

PHED COMMITTEE #1A
March 2, 2015

M E M O R A N D U M

February 26, 2015

TO: Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee
EO
FROM: Glenn Orlin, Deputy Council Administrator
SUBJECT: Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment—transportation issues

Councilmembers: Please bring your copy of the Draft Plan to this worksession.

This memorandum addresses the transportation elements in the Planning Board's Draft Plan (see pp. 20-23). Some purely technical corrections may be made to the final document. **Council staff concurs with the Draft Plan's transportation-related recommendations, except where noted.**

Much of the public hearing testimony raised concern about traffic that might be generated by the Vitro/BAE site. The Planning staff examined several scenarios for the buildout of that site, including office, residential, and retail. (For more detail, review the Draft Plan's Appendix C.) For retail the staff assumed its M-NCPPC trip generation rates in the analysis. Using M-NCPPC's locally-based retail trip rates—which are higher than those used by the Institute of Transportation Engineers or by Walmart—the staff found that the proposed zoning for the Vitro/BAE site would generate a theoretical maximum of 305 peak-hour vehicle trips during the morning rush hour. The morning trips are fewer than if the existing Vitro/BAE building were re-occupied with office (450 trips) or even if it were expanded to the limit of its current EOF zoning: 320,000 sf (660 trips). The intersection potentially most affected in the morning is Connecticut Avenue/Aspen Hill Road, which is currently operating at a Critical Lane Volume (CLV) of 1,300, well better than the Subdivision Staging Policy's 1,475 CLV standard for intersections in the Aspen Hill Policy Area. Under the proposed zoning, the maximum theoretical buildout of Vitro/BAE site of 218,000 sf would produce in the morning a congestion level of 1,385 CLV, still better than the 1,475 CLV standard. Due to constraints on the site, however, the Planning staff believes 170,000 sf is a more likely order of magnitude for buildout, which would result in a slightly lower 1,375 CLV.

There is more traffic and congestion in the evening rush hour, although currently each of the three of Aspen Hill's major intersections is operating at no worse than 1,125 CLV. Under the theoretical maximum retail buildout, one of the intersections—Connecticut Avenue/Aspen Hill Road—would operate at 1,540 CLV: worse than the 1,475 CLV standard. Again, however, because of the site constraints, a buildout in the range of 170,000 sf is more likely, resulting in a congestion level just within the standard at 1,470 CLV.

The State Highway Administration (SHA) concurs with the Planning staff's analysis. In its September 9, 2014 letter to the Planning Board Chair, it noted that "it is unlikely a developer could pursue maximum build-out of sites within the amendment area due to site constraints and that, therefore,

it is unlikely the amendment area's intersections' critical lane volume threshold would be exceeded." (See ©1 for this excerpt.)

The Draft Plan assumes a Georgia Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) line, as have prior plans for this area. The trip generation rates used the above analysis were not discounted to assume BRT. The Draft Plan refers to an ongoing study of the BRT line by the State Highway Administration and the County, but as the public has noted in its testimony, the Executive has suspended it. **Council staff recommends deleting the references to this study: the last sentence of the third paragraph on page 20, as well as the last two sentences on page 21.**

The Board makes seven specific transportation recommendations on pages 22-23. The Department of Transportation believes that four of them should be removed as they are operational in nature and not appropriate for inclusion in the adopted plan. In lieu of removal, DOT believes the language could be softened, stating, for example, that future development approvals should *consider* the referenced improvements. Douglas Wrenn of Rodgers & Associates, which is a consultant to the Lee Development Group, provided similar testimony regarding the first recommendation (©2-3).

Limiting the inclusion of specific operational improvement recommendations within the context of master plan adoption is consistent with prior master plans. Such improvements should be considered rather than prescribed. **Council staff recommends that the first, second, fifth, and sixth recommendations on pages 22-23 be modified as follows:**

Replace the first and second bullets on page 22 with:

- **To the degree feasible direct access to and from the Vitro/BAE site from the existing full-movement Home Depot driveway from Connecticut Avenue, so that back-ups on eastbound Aspen Hill Road from its intersection with Connecticut Avenue would not be exacerbated. Some measures to consider include providing primary access to Vitro/BAE from the existing Home Depot driveway from Connecticut Avenue and installing a traffic signal there, and limiting access from Aspen Hill Road to westbound right-ins/right-outs as far west of Connecticut Avenue as possible.**

Replace the fifth bullet on page 22 with:

- **Consider shifting, as far west as possible, the westbound transition on Aspen Hill Road from four-lanes to two-lanes to provide more merging room for westbound vehicles and stacking space for eastbound vehicles queuing from the traffic signal Connecticut Avenue.**

Replace the first bullet on page 23 with:

- **Consider removing the southbound free-right ramp from Georgia Avenue to Connecticut Avenue, so that southbound right turns would come to the traffic signal with all other traffic. Removal of the free-right ramp would slow traffic traveling southbound on Connecticut Avenue by the Vitro/BAE site.**

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has compiled the Executive's fiscal impact of the capital improvements recommended in the Draft Plan. OMB estimates the County's cost to be in the \$3.5-4.0 million range (©4).

- P. 19 – The recommended bikeways mentioned could be more clearly defined in this plan. Referencing the 1994 Master Plan, a separated bike path was recommended on Aspen Hill and bike lanes were recommended on Connecticut Ave. It would be helpful to clearly state whether these are still the recommended bicycle accommodations in the area.
- P. 20 – Internal circulation networks discussed and illustrated are very important for supporting safe circulation of pedestrians, bicyclists and effective vehicular access. To reinforce the images, consider adding a target maximum block length or size and/or other quantitative guidelines for an internal circulation network.
- PP. 21-22 – The State's fiscally constrained draft 2015-2020 Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) includes projects under construction and/or development and evaluation. The CTP includes no projects affecting SHA facilities in the amendment area. However, while not in the amendment area, the CTP does include, as noted in this amendment, a nearby study of improvements necessary to implement MD 97 (Georgia Avenue) bus rapid transit between Wheaton Metro Station and MedStar Montgomery Medical Center in Olney. This project is currently in planning. SHA is working with the Montgomery County Department of Transportation to form a citizens' advisory committee in Fall 2014, after which SHA will determine the timeline for obtaining location approval.
- PP. 21, 25 – Relocation of transit stops on MD 185 (Connecticut Avenue) will be subject to SHA review and approval, especially with respect to pedestrian access, ADA accessibility, traffic queuing, pedestrian and motorist sight distance, etc. Coordinate with Ms. Anyeka Mockherjee, Assistant District Engineer-Traffic, SHA/D3 at 301-513-7404 or via email at amockherjee@sha.state.md.us and Mr. Paul Lethak, Chief, Right-of-Way, SHA/D3 at 301-513-7466 or via email at p lethak@sha.state.md.us.
- PP. 23-25 – SHA notes that it is unlikely a developer could pursue maximum build-out of sites within the amendment area due to site constraints and that, therefore, it is unlikely the amendment area's intersections' critical lane volume threshold would be exceeded. Coordinate modeling efforts with Mr. Santanu Mukhopadhyay, Transportation Engineering Manager, Data Services and Engineering Division, SHA at 410-545-5649 or via email at sam Mukhopadhyay@sha.state.md.us.
- PP. 25-26 – SHA concurs that where possible, redevelopment should seek to consolidate MD 185 (Connecticut Avenue) driveway access, especially three driveways immediately north of Aspen Hill Road on southbound MD 185 (Connecticut Avenue). Coordinate with Mr. Steve Foster, Chief, SHA/AMD at 410-545-5601 or via email at k foster1@sha.state.md.us.
- P. 25 – SHA concurs redevelopment should seek to construct missing MD 185 (Connecticut Avenue) sidewalk segments. Coordinate with Ms. Lisa Choplin, Chief, SHA/ICD at 410-545-5524 or via email at l choplin@sha.state.md.us.

15

ASPEN HILL MINOR PLAN AMENDMENT

COUNTY COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY

DOUGLAS M. WRENN

FEBRUARY 3, 2015

President Leventhal and members of the County Council; I am Doug Wrenn, a Principal with Rodgers Consulting. We are land planners, civil engineers, and landscape architects and have been advising Lee Development Group during the Minor Plan Amendment process.

The Lee Development Group has been a part of the Aspen Hill Community for many decades. As long-term property owners, they are excited about the near-term opportunity to improve the area as well as the long-term vision outlined in the Amended Plan. It is my opinion that the Planning Board Draft Plan Amendment contains the land use and zoning recommendations necessary to achieve both of these important goals.

Based on the Planning staff's analysis, the near-term use of the Vitro/BAE site should be retail. Therefore the near-term zoning should align with the near-term use. The recommended NR-0.5 with a 60-foot building height limit does just that. The NR Zone allows flexibility regarding building placement, parking layout, and internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation that will be necessary to implement the retail use on this site. Flexibility is needed, because retail and anchor tenants will dictate the layout of their building, or they will not come to the site.

It is also important to make sure that the near-term redevelopment does not preclude or hinder the realization of the long-term vision—but only when the area reaches the character and intensity to support that vision. This is one reason why the Draft Plan contains Design Requirements that specifically address:

1. Public Realm Enhancement
2. Building Placement
3. Building Entrances
4. Façade Articulation
5. Parking and Loading Areas
6. Open Space

(2)

ASPEN HILL MINOR PLAN AMENDMENT

COUNTY COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY OF DOUGLAS M. WRENN

FEBRUARY 3, 2015

While these requirements add another layer of complexity to the redevelopment of the site, we believe that the challenges they present are not insurmountable.

There is one Plan recommendation that I think should be reconsidered. Under the heading Transportation Recommendations (page 22) the Draft Plan states: "Access to Aspen Hill Road from the Vitro/BAE site should be provided via a right-in/right-out driveway." Although this may ultimately be the best solution, at this stage in the process it would be better to allow some flexibility in how access could be designed, rather than creating proscriptions today without analysis of a specific design. For example, if internal access was provided from the Vitro/BAE site to the Dunkin' Donuts and/or Shell gas station and their driveways onto Aspen Hill Road could be consolidated or eliminated, then it would be advantageous to have full movement access at the Vitro/BAE driveway.

In closing, I want to commend both the Planning Board and Planning staff for working very hard to prepare and approve a Minor Plan Amendment that I believe strikes the appropriate balance between certainty of vision and flexibility in implementation.

PH 2/3/15
ASPEN HILL MP

MM
CC
SBF
LL



5012917

2015 JAN 30 PM 4:03

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

Jennifer A. Hughes
Director

RECEIVED
MONTGOMERY COUNTY
COUNCIL

MEMORANDUM

January 28, 2015

TO: George Leventhal, President, County Council
MLH

FROM: Jennifer A. Hughes, Director

SUBJECT: Fiscal Impact of the Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment

The Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment is very limited in size and scope. The scope of the Amendment results in Montgomery County being responsible for only a portion of the projects identified in the Amendment's vision. Much of the Amendment's recommendations are related to transportation improvements along Connecticut Avenue, within the jurisdiction of the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA).

The extension of the four-lane section of Aspen Hill Road westbound from Connecticut Avenue would be at County expense and is estimated to cost approximately \$1.5 to 2 million for 3000 linear feet of paving (conversion of shoulder lanes to traffic lanes to Parkland Drive). Additional costs for planning, design, right-of-way acquisition, utility relocation and construction management could easily equal the cost of construction. Therefore the total fiscal impact is \$3.5 to \$4 million.

The Department of Transportation contributed to this fiscal impact statement.

JAH:jdm

cc: Timothy L. Firestone, Chief Administrative Officer
Al Roshdieh, Acting Director, Department of Transportation

Office of the Director

101 Monroe Street, 14th Floor • Rockville, Maryland 20850 • 240-777-2800
www.montgomerycountymd.gov

PHED Committee #1B
March 2, 2015

MEMORANDUM

February 26, 2015

TO: Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee
MM
FROM: Marlene Michaelson, Senior Legislative Analyst
SUBJECT: Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment

This is the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee's first worksession on the Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment. A separate memorandum from Glenn Orlin addresses the transportation issues in the Plan. This memorandum addresses all other Plan issues.

Councilmembers should bring their copy of the Plan to the meeting.

Background

The Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment covers an area of about 14 acres west of Connecticut Avenue, just north and south of Aspen Hill Road. The vacant Vitro/BAE property encompasses ten of those acres. At the time the Council reviewed the 1994 Aspen Hill Master Plan Amendment, the Vitro/ BAE office building was occupied and the Master Plan supported the continued office focus. In 2008 the Planning Board approved a Georgia Avenue Study/Urban Design Framework, which envisioned an evolution of the commercial node in Aspen Hill from an auto-oriented group of strip shopping centers to a more walkable community with a grid system of streets, a mix of uses, and enhanced pedestrian amenities.

Since 2010, the 265,000 square foot office building has been vacant. One of the central purposes in this Minor Master Plan Amendment is to determine whether there is a more appropriate zone that will encourage redevelopment compatible with the adjacent residential neighborhood. The purpose and vision for the Plan are described on pages 5-6.

LAND USE

The Plan examines 4 areas for zoning, 2 south of Aspen Hill Road and 2 north of it.

The properties **south** of Aspen Hill Road are shown on page 15 of the Plan. Area 1 in the top map on page 15 is the site of a service station that was zoned Convenience Commercial (C-1) on the 1994 Master Plan and then Commercial/Residential Town (CRT) 0.75, C 0.75, R 0.25, H 35.¹ This Plan recommends reducing the floor area ratio (FAR) while slightly increasing the height. The Plan recommends CRT 0.5, C 0.5, R 0.25, H 45. The Council did not receive any testimony on this parcel.

Area 2 (map on page 15) is the location of the Aspen View Center Office Building. It was recommended for Office Building, Moderate Intensity (O-M) zoning in the 1994 Plan and rezoned to Employment Office (EOF) 1.5 in the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite. The Plan recommends confirming the EOF 1.5 zoning, but reducing the height from 60 and 75 feet to 45 feet. The Council did not receive any testimony on this parcel.

Staff supports the zoning recommended for these two areas.

There are two parcels north of Aspen Hill Road. Area 2 (top map on page 14) is the site of a Dunkin Donuts and service station. The 1994 Plan did not discuss this parcel and the Sectional Map Amendment confirmed the C-1 zoning. The Zoning Ordinance Rewrite zoned the area EOF 3.0, H 60, and CRT 0.75, C 0.75, R 0.25, H 45 (a portion of the Dunkin Donuts property is split zoned). The Plan recommends CRT 1.5, C 0.5, R 1.0, H 60 for this corner.

Staff supports the recommended zoning for Area 2.

VITRO/BAE SITE

Area 1, the Vitro/BAE site (top map on page 14), was the focus of virtually all the testimony the Council received on the Plan. This approximately 10-acre site is the location of the now vacant office building formerly occupied by Vitro/BAE. The site has been vacant since 2010 and the market analysis in the appendix concludes that the market “probably will not absorb the existing block of vacant office space or support the construction of a new or replacement office space in the planning area in the near future. Limited demand may exist for community-serving office uses, such as a medical or professional building.”

Three zones have been considered for this site: the CRT originally recommended by Planning Department staff, the Commercial/Residential Neighborhood (CRN) zone supported by many of the residents of the area, and the Neighborhood Retail (NR) zone recommended by the Planning Board and supported by the property owner. Attached on © 1-3 is a chart that compares the uses allowed under each zone and a comparison of the development standards in different Commercial/Residential and Employment zones (© 4). A map on © 15 shows the current location of CRN, NR, and CRT zoning in the County. The map also shows CR zoning for reference (although it is not being considered for this site).

¹ In the CRT and CRN zones, the C indicates the Commercial Floor Area Ratio (FAR), the R indicates the Residential FAR, and the H indicates the Height.

Since much of the Council testimony addressed whether a Walmart or other Big Box could locate on this site, it is worthwhile to address this issue first. A large Walmart or any other department or retail store that exceeds 85,000 square feet and includes a pharmacy and a full line of groceries is called a Combination Retail use in the Zoning Ordinance. While a Combination Retail store is not allowed in the CRN zone, it is a conditional use in the CRT and NR zones that requires the approval of the Hearing Examiner via a separate process. The Hearing Examiner must make a number of findings (see © 5-6) before approving a conditional use, including that the proposed development “substantially conforms with the recommendations of the applicable master plan” and that it “is harmonious with and will not alter the character of the surrounding neighborhood in a manner inconsistent with the Plan”. **If the Council believes that a Combination Retail use would not be appropriate for Aspen Hill, it can state this in the master plan so that the Hearing Examiner would not be able to make the necessary findings needed to approve the conditional use application for development in the CRT or NR zone.**

One of the similarities among the zones that should be noted is that **each zone will require site plan for any employment or mixed-use development over 10,000 square feet, since the property is adjacent to residential development** (see chart in the Zoning Ordinance on page 7-23).² In many cases, uses designated as limited will require site plan, even if they are less than 10,000 square feet.

CRN Zone

The Council received extensive testimony, including a petition with over 2000 signatures, opposing rezoning that would allow “Walmart or other big box stores in Aspen Hill”. While a very limited number of individuals did not support any redevelopment, the vast majority who addressed this issue asked for smaller scale redevelopment and many specifically suggested the CRN zone, which does not allow retail uses greater than 15,000 square feet or a grocery store greater than 50,000 square feet. Uses specifically mentioned in testimony by residents or civic groups included professional or medical offices or clinics, assisted living or continuing care retirement facilities, restaurants, small retail shops, a health club, and a movie production space. The size limitations in the CRN zone would certainly prevent the development of a large Walmart or big box store, **but they also significantly limit redevelopment opportunities, primarily because they limit the owner's ability to attract a large “anchor” store which is generally needed to attract other smaller retailers.** In addition, some of the retail uses specifically mentioned by residents in testimony would not be allowed in the CRN zone (e.g., even limited service health clubs exceed the 15,000 square foot limit).

Attachments on © 7-13 show the general sizes of different types of businesses, as well as specific businesses in the County that are over 15,000 square feet. These or similar businesses could serve as an anchor for a new retail center. Redevelopment of this site will be a challenge under any circumstance, but limiting the anchor to a grocery store under 50,000 square feet will make it far more challenging and less likely.

Zoning this property CRN would also be inconsistent with the use of CRN elsewhere in the County, where it has been used as an **edge** to provide a transition between residential development and higher density mixed-use development or in **rural villages** as shown in the map on © 15. CRN has only been applied to 0.02% of County land. **Staff does not believe the Council has applied CRN zoning to any areas with the characteristics of the Vitro site.**

² Since there has been some confusion as to this requirement, it may be helpful to clarify in the Master Plan, or perhaps in the Zoning Ordinance, that site plan will be required.

Staff recommends against CRN due to the following reasons:

- It would significantly limit the ability of the property owner to secure an anchor store, which would make it far more difficult to redevelop this site.
- It would be inconsistent with the use of CRN elsewhere in the County.

NR Zone

The Neighborhood Retail (NR) zone was developed as part of the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite. It “is intended for commercial areas that have a neighborhood orientation and which supply necessities usually requiring frequent purchasing and convenient automobile access. The NR zone addresses development opportunities within primarily residential areas with few alternative mobility options and without a critical mass of density needed for pedestrian-oriented commercial uses.”

The primary intent of this zone was to allow retail in lower density areas where mixed-use development was unlikely and the commercial uses were surrounded by lower density residential uses (R-150 and lower). It does not have an optional method and therefore does not have sketch plan or public benefit requirements, nor does it have the focus on form and design that is one of the hallmarks of the CRT zone. The Council focused on the creation of the CR family of zones before and during the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite and did not spend a significant amount of time discussing the NR zone. This Master Plan provides the opportunity for the Council to consider the circumstances under which NR zoning would be appropriate. In Staff’s opinion, the NR zone should only be used in the following circumstances:

- In areas where there is no expectation of pedestrian orientation/activity – even in the long term
- In areas where mixed-use could not be accommodated – even in the long term (with the focus on long-term goals rather than whether short-term market forces support mixed-use development)
- For small commercial developments surrounded by lower density residential development where it is unlikely that surrounding residents would walk to the commercial use – or very small properties in higher density areas that cannot develop as mixed-use (such as the one-acre gas station/7-11 in White Oak surrounded by residential properties and highways).

Staff does not believe the NR zone is appropriate for the Vitro/BAE site for the following reasons:

1. As noted above, the Georgia Avenue Study/Urban Design Framework envisioned an evolution of the commercial node in Aspen Hill from an auto-oriented group of strip shopping centers to a more walkable community with a grid system of streets, a mix of uses, and enhanced pedestrian amenities. CRT focuses on design that will encourage a walkable community while the NR zone presumes the area will not have pedestrian activity.
2. There is already CRT zoning in Aspen Hill. Where CRT exists, Staff sees no reason for zoning adjoining property NR, since the presence of CRT means that mixed-use development will be possible and pedestrian-oriented development (or long-term redevelopment) will be required.
3. The NR zone does not allow more than 30 percent residential. While the current property owner is not contemplating residential development at this time, the Council received testimony suggesting that this may be an appropriate location for assisted living or a continuing care facility.

4. The Council has used the CR or CRT zone for every similar development in each of the recently approved master plans (including Kensington, Long Branch, Chevy Chase Lake, Wheaton and White Oak). To Staff's recollection, NR has only been applied on a 1-acre site in White Oak via the master plan process. There should be a consistent zoning strategy.
5. The property owner has described the reasons why CRT will make development difficult due to the unique attributes of this site. However, many of these exact same circumstances will impact other sites where it has been applied, and the zone should be modified rather than allow this property owner to use NR and problems to still exist in each of the other areas.
6. Property owners in each of the other areas where CRT has been applied have asked the Council for an interim zone that would facilitate short-term development without the requirements of CRT until they were ready to complete the mixed-use development contemplated at build-out. In each case, the Council turned down this request to ensure that the long-term vision would not be compromised.

The map on © 15 shows how little NR has been used and Staff recommends reducing its use even further in places such as Aspen Hill, which do not fit the criteria for using the NR zone described above. Staff recommends reexamining all of the NR zoning in Aspen Hill when the broader master plan comes to the Council.

CRT Zone

Staff believes the CRT zone is the best choice for this site. Staff supports using the same density as the adjacent property at the corner (and originally recommended by Planning Department staff for the entire property), which is CRT 1.5, C 0.5, R 1.0, and H 60. This keeps the commercial density at the same level recommended by the Planning Board but also adds the potential for residential development. Should the property develop with both residential and commercial in separate structures, residential development should be located on the western portion of the property closest to the existing residential development. Staff supports prohibition on commercial development within 100 feet of the existing homes.

The CRT zone is not without difficulties at this location. In particular, the property owner has indicated that the build-to-area requirements are problematic when a site is not square or rectangular and that the transparency and entrance spacing requirements would be problematic for a grocery store and perhaps other uses. **One or more of these problems will apply to every site the Council has zoned CRT, and issues associated with a grocery store will exist for many, if not all, CRT areas.** It is important that Council address these issues via a text amendment that will impact all properties, rather than just address it for this single area. Staff recommends that the Council direct the Planning Department to prepare a text amendment to provide additional flexibility to address these issues. The CRT zone specifies standards, rather than objectives that can be met with alternative strategies, and the text amendment should allow property owners to achieve the objectives of the zone in alternative ways. To ensure that it can be completed quickly, the zoning text amendment should focus on the issues identified through this Plan, rather than be a comprehensive review of potential changes to the CRT zone. The goal should be to introduce a text amendment at the same time as the Sectional Map Amendment so that it can be approved on the same schedule.

Design Criteria

The Plan includes design criteria on page 16. If the Council concurs with the Staff recommendation for CRT zoning, then some of the language may be redundant since the design criteria are meant, in

part, to replace the requirements in the CRT zone, although in many cases the standards have been changed. Regardless of which zone is selected, design guidance should be included in the Plan. Staff recommends expanding the section on the transition between the commercially zoned properties and the adjacent residential neighborhood, rather than just referring to the Zoning Ordinance.

ENVIRONMENT

The Environment is addressed on page 24. This section describes the subwatershed, the carbon footprint, and the need for stormwater management and tree canopy as redevelopment occurs. Staff supports the section on the environment with the exception of the last sentence on the page, which recommends reducing energy consumption by “integrating geothermal systems to reduce energy consumption and allowing and encouraging wind energy conversion systems and large energy systems”. As the Council has noted on previous occasions during its review of master plans, long-term land use planning documents should not discuss specific energy technologies, which could change over time.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Community Facilities (including schools, parks, recreation and libraries) are not addressed in the Plan. Every master plan, no matter how limited the area, needs to have a comprehensive review of the issues addressed in all plans. Staff raised this concern with Planning Department Staff and they have prepared a new section on Community Facilities (attached on © 14).

Staff supports adding this section to the Plan.

f:\michaelson\1plan\1mstrpln\aspen hill mmpa\packets\150302phed.doc

Excerpted from Section 3.1.6. Use Table

USE OR USE GROUP	Definitions and Standards	CRN	CRT	NR
NURSERY	3.2.7			
Nursery (Retail)	3.2.7.A		P	P
HOUSEHOLD LIVING	3.3.1			
Single-Unit Living	3.3.1.B	P	P	L
Two-Unit Living	3.3.1.C	P	P	L
Townhouse Living	3.3.1.D	P	P	L
Multi-Unit Living	3.3.1.E	P	P	L
GROUP LIVING	3.3.2			
Residential Care Facility (9 - 16 Persons)	3.3.2.E	L	P	L
Residential Care Facility (Over 16 Persons)	3.3.2.E	L	L	
CIVIC AND INSTITUTIONAL				
Ambulance, Rescue Squad (Private)	3.4.1		L	P
Charitable, Philanthropic Institution	3.4.2	P	P	C
Cultural Institution	3.4.3	L	P	
Educational Institution (Private)	3.4.5	L	P	P
Hospital	3.4.6		L	
Private Club, Service Organization	3.4.8	L	P	
COMMUNICATION FACILITY	3.5.2			
Telecommunications Tower	3.5.2.C			C
EATING AND DRINKING	3.5.3			
Restaurant	3.5.3.B	L	P	P
FUNERAL AND INTERMENT SERVICES	3.5.4			
Funeral Home, Undertaker	3.5.4.C		L	
Landscape Contractor	3.5.5			

USE OR USE GROUP	Definitions and Standards			
		CRN	CRT	NR
LODGING	3.5.6			
Hotel, Motel	3.5.6.C		P	
MEDICAL AND DENTAL	3.5.7			
Clinic (More than 4 Medical Practitioners)	3.5.7.B	L	P	C
Medical, Dental Laboratory	3.5.7.C		P	
OFFICE AND PROFESSIONAL	3.5.8			
Research and Development	3.5.8.C		P	
PARKING	3.5.9			
Structured Parking	3.5.9.B		P	
Surface Parking for Commercial Uses in an Historic District	3.5.9.D			
RECREATION AND ENTERTAINMENT	3.5.10			
Conference Center	3.5.10.C		P	
Health Clubs and Facilities	3.5.10.E	L	P	L
Recreation and Entertainment Facility, Indoor (Capacity up to 1,000 Persons)	3.5.10.F	C	L/C	C
Recreation and Entertainment Facility, Major (Capacity over 1,000 Persons)	3.5.10.H		C	C
RETAIL SALES AND SERVICE	3.5.11			
Combination Retail	3.5.11.A		C	C
Retail/Service Establishment (5,001 - 15,000 SF)	3.5.11.B	L	P	P
Retail/Service Establishment (15,001 - 50,000 SF)	3.5.11.B	L	P	P
Retail/Service Establishment (50,001 - 85,000 SF)	3.5.11.B		L	P
Retail/Service Establishment (85,001-120,000 SF)	3.5.11.B		L	L
Retail/Service Establishment (120,001 SF and Over)	3.5.11.B		L	C
VEHICLE/EQUIPMENT SALES AND RENTAL	3.5.12			
Light Vehicle Sales and Rental (Indoor)	3.5.12.B		L	
Light Vehicle Sales and Rental (Outdoor)	3.5.12.C		L	C

USE OR USE GROUP	Definitions and Standards			
		CRN	CRT	NR
VEHICLE SERVICE	3.5.13			
Car Wash	3.5.13.B		C	
Filling Station	3.5.13.C		C	C
Repair (Commercial Vehicle)	3.5.13.D			
Repair (Major)	3.5.13.E		C	
Repair (Minor)	3.5.13.F		L	C
ACCESSORY COMMERCIAL USES	3.5.14			
Drive-Thru	3.5.14.E		L/C	L/C
INDUSTRIAL				
Dry Cleaning Facility (Up to 3,000 SF)	3.6.3.A		L	L
MANUFACTURING AND PRODUCTION	3.6.4			
Artisan Manufacturing and Production	3.6.4.A	P	P	
Medical/Scientific Manufacturing and Production	3.6.4.D		L	
TRANSPORTATION	3.6.6			
Bus, Rail Terminal/Station	3.6.6.A		L	P
Taxi/Limo Facility	3.6.6.D		L	P
UTILITIES	3.6.7			
Distribution Line (Above Ground)	3.6.7.A		L	
Pipeline (Above Ground)	3.6.7.C	C	C	
Public Utility Structure	3.6.7.E	C	L	C
WAREHOUSE	3.6.8			
Self-Storage	3.6.8.D		C	
Storage Facility	3.6.8.E		L	

ATTACHMENT 2

Prepared by Planning Department Staff

Table 2: Comparison of Development Standards by Zone

Development Standard	Commercial/Residential Zones			Employment Zones		
	CRN	CRT	CR	NR	GR	EOF
Max Total Density	0.25-1.5	0.5-4.0	0.5-8.0	0.25-1.5	0.5-2.5	0.5-4.0
Max Commercial Density	0.00-1.5	0.25-3.5	0.25-7.5	n/a	n/a	n/a
Max Residential Density	0.00-1.5	0.25-3.5	0.25-7.5	limited to 30% of total site GFA		
Max Height	25'-65'	35'-150'	35'-300'	25'-50'	25'-120'	35'-200'
Max total standard method FAR	n/a	> of 1.0 FAR or 10k SF GFA	> of 0.5 FAR or 10k SF GFA	n/a	n/a	> of 1.0 FAR or 10k SF GFA
Parking Setbacks (min for surface lots)						
Front setback	must be behind front bldg line (Apartment, Multi Use, General Buildings)			must accommodate landscaping, §6.2.9 (Apt., Multi Use, General Bldgs.)		must be behind front bldg line*
Side street setback	must be behind front bldg line (Apartment, Multi Use, General Buildings)			must accommodate landscaping, §6.2.9 (Apt., Multi Use, General Bldgs.)		must be behind front bldg line*
Open Space (standard method, site > 10k SF)						
Townhouse	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Apartment (Apt.); Multi Use; General Buildings	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Building Orientation (entrance facing street or open space)	required	required	required	n/a	n/a	required*
Transparency (walls facing a street or open space)						
Ground story, front and side/rear (min % for Apt., Multi Use, General Buildings)	required	required	required	n/a	n/a	required*
Upper story (min % for Apartment, Multi Use, General Buildings)	required	required	required	n/a	n/a	required*
Blank wall, front and side/rear (max length for Townhouse, Apt., Multi Use, General Buildings)	required	required	required	n/a	n/a	required*
Build-to Area (BTA: max setback & min % of lot width)	Y	Y	Y	n/a	n/a	Y*
Optional Method?	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Sketch Plan and Site Plan	n/a	Y	Y	n/a	n/a	Y
Public Benefits	n/a	by tract size or max total FAR		n/a	n/a	by tract size or max total FAR
Open Space (based on lot area & # of frontages)	n/a	Y	Y	n/a	n/a	Y
Max Height	n/a	mapped unless add. MPDUs		n/a	n/a	mapped unless add. MPDUs

*only applies when development fronts on a business district street or is recommended in a master plan. If site plan is required, PB may waive requirements.

Note: Table 2 is a sampling of development standards and not meant to be an all-inclusive list. For all development standards by zone, see Division 4.5 Commercial/Residential Zones and Division 4.6 Employment Zones of the Montgomery County Zoning Code.

E. Necessary Findings

1. To approve a conditional use application, the Hearing Examiner must find that the proposed development:
 - a. satisfies any applicable previous approval on the subject site or, if not, that the previous approval must be amended;
 - b. satisfies the requirements of the zone, use standards under Article 59-3, and applicable general requirements under Article 59-6;
 - c. substantially conforms with the recommendations of the applicable master plan;
 - d. is harmonious with and will not alter the character of the surrounding neighborhood in a manner inconsistent with the plan;
 - e. will not, when evaluated in conjunction with existing and approved conditional uses in any neighboring Residential Detached zone, increase the number, intensity, or scope of conditional uses sufficiently to affect the area adversely or alter the predominantly residential nature of the area; a conditional use application that substantially conforms with the recommendations of a master plan does not alter the nature of an area;
 - f. will be served by adequate public services and facilities including schools, police and fire protection, water, sanitary sewer, public roads, storm drainage, and other public facilities. If an approved adequate public facilities test is currently valid and the impact of the conditional use is equal to or less than what was approved, a new adequate public facilities test is not required. If an adequate public facilities test is required and:
 - i. if a preliminary subdivision plan is not filed concurrently or required subsequently, the Hearing Examiner must find that the proposed development will be served by adequate public services and facilities, including schools, police and fire protection, water, sanitary sewer, public roads, and storm drainage; or
 - ii. if a preliminary subdivision plan is filed concurrently or required subsequently, the Planning Board must find that the proposed development will be served by adequate public services and facilities, including schools, police and fire protection, water, sanitary sewer, public roads, and storm drainage; and
 - g. will not cause undue harm to the neighborhood as a result of a non-inherent adverse effect alone or the combination of an inherent and a non-inherent adverse effect in any of the following categories:
 - i. the use, peaceful enjoyment, economic value or development potential of abutting and confronting properties or the general neighborhood;
 - ii. traffic, noise, odors, dust, illumination, or a lack of parking; or
 - iii. the health, safety, or welfare of neighboring residents, visitors, or employees.
2. Any structure to be constructed, reconstructed, or altered under a conditional use in a Residential Detached zone must be compatible with the character of the residential neighborhood.

3. The fact that a proposed use satisfies all specific requirements to approve a conditional use does not create a presumption that the use is compatible with nearby properties and, in itself, is not sufficient to require conditional use approval.
4. In evaluating the compatibility of an agricultural conditional use with surrounding Agricultural or Rural Residential zoned land, the Hearing Examiner must consider that the impact does not necessarily need to be controlled as stringently as if it were abutting a Residential zone.
5. The following conditional uses may only be approved when the Hearing Examiner finds from a preponderance of the evidence of record that a need exists for the proposed use to serve the population in the general neighborhood, considering the present availability of identical or similar uses to that neighborhood:
 - a. Filling Station;
 - b. Light Vehicle Sales and Rental (Outdoor);
 - c. Swimming Pool (Community); and
 - d. the following Recreation and Entertainment Facility use: swimming pool, commercial.
6. The following conditional uses may only be approved when the Hearing Examiner finds from a preponderance of the evidence of record that a need exists for the proposed use due to an insufficient number of similar uses presently serving existing population concentrations in the County, and the uses at the location proposed will not result in a multiplicity or saturation of similar uses in the same general neighborhood:
 - a. Funeral Home; Undertaker;
 - b. Hotel, Motel;
 - c. Shooting Range (Outdoor);
 - d. Drive-Thru
 - e. Landfill, Incinerator, or Transfer Station; and
 - f. a Public Use Helipad, Heliport or a Public Use Helistop.

Typical Retailers by Size (in SF)

Store Size Range (SF)	Typical Retailers	Location Examples	Typical Retailer Price Range (SF)
5,000 and Below	• Fast Casual Dining	Panera Bread, Roti, Smashburger, Chipotle	2,000 - 5,000
	• Carry Out Restaurants		500 - 3,000
	• Local Restaurants (Sit-Down)		1,000 - 4,000
	• Fast Food Restaurants	McDonalds, Roy Rogers, Burger King	2,000 - 3,500
	• Coffee Shops	Starbucks, Caribou Coffee, Peets Coffee and Tea	1,000 - 4,000
	• Delis		500 - 1,500
	• Beer/Wine/Liquor Stores		500 - 3,500
	• Retail Banks	Bank of America, PNC Bank, Capital One	500 - 7,000
	• Insurance/Real Estate Agents		1,000 - 5,000
	• Phone/Communications Retailers	AT&T, Verizon Wireless	1,500 - 6,000
	• Post Offices		800 - 7,000
	• Dry Cleaners		1,000 - 3,000
	• Boutique and Gift Shops	Papyrus, Paper Source	700 - 1,500
	• Jewelry Stores		500 - 3,600
	• Beauty Salons	Hair Salons, Nail Salons	500 - 2,500
	• Florists		500 - 3,000
5,000 to 15,000	• Casual Dining Restaurant Chain (Sit-Down)	On the Border, Carrabba's, California Pizza Kitchen	5,000 - 6,000
	• Bar & Entertainment Restaurants	American Tap Room, Paladar Rum and Bar	6,000 - 7,500
	• Mattress Stores	Mattress Discounters	3,000 - 11,000
	• Paint/Glass/Wallpaper Stores	Sherwin Williams, Benjamin Moore Paints	3,000 - 6,000
	• Discount Variety Stores	Five Below, Tuesday Morning, Dollar Tree	4,000 - 12,000
	• Drugstores	CVS, Walgreens, Rite Aid	7,000 - 15,000
	• Auto Supply Stores	Autozone, Firestone, Advance Auto Parts, PEP Boys	3,000 - 18,000
	• Boutique Furniture and Furnishings	Ethan Allen, World Market, Pier 1	5,000 - 10,000
15,000 - 30,000	• Large Format Apparel and Discount Clothing	Marshalls, TJ Maxx, H&M, Old Navy	25,000 - 30,000
	• Limited-Service Health Clubs	Planet Fitness, Bally's, Rock Creek Sports Club	10,000 - 24,000
	• Junior Anchor Stores	Barnes and Noble, PetsMart, Staples, Big Lots, Homegoods	15,000 - 35,000
30,000 - 50,000	• Small Grocery Stores	Giant, Safeway, Harris Teeter, H-Mart, Whole Foods	35,000 - 50,000
	• Full-Service Health Clubs	Sport and Health, LA Fitness, Golds Gym	29,000 - 48,000
	• Small(er) Movie Theaters	iPic, Landmark	30,000 - 45,000
	• Mid Anchor Stores	Best Buy, Bed Bath and Beyond, Sports	35,000 - 60,000
50,000 - 85,000	• Traditional Grocery Stores	Giant, Safeway, Shoppers,	50,000 - 72,000
	• Warehouse Furniture Stores and Showrooms	Bob's Furniture	35,000 - 60,000
85,000 and Above	• Home Improvement Stores	Home Depot	100,000 - 130,000
	• General Merchandise/Combination Retail	Costco, Target, Walmart, Kohl's	90,000 - 225,000

(4)

Company Name	SF Occupied	Industry Type	City	State
A.C. Moore Arts & Crafts	25,045	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
AMC Theatres	40,000	Personal Services	Gaithersburg	MD
Angel Furniture	15,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Animal Exchange	18,000		Rockville	MD
Arclight Cinemas	66,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Bethesda	MD
Arhaus	26,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Arts for the Aging, Inc.	29,000	Personal Services	Rockville	MD
Arut Oriental Rugs Inc	21,000		Rockville	MD
Ashley Furniture Homestore	24,560	Manufacturing	Gaithersburg	MD
Babies R Us	37,362	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
Balducci's	20,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Bethesda	MD
Bally Total Fitness	20,422	Personal Services	Wheaton	MD
Barnes & Noble	37,500	Retailers/Wholesalers	Bethesda	MD
Barnes & Noble Booksellers	22,850	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Bed Bath & Beyond	30,694	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Bed Bath & Beyond	62,040	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Bed Bath & Beyond	28,006	Retailers/Wholesalers	Germantown	MD
Best Buy	46,250	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Best Buy	50,843	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Best Buy	61,978	Retailers/Wholesalers	Wheaton	MD
Best Buy	42,300	Retailers/Wholesalers	Germantown	MD
Best Buy Furniture	16,562		Takoma Park	MD
Best Friends Pet Care	23,986	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Bob's Discount Furniture	61,045	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Bowl America	45,000	Personal Services	Gaithersburg	MD
Bowl or Lanes	27,000		Bethesda	MD
Burlington Coat Factory	130,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
Burlington Coat Factory	69,032		Gaithersburg	MD
buy buy BABY	21,736	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Capital Properties/Ames	54,748		Wheaton	MD
CARE Pharmacies	55,382	Retailers/Wholesalers	Bethesda	MD
Charleston Alexander Jewelers	16,000		Bethesda	MD
Chipotle	18,528	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD

Company Name	SF Occupied	Industry Type	City	State
Clyde's Of Chevy Chase	17,885	Retailers/Wholesalers	Chevy Chase	MD
Collision Expert Inc.	17,646	Personal Services	Rockville	MD
Cost Plus World Market	17,158	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
CVS Pharmacy	15,144	Retailers/Wholesalers	Potomac	MD
David's Bridal	18,047	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Daycon Products Co., Inc.	19,600	Manufacturing	North Bethesda	MD
Dick's Sporting Goods	104,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Dick's Sporting Goods	40,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Wheaton	MD
Dollar & More	15,250		Gaithersburg	MD
DSW	35,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Bethesda	MD
DSW	26,136	Retailers/Wholesalers	Germantown	MD
DSW	20,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Wheaton	MD
Equinox Fitness	19,000	Personal Services	Bethesda	MD
Ethan Allen	19,750	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
EZ Storage	123,375	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Fidelity & Trust Mortgage, Inc.	26,732	Financial Institutions	Chevy Chase	MD
Fitness First	19,067	Personal Services	Germantown	MD
Fitness First	16,000	Personal Services	Bethesda	MD
Furniture & Rug Depot	18,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Furniture City	25,233	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
G Street Fabric	27,050		Rockville	MD
Global Environment Fund	28,178	Financial Institutions	Chevy Chase	MD
Gold's Gym	29,036	Personal Services	Rockville	MD
Golf Galaxy	35,317	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Great Beginnings Furniture, Inc.	60,102	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Guitar Center	47,772	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Gussini Fashion & Shoes	20,339	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
H & M	20,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
H & M	40,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Wheaton	MD
H & M	18,052	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
Harbor Freight Tools	15,005	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Hardware City, Inc.	16,800	Retailers/Wholesalers	Kensington	MD
Havertys Furniture	35,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD

Company Name	SF Occupied	Industry Type	City	State
HH Gregg	32,742	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Home Depot	107,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Home Depot	160,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Aspen Hill	MD
Home Depot	132,335	Retailers/Wholesalers	Bethesda	MD
Home Needs	15,701		Olney	MD
HomeGoods	28,768	Retailers/Wholesalers	Kensington	MD
HomeGoods	23,500	Retailers/Wholesalers	Olney	MD
HomeGoods	23,672	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
IPIC Theatres	44,500	Personal Services	North Bethesda	MD
JCPenney	143,060	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
JCPenney	198,374	Retailers/Wholesalers	Wheaton	MD
Jo-Ann Stores	25,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Jo-Ann Stores	25,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Wheaton	MD
K&G Fashion Superstore	15,305	Manufacturing	Rockville	MD
Kentlands Stadium 8	30,000		Gaithersburg	MD
Kmart	86,951	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
Kohl's	92,576	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
Kohl's	93,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Kohl's	86,835	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
Kohl's	91,704	Retailers/Wholesalers	Germantown	MD
Kohl's	59,237	Retailers/Wholesalers	Aspen Hill	MD
Kohl's	66,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
LA Fitness	48,422	Personal Services	Silver Spring	MD
LA Fitness	45,000	Personal Services	Gaithersburg	MD
LA Fitness	42,500	Personal Services	Wheaton	MD
LA Fitness	29,393	Personal Services	Gaithersburg	MD
LA Fitness	42,500	Personal Services	Rockville	MD
Landmark Theater	30,475		Bethesda	MD
Last Call	26,797	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
La-Z-Boy	19,825	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Lord & Taylor	149,644	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Lord & Taylor	120,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Kensington	MD
Lowe's	122,689	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD

Company Name	SF Occupied	Industry Type	City	State
Lumber Liquidators	21,800	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Macy's	169,602	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Macy's	354,084	Retailers/Wholesalers	Wheaton	MD
Macy's	203,266	Retailers/Wholesalers	Bethesda	MD
Macy's Home Store	98,548	Retailers/Wholesalers	Bethesda	MD
Marshalls	28,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
Marshalls	31,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Marshalls	25,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Mens Wearhouse	15,250	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
Michaels	21,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Michaels	21,235	Retailers/Wholesalers	Aspen Hill	MD
Michaels	23,296	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Michaels	18,200	Retailers/Wholesalers	Germantown	MD
Micro Center	30,046	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Modell's, Inc.	20,694	Retailers/Wholesalers	Bethesda	MD
Montgomery Autohouse, Inc.	17,199	Personal Services	Rockville	MD
National Tire & Battery	27,585	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
Nissan	33,891	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
Nordstrom	225,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Bethesda	MD
Nordstrom Rack	49,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Office Depot	27,675	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Office Depot	23,333	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
Old Navy	32,850	Retailers/Wholesalers	Bethesda	MD
PEPBOYS AUTO	18,576	Retailers/Wholesalers	Germantown	MD
PETCO	16,500	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
PetSmart	20,383	Retailers/Wholesalers	Kensington	MD
PetSmart	65,028	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
PetSmart	19,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Bethesda	MD
PetSmart	18,741	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Pinstripes	30,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Planet Fitness	16,050	Personal Services	Germantown	MD
Planet Fitness	17,928	Personal Services	Rockville	MD
Planet Fitness	20,464	Personal Services	Silver Spring	MD

Company Name	SF Occupied	Industry Type	City	State
Porcelanosa	20,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Potomac Adventist Book Store	33,038		Silver Spring	MD
Pottery Barn	16,608	Retailers/Wholesalers	Bethesda	MD
Regal Cinemas	58,648	Personal Services	Rockville	MD
Regal Cinemas	60,000	Personal Services	Germantown	MD
Regal Cinemas	99,770	Personal Services	Silver Spring	MD
Rite Aid	11,841	Retailers/Wholesalers	Aspen Hill	MD
Rockville Sports Plex	58,109		Rockville	MD
Ross Dress for Less	28,303	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
Ross Dress for Less	29,700	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Ross Dress for Less	27,957	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
RS Fitness, LLC	19,517		Rockville	MD
Rumba Y Carbon Bar & Grill	28,248	Retailers/Wholesalers	Wheaton	MD
Saks Fifth Avenue	26,695	Retailers/Wholesalers	Chevy Chase	MD
Sandy Spring Bancorp, Inc.	49,464	Financial Institutions	Olney	MD
School Box	19,212	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Sears	139,928	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
Sears	154,334	Retailers/Wholesalers	Bethesda	MD
Sears	181,214	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Sears Auto Centers	58,000	Personal Services	Silver Spring	MD
Sears Auto Centers	28,149	Personal Services	Bethesda	MD
Sears Outlet	19,637	Retailers/Wholesalers	Wheaton	MD
Sheffield Furniture & Interiors	39,677		Rockville	MD
Shemin Nurseries	50,900		Burtonsville	MD
Silver Spring Stage	18,520		Silver Spring	MD
Sleep Inn	60,000	Personal Services	Rockville	MD
Sloans & Kenyon Auctioneers and Appraisers	29,405	Business Services	Chevy Chase	MD
Sport & Health	79,888	Personal Services	Gaithersburg	MD
Sport & Health	67,303	Personal Services	Bethesda	MD
Sport & Health	47,743	Personal Services	Gaithersburg	MD
Sport & Health	32,791	Personal Services	North Bethesda	MD
Sports Authority	48,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Sports Authority	43,129	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD

Company Name	SF Occupied	Industry Type	City	State
Spunk Fitness	22,371	Personal Services	Silver Spring	MD
Stanley Steamer	15,357	Personal Services	Rockville	MD
Staples	25,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Bethesda	MD
Staples	15,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
Staples	30,406	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
Staples	19,478	Retailers/Wholesalers	Silver Spring	MD
Staples	16,543	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Staples	30,406	Retailers/Wholesalers	Germantown	MD
Staples	24,910	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
T.J. Maxx	26,539	Retailers/Wholesalers	Olney	MD
T.J. Maxx	30,000	Retailers/Wholesalers	Germantown	MD
T.J. Maxx	31,500	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
The Container Store	23,848	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
The Tile Shop	35,285	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Total Wine & More	25,895	Retailers/Wholesalers	Potomac	MD
Total Wine & More	37,952	Retailers/Wholesalers	Potomac	MD
Toys"R"Us	101,035	Retailers/Wholesalers	Gaithersburg	MD
Tractor Supply Company	25,970	Retailers/Wholesalers	Poolesville	MD
United Bank	16,000	Financial Institutions	Bethesda	MD
Walgreens	16,643	Retailers/Wholesalers	Rockville	MD
Washington Sports Club	35,000	Personal Services	Bethesda	MD
Washington Sports Clubs	24,000	Personal Services	Silver Spring	MD
Washington Sports Clubs	38,056	Personal Services	Bethesda	MD
White Oak Bowl Lanes	20,555	Personal Services	Silver Spring	MD

**Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment
Community Facilities Section**

Community Facilities

The Minor Master Plan Amendment area (MMPA) is well served by nearby schools, parks, recreation areas, and libraries. Brookhaven Elementary School and Parkland Magnet Middle School are located within a mile of the MMPA area. The Aspen Hill Public Library, situated on Aspen Hill Road, is less than a half mile from the intersection of Connecticut Ave and Aspen Hill Road, and the Wheaton Woods Swimming Pool is a short walk to the west beyond the Library. According to Montgomery County Public Schools, the elementary and middle schools that serve the MMPA area are projected to be within capacity for the next six years. At the high school level the area is served by the Downcounty High Schools Consortium - Blair, Einstein, Kennedy, Northwood, and Wheaton. Blair, Einstein, and Northwood high schools are projected to exceed their capacities in the coming years. Given the smaller geographic scope of this Plan and the limited emphasis on new, near-term residential redevelopment, this MMPA would have limited to no impact on school capacity. As part of the overall update to the 1994 *Aspen Hill Master Plan*, school capacity and the need for any future capital programs will be evaluated in greater detail.

Several nearby parks serve this area of the Aspen Hill community, including English Manor Neighborhood Park, Parkland Local Park, Aquarius Local Park, Northgate Local Park, Strathmore Local Park and Harmony Hills Neighborhood Park. The Matthew Henson State Park and Trail is within a mile of the MMPA and Rock Creek Park and Trail is within approximately one and a half miles. The 2012 Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan does not identify needs for additional parkland in this area of the County; it only specifies 2 additional tennis courts. As properties redevelop within the boundaries of this MMPA, the new development will be required to provide public amenity space as well as meet the recreation guidelines to help offset the needs of any new residents.

As recommended in the Transportation section (page 23), this plan supports connections that serve as vital links to the regional network and Countywide trail corridors. This Plan affirms the recommendation in the 2005 *Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan* to install a shared use path along the western side of Connecticut Avenue (reference code SP-27) to connect to the regional network, including the Matthew Henson Trail. This shared use path should be constructed in conjunction with applicable redevelopment in the MMPA.

Selected Zones in Montgomery County

February 2015

