

# Montgomery County Planning Board

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

## **MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING BOARD APPROVED PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES**

**Meeting Date:** Thursday, March 12, 2026

**Meeting Location:** 2425 Reedie Drive, Wheaton, MD 20902

### **SUMMARY**

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, March 12, 2026, beginning at 12:35 p.m. and adjourning at 4:44 p.m.

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

Items 2 through 4, Item 7, Item 8, Item 12, Item 10, Item 11, Item 6, and Item 9 were discussed in that order and reported in the attached Minutes.

Item 5 was postponed to March 19, 2026.

Commissioner Hedrick left the meeting after Item 7 at 12:58 p.m. and returned during Item 12 at 1:43 p.m., and Commissioner Bartley briefly left the meeting during Item 12 at 1:29 p.m. and returned at 1:35 p.m. Commissioner Hedrick also briefly left the meeting at 3:28 p.m. during Item 10 and returned to the meeting at 3:49 p.m. during Item 11.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:44 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Planning Board will be held on Thursday, March 19, 2026, 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

There were no Resolutions submitted for approval.

#### B. Approval of Minutes

There were no Minutes submitted for approval.

#### C. Other Preliminary Matters

There were no other Preliminary Matters submitted for approval.

### Item 2. Record Plats (Public Hearing)

**Subdivision Plat No. 220230840 thru 220230880, Dickerson**

**Subdivision Plat No. 220250800, Olney Medical Building**

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval

**Board Action:** Approved Staff recommendation for approval of the Record Plats cited above, as submitted.

**Motion:** Hedrick/Pedoeem

**Vote:** 5-0

### Item 3. Regulatory Extension Requests (Public Hearing)

**Poplar Grove, Sketch Plan Amendment No. 32018022A, Preliminary Plan Amendment No. 12019004C, Site Plan No. 820250110, and Forest Conservation Plan No. F20250770:** Regulatory Review Extension Request No. 2 to extend the regulatory review period until June 25, 2026.

**Executive Office Center, Site Plan No. 81984017A:** Regulatory Review Extension Request No. 2 to extend the regulatory review period until May 14, 2026.

**Wheaton Lane Subdivision, Preliminary Plan No. 120250200 and Final Forest Conservation Plan No. F20250860:** Regulatory Review Extension Request No. 1 to extend the regulatory review period until May 14, 2026.

**Iglesia De Cristo Mi El Maryland: Preliminary Plan No.120220040:** Regulatory Extension Request No.7 to extend the regulatory review period until March 26, 2026.

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval of the extension requests

**Board Action:** Approved Staff recommendation for approval of the Regulatory Extension Requests cited above.

**Motion:** Hedrick/Pedoeem

**Vote:** 5-0

**Item 4. Roundtable Discussion**

**Board Action:** Received briefing.

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

Mr. Sartori discussed upcoming County Council sessions in March, the Affordable Housing Conference of Montgomery County Winter Roundtable, and the upcoming Growing Smarter in a Changing Climate Speakers' Series. Mr. Sartori also provided a recap of the Spring Semiannual presentation to the Montgomery County Council and discussed the FY27 Budget schedule.

Lastly, Mr. Sartori welcomed Crepin Kamano and Oluwole Ojeyinka to the ITI Division.

**Item 5. POSTPONED - Eastern Silver Spring Communities Plan: Preliminary Plan-wide Recommendations Briefing: Part 2**

This item was postponed to March 19, 2026.

**Item 7. Adventist HealthCare Shady Grove Medical Center, Regulatory Extension Request No. 1 for Preliminary Plan Amendment No. 12011016B and Site Plan Amendment No. 81999024J (Public Hearing)**

**A. Regulatory Extension Request No. 1 for Preliminary Plan Amendment No. 12011016B:** Request to amend the regulatory review period until June 13, 2026.

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval of the extension request.

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

**Motion:** Hedrick/Pedoeem

**Vote:** 5-0

**B. Site Plan Amendment No. 81994024J:** Request to amend Condition No. 2 of Site Plan No. 81999024I to accommodate an additional two feet of building height, in addition to revisions made to the plaza area. Located on the NW corner of the intersection of Medical Center Dr. and Medical Center Way; 2010 Great Seneca Science Corridor Master Plan; LSC-1.5 H-150 zone, reviewed under the Zoning Code in effect on October 29, 2014; 39.16 acres.

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval of the Site Plan Amendment with conditions.

**Board Action:** Approved Staff recommendation for approval of the Site Plan Amendment 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

**Motion:** Hedrick/Pedoeem

**Vote:** 5-0

Jeffrey M. Server, Planner III, offered a multi-media presentation regarding Adventist HealthCare Shady Grove Medical Center. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated February 27, 2026.

Mr. Server stated the Applicant is requesting to extend the review period for Preliminary Plan Amendment No. 12011016B from March 13, 2026 until June 13, 2026, to allow the Applicant additional time to address DRC comments.

Mr. Server noted the Applicant is also requesting to amend Condition No. 2 of Site Plan Amendment No. 81999024I to increase the maximum building height from 80 to 82 feet to accommodate as-built conditions for the front plaza, garage access, and ambulance area. Additionally, minor revisions were made to the plaza area associated with the patient tower.

The Board asked questions regarding the reasoning and need for the requested Preliminary Plan Amendment extension request.

Patrick O'Neil of Lerch, Early, and Brewer offered comments on behalf of the Applicant regarding the reasoning for the requested Site Plan Amendment and extension request.

**Item 8. College View Campus, Preliminary Plan Amendment No. 12020017A  
(Public Hearing)**

Request to reinstate Preliminary Plan No. 120200170, which was approved for three lots for up to 142 multi-family residential units, including 25 percent MPDUs, and up to 47,887 square feet of commercial use, and extend the Adequate Public Facilities (APF) validity period by five additional years. Located on the east side of Frederick Road (MD 355), approximately 500 feet north of Cider Press Place, 2009 Germantown Employment Area Sector Plan, and in the CRT-0.75 C-0.25 R-0.50 H-40 Zone and R-60/TDR Zone.

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval with Conditions

**Board Action:** Approved Staff recommendation for approval of the Preliminary Plan Amendment 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.

**Motion:** Pedoeem/Linden

**Vote:** 4-0

**Other:** Commissioner Hedrick was necessarily absent.

Jeffrey M. Server, Planner III, offered a multi-media presentation regarding College View Campus. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated February 27, 2026.

Mr. Server noted a correction to the Staff Report regarding the numbering for the new condition for the Preliminary Plan Amendment

Mr. Server stated the Applicant is requesting to reinstate Preliminary Plan No. 120200170, which was approved for three lots for up to 142 multi-family residential units, including 25 percent Moderately Priced Dwelling Units (MPDUs), and up to 47,887 square feet of commercial use for a one-year Preliminary Plan validity period, and extend the Adequate Public Facilities (APF) validity period by five additional years. The Amendment will not result in any changes to the original design or layout of the Preliminary Plan approval. Mr. Server also stated the Applicant requested a waiver for Section 50-4.3.J.7.d of the Subdivision Regulations, which requires 40 percent of building permits for approved gross floor area to have been issued and must not exceed 2.5 years as an extension. Lastly, the three lots will be platted/developed, and the remaining public infrastructure and improvements will be completed.

Casey Cirner of Miles and Stockbridge offered comments on behalf of the Applicant regarding the phased development and filed record plat, and noted agreement with Staff's conditions. Ms. Cirner offered further comments regarding reasoning for not recording the original record plats, financing, what drove 25 percent MPDUs, and reasoning for the three separate lots.

The Board asked questions regarding reasoning for the requested waiver, potential timeline for filing for building permits, the grade establishment plan, why the original

plats were not recorded, TDR numbering, what drove the 25 percent MPDUs, financing, and party responsible for constructing the natural surface trial.

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

Michael J. Birkland and Andreza Danelski of Bohler Engineering offered comments regarding the project schedule and grade establishment plan.

**Item 12. Legislative Update**

**A. HB 1250/ SB 827 Chatbots Informational**

**Staff Recommendation:** Discussion/Informational

**Board Action:** The Board agreed by consensus to move forward as informational.

**B. HB 1517 Land Use – Qualified Project – Retaliatory Downzoning**

**Staff Recommendation:** Discussion/Informational

**Board Action:** The Board agreed by consensus to move forward as informational.

**C. HB 1538 - Land Use - Accessory Dwelling Units - Requirements and Prohibitions**

**Staff Recommendation:** Discussion/Informational

**Board Action:** The Board agreed by consensus to move forward as informational.

**D. SB 1005 – MNCPPC General Counsel and Powers of Local Planning Boards – Alternations**

**Staff Recommendation:** Oppose

**Board Action:** The Board voted to oppose Bill SB 1005.

**Motion:** Hedrick/Linden

**Vote:** 5-0

Jordan Baucum Colbert, Senior Government Affairs Analyst, and Michael Aniton, Acting General Counsel, gave an overview and briefed the Board on Bills HB 1250/SB 827 and HB 1517. Further information on the bills can be found under the Agenda for March 12, 2026.

**HB 1250/ SB 827 Chatbots**

Ms. Baucum Colbert stated HB 1250/SB 827 seeks to regulate the manner in which a developer designs and creates and an operator makes available to users in the State a chatbot, including establishing safety and privacy protections for users, establishing an enhanced protection for users who are minors under a certain age, requiring the display of certain warnings when using a chatbot, and establishing reporting mechanisms and requirements.

Ms. Baucum Colbert noted aspects of the bill are concerning and stated Staff recommends the sponsor consider a carve out for bi-county agencies and local governments.

The Board agreed by consensus to move forward as informational with amendments.

**HB 1517 Land Use – Qualified Project – Retaliatory Downzoning**

Ms. Baucum Colbert stated HB 1517 establishes that a "qualified project" is a certain residential project that has been subject to retaliatory downzoning; requiring a local jurisdiction to allow the density of a certain qualified project to exceed the density

otherwise authorized; and permitting a certain qualified project to consist of certain types of developments with certain density limits under certain circumstances.

The Board asked for further defining of retaliatory downsizing and Jason Sartori, Planning Director, offered comments and responses.

The Board agreed by consensus to move forward as informational.

### **HB 1538 - Land Use - Accessory Dwelling Units - Requirements and Prohibitions**

Ms. Baucum Colbert stated HB 1538 requires a certain local law to authorize development of at least one internal accessory dwelling unit and one external accessory dwelling unit on certain land notwithstanding a certain density limit. It also limits the imposition of off-street parking requirements to certain accessory dwelling units. It prohibits a utility provider from charging a certain property owner certain fees and authorizes a certain accessory dwelling unit to share certain utility meters and service laterals with a primary single-family detached dwelling unit. Ms. Baucum Colbert recommended moving forward as informational in order to gain more clarification on the bill.

Robert Kronenberg, Deputy Director of Planning, offered comments and noted concerns with the bill appearing to allow two accessory dwelling units on one property, which could raise questions relating to parking/school requirements and other development standards.

The Board asked questions regarding internal versus external accessory dwelling units, setback requirements, and in which zones the accessory dwelling units would be allowed.

Staff, including Jason Sartori, Planning Director and Lisa Govoni, Housing, Infrastructure and Zoning Supervisor, offered comments and responses to the Board's questions.

The Board agreed by consensus to move forward as informational.

### **SB 1005 – MNCPPC General Counsel and Powers of Local Planning Boards – Alternations**

Ms. Baucum Colbert stated SB 1005 repeals the requirement that the Maryland–National Capital Park and Planning Commission appoint a general counsel; requiring the Montgomery County Planning Board and the Prince George's County Planning Board to appoint legal counsel for Commission operations within each respective county subject to certain requirements; requiring the Montgomery County Planning Board and the Prince George's County Planning Board to exercise direct authority over certain functions within each County for human resources, information technology, and legal services (most recently adding procurement); authorizing the Commission to use shared administrative services under certain circumstances; and generally relating to the Maryland–National Capital Park and Planning Commission and local planning boards in

Montgomery County and Prince George's County. Ms. Baucum Colbert stated the effective date of the bill would be October 26, 2026.

The Board offered comments regarding the potential impacts of the bill to both current employees and retirees as well as the lack of transparency and purpose. The Board also noted strong opposition to the bill and a motion was made to oppose SB 1005.

**Item 10. New Hampshire Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Study (Public Testimony Accepted)**

**Staff Recommendation:** Transmit the preferred alternative and comments to the County Council.

**Board Action:** Approved Staff recommendation to transmit comments to the County Council with additional comments discussed during the meeting, as stated in a transmittal letter to be prepared at a later date.

**Motion:** Pedoeem/Linden

**Vote:** 4-0

**Other:** Commissioner Hedrick was necessarily absent.

David Anspacher, Chief of Transportation Planning, offered a multi-media presentation regarding the New Hampshire Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Study. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated March 5, 2026.

Mr. Anspacher introduced Justin Willits of the Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) who continued the multi-media presentation and stated the project proposes to construct Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) infrastructure along an 8.5-mile segment of New Hampshire Avenue between Randolph Road and the Fort Totten Metrorail Station in Washington, DC. Mr. Willits discussed the purpose and need for the project as well as the current conditions of New Hampshire Avenue, key findings from the existing conditions, stakeholder and public outreach, overall process to determine the alternatives, and the approach to develop the four different alternatives. Mr. Willits also discussed four alternatives and the recommended preferred hybrid alternative in greater detail. Mr. Willits gave an overview of the travel time comparisons between the four alternatives and the hybrid alternative as well as total capital costs (including design). Lastly, Mr. Willits noted the strong overall support for the hybrid alternative and discussed next steps for the project.

Mr. Anspacher discussed the Master Plan consistency, project evaluation, comparisons of the different alternatives, additional considerations, and Staff's recommendations related to station locations, station access, and interim approaches to improving transit service on the corridor in greater detail. Lastly, Mr. Anspacher noted Planning Staff recommends advancing the hybrid alternative as the preferred alternative.

Peter James, an individual, offered testimony regarding the benefits of a Personal Rapid Transit (PRT) system and Microtransit transportation.

Bill Pugh of the Coalition for Smarter Growth offered testimony regarding support for the project.

The Board asked questions regarding whether there was consideration for an option to reduce six lanes to five lanes, if there was potential for a median reversable lane, if the hybrid alternative envisions a freer flowing bus lane, how the project is funded, if the project was considered a County project or State project, how often pullouts occur,

reasoning for the drastic drop in travel times, cue jumping, if intersection impacts were reviewed, whether access improvements to stations have been included in projected costs, bike storage, and the implementation timeframe for the hybrid alternative.

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

Mr. Willits and Aditya Inamdar of MCDOT offered comments and responses to the Board's questions.

The Board held further discussion on the hybrid alternative and offered comments regarding the importance of accessibility to the stations. The Board also suggested additional comments regarding potentially implementing some short-term improvements or interim options now to help speed up the current service. Staff agreed to include the additional comments with the transmittal.

**Item 11. Montgomery County Humane Society, Preliminary Plan Amendment No. 12019010A and Forest Conservation Plan No. F20260090 (Public Hearing)**

Request to reinstate and extend the Preliminary Plan validity period, establish a new Adequate Public Facilities validity period, and reconcile the approved density with the desired building program. Montgomery County Humane Society; 7.79 acres: R-60 Zone; 1994 Aspen Hill Master Plan.

**A. Preliminary Plan Amendment No. 12019010A**

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

**Board Action:** Approved Staff recommendation for approval of the Preliminary Plan Amendment 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.

**Motion:** Hedrick/Pedoeem

**Vote:** 5-0

**B. Forest Conservation Plan No. F20260090**

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

**Board 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.

**Motion:** Hedrick/Pedoeem

**Vote:** 5-0

Emily Tettelbaum, Planner IV, offered a multi-media presentation regarding the Montgomery County Humane Society. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated March 2, 2026.

Ms. Tettelbaum gave an overview of the history of the pet cemetery and stated the Applicant is proposing reinstatement and a one-year extension of the Preliminary Plan, a new five-year APF validity period, reconciling of the approved density and desired building program, and updating of development standards to allow flexibility in building placement. Ms. Tettelbaum noted the property is designated as historic in the Master Plan for Historic Preservation and is listed in the Burial Sites Inventory. Ms. Tettelbaum stated the project includes restoration of two historic structures and construction of new buildings and noted the Applicant is required to return to the HPC for permits. No human remains will be disturbed, and disturbance to animal graves will be minimal.

Ms. Tettelbaum discussed the Forest Conservation Plan noting a variance request for the removal of 12 trees and impact to seven trees.

Lastly, Ms. Tettelbaum noted updates to Preliminary Plan Condition Number 7 regarding the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services, Fire Department Access and Water Supply Section letter and Forest Conservation Plan Condition Number 2 regarding mitigation plantings.

Jody Kline of Miller, Miller, and Canby offered comments on behalf of the Applicant regarding coordination between the Applicant, Staff, and the Historic Preservation Commission.

Kyle Hughes of MHG offered a multimedia presentation and comments regarding potential renderings of the property and new campus as well as current conditions, changes from the previous amendment, and proposed tree mitigation.

The Board asked questions regarding the estimated timeframe, whether the cemetery was being maintained, and plans for the cemetery.

Cris Bombaugh of the Montgomery County Humane Society offered comments and responses regarding the estimated timeline for the project and cemetery.

**Item 6. 15% Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) Requirement Designation**

**Staff Recommendation:** Transmit designation of Planning Areas to the County Council.

**Board Action:** Approved Staff recommendation to transmit the designation of Planning Areas to the County Council, as stated in a transmittal letter to be prepared at a later date.

**Motion:** Hedrick/Pedoeem

**Vote:** 5-0

Bhavna Sivasubramanian, Planner II, offered a multi-media presentation regarding the 15 percent Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) Requirement Designation. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated March 5, 2026.

Ms. Sivasubramanian stated in 2018, Bill 38-17 was passed by the Montgomery County Council and created a 15 percent MPDU requirement in high-income Planning Areas, which must be designated by the Planning Board annually, in which 45 percent of the census tracts' acreages have a median household income of at least 150 percent of the County-wide median household income.

Ms. Sivasubramanian noted the Planning Areas with a 15 percent MPDU requirement in 2026 include Bethesda/Chevy Chase, Darnestown, Dickerson, Lower Seneca, North Bethesda, Olney, Potomac, and Travilah. Ms. Sivasubramanian also stated the Kemp Mill/Four Corners and Poolesville Planning Areas fell out of the requirement in 2026 and discussed the MPDU development since 2023.

The Board asked questions regarding whether other potential data types could be used and if the program requirements could be changed to avoid inconsistencies of Planning Areas being included and not included.

Staff, including Lisa Govoni, Housing, Infrastructure and Zoning Supervisor, offered comments and responses to the Board's questions.

The Board also requested additional comments be included regarding variability and potential changes to program requirements.

**Item 9. Paramount Self Storage, Sketch Plan No. 320260010, Site Plan No. 820260040, and Forest Conservation Plan No. F20240710 (Public Hearing)**

Request to construct a Self-Storage Facility; located at 15750 Paramount Drive, Rockville; located at the intersection of Paramount Drive and Somerville Drive; CRTF-2.75, C-2.75, R-1.5, H120; 2.1 acres; 2021 Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan.

**A. Sketch Plan No. 320260010**

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

**Board Action:** Approved Staff recommendation for approval of the Sketch 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.

**Motion:** Hedrick/Pedoeem

**Vote:** 5-0

**B. Site Plan No. 820260040**

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

**Board Action:** Approved Staff recommendation for approval of the Site 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.

**Motion:** Hedrick/Pedoeem

**Vote:** 5-0

**C. Forest Conservation Plan No. F20240710**

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

**Board 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.

**Motion:** Hedrick/Linden

**Vote:** 5-0

Mark Beall, Planner IV, offered a multi-media presentation regarding Paramount Self Storage. Further information can be found in the Staff Report dated February 27, 2026.

Mr. Beall noted an added condition that was not included in the Staff Report regarding the Applicant recording a covenant with Montgomery County Land Records to provide for a minimum 12-foot wide easement located along the western boundary of the property.

Mr. Beall stated the Applicant is proposing to demolish the existing structures on-site to construct a new four-story and six-story self-storage facility. The Project will be built in two phases with the southern portion in Phase 1 and the northern portion in Phase 2. Mr. Beall noted the Applicant is also proposing new landscaping and pedestrian connections to further activate the streetscape and improve the pedestrian environment along the street frontage at Paramount Drive.

Mr. Beall discussed the Forest Conservation Plan and noted 0.38 acres will be met by taking this requirement to an M-NCPPC approved forest bank or, if no banks are available, paying a fee-in-lieu to the Forest Conservation Fund.

Elizabeth Rogers of Lerch, Early, and Brewer offered comments on behalf of the Applicant regarding the Public Open Space area and potential for future retail.

The Board asked questions regarding the width of the Public Open Space area, potential for retail, and timeframe for construction.

Nana Baine of Arcland offered comments regarding the potential timeframe for construction.