



Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan: Planning Board Resolution

KO
RD
Rb
JAC


- Kristin O'Connor, Lead Planner, kristin.oconnor@montgomeryplanning.org, 301-495-2172
- Roberto Duke, Urban Designer, Area 3 roberto.duke@montgomeryplanning.org, 301-495-2168
- Frederick Vernon Boyd, Planner Coordinator, Area 3 frederick.boyd@montgomeryplanning.org, 301-495-4654
- John Carter, Chief, Area 3, john.carter@montgomeryplanning.org, 301-495-4575

Completed: 02/26/15

Description

Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan: Planning Board Resolution

Staff Recommendation: Approve the Resolution of Adoption for the Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan and to transmit the Resolution of Adoption to the Full Commission



Summary

On February 24, 2015, the District Council unanimously approved the Planning Board Draft of the Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan and Resolution. The Council held a public hearing on the Plan on January 22, 2015, and the Planning, Housing and Economic Development (PHED) Committee met on February 2, 2015, to discuss the Plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff Recommends approval of the Resolution of Adoption for the Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan and to transmit the Resolution of Adoption to the Full Commission

DESCRIPTION

This plan, which began in October 2014, will update approximately 52 acres of the Sandy Spring Village area in the 1998 Sandy Spring/Ashton Master Plan. The Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan contains recommendations that expand and add detail to the 1998 Plan concept for Sandy Spring as a rural village center. The Sandy Spring community is one of the oldest settlements in Montgomery County dating back to the early 1700s. The village is centered on the commercial properties near the historic intersection of MD 108 and Brooke Road.

The 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 land 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.

CONCLUSION

Staff recommends approval of the Resolution of Adoption of the Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan, adoption of the Planning Board Resolution, and to transmit the Plan and the Resolution to the Full Commission on March 18, 2015.

Attachments

- District Council Resolution
- Planning Board Resolution MCPB No. 15-24
- Planning Board Draft Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan

http://www.montgomeryplanning.org/community/sandyspring/documents/10.30.14_PlanningBoardDraftv2.pdf

Resolution No.: 18-65
Introduced: February 24, 2015
Adopted: February 24, 2015

**COUNTY COUNCIL FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND
SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PORTION
OF THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTON REGIONAL DISTRICT
WITHIN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND**

By: County Council

SUBJECT: Approval of Planning Board Draft Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan

Background

1. On October 31, 2014, the Montgomery County Planning Board transmitted to the County Executive and the County Council the Planning Board Draft Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan.
2. The Planning Board Draft Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan amends the approved and adopted 1998 Sandy Spring/Ashton Master Plan; the Master Plan of Bikeways; The General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, as amended; and The Master Plan of Highways within Montgomery County, as amended, and the Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan, as amended.
3. On January 20, 2015, the County Executive transmitted to the County Council an economic impact analysis of the Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan.
4. On January 22, 2015, the County Council held a public hearing regarding the Planning Board Draft Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan. The Plan was referred to the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee for review and recommendation.
5. On February 2, 2015, the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee held a worksession to review the issues raised in connection with the Planning Board Draft Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan.
6. On February 10, 2015, the County Council reviewed the Planning Board Draft Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan and the recommendations of the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee.

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 Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan, dated October 2014, is approved with revisions. County Council revisions to the Planning Board Draft Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan are identified below. Deletions to the text of the Plan are indicated by [brackets], additions by underscoring. All page references are to the October 2014 Planning Board Draft Plan.

Page 18: Revise the last paragraph as follows:

[Where applicable, the] The specific property recommendations in this section [lists the zoning for a property prior to October 30, 2014; then lists the zoning for the property after October 30, 2014, in parenthesis; and finally lists the proposed zoning for the property.] list the current zoning for the property; the zoning prior to the zoning conversion on October 30, 2014, in parentheses; and finally the proposed zoning for the property.

Page 20: Add the following sentence after the first sentence on the page as follows:

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. Many of these improvements will require partnerships among property owners, the State and/or County government, utilities, and others.

Page 22: Revise the last sentence as follows:

On the north side of Brooke Road, the [eight-foot wide] shared-use path on the Fire Department property has been extended to the north on the northeast side of Brooke Road past the Orchards Subdivision all the way up to Meadowsweet Drive (outside the Plan boundary area).

Page 23: Revise the last sentence in the paragraph that begins on page 22 and finishes on page 23 as follows:

This Plan recommends a connection to this shared-use path [as well as a sidewalk on the western side of Brooke Road].

Page 23: Revise the first sentence in the first paragraph as follows:

This Plan recommends that the north side of MD 108 have a [wide sidewalk] shared-use path to accommodate pedestrians/bicyclists and [provide ample space] an area for seating [areas]

and street trees in front of revitalized properties (see Streetscape Perspective above and Proposed Street Section on page 41).

Page 23: Revise the first bullet as follows:

Enhance Olney Sandy Spring Road (MD 108) with [sidewalks] a shared-use path, landscape, street trees, and on-street parking and narrow travel lanes.

Page 23: Revise the caption as follows:

Conceptual Streetscape Perspective of the Village Core Looking West: The north side of the Village Core (right side of image) will have a [wide sidewalk] shared-use path to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists and an area for seating and street trees in front of the revitalized properties. Additional crosswalks provide safe connections across MD 108.

Page 24: Delete the third bullet as follows:

- [Provide sidewalks on the east side of Brooke Road extending from the existing sidewalk at Meadowsweet Drive (outside the boundary area) south to MD 108.]

Page 25: Revise the bullets as follows:

- Provide a minimum of ¼ acre village green in Area 2B (and potentially in the adjacent portions of Area 2A) on the [north side of Olney Sandy Spring Road (MD 108) in the Village Core with] east side of Brooke Road 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 gathering. The space will also serve as a terminus for users of the Rural Legacy/Rachel Carson/Underground Railroad Trail.
- Provide [a wide retail sidewalk along the building frontage with] streetscape in front of new development at the intersection of Brooke and Olney Sandy Spring Roads that includes pedestrian-scaled lighting and street furnishings.
- [Provide] Include a small developer-provided green space south of MD 108 in Area 3 that will serve as 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.

Page 25: Amend the Specific Property Recommendations sentence as follows:

1. Parcels [P318, P333, and P330] on the North Side of MD 108 (west of Brooke Road) from [C-2 (CRT 1.5: C 0.75, R 0.75, H 35'/SSA Overlay Zone)] CRT 1.25: C 0.75, R 0.50, H 35'/SSA Overlay Zone (formerly C-2) to CRN 0.75: C 0.25, R 0.75, H 45', with the exception of Parcel P333, recommended for rezoning to CRN 0.75: C 0.75, R 0.50, H 45'. (See adjacent SSA Overlay Zone sidebar for details on the existing overlay zone).

Page 26: Amend the Specific Property Recommendations sentence as follows:

2. Parcels on the North Side of MD 108 (east of Brooke Road)
 - a. Commercial parcels [along] on the north side of MD 108, including a portion of Parcel P282 from [C-2 (CRT 1.5: C 0.75, R 0.75, H 35'/SSA Overlay Zone),] CRT 1.25: C 0.75, R 0.50, H 35'/SSA Overlay Zone (formerly C-2) to CRN 0.75: C 0.75, R 0.50, H 45'.
 - b. Commercially zoned portion of [split zoned] Parcel P260 from [(with single-family detached unit facing Brooke Road from C-2 (CRT 1.5/SSA Overlay Zone)] CRT 1.25: C 0.75, R 0.50, H 35'/SSA Overlay Zone (formerly C-2) to CRN 0.75: C 0.75, R 0.50, H 45'.
 - c. Parcel [P282, Parcel] P281 and the residentially zoned portion of [Parcel] Parcels P260 and P282, from R-60 to CRN 0.50: C 0.25, R 0.50, H 40'.
 - d. Four single-family residential properties west of Skymeadow Way from R-60 to CRN 0.50: C 0.25, R 0.50, H 40'.

Page 28: Amend the Specific Property Recommendations sentence as follows:

3. Parcels on the South Side of MD 108[: Stabler 1848 LLC Parcels P383 and P426] from [C-2 (CRT 1.5, C 0.75, R 0.75, H 35'/SSA Overlay Zone), C-1 (CRT 1.0, C 0.75, R 0.5, H 35'/SSA Overlay Zone), and O-M (] EOF 1.0, H 35'/SSA Overlay Zone)] (formerly O-M) to CRN 0.75: C 0.25, R 0.75, H 45'.

Page 28: Amend the Specific Property Recommendations sentence as follows:

4. Historic District Properties and [Parcels P368 and P369] the [(]Old Fire Station [and parking lot)] from [C-2 (CRT 1.5, C 0.75, R 0.75, H 35'/ SSA Overlay Zone), C-1 (CRT 1.0, C 0.75, R 0.5, H 35'/SSA Overlay Zone), and O-M (EOF 1.0, H 35'/SSA Overlay Zone)] CRT 1.25: C 0.75, R 0.50, H 35'/SSA Overlay Zone, EOF 1.0, H 35'/SSA Overlay Zone, and NR 0.75: H 30'/SSA Overlay Zone (formerly C-1, C-2, and O-M) to CRN 0.75: C 0.75, R [0.25] 0.5, H 45'.

Page 29: Revise the fourth sentence in the first paragraph as follows:

[This Plan proposes] The existing zoning would allow a modest expansion [to] of up to an additional 20 homes in the Sandy Spring Meadow subdivision, and this Plan seeks to preserve the attractive rural residential edge [adjacent to the Village Core] along MD 108.

Pages 30-31: Amend areas 1 and 2 on Residential Properties Map and text to continue with a single numbering system and replace with areas 5 and 6 as follows:

[1] 5. Residential properties[:] on the North Side of MD 108; Retain R-60 and R-200 [Zones], with the exception of Parcel P338, recommended for rezoning from R-200 to R-60.

[2] 6. Residential properties [:] on the South Side of MD 108; Retain R-200 [Zone].

Page 33: Amend the Open Space recommendation bullet as follows:

- Support open space activities on the existing green in front of the Sandy Spring Museum in Area 8, which has been the location of regional/community functions such as the Strawberry Festival and farmer's market.

Pages 34-36: Amend areas 1, 2, 3, and 4 on Cultural Neighborhood Properties Map and text to continue with a single numbering system and replace with areas 7, 8, 9, and 10.

[1] 7. Commercial property [,] (west of Bentley Road) [: from C-2 (CRT 1.5/SSA Overlay Zone)] from CRT 1.25: C 0.75, R 0.50, H 35'/SSA Overlay Zone (formerly C-2) to CRN 0.50: C 0.50, R 0.50, H 40'.

[2] 8. The Sandy Spring Museum [Property,] (east of Bentley Road): Retain RC.

[3] 9. The Olive Branch Community Church [property]: Retain [RE-1] RE-2.

[4] 10. Christopher's Hardware and Nichols Office Building [property:] from [C-2 (CRT 1.5/SSA Overlay Zone)] CRT 1.25: C 0.75, R 0.50, H 35'/SSA Overlay Zone (formerly C-2) to CRN 0.50, C 0.50, R 0.50, H 40'.

Page 38: Add a description of the Shades of Green Program in a new sidebar as follows:

The Planning Department's Shades of Green Program provides 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.

Page 38: Revise the first two sentences in the second paragraph under Transportation as follows:

The underlying [C-2, C-1 and O-M] EOF, NR, and CRT [Zones] zones (formerly the C-1, C-2 and O-M zones) allowed a floor area ratio (FAR) of [1.5] 1.0 to 1.25. With the Sandy Spring Overlay Zone, the 1998 Plan reduced the overall FAR in these zones to 0.75.

Page 39: Replace the last two sentences in the second paragraph under the Circulation section as follows:

[A new shared-use path will continue the connection from Sherwood High School through the planning area. This Plan will support a continued connection to Sherwood Elementary School to link the two schools to the proposed regional trail.] The 2005 Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan recommends a shared-use path connecting west to Onley, and east beyond Ashton to the Howard County Line. This continuous shared-use path will

provide a safe connection from Sherwood Elementary School to Sherwood High School and link to the proposed regional trail.

Page 40: Amend the third bullet as follows:

- [An eight-foot] A ten-foot-wide shared-use path on the north side (The shared-use path continues through the Residential and Cultural Neighborhoods, and the Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan recommends a shared-use path connecting west to Olney and East to the Howard County line).

Page 40: Amend the fourth bullet as follows:

- A minimum six-foot sidewalk on [both sides] the south side.

Page 41: Update the illustration to delete any reference to a sidewalk.

Page 43: Village Core Neighborhood, amend the second bullet as follows:

- Add minimum [eight-foot] ten-foot-wide shared-use path on the north side MD 108.

Page 43: Residential Neighborhood, amend the first bullet as follows:

- Provide a minimum [eight-foot] ten-foot-wide shared-use path on the north side to connect pedestrians and bicyclists to schools, religious institutions, and museum.

Page 43: Cultural Neighborhood, amend the first bullet as follows:

- Continue the [eight-foot] ten-foot-wide shared-use path on the north side of MD 108.

Page 48: Revise the third sentence in the second paragraph as follows:

This Plan supports the recommendation for a [eight-foot] ten-foot-wide shared-use path on the north side of MD 108 connecting the elementary school to the high school.

Page 53: Amend the third bullet as follows:

- [Propose a Zoning Text Amendment for Cultural Institutions] Support artisan manufacturing, production and sales and living history demonstrations, which are allowed as accessory uses for Cultural Institutions in the RC [Zone] zone.

Page 53: Amend the third Zoning section header as follows:

[Zoning Text Amendment for Cultural Institutions in the RC Zone] Cultural Institutions in the RC Zone

Pages 53-55: Delete references to the zoning text amendment and amend the Zoning Text Amendment for Cultural Institutions in the RC Zone section as follows:

A primary purpose of the RC [Zone] zone is to protect sensitive areas and agricultural uses. The Sandy Spring Museum, located in the RC [Zone] zone, preserves approximately half of its seven-acre site in forest conservation. In addition to the museum, the site contains a barn and brick house. The [property] museum is adjacent to low density [neighbors (RC, RNC, RE-1 and RE-2)] neighborhoods with properties that have large front setbacks [and], wooded areas, and are in the RC, RNC, RE-1, and RE-2 zones. The site [is defined as] defines the eastern edge of the rural entry into the Plan area.

The Sandy Spring Museum desires to use the buildings and grounds of their property for museum-related activities, including living history and artisan demonstrations, the sale of artist and artisan merchandise, and educational activities. These types of activities currently occur at other museums in the County, such as Glen Echo Park, Button Farm, and the Mooseum.

The Sandy Spring Museum is [identified as] considered a Cultural Institution in the Zoning Ordinance. [According to the Ordinance,] Cultural Institutions are uses where works of art or other objects are kept and displayed, or where books, periodicals, and other materials are offered for reading, viewing, listening, study, or reference, but not typically offered for sale. The Zoning Ordinance defines artisan manufacturing and production as: “the manufacture and production of commercial goods by a manual worker or crafts person, such as jewelry, metalwork, cabinetry, stained glass, textiles, ceramics or handmade food products. Artisan manufacturing and production do not include any activity that causes noise, odor or vibration to be detectable on a neighboring property.”

[The Sandy Spring Museum desires to allow artisan manufacturing and production and sale of goods that are not permitted under current zoning. The Zoning Ordinance defines artisan manufacturing and production as: “the manufacture and production of commercial goods by a manual worker or crafts person, such as jewelry, metalwork, cabinetry, stained glass, textiles, ceramics or handmade food products. Artisan manufacturing and production do not include any activity that causes noise, odor or vibration to be detectable on a neighboring property.”]

[The sale of merchandise, on site production of arts and crafts, and living history demonstrations occur in other zones in the County. Allowed in the County Inn Zone, blacksmiths can operate and sell merchandise. Ancillary buildings like barns and houses are often located in the Country Inn Zone. The museum site includes a brick house and a barn on their property. It is desired to hold the demonstrations in the barn located on the museum property. Equally desirable would be to sell the artists’ merchandise on the property.]

[The house can permit up to five unrelated people living on site, an artist studio with up to five unrelated people living in the house, bed and breakfast, rural antique shop, home occupation (low impact) and guest house. The museum would like to utilize its entire site. A

text amendment would clarify the sale of such demonstrations and artist manufactured items on a museum property located in the RC Zone.]

[The County boasts other museums such as Glen Echo Park, Button Farm and Mooseum that sell artists' goods and other on-site crafts. Allowing artisan and other living history demonstrations at the Sandy Spring Museum as a limited use will provide insight into the agricultural past of the community.]

[This Plan recommends a zoning text amendment to permit Cultural Institutions and their ancillary buildings (barns and house) to allow artisan manufacturing and production in the RC Zone as a limited use.]

The Department of Permitting Services has confirmed in writing that living history demonstrations and the sale of artist-manufactured items on a museum property are allowed under the Zoning Ordinance in the RC zone. Additionally, educational uses are allowed as a conditional use in the RC zone. Living history demonstrations, artisan manufacturing, and education-related functions at the Sandy Spring Museum will provide insight into the agricultural past of the community.

Page 54: Add zoning map to show new zones adopted as part of the District Map Amendment done at the completion of the zoning ordinance rewrite.

Page 55: Revise the map to make numbering consistent with other numbers used in text and use different colors (rather than numbers) to show identical zoning recommendations in the Proposed Zoning Map.

Page 56: Delete the first paragraph as follows:

[This Plan recommends a zoning text amendment to permit Cultural Institutions and their ancillary buildings (barns and house) to allow artisan manufacturing and production in the RC Zone as a limited use.]

Page 56: Amend the third paragraph as follows:

In the Village Core, the CRN [Zone] zone will allow [additional uses and provide] more flexible development standards while protecting the character of the community. Specifically, the Plan recommends replacing the existing [C-2, C-1, O-M] EOF, NR, and CRT zones (formerly C-1, C-2, and O-M zones) and some areas zoned R-60 [Zones in the Village Core] with the CRN [Zone] zone with a FAR between 0.25 and 0.75. In addition, [C-2] CRT zoning along Bentley Road and to the east of Auburn Village Drive will be replaced with the CRN [Zone] zone.

Page 56: Amend the third and fifth bullets under the "Why the CRN Zone?" section as follows:

- Provide greater flexibility to respond to current market conditions.
- Provide more certainty about density and building height.

- [Provide] Promote a mix of neighborhood-serving commercial uses and a variety of housing opportunities not available in the NR or EOF zones.
- Support infill and adaptive reuse of buildings.
- Provide neighborhood use protections not provided in the CRT zone.
- Allow development at a scale of a village.

Page 60: Amend the first sentence under the heading Capital Improvements Program as follows:

The Capital Improvements Program (CIP) should implement the following recommendations[:]. Many of these improvements will require partnerships among property owners, the State and/or County government, utilities, and others.


General

The Council supports renumbering properties so that each area has a single number each time it is discussed or illustrated anywhere in the Plan.


The Planning Board Draft included a recommended zoning text amendment to allow artisan manufacturing, production, and sale of goods at Cultural Institutions such as the Sandy Spring Museum. The Department of Permitting Services (DPS) indicated that these activities are allowed as accessory uses for Cultural Institutions in the RC zone and therefore the recommendations related to the text amendment have been deleted from the Plan. The Council supports allowing these uses and the DPS interpretation of allowable accessory uses. Should DPS change its interpretation, the Council would support a future text amendment to support the Museum's desire to add these uses.

All illustrations and tables included in the Plan are to be revised to reflect District Council changes to the Planning Board Draft. The text and graphics are to be revised as necessary to achieve clarity and consistency, to update factual information, and to convey the actions of the District Council. All identifying references pertain to the Planning Board Draft.

This is a correct copy of Council action.



Linda M. Lauer, Clerk of the Council



THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

6611 Kenilworth Avenue • Riverdale, Maryland 20737

M-NCPPC No. 15-01
MCPB No. 15-24

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, by virtue of the Land Use Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, is authorized and empowered, from time to time, to make and adopt, amend, extend and add to The General Plan for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, pursuant to procedures set forth in the Montgomery County Code, Chapter 33A, held a duly advertised public hearing on September 4, 2014, on the Public Hearing Draft of the Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan, being also a comprehensive amendment to the Approved and Adopted Sandy Spring/Ashton Master Plan, 1998, the Master Plan of Highways, the Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan, and the General Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, as amended; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Planning Board, after said public hearing and due deliberation and consideration, on October 23, 2015, approved the Planning Board Draft of the proposed Plan, and recommended that it be approved by the District Council and forwarded it to the County Executive for recommendation and analysis; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Executive reviewed and made recommendations on the Planning Board Draft Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan and forwarded those recommendations with an analysis to the District Council on January 20, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Council, sitting as the District Council for the portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District lying within Montgomery County, held a public hearing on January 22, 2015, wherein testimony was received concerning the Planning Board Draft Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan; and

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY

Christina Sone 2/20/15
M-NCPPC LEGAL DEPARTMENT

WHEREAS, the District Council, on February 24, 2015, approved the Planning Board Draft Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan subject to the modifications and revisions set forth in Resolution No. 18-65; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Montgomery County Planning Board hereby adopts said Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan, together with the General Plan for the Physical Development of Maryland-Washington Regional District, as amended; and the Master Plan of Highways within Montgomery County, as amended, and as approved by the District Council in the attached Resolution No. 18-65; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of the Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan must be certified by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and filed with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of each of Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, as required by law.

* * * * *