

**South Four Corners Citizens Association**

PO Box 792

Silver Spring, MD 20918

[sfcca.president@gmail.com](mailto:sfcca.president@gmail.com)

September 22, 2025

VIA ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

**Montgomery County Council**

% Council President Kate Stewart

100 Maryland Ave. 6th Floor

Rockville, MD 20850

RE: South Four Corners Citizens Association Testimony Regarding The University Boulevard Corridor Plan

Dear Council President Stewart and Members of the Montgomery County Council:

As the elected president of the South Four Corners Citizens Association (SFCCA), representing 1,152 households, I am submitting this written testimony to supplement the in-person testimony I provided on September 10, 2025, at the first public hearing regarding the University Boulevard Corridor Plan.

Attached are both my September 10, 2025 testimony and the resolution passed by the SFCCA in January of this year. This resolution was previously sent to the Planning Board concerning the then-current draft of the plan. Our position from January remains applicable to the University Boulevard Corridor Plan draft transmitted to the Council from the Planning Board.

Sincerely,

Jeff Lesperance

SFCCA President

[sfcca.president@gmail.com](mailto:sfcca.president@gmail.com)

<https://southfourcorners.org/>

Encl: SFCCA Testimony (1), SFCCA Resolution on the University Boulevard Corridor Plan (2)

CC Montgomery County Councilmembers:

Kate Stewart

Will Jawando

Gabe Albernoz

Marilyn Balcombe

Natali Fani-Gonzalez

Andrew Friedson

Evan Glass

Sidney Katz

Dawn Luedtke

Kristin Mink

Laurie-Anne Sayles

**University Boulevard Corridor Plan  
Montgomery County Council - Public Hearing  
September 10, 2025, 7:00 PM  
South Four Corners Citizens Association Testimony**

Good evening, Councilmembers. I'm Jeff Lesperance, President of the South Four Corners Citizens Association. South Four Corners comprises 1,152 households just across the way on the other side of Colesville Rd, and is further bounded by the Belway, Sligo Creek Parkway, Dennis Avenue, and the star of this show, University Boulevard.

The proposed University Boulevard Corridor Plan raises significant concerns for our community, and while time is limited, I'll highlight some key objections:

**First - The "Street Grid" Option:** We fundamentally oppose any "Street Grid" concept, including the "more connected network of Town Center Streets" concept such as extending Gillmoure Dr and connecting Sutherland and Rogart Roads to University Boulevard and/or connecting Loraine Ave to Lexington Drive. Our resolution from September 17, 2024, made it clear: this will inevitably increase cut-through traffic, compromise pedestrian and bicycle safety, worsen parking, erode privacy, and could destroy vital neighborhood facilities like our Post Office and Safeway. Even though the Planning Department withdrew an explicit "Street Grid" option, the Plan's continued references to similar concepts are unacceptable. Any reintroduction of this idea will be met with strong objections.

**Next - Immediate Safety Improvements:** We strongly support safety improvements for pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles on University Boulevard and residential streets. These are long overdue and should not be tied to UBC plan approval. Many safety projects, including the MDOT pedestrian safety improvement program for University Blvd can be implemented *now* without the need for extensive zoning changes or road redesigns. We must also ensure that "road diets" on University Boulevard do not simply divert traffic onto our narrow residential streets, where children are more vulnerable. A comprehensive plan to mitigate neighborhood safety concerns, independent of traffic diversion, is crucial.

**Finally - Parking and Other Diverted Traffic:** We oppose new commercial and housing development if it relies on our residential streets for overflow parking. The recent ZTA 23-10 removed baseline parking requirements, but new residents and customers will still have

vehicles, overwhelming our already limited on-street parking. The Plan must clearly explain how excessive parking incursions into our neighborhoods will be prevented.

Furthermore, we are deeply concerned that new developments along University Boulevard could have direct access to our residential streets like Sutherland, Rogart, and Gilmoure. This would divert significant traffic into our neighborhood. We need firm assurances that cars and trucks will not be allowed to access or leave properties along University Boulevard via these residential streets.

In closing, this is just a subset of the feedback from the SFCCA. I invite all Councilmembers to join us for further discussion in our neighborhood – perhaps at the SFC Front Porch Music Fest on Saturday, September 27, because there are other things that bring a neighborhood together besides zoning, land use, and transportation. Thank you

## **South Four Corners Citizens Association (SFCCA) Resolution University Boulevard Corridor Plan**

The South Four Corners Citizens Association (SFCCA), representing 1,152 homes in the South Four Corners neighborhood, has concerns regarding elements included in the University Boulevard Corridor Plan (UBCP) Working Draft proposal. SFCCA concerns are:

1. **SFCCA Remains Opposed to the “Street Grid” Option of the UBCP.** On September 17, 2024, SFCCA passed a resolution opposing the “Street Grid” option of the UBCP consisting of extending Gilmore Dr and connecting Sutherland and Rogart Rds in a grid plan to University Blvd. SFCCA does not believe that it is possible to avoid extensive cut-through traffic into South Four Corners (SFC) neighborhood streets if a similar “Street Grid” option is implemented. Higher traffic will lead to reduced pedestrian and bicycle safety, more congested parking, and loss of privacy within the SFC neighborhood. The “Street Grid” option would also cause the loss of important neighborhood facilities (particularly the destruction of the Post Office and Safeway). SFCCA notes that the Working Draft 2025 published in January 2025 includes the following on page 107, to which SFCCA is strongly opposed:

“The long-term vision for Four Corners includes a more connected network of Town Center Streets that provides increased local connectivity for people walking, biking, rolling, taking transit, and driving, and introduces a more regular street pattern than today’s one-way couplet. . . . More consolidated and rectangular parcels within a more regular network of streets can facilitate development of higher intensity private development, public facilities, and/or amenities, while relocating vehicular property access points from University Boulevard itself to intersecting and parallel streets. . . . While the Plan identifies a more connected network of Town Center Streets as a long-term vision, the Plan also recommends further study be advanced in the near-term. A near-term study should consider the following potential elements of the long-term vision: . . . Reconfiguring the portion of existing eastbound University Boulevard that is west of Colesville Road into a new Town Center Street that connects to the street network to the west at or near Lorain Avenue and to the east at Colesville Road. . . . Relocating vehicular site access points from the combined University Boulevard to intersecting or parallel Town Center Streets”

The Planning Department recently withdrew the “Street Grid” option from the draft UBCP, but SFCCA notes that the Working Draft refers to “a more connected network of Town Center Streets” which appears to represent a version of the Street Grid. Any effort by the Planning Board to reinsert the “Street Grid” option similar to the design presented in the emerging ideas in the UBCP will result in SFCCA’s strong objection to the UBCP for Four Corners (apart from safety and aesthetic improvements that do not involve road realignment or extensive new development).

2. **Safety.** SFCCA strongly supports improvements to the safety of pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles along University Blvd and on residential streets. These improvements are long overdue. SFCCA believes, however, that safety improvements should not wait for or be tied to UBCP approval. SFCCA notes that the Maryland Department of Transportation is currently pursuing a pedestrian safety improvement program for University Blvd that is not linked to the UBCP. SFCCA observes that there are many safety projects that could be done well in advance of the UBCP, and without requiring the zoning changes or road redesigns proposed in the UBCP Preliminary Recommendations. SFCCA believes that steps to improve safety on University Blvd (such as by “road diets”) should also consider safety and other impacts of diverting vehicular traffic into SFC and other residential neighborhoods. SFCCA believes such diversions of traffic without mitigation efforts will diminish safety on narrow and crowded residential streets, and is at odds with Vision Zero and walkability, bikeability, and accessibility goals. Children (obscured by parked cars) are much more likely to cross these neighborhood streets than they are to cross University Blvd. SFCCA encourages development of a comprehensive plan to mitigate safety concerns within the neighborhood, independent of any diversion of traffic into the neighborhood.
3. **Protection of Existing Residences on University Blvd.** There is a substantial risk that residents of single-family homes along University Blvd will lose frontage and driveway access to University Blvd so that new, larger buildings to be built nearby (and which require access to University Blvd) can be accommodated. The Planning Board should provide a detailed map of the length of University Blvd, including through the Four Corners area, that shows an outline of the dwellings on each property, the amount of additional Right of Way (ROW) that the UBCP would use on each property, and the driveways, fences, hedges, or other existing features on each property that would be eliminated. This information would allow residents along University Blvd to understand if their properties will lose value or utility because of closer proximity of their living spaces to cars, bicycles, and pedestrians; loss of ability to park on their properties; loss of green space; etc. SFCCA believes that the UBCP should do everything reasonably possible to minimize impacts on these residents from displacement and loss of property value.
4. **Accommodation of Parking.** SFCCA opposes the commercial and housing development proposed in the UBCP if SFC residential streets are expected to accommodate overflow parking from new, higher density development along University Blvd. The County Council's recent adoption of Zoning Text Amendment (ZTA) 23-10 does not require developers to meet previous baseline parking requirements for new mixed-use and multi-unit buildings within a quarter-mile radius of BRT stations (BRT bus stops). Residents and customers of the new multi-unit buildings along University Blvd will almost certainly have cars and trucks, and will necessarily park their vehicles on SFC and other residential streets. Whereas SFCCA acknowledges the need for new neighbors to park, current on-street parking in SFC is only adequate for existing, single residence dwellings and a few additional neighbors. A large influx of new vehicles will

overwhelm limited on-street capacity and create congested parking and driving conditions. The Planning Department should explain how excessive parking additions and incursions into SFC and other neighborhoods will be prevented.

5. **Adequacy of Infrastructure to Accommodate New Development.** The Planning Department must also demonstrate that planning and funding of infrastructure in the UBCP area (e.g., schools, storm drains, water supply, power grid) is sufficient to meet the growth in residential and commercial demand enabled by the UBCP and AHS. SFCCA will oppose the expansive development proposed in the UBCP (as well as the AHS) unless the Planning Department can demonstrate that sufficient infrastructure will be in place to accommodate the planned development or that Montgomery County's Growth and Infrastructure Policy (GIP) will be adequately funded to pay the full cost of needed additional infrastructure through development fees. It is not sufficient to simply assert that the GIP will automatically address any shortcomings that may appear in the future without knowing what these shortcomings will be and how much they will cost to fix.
6. **The Planning Department Must Provide Future Traffic Forecasts for University Blvd and Connecting Neighborhood Streets.** SFCCA will not support any traffic or development-related aspects of the UBCP unless the Planning Department undertakes and provides the results of detailed traffic modeling of the UBCP in 5-year increments for the period of 2025 through 2045. We recognize that traffic analysis was done for the initial plan drafts, but the presentation of the results did not include any of the input assumptions used by the Montgomery Planning consultant (VHB). Nor did it provide information on vehicular traffic that will be diverted from University Blvd onto SFC neighborhood streets as University Blvd is reduced in lanes and building density on the University Blvd corridor is increased. These forecasts must measure future traffic congestion on University Blvd and connecting residential streets caused by the combination of the following, and the underlying model assumptions should also be detailed:
  - a. Natural traffic growth on the University Blvd
  - b. Traffic growth caused by UBCP-related commercial and housing development
  - c. Attainable Housing Strategy (AHS)-generated traffic coming from the neighborhoods that feed into University Blvd
  - d. Reductions in lane numbers and widths on University Blvd proposed by the UBCP
  - e. Traffic congestion effects caused by potential underutilization of the proposed BRT on University Blvd. These cumulative traffic impacts, not discussed in the draft UBCP material provided by the Planning Department, could lead to severe traffic congestion on University Blvd that would overflow into SFC and other neighborhoods along University Blvd.
7. **Concerns about the "Limited Change" Option at Four Corners.** SFCCA is concerned that many cars and trucks will enter and transit SFC residential streets under

the proposed “Limited Change” option of the UBCP. Such access will occur if the parking lots and driveways of the new, large buildings to be built along University Blvd at Four Corners connect directly to neighborhood streets such as Sutherland Road, Rogart Road, and Gilmore Drive. Other neighborhoods at Four Corners would be affected by similar access. SFC will need firm assurances that cars and trucks will not be allowed to access or leave any properties along University Blvd via these residential streets. Until such assurances are obtained, SFCCA will oppose the large commercial and residential developments that were proposed on October 15, 2024, by the Planning Department under the “Limited Change” option.

8. **Concern about Accelerated Timeline and Insufficient Notice to the Affected Communities**. The Planning Department has accelerated the timeline for this project, without sufficient communication to the community. The published timeline (<https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/corridor-planning/university-boulevard-corridor-plan/#timeline>) indicates the draft plan and a public hearing in the Spring 2025. Now, with limited notice to the community, Montgomery Planning decided to present their final draft Plan (the Working Draft) to the Planning Board on Jan 16, and will request that the public hearing on the Plan be held on Feb 27 2025. SFCCA requests that the public hearing and future consideration of the plan be postponed -- to at least the Spring, when originally published -- to allow time for communication to the public and for details related to the concerns above to be addressed. SFCCA requests that 1) there is more time for the public to digest and study the UBC Plan Working Draft; 2) Planning staff mail information and educational materials to affected property owners.

APPROVED and ADOPTED this 30th day of January, 2025  
Jeff Lesperance, SFCCA President