



## Long Branch Sector Plan, Worksession 2

---

Melissa Williams, Senior Planner, Area 1, [Melissa.williams@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Melissa.williams@montgomeryplanning.org), 301-495-4642

Valdis Lazdins, Planning Chief, Area 1, [valdis.lazdins@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:valdis.lazdins@montgomeryplanning.org), 301.495.4506

John Marcolin Planner Coordinator, Urban Design, Area 1, 301.495.4547

Tom Autrey, Supervisor, Transportation, Functional Planning & Policy, 301.495.4533

David Anspacher, Senior Planner, Transportation, Functional Planning & Policy, 301.495.2191

Tina Schneider, Senior Planner, Environment, Area 1, 301.495.4506

Clare Lise Kelly, Research and Designation Coordinator, Historic Preservation, 301.563.3402

Charles Kines Park Planner, Parks Department, 301.495-2184

Completed: 02.21.13

---

### Description

A number of issues were left unresolved following the February 21<sup>st</sup> worksession. As such, Staff proposes revisions to the agenda for the March 7<sup>th</sup> to address them:

- City of Takoma Park Resolution #2013-6
- Phasing
- Arliss Street
- Historic Preservation
- Long Branch Town Center Area
- Piney Branch Neighborhood Village

### Board Decisions

- Approve changes to the recommended phasing
- Approve the Plan strategy to address the impacts of the Purple Line along Arliss Street:
  - Arliss Street cross-section (ultimate right-of-way)
  - Zoning recommendations for Arliss Street townhomes (Site #7)
  - Private street network within the Super Block
- Historic Preservation of the Flower Theater and Shopping Center
- Approve recommendations for the development of the Long Branch Town Center area and the Piney Branch Neighborhood Village

## City of Takoma Park Resolution #2013-6

The City of Takoma Park submitted a list of technical corrections to the Long Branch Sector Plan. These corrections included, but were not limited to errors, omissions and changes to the language that addressed the City's Flower Avenue Green Street Project.

### Staff Response

Staff has reviewed and supports the proposed technical corrections listed in the City of Takoma Park Resolution #2013-6.

## Phasing

After considering comments by the City of Takoma Park and the Housing Opportunities Commission's requests for changes in phasing, the Board expressed concerns that the current approach may limit development potential in an area that needs revitalization. The Board agreed with Staff's recommendations to move sites #3 and #4 into the Interim Development phase, but further asked Staff to draft language that would allow the development of sites in the Long Term phase before the full funding of the Purple Line is in place.

### Staff Response

The original recommendation can be found on page 39 - "Commercial properties will be rezoned to an appropriate CRT Zone and will be phased through two Sectional Map Amendments to minimize residential displacement and the loss of affordable housing, to leverage public investments and to encourage infill development with a maximum 3.0 FAR and heights ranging from 36 to 60 feet"

Staff proposes the following addition:

*"As retaining affordability remains a primary Plan goal, sites that are designated for the Long Term phase can be developed during the Interim Development phase as long as a minimum 20% MPDUs are provided and development is consistent with the Plan's ultimate vision."*

## Arliss Street

Staff presented the Plan strategy which addressed the physical impacts of the Purple Line on Arliss Street and nearby properties. The Plan offered the following land use, zoning and mobility recommendations:

- Rezone the Arliss Street townhome site to allow higher density, mixed land uses that better address significant right-of-way changes and that also provide an appropriate transition between the adjacent single family homes and the proposed Long Branch Town Center.
- Introduce a private street network that interconnects the Super Block and adjacent properties and addresses the loss of left turns along Arliss Street.
- Provide an attractive pedestrian-friendly street cross section that includes street furniture, wider sidewalks and bike lanes.
- Reduce the visual impact of the tunnel portal, which will be addressed in greater detail in the urban design guidelines.

### Staff Response

The Board has received testimony about the potential impacts associated with redeveloping the Arliss Street townhome site on adjacent single family properties (site #7).

Staff has acknowledged those concerns and proposes the following to address transitions and compatibility:

- Maintain the existing vegetated buffer on Site #7 to provide an appropriate transition between new development and existing single family homes along Plymouth Avenue.
- Maintain a maximum 40 foot building height along the rear property line of site #7 to allow an appropriate transition to adjacent single family homes.

Staff believes these recommendations will help mitigate the impacts of new development on the existing single family community.

Staff further proposes that the inconsistencies in the Arliss Street cross-section and impacts to the Super Block be addressed comprehensively during a discussion of other Purple Line and transportation related issues at the March 21<sup>st</sup> worksession.

### **HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION: Flower Theater and Shopping Center**

Board decisions:

- Whether the Shopping Center and/or Theater meet the criteria for historic designation established in section 24A of the County Code.
- Whether it is in the public's interest to designate this resource, balancing historic preservation with other public benefits.
- Whether the resource – or some portion – merits listing on the Locational Atlas and/or designation on the *Master Plan for Historic Preservation*.
- Whether specific guidelines should be adopted to guide alterations to and redevelopment of the resource, if designated.
- What defines an appropriate environmental setting?

At the February 21<sup>st</sup> worksession, issues were raised by the owner's representatives and by the Board on a variety of topics, including the following:

### Criteria for designation

**Issue:** Whether the Flower Shopping Center is a common and unremarkable example of a shopping center. The Park and Shop concept was introduced in the 1930s and was nearly two decades old by the time the Flower complex was built.

### Staff Response

The Maryland Historical Trust has found that the Flower Theater and Shopping Center meets the criteria for National Register listing. No claims have been made that Flower Shopping Center is the first of its

kind. It was designed only one decade after Silver Theater and Shopping Center. The continuity of shopping centers was interrupted in large part due to the intervening war, when retail development largely ceased. As detailed in staff's research report, the Flower complex represents both a continuation of earlier Shannon & Luchs Park and Shops conventions, as well as innovations. These include the introduction of supermarkets in the shopping center, involvement of a nationally known architect, and use of modern architecture design.

**Issue:** The Flower Shopping Center was built in stages over time and therefore does not merit designation.

#### Staff Response

The owner's consultant's 2010 report to the HPC (Attachment B, owner submission, 1-31-2013) suggested that because the complex was built over time, it did not merit designation. Staff conducted additional research in 2011 (Attachment to staff report, Feb 21<sup>st</sup> worksession), which establishes that the complex was envisioned as a single piece, realized in two development phases (1950, 1954) consistent with Shannon & Luchs' practice of building once tenants were identified. As shown in the 1948 architect's rendering and the 1949 site plan, the Flower Shopping Center was designed and planned as a single complex, but executed over a four year period. The State Preservation Office (MHT) reviewed staff's final research report prior to making its finding of eligibility.

**Issue:** Not all projects designed by recognized master architects qualify for historic designation. The architects of the Flower Shopping Center never referenced any awards or make mention of this project in their listings of work. Even many Frank Lloyd Wright projects do not merit designation.

#### Staff Response

The Robert Llewellyn Wright House in Bethesda, which Frank Lloyd Wright designed for his son, is not widely viewed as among Wright's most prominent national commissions, yet it is the only Frank Lloyd Wright House in Montgomery County and it is designated on the Master Plan for Historic Preservation and listed in the National Register. John J. Zink, who designed the Flower Theater and created the site plan for the Flower Shopping Center, is cited as a master architect in the recommended criteria. Of the 45 known theaters that Zink designed, the Flower Theater is one of only two – ***and the only extant Zink Theater*** -- in Montgomery County. The Maryland Historical Trust has found that the shopping center and theater are eligible for listing in the National Register.

**Issue:** Peter Blake, in *God's Own Junkyard* (1964), says that shopping centers are not necessarily something we need to designate.

#### Staff Response

The owner's consultant provided a 1964 quote from Blake, an architect, Catholic University professor and dean, and author. Blake questioned the value of shopping centers as cultural artifacts, arguing that symbols of suburbia are not necessarily something he wished to commemorate. In the intervening 50 years, serious architectural historians have found that shopping centers are worthy of study, and key ones are worthy of preservation. In the last two decades, shopping centers across the country have

been listed on the National Register of Historic Places and designated locally. In Montgomery County, the Silver Shopping Center and Theater, constructed a decade earlier than the Flower complex, is designated in the Master Plan for Historic Preservation. Although not every shopping center is worthy of preservation, the Flower Shopping Center is a rare extant shopping center from 1948 that has been found eligible for both the National Register and Master Plan for Historic Preservation.

**Issue:** The County made it a priority to change the façade of the shopping center. Going back to the original would be a step backward.

#### Staff Response

The shopping center was the subject of a street improvement project starting in 1978. The project included new signage for the shopping center, reflecting a design ethic and business improvement model of the late 70s. Restoration of the shopping center with the benefit of historic photos would bring the complex back to its original character. This history-based treatment, an aspect of one of the four principals of the widely successful National Trust for Historic Preservation Main Street program, has been used effectively in numerous jurisdictions to spur economic development and commercial revitalization.

**Issue:** The storefronts of Whelan Drug Store (current liquor store) and historic Giant store have been altered, including replacement windows--thus key components of the complex have been compromised.

#### Staff Response

Nearly all historic resources have had some type of change over time. This is especially true of commercial properties. Many storefronts in the Silver Theater and Shopping Center had been altered before the resource was designated and rehabilitated. Moreover, key features of the theater had been demolished, notably the vertical Silver marquee, and a stepped chimney on the theater auditorium. Yet the complex was still designated a historic site and successfully rehabilitated, enabling it to contribute to the economy and sense of place of downtown Silver Spring. Although elements of the Flower Shopping Center have been altered, the resource retains sufficient integrity for the Maryland Historical Trust to find the complex to be National Register-eligible. Moreover, ample archival materials exist to implement a rehabilitation that would be compatible with historic preservation standards.

**Issue:** There's a presumption of reversibility. We don't know the original material is in place.

#### Staff Response

There is no evidence that the majority of original building materials are **not** in place. In fact, a considerable amount of historic building fabric was evident when HPC Staff conducted multiple site visits. We have no reason to believe that the original limestone facing, for example, was removed. This process would have required considerable expense compared to covering it with new signage. Contemporary news coverage of the shopping center signage project gives no indication that the original material was replaced. Where original fabric is missing, preservation standards allow for suitable replacement.

**Issue:** Designate only the façade and “shoulders” of the Flower Theater. The theater façade provides visual interest to the community and its preservation would ensure that theater remains focal point of the site.

Staff Response

The Maryland Historical Trust has found that the entire shopping center is National Register eligible. Preservation of only the theater façade and “shoulders” would jeopardize the resource’s National Register eligibility, because designation of the façade of a portion of a resource is generally not considered to be consistent with preservation best practice. In order to qualify for state rehabilitation tax credits, a locally designated historic resource must also be determined National Register-eligible; in order to qualify for federal rehabilitation tax credits, a resource must be listed in the National Register. Staff and the Historic Preservation Commission have found the entire complex to be eligible for designation. It is representative of a modern design Park and Shop building type, which represents commercial efforts to promote a modern image for its day, recognizing that the complex may be integrated into a redevelopment project.

Public Benefit

**Issue:** The priority of Long Branch is revitalization and the preservation of the Flower Shopping Center is at odds with this goal.

Staff Response

The Master Plan for Historic Preservation charges the Planning Board with balancing historic preservation with other public interests. In addition to protecting the inherent cultural value of this historic resource, the preservation of the Flower Shopping Center would accomplish the additional public benefits of enhancing the sense of place in Long Branch. The Flower Theater and Shopping Center provides a place-making quality to Long Branch area, which is irreplaceable. In 1985, owners of the Silver Theater and Shopping Center testified to the Planning Board that “neither of the existing structures can be saved, for architectural, functional and economic reasons.” As we know now, this complex became the centerpiece of redevelopment and today the historic resource provides a vital sense of place to downtown Silver Spring. By pursuing the joint preservation and sensitive redevelopment strategy proposed by staff and the Historic Preservation Commission, the Flower Shopping Center and Theater could play a similar role in the Long Branch Town Center area as contemplated in the sector plan.

**Issue:** Strict preservation would only allow .75 FAR on the property, which is too limited to realistically allow redevelopment.

Staff Response

A strict preservation strategy would not allow any new construction on the property. Staff and the Historic Preservation Commission propose a compromise in the form of Design Guidelines, which recognize the owner’s intent to redevelop the property. Guidelines would guide new construction so it

is in keeping with the historic resource, while allowing the height and density recommendations proposed in the sector plan.

#### Locational Atlas and Master Plan status

**Issue:** Designation on the Master Plan for Historic Preservation gives the Historic Preservation Commission authority to balance historic preservation with redevelopment benefits. This diminishes the Planning Board's ability to more holistically evaluate the public interest.

#### Staff Response

The Sector Plan process gives the Planning Board the ability to balance public benefits now. The Planning Board can create language to guide development in the form of design guidelines. The HPC's review would be based on the design parameters included in the designation amendment.

Adding a resource to the Locational Atlas means that the property will be protected only under one specific provision of the Historic Preservation Ordinance – the Moratorium on Demolition and Alteration (Chapter 24A-10 of the County Code). Buildings on the Atlas are not subject to the other provisions of the Ordinance. In some cases, resources have been placed on the Atlas until sufficient research has been conducted in order to fully evaluate them for Master Plan for Historic Preservation designation. This was the case with several properties in the Silver Spring CBD, including the Silver Spring Fire Station and the Dry Cleaners Institute Building, which were identified in a comprehensive survey of historic resources. Both of these resources have been subsequently redeveloped, while remaining on the Locational Atlas.

In other cases, resources have been placed on the Atlas rather than designating them on the Master Plan for Historic Preservation, even when sufficient research has been conducted for a Master Plan evaluation. This was the case for Canada Dry in 2001. Even though HPC and HP staff recommended the resource for Master Plan designation, the Board opted to place the resource on the Locational Atlas. Placement on the Atlas highlighted that the resource has historic or architectural significance. It further serves as a way to alert potential developers that incorporation of the building into redevelopment plans is desirable.

When a resource is designated on the Master Plan for Historic Preservation it receives the full protection and benefits of preservation. Changes to the exterior of the resource must be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission through the Historic Area Work Permit process. The property owner may also benefit from local and state tax incentives. The designation may include design guidelines to guide redevelopment. This was the case with the Silver Theater and Shopping Center, which identified significant architectural features to be preserved, features which had been removed and were priorities to replace, and specified areas suitable for new construction. In addition, the Planning Board retains its review authority for development applications submitted for properties listed on the Master Plan for Historic Preservation.

#### Environmental Setting

**Issue:** Designation of the entire parcel including the north parking lot is expansive and unwarranted.

## Staff Response

Designating the entire parcel as the environmental setting is in accordance with guidelines established in the Master Plan for Historic Preservation and with the established practices of the HPC and the Board since the Master Plan was adopted in 1979. The Historic Preservation Ordinance defines Environmental Setting as “the entire parcel and structures thereon, on which is located a historic resource, unless reduced by the District Council or commission, and to which it relates physically and/or visually.” The definition goes on to say that driveways and other appurtenances shall be included.

### **Long Branch Town Center Area**

The Long Branch Town Center area includes all of the commercially zoned properties and identified residential properties east of the Long Branch Stream Valley Park. The Super Block (Long Branch Town Center) represents one of the largest developable sites within the Town Center area and serves as the focal point for Long Branch. The Town Center (aka Super Block) is comprised of six individually owned parcels and acts as the economic engine and the primary destination within the Plan area. It has a strong regional reputation due to its concentration of small businesses including a large number of culturally diverse shops and eateries, which also provide a considerable number of local jobs.

Equally important is the site’s proximity to a number of public facilities (i.e. Long Branch Library, Community Center and Swimming Pool), densely populated garden apartment complexes and a planned Purple Line station. The Sector Plan seeks to enhance the capacity of the Town Center by increasing density, introducing mixed use development, and defining its focus as the center of the Long Branch Community.

#### Long Branch Town Center

8701, 8800, 8805-8809 Flower Avenue

8528 and 8550 Piney Branch Road

8750 Arliss Street

Size: 431, 010 square feet

Existing Zoning: C-1 and CROZ Existing Height: varied 18-45 feet

The Sector Plan recommends the following:

Zoning: CRT – 2.5, C .5, R 2.0, H 60

Additional recommendations include the conveyance of up to one-half acre of land to the Parks Department for the creation of a Civic Green. This would provide much needed urban open space within the Long Branch Town Center area.

#### **Testimony:**

During the Public Hearing, general testimony was received regarding the utilization of the CRT Zones, rather than the less intensive CRN Zones. While residents primarily raised the issues of compatibility and appropriate transitions, property owners and developers expressed concerns that the proposed densities and maximum building heights were insufficient for many of the sites to reach full development potential.



### Staff Response

Staff believes that the proposed CRT Zones are appropriate for the Long Branch Town Center as the majority of the properties are currently zoned C-1, with a CROZ overlay allowing a mix of uses. Additionally, a Purple Line station is planned for the area, which benefits from and supports the Plan's mixed use development recommendations. Development of the Super Block and other properties located in the area is best suited for the CRT Zones since they accommodate buffers and transitions to protect existing single-family neighborhoods from potential impacts. These transitions and buffers will be described further in the urban design guidelines.

### *WRIT*

The largest of the property owners is the *Washington Real Estate Investment Trust* (WRIT) and it owns the 5.4 acre site located on the Super Block, in close proximity to the planned Purple Line Station. This property is home to the Giant Grocery Store and a number local serving retail and commercial services.

Representatives of WRIT testified that the Sector Plan's recommendation of 2.5 FAR is not achievable due to the following limiting factors:

- Maximum 60 foot height
- Loss of land along Arliss Road due to an expanded Purple Line and ROW
- proposed public benefits and amenities (including structured parking and the Civic Green)

WRIT has proposed a maximum height of 150 feet, with a transition to 60 feet along Arliss Road. Additionally, property owners recommend that the proposed private street be relocated so that it does not bifurcate the property. According to WRIT, the street as currently proposed, further reduces developable area.

### Staff Response

Due to time constraints, Staff was unable to discuss this issue during the February 21<sup>st</sup> worksession. However, there have been additional conversations with property owners, including a meeting where Staff presented and discussed revised recommendations. The property owners have requested additional time to review the most recent Staff recommendations and to respond to the Purple Line briefing, scheduled for February 28<sup>th</sup>. Staff supports their request and asks that the discussion of the WRIT property be moved to the March 21<sup>st</sup> worksession. This will include a comprehensive discussion of the Arliss Street cross-section, which is a contributing factor to this issue as presented by the property owner.

### *Flower Theater and Shopping Center*

The owners of the Flower Avenue Theater and Shopping Center (*Flower Avenue Shopping Center Limited Partnership*) testified that while they support the Plan's goal of reinvestment they disagree with the Historic Preservation Commission recommendation to designate the Flower Theater and Shopping Center as a historic resource. Additionally, the owners testified that the recommended 2.5 FAR is not achievable due to other Sector Plan recommendations (i.e. structured parking, LEED Gold certification,

and increased MPDU requirements). According to their testimony, the reduced FAR and limited mix of uses will not offer a reasonable return on investment and would likely discourage reinvestment.

#### Staff Response

Staff is revising the Plan's zoning recommendations in order to accommodate densities and building heights that could better incentivize retaining the Flower Theater and Shopping Center (see Historic Preservation discussion). Additionally, Staff is preparing language for the design guidelines to address place-making and potential redevelopment of the site. Staff anticipates meeting again with property owners prior to the worksession to discuss design guidelines and proposed revisions.

#### *Housing Opportunities Commission*

The Housing Opportunities Commission provides a number of affordable housing options in the Long Branch area and Manchester Manor (8401 Manchester Road) is their largest. It is located within Site #3 and is recommended for the following:

#### Piney Branch Road/ Flower Avenue (Northwest)

8736-8472 Flower Avenue and 8426 Piney Branch Road

Size: 89,429 square feet

Existing Zoning: R-10, C-1 and CROZ

Existing Height: varied 16-45 feet

The Sector Plan recommends the following:

Zoning: CRT – 2.5, C .25, R 2.5, H 60

Additional recommendations included the acquisition of 8426 Piney Branch Road for a future park (Piney Branch Road Urban Park)

HOC submitted testimony that was supportive of the Sector Plan vision and the potential for future public/private partnerships within the Long Branch area. Testimony also referenced the aging Manchester Manor and the pending expiration of the agency's tax increment financing limits. HOC expressed that they need to begin making decisions about potential redevelopment within the Long Branch area and stated that the Sector Plan doesn't allow sufficient heights and the density necessary to incentivize the redevelopment of Manchester Manor. The Board discussed the impact of additional building height on the abutting and adjacent single family community and suggested that language be crafted to address transitions and compatibility.

#### Staff Response

Staff supports HOC's request for additional height and has provided the following to address any potential impacts on the neighboring single family community along Manchester and Geren Roads:

*"To prioritize additional housing choice in the Town Center, compatible with the adjacent single-family homes, the Plan recommends zoning that allows only the smallest amount of commercial uses possible in the zone. Since commercial uses on this site are unlikely to be compatible with the adjacent housing, they are discouraged. In addition, the Plan seeks to limit commercial encroachment into the existing*

residential community and recommends that all non-residential uses are limited to the property's Piney Branch Road frontage. Commercial ingress and egress should also be limited to Piney Branch Road. "

### Public Benefits and Amenities

There was also general discussion and testimony regarding recommended public benefits and amenities and the resulting impacts on redeveloping the Super Block.

### Staff Response

Staff believes that the mix of uses as proposed are adequate and reflect the Plan's vision of a neighborhood town center that provides locally serving retail and commercial uses. Additionally, Staff's recommended Public Benefits and Amenities (i.e. Parking and Affordable Housing) are comprehensive in nature and are necessary to provide the community with much needed physical and quality of life improvements.

Staff acknowledges that the recent increases to the Arliss Street cross-section have reduced the developable area of the Super Block. As such, the recommendation for the Civic Green required further study and an exploration of other appropriately located sites. Consequently, Staff is proposing the following revision to the Plan's civic green recommendation (page 30):

*"A central civic green urban park, with a minimum size of .5 acre, to be located within the Long Branch Town Area on an Interim Development (Phase One) site. The park should be located near a public transit hub, next to or with a visible connection to activating uses and it should contain a mixture of hard and soft surfaces, including an event space. "*

Staff will continue to study the proposed ROW improvements including Winding Hill Way, the parking strategy and parkland and would like to address these issues as a part of the larger discussion of the Plan's open space and mobility network. This is now proposed for the March 21<sup>st</sup> worksession.

## **Piney Branch Neighborhood Village**

The Piney Branch Neighborhood Village is located east of the Long Branch Stream Valley and is home to a planned Purple Line station to be located within the median along University Boulevard at/near the Gilbert Street intersection. This area also has an existing commercial district, and contains a variety of uses including the New Hampshire Estates Public Park.

It includes one Interim Development site (Site #2) which is located at the northeast quadrant of Piney Branch Road and University Boulevard.

*Piney Branch Neighborhood Village (Northeast) (page 55)*

618,640,642 University Boulevard, East and 8818 Piney Branch Road

Size: 3.83 acres

Existing Zoning: C-1, CROZ and R-60

Existing Height: varied 18-45 feet

The Sector Plan recommends the following:

Zoning: CRT – 2.5, C .5, R 2.5, H 60

Additional recommendations included support for the development of a neighborhood service center that could provide social, educational and naturalization services and a publicly accessible green space of at least ¼ acre.

**Testimony:**

Staff had a meeting with representatives of the Clifton Park Baptist Church (located at 8818 Piney Branch Road) on February 14<sup>th</sup>. At the meeting, the representatives expressed their concern about the potential impact of the CRT Zone requirements if or when the church planned to expand. They also made Staff aware that while they had no desire to provide commercial and/or residential uses on their land they were supportive of the Plan and its vision.

Staff Response

Staff agreed to review the recommendation and after further study supports their request to maintain their existing R-60 zoning. This will reduce the developable area in Site #2 to approximately 2 acres. Staff supports retaining the green space recommendation and also proposes a revision to the recommendation for the neighborhood service center to include the following:

*“Recommend the development of a neighborhood service center providing social, educational and naturalization services, including but not limited to: legal services, vocational training and employment placement, and health education and community outreach.”*

*Glenville Road Extension*

The Plan recommends (page 60) as a part of Long Term development, that Glenville Road be extended to Piney Branch and reclassified as a Minor Arterial (between University Boulevard/Langley Drive and Piney Branch Road) with a minimum right of way of 70 feet. This street is also referenced in the Plan recommendations for Site #13 (page 82).

**Testimony:**

Testimony was received from Brett Rouillier and the Montgomery Housing Partnership regarding the proposed extension and reclassification of Glenville Road.

Mr. Rouillier testified to the impact of development on the already failing intersections (page 48 – Long Branch Sector Plan – Public Hearing Record Transcript). He stated that “...Piney Branch and University Boulevard is a failing intersection. They’re building like little ring roads to get around that intersection. One of them is Glenville Avenue...a very small street going through a neighborhood. How can you make this road an arterial street through a community?”

Greg Baker of the Montgomery Housing Partnership testified to the following at the public hearing (see page 86) “we have four properties at Glenville Road. We do not like the idea of connecting Glenville Road to Piney Branch Road”.

### Staff Response

This road was recommended to provide access for future development on Site #13, which includes the four properties owned by the Montgomery Housing Partnership. Glenville Road is currently a cul-de-sac and would be unsuitable for any significant increase in development. It was not intended as a road to alleviate CLVs at the intersection of Piney Branch Road and University Boulevard. Staff asks that further discussion of this issue be included in the overall discussion on Mobility scheduled for the March 21<sup>st</sup> worksession.

### **Attachments**

1. Summary of written and verbal testimony received for the public record.
2. Long Branch Sector Plan – Development Site Map
3. City of Takoma Park Resolution
4. Maryland Historical Trust, Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties Form
5. Historic Preservation Master Plan Amendment, Designation Criteria, Chapter 24A of the Montgomery County Code
6. Long Branch Sector Plan – Staff Report Worksession #1
7. Letter from Richard Longstreth – Chair, Maryland Governor’s Consulting Committee on the National Register of Historic Places

**Note:** The public record will not close until Thursday, March 7, 2013. Any testimony received after this memo, but while the public record is still open, will be added to the matrix and presented to the Planning Board at the following work session.