



**Committee:** PHED

**Committee Review:** Completed

**Staff:** Pamela Dunn, Senior Legislative Analyst

Glenn Orlin, Senior Analyst

**Purpose:** Final action – vote expected

**Keywords:** #Shady Grove, Minor Amendment, Zoning, Transportation

AGENDA ITEM #3

April 6, 2021

**Action**

## SUBJECT

Action to approve the Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment resolution

## EXPECTED ATTENDEES

Casey Anderson, Chair, Montgomery County Planning Board

Gwen Wright, Director, Montgomery Planning Department

Carrie Sanders, Chief, Mid-County Planning, Planning Department

Jessica McVary, Master Plan Supervisor, Mid-County Planning, Planning Department

Nkosi Yearwood, Planner Coordinator, Mid-County Planning, Planning Department

## COUNCIL DECISION POINTS & COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

- Action to approve the Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment resolution

## DESCRIPTION/ISSUE

Attached is a resolution approving the Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment. The resolution is consistent with the Council discussions that took place on March 23 and the recommendations of the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee.

## SUMMARY OF KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

N/A

### **This report contains:**

Resolution to approve the Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment ©1-8

### **Pages**

**Alternative format requests for people with disabilities.** If you need assistance accessing this report you may [submit alternative format requests](#) to the ADA Compliance Manager. The ADA Compliance Manager can also be reached at 240-777-6197 (TTY 240-777-6196) or at [ada.compliance@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:ada.compliance@montgomerycountymd.gov)

Resolution No.: \_\_\_\_\_  
Introduced: \_\_\_\_\_  
Adopted: \_\_\_\_\_

1  
2  
3 **COUNTY COUNCIL FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND**  
4 **SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PORTION**  
5 **OF THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTON REGIONAL DISTRICT**  
6 **WITHIN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND**  
7

---

8  
9 By: County Council  
10

---

11 **SUBJECT:** Approval of the Fall 2020 Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment  
12

- 13  
14
- 15 1. On December 9, 2020, the Montgomery County Planning Board transmitted to the County Executive  
16 and the County Council the Fall 2020 Planning Board Draft Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master  
17 Plan Amendment.  
18
  - 19 2. The Fall 2020 Planning Board Draft Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment  
20 contains the text and supporting maps for an amendment to portions of the Approved and Adopted  
21 2006 Shady Grove Sector Plan. It also amends The General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the  
22 Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery and Prince  
23 George’s Counties, as amended; the Master Plan of Highways and Transitways, as amended; and the  
24 Bicycle Master Plan, as amended.  
25
  - 26 3. On February 23, 2021, the County Council held a virtual public hearing on the Fall 2020 Planning  
27 Board Draft Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment. The Minor Master Plan  
28 Amendment was referred to the Council’s Planning, Housing, and Economic Development  
29 Committee for review and recommendations.  
30
  - 31 4. On March 22, 2021, the Office of Management and Budget transmitted to the County Council the  
32 County Executive’s Fiscal Impact Statement for the Fall 2020 Planning Board Draft Shady Grove  
33 Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment.  
34
  - 35 5. On March 1, March 15, and March 18, 2021, the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development  
36 Committee held worksessions to review the issues raised in connection with the Planning Board  
37 Draft Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment.  
38
  - 39 6. On March 23, 2021, the County Council reviewed the Planning Board Draft Shady Grove Sector  
40 Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment and the recommendations of the Planning, Housing, and  
41 Economic Development Committee.  
42  
43

**Action**

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland, sitting as the District Council for that portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery County, Maryland, approves the following resolution:

The Planning Board Draft Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment, dated Fall 2020, is approved with revisions. County Council revisions to the Planning Board Draft Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment are identified below. Deletions to the text of the Plan are indicated by [brackets], additions by underscoring. All page references are to the Fall 2020 Planning Board Draft Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment.

Page 35: Modify the first bullet under “Land Use and Zoning” as follows:

- Rezone the WMATA/Metro property, including the surface parking lot and the Somerville property, 15901 Somerville Drive, from the CR 1.75 C0.5 R1.5 H-160T/TDR 1.77 Zone to the [CR 2.0 C1.0 R1.5] CR-2.25 C-1.0 R-1.75 H-200 Zone to promote high-intensity mixed-use development at the Metro station that contributes to the Sector Plan’s public benefits, including the maximum percentage of affordable housing and a minimum one-acre Civic Green for the WMATA property (Map 14).

Page 37: Update Map 14: Metro West Proposed Zoning to reflect the Council’s recommended zoning changes.

Page 39: Modify the first bullet under “Land Use and Zoning” as follows:

- Rezone the vacant Somerville property (Parcel N313) at Redland Road and Somerville Drive from the CRT1.75 C0.5 R1.5 H-90T/TDR 1.77 Zone to the [CR 2.0 C0.5 R1.5] CR-2.25 C-0.5 R-1.75 H-120 Zone to promote the Sector Plan-recommended public benefits, including the maximum percentage of affordable housing and open space (Map 17).

Page 39: Update Map 17: Metro South Proposed Zoning to reflect the Council’s recommended zoning changes.

Page 41: Modify the first bullet under “Vehicle Emissions Inspection Program” as follows:

- [Relocate] Encourage the relocation of the VEIP inspection station to another location that is compatible to its existing light industrial use.

Page 42: Update Map 20: Old Derwood Proposed Zoning to reflect the Council’s recommended zoning changes.

Page 43: Modify the first paragraph under “The Derwood Store and Post Office” as follows:

The Derwood Store and Post Office reflects one of the last vestiges of Derwood’s history. During the creation of the 2006 Sector Plan, the Planning Board placed the property on the Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites (#22/33-3). In May 2019, the Historic Preservation [Committee] Commission (HPC) recommended the designation of this property to the Master Plan for Historic

92 Preservation and supported rezoning the property to an appropriate residential zoning category to  
93 allow for its adaptive reuse and restoration.  
94

95 Page 43: Modify the first bullet under “The Derwood Store and Post Office” as follows:  
96

- 97 ▪ Rezone this property from the R-200 Zone to the Commercial Residential [Neighborhood] Town  
98 Zone [(CRN1.0 C0.0 R1.0 H-50)] (CRT-1.0 C-0.25 R-1.0 H-50) to permit the building’s historic  
99 adaptive reuse, renovation and some additional residential development with a minimal amount  
100 of commercial density to fulfill the requirements of the Optional Method of Development of the  
101 CRT zone. Non-residential uses should provide neighborhood-serving uses or amenities, similar  
102 to the original Derwood Store, and should be integrated with residential development.  
103

104 Page 52: Modify the third bullet under “Shady Grove Crossing” as follows:  
105

- 106 ▪ [Develop] Consider developing a local park with active recreation or installing renewable energy  
107 generation such as a solar array, or co-locating these uses, if compatible, on the vacant Parks  
108 Department property.  
109

110 Page 57: Modify the fourth bullet under “The Sector Plan recommends” as follows:  
111

- 112 ▪ Rezone the King Buick and Mitsubishi property, 16200 Frederick Road, from GR 1.5 H-45 Zone  
113 to CRT-1.5 [C0.5 R1.0] C-0.5 R-1.5 H-80 Zone.  
114

115 Page 57: Update Map 30: Shady Grove Plaza Proposed Zoning to reflect the Council’s recommended  
116 zoning changes.  
117

118 Page 64: Modify the first and second bullets under “Crabbs Branch Office Park” as follows:  
119

- 120 ▪ Rezone the office property at 7361 Calhoun Place from the IM 2.5 H-50 Zone to the CRT-2.5  
121 C-2.0 R-0.5 H-80 Zone to permit a conforming building (Map 37).  
122
- 123 ▪ Rezone the office buildings at 7500 Standish Place, 7362 Calhoun Place and 15400 Calhoun  
124 Drive from the IM 2.5 H-50 Zone to the [EOF] IM-2.5 H-70 Zone.  
125

126 Page 65: Update Map 37: Crabbs Branch Office Park Proposed Zoning to reflect the corrections on page  
127 64.  
128

129 Page 69: Modify the second bullet under “Recommendations” as follows:  
130

- 131 ▪ Publicly-owned properties, including WMATA, should be encouraged to provide up to 25  
132 percent [of] MPDUs; however, a minimum of 15 percent MPDUs is required of residential  
133 development on a publicly-owned property.  
134

135 Page 69: Add a new third bullet under “Recommendations” as follows:  
136

- 137 ▪ Any optional method development with residential uses on a County-owned property is  
138 encouraged to provide a minimum of 30 percent of the units as regulated affordable units. At a  
139 minimum, 15 percent of the residential units must be affordable to households earning at the

140 standard MPDU level of 65-70 percent or less of Area Median Income (AMI) affordability range  
 141 and 15 percent affordable to households earning less than 50 percent of AMI.  
 142

143 Page 75: Add a new sentence at the end of the first bullet under “Goal: Prioritize acquisition,  
 144 development, and programming for new parks.” as follows:  
 145

- 146 ▪ Implement the acquired parkland at the Derwood Station and Shady Grove Crossing/Piedmont  
 147 Crossing properties into a neighborhood park and local park, respectively, with a variety of  
 148 recreational opportunities. The Shady Grove Crossing/Piedmont Crossing park should also be  
 149 considered for the inclusion of renewal energy generation resources, if feasible.  
 150

151 Page 77: Add new language to the first bullet under “Goal: Create a robust trail system of natural and  
 152 hard-surface trails” as follows:  
 153

- 154 ▪ Explore opportunities to provide trail connections between the Rock Creek Regional Park trail  
 155 system [to] and the Sector Plan area and, where possible, explore opportunities to connect trails  
 156 in the Sector Plan area with trails in the Cities of Rockville and Gaithersburg and the Town of  
 157 Washington Grove.  
 158

159 Page 109: Add the following paragraph after the second paragraph under “Shady Grove Road” as  
 160 follows:  
 161

162 Certain operational improvements may mitigate future congestion at the Shady Grove Road/MD 355  
 163 intersection, such as removing split signal timing, converting the eastbound lane configuration to  
 164 two exclusive left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and two exclusive right-turn lanes, and converting  
 165 the westbound lane configuration to two exclusive left-turn lanes, four through lanes, and one  
 166 exclusive right-turn lane.  
 167

168 Page 115: Delete the “Mid County Highway” section as follows:  
 169

170 [Mid County Highway (M-83) serves as the northern boundary of the Sector Plan. It is classified as  
 171 a major highway (M-83) with a minimum 150-foot right-of-way. Most of the existing road within  
 172 the Plan area does not have any sidewalks and it terminates at Shady Grove Road. The area between  
 173 Shady Grove Road and Redland Road is undeveloped and a wooded publicly owned right-of-way.  
 174

175 Prior plans, including the 2006 Sector Plan and the 2004 Upper Rock Creek Master Plan illustrate  
 176 this Roadway extending to Redland Road and the Intercounty Connector (MD 200). The construction  
 177 of MD 200 did not implement any access ramps to the extension of Mid County Highway.  
 178

179 The County Council in 2017, via Resolution No. 18-957, directed the Planning Board “not to assume  
 180 additional road capacity from the northern extension of Mid County Highway when calculating the  
 181 land use-transportation balance in future master plans, including but not limited to the upcoming  
 182 Gaithersburg East Master Plan and the Germantown Plan for the Town Sector Zone. This step  
 183 ensures that any new development allowed under these plans will not rely on the northern extension  
 184 of Mid County Highway, while retaining the right-of-way for this extension in these plans.”  
 185

186 The extension of Mid County Highway to Redland Road and the Intercounty Connector (MD 200)  
 187 is challenging, as the extension would disturb existing natural resources including forests and

188 streams. In addition, the extension of Mid County Highway to the Intercounty Connector (MD200)  
 189 would require an interchange that could possibly necessitate property takings from single-family lots.  
 190

191 This Sector Plan recommends the continued pursuit of high-quality transit service to improve  
 192 accessibility to the Plan area and other communities in the Mid-County area. In addition, this Sector  
 193 Plan supports the use of the existing public right-of-way as a trail that links Mill Creek Towne Local  
 194 Park with Redland Local Park.  
 195

196 This Plan neither endorses the removal of the extension segment from the Master Plan of Highways  
 197 and Transitways, nor supports its maintenance as no assessment of its drawbacks and merits was  
 198 undertaken during the planning process, per Council’s resolution 18-957. Because the segment  
 199 impacts mobility beyond the Plan area, this Sector Plan is not the appropriate place for a decision on  
 200 this segment as an appropriate outreach forum beyond the Sector Plan Area was not established  
 201 during this planning effort.]  
 202

203 Page 118: Revise Table 2: Roadway Classifications as follows:  
 204

205 Under Major Highways, change the eastern terminus of Mid County Highway within the Plan area  
 206 from Shady Grove Road to Redland Road by replacing the reference to Shady Grove Road on Row 7,  
 207 Column 3 to Redland Road.  
 208

209 Page 123: Revise Map 51: Proposed Metro Neighborhood Streets as follows:  
 210

211 Show Columbus Avenue Extended (B-7) connecting to Redland Road directly across from  
 212 Yellowstone Drive, and show the future Public/Private/Linear Open Space alignments between  
 213 Redland Road and the Metro Station to be more evenly spaced within the superblock.  
 214

215 Page 127: Revise Map 52: Pedestrian Network to show existing and proposed sidewalks along Oakmont  
 216 Avenue.  
 217

218 Page 130: Update Map 53: Existing and Proposed Bikeway Network as follows:  
 219

220 Show the existing sidepath on Crabbs Branch Way between the access road overpass and Redland  
 221 Road, and remove the proposed sidepath on Needwood Road between Redland Road and Blueberry  
 222 Hill Park.  
 223

224 Page 131: Update Table 3: Existing and Proposed Bikeway Network as follows:  
 225

226 Change the Bikeway Type for Redland Road under the Intercounty Connector Trail Breezeway to  
 227 “sidepath”.  
 228

229 Page 131: Update Table 4: Amendments to the 2018 Bicycle Master Plan as follows:  
 230

231 In Row 2, change the Redland Road limits to be From “Needwood Road (Northern Access)”, To  
 232 “Muncaster Mill Road”, and change the Bikeway Type to “Bikeable Shoulders”.  
 233

234 Page 132: Revised the fourth and fifth bullets under “Transportation Demand Management” as follows:  
235

- 236     ▪ [Increase the existing NADMS goal for employees commuting into the Plan area who reside  
237 elsewhere from 12.5 percent to 15 percent during the peak period.] Support a 20 percent NADMS  
238 goal for employees working in the Metro Station Policy Area for all peak hour home-based work  
239 trips (commute trips).
- 240     ▪ Support a [35] blended 39 percent NADMS goal for residents and employees living in the  
241 portions of the Sector Plan Area, exclusive of the Metro Station Policy area, for all peak-hour  
242 home-based work trips (commute trips).

243  
244 Page 134: Delete the last paragraph under “Transportation Standards” as follows:  
245

246 [This Sector Plan recommends a higher HCM standard, up to 100 seconds/vehicle, for the MD 355  
247 and Gude Drive intersection since it is part of a larger corridor where new BRT infrastructure and  
248 additional intense development are planned. This HCM recommendation acknowledges that both the  
249 City of Rockville and Derwood policy areas have lower HCM standards, but this intersection is  
250 approximately less than a half-of-a mile from the higher Shady Grove MSPA and is located along a  
251 proposed BRT corridor.]  
252

253 Page 137: Delete the five paragraphs and two bullets under “INTERCHANGES” as follows:  
254

255 [Interchanges are not the correct solution for corridors with closely spaced signalized intersections  
256 as they push congestion more quickly up and downstream, creating new traffic issues elsewhere.  
257

258 The 2006 Sector Plan identified three recommended interchanges within the Sector Plan area,  
259 including at MD 355 and Gude Drive. The interchange at MD 200 and I-370 has been since  
260 constructed as a component of the Intercounty Connector project.  
261

262 This Plan recommends raising the congestion threshold at the intersection to 100 seconds of delay  
263 per vehicle to allow for more modest, lower-cost improvements to be implemented as necessary  
264 based on findings commensurate with new development per the county’s subdivision staging policy.  
265

266 Operational acceptability as defined by the 2016 SSP, can be achieved at an 100 second/vehicle delay  
267 threshold in both the morning and evening periods in the forecast year with the addition of eastbound  
268 and westbound free right turns, receiving lanes for the turns on MD 355, and the conversion of the  
269 existing southbound right turn into a shared-through right lane.  
270

271 Because of the safety impacts related to free-right operations, this Sector Plan recommends analyzing  
272 the benefits of any improvement against safety costs, privileging safety over capacity when faced  
273 with potential trade-offs. This Sector Plan recommends:  
274

- 275     • Remove the recommended interchange at MD 355 and Gude Drive in favor of using limited  
276 county funds on improvements that support safety, multimodal choice, and throughput.
- 277     • Amend the congestion standard for this intersection to be no less than 100 seconds of delay per  
278 vehicle to have a more consistent transportation policy approach for the MD 355 corridor.]  
279

280 Page 137: Add the following new paragraphs and bullets after the fourth paragraph under “MD 355 and  
281 Gude Drive” as follows:

282

283 The intersection of MD 355 and Gude Drive is problematic for all users and is noted for significant  
284 traffic congestion affecting the surrounding area. Changes to the infrastructure and its operations are  
285 necessary to address the needs of current transit operations, planned Bus Rapid Transit, pedestrians  
286 and bicyclists, and drivers of motor vehicles.

287

288 This Sector Plan Amendment considered several alternatives at this location and identified that an  
289 overpass of MD 355 for through traffic on Gude Drive appears feasible and allows the intersection  
290 to meet the applicable congestion standard in the 2020-2024 Growth and Infrastructure Policy.  
291 However, significant concerns remain about the desirability, engineering feasibility and cost of such  
292 an interchange. Building upon the alternatives analysis in this Sector Plan, the further development  
293 of the following strategies is recommended at this location:

294

295 • Implementation of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and other operational adjustments to  
296 improve intersection performance, reduce conflicts with pedestrians and bicyclists and prioritize  
297 transit operations.

298 • Further evaluation of changes to the intersection configuration to improve multimodal safety and  
299 traffic operations while also maintaining or improving the multimodal performance of the  
300 intersection.

301 • If these first strategies do not result in achieving the then-current standards in the Growth and  
302 Infrastructure Policy, construction of a major modification to improve vehicular capacity should  
303 be implemented. Modification of this intersection, whether at-grade or by overpass, should  
304 include all reasonable measures to improve multimodal mobility, including comfortable  
305 sidewalks, low stress bikeways, and Bus Rapid Transit facilities.

306 • The construction of this major modification must not be prioritized for county funding over the  
307 construction of Bus Rapid Transit on MD 355 in the Plan area and its vicinity, and it must be  
308 constructed in a way that would not inhibit pedestrian, bicycle, and transit accessibility.

309

310 Page 140: Delete the fourth paragraph under “ZONING” as follows:

311

312 [Office properties in the Crabbs Branch Office Park were rezoned from Light Industrial (I-1) to  
313 Industrial Moderate (IM). The I-1 Zone permitted a broad range of office uses, as well as light  
314 industrial uses. This Sector Plan recommends rezoning eight office properties in the office park to  
315 the Employment Office (EOF) Zone since this zone better aligns better with existing office uses and  
316 addresses non-conforming building heights.]

317

318 Page 141: Update Map 56: Proposed Zoning to reflect Council’s recommended zoning changes.

319

320 Page 143: Delete the first sentence in the third paragraph under “STAGING OF DEVELOPMENT” as  
321 follows:

322

323 [This Plan recommends adjusting the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) standard for the Frederick  
324 Road (MD 355) corridor, including at MD 355 and Gude Drive, which would promote an acceptable  
325 service level for the MD 355 corridor.] Continuing the 2006 Sector Plan’s staging framework would  
326 preclude new development opportunities in the Metro Station Policy Area where existing mobility  
327 and infrastructure exists. In addition, the transportation improvements that were tied to the 2006



328 Sector Plan staging do not prioritize transit, are contrary to the County’s Vision Zero commitment,  
329 and could negatively impact accessibility to future BRT along MD 355. Finally, the long-range  
330 forecast for this Plan indicates the 2006 Sector Plan’s partial interchange recommendation from  
331 Crabbs Branch Way to the Metro Access Road is no longer necessary to achieve appropriate  
332 transportation and land-use balance.  
333

334 **General**

337 All illustrations and tables included in the Plan will be revised to reflect the District Council changes to  
338 the Planning Board Draft Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment (Fall 2020). The text  
339 and graphics will be revised as necessary to achieve and improve clarity and consistency, to update  
340 factual information, and to convey the actions of the District Council. Graphics and tables will be revised  
341 and re-numbered, where necessary, to be consistent with the text and titles.  
342

343  
344 This is a correct copy of Council action.  
345

346  
347  
348 \_\_\_\_\_  
349 Selena Mendy Singleton  
Clerk of the Council

**M E M O R A N D U M**

April 2, 2021

TO: County Council

FROM: Glenn Orlin, Senior Analyst

SUBJECT: Shady Grove Sector Plan Minor Master Plan Amendment

PURPOSE: **Addendum**—additions to the adoption resolution

After reviewing the resolution there are three more changes that should be included:

1. The first paragraph on page 134 notes the congestion delay standards within the planning area. However, the text was not revised in the Final Draft to reflect the Planning Board’s recommendation and the Council’s decision in the Growth & Infrastructure Policy that there is no longer a congestion standard within the Metro Station Policy Area. The following should be inserted in the resolution:

**Page 134: Revise the first bullet in the first paragraph, as follows:**

- **The Shady Grove Metro Station Policy Area (MSPA), which includes all the Metro Neighborhoods, has [an HCM standard of 120 seconds/vehicle] no congestion delay standard.**

2. The last paragraph on page 134 includes language similar to that found on page 137 of the Final Draft, which recommended against the Gude Drive/MD 355 interchange. However, the PHED Committee and Council replaced the text on page 137 with what is shown on Lines 253-308 of the adoption resolution, and so the text on page 134 should be consistent with that. The following should be inserted in the resolution:

**Page 134: Revise the last paragraph, as follows:**

**[As such, this Plan does not recommend the Gude and MD 355 interchange – which represents roughly 9.2 percent of the cost of the entire “B Modified” alternative for the proposed MD 355 Bus Rapid Transitway. Nor does t]This Plan does not recommend the Crabbs Branch Way and Metro Access Road [P]partial interchange as the costs do not align with projected benefits. Alternatively, the Plan recommends:**

- **Strong support and advancement of the MD 355 Bus Rapid Transitway and the Corridor Cities Transitway projects; and**

- **Support for further exploration of an additional MARC Rail Station proximate to the Shady Grove Metrorail Station and an infill Metrorail station proximate to Montgomery College.**

3. Map 55 on page 135 displays the congestion standards described in the first paragraph on page 134. The map's key, however, repeats the now-outdated standard for the Metro Station Policy Area. Also, the map should note the potentially changed status for the King Buick and adjacent parcel reflected in the GIP. The following should be inserted in the resolution:

**Page 135: Revise the key for Map 55 to note that there is no congestion delay standard for the Red Area. Add the following note at the bottom of Map 55:**

**Upon annexation of the 10-acre King Buick property by the City of Rockville, that property and the adjacent 10-acre property within the City will be excised from the Shady Grove Metro Station Policy Area and the Rockville City Policy Area, respectively, and become part of the Rockville Town Center Policy Area.**

f:\orlin\fy21\phed\shady grove plan\210406cc-add.doc