

Montgomery County Planning Board

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED
MINUTES AND SUMMARY

SUMMARY
Thursday, October 30, 2025
2425 Reddie Drive
Wheaton, MD 20902
301-495-4605

The Montgomery County Planning Board met in regular session in the Wheaton Headquarters Building in Wheaton, Maryland, and via Microsoft Teams video conference on Thursday, October 30, 2025, beginning at 9:06 a.m. and adjourning at 5:42 p.m.

Present were Chair Artie Harris, Vice Chair Josh Linden (attended virtually), and Commissioners Shawn Bartley, James Hedrick (attended virtually), and Mitra Pedoeem.

Item 6 and Item 5 were discussed in that order and reported in the attached Minutes.

The Planning Board recessed for lunch at 11:07 a.m. and reconvened in the auditorium and via video conference to return to open session at 1:00 p.m. to discuss Item 4, Item 8, and Item 9, as reported in the attached Minutes. Item 7 was moved to be heard during the morning session with Item 5.

Commissioner Hedrick left the meeting at 4:10 p.m. and returned at 4:47 p.m. during Item 9.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:42 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Planning Board will be held on Thursday, November 6, 2025, in the Wheaton Headquarters Building in Wheaton, Maryland, and via video conference.

Rachel Roehrich

Rachel Roehrich
Technical Writer/Legal Assistant

MINUTES

Item 1. Preliminary Matters

A. Adoption of Resolutions

BOARD ACTION

Motion:

Vote:

Other:

Action: There were no Resolutions submitted for adoption.

B. Approval of Minutes

BOARD ACTION

Motion:

Vote:

Other:

Action: There were no Minutes submitted for approval.

C. Other Preliminary Matters

BOARD ACTION

Motion:

Vote:

Other:

Action: There were no other Preliminary Matters submitted for approval.

Item 2. Record Plats (Public Hearing)

BOARD ACTION

Motion:

Vote:

Other:

Action: There were no Record Plats submitted for approval.

Item 3. Regulatory Extension Requests (Public Hearing)

BOARD ACTION

Motion:

Vote:

Other:

Action: There were no Regulatory Extension Requests submitted for approval.

Item 6. 500 Valley Brook Drive, Administrative Subdivision Plan No. 620240120 and Forest Conservation Plan No. F20240780 (Public Hearing)

Request to subdivide the property into two lots for two detached houses; located at 500 Valley Brook Drive, Silver Spring; 1.56 acres; R-200 zone; 1997 White Oak Master Plan.

- A. Administrative Subdivision Plan No. 620240120
- B. Forest Conservation Plan No. F20240780

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions
E. Tettelbaum/A. Lindsey

A. BOARD ACTION

Motion: Pedoeem/Hedrick
Vote: 5-0
Other:

Action: Approved Staff recommendation for approval of the Administrative Subdivision Plan cited above, which will be reflected in an associated draft Resolution to be adopted by the Planning Board at a later date.

B. BOARD ACTION

Motion: Pedoeem/ Hedrick
Vote: 5-0
Other:

Action: Approved Staff recommendation for approval of the Forest Conservation Plan cited above, subject to conditions, which will be reflected in an associated draft Resolution to be adopted by the Planning Board at a later date.

Emily Tettelbaum, Planner III, offered a multi-media presentation regarding 500 Valley Brook Drive. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated October 20, 2025.

Ms. Tettelbaum stated the Applicant is proposing to subdivide Parcel 617 into two lots for two detached houses, and the existing house on the property will be demolished. Lot 2 is proposed as a flag lot and a shared driveway will provide vehicle access to both lots. Ms. Tettelbaum also discussed the Forest Conservation Plan for the property noting a 0.24-acre afforestation requirement and a variance request for the removal of four Protected Trees and impact to one Protected Tree.

Ms. Tettelbaum noted community correspondence was received with concerns regarding the proposed shared driveway and potential drainage issues.

The Board asked questions regarding the existing access easement requirements and potential extinguishment, reasoning for one driveway versus two driveways, whether current sidewalks exist, and reasoning for reduction of number of originally proposed lots.

Montgomery County Planning Board
Public Meeting Minutes of October 30, 2025

Staff, including Katie Mencarini, Acting Supervisor for East County Planning, offered comments and responses to the Board's questions.

Jeff Lewis of Site Solutions, LLC offered comments and responses to the Board's questions regarding the potential extinguishment of the access easement.

Item 5. Public Hearing Draft of the Clarksburg Gateway Sector Plan – Work Session Numbers 3 and 4

A work session to review testimony received on the Public Hearing Draft of the Clarksburg Gateway Sector Plan. The work session will focus on Land Use, Zoning, Housing, and Neighborhood District, and Community Design topics.

Staff Recommendation: Discuss and provide direction to Staff.

C. Larson

BOARD ACTION

Motion:

Vote:

Other:

Action: Received briefing followed by discussion and direction from the Planning Board.

Clark Larson, Planner III, offered a multi-media presentation regarding the Clarksburg Gateway Sector Plan – Work Session Number 3 related to Land Use, Zoning, Housing, and Neighborhood District topics. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated October 23, 2025.

Work Session Number 3

Mr. Larson noted no testimony was received for the Introduction Section of the draft plan and discussed testimony as well as Staff's recommendations for the Concept Framework Plan. The Board agreed by consensus with Staff's proposed Introduction section and recommendations for the Concept Framework Plan.

The Board also offered comments encouraging the inclusion of language noting the flexibility of the framework, and Staff, including Patrick Butler, Chief of Upcounty Planning, offered comments and responses.

Land Use and Zoning

Mr. Larson discussed the testimony received and Staff's recommendations for market-ready development types, a "Mixed-Use" designation in the Planned Land Use Map, zoning, the proposed 200-foot residential building setback from I-270, and development constraints on the COMSAT property in greater detail with the Board.

A Market-Ready Development Plan

The Board offered comments regarding ways to implement the incremental approach of the Plan's vision, such as adding a general disclaimer for illustrative diagrams, figures, and images. The Board agreed by consensus with Staff's recommendation.

“Mixed-Use” Designation in Planned Land Use Map

The Board asked questions regarding the potential future compatibility between residential development and neighborhood-scale commercial development. Staff offered comments and responses to the Board’s questions.

The Board agreed by consensus with Staff’s recommendation.

Zoning Recommendations

The Board offered comments regarding whether the CR/CRT zones would provide enough flexibility for employment and suggested adding language to the implementation section to provide potential incentives.

The Board agreed by consensus with Staff’s recommendation.

200-foot Residential Building Setback from I-270

The Board asked questions regarding the I-3 zone, how the 200-foot setback was determined, potential for a sound wall if setback distance was reduced, whether the number of residential units would increase if setback would be reduced, environmental impacts of a reduced setback, and the 75-foot future right-of-way dedication along I-270.

Staff, including Robert Kronenberg, Deputy Planning Director, Patrick Butler, Chief of Upcounty Planning, Steve Findley, Planner IV, and Don Zeigler, Northern Activity Centers Supervisor, offered comments and responses to the Board’s questions.

Soo Lee Cho of Bregman, Berbert, Schwartz, and Gilday, LLC offered comments regarding the I-270 right-of-way.

The Board held further discussion regarding potentially reducing the width of the setback, recommending flexibility to modify the setback during the development phase based on mitigation provided, possibility for combination of sound wall and vegetation with reduced setback, importance of addressing health, sound, and pollution criteria, and further review of the I-270 right-of-way and implications of the buffer.

Staff agreed to bring recommendations back at a future work session with potential options for a substantial reduction to the 200-foot residential building setback with potential flexible development and mitigation measures. Staff will also review the I-270 right-of-way and implications of the buffer.

Development Constraints on the COMSAT property

The Board offered comments regarding maximizing the buildable land on the COMSAT property, adding language in the Plan to encourage flexibility, and the need for innovative ways to replace the forest stands on the COMSAT property.

The Board also suggested Staff bring recommendations back to a future work session and Staff agreed.

Housing

Mr. Larson discussed the comments received and Staff's recommendations on the Draft Plan's housing recommendations related to the minimum required percentage of Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) housing for a new housing development.

The Board agreed by consensus with Staff's recommendations.

Neighborhood Districts

Mr. Larson stated after reviewing testimony submitted to the Planning Board on the neighborhood recommendations of the Draft Plan, Planning Staff determined that all major testimony related to the Neighborhoods Chapter will be discussed as a part of future work sessions.

The Board agreed by consensus with Staff's recommendations.

Work Session Number 4

Mr. Larson discussed the major topics raised by testimony submitted to the Planning Board related to the Public Hearing Draft of the Clarksburg Gateway Sector Plan's Community Design recommendations.

On-Street Parking Priority

Roberto Duke, Planner III, discussed the testimony received on the Draft Plan's recommendation stating that, "all new streets should accommodate on-street parking, where possible, to help slow vehicular speeds and provide places for residents and visitors to park." (Recommendation S4, p. 57).

The Board held discussion regarding the importance and general support for on-street parking priority, noting potential complications with some areas designated for parking and others not. Staff offered comments and responses to the Board.

The Board requested Staff bring the recommendation back at a future work session presenting where on-street parking would be prioritized and where it could be more flexible.

Alley Landscaping

Mr. Duke discussed the testimony on the Draft Plan's recommendations related to alley landscaping, which recommends to, "incorporate landscaping within alleys to help soften their utilitarian purpose" (Recommendation K4.c, p. 58), as well as Staff's recommendation including providing new language stating "Provide landscaping in alleys outside of their rights-of-way (e.g., in the spaces between unit driveways) to help soften the utilitarian purpose of the alley."

Montgomery County Planning Board
Public Meeting Minutes of October 30, 2025

The Board agreed by consensus with Staff's recommendation.

Item 4. Roundtable Discussion

Parks Director's Report
M. Figueredo

BOARD ACTION

Motion:

Vote:

Other:

Action: Received briefing.

Montgomery Parks Director, Miti Figueredo, offered a multi-media presentation regarding recent updates for the Parks Department.

Ms. Figueredo highlighted and discussed the Eye Spy Halloween trains, wrapping up Birdability Week, and the Acoustics and Ales witchy paddle. Ms. Figueredo also discussed the different phases of the recent park facelift at Takoma Urban Park, the ribbon cutting for the Springfield Urban Park, the Northwest Disc Golf Course sneak peek, the Pope Farm Nursery tour, the Urban Wood Sale, and the NPDES Annual Permit submittal signing. Lastly, Ms. Figueredo highlighted the upcoming ribbon cutting for Royce Hanson Conservation Park at Broad Run taking place on November 1, 2025.

The Board asked questions regarding the Takoma Urban Park flagstone walkway, and Gary Burnett, Deputy Director of Operations, offered comments and responses.

Item 8. Beach Drive Open Parkway 2025 Program Update – Friday Closure Alternatives

In June 2024, Montgomery Parks adjusted operating hours for the Beach Drive Open Parkway by restoring Friday access while shortening the closure area to reduce cut-through traffic. The Planning Board approved the changes and requested a review of impacts and usage after one year. In June 2025, Montgomery Parks presented an update which prompted discussion of alternatives to the full Friday morning closure. This briefing will provide an update on public input on each of the alternatives for the Planning Board to consider when reviewing the operating hours.

K. Lukacs/A. Tsai

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Pedoeem/Bartley

Vote: 3-2

Other: Vice Chair Linden and Commissioner Hedrick voted Nay.

Action: Approved Staff recommendation to eliminate the Beach Drive Friday Open Parkway while maintaining Saturday and Sunday.

Kyle Lukacs, Montgomery Parks Senior Trails Planner, and Andrew Tsai, Montgomery Parks Engineer, offered a multi-media presentation regarding feedback obtained regarding the Friday closure alternatives for Beach Drive Open Parkway. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated October 17, 2025.

Mr. Tsai discussed the background of the Beach Drive Open Parkway and noted during a June 12, 2025 briefing, the Planning Board directed Staff to evaluate potential alternatives to a full-day Open Parkway closure of Beach Drive on Fridays.

Mr. Lukacs stated a public survey was conducted from July 14, 2025 through August 24, 2025, to collect feedback on these alternatives, and more than 1,300 responses were received to supplement previous outreach shared with the Planning Board. Mr. Lukacs noted Staff evaluated six potential alternatives that included eliminating or modifying Friday Open Parkway closures, limiting closures to specific times of year, and modifying the roadway segment where the Open Parkway closure would occur. Mr. Lukacs and Mr. Tsai discussed the alternatives in greater detail. Mr. Lukacs stated the alternatives were evaluated from least favorable to most favorable and noted none of the proposed potential alternatives were ranked overall as more favorable than the current condition in the full survey results.

Mr. Lukacs stated Staff recommends to either eliminate the Friday Open Parkway to address neighborhood vehicular traffic concerns while maintaining Saturday and Sunday; or delay the start time of the Friday Open Parkway to 12:00 p.m.

The Board asked questions regarding the average number of Friday users, approximate distance between Montgomery County and Washington DC's portion of the open parkway, school drop off and commuting concerns, and why the potential for 10:00 a.m. opening for Fridays was not studied.

Montgomery County Planning Board
Public Meeting Minutes of October 30, 2025

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

The Board held further discussion regarding the different options proposed by Staff and a motion was made to recommend eliminating the Friday Open Parkway.

Item 9. Notley Road LMA No. H-159 and Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan No. F20250680 (Public Hearing)

Proposal to rezone the property from R-200 to CRNF-1.0, C-0, R-1.0, H-50 for the development of a future townhouse community. The Local Map Amendment will be reviewed concurrently with the Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan No. F20250680 applications. The property is 9.99 acres and is within the 1997 *White Oak Master Plan*.

A. Local Map Amendment No. H-159

Staff Recommendation: Approval with binding elements and transmittal of comments to the Hearing Examiner for a November 6, 2025, public hearing.

B. Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan No. F20250680

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

T. Leftwich

A. BOARD ACTION

Motion: Hedrick/Linden

Vote: 3-1-1

Other: Commissioner Bartley voted Nay and Commissioner Pedoeem abstained.

Action: Approved staff recommendation to approve the Local Map Amendment with binding elements cited above, and transmit comments to the Hearing Examiner, as stated in a transmittal letter to be prepared at a later date.

B. BOARD ACTION

Motion: Hedrick/Linden

Vote: 3-1-1

Other: Commissioner Bartley voted Nay and Commissioner Pedoeem abstained.

Action: Approved Staff recommendation for approval of the Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan cited above, subject to conditions, which will be reflected in an associated draft Resolution to be adopted by the Planning Board at a later date.

Carrie Sanders, Chief of East County Planning, offered brief comments regarding the process for Local Map Amendments (LMA), and Troy Leftwich, Planner III, offered a multi-media presentation regarding the proposed LMA for Notley Road. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated October 120, 2025.

Mr. Leftwich discussed the community input timeline and the five proposed binding elements in greater detail. Mr. Leftwich stated the Applicant is proposing to rezone approximately 9.99 acres of land from the R-200 zone to the Commercial Residential Neighborhood Floating (CRNF) Zone to develop a residential community. The proposed zoning change would allow development of up to 130 dwelling units with 15 percent Moderately Priced Dwelling Units (MPDUs), a maximum building height of 50 feet, and a minimum of 10 percent open space. Mr. Leftwich also discussed the expectations from Staff for the central open space, neighborhood park connection, tree preservation, setback requirements, street alignment, compatible housing types, access points, and

defined developable area. Justine Gonzalez-Velez, Transportation Planner II, discussed the transportation aspects of the project and analysis performed.

Amy Lindsey, Environmental Regulatory Supervisor, also discussed the Forest Conservation Plan noting a planting requirement of 1.45 acres, which will be met off-site. Ms. Lindsey also discussed the variance request for the removal of approximately thirty-one significant trees and twenty-one specimen trees. Ms. Lindsey noted that Staff was unable to recommend approval of the variance request at this time, as the limits of disturbance and layout of the development are not sufficiently finalized to justify the necessary findings. As conditioned, the final impacts to the onsite trees will be determined at the time of Final Forest Conservation Plan and any variance requests would be reviewed at that time.

Testimony was received from the following:

In Person

Samuel Jones (Individual)
Gregory Golden (Individual)
Keith Nusbaum (Individual)
Dan Wilhelm (Individual)
Mike English (Individual)
Stephanie Helsing (Greater Silver Spring Chamber of Commerce)
Kyle Smiddie (Individual)
Christina Eaglin (Individual)
Toni Deboeck (Individual)
Kathleen Langan (Individual)
Michele Rosenfeld (Counsel for Greater Colesville Citizens Association)
Laura Boerum (Individual)
Brian Anleu (Individual)
Regina Ottaviani (Individual)
Dorothy Foellmer (Individual)
Jennifer Bauer (Individual)
Hugh Johnson (Individual)
John Buck (Individual)

Virtual via Teams

Dan Reed (Greater Greater Washington)
Angela Dobransky (Individual)
Robert Cullen (Individual)
Hong Phan (Individual)
Dung Phan (Individual)
Caitlin Curry (Individual)
Avi Nath (Individual)
David Heinemann (Individual)
Ronald Dobransky (Individual)
Eliza Hughes (Individual)

Mr. Phan showed an exhibit during his testimony.

Elizabeth Rogers of Lerch, Early, and Brewer offered a multi-media presentation and comments on behalf of the Applicant regarding the Local Map Amendment process, noted general agreement to Staff's proposed binding elements (except for Binding Element Number 3), and changes to the originally proposed plan. Ms. Rogers requested a modification to Binding Element Number 3 regarding building typologies listed and requested the addition of stacked flats. Ms. Rogers also offered comments regarding the CRNF Zone and prerequisites for requesting a floating zone where it is not recommended in the master plan.

The Board asked questions regarding potential impacts of adding stacked flats to the building typology, whether the CRNF Zone would mandate mixed-use development, the location-based prerequisites, open space, possibility of lowering townhome heights to 45-feet, height compatibility to abutting residential zone, reasoning for no access/curb cut on New Hampshire, and why MCDOT/SHA thought dedicated lanes not were needed.

Staff, including Robert Kronenberg, Deputy Director of Planning and Carrie Sanders, Chief of East County Planning, offered comments and responses to the Board's questions.

The Board held further discussion regarding the requested modification to Binding Element Number 3 with regard to adding stacked flats as an additional building typology. Staff raised the concern that "stacked flat" is not a term defined in the Zoning Ordinance and proposed potential options to modify language for Binding 3, including removal of the Binding Element to allow all residential building types permitted in the CRNF zone or the addition of "apartment" to the allowable residential building types. After discussion with Staff, the Board recommended no change to Binding Element Number 3.