

Montgomery County Planning Board

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED
MINUTES AND SUMMARY

SUMMARY
Thursday, November 20, 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, November 20, 2025, beginning at 9:00 a.m. and adjourning at 5:11 p.m.

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

Items 1 through 6 were discussed in that order and reported in the attached Minutes.

Commissioner Hedrick was necessary absent during Item 6 from 10:56 a.m. to 11:13 a.m.

The Planning Board recessed for lunch at 1:43 p.m. and reconvened in the auditorium and via video conference to return to open session at 2:05 p.m. to discuss Items 7, 8, 10, and 11, as reported in the attached Minutes. Item 9 was moved to December 4, 2025.

Vice Chair Linden left the meeting at 4:04 p.m. during Item 10 and Chair Harris left the meeting after Item 10 at 4:56 p.m. Chair Harris and Vice Chair Linden were necessarily absent for the remainder of the meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:11 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Planning Board will be held on Thursday, December 4, 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

1. Zion Road Bridge Over the Hawlings River, Forest Conservation Plan No. F20240870 - MCPB No. 25-111
2. Friendship Commons (Geico), Preliminary Plan Amendment No. 11999039A - MCPB No. 25-112
3. 500 Valley Brook Drive, Administrative Subdivision Plan No. 620240120 - MCPB No.25-115
4. 500 Valley Brook Drive, Forest Conservation Plan No. F20240780 - MCPB No. 25-116

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Pedoeem/Linden

Vote: 5-0

Other:

Action: Adopted the Resolutions above, as submitted.

B. Approval of Minutes

1. Minutes for October 30, 2025

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Pedoeem/Linden

Vote: 5-0

Other:

Action: Approved the Minutes for October 30, 2025, as submitted.

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)

Primrose at 16550 Georgia Avenue, Preliminary Plan No. 120250090: Regulatory Extension Request No. 5 - Request to extend the regulatory review period until February 19, 2026.

An application to create one lot for an existing antique shop, a new Day Care Center (Over 30 Persons), a conditional use application being processed concurrently. Located at 16550 Georgia Avenue, on the west side of Georgia Avenue (MD 97), approximately 150 feet south of Emory Church Road: 2005 Olney Master Plan; R-200 zone; 2.12 acres

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the Extension Request

J. Casey

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Pedoeem/Linden

Vote: 5-0

Other:

Action: Approved Staff recommendation for approval of the Regulatory Extension Request cited above.

Item 4. Roundtable Discussion

Planning Director's Report
J. Sartori

BOARD ACTION

Motion:

Vote:

Other:

Action: Received briefing.

Montgomery Planning Director, Jason Sartori, offered a multi-media presentation regarding recent updates for the Planning Department.

Mr. Sartori discussed the official launch of the Community Planning Academy on December 1, 2025. Mr. Sartori highlighted the graduation of the summer Community Planning Academy cohort, discussed the feedback received from the summer cohort, and showed a short video of recent graduates speaking about their summer Community Planning Academy cohort experience. Mr. Sartori discussed the selection process for the summer participants, as well as the geographic distribution of the participants. Bridget Broullire, Deputy Planning Director, gave an overview of the course, goals, the course outline, how success will be measured, feedback highlights, key enhancements made for the official launch, and coordination across County agencies. Ms. Broullire also discussed the next steps for the Community Planning Academy and highlighted the recent publication in the Urban Land Institute Magazine.

Lastly, Mr. Sartori announced the promotions of Rebecca Ballo as the Division Chief for the Historic Preservation Division and Katie Mencarini as Planning Supervisor for the East County Planning Division.

The Board asked questions regarding lessons learned from the summer cohort group, improvements made to the course before the December 1, 2025 launch, and whether any comments had been received regarding ADA issues.

Staff and Victoria Cain of The Hatcher Group, Planning's consultant, offered comments and responses to the Board's questions.

Item 5. Approval of FY27 Operating Budget including SRF, and ISF: Commissioners' Office, Planning, CAS

- A. Commissioners' Office
- B. Planning
- C. CAS

I. Branda/J. Sartori/K. Warnick/T. Charles

A. BOARD ACTION

Motion: Pedoeem/Linden

Vote: 5-0

Other:

Action: Approved Staff recommendation for approval of the FY27 Operating Budget for the Commissioners' Office.

B. BOARD ACTION

Motion: Pedoeem/Linden

Vote: 5-0

Other:

Action: Approved Staff recommendation for approval of the FY27 Operating Budget for the Planning Department.

C. BOARD ACTION

Motion: Pedoeem/Linden

Vote: 5-0

Other:

Action: Approved Staff recommendation for approval of the FY27 Operating Budget and Internal Service Fund for CAS.

Ilana Branda, Commissioners' Office Chief of Staff, Karen Warnick, Chief of the Management Services Division, and Terri Charles, Deputy Corporate Budget Director discussed the FY27 Operating Budgets for their departments respectively. Further information can be found in the Staff Reports dated November 14, 2025.

Commissioners' Office

Ms. Branda offered a multi-media presentation and stated the recommended Commissioners' Office FY27 proposed budget is \$1,424,744, which is an increase of 6.3 percent, or \$84,217 above the FY26 adopted and adjusted budget. Ms. Branda stated benefits and pension numbers are now finalized. The requested budget includes base budget and major known commitments, and Ms. Branda noted no enhancements are requested for FY27.

Planning

Ms. Warnick offered a multi-media presentation and stated the Planning Department's updated FY27 Proposed Budget request is \$30,185,965, which is an increase of \$2,354,873, or 8.5 percent, over the FY26 Adjusted Adopted budget. Ms. Warnick discussed the FY27 lapse and staffing level request, the FY27 proposed Administration Fund Revenue, the Water Quality Protection Fund, Special Revenue Funds, the Capital Equipment Internal Service Fund (CE-ISF), and the proposed Work Program Schedule.

The Board asked questions regarding potentially increasing fees for the Development Review Special Revenue Fund and the Water Quality Fund.

Staff, including Jason Sartori, Planning Director and Robert Kronenberg, Deputy Director of Planning, offered comments and responses to the Board's questions.

CAS

Ms. Charles offered a multi-media presentation and stated the recommended CAS FY27 proposed budget is \$28,994,014 with Montgomery County's portion totaling \$13,726,843 or 1.2 percent. Ms. Charles discussed the FY27 proposed budgets for the Department of Human Resources and Management (DHRM), Finance Department, Legal/Office of the General Counsel, Office of the Inspector General, Corporate IT, Merit System Board, and CAS Support Services in greater detail. Ms. Charles also discussed the proposed budgets for the Internal Service Fund including CIO, CWIT, Risk Management, Capital Equipment, Group Health Insurance, and the Executive Office Building (EOB). Ms. Charles also noted an error on the slide presentation under the FY27 Proposed Budget Adjusted (October) column for the CIO noting the number should have been \$7.7 million.

The Board asked questions regarding the percentage changes for the Internal Service Funds, term contract positions for CIO, and approximate time limit for the ERP contracted positions.

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

Item 6. Public Hearing Draft of the Clarksburg Gateway Sector Plan – Work Session Number 6

A work session to review testimony received on the Public Hearing Draft of the Clarksburg Gateway Sector Plan. This work session is scheduled to focus on Transportation topics and any discussion items remaining for the Public Hearing Draft.

Staff recommendation: Direct staff to incorporate revisions to the draft plan and approve the Planning Board Draft of the Clarksburg Gateway Sector Plan for transmittal to the County Council.

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 6. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated November 14, 2025.

Neighborhoods

Mr. Larson gave an overview and discussed Staff's recommendations for the Gateway Center, COMSAT, Linthicum, and Upper Coolbrook neighborhoods.

The Board asked questions potential future development in the Upper Coolbrook area.

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

The Board agreed by consensus with Staff's recommendations for the Neighborhoods section.

Development Constraints for the COMSAT property

Mr. Larson discussed the revised analysis for the COMSAT property constraints, including changes to the calculations for potential buildable/unbuildable acreage in greater detail.

The Board asked questions regarding whether the potentially constrained unbuildable acreage is due to existing constraints or due to Master Plan constraints and residential building setback acreage.

Staff, including Patrick Butler, Chief of Upcounty Planning, offered comments and responses to the Board's questions.

Travel Analysis and Performance Metrics

Mr. Larson discussed the travel analysis development projections for travel networks within the Plan area. Richard Brockmyer, Transportation Regulatory Supervisor, discussed three scenarios proposed by Staff including the Master Plan Baseline Travel Network and three other travel network scenarios in greater detail. Mr. Brockmyer also discussed the Transportation Adequacy Metrics for the Master Plan Baseline Travel Network and other travel network scenarios.

The Board asked questions regarding which land use predicted more jobs, baseline metrics and achievability, whether the network transportation or land use was driving the baseline, and possibility for a change in metrics if the baseline was based on the current date.

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

Haley Peckett of the Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) offered comments regarding the baseline/theoretical metrics and which scenarios may provide the best outcome for transportation.

I-270 Highway Right-of-Way and Future Dedications

The Board asked questions regarding how the State Highway Administration (SHA) determines the right-of-way requirements for future I-270 widening, reasoning for inclusion of dedication/widening recommendations within the Master Plan, and length of potential I-270 widening.

Staff, including Patrick Butler, Chief of Upcounty Planning and Dave Anspacher, Chief of Transportation Planning, offered comments and responses to the Board's questions.

Nate Evans of SHA offered comments regarding widening of right-of-way in the area and the need for potential highway realignment due to utility and environmental issues based on a high-level review of the area and potential needs. Mr. Evans noted, however, that SHA does not currently have specific plans to widen this area of I-270.

The Board held further discussion regarding Staff's recommendation regarding future right-of-way dedication and agreed by consensus with Staff's recommendation of a future dedication of 350 feet.

Observation Drive Extended and New "Street A" Cross-Sections

Mr. Brockmyer discussed the proposed cross-section replacements for Observation Drive and New "Street A". The Board agreed by consensus with Staff's proposed recommendations.

Observation Drive Extended Interim Cross-Section

Mr. Brockmyer stated Staff is proposing to remove an illustrated cross-section for an interim treatment for Observation Drive Extended and to add transportation recommendation 3.B.16 (page 46) with language that discusses possible interim configurations.

The Board asked questions regarding reasoning for not recommending bus lanes as part of the interim condition, possibility of a transit option without a dedicated bus lane, and potential review of accessibility if bus lanes are added.

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

Chris Van Alstyne of MCDOT offered comments regarding the challenges of operating transit operations during the interim condition due to lack of funding.

The Board held further discussion and suggested adding language to the beginning of the recommendation stating "While bus lanes should remain a priority, at the time of design or construction....".

The Board agreed by consensus with Staff's proposed language and additional recommendation.

Observation Drive Extended Street Alignment

The Board agreed by consensus with Staff's recommendation.

Complete Streets Approach Introduction

The Board agreed by consensus with Staff's recommendation with modified language.

On-Street Parking Priority

The Board asked questions regarding whether there would be an opportunity for exemptions during development plan review.

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

The Board agreed by consensus with Staff's recommendation with modified and additional language.

Economic Development Incentives

The Board asked questions regarding who would be pursuing economic development opportunities and Staff offered comments and responses.

The Board agreed by consensus with Staff's recommendation and supported highlighting options for economic development.

Clarksburg Gateway Local Park (“Constellation Park”)

Lily Murnen discussed the “Constellation Park” concept and stated Staff recommends additional revisions to maximize flexibility but clarify the implementation process. Ms. Murnen read allowed the proposed revisions.

The Board offered comments regarding Staff working together with the individual property owners to ensure the parks are implemented as a whole, timing of the review of design for the entire network of parks and amenities, and how the required park amenities would be distributed to the proposed parks to ensure that property owners’ contributions are proportional.

Staff, including Miti Figueredo, Montgomery Parks Director and Patrick Butler, Chief of Upcounty Planning, offered comments and responses regarding the review of design for the entire network of parks and amenities to be conducted during regulatory review instead of sketch plan and to clarify the language of the recommendation describing amenities that are to be provided in order to allow more flexibility for Parks to adapt the list of amenities based on future needs and to clarify that the amenities listed are for the entire park system in area, not all required for each individual park.

The Board agreed by consensus with Staff’s proposed recommendations, with the modified language.

Forest Preservation

Mr. Larson discussed Staff’s revisions to Environment Recommendations 3.E.2.c (page 67), 3.E.5 (pp. 67-68), and 3.E.9 (p. 68) as well as COMSAT Neighborhood Recommendation 4.B.12 (p. 95) and Linthicum Neighborhood Recommendation 4.C.7 (p. 96).

The Board asked if the 50-foot forested buffer could count towards afforestation and reforestation requirements for forest conservation plans, and Staff, including Steve Findley, Planner IV, offered comments and responses.

The Board agreed by consensus to Staff’s proposed recommendations.

Tree Canopy Coverage on Parking Lots

The Board asked questions regarding whether trees over a parking lot would account for green cover, if there was potential to provide an illustrative example to portray how a parking lot expands/grows with the addition of tree canopy, and the achievability of the 50 percent tree canopy goal.

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

The Board held further discussion regarding 50 percent tree canopy being a stretch goal but noted the need for flexibility if the 50 percent goal is not achievable.

Montgomery County Planning Board
Public Meeting Minutes of November 20, 2025

Staff, including Jason Sartori, Planning Director, Robert Kronenberg, Deputy Director of Planning, and Patrick Butler, Chief of Upcounty Planning, offered comments and Mr. Sartori suggested additional language stating “As practicable, design areas of surface parking lots...”.

The Board agreed by consensus with Staff’s proposed recommendation and modifications.

Green Cover

The Board asked questions regarding reasoning for not including public parks and whether forest and environmental buffers are subtracted from the green cover calculation.

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

The Board held further discussion regarding whether landscaped areas of public parkland should be allowed to count toward the 35 percent minimum and if the language “excluding environmental buffers and forest conservation easement areas” should be eliminated.

The Board agreed by consensus to allow landscaped areas of parkland (public or private) and forest conservation easements to be counted toward the 35 percent minimum green cover recommendation.

I-270 Residential Setback

Mr. Larson discussed I-270 setback analysis and provided the following proposed options: Option 1 (200-foot residential building setback), Option 2 (150-foot setback for detached and attached residential lots; 125-foot setback for multifamily buildings), and Option 3 (125-foot residential building setback). For each option, the proposed setback would be measured from the edge of the highway right-of-way after the recommended 75-foot dedication. Each option also included required mitigation, such as construction of sound walls and installation of a vegetated buffer. Mr. Larson indicated that Staff continues to recommend a 200-foot residential setback, as presented in Option 1.

The Board held discussion on the options proposed by Staff but did not adopt any of the three options presented. The Board proposed that the Plan recommend a 50-foot forested buffer, which would be measured from the edge of the highway right-of-way after the recommended 75-foot dedication, along with the construction of sound walls for additional mitigation. The Board agreed by consensus with the proposed recommendation.

I-270 Interchange (Exit 17)

Mr. Larson discussed Staff’s proposed recommendations regarding the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17) at the planned Little Seneca Parkway Extended overpass: Option A (retain recommendation to remove the planned interchange from the Master Plan of Highways and Transitways, supporting a bridge overpass instead), Option B (revise the Draft Plan to support a planned interchange), and Option C (revise the Draft Plan to support a planned interchange with a condition of establishing certain land uses in the vicinity of the interchange). Mr. Larson noted

Montgomery County Planning Board
Public Meeting Minutes of November 20, 2025

that Option A, to remove the interchange from the Master Plan of Highways, is staff preferred recommendation. Mr. Larson also highlighted the addition of language to Option B noting that “if an interchange is not feasible, the plan supports a bridge over I-270 at Little Seneca Parkway Extended.”

Haley Peckett and Chris Van Alstyne of MCDOT offered comments regarding potentially replacing the word “bridge” with “facility” as well as providing a sketch of the interchange with development applications.

Staff, including Patrick Butler, Chief of Upcounty Planning and Dave Anspacher, Chief of Transportation Planning, offered comments and responses to MCDOT’s comments.

The Board held further discussion regarding Staff’s options and agreed by consensus with Option B, to retain the I-270 interchange per the *1994 Clarksburg Master Plan*, with the proposed revisions reflected in the staff report.

The Board also requested a redline version of the draft Plan be brought back to the Board for final review, and Staff agreed.

Item 7. Friendship Heights Sector Plan Engagement Update

Staff will brief the Planning Board on community feedback gathered during the visioning phase.

Staff Recommendation: Briefing

A. Margolies

BOARD ACTION

Motion:

Vote:

Other:

Action: Received briefing.

Atara Margolies, Planner III, offered a multi-media presentation regarding an update for the Friendship Heights Sector Plan Engagement. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated November 13, 2025.

Ms. Margolies stated the Friendship Heights Sector Plan team has been gathering feedback on the future vision for Friendship Heights since November 2024 through in-person workshops, virtual meetings, online questionnaires, and dozens of meetings with community groups, property owners, business owners, residents, and other stakeholders.

Ms. Margolies, Bhavna Sivasubramanian, Planner II, Ronnetta Zack-Williams, Transportation Planner II, and Cristina Sasaki, Park Planner III, discussed the key takeaways for community identity, land use and development, housing, amenities, transportation, parks and public spaces, and environment. Lastly, Ms. Margolies discussed the Plan schedule and next steps.

The Board asked questions regarding feedback received for an increase of more people in the Plan area, transit/bus service within the Plan area, reasoning for concerns with service to Bethesda, what transportation improvements can be implemented now versus later, when future community engagement will take place, and whether County Council Staff has attended community engagement sessions.

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

Item 8. Incentive Zoning Update: Draft Implementation Guidelines

Subsequent to the adoption of ZTA 25-05, Planning Staff has prepared a draft update to the Implementation Guidelines that will assist Staff and the development community in preparing, reviewing, and implementing the updated Incentive Zoning criteria.

Staff Recommendation: Approve the Implementation Guidelines

G. Bogdan

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Pedoeem/Linden

Vote: 5-0

Other:

Action: Approved Staff recommendation for approval and adoption of the Incentive Density Implementation Guidelines for the CR and CRT Zones.

Atul Sharma, Chief of Design, Placemaking and Policy, offered brief comments regarding the proposed Implementation Guidelines and Grace Bogdan, Planner IV, offered a multi-media presentation regarding the draft implementation guidelines for Incentive Zoning. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated November 13, 2025.

Ms. Bogdan discussed the process and stated Staff first created draft guidelines and reviewed internally with colleagues that work in regulatory review. The group included regulatory reviewers and master planners from the regional planning areas, and technical reviewers from the transportation, environment, and urban design divisions. Ms. Bogdan stated Staff also met with the coordinating agencies that work within development review such as Montgomery County Department of Housing and Community Affairs (DHCA), Department of Transportation (DOT), Department of Permitting Services (DPS), and the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) to ensure the criteria being asked for was appropriately detailed and timed in the process.

Ms. Bogdan noted the Implementation Guidelines contain four sections including: 1) Introduction, 2) How to use the guidelines, 3) Criteria for review, and 4) Migration from old to current system. Ms. Bogdan discussed each section in greater detail. Lastly, Ms. Bogdan discussed next steps.

The Board asked questions regarding green requirements and possible incentives, potential thresholds for green requirements, and the process of review for how public benefits are used.

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

Item 9. POSTPONED - 2025 Travel Monitoring Report

The 2025 Travel Monitoring Report (TMR) provides insights into Montgomery County's transportation system and serves as a compendium for the agency's transportation-related monitoring activities, evaluating how well Montgomery County is advancing the goals, objectives, and metrics defined in the Pedestrian Master Plan and the Bicycle Master Plan.

Staff Recommendation: Review report and transmit to the County Council Transportation & Environment (T&E) Committee

J. Ryder/R. Brockmyer

BOARD ACTION

Motion:

Vote:

Other:

Action: Item postponed to December 4, 2025.

Item 10. Wheaton Gateway Preliminary Plan No. 120240120, Sketch Plan Amendment and Site Plan No. 820240150, and Forest Conservation Plan No. F20240810 (Public Hearing)

- A. Preliminary Plan No. 120240120
- B. Sketch Plan Amendment and Site Plan No. 820240150
- C. Forest Conservation Plan No. F20240810

Proposal to create two lots for a mixed-income, affordable, mixed-use development containing up to 800 multifamily dwelling units, underground and structured parking garage, and up to 55,000 square feet of non-residential uses; and up to 897,222 square feet of residential, including 40 percent MPDUs, for a total of 952,222 square feet; amendments to the binding elements of the approved Sketch Plan include an increase the maximum density, an increase to the maximum height across the entire property, and a decrease to the minimum required Public Open Space; located in downtown Wheaton at the northwest corner of Veirs Mill Road and University Boulevard; Zoned CR 5.0, C-4.5, R-4.5, H-130; CR 3.0, C-2.5, R-2.5, H-100; CRN 1.5, C-.25, R-1.5, H-45; R-60; 5.16 acres; 2012 Wheaton CBD and Vicinity Sector Plan.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the Subject Applications with conditions.

T. Leftwich/K. Mencarini/C. Sanders/A. Lindsey

A. BOARD ACTION

Motion: Pedoeem/Hedrick

Vote: 4-0

Other: Vice Chair Linden was necessarily absent.

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

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Pedoeem/Hedrick

Vote: 4-0

Other: Vice Chair Linden was necessarily absent.

Action: Approved Staff recommendation for approval of the Sketch Plan Amendment and Site Plan cited above, subject to conditions as modified during the meeting, which will be reflected in an associated draft Resolution to be adopted by the Planning Board at a later date.

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Pedoeem/Hedrick

Vote: 4-0

Other: Vice Chair Linden was necessarily absent.

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

Troy Leftwich, Planner III, offered a multi-media presentation regarding Wheaton Gateway. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated November 10, 2025.

Mr. Leftwich stated the Preliminary Plan proposes to consolidate 10 lots and 1 parcel into two lots with an APF validity period for seven years. Lot 1 will accommodate three multifamily buildings with non-residential uses, and an underground parking garage, and Lot 2 will be designated for a pocket park.

Mr. Leftwich stated the Site Plan establishes a total of three building sections to be constructed in two phases, accommodating up to 952,222 square feet of total development, including up to 897,222 square feet of residential uses (up to 800 dwelling units), and up to 55,000 square feet of nonresidential uses as well as an underground and structured parking garage. The residential component will offer a mix of 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom units, with a target of 40 percent MPDUs. Phase 1 of the Project will redevelop the Lindsay Ford portion of the site in two sections. Section 1 will feature a mixed-use building fronting on Veirs Mill Road providing a daycare on the ground floor with residential units above, while Section 2 will include a residential building designed to transition in scale and character to the adjacent single-family homes along East Avenue. Phase 2 will deliver Section 3, a mixed-use building at the northern gateway to Wheaton's Core District.

Natasha Fahim, Urban Designer, discussed the design aspects for the project including the public open spaces, the Gateway Feature to the CBD, and the frontages along Veirs Mill Road, University Boulevard, and East Avenue.

Mr. Leftwich discussed the Forest Conservation Plan noting a total afforestation requirement of 0.90 acres and a variance request to impact one Protected Tree and remove four Protected Trees.

Mr. Leftwich also stated community correspondence was received with concerns for adding over 700 residential units to the neighborhood.

Lastly, Mr. Leftwich noted modifications to Preliminary Plan Condition 12.c and Condition 20, as well as Site Plan Conditions 14, 15, and 16, and Forest Conservation Plan Conditions 2, 7, and 8.

Judy Higgins of the Kensington View Civic Association offered testimony regarding concerns for increased traffic, loading location, timing of construction for the underground road, and traffic mitigation.

Kathleen Guinan of Crossway Community offered testimony regarding safety concerns for pedestrians.

Gus Bauman offered testimony on behalf of Bank Realty noting support for the project and ongoing conversations with WSSC regarding easements.

Pierre Romand-Heuyer, an individual, offered testimony noting concerns regarding increased traffic at University Boulevard and East Avenue and the left turn lane on Veirs Mill, as well as requesting a detailed traffic study.

Shane Pollin of PS Ventures, the Applicant, offered comments regarding the housing the project will deliver, community outreach performed, transportation circulation, loading, the traffic impact

Montgomery County Planning Board
Public Meeting Minutes of November 20, 2025

study, potential traffic mitigation measures, noise mitigation, and potential tenants for the childcare/grocer.

The Board asked questions regarding noise mitigation, the location of the proposed childcare facility, if the parks will be maintained publicly or privately, the approximate size of the parks, entrance/access locations, traffic mitigation, further clarification on the traffic studies performed, acceptable cap for traffic delays, and the potential for additional traffic queuing along University Boulevard.

Staff, including Jason Sartori, Planning Director; Carrie Sanders, Chief of East County Planning; and Katie Mencarini, Eastern Corridors Supervisor, offered comments and responses to the Board's questions.

Item 11. Bill 34-25, Legislative Process – Climate Assessments – Amendments (Public Testimony Accepted)

This Bill would amend the contents of Climate Assessments performed for Bills and Zoning Text Amendments by defining two new terms: Community Climate Resilience, and Climate Hazard; and combining the elements of Community Resilience, and Adaptive Capacity, into Community Climate Resilience.

Staff Recommendation: The Planning Board transmit comments to the County Council.

B. Berbert

BOARD ACTION

Motion: Bartley/Hedrick

Vote: 3-0

Other: Chair Harris and Vice Chair Linden were necessarily absent.

Action: Approved Staff recommendation for approval to transmit comments to the County Council, as stated in a transmittal letter to be prepared at a later date.

Benjamin Berbert, Planner III, offered a multi-media presentation regarding Bill 34-25, Legislative Process – Climate Assessments – Amendments. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated November 14, 2025.

Bill 34-25 would amend the contents of Climate Assessments performed for Bills and Zoning Text Amendments by defining two new terms: Community Climate Resilience and Climate Hazard; and combining the elements of Community Resilience and Adaptive Capacity into the definition of Community Climate Resilience.

Mr. Berbert noted Staff recommends the Planning Board support Bill 34-25, with the discussed amendments adding definitions for greenhouse gas emissions, sequestration, and carbon drawdown, and adding the option for a Planning Board designee to transmit the climate assessments from the Planning Board. Mr. Berbert noted the clarifications will make the preparation of future climate assessments by both Montgomery Planning and the Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) more consistent and straight-forward.

The Board asked questions regarding potential process for a future Planning Board designee to approve and transmit climate assessments.

Mr. Berbert and Jason Sartori, Planning Director also offered further comments regarding the potential suggestion for a Planning Board designee to transmit climate assessments and noted the process of selecting and determining a designee could be discussed and approved at a future Planning Board meeting.