



December 17, 2011

MEMORANDUM

TO: Montgomery County Planning Board

VIA: Glenn Kreger, Acting Chief, Area 2 Division *GK*
Khalid Afzal, Team Leader *KA*
Area 2 Division

FROM: Sandy Tallant, Planner Coordinator (301-495-1329) *ST*
Area 2 Division

SUBJECT: Worksession #5 – Wheaton Central Business District (CBD) and Vicinity Sector Plan: Community Presentation – GreenWheaton

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Informational

INTRODUCTION

This is the Planning Board's fifth worksession on the proposed Wheaton CBD and Vicinity Sector Plan. The Board held a public hearing on the Public Hearing Draft of the Wheaton CBD and Vicinity Sector Plan on Thursday, July 29, 2010 at 7:30 p.m. in the MRO Auditorium. On October 7, 2010 the Planning Board held its first worksession which covered overarching issues. Planning Board worksessions #2 (held on October 28), #3 (held on November 18), and #4 (held on December 9, 2010) covered district and parcel specific issues. The community can find copies of the submitted testimony on the Wheaton Sector Plan website at:

www.montgomeryplanning.org/community/wheaton/index.shtm.

This worksession consists of a presentation from a private group called GreenWheaton. They will address environmental concepts that support the goal of the Draft Plan to make Wheaton a unique and sustainable community - economically, environmentally, and socially.

The Board members should bring their copies of the Public Hearing Draft.

In the next worksession on February 3, 2011, the Board will review the remaining parcel-specific issues, urban design guidelines, and 3-D fly-through of Wheaton.

Additional worksessions on land use and zoning in Wheaton have been delayed to allow staff to develop new CR Zones that will address compatibility and ensure appropriate transitions. These new CR Zones could be applicable in Kensington and Takoma/Langley as well as Wheaton. The Board will review a draft of the new zones on January 6, 2011.

The attached matrix lists the actions the Planning Board has taken so far on issues raised during the public hearing on July 29, 2010 and other communication received since.

ST:ha: M:\Wheaton (Sandy)\Planning Board Packets\PB Worksessions\Worksession # 5\Planning Board Packet Worksession #5.doc

Attachment

**Wheaton CBD and Vicinity Sector Plan July 29, 2010 Public Hearing Testimony Digest and Correspondence Received After
the August 13, 2010 Closing of the Public Hearing, September 2010
Worksession #5 Revised 12/16/10**

ISSUE (SPEAKER)	STAFF RESPONSE	BOARD DECISION
<p>WORKSESSION #1, OCTOBER 7, 2010</p> <p>Issue 1: The Plan should promote more office growth in Wheaton. The proposed jobs/housing balance should be significantly revised to emphasize Wheaton as a major employment center instead of a bedroom community. (Pages 7-9, 23)</p> <p>Montgomery County Sierra Club, Pamela Lindstrom – The plan does not inspire growth; it describes the un-dynamic place the growth forecast sees. Should envision the Georgia Avenue corridor becoming a “complete community” and not just a bedroom community for the I-270 Corridor. Wheaton’s residents should not be expected to commute to the I-270 Corridor if they want to better their lot. The need for balanced land use among the corridors was a major conclusion of the 2001 Transportation Policy Report (TPR).</p> <p>The goal should be growth in professional jobs in downtown Wheaton near transit access for the workforce. Such jobs would be the foundation for better incomes in the area, more demand for new urban housing and more prosperous retail.</p> <p>Upper Sligo Civic Association, Kathleen Michels – Wheaton could be a 24/7 destination with more jobs and entertainment opportunities in the evening then a bedroom community. Would like Wheaton to be a unique model of urban greening. Could be more innovative at the mall, including re-purposing. Current model with anchor stores is very 20th century.</p> <p>Housing Opportunities Commission, Maryann Dillon – Emphasize the need for additional commercial development in Wheaton’s core.</p> <p>Wheaton Redevelopment Advisory Committee, Jonathan Fink – The Plan must promote Wheaton’s potential as an office and employment hub. It is essential to Wheaton’s future that the office real estate market be expanded to ensure Wheaton can attract a large employer(s) to enhance Wheaton’s daytime economy.</p> <p>Audubon Naturalist Society, Diane Cameron – Wheaton should become a green business and job center, not a bedroom community. The jobs/housing balance in the draft should be flipped so that Wheaton will grow many more jobs and fewer new residential units. Grow enough jobs in Wheaton that more people are commuting “in the opposite flow path” (north in the morning and south in the evening) on the Red Line.</p> <p>Sligo Headwaters Civic Association, Leah Haygood – Concerned that not enough is done to encourage and develop jobs in Wheaton. Value diversity of small businesses in Wheaton and it’s not clear how the Plan helps preserve them and encourage new ones to locate in Wheaton.</p>	<p>No change in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>The estimated jobs/housing ratio in the Draft Plan is adequate. See staff report for detailed discussion.</p> <p>The small businesses will be supported by a combination of the proposed CR Zone’s incentives for on-site space for small stores, a possible retail action plan, expanding a streetscape program, and creating a community development corporation to help implement revitalization strategies along with the small business help programs by the County’s Department of Economic Development and Wheaton Redevelopment Office.</p>	<p>Insert revised table and explain it better (e.g., how the estimate relates to the low and high scenario, and the zoning envelope). Emphasize that the market will determine the J/H ratio and the proposed zoning provides sufficient flexibility – it does not constrain the potential for office development if there is a market for it. More office is desirable and the CR zone permits it.</p> <p>Include text in the Plan that encourages landowners and developers to come to Wheaton, NOT discourage them.</p>

ISSUE (SPEAKER)

STAFF RESPONSE

BOARD DECISION

Issue 2: The goal of 30 percent non-auto driver mode share seems low compared to Silver Spring and Bethesda (other Metro-served CBDs in the County). (Pages 40-49)

County Executive – The 30 percent non-auto driver mode share goal seems low compared to other Metro-served CBDs (Silver Spring, Bethesda).

No change in the Draft Plan. The proposed 30 percent mode share is an appropriate goal for Wheaton. See the staff report for a detailed discussion.

Explain how we got the NADMS percentage in the text of the Plan.

Issue 3: The Plan's jobs/housing ratio will result in Wheaton residents boarding an already over-crowded Metro Red Line at peak hours in Wheaton instead of coming to jobs in Wheaton. (Pages 40-49)

Sligo Headwaters Civic Association, Leah Haygood – Plan's current J/H ratio will result in Wheaton residents boarding an already over-crowded Red Line at peak hours instead of working in Wheaton.

No change in the Draft Plan. The proposed jobs/housing ratio is an appropriate goal for Wheaton as discussed in the staff report.

No change to Plan text.

Issue 4: Existing school facilities in the area may not be adequate for the projected student population generated by new development in Wheaton. (Page 58)

Kensington Heights Citizens Association, William Houston – Can the projected additional elementary students generated by new development in Wheaton be absorbed down the road into middle school and high schools when the time comes?

The estimated number of students in the Plan is in error. Change the incorrect number of projected elementary school students as revised by the MCPS staff.

Change the text on page 58 of the Draft Plan to reflect that the proposed residential development could yield up to 386 elementary school students, 310 middle school students, and 300 high school students. There are no capacity issues for middle and high school students, but an additional elementary school site may be needed if actual development is higher than the development estimated in this Plan.

Kensington Heights, Jane Folsom – An increased number of residents associated with infill development has affected the schools which has caused overcrowding at Oakland Terrace Elementary School.

The middle and high schools in the area have capacity to absorb the amount of development proposed for Wheaton. See discussion in the staff report.

Issue 5: The proposed CR Zone may be a disincentive to redevelop properties in Wheaton. (Pages 33-39)

Aaronson Family, Jody Kline, Miller, Miller & Canby, commercial property owners – The CR Zone will be a disincentive for redevelopment because the zone is complicated and costly for standard method of development, the likely development for most properties. This Plan may actually stifle interest in redevelopment, by reducing the standard method of development threshold from 2.0 to .5 FAR, in effect, a down zoning that requires buying back that density and going through the sketch plan review process. Oppose the proposed CR zoning for their property. The first wave of development could be encouraged by the standard method of development in the existing CBD-2 zone and would probably be discouraged by the CR zone's maximum 0.5 FAR for standard method development.

No change to the Draft Plan.

Approve staff recommendation. Conduct outreach (community seminars/forums) for small business owners/property owners to explain how the proposed CR zone works in layman's terms and compare it to how existing zoning works.



ISSUE (SPEAKER)	STAFF RESPONSE	BOARD DECISION
<p>The Use Table in the CR Zone is confusing; some uses specifically designated in the CBD zones are not permitted in the CR zone. Owners of commercial retail properties may not be “grandfathered” for existing uses and may have less flexibility to re-lease their property to fill vacancies. The lack of consistency may cause questions about nonconformity of uses.</p>		
<p>Virginia Sheard, residential property owner – The CR Zone may not be the most appropriate for small properties due to a burden to provide public space and the like.</p>	<p>No change in the Draft Plan.</p>	
<p>Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee, Jeannette Feldner –Should place more emphasis on including small retail in new construction along the arterials to create street level activity and long-time identity as a “small retail” downtown at the same time attracting some office development with the creation of a signature building.</p>	<p>Street level activity is encouraged in the core and even required on some streets.</p>	
<p>Chris Lindsay, commercial property owner – Transfer of density within the Sector Plan area should be permitted for all properties in order to foment a more cohesive implementation to the Sector Plan’s proposals.</p>	<p>No change in the Draft Plan.</p>	
<p>Existing permitted and special exception uses should continue to remain permitted under the zone and the Plan without the stranglehold that can be brought about by nonconforming or similar designations.</p>	<p>Transfer of density can only occur on abutting and adjacent properties within the CR zone.</p> <p>Existing uses are grandfathered in the CR zone.</p>	
<p>Issue 6: Rezone existing single-family detached homes within one mile of the Metro station to higher densities (pages 16-23).</p>		
<p>Leonard Greenberg, CBD property owner/developer – Incentivizing the redevelopment of existing single-family homes adjacent to the Core by recommending townhouses and multi-family zoning within one mile of the Metro entrance.</p>	<p>No change in the Draft Plan.</p>	<p>The Plan should include text that supports accessory apartments even if the comprehensive zoning re-write doesn’t make them a permitted use in the residential zones.</p>
<p>Elizabeth Chaisson, Wheaton resident – Increase density within walking distance of the Wheaton Metro Station. Retrofit small single-family detached homes in the neighborhoods surrounding the downtown thus enhancing their desirability for future generations. Allow by-right conversion of homes to include accessory dwelling unit or home office.</p>	<p>See discussion in the staff report.</p>	
<p>Issue 7: The Plan’s vision should include the concept of sustainability. It should include economic development tools to promote “green businesses” in Wheaton. (Pages 7-9, 16, 23, 49-51)</p>		
<p>Audubon Naturalist Society, Diane Cameron – Green infrastructure should be an integral part of revitalization because it will increase property values and business profitability.</p>	<p>Add language to the Draft Plan to better highlight the sustainable aspects of the Plan.</p>	<p>Include modified language in the Planning Board Draft to add emphasis on sustainable development, green infrastructure and environmental best management practices.</p>
<p>Elizabeth Chaisson, Wheaton resident – Wheaton should be the first green district in the County that markets and attracts green businesses and implements going green.</p>		
<p>Sligo Headwaters Civic Association, Leah Haygood –The Plan needs a stronger vision-one based on Wheaton being unique and evolving into a green economy center of Montgomery County. Create a “sustainable district,” like the arts and entertainment</p>		

ISSUE (SPEAKER)

district. Provide incentives for green businesses, non-profit organizations, educational institutions, residences and public amenities.

Issue 8: The Plan should provide more east-west bike connections in Wheaton. (Pages 40-49)

Wheaton Redevelopment Advisory Committee, Jonathan Fink – The design of any future pedestrian and bicycle path network should not impede the redevelopment of large lots, or interfere with the assemblage of smaller lots.

Washington Area Bicycle Association, Casey Anderson – Would like a couple more east-west connections.

Montgomery Bicycle Advocates, Jack Cochran – A number of business district streets need to be identified as shared roadway bikeways or having bike lanes: Blueridge Avenue (B-15), Realigned Ennalls Avenue and Price Avenue (B-19 and B-20), entire Mall ring road (B-25), bike route parallel to University Blvd. on north side (B-8, etc.), Reedy Drive (B-22), Galt Avenue, Pritchard, Horde Street (P-34), Alberti Drive, and at least one (two would be better) bike-friendly mall entry at Ennalls (B-19) and the existing mall entry (B-22) would be useful for bikes.

State Highway Administration – Prefer Wheaton be designated as a Bicycle Pedestrian Priority Area rather than a requirement for development.

STAFF RESPONSE

Revise the Draft Plan to include more bike connections.

Modify the proposed Draft Plan (text and graphics, pages 44-45) to include the following streets as shared roadway bikeways:

- a. Blueridge Avenue (B-15) - From Galt Avenue to Amherst Avenue.
- b. Entire mall ring road (B-25) around Wheaton Mall, not just the north and east portions.
- c. Bike route parallel to University Boulevard on north side (B-8, etc.) – Along Geiger Avenue to West Avenue to Oak Drive to Hillside Drive. Then take the most expedient route to the best crossing of Veirs Mill Road, ideally at Kensington Boulevard.
- d. Pritchard Road (B-27, P-33) – from Amherst Avenue to Horde Street – this will provide a better connection between the park facilities on the eastern edge of the Sector Plan area and the CBD.
- e. Galt Avenue – Extend the bikeway designation southward to University Boulevard to connect to other routes.

6

ISSUE (SPEAKER)

STAFF RESPONSE

BOARD DECISION

Other: Additional Planning Board Directives to Staff - Planning Board Worksession #1

Page 13 describes Wheaton and lists the public sector revitalization programs/projects. Describe the projects further and locate the maps on page 16, 17 and 18 closer to the text.

Page 15 identifies the usefulness of the overlay zone as an issue. Cross-reference the RETAIL overlay zone to the other pages referencing the overlay zone in the Plan.

Strategically reorganize the following pages: page 24 Existing Land Use (map), page 28 Proposed Land Use (Map) and page 25: Existing Zoning (Map)

Include text in the Plan that open spaces that are proposed are suggestions and not site specific places (open spaces and parks) and that there may be others not shown on maps. Staff will revisit this issue with the Planning Board when open spaces are discussed in each district in upcoming Worksessions 2 and 3 for additional direction.

WORKSESSION #2, OCTOBER 28, 2010

<p>Optional Method CR v Standard Method CBD-2: Continuation of Issue #5 from Worksession #1</p>	<p>Powerpoint illustration of Standard Method CBD v Optional Method CR for a 2.0 FAR development on Aaronson properties</p>	<p>Agree with staff's recommendation – no change in the Draft Plan</p>
<p>Issue 9: Should Parking Lot 13 be specifically designated as the location for a major public space? Should the proposed public space on Parking Lot 13 be owned by the Department of Parks? (Pages 16-23)</p>	<p>Executive Branch –Are concerned about the recommendation that the current Parking Lot 13 be the designated location for this public use space. The County needs to assess whether this would be in the best interest of an overall strategy for redevelopment. Rather than focusing specifically on Parking Lot 13, the Plan should recognize the need for an urban park to be included as a part of the redevelopment plan, without reference to how it is done.</p> <p>Department of Economic Development – Suggest eliminating/modifying recommendation that the Department of Parks should own and operate the major civic space recommended for the Core District as part of a public private partnership to better maintain flexibility and consider alternate management options as appropriate.</p> <p>Audubon Naturalist Society, Diane Cameron – Would like to see a proposed park in the core (triangle park) to include a beautiful public plaza and amphitheater.</p> <p>Wheaton Redevelopment Advisory Committee, Jonathan Fink – Believe that creating active use public open spaces will be vital in promoting Wheaton's potential as a lively and safe urban center. The use of County owned land must be used to spur development of "activity generating people places."</p> <p>Elizabeth Chaisson, Wheaton resident – Supports five or six public or private 1-acre sites scattered within a mile of the Metro, each with its own iconic green 12-plus-story elevator building fronting a small half-acre public park or space. This would allow the rent in the older one and two-story commercial buildings in Wheaton to remain affordable to the smaller businesses while providing room for middle to upscale businesses, housing and retail in the newer high rent towers.</p>	<p>Confirmed staff's recommendation to include text in the Plan that expands upon the recommendation that the major civic open space for Wheaton in the Core District should be centrally located in the vicinity of Parking Lot 13. The exact location of the major open space should be determined during the development review process for a public/private project that incorporates Parking Lot 13.</p> <p>Modify the Draft Plan indicating that the ownership by the Parks Department may be one of the options, and that the final status of ownership, management, and operation will be determined as part of the development review process.</p>
<p>Issue 10a: Should Ennalls Avenue be extended across Veirs Mill Road onto the Westfield Wheaton Mall property?</p>	<p>The Draft Plan proposes to connect the Wheaton Plaza Ring Road across Veirs Mill Road with Ennalls Avenue via a new business street. The proposed roadway would complete the three part Ennalls/Price connection which would provide additional circulation options in the CBD.</p>	<p>To be discussed at a later worksession</p>

ISSUE (SPEAKER)

STAFF RESPONSE

BOARD DECISION

Issue 10b: Should Ennalls Avenue be realigned to connect with Price Avenue?

One of the property owners impacted by the proposed extension of Ennalls Avenue sent in a letter opposing the proposed extension.

Ennalls Avenue extension is needed to improve mobility and connectivity in the Core. Retain the Draft Recommendation.

Retain the proposed Ennalls Avenue realignment in the Plan at this time. Additional information requested by Commissioner Dreyfuss. Will be discussed further at a later worksession.

Issue 11: Clarify the purpose of extending Price Avenue to Amherst Avenue through private properties and the County garage. (Pages 41-44)

County Executive – The proposed extension of Price Avenue towards east will go through the Garage 45 structure, which was not designed nor constructed to accommodate the extension of Price Avenue. The Plan should include additional text to explain a rationale and justification for this proposal, recognizing that such plans are not always feasible. An alternative should be described in the Plan.

The proposed extension is needed to improve mobility and connectivity in the core. Retain the Draft Plan recommendation.

Retain the proposed extension in the Draft Plan at this time. Will be discussed at a later worksession.

WORKSESSION #3, NOVEMBER 18, 2010

Issue 12: Should Veirs Mill Road and University Boulevard (west of Veirs Mill Road) be designated as Priority Retail Streets? (Pages 16-23)

Executive Branch – Extend Priority Retail Streets to include Veirs Mill Road from Georgia Avenue to just northwest of University Boulevard and along University Boulevard to just west of Veirs Mill Road. The Plan should foster flex office and rental residential space at street level that can be converted to retail space when the market allows.

No change to Draft Plan

Approve staff recommendation

Issue 13: Retain Veterans Park at its current location. (Page 58)

Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee, Jeannette Feldner - Support the enhancement and better use of Veterans Park.

No change to Draft Plan

Approve staff recommendation

Wheaton Forest Civic Association, Diane Lynne – Oppose any plans to develop the Wheaton Veterans Park.

Issue 14: Increase the proposed height on the Standard Properties parcel to emphasize Wheaton’s southern gateway and encourage a signature building (page 34, Block A). (Pages 33-35).

Standard Properties, Inc., Stuart Barr, Learch Early & Brewer, Chtd. – Provide the opportunity for a signature development to complement the “landmark building” envisioned across the street at the WMATA triangle site. Increase maximum density from CR4 to CR5 and an increase in the maximum height from 100 feet to 150 feet. Envision the tallest buildings on the property located along Georgia Avenue with the height tapering down towards Amherst Avenue.

Increase the density of the site from 4.0 FAR to 5.0 FAR and the maximum building height to 150 feet along Georgia Avenue, transitioning down to a maximum height of 45 feet adjacent to the low-rise residential development along Amherst Avenue. This zoning approach would be similar to the block directly north of the site (Block J). The new proposed zoning is CR 5: C 4.5, R 4.5, H 150 feet.

Approve staff recommendation

ISSUE (SPEAKER)	STAFF RESPONSE	BOARD DECISION
	<p>In order to maintain consistent zoning and maximum building height along the east side of Georgia Avenue increase the density and height of the portion of Block J (the Archstone at Wheaton Station building) from a maximum 4.0 FAR and 100-foot building height proposed in the Plan to an FAR of 5.0 with a maximum height of 150 feet should this site ever redevelop. The new proposed zoning is CR 5: C 4.5, R 4.5, and H 150 feet.</p>	
<p>Issue 15: Rezone the WTOP site on University Boulevard from the existing R-90 to higher mixed use densities. (Page 60)</p>	<p>Executive Branch – Consider increasing zoning for the non-historic portion of the WTOP property.</p>	<p>The Plan should indicate that a floating zone would be appropriate should the property ever redevelop. Consider re-zoning the WTOP property to either PD-18 or RT-15. Analyze and bring back to the Planning Board.</p>
<p>Issue 17: Consider preserving the four-acre Montgomery College Art and Design School (MCAD) property on Georgia Avenue south of the Sector Plan area as green space to offset CBD redevelopment. (Pages 55-58)</p>	<p>No change to Draft Plan</p>	<p>Approve staff recommendation</p>
<p>Issue 20: Provide a pedestrian and bikeway only connection with no vehicular access for the unbuilt portion of Kensington Boulevard between East Avenue and Veirs Mill Road.</p>	<p>No change to Draft Plan</p>	<p>Approve staff recommendation</p>
<p>Stephanie Savolaine, residential property owner, Kensington View – Pedestrians and bicyclists should have a safe network of routes that allow access to key amenities within our increasingly urban neighborhood.</p> <p>The currently un-built ROW of Kensington Boulevard should be developed as a pedestrian and bicycle through-way, made safer and better able to serve all members of the community consistent with the specific staff recommendations. This would retain the ROW in public ownership in the possible future event that the County needs to relieve vehicular traffic at the south-bound intersection of Veirs Mill Road and University Boulevard. Strongly believes that the ROW should not be opened to vehicular traffic simply to enhance the</p>	<p>Retain the paper ROW for the Kensington Boulevard connection to Veirs Mill Road until otherwise determined through the development review process for a future project on the Lindsay Ford properties.</p> <p>Staff further recommends including language in the Draft Plan that recommends that the Kensington Boulevard ROW connecting East Avenue to Veirs Mill Road be retained as a</p>	<p>Retain the paper ROW for the Kensington Boulevard connection to Veirs Mill Road until otherwise determined that the ROW should be abandoned in response to development and decided during the development review process for a future project on the Lindsay Ford properties.</p>

ISSUE (SPEAKER)	STAFF RESPONSE	BOARD DECISION
<p>development potential of lots 9-13 on the east side of East Avenue.</p> <p>Chris Lindsay, commercial property owner – Owner does not support a Kensington Boulevard connection from Veirs Mill Road to the existing Kensington Boulevard. Suggest a properly stepped pedestrian/bike connection in the paper Kensington Boulevard right-of-way at this location if contours allow.</p> <p>Does not support pedestrian connections on Lindsay property located south of Veirs Mill Road and north of University Boulevard due to its encroachment on Lindsay's property making it notably smaller and reducing redevelopment potential. Suggest extending it along East Avenue from Upton Drive westward toward Kensington Boulevard.</p>	<p>pedestrian/bike connection. If the roadway is constructed, its design should limit the impact upon the adjacent residential properties. The needed ROW should come from the larger block on the east side of East Avenue.</p>	<p>Include language in the Draft Plan that recommends that the Kensington Boulevard ROW connecting East Avenue to Veirs Mill Road be retained as a pedestrian/bike connection even if it's not needed. If a vehicular connection is determined to be needed, its design should limit the impact upon the adjacent residential properties. The needed ROW should come from the larger block on the east side of East Avenue.</p>
<p>Issue 22: Increase the residential and commercial densities on the Weinberg property from 3.5 to 4.0 FAR (pages 35-36)</p> <p>Weinberg Family property, Michele Rosenfeld, Rosenfeld & Rosenfeld – Supports the CR Zone on the Weinberg property (Block 7, parcel 8) but requests that the recommended commercial and residential density be increased from 3.5 to 4 because it would give additional flexibility to a larger redevelopment project with respect to market-driven demand for residential over commercial space, and vice versa.</p>	<p>No change to Draft Plan</p>	<p>Approve staff recommendation</p>
<p>Issue 23: Allow Hickerson Drive to be closed permanently to vehicular traffic to achieve a vibrant retail corridor and pedestrian circulation within the Blueridge District. (Pages 41-44)</p> <p>Jody Kline for the Aaronson Family, commercial property owners – Deemphasize Hickerson Drive as a vehicular right-of-way and emphasize its importance for pedestrian connectivity so that it could become the "spine" or retail corridor of an integrated mixed use development within sight and walking distance of the Wheaton Metro Station.</p>	<p>Modify the Draft Plan's text to reflect that the abandonment of Hickerson Drive may be considered if a private street designation would provide flexibility in creating a vibrant retail corridor with enhanced pedestrian and vehicular circulation within the Blueridge District. The abandonment of Hickerson Drive as a public street should be considered only if a combined development of the two blocks is proposed. A through block pedestrian connection should be maintained with retail as shown on Map 7, Priority Retail Streets, on page 18 of the Draft Plan.</p>	<p>Approve staff recommendation</p>
<p>Issue 25: The proposed Veirs Mill Road right-of-way would negatively impact the redevelopment potential of the Lindsay Ford properties. (Pages 41-46)</p> <p>Chris Lindsay, property owner – Oppose pedestrian connections on Lindsay property located south of Veirs Mill Road and north of University Boulevard. Instead, extending it along East Avenue from Upton Drive westward toward Kensington Boulevard. Does not support a Kensington Boulevard connection from Veirs Mill Road to the existing</p>	<p>Retain the 120-foot right-of-way recommendations for Veirs Mill Road as set forth in Table 2 of the Public Hearing Draft Plan.</p>	<p>Approve staff recommendation</p>

ISSUE (SPEAKER)	STAFF RESPONSE	BOARD DECISION
<p>Kensington Boulevard, but suggests a properly stepped pedestrian/bike connection in the unbuilt Kensington Boulevard right-of-way at this location if feasible.</p> <p>Does not support the Master Plan ROW of 120' for Veirs Mill Road or the proposed local street bisecting the subject block, which will reduce the amount of developable land.</p> <p>Stephanie Savolaine, residential property owner - Kensington View – The currently un-built ROW of Kensington Boulevard should be developed as a pedestrian and bicycle through-way, retaining the ROW in public ownership in case the County needs to relieve vehicular traffic at the south-bound intersection of Veirs Mill Road and University Blvd.</p>		
<p>Issue 25a: The two conceptual pedestrian connections shown bisecting the southern Lindsay Ford property on pages 41 and 42 of the Draft Plan would restrict the ability to redevelop the property: The one parallel to Veirs Mill Road is unnecessary, and both would reduce the redevelopment potential of the property.</p>	<p>On Map 16, page 42 of the Draft Plan, remove the lines denoting pedestrian connections on the Lindsay property south of Veirs Mill Road and add text to the Plan acknowledging that any development on the southern Lindsay property must provide for adequate pedestrian circulation, bike connections, neighborhood compatibility, and consideration of public access to remaining parcels. The exact alignment and design of pedestrian connections would be determined during the development review process.</p>	<p>Approve staff recommendation</p>
<p>Issue 25b: The proposed local street depicted on the northern Lindsay Ford property at this location and effectively preclude its development.</p>	<p>On Map 16, page 42 of the Draft Plan, remove the lines denoting local streets on the Lindsay property north of Veirs Mill Road and add text to the Plan acknowledging that any development on the northern Lindsay property must provide for adequate pedestrian and vehicular circulation, neighborhood compatibility, and consideration of public access to remaining parcels. The exact location of pedestrian and vehicular connections would be determined during the development review process.</p>	<p>Approve staff recommendation</p>
<p>Chris Lindsay, Lindsay Ford, The proposed local street depicted on the northern Lindsay Ford properties on page 42 and described on page 41 of the Draft Plan would overtake the northern Lindsay Ford property at this location and effectively preclude its development.</p>	<p>On Map 16, page 42 of the Draft Plan, remove the lines denoting local streets on the northern Lindsay Ford property at this location and effectively preclude its development.</p>	<p>Approve staff recommendation</p>

WORKSESSION #4, DECEMBER 9, 2010

Issue 16: Is the CR Zone the appropriate zone on properties in Kensington View and Wheaton Forest that serve as transitional areas between commercial and single-family residential uses? (Pages 34-36, 38-39)

<p>Wheaton Redevelopment Advisory Committee, Jonathan Fink – Agrees that certain lots at the edges of residential neighborhoods have the potential to sustain small-scale, non-residential uses but need to ensure that adjacent residential neighborhoods are not adversely impacted.</p>	<p>Retain the CR Zone for the transitional areas in the Draft Plan. A proposed text amendment to the CR zone will address some of the transitional issues raised by the community.</p>	<p>Move this item to a future Worksession to coincide with development of new CR Zones.</p>
<p>Judy Higgins, Eleanor Duckett, Stephanie Savolaine – <i>Kensington View</i> Strengthen language to protect the neighborhood from retail development on transition sites along East Avenue, and on University Boulevard (Block S –East Avenue between Kensington Blvd. and University Blvd.). A far more compatible and limiting zone should be assigned to these properties instead of the proposed CR Zone on the properties currently zoned R-60, C-0, and C-2.</p>	<p>Virginia Sheard, residential property owner – Proposed zoning for edge communities like Kensington View is not adequately addressed. The CR zoning recommendations, particularly on East Avenue and parts of University Blvd. and between Valley View and East Avenue, do not protect the adjacent residents from adverse impacts. Specific language must be written to ensure that only low impact activities can occur within the 45 feet height limits, and only a minimum commercial component should be allowed.</p>	<p>Wheaton Forest Civic Association, Diane Lynne – The CR Zone adjacent to our residences may be inconsistent with the surrounding residential neighborhood. Oppose the proposed CR designation on these properties.</p>
<p>Issue 24: Should Wheaton have a Transportation Management District (TMD) to encourage more people to take transit? (Pages 48-49) The County Department of Transportation – Given the current lack of office employment, and the fact that this Plan states Wheaton “is not envisioned to be a major office hub”, the success of a TMD effort in achieving the employee mode share goals is questionable.</p>	<p>No change to Draft Plan.</p>	<p>Remove bullet # 3 from paragraph two on page 41 which reads, “<i>Strong transportation demand management systems are already in place in Wheaton.</i>”</p>
<p>Issue 26: Road designation should be in conformity with community context. (Pages 40-49)</p>	<p>Amend the Draft Plan to include roadway designation changes as appropriate.</p>	<p>Accept the staff recommended changes except for Amherst Avenue and Windham Lane. Change the designation of Amherst Avenue from Business to Residential Primary on the entire block from Windham Lane to Pritchard Road. Bring cross-sections back to the Planning</p>

ISSUE (SPEAKER)	STAFF RESPONSE	BOARD DECISION
		Board in a future worksession. Maintain Windham Lane as Residential Primary.
<p>Issue 18a: Westfield Wheaton Mall should be able to retain the existing APFO approval if zoning is changed from C-2 to CR.</p> <p>Westfield Corporation, Inc., Jim Agliata and Furey, Doolan, & Abell – They seek assurances that a new Sector Plan for Westfield will have no effect on contractual rights per a July 2001 LATR agreement.</p>	<p>Include language in the Implementation section of the Plan to note that the APFO approvals remain vested through their expiration date and are not affected by re-zoning.</p>	Approve staff recommendation.
<p>Issue 18b: Site plan review requirement of the proposed CR Zone should be eased for the Westfield property through the creation of a Westfield overlay zone.</p>	<p>No change to Draft Plan.</p>	Approve staff recommendation.
<p>Westfield Corporation, Inc., Jim Agliata and Furey, Doolan, & Abell – Requests consideration of an overlay zone for the Mall property which could reduce or eliminate the site plan review process.</p>		
<p>Issue 18c: The 10 percent minimum public use space requirement applied to the entire Mall property would be excessive and difficult to meet before the full redevelopment of the Mall property.</p>	<p>No change to Draft Plan.</p>	Approve staff recommendation.
<p>Westfield Corporation, Inc., Jim Agliata and Furey, Doolan, & Abell – Westfield suggests that open space and amenities may be found in appropriate interior spaces as well as outdoor. Current lease arrangements severely limit the control Westfield has on their property which could hinder the ability to provide open space.</p>		
<p>Issue 18d: The CR Zone's grandfathering provision of expansion/addition to existing facilities should be increased from 30,000 square feet to 50,000 square feet.</p>	<p>No change to Draft Plan.</p>	Approve staff recommendation.
<p>Westfield Corporation, Inc., Jim Agliata and Furey, Doolan, & Abell – Westfield requests increasing the grandfathering provision of expansion/addition to existing facilities from 30,000 square feet to 50,000 square feet to further limit the need for Site Plan Review for exterior renovations of the Mall to accommodate new tenants.</p>		
<p>Issue 18e: Increase maximum building height on the Veirs Mill frontage of the Westfield property from 150 feet to 200 feet.</p>	<p>Change the rezoning designation on page 37 for the portion of the Westfield Mall property along Veirs Mill Road and University Boulevard to CR 6: C 5.5, R 5.5, H 200.</p>	Approve staff recommendation.
<p>Westfield Corporation, Inc., Jim Agliata and Furey, Doolan, & Abell – To accommodate future plans for the Mall property being considered by Westfield.</p> <p>Executive Branch – Encourage the transformation of the mall to an urban town center with strong synergies to the rest of Wheaton. Consider increasing both height and density on the Westfield property while stepping down beyond the ¼ mile station boundary towards the existing communities. The proposed height of 75 feet and FAR could be too restrictive.</p>	<p>Change the recommended zoning on page 33 and 34 of the Draft Plan for blocks A and C in the core across Veirs Mill Road from the Mall property to CR 6; C 5.5, R 5.5, H 200 to create consistent scale in the core. Specifically delineate the western boundary of the proposed CR Zone along Veirs Mill Road.</p>	Approve staff recommendation.



ISSUE (SPEAKER)

STAFF RESPONSE

BOARD DECISION

Issue 18f: Is the proposed building height and density on the Wheaton Mall property near residential neighborhoods too high?

Kensington Heights Citizens Association – Retain a green buffer between the neighborhood and the ring road surrounding the Mall to reduce the impact of new development on Mall property adjacent residential areas. Reduce the allowable height of buildings along the edge of the Mall property to 35 feet stepping up to 45 feet, then to 75 feet to reduce the issues of scale, privacy, and access to natural light and air on residential properties.

No change to Draft Plan.

Approve staff recommendation.

Danila Sheveiko, residential property owner – Include a green buffer zone between the Westfield Mall ring road and their property line abutting residential uses.

Issue 18g: Should the existing ring road and proposed local streets on the Mall property be in public or private ownership?

Westfield Corporation, Inc., Jim Agliata and Furey, Doolan, & Abell – Westfield is strongly opposed to any change in control over the Ring road. The Ring road is a facility designed to accommodate the critical issues related to traffic flow within the Mall to accommodate major tenants and their economic interests. Traffic patterns mean everything to the success of the Mall. Mall tenants would not stand for the conversion of the Ring Road from a private facility to a “public” street with attendant controls over which Westfield would lose critical decision-making rights. As a public road, the road would, for example, require ROW permits subject to public road standards. Westfield would be faced with legal challenges to any change in legal control over the critical Ring. Conversion to public status would create impossible legal issues regarding setbacks, landscaping issues, etc. Design standards called for in the Road Code further create more legal ad security issues - the Ring Road is a private facility and must remain so.

Add language to the Draft Plan to reinforce the importance of enhanced connectivity on the mall property with improved access to Wheaton’s core and the Metrorail station while the site continues as a regional mall. The Plan should note that the existing Mall Ring Road and access drives will play a role in achieving the Plan’s connectivity goals. The proposed internal streets serving the mall property can remain private. If the Planning Board is asked to approve a future redevelopment of the Mall property for something other than a regional shopping center as defined in the County Code, public designation of these streets may be considered. Include text which confirms private ownership of the Mall street network as well as the objective of increased connectivity.

Approve staff recommendation.
Add text to the Draft Plan noting that it would be beneficial to add sidewalks along Westfields’s ring road.

Issue 18h: The adjoining community raised concerns about existing stormwater management (SWM) issues on the property.

Kensington Heights Citizens Association – There are continued drainage problems suffered by houses in the vicinity of the Mall at the current level of development. Any future development on the Mall property should be required to be in full compliance with the principles of environmental site design and should include planning for 100-year stormwater management requirements.

The Draft Plan emphasizes sustainability and green developments to the extent that the Plan can influence the sustainability of future development beyond the applicable regulatory controls. However, the staff will review the Draft Plan language and propose any necessary modifications in the Planning Board Draft to address these comments.

Approve staff recommendation.



ISSUE (SPEAKER)

STAFF RESPONSE

BOARD DECISION

<p>Issue 18i: Signage may not be allowed as envisioned by the Mall. Westfield Corporation, Inc. – Existing regulations in the Zoning Code do not allow them to install new signs including electronic or computerized signs of various sizes and regulations.</p>	<p>Evaluate changes to Article 59-F to allow Westfield Mall to create improved signage for their property along Veirs Mill Road either as a zoning text amendment or as part of the zoning re-write. Include guidance on signage in the Wheaton Urban Design Guidelines, as appropriate.</p>	<p>Approve staff recommendation.</p>
<p>Issue 18j: Westfield proposed edits to the Draft Plan Text Westfield Corporation, Inc., Jim Agliata and Furey, Doolan, & Abell –The Plan must recognize the place and function of regional malls and of Westfield Wheaton in particular as a key to the success of Wheaton.</p>	<p>Make suggested changes to the Draft Plan as appropriate. Add language to the Draft Plan that recognizes the importance of maintaining an economically competitive mall.</p>	<p>Approve staff recommendation.</p>
<p>Issue 18k: Retain the existing green buffer along the ring road on the Wheaton Mall property to reduce the impact of future Mall redevelopment on adjacent residential areas. Kensington Heights Citizens Association – Retain a green buffer between the neighborhood and the ring road surrounding the Mall to reduce the impact of new development on Mall property adjacent residential areas. Reduce the allowable height of buildings along the edge of the Mall property to 35 feet stepping up to 45 feet, then to 75 feet to reduce the issues of scale, privacy, and access to natural light and air on residential properties. Danila Sheveiko, residential property owner – Include a green buffer zone between the Westfield Mall ring road and their property line abutting residential uses.</p>	<p>Revise the Draft Plan text to include recommendations for retaining the existing green buffer.</p>	<p>Approve staff recommendation.</p>

ISSUE (SPEAKER)

STAFF RESPONSE

BOARD DECISION

<p>Issue 10a: Should Ennalls Avenue be extended across Veirs Mill Road onto the Westfield Wheaton Mall Property?</p> <p>Westfield Corporation, Inc., Jim Agliata and Furey, Doolan, & Abell –Westfield is strongly opposed to any change in control over the Ring road. The Ring road is a facility designed to accommodate the critical issues related to traffic flow within the Mall to accommodate major tenants and their economic interests. Traffic patterns mean everything to the success of the Mall.</p>	<p>Retain the proposed extension of Ennalls Avenue from Veirs Mill Road to the Wheaton Plaza Ring Road in the Plan. The specific alignment should be determined during the development review process not in the Wheaton Sector Plan. Both the development review process and the abandonment process accommodate community input and require a public hearing. Add a note to the Draft Plan that the proposed realignment may require the Department of Permitting Services to deny a building permit and cause a property owner impacted by the proposed realignment to go through an appeal process with the County Board of Appeals.</p>	<p>Approve staff recommendation with additional language: Retain the proposed extension of Ennalls Avenue from Veirs Mill Road to the Wheaton Mall Ring Road as a private road. Recommend sidewalk and streetscaping in the Urban Design Guidelines. Give clearer direction to the Department of Permitting Services (DPS) that the proposed road extension is not intended to be built until a significant amount of redevelopment of the northeastern portion of the Mall property is initiated by the property owner. The proposed conceptual location of the road is not intended to impact the footprint of the existing building (CVS) or an expansion of the building currently adjacent to the conceptual location of Ennalls Avenue extended.</p>
<p>Issue 10b: Should Ennalls Avenue be realigned to connect with Price Avenue?</p> <p>One of the property owners impacted by the proposed extension of Ennalls Avenue sent in a letter opposing the proposed extension.</p>	<p>Add text to the Plan specifying that the specific alignment of the Ennalls Avenue to connect with Price Avenue and the associated abandonment of the existing right of way will be determined at a later date during the development review process which will accommodate community input and require a public hearing.</p> <p>Add a note to the Draft Plan that the proposed realignment extension may require the Department of Permitting Services to deny a building permit and cause a property</p>	<p>Approve staff recommendation.</p>

ISSUE (SPEAKER)	STAFF RESPONSE	BOARD DECISION
<p>Issue 11: Clarify the purpose of extending Price Avenue to Amherst Avenue through private properties and the County garage. (Pages 41-44)</p> <p>Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee, Jeannette Feldner – Supports the proposed extension of Price Avenue across Georgia Avenue creating a more logical grid for the downtown.</p> <p>County Executive – The proposed extension of Price Avenue towards east will go through the Garage 45 structure, which was not designed nor constructed to accommodate the extension of Price Avenue. The Plan should include additional text to explain a rationale and justification for this proposal, recognizing that such plans are not always feasible. An alternative should be described in the Plan.</p>	<p>to go through an appeal process with the County Board of Appeals.</p> <p>Add text to the Plan’s sections on Approach and Network Integrity, and The Street Network, (page 41 of the Draft Plan) to explain the extension of Price Avenue to Amherst Avenue as described above. Additionally, the text should state that this road extension would only be considered as part of a public/private partnership that incorporates a redesign and removal of Garage 45. The extension of Price Avenue would not be required as part of a future renovation of Garage 45.</p> <p>Add a note to the Draft Plan that the proposed realignment extension may require the Department of Permitting Services to deny a building permit and cause a property owner impacted by the proposed realignment to go through an appeal process with the County Board of Appeals.</p>	<p>Approve staff recommendation.</p>
<p>Issue 28: Should the Urban Design Guidelines be in the Sector Plan as they used to be in the past?</p> <p>Montgomery County Civic Federation – Do not support the idea of master plans and design guideline as separate documents. Design guidelines should be in master plans as they have been in the past.</p> <p>Other Testimony -</p> <p>County Department of Transportation – Re-evaluate the minimum Sector Plan rights-of-way widths including all major highway segments given their bikeway and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) potentials. (Pages 40-49)</p> <p>County Department of Transportation – Reevaluate the minimum master planned right-of-way widths for all Major Highways segments, given their BRT and bikeway potentials.</p> <p>Executive Branch –Recommends that references to the bus transit includes all the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) routes under study. Further, we recommended the recently completed WMATA Station Access Study be cited and that the Plan recognize the critical role of the existing and extensive bus network.</p> <p>State Highway Administration, Pages 40-49 – Further study is needed regarding the placement of signals, and the lowering of speed limits.</p>	<p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p> <p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p> <p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p> <p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p> <p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p>	<p></p>

ISSUE (SPEAKER)	STAFF RESPONSE	BOARD DECISION
<p>Supports short-term on-street parking, provided that parking does not generate increased operational and safety concerns along state roadways.</p> <p>Supports the Plan's efforts to revitalize the area. Encourage Montgomery County to coordinate developer-improvements in order to properly mitigate traffic and support transportation vision as outlined in the Plan.</p> <p>The recommendation of BRT on the outside curb lane is too specific.</p> <p>The County Department of Transportation, Pages 40-49 – There is a discrepancy between the total numbers of parking spaces as shown in table 5.</p>	<p>Will be corrected in the Planning Board Draft</p>	
<p>County Department of Environmental Protection – The Plan does not mention solid waste and recycling requirements for future development and for retrofits. The Plan should include language to lay the groundwork for adequate solid waste management infrastructure in the CBD.</p> <p>As part of raising awareness of water flow through increased visibility, we recommend including a commitment to daylight streams when possible during the redevelopment process.</p> <p>Clarify how encouraging small properties to redevelop together to facilitate shared use minimizes and mitigates impervious surfaces.</p> <p>County Fire and Rescue Services, Pages 40-49 – Roundabouts slow responding fire-rescue vehicles more than smaller vehicles. If any are to be included in the CBD, they must be designed to accommodate easy traversing by fire-rescue vehicles to minimize delays for essential life and property saving efforts.</p> <p>Reduced traffic speeds, and street closure for events will slow response time of emergency vehicles due to traffic congestion.</p> <p>Page 49-The newer proposal of planting trees on roof-tops would present a long-term maintenance concern and may require changes to the Life Safety Code in order to be able to provide firefighting water supply directly to rooftops.</p>	<p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p>	
<p>Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee, Jeannette Feldner - Page 59 – Bring some amenities or recreational facilities such as an indoor pool to the downtown.</p> <p>Sligo Headwaters Civic Association, Leah Haygood – Pages 49-53 – Wheaton should model how a degraded urban environment can transform into one that improves the environment through green building, environmental site design, etc.</p>	<p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p> <p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p>	

ISSUE (SPEAKER)	STAFF RESPONSE	BOARD DECISION
<p>Audubon Naturalist Society, Diane Cameron, Pages 49-53 – Would like to see environmental site design applied through retrofits to parking lots, roofs and yards, and integrated into the County’s considerable economic development resources. Suggest inclusion of the new Environmental Site Design requirements for all projects.</p> <p>Hope that a green direction will be woven throughout the entire Plan including economic development and transportation components.</p> <p>Anacostia Watershed Citizens Advisory Committee, Michael Smith –Plan should use the Anacostia Restoration Plan as a kick start to make Wheaton a nationally recognized showcase of Environmental Site Design. The Plan should make explicit mention of both Sligo Creek and the Anacostia Watershed.</p> <p>Washington Area Bicycle Association, Casey Anderson – The land use component should make this a place where you’d actually want to ride your bicycle and walk. Additional mixed use, and more density should be done in a way that activates the street and makes it more appealing to be out on the street, which in turn will give drivers the idea that this is a place for people and not just for cars.</p> <p>Kensington Heights Citizens Association, William Houston, pages 40-49 – Consider redirecting a portion of Veirs Mill Road beneath the current ground level, and creating a vibrant pedestrian-only plaza between the Mall and the CBD.</p> <p>Consider what responsibility we have for ensuring that the services provided by Crossways Community Center continue if a new elementary school is located to this site. Where would the services provided at Crossways Community go?</p> <p>Housing Opportunities Commission – The Plan should have a dedicated section on housing. Housing is a fundamental element in any community and deserves a discreet discussion.</p> <p>Virginia Sheard, Kensington View, pages 40-49 – While a 30% mode share goal is desirable, plans must accommodate parking and accessibility, the high number of drivers who converge on Wheaton for bus and transit services, which is likely to increase if the BRT becomes a reality; the number of outside Wheaton patrons and shoppers who will be necessary to sustain the expected new restaurants, services, and events.</p> <p>The proposed town center on part of Parking Lot #13 will have limited visibility from the bounding highways. Development on corners such as Reedie and Veirs Mill and Georgia and Veirs Mill should be set back sufficiently and limited in height to provide a visual connection to the outside world. 150’ and 200’ buildings to the lot lines will block all invitation to enter the activity area.</p> <p>Guidelines should be available for review concurrently with the Sector Plan.</p>	<p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p> <p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p> <p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p> <p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p> <p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p> <p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p> <p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p>	

ISSUE (SPEAKER)	STAFF RESPONSE	BOARD DECISION
<p>Guidelines should be available for review concurrently with the Sector Plan.</p> <p>Strongly request that until a document is approved for final distribution, drafts and associated reports be formatted only as black and white, portrait-oriented documents. Graphics should be made readable with best use of black and gray tints, and variation in line weights.</p> <p>Questions the importance of the information in the Appendices and why they exist, and hopes they go away before transmitted to the Council. Need to use clear simple English to make documents more understandable.</p>		
<p>Chris Lindsay, commercial property owner, pages 40-49 – Has State Highways Administration vetted the proposed roadways in the context of Veirs Mill Road and University Boulevard as State Roads?</p> <p>How and by whom proposed local streets will be maintained since they are not on the Master Plan of Highways?</p>	<p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p>	
<p>Danila Sheveiko, residential property owner, pages 41-42 – Plan a path to the Metro across the south and southeast parking lots that has some shade by converting some of the Mall's surface parking to pedestrian and non-motorized vehicle use with curbing to protect people from cars and trucks.</p> <p>The Plan should fully embrace Environmental Site Design (ESD) requiring that ESD be applied to the maximum extent practical on all development projects in accordance with state and local regulations.</p>	<p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p>	
<p>Elizabeth Chaisson, Wheaton resident – Plan should show how to retrofit what we have so that it will be sustainable in the years to come such as: Painting roofs white to cool it, improving stormwater runoff with rain barrel and a garden, building living edible walls with fruit trees, composting, converting basements to legal one bedroom accessory dwelling units.</p> <p>Washington Properties Company, Heather Dihopolsky, Linowes and Blocher LLP, page 37 – Need to ensure that the proposed project at the corner of Georgia Avenue and Veirs Mill Road (245 multi-family dwelling units on 1.76 acres) adheres to the proposed vision and recommendations in the Draft Sector Plan.</p>	<p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p> <p>Staff will address comments in the Planning Board Draft Plan as appropriate.</p>	