

**ATTACHMENT F - Summary of Revised Recommendations**

| <b>Area/Property Name</b>                                    | <b>Public Hearing Draft Proposed Zoning</b>                                   | <b>Current Staff Recommendation</b>   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Town Center</b>   |   |   |
|  | Mixed Use Town Center Zone with two levels of emphasis                        | <i>Revise Draft Recommendation</i><br>Mixed Use Town Center Zone with land use emphasis discussed in Plan |
| <b>Northeast Transition Area</b>                             |   |   |
| <b>Burdette Property</b><br>82 acres                         | RNC .4 – 32 lots<br>Public Water/Gravity Flow Sewer                           | RNC .40 - .32 lots*<br>Public Water and Sewer   |
| <b>Miller Property</b><br>21 acres                           | RE-1 Public Water   | RE 1 – 15 lots<br>Public Water  |
| <b>Town Spring Neighborhood</b><br>39 Properties<br>18 acres | RE-1 Public Water   | RE-1 – existing development<br>Public Water   |
| <b>Patuxent Properties</b><br>560 acres                      | Rural Cluster   | Rural Cluster – 112 lots  |
| <b>Southeast Transition Area</b>                             |   |   |
| <b>Warfield Property</b><br>78 acres                         | RNC .4 – 31 lots<br>RNC/TDR .75 – 58 lots<br>Public Water /Gravity Flow Sewer | RNC .4 – 31 lots*<br>RNC/TDR .75 – 58 lots*<br>Public Water/Gravity Flow Sewer                            |
| <b>Southwest Transition Area</b>                             |   |   |
| <b>Smart/Miner Properties</b><br>16 acres                    | RNC .4 – 6 lots<br>Public Water/Gravity Flow Sewer                            | <i>Revise Draft Recommendation</i><br>RNC Base .83 – 13 lots*<br>Public Water and Sewer                   |
| <b>Kingstead/Leishear Properties</b><br>126 acres            | RNC .21 – 26 lots<br>RNC/TDR .58 – 71 lots<br>Public Water/Gravity Flow Sewer | RNC .21 – 26 lots*<br>RNC/TDR .56 – 71 lots*<br>Public Water/Gravity Flow Sewer                           |
| <b>Lewis/Casey Properties</b><br>17 acres                    | RE-2C<br>Public Water   | <i>Revise Draft Recommendation</i><br>RNC .62 – 10 lots*<br>Public Water and Sewer                        |
| <b>King/Souder and Adjoining Properties</b><br>3.7 acres     | RE-2C<br>Public Water   | <i>Revise Draft Recommendation</i><br>R-90 Cluster – 16 lots*<br>Public Water and Sewer                   |
| <b>Rice/Conway Properties</b><br>35 acres                    | RE-2C<br>Public Water   | <i>Revise Draft Recommendation</i><br>RNC .82 – 28 lots*<br>Public Water and Sewer                        |

|  |                       |   |
|--|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Southwest Transition Area Continued</b>                               |                       |   |
| <b>Existing Properties Ridge Road</b><br>31 properties<br>26 acres       | RE-2C<br>Public Water | <i>Revise Draft Recommendation</i><br>R-200 – existing development<br>Public Water and Sewer  |
| <b>Kings Valley Ltd.</b><br>50 of 114 acres                              | RDT                   | <i>Revise Draft Recommendation</i><br>RNC for 50 acres<br>RNC .04 – 2 lots*<br>RNC/TDR 1.0 – 50 lots* / 48 TDRs<br>Public Water and Sewer |
| <b>Clifford Property</b><br>1.6 acre                                     | RDT                   | <i>Revise Draft Recommendation</i><br>RE-1 – existing development<br>Public Water and Sewer   |
| <b>Northwest Transition Area</b>   |                       |   |
| <b>Stanley/Leishear Day, Browning Properties</b><br>27 acres             | RE-2C<br>Public Water | <i>Revise Draft Recommendation</i><br>RNC .82 – 22 lots*<br>Public Water and Sewer  |
| <b>Ridge Road North Existing Properties</b><br>57 properties<br>36 acres | RE-2C<br>Public Water | <i>Revise Draft Recommendation</i><br>R-200 - existing development<br>Public Water and Sewer  |
| <b>Ridge Road North Existing Properties</b><br>20 properties<br>27 acres | RE-2C<br>Public Water | <i>Revise Draft Recommendation</i><br>RE-1 – existing development<br>Public Water and Sewer   |

\* Properties subject to required or voluntary MPDU development, additional density.

Attachment G: Public Hearing  
Summary Comments

| # | Speaker/<br>Speaker<br>Context      | Issues Raised  | Master Plan Recommendation on Topic Discussed  | Staff Response   |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | Randy Scribfield, Damascus Alliance | Still concerned about congestion and need for Bypass Road, although support Woodfield Extended, A-12 Road. It will help pedestrian safety downtown. It will not resolve the through traffic problems, although it will divert some congestion. Will continue to lobby for alternate road.<br><i>Commissioner Robinson interested in why bypass issue not in master plan at this time.</i>  | The Plan supports the need for a thorough analysis of the potential for a bypass around Damascus. This follows the determination of the 1994 Master Plan Amendment that it would be premature to make any Bypass decision until the Woodfield Road Extension is completed. That road segment will begin construction in 2005. The Plan recommends that a Bypass Study should begin after Woodfield Road Extended is completed and functioning.   | Support the recommendation of the Plan to evaluate the need for a Damascus Bypass after the completion of Woodfield Road Extended.   |
| 2 | J. R. Smart, Smart/Miner Property   | A bypass route is needed, preferably on the west side of Damascus. Frustrating that this alternate road was not part of the Master Plan discussions. Suggest a privately funded road around the west side, two lane. Extend Kings Valley Road across Bethesda Church Road and then connect to Ridge north of Town, perhaps at the Woodfield Road intersection. Environmental issues not a tradeoff for the congestion and pollution from the cars stuck in congestion. Need to give property owners along the way additional density, water and sewer so they will pay to build the road. Worth the tradeoff for the people of Damascus. | As noted previously, the Plan supports a bypass evaluation after the completion of Woodfield Road Extended.  | Support the Plan recommendation to delay a Bypass evaluation until the completion of Woodfield Extended.   |
| 3 | Joan Snow                           | Do not need a bypass yet. Use the traffic calming and other measures recommended in the plan and see if they work before spend the money and time on a bypass for now.   | The Plan recommends waiting until the completion of Woodfield Extended before evaluating a Bypass, due to the need for accurate statistics on the reduction of through traffic in downtown Damascus that will result from the new routing north of the town center. The comment supports the Plan recommendation.  | Support the Plan recommendation to delay a Bypass evaluation until the completion of Woodfield Extended.   |
| 4 | Gary Richard (letter)               | Transportation frustrating because bypass not considered. Recommend consideration of improvements to Clarksburg Road, making it an alternate commuter road from the Mt. Airy area to Clarksburg.   | This Plan supports the need for a thorough analysis of the potential for a bypass around Damascus. Within two-years, after the completion of Woodfield Rd. Extended (A-12), the M-NCPPG will begin an evaluation of current traffic conditions and work with the community to determine whether a Master Plan Amendment process is warranted to evaluate the need for a bypass type of road. At that time, a regional study of the traffic load implications of growth patterns in the adjoining, regional counties should be authorized and directed by the County Council (P. 57). | Support the Plan recommendation to wait until County-Council authorizes staff to conduct a study of the long-term traffic implications of growth patterns from adjoining counties, after the completion of Woodfield Road Extended. The staff believes the transportation improvements recommended in the Plan are consistent with County policies on land use and public facility adequacy. |



| # Speaker/<br>Speaker<br>Context                                     | Issues Raised  | Master Plan Recommendation on Topic Discussed  | Staff Response  |
|--|--|--|---|
| 5<br>J. R. Smart,<br>Smart/Miner<br>Property                         | 1. To aid traffic flow on Ridge Road, eliminate traffic light at Main Street and re-align road, and lower street elevation after firehouse. Use a road club to pay for the changes.<br>2. Sidewalk proposed along Ridge Road between Recreation Center and High School will be dangerous as traffic flow is fast. Consider a path in the valley on the west side of Ridge Road and a tunnel under Ridge to the High School. Work with property owners along this route, and give them sewer and perhaps higher density zoning. | 1. The Plan recommends these operational improvements to address traffic flow on Ridge Road (P. 56).<br>--Support turn lanes as needed<br>--Evaluate the design of subdivision entry/exit lanes on Ridge.<br>--Evaluate and support traffic signals when warranted: especially at the Kempton Rd and Ridge intersections and Ridge and Valley Park Drive.<br>2. The Plan recommends a below-grade pedestrian crossing at Ridge and Valley Park Dr./Oak Drive Intersection (P. 58). | Support the Plan recommendations.<br>1. Staff does not believe realignment of the state highway system roadways within the Town Center would be effective in creating or maintaining a stable Town Center environment.<br>2. The sidewalks connecting the Town Center to nearby civic destinations are an integral part of the transportation plan. The existing roads generally follow the ridgeline and have higher development densities, and therefore more pedestrian trip generation, than the adjacent valley to the west. The plan also recommends a below-grade pedestrian underpass of Ridge Road for the proposed east-west trail corridor linking Seneca Greenway, Magruder Branch, and Little Bennett Creek trail systems. |
| 6<br>Mickey<br>Cochran,<br>Damascus<br>United<br>Methodist<br>Church | Concern about extending the "Lane" between 27 and 124, adjacent to cemetery. Intersection with 124 awkward, will be traffic issue. 1982 Plan said it would be an "alley" for businesses, not real road.  | The Plan recommends retaining the small business street behind Main Street that is in the 1994 Master Plan Amendment. This "lane" will provide needed access to the underutilized areas behind these buildings. The street will additionally provide access to a planned Trailhead Park at Magruder Branch (P.22 and P. 50).   | Support the Plan recommendations to reconfirm this small street behind the businesses on Main Street in order to provide access to underutilized areas behind businesses on Main; and to provide access to the Magruder Branch Trailhead. The staff believes that the planned T- intersection with Woodfield Road is appropriate.   |
| 7<br>Gary Richard<br>(letter)  | Damascus Lane as a through street will be a traffic problem. The road should terminate in a parking area behind the stores on Main street. Further extension will conflict with the cemetery, and add to congestion on Route 124. Turning will be difficult. Road would be mis-aligned with New Church Street. The right-of-way beyond the Druid Theater would be better as part of the Magruder Valley Trail connection, to access the Park and Ride lot.   | The Plan recommends maintaining a two-lane road policy throughout the Master Plan area, but it also recommends adding safety and operational improvements such as turning lanes and traffic signals as warranted to allow smoother flow of traffic (P. 55).  | Support the Plan recommendations of maintaining a two-lane road policy throughout master plan area, and supporting operational improvements as warranted to allow smoother flow of traffic at peak times.   |
| 8<br>Cindy Snow  | Support two lane road policy continuing, with changes recommended in the Plan to improve flow of traffic.  |  |   |
| 9<br>Gary Richard<br>(letter)  | Retain two-lane road policy and language of 1994 Plan due to linear residential character of older residential areas.  |  |   |
| 10<br>Cindy Snow   | 1. Concerns with use of accel/decel lanes, a safety hazard.<br>2. Through commuter traffic is an issue, but should do as Plan recommends, alternate route study after Woodfield Road is completed.<br>3. Should also provide commuter transit from Mt. Airy.   | 1. The Plan recommends a two lane road policy, but supports spot safety and operational improvements such as turning lanes or signalization as warranted (P. 55).<br>2. The Plan recommends an alternate route evaluation after the completion of Woodfield Road Extended (P. 57).<br>3. This Plan supports an inter-jurisdictional study of transit and para-transit opportunities (P. 61).   | 1. Support the Plan recommendations for a two lane road policy and operational improvements at selected locations as warranted.<br>2. Support the Plan recommendation for an alternate route study after the completion of Woodfield Road Extended.<br>3. Support the Plan recommendation to increase transit opportunities.  |

| #  | Speaker/<br>Speaker<br>Context   | Issues Raised  | Master Plan Recommendation on Topic Discussed  | Staff Response   |
|----|--|--|--|--|
| 11 | Gary Richard<br>(letter)   | 1. Question Woodfield Extension (A-12) because it should never be widened south of Damascus to 4 lanes.<br>2. Support new Park and Ride location at Ridge/Route 80 intersection to intercept more commuter traffic from the north.   | 1. The Plan recommends a two-lane road network outside the Town Center to protect the rural character of Damascus (P. 55).<br>2. The statement supports the Plan recommendation of a new Park-and-ride lot at MD 108/MD 124 intersection (P.61).   | 1. Support the Plan recommendation for Woodfield Road. The Plan does not conclude that completing Woodfield Road Extended will create a need to widen Woodfield Road to the south.<br>2. Support the Plan recommendation for the new Park and Ride lot north of Damascus.  |
| 12 | Martini Vela<br>(letter)   | Support more sidewalks in Damascus. Current lack of sidewalks. Need along Ridge Road, Kings Valley Road. Safe bus stops needed too. Traffic too fast, needs to be slower.  | This Plan recommends tools such as visual cues at the gateways into the Town Center, narrower travel lanes, and street trees to improve pedestrian safety (P. 56).   | Support the recommendations of the Plan for additional sidewalks. Although the Plan does not explicitly recommend sidewalks along Kings Valley Road due to the lower density of adjacent land uses, an explicit plan recommendation is not required for sidewalk implementation along residential and arterial roadways in the context of new development.   |
| 13 | Barbara Zellers  | 1. Concerned about traffic safety impact of accel/decel lanes. At Woodfield Elementary used as a bypass lane. Unsafe.<br>2. Need more bikelanes and sidewalks. We want a pedestrian / bike friendly community. Bikelane on Ridge is for experts riders, not children.<br>3. Extend sidewalk recommendation on Woodfield to country store, beyond Sweepstakes.  | 1. This Plan recognizes the need for and supports operational transportation improvements including auxiliary turning lanes and pedestrian and bicycling amenities, particularly along the portions of Ridge Road north of Woodfield Road Extended and south of Bethesda Church Road (P. 57).<br>2. The Plan supports the creation of bikeway and pedestrian routes to support the goal of increasing opportunities to provide convenient connections and encouraging walking (P. 57).<br>3. The Plan supports sidewalks or shared-use path connections along Ridge and Woodfield Roads from the Town Center as far south as Sweepstakes Road (P. 57).   | 1. Support the Plan recommendation for incremental modifications as warranted, considering both traffic flow and pedestrian safety.<br>2. Support the Plan recommendations for additional pedestrian and bike trails and sidewalks.<br>3. The staff does not specifically support a sidewalk extension from Sweepstakes to the Woodfield Country Store due to distance and low density development in this area. Yet, an explicit plan recommendation is not required for sidewalk implementation along arterial roadways in the context of new development. |
| 14 | Jill Murtagh<br>(Charlie Burr),<br>Valley Park<br>Drive (and<br>submitted<br>letter) | 1. When Valley Park Drive is completed in near future, traffic flow will be a major safety issue. Already cannot get onto Woodfield Road, and this will bring more traffic. Will immediately need traffic lights at Valley Park intersections with Woodfield Road and Ridge Road. Don't wait until accidents like Sweepstakes.<br>2. Also need speedbumps from the beginning.<br>3. Already a lack of parking for residents in area who use the hillside to park. This area will disappear or shrink. The County should provide additional resident parking. | The Plan specifically recommends safety and operational improvements for Valley Park Drive including:<br>--Traffic signals when warranted at the intersection of Valley Park with Woodfield Rd. and Ridge Rd (P. 56).<br>-- A realignment (for safety and traffic flow) of the intersection of Ridge Road with Oak Drive and Valley Park Drive to eliminate the offset intersection. This location will see increased turning due to the completion of the Recreation Center (P. 56).<br>--Creating a shared-use path along Valley Park Drive (P. 57).<br>-- Consideration of a below-grade pedestrian tunnel under Ridge Road at the intersection of Valley Park Dr./Oak Dr. for pedestrian safety (P. 58). | 1. Support the recommendations of the Plan for safety and access improvements on Valley Park Drive.<br>2. The staff would not support installing speed humps on Valley Park as it is an arterial roadway. Support the Plan recommendations for slowing vehicular speeds along Valley Park Dr. and other streets within the Master Plan area by use of context-based roadway designs - visual cues such as narrower travel lanes and street trees (P. 58).<br>3. Operational issue, not a Master Plan issue.  |

35

| #                            | Speaker/ Speaker Context                 | Issues Raised   | Master Plan Recommendation on Topic Discussed  | Staff Response   |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Trails and Recreation</b> |  |   |  |  |
| 15                           | Linda Palmer                             | Hiker/biker trails are a very important resource.   | The Plan supports the creation of east-west trail connectivity by:<br>--Adding trail links to the Seneca Trail to the west and Little Bennett Trail to the east<br>--Adding bike and pedestrian paths to access Magruder Branch Trail<br>--Support recommended trails identified in the Countywide Park Trail Plan and this Plan during the time of subdivision (P. 79).   | Support the Plan recommendations for trails.   |
| 16                           | Randy Scritchfield<br>Darnascus Alliance | Trails and connectivity are important. Support better access to parks and more trail connections.   |  |  |
| <b>Legacy Open Space</b>     |  |   |  |  |
| 17                           | Joan Snow                                | Support Legacy Open Space recommendation to protect through easements, not acquisition.   | Three sites are recommended to be included as Natural Resource sites within the Legacy Open Space Program:<br>Little Bennett Creek Headwaters area through parkland acquisition, Bennett Creek Headwaters Area and the Upper Patuxent River are recommended through easements (P. 80).   | Support the Plan recommendation. The initial Legacy Open Space (LOS) recommendations generated a lot of controversy in this community. There was widespread fear and antipathy toward the concept of acquisition oriented LOS designations in the Bennett Creek headwaters area. The final recommendation was for easement oriented designations in that area, and the community now seems to support the recommendations.   |
| 18                           | Cindy Snow                               | Support Legacy Open Space recommendations.  | The Plan recommends three areas for Legacy Open Space Protection, primarily through easements.   | Support the Plan recommendation for Legacy Open Space preservation.  |
| 19                           | Gary Richard (letter)                    | Support voluntary easements to protect open space.  | The Plan recommends three areas for Legacy Open Space Protection, primarily through easements.   | Support the Plan recommendation for Legacy Open Space preservation primarily through easements.  |
| <b>Land Use Town Center</b>  |  |   |  |  |
| 20                           | Tony Dibase,<br>Town Center property     | 1. Own building on Main Street. New street behind buildings needed for deliveries and parking. Cars now cutting through. Narrow street would not cause undue traffic.<br>2. Trailhead may be ok.<br>3. Need more information about what the TC Zone will allow. | 1. The Plan recommends adding a small new street behind the buildings on the south side of Main Street to provide alternative access between Ridge and Woodfield roads. (P. 22)<br>2. Indicates an extension of the Magruder Branch Trail from Bethesda Church Road to the proposed Magruder Branch Trailhead Park south of Main Street. Providing this extension as part of the stream valley park will allow safe access to the Town Center. (P. 22)<br>3. This Plan envisions creating mixed-use zoning appropriate for town-scale development (P. 93)<br>The first two comments support the Plan recommendations for the new Town Center Lane and the Magruder Branch Trail Trailhead. | Support for the Plan recommendations for the new "lane" street in the Town Center, the Magruder Branch trailhead, and the Town Center Zone. Although the Darnascus business community has been generically supportive of the Town Center Zone concept, the staff is aware that they want to have more details about how the Town Center Zone would work, so they could have certainty that their businesses would remain permitted uses, not subject to undue regulations. The staff has told them that it is important to be sure that the Planning Board is in general support of this new concept before more details are considered. The general concept presented to the community is that existing businesses of any size would be considered conforming, many other businesses would be permitted by right - and the main limitation would be on size and scale of proposed free-standing businesses. |
| 21                           | James Clifford,<br>Burdette Property     | Support inclusion of this Burdette Property in Town Center Zone.  | This Burdette property is within the proposed Town Center. The comment supports the Plan recommendation.   | Support the Plan recommendation for the Burdette property.   |



| #                           | Speaker/<br>Context  | Issues Raised   | Master Plan Recommendation on Topic Discussed   | Staff Response   |
|-----------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| 22                          | JR Smart,<br>Victoria Bryant,<br>Smart/Miner<br>Property                     | Location of Smart/Miner property should be included in Town Center, center of town should be High School not Main Street.   | The Town Center is proposed to concentrate densities within the historic core of Damascus near the vicinity of Main Street. This creates opportunities for residential and commercial development in this area. (P. 13). The comment does not support the Plan recommendation for the Town Center.  | Support the Plan recommendation. The High School is a focal point for recreational and educational activity in the community; but it is not the commercial heart of the community. It would be against standard core planning principles to make the High School, located south of Main Street, the geographic core of the community. Also, Main Street is the geographic "high point" of the town.  |
| 23                          | Michael T.<br>Rose, Dr.<br>Richard<br>Schoeb,<br>Schoeb<br>Property          | Agree with recommendation for property. Keep in mind Greenbelt as a model from 1938 and still livable. Dominant Main Street, Town Center parking district, local owned and mixed uses encouraged. This plan will help it come together for Damascus.  | The Schoeb property is located in the proposed TCZ-2 which is a mixed-use zone proposed to emphasize commercial uses. (P. 14) The comment supports the Plan recommendation.   | Support the Plan recommendation for the Schoeb property.   |
| 24                          | Perry Berman   | 1. Damascus Shopping Centre unlikely to follow plan. Should discuss more clearly (page 17).<br>2. Like mixed use option, but should not require mixed use.  | Moderate-density development within the Town Center is recommended. Multi-family, single-family attached, and live work units will accommodate a significant portion of the need for affordable housing. MPDUs can be built with increased densities. (P. 41). The Plan makes recommendations to guide development on the Damascus Centre property. The Town Center Zone details are not in the Draft Plan.   | Support the Plan recommendations. Although the redevelopment plans for the Damascus Shopping Centre cannot be fully known in advance the Plan provides ample guidance for redevelopment, that would also need site plan review, under the proposed zoning. Site plan review is not required under the current C-1 Zone. The greater concern is that the owners will begin redevelopment before the new Master Plan is adopted. The staff did not plan to recommend that the mixed-use provisions for the TCZ be mandatory. The staff believes it would be better to provide incentives to encourage mixed-use buildings, than mandatory requirements that may be economically counterproductive.                       |
| 25                          | Mickey<br>Cochran,<br>Damascus<br>United<br>Methodist<br>Church              | Glad church property still adjacent to residential zoning.  | The Damascus United Methodist Church is located within Town Center Zone, adjoining residential property in the R-200 Zone. (P. 13) The comment supports the Plan recommendation.  | Support the Plan recommendation for land use adjoining the church.   |
| <b>Land Use Town Center</b> |  |   |   |  |
| 26                          | Harry Lersch,<br>Michael T.<br>Rose, Dan<br>King,<br>King/Souder<br>Property | 1. Include all of Souder property in the Town Center. May be difficult to sewer alone, but will work when combined with other adjoining King properties.<br>2. Allow up to 20 dwelling units per acre and 4 story buildings in the Town Center for the TRZ-2.<br>3. Do not make mixed uses mandatory for Town Center. | 1. The Souder property was found to be technical difficult and too expensive to be sewerred. It would need grinder pumps. It was not recommended to be included in the Town Center. (P. 27)<br>2. TCZ-2 is recommended to have a slightly lower yield, but higher proposed density than historic development trends in the Town Center. This will encourage the development potential of 322 dwelling units in the TCZ-2. (See Revised Chart on page 12 of the Worksession 1 Staff Memorandum)<br>3. The Plan recommends mixed-use as the primary vision for the Town Center but many specifics have not yet been determined. (P. 15) | 1. The staff could support the request for including the Souder property (adjoining and under joint ownership with the Town Center King property) if sewer service could be provided to it without grinder pumps, and if jointly developed with the King property. This property is immediately adjoining the Town Center, next to the Damascus Elementary School.<br>2. Support the Plan recommendation as the density requested is approximately what the Plan recommends.<br>3. Support the Plan recommendation, as the staff does not believe that mandatory mixed-uses are a good planning tool. Incentives are more market friendly, and better fit the changes that are inevitable in a long range master plan. |

| #  | Speaker/<br>Speaker<br>Context  | Issues Raised  | Master Plan Recommendation on Topic Discussed  | Staff Response   |
|----|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 27 | Gary Richard<br>(letter)        | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The trail on Damascus Lane across Ridge to the Damascus Neighborhood Park would be nice, but the route shown is not practical. Better to cross Ridge at Locust Drive.</li> <li>2. Completing Woodfield Extended will help make Main Street more pedestrian friendly. Need "human scale" Main Street.</li> <li>3. Generally support streetscaping, but don't require trees in front of building signs, as this can hurt the businesses.</li> <li>4. Town Center Zones should not require grandfathering of existing legal uses. All existing uses should be legal and permitted. Need to have a workshop with existing business owners</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Plan recommends extending the hard surface trail north of Valley Park Drive to Damascus Town Center with a figurative route beyond. (P. 77). The comment implies more detail than the Plan states.</li> <li>2. The comment supports the recommendations of the Plan for policies and regulations to rebuild the identity of Main Street. (P. 18).</li> <li>3. The comment supports the Plan with a specific reservation about blocking views of storefronts. (P. 18)</li> <li>4. The comment states a concern of what could be in the details of the Town Center Zone. The Plan intends that the range of uses allowed in the TCZ will allow a very broad range of uses by right, but will require site plan review for most new structures and major structural modifications. (P. 93)</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support the Plan recommendation as the exact routing for an eventual trail cannot be determined until planning for it begins. The Plan drawing is illustrative only.</li> <li>2. Support the Plan recommendations for Main Street.</li> <li>3. Support the Plan and the incrementally adopted Damascus streetscaping. The staff agrees that trees should not block the view of business signage, and we support a modification to alleviate this concern.</li> <li>4. Support the Plan, as it is the intent of the staff that the TCZ should make all existing businesses permitted uses in the zone.</li> </ol>   |
| 28 | Gary Richard<br>(letter)        | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerned about proposed residential/commercial mix for the residential areas along Woodfield from Mt. Vernon to the Methodist Church. In future would disrupt the linear residential neighborhood.</li> <li>2. Same concern about residential area on Ridge Road north of the Town Center boundary. Consider first house of the three between the TCZ and Beall Avenue. This is the traditional border.</li> <li>3. Remove the Church at Main and Mt. Vernon from the Town Center boundary. This area should remain residential.</li> </ol>   | <p>These comments reflect concern regarding the perimeters of the Town Center Zone.</p> <p>The comment reflects a concern about an area proposed to be rezoned to TCZ-2. (P. 14) from RE-2C.</p> <p>2. &amp; 3. The comment reflects concerns about areas proposed to be rezoned from RE-2C and R-200 to TCZ-2. The Town Center boundary was created to concentrate densities within the Town Center. (P. 13)</p>  | <p>1. Support the Plan recommendation. The area noted is already mixed use. The homes adjoining the church are across the street from a fish market and auto dealership. There is no requirement for change of use. The property owners may continue residential use as long as they wish, but over the life of the Plan this area may be appropriate for mixed-use development under the limitations of the proposed TCZ-2.</p> <p>2. Support the Plan recommendation. The staff believes that the border chosen is appropriate given the uses behind and across from the houses noted.</p> <p>3. Support the Plan recommendation. The church, as one of the major institutional uses - and one of the largest buildings - in the town of Damascus, is appropriate to include in the Town Center. Including it does require the church to make any changes.</p> |
| 29 | Randy<br>Scritchfield           | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support the Town Center concept, especially making it more pedestrian friendly. Will be very good for the community.</li> <li>2. Want to know more about zoning definitions in Town Center Zone - must include input of residents and business owners.</li> </ol>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A mixed-use Town Center concept is recommended for central Damascus. The comment supports the Plan recommendation.</li> <li>2. The comments requests additional details on the proposed Town Center Zone. The Plan recommends a mixed-use zone appropriate for town-scale development, but further details are not developed in the Plan.</li> </ol>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support the recommendations of the Plan for the Town Center Zone.</li> <li>2. Support the recommendations of the Plan. Further details on the TCZ await the Planning Board determination as to its general appropriateness for the community. If the zoning concept is found appropriate, the staff will work with the community to refine the uses allowed, the size and scale of the uses, and the development regulations.</li> </ol>   |
| 30 | Christina C.<br>Waters (letter) | <p>25 acres of RDT land on Bethesda Church Road (11081 Bethesda Church Road) wants to be included in the Town Center Zone-2 or rezoned to allow additional density--possibly for senior housing, multi-family or single family.</p>  | <p>This property is located within the northwest portion of the Rural Transition Area. The Plan recommends no land use changes because of the many important natural resources within the Bennett Creek watershed (P. 31). The comment is contrary to the recommendations of the Plan.</p>   | <p>Support the Plan recommendations. This property is located over a half mile from the Town Center and not appropriate to consider as part of the central part of Damascus. The staff would not support any rezoning of the RDT Zone property this far from the designated growth areas.</p>  |



# Speaker/  
Speaker  
Context

Issues Raised

Master Plan Recommendation on Topic Discussed

Staff Response

**Land Use Town Center**

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>31 Eugene Casey (also speaking for Rex Sturm, R. Edwin Brown, Ben Lewis, and Shawn McIntosh)</p> | <p>Mr. Casey is partner for these properties. Very near town and wants to build affordable housing. Add these properties to the Town Center. Sleep slopes, but can build 90 or more townhomes and apartments. Will pledge to make 50%-100% affordable at MPDU levels; and still keep 80% of land as open space. Staff would not accept from the start. Property was R-200 before 1982. Location meets criteria outlined at beginning for location of denser growth. <b>Commissioner's Bryant and Robinson</b> particularly interested in this location and why it was not recommended.</p> | <p>This 45.3 acre area in the RE-2C Zone was not recommended for additional development densities and not included in the Town Center because of environmental, topography and traffic access constraints (P. 27). The request is not supported in the Plan recommendations.</p> | <p>Support the Plan recommendation. The staff does not support additional density for these properties. The property grouping was extensively evaluated during the Master Plan process. The staff met with Mr. Casey separately, and he was given the opportunity to give a presentation to the Land Use Task Force. The property grouping is problematic due to steep topography and location at the headwaters of Bennett Creek. And any new traffic it would generate would come out of Lewis Drive into the busiest part of an already congested Town Center at Ridge Road. Topography is a dramatic reality in Damascus, and the staff does not believe in stressing steep, environmentally sensitive areas with significant density.</p> |
|---|--|--|--|

**Land Use Transition Area**

|  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>32 Randy Scritchfield, Damascus Alliance</p>          | <p>Support use of clustering to achieve environmental goals and community character goals.</p>   | <p>The Plan recommends the clustered development on most developable sites in the Transition Areas. (P. 25) in order to minimize impervious surfaces to protect environmentally sensitive areas. (P. 66) Developable sites within the Transition Areas are recommended for single-family cluster development where public sewer is available (P. 42). The comments support the Plan recommendations.</p>                                  | <p>Support the Plan recommendations for extensive use of clustered housing.</p>   |
| <p>33 Cindy Snow</p>                                     | <p>Cluster wherever possible, as recommended.</p>  |   |   |
| <p>34 Gary Richard (letter)</p>                          | <p>Support housing on cluster to help environment.</p>   |   |   |
| <p>35 Wayne Goldstein, Montgomery Preservation, Inc.</p> | <p>Worry that mansions along Hawkins Creamery Road are changing the rural character of the area. Nurseries would like to buy and protect other parcels. Need better ways to use easements to keep them in production. Need more limits on residential outside Town Center.</p> | <p>The comment implies a request for lower density for properties located along the portions of Hawkins Creamery Road, within the Neighborhood Transition Areas (P. 27). This area was recommended for low-density residential development in 1982 for environmental reasons. No changes to the zoning are proposed in the Plan.</p>  | <p>Support the Plan recommendation for no change in zoning. The Plan does not recommend zoning changes for this area that has been designated for large lot residential development since 1982. Although it destroys the rural watershed, this is a popular form of housing for certain income groups. Easements would be desirable for the remaining open properties, as would more use of well designed cluster housing patterns (which is an option here). But this area, although it was had nice scenic view, was not included in the Agricultural Reserve.</p>      |
| <p>36 Joan Snow</p>                                      | <p>Area along Route 27 (Ridge Road) north of town recommended for downzoning from RE-2C (1 per 2 acres) to RC (1 per 5 acres). Housing needed, so why downzone?</p>  | <p>The comment questions the Plan recommendation to downzone certain areas from RE-2C to the Rural Cluster Zone (approximately 560 acres in the northeast section of the planning area) for environmental and water supply protection goals. The recommendation reflects the environmental considerations of the Functional Master Plan for the Patuxent River Watershed, and the actual development potential of this area (P. 101).</p> | <p>Support the Plan recommendation for a change of zoning. The staff believes that housing goals appropriate for this small community can be better met through the recommendations in the Plan for additional housing in the Town Center and in the immediately surrounding Transitional Areas. The area proposed for a change from the RE-2C to the RC Zone is in the Patuxent Watershed (thus subject to strong environmental regulations) and has a poor outlook for septic approval. The proposed zoning more closely reflects its actual development potential.</p> |



# Speaker/ Speaker Context Issues Raised Master Plan Recommendation on Topic Discussed Staff Response

Land Use Transition Area - Combined with Sewer Policy, Housing Policy

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>37 James Clifford, Leishear Property</p>                 | <p>Allow density increase and cluster alone on this property, not just it with Kingstead Property.</p>   | <p>The Plan recommends the Leishear property for joint development with the Kingstead because of its close proximity to significant environmental resources that can be preserved if developed in conjunction with the Kingstead property (P. 32). Rezoning to the RNC Zone is not recommended unless it is jointly developed.</p>   | <p>Support the Plan recommendation for joint development, and rezoning only if jointly developed. The staff believes that this small property is too far from a potential sewer connection to be appropriate for additional density unless it is considered as part of a larger development. Without sewer, its current RC Zoning is appropriate.</p>  |
| <p>38 Erin Girard, Mike Frits, Kingstead Property</p>       | <p>Sewer should allow use of grinder pumps to allow additional density. Allowed by WSSC. WSSC says whole east side can be served. Mainly disagree on sewer north of the stream tributary, and with minor stream crossing can sewer and avoid environmental area.</p>   | <p>The Plan recommendation reflects WSSC recommendations to limit the use of grinder pumps (P. 106).</p>   | <p>Support the Plan recommendations to limit the use of grinder pumps. The staff and the property owners seems to have been told differing philosophies from WSSC. The staff position, based on WSSC advice, has been to limit recommendations for sewer service that will depend on the use of grinder pumps. The staff also believes that providing sewer service north of the stream tributary that crosses Kings Valley Road will create environmental concerns.</p>   |
| <p>39 J.R. Smart, Victoria Bryant, Smart/Miner Property</p> | <p>1. Logical site for more density than proposed, immediately adjacent to Town Center. Maybe R-200, allowing half-acre cluster, up to 30 homes.<br/>2. Property has Little Bennett Creek headwaters. Would propose internal trail to connect High School with Recreation Center.<br/>3. Sewer is available, but need grinder pumps to achieve more density.</p> | <p>The Plan recommends rezoning property to RNC at .4 du/acre with public water and sewer service for the Smart property (15.55 acres) (P. 101). Although the Smart property is in close proximity to the Town Center, no additional density is recommended as the small size of the property and the steep slopes at the rear would result in too much crowding on the developable portion near Bethesda Church Road.</p> | <p>Support the Plan recommendation for density. As with the Rice property, this property faces topographic and environmental constraints - as well as the advice of WSSC on the over-reliance on grinder pumps. However, if this quadrant were to be reconsidered holistically and a pump station considered - some limited additional density might be appropriate. But the staff believes the Town Center boundary should remain along Bethesda Church Road. The staff also believes the "streamside" trail to the Recreation Center is worth considering.</p> |
| <p>40 James Clifford, Leishear/Stanley Property</p>         | <p>Allow density for up to 22 cluster lots with water and sewer. WSSC allows use of grinder pumps, necessary for sewer. Not a density increase.</p>  | <p>The Plan recommends public water for this property but not sewer. The Stanley/Leishear property located in the RE-2C zone was evaluated for higher density and possibly sewer access, but this was found to be economically infeasible due to sewer access constraints. It would also have access problems unless a more northern access were found (P. 28 and P. 107).</p>   | <p>Support the Plan recommendation for no sewer. Sewer access would be technologically difficult, the site has topographic and other environmental constraints, and there are traffic congestion concerns. WSSC advised staff that the frequent use of grinder pumps is not advisable, due to maintenance concerns (P. 107).</p>   |

40

| # Speaker/ Speaker Context  | Issues Raised   | Master Plan Recommendation on Topic Discussed  | Staff Response  |
|---|---|--|---|
| 41<br>Erin Girard,<br>Mike Friis,<br>Kingslead<br>Property                | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should have additional density, up to 150 to 200 DU. Only 69 DU recommended for this property, and 17 of those from TDR purchase. Do not consider with Leisner property. Should get more density. Plan says area appropriate for moderate density. Also would be up to 185 acres for parks.</li> <li>2. Propose either an RNC or PRC plan. Under RNC would have 137 homes - attached and detached. 21 would be MPDU. Requires rezoning most of entire 283 acres to RNC. Density of .4 per acre, density of up to 140.</li> <li>3. Under PRC proposal, but active senior housing for up to 350 DU, including elevator condominiums and single level villas.</li> </ol> | <p>The request is for significantly more density than recommended in the Plan. The Plan recommends clustered development with up to .56 dwelling units per acre yielding up to 71 dwelling units/acre. If TDRs are not used, the Plan recommends the RNC Zone at a density of .21 acres yielding equal 26 lots per acre (P. 102).</p>  | <p>Support the Plan recommendations. The staff has recommended density that we believe to be appropriate for this location on the edge of the Rural Transition area. Except for 10 acres currently zoned RE-2C, these areas would be changing from 5 acre and 25 zoning. The density proposed, combined with the transfer of the inherent and additional TDRs, will create a fairly suburban community at this edge location. Further intensifying the density will create transportation, environmental, and community character concerns. The other properties in the Plan area recommended for RNC are going from RE-2C to the RNC, and they are located on the perimeter of central Damascus, so the shift is not as dramatic. The staff also believes that the Planned Retirement Community concept is far too large and intense for this rural location, and too far from retail and medical services that aging residents will need.</p> |
| <b>Land Use Transition Area Combined with Sewer Policy Housing Policy</b> |   |  |   |
| 42<br>Henry<br>Fitzgerald,<br>Miller Property                             | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This property right next to Town Center. Why not treat like Dan King or Schoeb property? Put in the Town Center.</li> <li>2. This is a property rights issue. Family has owned property for 30 years, have not been fairly treated by State and County. Want to do something sensible with the property. Family should be given some relief.</li> </ol>   | <p>The request is for more density than recommended in the Plan. The Miller Property contains the headwaters for and is bisected by the Town Spring tributary, which requires the maximum protection of streams and wetlands. Approximately 21 acres of the Miller property located east of the Town Spring stream is located in the Transition Area and is recommended for the RE-1 (one-acre density) Zone. The residual portion of the property, west of the Town Spring stream is included in the Town Center and proposed to be rezoned to TCZ-1 (P. 29). Since the 1982 Master Plan this property has been zoned RE-2C with a master plan recommendation for PD-5, but a rezoning proposal for the PD-5 Zone (with less than the allowed density in the zone), was denied by the County Council due to environmental concerns.</p> | <p>Support the recommendations in the Plan. Taking into account the Council's rejection of the Master Plan recommendation, the staff believes that the Council wants to see strong enforcement of the Patuxent Master Plan recommendations and guidelines; so density above one acre was not considered. The recommendation made reflects the density of the existing development just to the south of the Miller property between it and MD 108.</p>   |
| 43<br>Jody Kline,<br>Rice Property  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Situation similar to Smart/Miner. Location edge of Town Center. High School and Recreation Center are centers of activity in Damascus. Rice property between these. All in that quadrant think more intensity appropriate. More density is appropriate. Request two per acre density with cluster.</li> <li>2. Sewer with grinder pumps would provide means to density.</li> </ol>  | <p>The request is for higher density than recommended in the Plan. The Rice property, located south of the Smart/Miner property and west of Ridge Rd, was evaluated for possible sewer access but was found to be technically difficult and too expensive to be feasible unless it was authorized to have significantly higher density, which was inadvisable due to environmental and topographic constraints (P. 30).</p>  | <p>Support the Plan recommendation. However, as with the Smart/Miner property, if this quadrant is reconsidered holistically for a sewer pump station, the Rice property is in a location that would be appropriate for some additional development density. It is located between the Town Center and the new Recreation Center. The Rice properties, and the other intervening properties, face topography concerns, wetland and stream valley concerns. Frequent use of grinder pumps is discouraged by WSSC. If a new pump station is considered, along with a rethinking of the density of this quadrant southwest of the Town Center, some additional density could be appropriate.</p>   |

41

| # Speaker/<br>Speaker<br>Context  | Issues Raised   | Master Plan Recommendation on Topic Discussed   | Staff Response  |
|---|---|---|---|
| 44<br>James<br>Warfield,<br>Warfield<br>Property                            | 1. Density should return to two per acre, as before 1982.<br>2. Don't use TDR to get additional density. TDRs now too expensive, too costly method of creating density.<br>3. Plan proposes 58 dwellings, sewered in two areas, much in green space. But that green area will perk, so why not do more density and allow large lot subdivision. | The request exceeds the recommendations of the Plan. The Plan recommends limited additional density, up to 58 lots in the RNC .75 du/acre using 27 TDRs to achieve this density. If TDRs are not used, then the Plan recommends the RNC Zone of .4 units per acre yielding approximately 31 lots (P. 100).  | Support the Plan recommendation. The County has a commitment to the TDR program, and a need to locate additional TDR receiving sites. The staff believes it is entirely appropriate to use TDRs as a means to provide limited additional density for certain properties. The 1982 Master Plan made a commitment to lower residential densities in Damascus outside the core and the Magruder Valley. Environmental concerns and sewer access were the primary issues. Significant additional density on this property would mean extensive use of grinder pumps, which WSSC has advised the staff is not a wise long term policy. Finally, the Plan recommends clustered zoning to preserve the long scenic vistas on this beautiful property. The entire intent of clustering is to avoid large lot residential development in close proximity to the Town Center, and to allow the visual rural character of the approaches to Damascus to remain intact. |
| 45<br>James Clifford,<br>Burdette<br>Property                               | Increase density to allow up to 40 lots and use of grinder pumps. Will need half gravity, half grinder to get this density which will still meet 10% impervious goal of Patuxent Master Plan. WSSC policy allows use of grinder pumps. This a appropriate location next to Town Center.   | The request is for slightly more density than recommended in the Plan. The Burdette Property is recommended for .4 dwelling units per acre with public water and sewer which would yield approximately 32 lots-- which is currently the allotted yield under the existing RE-2C zone. Limited additional density can be considered through the use of TDRs if the existing sewer pump (located in the Damascus Shopping area) is relocated to allow a greater gravity flow service area (P. 98).                        | The staff would support the additional density requested if the development can still meet the 10% imperviousness cap required of properties in the Patuxent watershed. If any property reviewed in the Master Plan should be allowed use of grinder pumps it would be the Burdette Property. Although it is in the Patuxent watershed, it is located immediately adjacent to the Town Center, along the soon to be constructed extension of Woodfield Road.  |
| <b>Land Use Rural Area</b>  |   |   |   |
| 46<br>Rick Mencia,<br>Joe D'Erasmo,<br>(letter),<br>Property in<br>Eichison | 35 acres: CI, R-200, and RDT. Eichison Store and Cycle Repair. Believes Hamlet zone will be more restrictive. Other property owners being given value, which devalues Mencia property. And no water/sewer recommended. Combined, this damages his investment. Hamlet motivated by aesthetics, not health/safety. Oppose.                        | The Rural Hamlet Zone (RHZ) is recommended for Eichison and Browningsville. The zone is intended to protect the rural character of these villages by limiting the development potential to smaller scale uses, but still allowing a variety of commercial and residential uses at a scale appropriate for a rural setting. The Plan supports the continuation of limited convenience retail, agriculturally related commercial activity, or tourism related uses that are currently permitted in the C-1 Zone (P. 104). | Support the Plan recommendation. The staff understands the concern expressed, but the recommendation for the RHZ derives from a long standing recommendation that rural village areas be protected from the potential for inappropriately scaled commercial development. The mixed-use nature of the proposed RHZ will provide some additional development potential for some property owners, and will put some constraints on the owners of the small pieces of commercial property in these villages. But the intent of the zone is to protect and enhance the scale, integrity and character of the village overall, and the staff believes that is the greater good.   |
| 47<br>Rick Mencia,<br>Joe D'Erasmo,<br>(letter),<br>Property in<br>Eichison | Deserve compensation if downzoned. Expand Hamlet zone to RDT portion of property (32 acres). Or expand C-1 Zone.  | The RHZ is recommended for Eichison and Browningsville (P. 104).  | The staff does not believe that compensation is required for the owner of 1.29 acres of commercial property, which already has a viable commercial use that would continue to be an allowed use in the zone; even if other property owners in the zone would have the potential to have other small commercial uses. The staff does not believe that many people in these village would turn their homes into businesses. The staff does not support turning 32 acres of RDT property into the RHZ. The staff believes that preservation of community historic character is a viable reason for recommending the use of this zone.  |



| #                          | Speaker/<br>Speaker<br>Context                   | Issues Raised   | Master Plan Recommendation on Topic Discussed  | Staff Response   |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| 48                         | Neal King,<br>Browningville<br>(letter)          | Property currently zoned C-1, purchased in 2001. Not clear how proposed Hamlet Zone would impact property and uses currently allowed. Oppose if it reduces uses allowed. Need to be allowed to continue small businesses as in the past.              | The RHZ is recommended for Etchison and Browningville. The zone is intended to protect the rural character of these villages by limiting the development potential to smaller scale uses, but still allowing a variety of commercial and residential uses at a scale appropriate for a rural setting. The Plan supports limited convenience retail, agriculturally permitted commercial activity, or tourism related uses that are currently permitted in the C-1 Zone (P. 104). | Support the Plan recommendation. The intent of the Rural Hamlet Zone is to allow small businesses of many types to continue and expand to a limited extent. The restrictions of the RHZ would prevent inappropriate, suburban type uses (such as multipump gas stations with minimarts) from locating in historic rural crossroad communities.   |
| <b>Land Use Rural Area</b> |  |   |  |  |
| 49                         | Steve<br>Elmendorf,<br>Roger Watkins<br>Property | 1. Property has had split zoning since 1958, making any development a problem. Rural Hamlet Zone would be appropriate, or put all C-1.<br>2. Correct error in one of maps for Purdum on page 40. Proposed zoning shows all of Purdum in RDT, mistake. | Although it was discussed during the Task Force process, the village of Purdum was not included in the Public Hearing draft of the Plan because of a staff determination that it was less susceptible to development pressure because of its location away from major commuter roads (P. 40).  | The staff would support a Rural Hamlet Zone designation for Purdum village. The Plan did not recommend Purdum as a Rural Hamlet as it is not on a major road, and not as potentially threatened by inappropriate development as Etchison (MD 108 and Damascus Road) and Browningville (Clarksburg Road).<br>The staff was not aware of the split-zoned property situation of this property in Purdum. Revise the Plan to recommend Purdum for the RHZ, to resolve this issue. The staff would not recommend C-1 Zoning for either of the two split-zoned properties in Purdum: 1.27 acres (P. 046) or the 38,796 SF (P. 064) property. |
| 50                         | Pamela<br>Bussard                                | The viewshed language particularly important, as structures can interrupt vistas. This is one of the last true rural areas in the county. Can make it a model.  | This Plan encourages the protection of rural vistas that are intrinsic to the character of Damascus. Land uses that impede these scenic view sheds should be discouraged (P. 38).  | Support the recommendation of the Plan for viewshed protection language.   |
| 51                         | Gary Richard<br>(letter)                         | Support the proposed language for viewshed protection.  |  |  |

43

# Speaker/  
Speaker  
Context

Issues Raised

Master Plan Recommendation on Topic Discussed

Staff Response

**Sewer Envelopes and Policy**

|                 |  |   |  |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| 52 Perry Barman | <p>1. Working with several property owners. Good place for affordable family housing. Good schools, other facilities. Needs more people to support businesses. Need all sizes and types. Makes good start, but needs to go further.</p> <p>2. Other properties ok for sewer. Sewer expense is not correct. Sewer critical to affordable housing. Sewer should be public policy, not just expense. King, Souder, Kingstead, Rice should be included in the sewer envelope</p> <p>3. Believes that Plan should not require mixed uses but should permit them as not every site in the TC is suitable for residential or suitable for commercial.</p> | <p>1. The Plan supports moderate-density development within the Town Center. Increased densities will accommodate MPDUs and contribute to the economic base for local retail and service businesses (P. 41).</p> <p>2. This Plan recommends sewer service in the planning area in conformance with the Water and Sewer Plan service policies. This excludes areas currently zoned for low density development (RE-1, RE-2 and RC) not already approved for service from further extension of community service (P. 107).</p> <p>3. The TCZ-1 will encourage, but not be limited to residential uses and TCZ-2 will encourage, but not be limited to commercial uses. Mixed-use development will be strongly encouraged to retain commercial uses on the ground floor (P. 94).</p> | <p>Support the Plan recommendation to limit use of grinder pumps. The staff position, based on WSSC advice, has been to limit recommendations for sewer service that will depend on the use of grinder pumps. 1. The proposed sewer envelope reflects the limits of gravity service and WSSC policy of avoiding frequent use of grinder pumps. 2. Some additional density may be appropriate in the quadrant between Bethesda Church Road and Ridge Road if a small pump station can be built. 3. The staff envisions mixed use to be achieved by incentives, not mandate in the Town Center Zone.</p> |
|-----------------|--|---|--|

|  |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
| 53 Harry Lersch, Michael T. Rose, Dan King, King/Souder Property | <p>Believes that all of Town Center is included in the sewer envelope, but add sentence so there is no confusion.</p> | <p>All of the Town Center is expected to be sewer as indicated in the map on Page 109 of the Master Plan.</p> | <p>The staff will revise the language in the Public Hearing Draft if necessary to avoid confusion.</p> |
|--|---|---|--|

**General Comments about the Plan Recommendations**

|                   |  |   |   |
|-------------------|--|---|---|
| 54 Joav Steinbach | <p>Make the Plan happen as recommended. We support it as is.</p> | <p>The recommended actions in this Plan implement the goal of ensuring the identity of central Damascus as the heart of the master plan area. Major issues include: improving connectivity and cohesiveness, strengthening local retail and residential opportunities within and near the Town Center, enabling growth appropriate for the town vision, and protecting the surrounding rural areas. Opportunities for additional residential growth outside the Town Center are limited due to infrastructure concerns and to achieve environmental policy objectives (P. 1).</p> | <p>Support the Plan recommendations. These comments support the Plan recommendations.</p> |
|-------------------|--|---|---|

|                |   |  |  |
|----------------|---|--|--|
| 55 Lisa Rother | <p>Nothing detailed, excellent plan with a unique vision. Recommendations generally supported by executive staff.</p> |  | <p>Support the Plan recommendations.</p> |
|----------------|---|--|--|

|                   |   |  |  |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| 56 Pamela Bussard | <p>Support the Plan recommendations, this a Plan of the people.</p> |  | <p>Support the Plan recommendations.</p> |
|-------------------|---|--|--|

|                 |  |  |  |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| 57 Linda Palmer | <p>Support the Plan as presented. The staff listened to the community. Did not overdevelop. Area is environmentally sensitive.</p> |  | <p>Support the Plan recommendations.</p> |
|-----------------|--|--|--|

|              |   |  |  |
|--------------|---|--|--|
| 58 Joan Snow | <p>Don't change the Plan recommendations and substitute, this will dilute the effort that went into the Plan.</p> |  | <p>Support the Plan recommendations.</p> |
|--------------|---|--|--|



| # Speaker/<br>Speaker<br>Context                            | Issues Raised   | Master Plan Recommendation on Topic Discussed   | Staff Response  |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>General Comments about the Plan Recommendations</b>      |   |   |   |
| 59 Barbara Zellers  | 1. This Plan reflects the wishes of the majority of the community. The planners listened to the community.<br>2. Many requests for more and more density from developers, but this Plan is already a compromise between those who wanted much more and those who wanted no growth. Schools already crowded, so we do not need more houses.            | The community vision for the Damascus Town Center is a viable, walkable, human-scaled town easily identifiable as the heart of the surrounding community. The Town Center should reflect the compact urban forms of traditional Maryland rural towns and provide a vibrant quality of life for its residents. The Town Center should respect the legacy of the past and its agrarian context while maintaining a framework for the market needs of future generations anchoring the northern borders of Montgomery County (P. 13).  | Support the Plan recommendations.   |
| 60 Gary Richard (letter)                                    | 2. Many requests for more and more density from developers, but this Plan is already a compromise between those who wanted much more and those who wanted no growth. Schools already crowded, so we do not need more houses.  | The Plan reflects the need to balance the occasionally competing goals of housing, the environment, transportation and town building (P. 41).   | Support the Plan recommendations. The comments support the existing Plan recommendations.   |
| 61 Steve C. Horn, Carroll County Dept. of Planning (letter) | 1. The Plan incorrectly mentions, on page seven, that Carroll County has five Community Planning Areas. There are eight Community Planning Areas in Carroll County.<br>2. Carroll County Department of Planning would like to be included in the regional transportation study that is proposed to be conducted on the need for a bypass in Damascus. | The Plan briefly describes the adjoining areas that will be impacted by the Damascus Master Plan (P. 7).<br><br>The Plan proposes the County Council conduct a regional study on the long-term traffic implications of growth patterns in the following adjoining counties: State of Maryland, Howard County, Frederick County, and Carroll County (P. 57).   | The Staff will modify the Plan language to reflect these comments.  |
| <b>Historic Preservation</b>                                |   |   |   |
| 62 James Warfield, Warfield Property                        | Family has owned property for four generations, since 1898. Historic Preservations wrong, not a former dairy farm, and don't consider it historic just because old.   | The Montgomery County Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) reviewed the architectural and historical significance of these resources. The HPC's recommendations on whether or not the properties merit historic designation regarding these resources are reflected in the Draft Amendment of the Master Plan for Historic Preservation (P. 90).<br><br>If ultimately designated in that Master Plan, these properties will be protected under the Historic Preservation Ordinance, which provides certain controls regarding alteration, demolition, and maintenance. The designation of a site should not infringe on the private property rights of its owner. A public hearing on the amendment to the Master Plan for Historic Preservation was held on December 2, 2004 | Support the Plan recommendations to reconfirm the existing designated properties. Historic Preservation issues are being reviewed separately through the Historic Preservation Commission review process. |
| 63 Randy Scritchfield, Damascus Alliance                    | Concerns about the Historic Preservation process.   |   |   |
| 64 Joan Snow  | Historic Preservation sites are a problem. They should not be designated if dilapidated. Maybe can move them instead of trying to save on site.   |   |   |



# Speaker/  
Speaker  
Context  
Historic Preservation

Issues Raised

Master Plan Recommendation on Topic Discussed

Staff Response

|   |   |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| 65<br>Gay Richard<br>(letter)                                   | Many local concerns about the Historic Preservation process. Browningsville residents upset about proposed Historic District.   |  |  |
| 66<br>Wayne<br>Goldstein,<br>Montgomery<br>Preservation,<br>Inc | 1. Woodfield Community was recommended for protection by HPC, but they heard strong opposition and offered a truncated version instead. Should not require community assent to create a Historic District. Odd that some oppose designation, like the current character, but don't want government involved. Modest limitations work. Starter mansions will ruin the character. There is a real fear of teardowns in the future. Protect the area now, and the community will thank you in the future. Need conservation district legislation. Consider recommending that the entire original Historic District included.<br>2. There are too few HPC staff, need more. |  |  |

46