 14 miles on each end of a trip) or on a road
 - o people are not designed to walk and back seats for people to put their things in, plus the lack of trying to walk with multiple bags while getting out of a crowded bus is simply not practical. In even those places where people are used to walking, the weather is often in direct conflict with it and direct weather will not do so when shopping is required, so the reason people are not walking is great, whatever it is called these days) which is why the people who do manage to do it are the ones who are the most resilient and practical conditions created a huge barrier to people who are not used to walking and are not practical for most people, even if (individually) the bus is functional

But most of all, the vast majority of trips by most people in the affected neighborhoods, except for a small percentage who commute to a location near a Metro station, simply find it impractical to use transit for such trips. This includes medical appointments (and if you are sick with any respiratory or other potentially contagious disease then a bus is not advisable, and if you have mobility problems, even temporary ones such as a broken leg, again a bus just doesn't work) as so many medical offices are not convenient to transit, visiting friends and family, entertainment venues, etc. The list is endless.

- 5 - The vast majority of Montgomery County is SUBURBS, not CITIES. Housing and transit simply work differently. Throwing around buzzwords and bike paths and bus lanes will NOT magically turn suburbs into cities. Period. If people want to live in cities, they can move to downtown Bethesda or Washington, DC or New York City or Baltimore (city, not county). Plenty of people live in cities and WANT to live in cities. Let the people who WANT to live in SUBURBS have that choice.

- 6 - Much is made of the need to right past wrongs against various groups of people. While that is a noble cause, I firmly believe that the way to help such groups is NOT by making everyone else lives worse but rather to make their lives better. Whether someone is black, white, brown or green with purple polka dots (yes, I use that as an example of how absurd it is to group people by skin color), most Americans I know want:

* The ability to get a good job - to make it big, move up in the world, not to be lumped forever with "you can't afford what the others have, so let's give you second-best" - which is I think the message shown about "affordable housing" must be high density, no cars, etc."

* Mobility For the past 100 years there has meant private cars. Period. Make them better (more efficient, electric, etc.) if you are concerned about pollution and "climate change." But you can't restrict mobility. People have the right to be able to go anywhere they want, when they want - that "transit is good enough for you, because we say so." Restricting movement to specific areas is a violation of the basic rights of all citizens. The regime, not of the free country you live in.

* The ability to choose what type of housing they live in For most people that ultimate goal is a single family home - no worry about noise from neighbors, no need to share a driveway, and many other advantages. Montgomery County built primarily on that concept and that is why people moved here rather than into Washington, D.C. or other places. For those who prefer (because they don't own a car) to live in a townhome or home replacement (or whatever) to live in apartments or other multi-family dwellings, let them choose that. But this plan seems to FORCE a high-density homes both by zoning changes and by designating areas for high-density housing. It's trying to push people into what, walk, roller skis,

Noble goals But the wrong place, affecting THOUSANDS of people who live nearby or travel through the area, without actually giving people what they want

If you truly want to build a 15-minute city, build something new, planned from the beginning Columbia, MD or perhaps Brasilia - a fascinating experiment in "planned cities" - and by the way, according to Wikipedia "The average commute time on public transit in Brasilia, for example to and from work, on a weekday is 96 min 31% of public transit riders, ride for more than 2 hours every day" - now there are some wonderful numbers to compare - ah, the glories of public transit

11/11/2016

1006 South Belgrade Road, Wheaton, MD 20902 (Less
than 1 block outside the official plan area)



From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Comments Regarding The University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 11:33:25 AM

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

Hi,

I'd like to voice my opposition to University Boulevard Corridor Plan. I am a resident of the University Towers at the corner of Arcola and University. The implementation of this plan will making getting around SUBSTANTIALLY more difficult, given the reality that public transit is not and almost definitely **cannot be** as convenient as typical car travel. Given that we travel to a number of places on a weekly basis which are not served by existing routes and will not be conveniently serviced by new routes, substantial increases in traffic due to less available lanes, no turn on red, etc, will be **hugely** burdensome. It seems extremely unreasonable to disenfranchise thousands and thousands of residents who will never opt to use public transit given that it will never reach parity in terms of convenience in the name of 'equity.'

Additionally, my understanding is that the plan will rezone key religious infrastructure in the Kemp Mill neighborhood, potentially making it subject to the invocation of eminent domain. I, along with thousands of other residents, am a tremendous beneficiary of these institutions, spending 6+ hours in them on a daily basis. We need these institutions within walking distance of our residences, and putting them at risk of being bought out and developed will leave the Jewish community of Kemp Mill (which is decades old and thousands strong) in an untenable circumstance.

Please do not change the wonderful character of our neighborhoods in favor of some 'public benefit' which the public doesn't actually seem to favor.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Testimony 2/27 - Jeremy Baer
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 11:42:55 AM
Attachments: [Copy of Untitled.png](#)

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

Testimony University Blvd. Plan

Hearing date: 2/27/2025

Mailing address: 100 Williamsburg Dr, Silver Spring, MD 20901

Sending date: 2/25 11:41 p.m.

Please confirm upon receipt.

Testimony:

Dear Members of the Montgomery County Planning Board/County Council,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan, particularly the zoning changes that will directly impact my home and our neighborhood. As a resident who chose this area to escape the city's congestion and embrace a suburban lifestyle, I am deeply concerned about the following issues.

Many of us moved to this area to escape the city's hustle, looking for a suburban living feeling. The proposed development threatens to erode this lifestyle, replacing it with an urban density incompatible with the reasons we chose to live here. There are 77,000 households three miles from my property, with a population of 210,000 people. I can assure you that the majority of these households oppose this plan as we will all be affected. The planned 4,000 units you are proposing will disturb the more than 200,000 people who already worked hard to build these communities. I understand you are worried about the lack of new development, but I am afraid that this growth will only benefit the home builders. In one of your documents, you said you want to preserve the residential character, but myself and the 2,398 people who signed the [change.org petition](#) are concerned this is contrary to your promise mentioned above.

Our home served as a model for the neighborhood in 1940 if I am not mistaken my home was the first house in the Woodmoor neighborhood. It was called the Wishmaker's Home. It was the ideal home back then and now. The house itself has preserved its charm after all these years. The history and charm of this house and the community cohesion is what has attracted us here. Now, please picture this "Wishmaker Home" next or across builder-grade townhomes. The zoning change threatens to disrupt the character, not only for my house but many others, by replacing or destroying almost 100 single-family homes with high-density housing that is inconsistent with the existing community.

The traffic along University Boulevard is already dense, and the addition of numerous new homes will exacerbate this issue. The increased volume of vehicles will lead to longer commute times, heightened pollution, and a diminished quality of life. Right now, I sit approximately 15-20 minutes in traffic in the morning at the light of Colesville Rd and Williamsburg Dr, and this is just to wait for my turn to turn left on Colesville Rd.

The proposed plan will significantly alter the neighborhood's dynamics, increase noise, and reduce the green spaces. The increase in new residents will place additional strain on our local schools, parks, and other public services. This overpopulation could result in overcrowded classrooms, reduced access to recreational areas, and a decline in the quality of services that our community currently enjoys. The Woodmoor neighborhood and the neighborhoods around it have the most special traditions, including community events, including the kid's 4th of July parade, the Woodmoorstock, and many others.

In conclusion, while I understand the need for development and growth, I urge the Planning Board to reconsider the proposed zoning changes along University Boulevard, including my home. Please protect the integrity of our neighborhood by taking other measures, like maintaining manageable traffic levels, ensuring the quality of our schools and public services, and preserving the suburban lifestyle that drew us here. I invite you to conduct a public poll so we can have the chance to decide on the future of our communities.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the author.

Visual exhibit

Interiors and Exterior of 'Wishmaker's House,' Indian Spring Village



Arrangement
Of Wishmaker
Home Is Novel

Indian Spring House,
Built and Furnished
As Complete Unit

"Wishmaker's House" Now Open in Indian Spring Village, Md.



Wishmaker's House is one of the most unusual and interesting houses in the Indian Spring Village, Md. It was built and furnished as a complete unit, and its arrangement is novel. The house is a two-story structure with a prominent chimney and a gabled roof. The interior is a complete unit, and the arrangement is novel. The house is a two-story structure with a prominent chimney and a gabled roof. The interior is a complete unit, and the arrangement is novel.

'Wishmaker's
House' Wins
Visitors' Favor

Indian Spring Village
Demonstration Home
Attracts Thousands

'Wishmaker's House' has attracted the attention of thousands of visitors during the two weeks it has been open for inspection. Planned by the best in modern (rational) architecture, this first arrangement of a complete living unit with

modern detail and adjoining several living rooms, dining room, and kitchen with built-in units. Situated at 1 Williamsburg Drive, Indian Spring Village, Md., the house has been built and is prepared to make living units - owners and designers of this popular section, designed by E. J. Campbell, architect, sponsored by The Washington Post and directed by L. B. Wright, president of the Board of the 'Wishmaker's House' society, the audience may be reached by driving from the Lumber Yard at Indian Spring, Md., and not far from the Washington Post and the Capital City. The house is a complete unit, and the arrangement is novel. The house is a two-story structure with a prominent chimney and a gabled roof. The interior is a complete unit, and the arrangement is novel.



100 WILLIAMSBURG DR
The proposed University Boulevard
Plan will change the zoning of this
house and many other to CRN*.
Please say no to the proposed plan.

Let's preserve our neighborhoods.

*Commercial-Residential zone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Comments about the University Blvd Corridor plan
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 11:51:03 AM

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

I have been a resident of Kemp Mill since 1998. Prior to that I lived in White Oak for 18 years. As I continue to travel between Kemp Mill and White Oak I have seen how congested the Four Corners area is even with the existing lanes.

The idea that anyone would consider removing lanes from University Blvd between Dennis Ave and Colesville Road (or beyond) must mean that

They do not understand the high volume of traffic that already exists.

People use it to:

Get onto the Beltway at Colesville Road

Get onto the Beltway going toward Baltimore (on University)

Get to Blair High School

Get to the Church (and I think a daycare center) at 4 Corners

Get to and from White Oak

I would hope the County would try to improve the traffic and safety at Four Corners instead of making it worse.

Plans should include making vehicular traffic move smoothly AND improving pedestrian safety. Instead, I see language such as the following in the proposed plan for University Blvd (page 115):

...as part of a long-term comprehensive redesign of the intersection of University Boulevard and Colesville Road. Improving multimodal safety—not increasing capacity or vehicular travel speeds through Four Corners—should remain the top priority of the study; as such, pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements, including a human scale and reduced pedestrian crossing distances, a Breezeway that connects to bicycle and pedestrian facilities along University Boulevard, and ample street buffers should remain part of the long-term vision.

The plan also proposes to increase congestion further west on University Blvd as well as on Arcola Avenue.

Please note that Kemp Mill residents can only get out of the neighborhood going west via University Blvd or in a round about way via Arcola Ave to Georgia.

Two lanes have already been removed from Arcola from Kemp Mill Road to University.

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE THE RIGHT HAND LANE FOR TURNING ONTO UNIVERSITY BLVD.

Traffic is already backed up badly trying to get out of the neighborhood in the morning.

All of the current lanes are necessary to ensure Arcola Ave backup does not get worse.

If a new road is built connecting University Blvd to the Kemp Mill shopping center it will:

1. Cause even more traffic congestion onto Arcola Ave (note that an MVA office was recently added to the shopping center and it has already increased that traffic)
2. Remove a nice quiet walking path behind the Kemp Mill shopping center that connects to the Sligo Creek walking path

Housing:

Adding housing in the small Kemp Mill shopping center will also only make congestion on Arcola Avenue worse.

A better alternative would be to use the nearby land formerly used by WTOP. Housing at that site would have much easier access to University Blvd and it would be closer to downtown Wheaton.

I urge the Planning board to NOT recommend the University Blvd Corridor Plan to the County as it stands. Furthermore, any future plans should first be discussed in a meeting specifically with the Kemp Mill Community.

The people who live in this area are counting on you to improve their lives here, not make them worse. Getting to school, work, and doctor appointments are a major part of life. Please do not make that more difficult and stressful.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: opposition to the University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 11:56:48 AM

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

Chair, Montgomery County Planning Board
2425 Reddie Drive
Wheaton, MD 20902

Dear Planning Board Members,

I send this letter in advance of the public hearing set for February 27th. I strongly oppose the University Boulevard Corridor plan. As a physician, I am concerned that the proposed traffic changes will significantly increase congestion and slow emergency response times, particularly for cars and ambulances traveling to Holy Cross Hospital. This is a serious public safety issue. Rather than reducing lane capacity and lowering speed limits at a time where more people are commuting to the office and a high school is going to reopen, the county should be seeking solutions that accommodate the growing number of drivers and improve road efficiency.

I urge the Planning Board to reconsider this plan and develop a more balanced approach—one that acknowledges the needs of Montgomery County residents who rely on University Boulevard and surrounding streets for their daily commutes and essential travel while also preserving the existing communities and the ability of emergency services to operate effectively.

Additionally, as someone who heavily relies on the businesses in the Kemp Mill shopping center, I strongly oppose rezoning it for mixed use capacity. It will also further road congestion and commute times, let alone possibly eliminate these businesses and affect county residents' quality of life.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
313 Stonington Road
Silver Spring, Maryland 20902

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: opposition to the University Boulevard Corridor Plan
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 11:58:08 AM

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

Chair, Montgomery County Planning Board
2425 Reddie Drive
Wheaton, MD 20902

Dear Planning Board Members,

I send this letter in advance of the public hearing set for February 27th. I strongly oppose the University Boulevard Corridor Plan. Having grown up in New York City, there's a reason I chose to move to suburban Silver Spring. The proposed traffic changes and rezoning will reduce access to community resources including our local hospital and businesses. The plan presents potential safety impacts to pedestrians and drivers by proposing changes that will increase congestion. It also doesn't take into account the reopening of Northwood High School and the enforcement of return to office policies. Reducing lane capacity and lowering speed limits will lead to even greater gridlock and possible traffic injuries and fatalities.

As far as I know, there had been no engagement with the community prior to this draft. Rezoning the Kemp Mill shopping center will not only lead to increased congestion and undermine the existing neighborhood, but it could lead to increased safety issues. As someone who heavily relies on the businesses in the Kemp Mill shopping center, I strongly oppose rezoning it for mixed use. These businesses are an essential part of our community. There is plenty of undeveloped land outside of Kemp Mill. There is no reason to ruin our existing community.

I strongly encourage the board members to meet with Kemp Mill residents to understand our needs and make serious changes to this draft. The county should seek solutions that accommodate the growing number of drivers and improve road efficiency, not the opposite.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
313 Stonington Road
Silver Spring, MD 20902

February 19, 2025

Chair Artie Harris
Montgomery Planning Board
2425 Reedie Drive, 14th Floor
Wheaton, MD 20902

Dear Chair Harris and Members of the Planning Board,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the draft University Boulevard Corridor Plan. We are the Kemp Mill Civic Association (KMCA), a neighborhood association serving the approximately 1,300 households in Kemp Mill.

We developed this position statement collaboratively and democratically, including through a Transportation Committee [meeting attended by over 60 members](#), through dozens of emails exchanged through our listserv, and through countless conversations between our nine directors and members of the community. We do not pretend this letter reflects the unanimous views of all our members (or directors), but we are proud of our process and believe these comments reflect a broad consensus. Underscoring this, our members approved this letter by a vote of 54 households to 5 households at an in-person vote on February 19.

As an overview, the community is appreciative of the opportunity presented to make our community and the surrounding community a better place to live in. There are plenty of elements here that we will discuss that we feel would be of great benefit to the community and corridor if implemented in the proper way. But there is also significant concern about some elements within the plan as well as some omissions.

Our concerns are compounded by the lack of trust we have with the County right now, particularly as it relates to the process of public/community input. This is evident from the process regarding the bike lanes along University Blvd (MD 193), followed by the bus lanes along MD 193, and then the bus lanes along Georgia Ave (MD 97). While we felt that this process was somewhat better, we are still upset at the very short timeframe to provide comments after seeing the draft plan that is over 350 pages long with appendixes. We also felt that some of the results were skewed based on not getting enough representation from certain stakeholders, such as institutions just outside of the corridor and the many people who do not live adjacent to the corridor but utilize University Blvd for a variety of reasons. This lack of trust is contributing to a lot of the concerns you will see in our comments. Some of the elements could have great potential, but if the County cannot deliver the elements needed to meet the great potential, the results could significantly harm our community.

Below is an overview of our position as it relates to the University Blvd. Corridor plan. Note that we are not able to provide every single point that has been articulated by the community and would encourage the County to meet with us before the Plan is finalized.

University Blvd Corridor Vision

There are many ideas presented to transform University Blvd (MD 193). But looking at the big picture of the corridor, the primary purpose of MD 193 is to be a road to connect destinations that are in defined places. KMCA does not oppose efforts to improve other modes of transportation through

the corridor, such as walking, biking, and taking transit, but KMCA is concerned that the Plan does not adequately address the needs of vehicular traffic.

MD 193 is classified as an arterial. Arterials are meant to move people from place to place. Arterials are not meant to be places within the corridor. We need slow streets in defined places such as downtown Wheaton. We need faster, efficient roads to connect places. When a corridor is transformed into a place, the road becomes a “stroad,” part street, part road ([What Is a Stroad and Why Is It Dangerous? | Streetlight Data](#)).

The plan’s current vision is to essentially convert MD 193 from a road that has some stroad elements into a complete stroad. This is bad for every mode of transportation for both operations and safety. KMCA fully supports MD 193 remaining a “road” between Wheaton and Four Corners, not a street or a stroad. We need a suburban design strategy, not an urban design strategy.

This means that KMCA does not want to see any reduction in the speed limit along MD 193 through this section of the corridor. We need moderate to higher speed corridors along MD 193 and other arterial roads to have a desirable, livable suburban community that relies on traveling longer distances than in an urban environment. Higher speeds reduce travel time not just for vehicular traffic, but for transit traffic as well. This is critical for a successful transit system. If MD 193 is planned properly, it may even be possible to raise the speed limit.

Rather than reduce speed limits, KMCA supports other aspects of the Plan that will protect the safety of drivers, pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders. These include:

- Separating pedestrian and bicycle facilities from the roadway. Greater separation of the modes allows higher speeds along the corridor to be safe.
- Better access management, by encouraging future development to reduce the number of access points that open directly onto MD 193. Removal of these access points reduces conflicts between vehicles and all the modes of transportation. Better access management allows drivers to travel at faster speeds due to only needing to be concerned with a limited number of potential conflicts that are spread out.
- Ensuring that planned BRT stations are located at or near existing traffic signals that allow controlled pedestrian crossings. This is key to pedestrian safety along a corridor with moderate speeds. The speed limit when there is a pedestrian crossing any road should be zero (0). This happens at controlled crossings when the driver must stop at a red light for the pedestrian to cross.

For this same reason, KMCA opposes the Plan’s intention to create corridor-fronting properties along MD 193 midway between existing traffic signals. Adding pedestrians between traffic signals will either force pedestrians to walk long distances for a traffic signal, or to cross at uncontrolled crossings—which presents the greatest risk of pedestrian fatalities and creates the “stroad” that needs to be avoided. The corridor needs safe “points” along the road and not “places” that make MD 193 into a stroad. In sum, we believe that with responsible safety measures, MD 193 can have safe speeds that are equivalent to the current design speed of the road.

Concerns with Effects of Thrive Montgomery 2050

KMCA is strongly opposed to the Thrive Montgomery 2050 policy that stops proposing 4+ lane roads in master plans. There is clear evidence already that this policy does not work. Old Georgetown Road (MD 185) is a prime example where the road diet to 4 lanes has created unbearable gridlock conditions not just during rush hour, but throughout a large portion of the day. The removal of thru lanes on Georgia Ave (MD 97) to make room for a bus lane, has created gridlock conditions during rush hour along the remaining 4 lanes, with many drivers ignoring the designated bus lane signs. These State Highways were meant to be the primary routes for vehicular traffic, i.e. they were meant to be roads, not streets. Essentially, the County's policy is trying to systematically convert all roads to streets. This forces traffic into the streets that were not designed for traffic. For example, many in our community for many years use Sligo Creek Pkwy as an alternative route to MD 97. Sligo Creek Pkwy, a street, was never meant as a commuter route, but it has turned into one due to the congestion issues along MD 97, a road, that are now getting much worse.

Along MD 193, the current road diet between Amherst and Dennis avenues has not produced significantly longer delays through the corridor. However, the results of this temporary road diet are skewed and do not mean that a permanent road diet will necessarily work, especially the one proposed in the corridor plan that is more extreme in length and restrictions. The current traffic conditions are still not close to traffic conditions pre-pandemic. (It was also very helpful to traffic that Northwood High School has been closed this entire academic year.) But there is a growing trend, not just in the federal government, to get workers back into the offices. This will soon get traffic beyond pre-pandemic numbers. There will continue to be a steady increase in traffic growth in general by the standard 1-2% a year. In and near designated growth areas, such as MD 193, the growth rate could be even higher, even with improved transit potentially taking many of those extra vehicle trips away.

KMCA is currently opposed to making the current MD 193 road diet permanent, let alone having a road diet in the corridor plan. Furthermore, the KMCA has great concerns with how this would affect the MD 193/Arcola Ave intersection, which is further discussed below.

To summarize the main concern with the overall corridor plan, our community is almost fully reliant on the vehicle as the only mode of transportation. So are most of the communities adjacent to us and the corridor. Improving transit in the corridor is not going to change this fact due to a combination of not being able to access transit to begin with (i.e. "last mile" problem) and that the transit lines do not go efficiently to the vast majority of destinations that residents of our surrounding communities are trying to get to anyway. In addition, certain functions like grocery shopping are difficult via transit.

"Arcola Ave District"

There are only two roads that access our community, Arcola Ave and Kemp Mill Road, with entries only from MD 193, MD 97, and Randolph Road. Arcola Ave is our community's Main Street that accesses our neighborhood shopping center and several religious institutions/schools, which are all very active. The pedestrian and bicycle activities along Arcola Ave and within our community are

extremely high compared to similar looking communities. Arcola Ave is also an important part of the County roadway network. It acts as a cut-through between MD 193 with MD 97 and Randolph Road.

Arcola Ave is a local stroad. Arcola Ave had a road diet about 20 years ago from 4 lanes to 2 lanes after a pedestrian fatality. Our community loves that Arcola Ave is now very pedestrian friendly. But the congestion in our community has historically been very severe due to the road diet, that pre-pandemic was about 2.5 miles in length. KMCA has significant concerns that the corridor plan with the higher-density development within the proposed Arcola Ave district, as well as the proposed development along the corridor will cause congestion to significantly exceed the historic congestion issues.

The corridor plan proposes a new access point from MD 193 to the Kemp Mill Shopping Center and the Arcola Ave/Lamberton Drive intersection. This new connection, which we will call Lamberton Drive Extension, presents some opportunities, but also some concerns.

On the positive side, the KMCA sees the Lamberton Drive Extension as a potential new access point into our community that can alleviate the recurring and non-recurring (i.e. crash-related, weather-related) congestion that is experienced along Arcola Ave. The Lamberton Drive Extension also creates opportunities for the Shopping Center to get new customers, which could help the businesses survive and thrive more. Lastly, the new added traffic to the MD 193/Lamberton Drive Extension intersection could justify a traffic signal, which would be great for all modes of transport.

On the negative side, the combined increased traffic along Lamberton Drive Extension and Arcola Ave will make an already severely congested intersection into a complete nightmare. Additionally, there is concern about the effects of safety and security along this new extension. Young Israel Shomrai Emunah Synagogue, located on the corner of this intersection, has experienced anti-Semitic events in front of the synagogue entrance and would want to make sure that their security needs are met. Lastly, we would like to ensure that any plan for Lamberton Drive Extension is a street and not a road.

To address our concerns and help us decide whether we could support this extension, the KMCA would like to see more information on what Lamberton Drive Extension would look like, such as typical sections and general strategies for safety and security. We also want a commitment in the plan that the Arcola Ave/Lamberton Drive intersection will be upgraded to meet the operational and safety demands of all users. Lastly, we want a commitment from the County that it will work with the community to update the Kemp Mill Master Plan as soon as this corridor plan is complete. In that updated Kemp Mill Master Plan, we want to ensure that all the secondary effects that the University Blvd Corridor Plan will have on Kemp Mill will be addressed.

Zoning Changes

The corridor plan also has some zoning changes within the Arcola Ave district. This includes a combination of higher density and mixed-use development. Again, the KMCA sees some opportunities but also concerns.

Members of our community are open to additional housing, but our community also has concerns about traffic and overloading existing infrastructure. If additional housing is built, our members are particularly interested in owner-occupied multi-family housing (such as condos or townhouses) that could enable first-time homeowners to begin developing home equity. The Kemp Mill community is a very desirable community where many multiple generations of the same family are spread out through the community. With housing prices skyrocketing and mortgage rates relatively high, it is getting harder and harder for the next generation of a family to return to the community or get younger families from outside the community to buy. Additional townhouses or condos could help meet this need. Before supporting a specific proposal for additional housing, KMCA would ask for additional information regarding the number of units and intended price points.

In terms of the proposed mixed-use development, the KMCA again sees opportunities and concerns. On the positive side, mixed-use development with higher-density housing has great potential for the current businesses within the Kemp Mill Shopping Center, as well as attract other businesses that could benefit the community. It would also be great for Kemp Mill Shopping Center to become a more pedestrian/bicycle-friendly environment.

But there are concerns that are very unique to our community. Kemp Mill has a very large Jewish community, much of which keeps kosher. Several businesses in the Kemp Mill Shopping Center cater specifically to the Jewish community such as a kosher supermarket, restaurants, and bakeries. Other businesses in the shopping center cater to non-kosher keeping patrons, or to the general public. All these businesses are a huge resource to the community and if any of them were to go out of business either temporarily due to the transition of the property or permanently due to economic factors (similar what happened to the kosher establishment in Cabin John Shopping Center as it transitioned to mixed-use development), it would take away a huge community resource that is vitally important to the Jewish community.

It was disappointing that the planning team recognized the Jewish history of the area and yet did not proactively engage the Jewish community in Kemp Mill regarding the community's unique needs. The KMCA wants to ensure that our concerns are addressed appropriately before considering whether we could support the mixed-use zoning changes proposed in the corridor plan.

The last major concern that the KMCA has regarding the Arcola Ave District relates to the MD 193/Arcola Ave signalized intersection. We simply cannot accept an intersection that has any fatal flaws in traffic operations. These fatal flaws include recurring cycle failures for any turning movement within the intersection, as well as recurring queuing of any lane that backs into another intersection or blocks an adjacent lane. The corridor plan should not reference details such as restricting right turns on red or removing the channelized right turn from Arcola to MD 193. These details should be discussed during the preliminary design phase. Instead, the corridor plan should set minimum standards of service for the intersection and require significant improvements to the intersection if needed to meet the vision of the corridor.

“Four Corners District”

KMCA has some specific concerns as it relates to the Four Corners District proposal. Four Corners is unique in that it is not only an area of business, but it is also an integral part of the I-495 interchange with both US 29 and MD 193. Both MD 193 and US 29 must remain “roads” through Four Corners and not “streets” or “stroads”. Any proposal that increases vehicle delay through Four Corners is unacceptable, as this is a key junction to connect to other places. If BRT needs to go through this intersection, BRT must be on its own alignment through Four Corners. Four Corners needs to be considered a point within the corridor and not a place.

Furthermore, removing the one-way pair of MD 193 will not just hurt vehicle operations, but it will also remove the whole character of Four Corners. Further analysis of various alternatives are needed to meet the functionality of MD 193 as a road while supporting the growth of Four Corners.

Secondary Effects

As stated earlier, the University Blvd Corridor Plan will have secondary effects. These secondary effects are not just for our community, but the communities that surround the corridor and the many drivers that use MD 193 as simply a road to get to other destinations. These effects are not just transportation related. There are also social and environmental effects that are beyond the corridor. The corridor plan must recognize these secondary effects and discuss a plan on how they would be addressed.

BRT

There are a wide variety of opinions as it relates to the proposed BRT through the corridor. The community recognizes that if more growth is desired in this corridor, it needs to be supported by better transportation. Whether growth should be in this corridor is debatable within the community. It is also debatable whether the only growth in the County should be transit-oriented, particularly in a County that is primarily suburban in nature, not urban. It is also debatable if a BRT system in this corridor has enough benefits to the County that it is worth the cost of developing and operating a BRT system.

There are members in our community that fully support better transit along the corridor. Some of them are upset though that we live in a community that is just out of range of being able to use it because of the “last mile” issue.

While there are a variety of opinions within the community of whether a BRT system is appropriate in this corridor, it is nearly unanimous in the community that if a BRT system is built, it cannot be to the detriment of vehicle traffic to the point of congested intersections or corridors. This is not just an operational issue, it is also a safety issue, as crashes exponentially increase in congested conditions. A detailed traffic study must be conducted to meet the operational and safety needs of all users,


which include pedestrians, bicycle, transit, and vehicular traffic. KMCA is opposed to any BRT that is designed to disproportionately hurt vehicular traffic.

Conclusions

Due to the tight time crunch of responding to this plan and the limitations of getting everyone's point across in this type of letter, these comments and positions from KMCA are not fully comprehensive. We would encourage the County to meet with KMCA and the community at the earliest opportunity possible to discuss our concerns and how they can be addressed in this Corridor Plan. As stated at the beginning of this letter, we do see many of positive elements within this corridor plan if implemented properly, some of which we noted, some of which we didn't. But there are significant concerns related to transportation, housing, and our shopping center that need to be addressed.

Thank you for carefully going through our comments and we hope we can have a fruitful discussion that can ultimately lead to a better vision of our community and the MD 193 corridor.

Respectfully,



Jules Szanton
President, KMCA

On behalf of the Members of the Kemp Mill Civic Association

Cc: County Executive Marc Elrich
Montgomery County Council

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Submission of Written Comments for the February 27 Planning Board hearing on the UBCP
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 11:59:49 AM
Attachments: [Written comments for Feb 27 UBCP meeting.pdf](#)

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

Attached are my written comments for the February 27 Planning Board hearing on the UBCP. My name is [REDACTED]

My address is:

[REDACTED]
10125 Markham Street
Silver Spring, MD 20901

**WRITTEN COMMENTS BY [REDACTED] RESIDENT OF SOUTH FOUR CORNERS IN SILVER
SPRING, FOR THE FEBRUARY 27 MASTER PLAN PUBLIC HEARING – UNIVERSITY BOULEVARD
CORRIDOR PLAN**

February 25, 2025

Uncoordinated Plans and Unfair Burdens. The “More Housing N.O.W. (New Options for Workers)” and University Boulevard Corridor Plan (UBCP) proposals to rezone Montgomery County properties do not appear to be coordinated with each other. Assuming that the County Council believes that its More Housing N.O.W. rezoning proposal is fair and reasonable, how can the much denser and intrusive rezoning and development of the UBCP be reconciled with it (compare Figure 10 in the UBCP Working Draft 2025 (p. 28) with the More Housing N.O.W. interactive map at <https://mcplanning.maps.arcgis.com/apps/instant/lookup/index.html?appid=35c44dee1734457185b0604f3ce67e5e&find=909%2520BENSON%2520TER%252C%2520SILVER%2520SPRING%252C%252020901>)? It would be much less confusing if the UBCP effort were to await the resolution of the More Housing N.O.W. legislation and then be made compatible with it.

If the UBCP proceeds without reconciling with the More Housing N.O.W. legislation, this would imply that properties along University Boulevard would be rezoned initially by the More Housing N.O.W. legislation and then be rezoned again (almost immediately thereafter) by the UBCP. Would this two-stage and very inefficient rezoning practice also occur along other boulevards and large streets throughout Montgomery County?

- If the answer from the Planning Board is that other corridors in Montgomery County will be rezoned again after the More Housing N.O.W. rezoning, then citizens of Montgomery County should be warned now that the proposed changes in rezoning shown in the More Housing N.O.W. interactive map are misleading (see <https://mcplanning.maps.arcgis.com/apps/instant/lookup/index.html?appid=35c44dee1734457185b0604f3ce67e5e&find=909%2520BENSON%2520TER%252C%2520SILVER%2520SPRING%252C%252020901>).
- If the answer from the Planning Board is that the University Boulevard Corridor is a special case of higher density redevelopment, the Planning Board should explain why this is so. The draft UBCP would add 4,000 new residential units to a corridor that currently has 3,500 residential units, resulting in a 114 percent increase in residential units even though Montgomery County is expecting a total growth in households of only 16 percent between 2025 and 2045 (see <https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Countywide-Round-10.0-Summary-Table.pdf>). Whereas not all of the newly-zoned residential units in the draft UBCP will necessarily be built by 2045, the potential for rapid growth is there. Surely there are more geographically-equitable ways to share the responsibility of providing housing in Montgomery County (as demonstrated by the More Housing N.O.W. proposal).
- To accommodate this high burden of new housing, the draft UBCP would open neighborhoods along University Boulevard corridor to cut-through car traffic that will seek to avoid rising traffic congestion on University Boulevard. Rising congestion on University Boulevard would result from the new commercial and housing development along the corridor and because the UBCP would remove two through-lanes from University Boulevard

at Four Corners (to make the intersection more suitable for cyclists, walkers, and people riding scooters). Higher traffic may arise even more quickly than expected due to the termination of “Work From Home” policies by the Federal Government. The draft UBCP calls for new cut-through access into neighborhoods via an extended Gilmore Drive, possible access from University to Tenbrook Avenue, new connected intersections along University Boulevard, etc. (see the next section of these comments for more detail). The street access proposals in the UBCP would effectively convert major portions of the South Four Corners residential area into an extension of the Four Corners intersection, even though this area is already close to the noise and pollution of three high traffic roads (I-495, U.S. Route 29, and University Boulevard). Cars will pass literally 30 feet away from many interior residential homes (originally purchased in part because they were not on busy streets). Because our residential streets are narrow and often lack sidewalks, the walkability of our streets will be diminished. Again, how is this fair, particularly if other residential areas of the County are spared, including affluent areas in the western part of the County?

- Efforts to provide multi-family housing along the University Boulevard Corridor should also reflect the redevelopment of vacant office space in Montgomery County into residential space (being promoted in the legislation by the County Council).
- The UBCP depends on bus rapid transit (BRT) being in place. The UBCP should therefore not be voted on until funding for BRT on University Blvd is secured.
- The UBCP is not being coordinated with traffic flow disruptions to be caused by U.S. Route 29 Flash Bus centerline project, which will also affect traffic into neighborhoods at Four Corners.

Rushed Consultation Process. The consultation process on UBCP is moving along too quickly. As noted, we have just learned about the More Housing N.O.W. proposal but have no idea how the UBCP will be influenced by it. Just as importantly, members of the community only received the draft 150 page UBCP Working Draft 2025 in January 2025 along with a 209 page appendix to the draft plan. Then, as of February 19, we learned there is now an expanded 425 page appendix to the draft plan. How are residents along University Boulevard supposed to interpret the combined 575 pages of UBCP material prior to the February 27 Public Briefing on the UBCP plan? We need much more time to read and interpret this material (especially the new appendix). The following items (many newly announced) require more consultation with the community:

- Even with this avalanche of briefing material, there is little or no data available to answer basic questions, such as how much traffic (in cars per hour) will be added to our residential streets by the recently announced street access points (see p. 100 and 101 of the UBCP Working Draft 2025). The extended Gilmore Drive (which would be created by connecting the existing streets of Gilmore Drive, Whitehall Street, and Breewood Road) is to serve as a parallel route to University Boulevard between Gabel Street near Northwood High School and Lorain Avenue in South Four Corners. Will this extended road be bordered by a bicycle “breezeway” and, if so, how much of the 60 foot right-of-way along Gilmore Drive would be used to accommodate it? There is no information in the draft materials about future traffic on Tenbrook Drive after it is connected to University Boulevard near Sligo Creek via an “Access Road.” There is no information about future traffic on Greenock Road and Royalton

Road after they are connected (apparently by eliminating the current site of Mary's Center, also not discussed in the UBCP Working Draft 2025). Nor is there traffic information on the effects of the future realignments of Markwood Drive/Dayton Street; Nicholas Drive/Pomander Court/Glenpark Drive; and Eisner Street/Orange Drive. None of the streets noted above (apart from Lorain Avenue) are listed in the limited traffic data provided in Table 3 and Table 4 of the 425 page appendix to the UBCP Working Draft 2025.

- Note that there would almost certainly be significant traffic increases from the new street connections described above in our neighborhoods. Everyone who uses Waze to navigate their cars knows that Waze will direct them through neighborhood streets to bypass congestion on a main road. Such congestion occurs often on University Boulevard and U.S. Route 29.
- No where in the 575 pages of the working draft or its appendix is there a map or graphic to show the new traffic flow patterns through the connected streets described above. Such information is essential for informed consultation with neighborhood residents.
- In many cases, the text in the Working Draft about road redesign references only benefits for bicyclists and walkers, without indicating that cars would also be using the newly-connected roads. For instance, on p. 100, the UBCP Working Draft 2025 states "Connect parallel streets [Gilmoure Drive, Whitehall Street, and Breewood Rd] along the south/west side of University Boulevard to provide a more direct travel route for people *walking and biking* [italics added] and to provide site access and local circulation for properties along University Boulevard in the event of their redevelopment." The text does not mention that cars would make use of the redesigned roads. In community discussions, some residents of South Four Corners have understood that by referencing only bicyclists and walkers, the Planning Department is asserting that cars would not be given access. The Planning Department should advertise a clarification to all persons living along these roads that more car traffic will result.
- The UBCP Working Draft 2025 illustrates a couplet (split) configuration of University Boulevard at Four Corners, implying this configuration will be maintained over the 20 year life of the UBCP. It is not clear, however, from the text within the Working Draft that the couplet will be maintained over the 20-year life of the UBCP. For instance, on p. 9, the Working Draft states that "With more detailed design for bus rapid transit, further study additional street connections in the Four Corners area to achieve a long-term vision for a more connected network of Town Center Streets that increase local connectivity and a more regular street pattern." Note that this "further study" would extend Gilmoure Drive through the existing Safeway, Post Office, and BP gas station at Four Corners, connecting directly to U.S. Route 29 and into portions of the Montgomery Blair High School property. This action would make Gilmoure Drive a full parallel route to University Boulevard from just south of Arcola Avenue to U.S. Route 29. Also see the draft UBCP's endorsement of a street grid approach at Four Corners on p. 107 "FOUR CORNERS LONG TERM VISION." To provide a basis of certainty for property developers who may build at Four Corners along the current couplet layout, the UBCP should explicitly state that the couplet layout at Four Corners will remain in effect for at least the full 20 year life of the UBCP. This commitment will greatly reassure current stores and residents at South Four Corners as well.

- It is unclear if the Planning Department conducted traffic analysis on the effects of new traffic lights associated with the UBCP (e.g., such as at Lorain Avenue and University Boulevard). The Lorain Avenue traffic light crossing, for instance, would facilitate a higher volume of traffic in both directions of Lorain Avenue seeking to avoid the Four Corners intersection.
- There is no discussion of the traffic volumes that would be introduced onto residential streets by allowing large mixed commercial/residential buildings fronting University Boulevard or U.S. Route 29 to directly access residential streets from parking lots in the rear of these buildings. This traffic is likely to be significant as cars seek to avoid the congestion on these corridors by using residential streets, and even more so if University Boulevard access is not provided for some of these buildings.
- All of the above information should be provided to residents, who should then be reconsulted about the draft UBCP proposals.

Inadequate Parking in Neighborhoods. The recently approved ZTA 23-10 PARKING, QUEUING, AND LOADING – CALCULATION OF REQUIRED PARKING exempts residential uses from providing minimum parking if located within ¼ mile of a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Station that exists or is funded for construction in the 6 year capital improvement program. Presumably, for most of University Boulevard, this exemption will not kick in until the University Boulevard BRT is funded (which may take many years, if ever). However, a significant number of commercial/residential properties listed in the draft UBCP are already within one quarter mile of the two active U.S. Route 29 BRT stops at Four Corners. What guarantees would the UBCP offer to prevent parking from new development at Four Corners from overcrowding nearby residential streets?

Costs of UBC Plan Alternatives. There is no information in the UBCP Working Draft 2025 about the public cost of implementing the proposed UBCP, including the cost of the necessary BRT service, street realignments and additions, acquisition of private properties, etc. Much of the money that would be spent for this initiative could be used to directly support Montgomery County programs that provide low-cost housing.

Safety. I strongly support improving the safety of University Boulevard, but do not agree that the diversion of cars from University Boulevard onto neighborhood streets is the best way to accomplish it. Most neighborhood streets, at least in South Four Corners, are narrow and many do not have sidewalks. Inviting a large volume of cut-through traffic into the neighborhood (which often moves at speeds above the 25 mph limit) is almost certain to diminish existing safety levels (the UBCP Working Draft 2025 does not measure this impact). The Working Draft does suggest possible steps to improve safety when this traffic influx occurs, such as allowing us to park on only one side of residential streets, installing speedbumps, adding sidewalks, painting lines on pavements, etc., but the best way to sustain safety on our narrow streets is to not invite the cut-through traffic in the first place. University Boulevard needs significant safety improvements, but many things can be done to make University Boulevard safer that do not require taking away its lane capacity (as proposed in the UBCP Working Draft 2025). The Planning Department should work in coordination with the Maryland Department of Transportation, which is currently pursuing a pedestrian safety improvement program for University Blvd that is not linked to the UBCP.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: University Blvd. Corridor Plan
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 12:02:08 PM

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

To whom it may concern:

I have been a resident of Kemp Mill for over 25 years. I have family that lives in the white oak area, and I travel on Univ. Blvd. quite often going both directions.

As I continue to travel between Kemp Mill and White Oak I have seen how congested the Four Corners area is even with the existing lanes.
Removing lanes from University Blvd between Dennis Ave and Colesville Road (or beyond) would make the already high volume of traffic that much worse!
Please do not do this to us!

People use it Univ. Blvd. for the following and more:
Get onto the Beltway at Colesville Road
Get onto the Beltway going toward Baltimore (on University)
Get to Blair High School
Get to the Church and day care center at 4 Corners
Get to and from White Oak

I would hope the County would try to improve the traffic and safety at Four Corners instead of making it worse.
Plans should include making vehicular traffic move smoothly AND improving pedestrian safety.
Instead, I see language such as the following in the proposed plan for University Blvd (page 115):

...as part of a long-term comprehensive redesign of the intersection of University Boulevard and Colesville Road. Improving multimodal safety—not increasing capacity or vehicular travel speeds through Four Corners—should remain the top priority of the study; as such, pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements, including a human scale and reduced pedestrian crossing distances, a Breezeway that connects to bicycle and pedestrian facilities along University Boulevard, and ample street buffers should remain part of the long-term vision.

The plan also proposes to increase congestion further west on University Blvd as well as on Arcola Avenue.

Please note that Kemp Mill residents can only get out of the neighborhood going west via University Blvd or in a roundabout way via Arcola Ave to Georgia.

Two lanes have already been removed from Arcola from Kemp Mill Road to University.

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE THE RIGHT HAND LANE FOR TURNING ONTO UNIVERSITY BLVD. Traffic is already backed up badly trying to get out of the

neighborhood in the morning. All of the current lanes are necessary to ensure Arcola Ave backup does not get worse.

If a new road is built connecting University Blvd to the Kemp Mill shopping center it will:

1. Cause even more traffic congestion onto Arcola Ave
2. Remove a nice quiet walking path behind the Kemp Mill shopping center that connects to the Sligo Creek walking path

Housing:

Adding housing in the small Kemp Mill shopping center will also only make congestion on Arcola Avenue worse.

A far better alternative would be to use the nearby land formerly used by WTOP. Housing at that site would have much easier access to University Blvd and it would be closer to downtown Wheaton.

I respectfully request the Planning board to NOT recommend the University Blvd Corridor Plan to the County as it stands. Furthermore, any future plans should first be discussed in a meeting specifically with the Kemp Mill Community.

The people who live in this area are counting on you to improve their lives here, not make them worse. Getting to school, work, and doctor appointments are a major part of life. Please do not make that more difficult and stressful.

Thank you for your time regarding this important matter.

[REDACTED]



Sent with Mailsuite · [Unsubscribe](#)