

MEMORANDUM

January 30, 2015

TO: Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee

FROM: *MM* Marlene Michaelson, Senior Legislative Analyst
GO Glenn Orlin, Deputy Administrator

SUBJECT: Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan

This is the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee's first and only scheduled worksession on the Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan. This memorandum addresses all Master Plan issues including Land Use, Historic Preservation, Environment, Parks and Open Space, Community Facilities, Transportation, and Implementation. A map of the study area is on page 11 and the concept plan for the area is on page 19. A memorandum from Planning Department Staff on issues raised in testimony or by Council Staff is attached at © 1-6. The Executive's fiscal analysis is attached at © 7.

Councilmembers should bring their copy of the Plan to the meeting.

Background

The Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan covers an area of about 52 acres located in northern Montgomery County around the commercial properties near the intersection of MD 108 and Brooke Road. The Plan was initiated because the single use zoning and significant height limits (24 feet) in the Sandy Spring-Ashton Rural Village Overlay Zone limited potential redevelopment and to address public use space. The purpose of the Plan is described on page 5:

- To maintain the rural village character
- To provide a mix of uses in one to three story buildings
- To provide pedestrian and vehicular improvements and address street character
- To create quality open space that provides opportunities for gathering.

LAND USE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Master Plan divides the planning area into three neighborhoods: the Village Core Neighborhood, the Residential Neighborhood, and the Cultural Neighborhood. This section of the Staff memorandum addresses general planning issues, followed by the specific properties in the 3 neighborhoods.

Overlay Zone

The existing Sandy Spring-Ashton Rural Village Overlay Zone limits the density on all commercial properties to 0.75 floor area ratio (FAR) instead of the 1.5 FAR allowed in the existing C-2 and Commercial/Residential Town (CRT) zones. It also limits height to 24 feet, or 30 feet with Planning Board approval. The Plan recommends removing the Overlay Zone from properties in the Plan. The recommended Commercial/Residential Neighborhood (CRN) zone as used in the Plan limits properties to a maximum density of 0.75 and sets heights ranging from 35 to 45 feet to allow 1 to 3 stories. Heights are greatest at the commercial center and taper off closer to residential neighborhoods. Staff believes the increased heights are appropriate and better encourage development.

Staff supports the Plan's recommendation to remove the Overlay Zone.

Impact of Zoning Ordinance Rewrite

Since preparation of the Draft Plan, the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite has become effective. The commercial and office zones (C-1, C-2, and O-M) shown on page 54 of the Plan were converted to the new zones, such as CRT, Employment Office (EOF), and Neighborhood Retail (NR). Although these appear to allow more density than the Planning Board Draft, density and height remained capped by the Overlay Zone and therefore the Rewrite does not allow more development than the current Master Plan. **The information on existing zoning throughout the Plan and on page 54 of the Plan should be updated to reflect the changes in effect.**

Village Core Neighborhood

The Village Core Neighborhood Recommendations are on pages 20 to 28 of the Plan. A map showing the key properties and identifying them by number appears on page 25. This is the focus of commercial development in the planning area.

Area 1 is discussed on pages 25-26. It is a 1.65 acre parcel that is recommended to be rezoned from C-2 to CRN 0.75, C 0.25, R 0.75, H 45. (The Zoning Ordinance Rewrite rezoned it to CRT 1.5, C 0.75, R 0.75, H 35, but the Overlay Zone limited overall FAR to 0.75 and limited the height to 24 feet.) The rezoning allows for greater height at this key intersection, but keeps the focus on residential development to insure compatibility with the residential development to the south and west.

Staff supports the recommended rezoning.

Area 2 has four subareas shown on page 25 and discussed on pages 26-27. Areas 2a and 2b, closest to MD 108, are recommended to be rezoned from C-2 to CRN 0.75, C 0.75, R 0.5, H 45. (The Zoning Ordinance Rewrite rezoned it to CRT 1.5, C 0.75, R 0.75, H 35, but the Overlay Zone limited overall

FAR to 0.75 and limited the height to 24 feet.) Area 2b is also the proposed location for a new civic green (discussed further under the section on Parks and Open Spaces below). Areas 2c and 2d, currently R-60, are closer to residential development and therefore recommended for lower density and height: CRN 0.5, C 0.25, R 0.5, H 40. The Plan provides illustrations for different potential development patterns, depending on how many properties redevelop (see pages 26-27).

The Council received testimony from ERA Investment Group Inc., indicating that their property (Area 2b and portions of 2a and 2c) is recommended for downzoning (from CRT 1.5 to CRN 0.75); however, their statement did not recognize that the Overlay Zone already limited development to 0.75 or that a significant portion of their property is recommended to be rezoned from R-60 to CRN 0.75, thereby significantly increasing development potential. They also requested that existing uses and buildings be grandfathered, which they already are. They requested that parking be addressed as it is in other communities, but Staff does not believe it will be possible to have a parking district in Sandy Spring, if that is what they intend. Finally, they have asked for more clarification on the public improvements that will be required with redevelopment, but further detail should be deferred until redevelopment occurs and more is known about the specific project and necessary improvements. It is appropriate, however, to indicate in the introduction to the section on the Village Core that many of the recommended improvements will require partnerships among property owners, the State and/or County, and utilities.

Staff supports the recommended rezoning.

Area 3 in the Village Core Neighborhood is shown on a map on page 25 and discussed on page 28. The property was zoned C-2, C-1, and O-M and this vacant site has an approved plan for a three-story office and school building. (The Zoning Ordinance Rewrite rezoned it to CRT 1.5, CRT 1.0, and EOF 1.0, but the Overlay Zone limited overall FAR to 0.75 and limited the height to 24 feet.) The Plan recommends rezoning this property to CRN 0.75, C 0.25, R 0.75, H 45 to allow a residential townhouse development. Staff understands that both the property owner and community support a shift to a residential focus.

Staff supports the recommended rezoning.

Area 4 in the Village Core Neighborhood is shown on a map on page 25 and discussed on page 28. These properties were zoned C-2, C-1, and O-M and include properties in the Historic District (the portion of Area 4 west of Meeting House Road – see map of the Historic District on page 11). The Zoning Ordinance Rewrite rezoned these properties to CRT 1.5, CRT 1.0, and EOF 1.0, but the Overlay Zone limited overall FAR to 0.75 and limited the height to 24 feet.) The text of the Plan on page 28 recommends rezoning this property to CRN 0.75, C 0.75, **R 0.25**, H 45 to allow a residential townhouse development; however, the proposed zoning map on page 55 shows zoning of CRN 0.75, C 0.75, **R 0.5**, H 45. (Note that this area is shown as Area 4 in the map on page 25, but as Area 1 in the map on page 55; Planning Department Staff have agreed to use a single numbering system for the final publication.)

The Council should correct the discrepancy and Staff believes that the higher residential FAR (0.5) is appropriate to provide the greatest flexibility for any potential redevelopment of these historic properties. Therefore Staff recommends changing the text on page 28 to conform with the map on page 55 and setting the zoning as CRN 0.75, C 0.75, **R 0.5**, H 45.

Residential Neighborhood

The Plan's recommendations retain the existing zoning in the Residential Neighborhood with the exception of one parcel (P338 – see page 31), which is recommended to be rezoned from R-200 to R-60. The parcel is adjacent to other R-60 land owned by the Housing Opportunities Commission (HOC), and HOC is in the process of purchasing this parcel. **Area 1**, north of MD 108, could redevelop with 20 additional housing units based on zoning capacity. **Area 2**, south of MD 108, is developed with single family homes in the R-200 zone. The Plan confirms the existing zoning.

Staff supports the recommended zoning in the Residential Neighborhood.

Cultural Neighborhood

The Cultural Neighborhood includes 4 areas that include retail and offices, the Sandy Spring Museum, and the future home of the Olive Branch Community Church (see map on page 34).

Area 1 is shown on a map and discussed on page 34. It was zoned C-2 and has a gas station, convenience store, and three-story building with offices. (The Zoning Ordinance Rewrite rezoned it to CRT 1.5, C 0.75, R 0.75, H 35, but the Overlay Zone limited overall FAR to 0.75 and limited the height to 24 feet.) The Plan recommends rezoning it to CRN 0.5, C 0.5, R 0.5, H 40 to accommodate a mixed-use development and still provide a transition to the adjacent residential and cultural properties.

Staff supports the recommended rezoning.

Area 2 is shown on a map on page 34 of the Plan and discussed on page 35. It is the site of the Sandy Spring Museum. It is currently zoned Rural Cluster (RC) and the Plan recommends retaining the existing zoning. The Council received testimony supporting a text amendment to allow artisan manufacturing, production, and sale (such as blacksmiths) and living history demonstrations at the Museum, and the Plan recommends a text amendment to accomplish this. Staff has learned that the Department of Permitting Services (DPS) believes such uses are currently allowed under the Zoning Ordinance and a text amendment is not needed. A memorandum from DPS addressing this issue is attached at © 8. The section of the Plan that recommend a text amendment should be changed accordingly.

Staff supports the recommendation to retain the existing RC zoning but recommends changing the language recommending a text amendment to indicate that artisan manufacturing, production and sale and living history demonstrations are allowed with the existing zoning.

Area 3 is shown on a map on page 34 of the Plan and discussed on page 35. It has the rectory and administrative office for the Olive Branch Church and is the future home of the new Church building. It is zoned RE-1 and the plan recommends retaining the RE-1 zoning. The Council received testimony asking that the Master Plan mention the option for the Church to use the adjacent school parking lot at Sherwood High School. The approved Site Plan already requires parking to be provided on site and the attached memorandum from Planning Department Staff (see © 3) indicates why it would not be appropriate to have shared parking with the high school.

Staff supports the recommendation to retain the existing RE-1 zoning.

Area 4 is shown on a map on page 34 and discussed on page 36. It is the site of Christopher's Hardware and Nichols Office Building. The Plan recommends rezoning it from C-2 to CRN 0.5, C 0.5, R 0.5, H 40. (The Zoning Ordinance Rewrite rezoned it to CRT 1.5, C 0.75, R 0.75, H 35, but the Overlay Zone limited overall FAR to 0.75 and limited the height to 24 feet.) The rezoning will accommodate a mixed-use development with appropriate setback transitions to adjacent residential properties.

Staff supports the recommended rezoning.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION

The History of Sandy Spring and notable architecture are described on pages 12-15. Properties designated historic by the County are listed here and again on pages 36-37. Within the planning area, the following resources are on the County's Master Plan for Historic Preservation:

- The 1895 Sandy Spring Bank Building
- The 1904 fire insurance building
- The 1977 Montgomery Mutual Insurance Building.

The Sandy Spring Meeting House, just outside the planning boundaries, is also historic. The Plan confirms these designations. There are several other properties that are considered notable (described on page 14), some of which are listed on the National Register of Historic Places, although not designated historic by the County. The Plan also indicates that Sandy Spring is located within the Underground Railroad and Quaker Cluster of the Montgomery County Heritage Area and therefore may be eligible for certain grants.

The Council received testimony asking for further discussion of the Maryland Heritage Area program and further emphasis on the importance of the notable properties that have not been designated historic by the County. The Council has traditionally limited the discussion of operating programs in master plans, since master plans are long-term documents and programs can change over time. While the Maryland Heritage Area Program may not be utilized as much as it should be, the Master Plan is not the appropriate venue to advocate for greater use. Staff believes that the references to the notable properties in the Master Plan are sufficient for properties that were not designated by the County as historic.

ENVIRONMENT

Environmental issues are addressed on pages 37-38 of the Plan. The sensitive environmental resources that surround the Sandy Spring Rural Village are critical to maintaining the quality of the Patuxent River Watershed. New development will be subject to stormwater management regulations. The Plan also recommends low density edges outside the Village Core to protect and enhance the water quality, limiting imperviousness as much as possible, protecting and expanding the forested edges, planting trees along the perimeter and interior or parking lots, and designating the Plan area as part of the Shades of Green Program. This program, which provides funds to plant trees, is not described anywhere in the Plan and Staff recommends that a brief description of the program be added to the Plan. Planning Department Staff have provided such a description on © 4.

Staff supports the section on the environment with the addition of a description of the Shades of Green Program.

PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

Parks and Open Space Concepts are addressed on page 50 of the Plan and a map of parkland and facilities is on page 51. The Plan recommends the creation of a ¼ to ½ acre village green in the Village Core, west of the new mixed-use development described under Area 2 in the Village Core above and shown on page 50. The Plan also recommends retaining the existing open space at the Museum and Sandy Spring Meeting House and providing small gathering spaces or setbacks for new residential development on the western boundary of the Village Core along MD 108. Staff asked for further clarification of the function of these different open spaces and how they differ from one another, and Planning Department Staff have suggested some amendments to clarify their purpose on © 3-4.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Community Facilities are addressed on pages 50-52 of the Plan. The Plan indicates that the area has sufficient recreation, police stations, fire and rescue facilities, libraries, and schools to serve the residents of the planning area. No additional facilities, beyond the expansion to Farquhar Middle School planned to open in 2016, are recommended.

TRANSPORTATION

The Plan's recommendations for transportation are on pages 38-49. Two notable changes proposed are to reclassify Meetinghouse Road from a Rustic Road to an Exceptional Rustic Road and to reclassify Bentley Road from a Country Road to a Rustic Road. The Department of Transportation prefers not reclassifying the portion of Bentley Road closest to MD 108, to support potential roadway and intersection improvements associated with potential expansion of the Sandy Spring Museum or land uses on the west side of Bentley Road. However, the Executive Regulation governing Rustic Road improvements and maintenance does not preclude future roadway and intersection improvements, as long as the improvements are done in a manner that protects the significant features which made the road eligible for designation in the first place.

The Plan calls for an 8 foot wide shared use (i.e., hiker-biker) path on the north side of MD 108, and 6 foot wide sidewalks on both sides. However, there is no reason for a sidewalk on the north side if there will be a continuous hiker-biker path; it would result in higher cost, greater impacts, and more impervious surface than is necessary. The path, however, should be 10' wide; this is now the standard width for a path with moderate use. **Staff recommends eliminating the recommendation for a sidewalk on the north side, and changing the width of the planned north-side shared use path to 10 feet.**

Robin Ziek testified advocating that the shared use path extend west to Olney and east to Ashton, in both cases beyond the boundary of the Sandy Spring Plan. However, the Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan (adopted in 2005) already recommends a shared use path connecting west to

Olney, and east beyond Ashton to the Howard County Line (Bikeway SP-37), so no further reference is necessary in this Plan.

Fiscal impact. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has transmitted the fiscal impact statement for this plan (© 7). The only proposed County improvements are a shared use path on the north side of MD 108, a sidewalk on the south side, and sidewalks on both sides of Brooke Road for about one-half mile north of MD 108. OMB estimates the cost of the path and sidewalks to be about \$9 million.

IMPLEMENTATION

The Plan addresses a variety of implementation issues on pages 53 to 60. The existing and proposed zoning maps appear on pages 54 to 55. Planning Department Staff plan to modify this to include information about the temporary change in zoning made as a result of the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite. This Plan includes a Design Checklist on pages 58 to 59, which Staff believes is a very useful approach to summarize design recommendations that appear throughout the Plan. Page 60 includes a recommendation that the entire planning area be designated as a Priority Funding Area so that it is eligible for funding available via the Maryland Sustainable Community program and other state programs. **Staff recommends that this be done at the same time as the Sectional Map Amendment.**

The Council received testimony from HOC concerned that the Plan's recommendations could require them to underground utilities. The Plan indicates on page 60 that it may be necessary to relocate utilities, **but does not require that they be put underground.** The Plan also indicates that a number of parties would be responsible for relocation, including PEPCO, the State Highway Administration (SHA), the Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT), and property owners. Staff believes that the detailed determination of the allocation of costs should be determined at time of development, not in a master plan.

OTHER TESTIMONY

In addition to testimony regarding the specific issues addressed above, the Council received testimony indicating that the Plan does not sufficiently indicate that diversity is part of the character of Sandy Spring. Staff believes that the importance of diversity is addressed at several locations throughout the Plan as listed on © 5-6. The Council also received testimony asking that the Master Plan address the inadequate bus service and expedite funding for certain capital improvements. As noted earlier, operational programs are not appropriate issues for master plans, nor are specific budget recommendations, which are considered in annual budget decisions before the Council and not in long-term planning documents.



MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

January 28, 2015

TO: Marlene Michaelson,
Senior Legislative Analyst

VIA: John Carter, Chief, Area 3
Montgomery County Planning department

FROM: Kristin O'Connor, Project Planner
Montgomery County Planning Department

Roberto Duke, Urban Designer
Montgomery County Planning Department

SUBJECT: Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan

INTRODUCTION

The Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan provides recommendations for land use, zoning, environment and design while fulfilling the community's aspirations for preserving rural village character, providing a mix of uses, preserving affordable housing, designing better connections, providing village-scaled street character, and creating quality open spaces. These recommendations promote the creation of a mixed-use village core with housing in an area that is now principally commercial in character. The Plan also envisions new public spaces and lively, active streets that will identify the Village Core as a unique place along the MD 108.

This memorandum summarizes the public testimony and provides a response from the Council's Public Hearing held on January 22, 2015. Four speakers testified, and they were in general agreement on the following key elements in the Plan:

- Agreed upon vision for a new mixed-use village center with housing
- Reuse of older, historic commercial buildings and the redevelopment of non-historic buildings on the north side of MD 108
- Design of new buildings with densities in keeping with the character of the community
- Design open spaces for gathering
- Provide pedestrian connections from the village center to the adjacent neighborhoods

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Historic Preservation

Testimony: Plan area buildings are historic and have value

Response: The Planning Department has reviewed the recommendations of the Historic Preservation Division and has incorporated all of their recommendations in the Plan. The Plan includes a section on Sandy Spring's rich history, pattern of development and notable architecture. The Plan recommends retaining the Sandy Spring Historic District (28/11) on page 36 and include the following buildings: the 1817 Sandy Spring Friends Meeting House, the 1879 Lyceum, the 1857 Montgomery Mutual Insurance Company building, the 1895 Sandy Spring National Bank building and the newer Montgomery Mutual Insurance Building (1977).

Testimony was received about the evaluation of buildings outside of the Historic District. Preservation staff reviewed buildings on both the north side and south side of MD 108. Staff noted that the Sandy Spring Store and Post Office building on the north side of MD 108 has been modified over the years and should not be designated. The houses on the north side of MD 108 (Holly Cottage and Kirk House) are both National Register eligible, but not listed. Other buildings, including the former fire station (1930, 1950) located at 1001 Olney Sandy Spring Road were looked at but not designated.

Other notable residential properties on the south side of MD 108 (see page 31) were evaluated and discussed in the Plan. They include the Frank Leishear House (1870) located at 708 Olney Sandy Spring Road, and Elmhurst (late 1800s) at 416 Olney Sandy Spring Road (p 14 in the Plan). These older homes, dating from the mid- to late 1800s to the 1940s were reviewed by Preservation staff and were not designated historic. The Plan notes that these homes add vernacular architectural interest to the neighborhood (pages 31-32). The Plan recommends protecting the single-family residential edge along MD 108, and the existing residential zoning will be retained at R-200.

Utility improvements along MD 108

Testimony: Request to clarify whether the overhead lines are recommended to be underground or relocated elsewhere and whether the State and the County will participate in the cost of these improvements as utility pole relocation will make redevelopment financially unviable for any redevelopment on the north side of MD 108 in the Village Core.

Response: The Plan does not require the undergrounding of utilities. Utility relocation is likely necessary and may require a public/private partnership between property owners and the County/State. The CIP section has a recommendation on page 60 for lighting and utility relocation to be the responsibility of Pepco, SHA, MCDOT, and property owners. The Plan will be revised to include language for a utility recommendation in the Village Core section.

Shared Parking for the Olive Branch Community Church

Testimony: Request for the Olive Branch Community Church to share parking with Sherwood High School.

Response: Site Plan 820120200 for the Olive Branch Community Church required parking to be provided onsite. Earlier discussions at the preliminary plan stage identified the Sandy Spring Museum as a possible place to share parking with the church if they could not provide all of their parking onsite. A shared parking agreement was never pursued because the church was able to deliver all parking onsite. The approved church site plan provides landscape screening and meets the required setbacks. Sherwood High School does not support a through connection as it may encourage trespassing by church patrons and students, and be used as a cut-through by vehicles. Sherwood is also on record of not supporting shared parking as they cannot guarantee the spaces will exist if the school is rented out for weekend/evening activities. The proposal plan below is taken from the Site Plan submittal.



OTHER ISSUES

Open Space

Issue: Identify the differences between the three open spaces discussed in the Plan regarding location, use, and size.

Response: The three open spaces include: the village green (in the Village Core), the townhouse residential setback (in the Village Core), and the Museum green space (in the Cultural

Neighborhood). Staff proposes to substitute the following bullets for the existing bullets on page 25 and page 33:

Open Space recommendations in Village Core Neighborhood

• *Provide a minimum of ¼ acre village green in Area 2B on the north side of Olney Sandy Spring Road (MD 108) at the time of redevelopment. The property owner will provide a combination of landscape, hardscape and ample space for large shade trees with areas for seating. This space will serve as a focal point for the village center and offer a place for both social interaction and individual contemplation. The space will also serve as a focal point for the Rural Legacy/Rachel Carson/Underground Railroad trail as it reaches the village center.*

• *Provide a setback area along the building frontage with pedestrian-scaled lighting and street furnishings.*

• *Design a small, developer-provided setback in Area 3 that will serve as a gateway and a transition from the western rural entry to the Village Core. This green space will have shade trees and benches for gathering and passive recreation.*

In the Open Space recommendations in the Cultural Neighborhood (p. 33)

- *Support open space activities on the existing green in front of the Sandy Spring Museum in Area 2 to serve for regional/community functions such as the Strawberry Festival and farmer's market.*

Shades of Green Program

Issue: Add sidebar in Plan to identify the program.

Response: (Sidebar) The Planning Department's Shades of Green Program provides free trees and planting for qualifying property owners in designated areas. An increased tree canopy provides environmental and community benefits by improving water quality, reducing air pollution, decreasing energy demands, improving habitat and nesting areas, and reducing heat island effect. The program is financed through the Forest Conservation Fund, made up of contributions paid during the development process as compensation for tree loss when tree-planting on site is impractical. http://www.montgomeryplanning.org/environment/shades_of_green.shtml

Shared Use Path on North side

Issue: Provide only a shared use path on the north side

Response: Planning staff will update the text and graphics to delete any reference to a sidewalk and a shared use path (text on p. 40, illustration on p. 41, and text on p. 43)

References from the Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan identified by Planning Department Staff regarding housing and income diversity and affordable housing preservation.

p. 10 While Quaker culture and history still influence the area, many newer residents have also settled into neighborhoods surrounding the rural village over the past 10 years. **These recent community members have diverse interests and viewpoints.** The market study of the area indicates **a wide variety of incomes with a high level of home ownership** and new housing construction in the area. Based on this analysis, a strong potential for new businesses, specialty retail and restaurants exists within the village.

p. 16 The four-day workshop identified the vision, unique characteristics of the community and an implementation strategy for enhancing Sandy Spring as a great community. The workshop established an agreed upon vision for the Plan: “An historic rural village that serves as a focal point of community life.” The characteristics identified by workshop participants included:

- A rural, walkable village.
- Civic spaces for gathering, socializing, eating and contemplation.
- Safe connections to schools, museums, fire station, stores, post office and places of worship.
- Streets, open spaces, buildings and wayfinding signage that reflect the area’s historic character.
- Streets with appropriate pedestrian-scaled lighting, signage, landscaping and streetscape elements.
- Contextual building types of one- to three-stories.
- Retail, service and restaurants in the village center.
- Vibrant streetscape with areas for sidewalks and seating.
- **A variety of housing types for all ages and incomes.**

p. 20-21 VILLAGE CORE NEIGHBORHOOD RECOMMENDATIONS

Planning and Land Use

This Plan specifically targets the intersection of Brooke Road and Olney Sandy Spring Road (MD 108) as the “heart” of the village for improvements to streetscape, open spaces, connections, traffic operation, and proposals for under-utilized buildings. The Village Core is envisioned as the vibrant, walkable center for community life in Sandy Spring, along both sides of MD 108. Planning and land use recommendations include:

- Provide a mix of residential and commercial uses with a floor area ratio (FAR) consistent with the SSA Overlay Zone.
- Provide a village green and open spaces for gathering.
- Extend the Village Core to the north and east to Skymeadow Way.
- Reinforce the edges of the Plan area with medium density residential uses.
- Increase heights in the Village Core and taper building heights from the Village Core to the Plan boundaries.
- Provide opportunities for shared parking.
- Encourage various housing opportunities, including townhouses and residential over retail/office.
- Provide for business expansion, infill and revitalization opportunities

p. 29 Residential Neighborhood Recommendations

Planning and land use recommendations include:

- Support single-family detached and attached residential development.
- Protect the single-family residential edge along Olney Sandy Spring Road (MD 108).
- Provide infill housing opportunities for all ages and income levels.

p. 31 2. Residential properties: South Side of MD 108 Retain R-200 Zone

Four older homes, dating from the mid- to late 1800s to the 1940s, line the south side of Olney Sandy Spring Road (MD 108). These homes add vernacular architectural interest to the neighborhood. The Plan recommends protecting the single-family residential edge along MD 108 at R-200 densities. The Plan recommendation is:

- Protect the single-family edge along MD 108.
- Provide additional street trees along the edge.



OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

Jennifer A. Hughes
Director

MEMORANDUM

January 20, 2015

TO: George Leventhal, President, County Council

FROM: Jennifer A. Hughes, Director, Office of Management and Budget

SUBJECT: Fiscal Impact of the Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan

The Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan is very limited in size and scope. The scope of the plan results in Montgomery County being responsible for only a portion of the projects identified in the Plan's vision. Much of the Plan's recommendations for public investment are related to sidewalk and open space projects. Remaining recommendations are primarily shared by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) and private property owners.

The Plan recommends approximately three miles of pathway installation (one mile of sidewalk with street trees on the south side of MD108, one mile of shared-use path on the north side of MD108, and one-half mile of sidewalk on both sides of Brooke Road). Using a unit price derived from the MD355 sidewalk project of approximately \$3 million per mile, the estimated fiscal impact totals \$9 million. Projects are assumed to be undertaken as redevelopment occurs over the life of the Plan.

The Parks Department reported no fiscal impact as no new parks are recommended by the Plan. The recommended village green space would likely be privately owned and maintained. The Rural Legacy Trail exists within the Plan area currently, maintenance of which is not expected to increase.

The Departments of Transportation and Parks contributed to this fiscal impact statement.

JAH:jdm

cc: Timothy L. Firestine, Chief Administrative Officer
Al Roshdieh, Acting Director, Department of Transportation
Mike Riley, Director, Department of Parks
Office of the Director

101 Monroe Street, 14th Floor • Rockville, Maryland 20850 • 240-777-2800
www.montgomerycountymd.gov



DEPARTMENT OF PERMITTING SERVICES

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

Diane R. Schwartz Jones
Director

January 29, 2015

Sandy Spring Museum
Attention: Allison Weiss
17901 Bentley Road
Sandy Spring, MD 20860

RE: Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan; Sandy Spring Museum

Dear Director Weiss

This is in reply to your letter addressed to the County Council on January 21, 2015 as well as a follow up to our phone conversation on January 27, 2015.

It is our understanding from our phone conversation the museum accounts for around 12,000 square feet of occupied space and the blacksmithing and sale of those items made by the blacksmiths account for around 2,500 square feet of that 12,000 square feet. We also understand the items being sold are from the demonstrations the blacksmiths perform on site for the museum. Also you had mentioned there were other artisans onsite that would be demonstrating their processes and would be selling the items that were made onsite too in part of this 2,500 square feet of area. As long as these artisans and blacksmiths are demonstrating the processes that are associated with the museum and the items being sold are being made on site then we would look at this use as being an accessory use (Section 59-3.7.4.B) to the museum.

If you require any additional information regarding this matter, please contact me at 240-777-6321.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ehsan Motazed", written over a horizontal line.

Ehsan Motazed
Division Chief

Cc: Jeff Zyontz, Montgomery County Council
255 Rockville Pike, 2nd Floor • Rockville, Maryland 20850 • 240-777-6300 • 240-777-6256 TTY
www.montgomerycountymd.gov