

Hello -

My name is Candace. I have lived at 13512 Sherwood Forest Drive for a little over 10 years now. I am emailing you with my serious concerns regarding the proposed development of 150 new townhouses at the intersection of Notley Road and New Hampshire Ave (Notley Road LMA H-159 & F20250680).

I know this is a long email. I sincerely appreciate your time reading this. I have two kids who like to walk and bike our street - one of whom has multiple neuropsych and physical diagnoses. **I do not know if we can continue to live in this house if we are seeing 300+ more cars traveling this street.** I am not against development, but I am very very much against this *much* development that would negatively impact our lives.

My most pressing concern is the safety impact directly to my street, and moreover the traffic issue in the immediate area as a whole. I have many concerns about mischaracterizations in the developer's proposal, all detailed below. I have copied the traffic group regarding their interest in improving walkability for students in this area, as it would directly impact this.

A. The Notley Proposal for 150 homes would create a dangerous increase in traffic to neighborhood roads, creating an unsafe environment for residents.

- a. **Completely alter the state of neighborhood roads.** Page 8 of the [White Oak Master Plan](#) says "Provide a safe and efficient transportation system that serves the environmental, economic, social, and land use needs of the County and provides a framework for development. The White Oak Master Plan supports many of the General Plan Transportation principles, including an improved transit system, bikeway system, and *movement of through traffic away from local streets.*" The proposed development goes against the intent of the Master Plan, and in fact, would greatly increase traffic through local residential streets. The Colesville area has a dangerous problem with cut-through traffic. Travelers use Sherwood Forest Drive and Notley to bypass the congestion at New Hampshire and Randolph; travelers use Notley to connect from Bonifant Road to New Hampshire rather than go all the way to the intersection of those two roads; and travelers use Sherwood Forest Drive and Notley to connect to Bonifant. Added to this is a ripple effect: the recent increase in these cut-through travelers, as well as normal neighborhood growth and the return to office decree for federal workers, has resulted in too much traffic at the intersection of Notley and New Hampshire. Since it's so hard to turn off Notley, more are driving through Shannon Drive and Colesville Manor and therefore causing unintended traffic on those neighborhood roads. 150 new homes on Notley will only exacerbate this already out-of-control issue.

- i. The developer's proposal seems to take the opinion that a neighborhood built next to New Hampshire is convenient for residents to use New Hampshire. **I am telling you this is not how this area works - those residents will drive Notley to Sherwood Forest Drive and Bonifant whenever possible causing extreme stress on the neighborhood roads.** The road I live on will no longer be quiet residential streets but major cut-through or connector roads.
- b. **Increase reckless driving, endangering pedestrians and bikers.** Daily, we see reckless and aggressive driving on our neighborhood street as people drive too fast, speed through stop signs - especially on Notley and Sherwood Forest Drive, but also at Sherwood Forest Drive and Beaumont Road, and driving in the center of the street or into on the other side of the road while travelling a turn in the road. In our 10 years living here, we have: replaced our mailbox 4-5 times, filed a police report after someone drove through our front yard and crashed into a tree, and previously requested a traffic study with the county to combat these issues. Me neighbors who have lived here for decades say this is not unique.
- c. My children walk and bike Sherwood Forest Drive on a weekly basis. We walk or bike to school - a fact I stressed to county representatives at Westover last year when I pointed out that walking paths greatly expand the "1 mile radius" for kids walking to the elementary school. Our neighborhood has a rich culture full of bikers, dog-walkers, joggers, and families walking with their strollers. People walk or bike to the neighborhood pool along this street. **An increase in traffic would make it unsafe to walk our kids to school. It would make it unsafe to walk my dog, and really unsafe for the elderly neighbors to walk the streets. We would no longer feel safe letting our middle schooler bike this street.** It would also increase more traffic for parents - potentially along other roads such as Vierling - to access the elementary school.
- d. **I implore you to require a re-assessment of traffic study, or conduct a parallel county study, to address:**
 - i. **Change in volume due to federal employees returning to office.**
 - ii. **Ensuring the study is done during the school year, and potentially monitoring for pedestrians and bikers along Sherwood Forest Drive.**
 - iii. **Examine the amount of traffic that use Sherwood Forest Drive and Notley Road as cut-through roads on their trip to access Randolph, New Hampshire, and/or Bonifant.**
- e. The traffic study and proposal do not seem to take into account the congestion and issues around accessing the shopping center (with the Giant grocery store). I imagine that this isn't a normal part of traffic studies, but I want to highlight that part of the congestion noted with the Randolph/New Hampshire intersection is due to a poorly-designed access in and out of this shopping center that causes blockages for travellers along New Hampshire. Again, an issue that will be exacerbated with more residents directly north of this intersection.

B. Short-sighted and Insufficient Parking Plans would lead to stress on the surrounding residents and create dangerous situations.

- a. The proposal says it will have “ample on street parking” but does not include any details about this in their written proposal. During the in-person presentation to the Greater Colesville Community Association (GCCA), the developer explained they would have about 30 parking spots along the internal streets. The developer tried to support this lack of parking by explaining that the units would have garages and driveway space, which would total in 2-4 parking spaces per units for residents and visitors. This is preposterous for many reasons:
 - i. Most families in 2025 have at least two cars.
 - ii. Many people do not use garages to park in, but more for storage.
 - iii. Some residences are inhabited by multi-generational families or, not by families but by friend groups.
- b. To propose 150 units where not every unit is guaranteed space for visitors or more than 2 cars is, frankly, ridiculous and unacceptable. There is no shoulder or parking along Notley Road. It is a logical conclusion that people will park on Petwyn Court, in Colesville Manor Neighborhood Park, or in the retirement community parking lot - or even along Notley. This scenario of overflow parking expanding out from the proposed development could lead to dangerous walking along Notley Road to get to the proposed development.

C. Concerns about Impact to Westover Elementary School

- a. I pulled up the MCPS FY25 Annual School Test - School Utilization report, dated 2024, which projects enrollment at 278 for 2028-2029 (100.7% capacity). But the new FY26 report shows expected enrollment at 288 (104.3%). It is noteworthy that Westover Elementary School has been over 105% capacity since 2018. I am not sure why the FY25 report would show a sudden dip in enrollment, but the updated report is on trend with the preceding decade.
 - i. **Using the FY26 numbers, a projected increase of 33 students to Westover would put the school at 321 enrollment, or 116.3% capacity.**
- b. I want to stress for the committee that not all schools can assume such an increase in enrollment equally. Westover Elementary School is one of, if not the smallest elementary schools in the county. This means two classes per grade. An increase is going to increase class size rather than spread across multiple classes.
- c. **Finally, Westover ES is one of 21 elementary schools in the county with an Autism Services program. I further stress that you consider the impact on resources for this valuable program if the school needs to shift support and space to so many more incoming students.** It is unacceptable to approve any changes to the school that would negatively impact this program.

D. Pedestrian and Cycling plans are lip-service and do not add value.

- a. The proposal does not account for pedestrian or bicycle safety crossing New Hampshire.

- b. **The proposal talks a lot about improving pedestrian and bicycle flow, but these paths don't GO anywhere! Connecting to the park does not allow for walks or bike rides - what happens after the sidewalk ends? Then what?**
 - i. The lack of sidewalks on Notley has been a big issue - causing dangerous interactions between bikes or pedestrians and cars. A short sidewalk would encourage more to walk the side of Notley from the end of the proposal's sidewalk.
 - ii. Page 21 says they will "facilitate bicycle and pedestrian connectivity within the surrounding neighborhood." But there is nothing in the proposal about connecting to any of the surrounding neighborhoods or streets.
- c. The proposal talks about connecting with the New Hampshire sidewalk, to allow bike & pedestrian access to the shopping centers in Colesville. However, I question this logic when the County has a safety study going on just around the corner on Randolph. If there are concerns about safety on Randolph in this area, why would the county support a proposal to increase similar pedestrian traffic along a similar road/sidewalk?

E. Does not consider surrounding neighborhoods AT ALL.

- a. Throughout the proposal, the developer claims to take into account the surrounding neighborhoods, connect with the surrounding neighborhoods, or improve certain things for the surrounding neighborhoods. This is simply not true. Page 14 discusses "protection of established neighborhoods" and "compatibility" with the neighborhoods.
 - i. **The developer did not consult the established neighborhoods in this proposal, or discuss protection of the character with our neighborhood.**
 - ii. **There is no connection or integration with the neighborhoods.**
 - iii. **The development backs directly, and very close, to existing homes without consideration to the increase in noise, visibility, and activity.**
 - iv. **As mentioned above in the traffic concerns, there is no concern or discussion on how to mitigate negative impacts to our neighborhood's safety.**
- b. Page 10 discusses offering a transition between different zones of the major New Hampshire road and the other single family neighborhoods - but as these neighborhoods are large lots with many trees, the proposal for a high clearance, high density, and complete tree removal does not preserve or respect the integrity of this area.
 - i. Page 14 says that the project "will also provide substantial open space on site" - This is illogical. 150 townhomes on less than 10 acres, with streets and sidewalks, simply cannot provide "substantial" open space. Small community areas are included in the plan, but they are in no way substantial.
- c. Nowhere in the proposal does it discuss connecting pedestrian and bike paths or access to the surrounding neighborhoods (as mentioned above).

F. Environmental Resources section lacks detail

- a. This section says "storm management strategy will *likely* include the implementation of environmental site design..." This is insufficient and needs to fully address the severe storm water issues in this area.
- b. The proposal says it will "increase the overall tree canopy (as compared to existing conditions)." It is highly doubtful that decorative trees in a development will compare to mature trees currently there.
- c. Relatedly, on page 18, the proposal cites that there are local parks within a $\frac{3}{4}$ mile radius - but it lists Sherwood Forest Park as an option. This is not a recreational park. This is a small forested area that encompasses a creek with a "desire path" that connects two roads.

I thank you for your time and consideration. Please do not hesitate to reach out either by email or phone (301-509-2202).

Candace Anderson

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Candace Anderson", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Candace Anderson

9/8/2025

Environmental Monitoring and Assessment

The purpose of this study is to assess the environmental impact of the proposed project. The study will focus on the following areas:

- 1. Air quality: The study will monitor the concentration of particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen dioxide in the area surrounding the project.
- 2. Water quality: The study will monitor the pH, dissolved oxygen, and total suspended solids in the water bodies adjacent to the project.
- 3. Noise levels: The study will monitor the noise levels in the area surrounding the project.
- 4. Soil quality: The study will monitor the concentration of heavy metals and other pollutants in the soil.

The study will be conducted over a period of six months. The data collected will be used to develop a management plan to mitigate the environmental impact of the project.

The study will be conducted in accordance with the following standards:

- 1. Air quality: National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)
- 2. Water quality: Clean Water Act (CWA)
- 3. Noise levels: Federal Noise Criteria
- 4. Soil quality: National Sanitation Foundation Environmental Quality Index (NSF-EQI)

Environmental Monitoring and Assessment

Environmental Monitoring and Assessment

Environmental Monitoring and Assessment