



**Committee:** Directly to Council  
**Committee Review:** N/A  
**Staff:** Pamela Dunn, Senior Legislative Analyst  
Glenn Orlin, Senior Analyst  
**Purpose:** Final action – vote expected  
**Keywords:** #Ashton Village Center, Sector Plan

AGENDA ITEM #16C  
June 15, 2021  
**Action**

## SUBJECT

Action to approve the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan resolution

## EXPECTED ATTENDEES

Casey Anderson, Chair, Montgomery County Planning Board  
Gwen Wright, Director, Montgomery Planning Department  
Robert Kronenberg, Deputy Director, Montgomery Planning Department  
Patrick Butler, Chief, Up-County Planning, Montgomery Planning Department  
Jamey Pratt, Senior Planner, Up-County Planning, Montgomery Planning Department

## COUNCIL DECISION POINTS & COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

- Approve the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan resolution.

## DESCRIPTION/ISSUE

Attached is a resolution approving the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan. The resolution is consistent with the Council discussion that took place on May 4 and the recommendations of the Planning, Housing and Economic Development (PHED) Committee.

## SUMMARY OF KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

N/A

| <b><u>This report contains:</u></b>                         | <b>Pages</b> |
|---|--------------|
| Resolution to approve the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan | ©1-5         |

**Alternative format requests for people with disabilities.** If you need assistance accessing this report you may [submit alternative format requests](#) to the ADA Compliance Manager. The ADA Compliance Manager can also be reached at 240-777-6197 (TTY 240-777-6196) or at [adacompliance@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:adacompliance@montgomerycountymd.gov)

Resolution No.: \_\_\_\_\_  
Introduced: \_\_\_\_\_  
Adopted: \_\_\_\_\_

1 **COUNTY COUNCIL FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND**  
2 **SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PORTION**  
3 **OF THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTON REGIONAL DISTRICT**  
4 **WITHIN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND**

5 \_\_\_\_\_  
6 By: County Council  
7 \_\_\_\_\_  
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 \_\_\_\_\_

10 **SUBJECT: Approval of December 2020 Ashton Village Center Sector Plan**

11

12 1. On January 11, 2021, the Montgomery County Planning Board transmitted to the County  
13 Executive and the County Council the December 2020 Planning Board Draft of the Ashton  
14 Village Center Sector Plan.

15

16 2. The December 2020 Planning Board Draft of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan  
17 contains the text and supporting maps for an amendment to portions of the approved and  
18 adopted 1998 Sandy Spring/Ashton Master Plan, as amended. It also amends The General  
19 Plan (On Wedges and Corridors) for the Physical Development of the Maryland-  
20 Washington Regional District in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, as amended;  
21 the Master Plan of Highways and Transitways, and the Bicycle Master Plan, as amended.

22

23 3. On March 2, 2021, the County Council held a virtual public hearing on the December 2020  
24 Planning Board Draft of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan, which was referred to the  
25 Council's Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee for review and  
26 recommendations.

27

28 4. On March 26, 2021, the Office of Management and Budget transmitted to the County  
29 Council the County Executive's Fiscal Impact Statement for the December 2020 Planning  
30 Board Draft of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan.

31

32 5. On April 5, 2021 and April 19, 2021, the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development  
33 Committee held work sessions to review the issues raised in connection with the December  
34 2020 Planning Board Draft of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan.

35

36 6. On May 4, 2021, the County Council reviewed the December 2020 Planning Board Draft  
37 of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan and the recommendations of the Planning,  
38 Housing, and Economic Development Committee.

39

40

47 The Ashton Village Center Sector Plan, dated December 2020, is approved with revisions. County  
48 Council revisions to the Planning Board Draft of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan are  
49 identified below. Deletions to the text of the Plan are indicated by [brackets], additions by  
50 underscoring. All page references are to the December 2020 Planning Board Draft of the Ashton  
51 Village Center Sector Plan.

53 Page 37: Revise the eighth recommendation under “Community Design Recommendations” as  
54 follows:

56 8. Building heights should vary between adjacent buildings, with lower heights closer to  
57 the edge of the Village Core neighborhood and higher heights closer to the MD 108/650  
58 intersection. Taller buildings may also be located interior to a site to take advantage of  
59 natural grade and screening from other buildings, limiting their visibility from the main  
60 roads [(see Figure 4)].

62 Page 39: Delete the right half of Figure 4 and revise the Figure 4 caption as follows:

64 Figure 4. Existing building heights [(left) and maximum proposed building heights (right)]  
65 in the Village Core neighborhood and [surroundings, including suggested building heights  
66 for buildings in the southeast quadrant showing the tallest buildings in the interior of the  
67 quadrant and maintaining a transition along the state highways] surrounding areas. The  
68 building heights shown along Porter Road are for the approved Ashton Market  
69 development (M-NCPPC Site Plan No. 820180160).

71 Page 41: Revise “Table 1: Road Classifications” as follows:

73 Add a “Target Speed” column and assign each road in the table a target speed of 25 mph.

75       Include a footnote to the “ROW Width” column that states: “Reflects minimum right-of-  
76       way and may not include right-of-way needed for on-street parking and pedestrian, bicycle,  
77       transit, and stormwater management facilities.”

79 Page 56: Revise the first and second paragraphs under "Public Schools" as follows:

Ashton is served by Sherwood High School, William H. Farquhar Middle School, and Sherwood Elementary School. [A school cluster adequacy test for 2024] The most recent Growth and Infrastructure Preliminary FY2022 School Test shows that at the elementary, middle, and high school levels [in the Sherwood High School Cluster], an additional [142, 159, and 222] 50, 203, and 235 students, respectively, could be accommodated before

86 exceeding the [current program capacity] Tier 1 Utilization Premium Payment  
87 requirement.

88  
89 [At an individual school level, Sherwood Elementary School would require an additional  
90 120 students to reach the utilization rate that would trigger a residential building  
91 moratorium in the school's service area. William H. Farquhar Middle School is 238  
92 students away from reaching a moratorium utilization rate.] Given the modest residential  
93 density increases included in this plan and analyzed in the Plan appendix, all school levels  
94 have sufficient capacity to accommodate the number of students that would be generated  
95 by the zoning recommended in this Plan.

96  
97 Page 57: Revise the ninth recommendation under "Open Space Recommendations" as follows:  
98

99 9. [Designate the] Consider the designation of proposed [public] open spaces [within] for  
100 inclusion in the Legacy Open Space Functional Master Plan.

101  
102 Page 74: Revise the last paragraph as follows:  
103

104 The southeast quadrant also presents the best opportunity for creating a new, meaningful  
105 public open space and gathering place. During the time of development, the open space  
106 requirements mandated by zoning should be clustered to create a publicly accessible green,  
107 ideally located to take advantage of the on-site environmental features while remaining  
108 accessible to the public. Woodlands and wetlands have been previously identified in the  
109 eastern part of the quadrant and should be protected during any development application.  
110 At the corner in front of the existing bank, large canopy trees serve as a landmark in Ashton  
111 and should be protected if possible. [Designation within] Potential designation for  
112 inclusion in the Legacy Open Space Functional Master Plan as important open spaces [will]  
113 would provide an additional [tools] tool to support the creation of these spaces.

114  
115 Page 75: Revise the first full paragraph as follows:  
116

117 In the southeast quadrant, the proposed zoning should be consistent with the other three  
118 quadrants at CRN-0.5 total FAR, but [the] with a maximum allowable height [is] of 45 feet  
119 instead of 35 feet. The additional 45-foot height [should] must be limited to buildings that  
120 [are interior to the site (to take advantage of the natural grade) and to buildings where the  
121 additional height helps to define a focal point that stands out from the rest of the block] do  
122 not front on MD 108 or MD 650. [In any event, the] The 45-foot maximum building height  
123 [should] must be applied selectively[; this], taking advantage of natural grade where  
124 possible (see Figure 10). This maximum is not intended to apply across all new buildings  
125 in the quadrant [(see Figure 10)]. The BG&E property is an exception that should remain  
126 under its current zone, R-60.

127  
128 Page 76: Modify Figure 10 to primarily show properties in the southeast quadrant and revise the  
129 text of the Figure 10 caption as follows:  
130

131       Figure 10. [Maximum proposed building heights in the Village Core neighborhood and  
132       surroundings, including suggested] Suggested building heights for buildings in the  
133       southeast quadrant [showing the tallest buildings in the interior of the quadrant and  
134       maintaining a transition along the state highways], where the tallest buildings must not  
135       front on MD 108 or MD 650, and where building heights maintain a transition along MD  
136       108 and MD 650 starting from the edge of the Village Core to the intersection of these  
137       roadways.

138       Page 89: Delete the third and fourth paragraphs under section “5.2.2.1 Building Types” as follows:

141       [With the exception of multi-use or general building types, new buildings along the two  
142       state roadways should be 80 feet or less in width to maintain a building massing that  
143       replicates the building forms found along MD 108 and MD 650. Multi-use and general  
144       buildings may be up to 120 feet wide along the state roads to accommodate mixed-use  
145       tenants, but if they are wider than 80 feet, they may only be built to the maximum allowed  
146       height for two thirds of the total building width, with the remainder of the building having  
147       a readily apparent transition in roofline or number of actual stories to reflect a change in  
148       scale to the structure. On non-state road street frontages, buildings should be no wider than  
149       120 feet to remain compatible with the vision for Ashton.]

151       [Buildings may be deeper than their road frontage if the depth is not highly visible.  
152       Buildings at the recommended maximum width, or that are deeper than wide, should be  
153       carefully located to ensure that they are dispersed throughout the Village Core and not  
154       clustered in one area.]

156       Page 92: Insert the deleted third and fourth paragraphs under section “5.2.2.1 Building Types”  
157       after the first paragraph of section “5.2.2.3 Building Massing and Composition” as follows:

159       With the exception of multi-use or general building types, new buildings along the two  
160       state roadways should be 80 feet or less in width to maintain a building massing that  
161       replicates the building forms found along MD 108 and MD 650. Multi-use and general  
162       buildings may be up to 120 feet wide along the state roads to accommodate mixed-use  
163       tenants, but if they are wider than 80 feet, they may only be built to the maximum allowed  
164       height for two thirds of the total building width, with the remainder of the building having  
165       a readily apparent transition in roofline or number of actual stories to reflect a change in  
166       scale to the structure. On non-state road street frontages, buildings should be no wider than  
167       120 feet to remain compatible with the vision for Ashton.

169       Buildings may be deeper than their road frontage if the depth is not highly visible.  
170       Buildings at the recommended maximum width, or that are deeper than wide, should be  
171       carefully located to ensure that they are dispersed throughout the Village Core and not  
172       clustered in one area.

174       Page 98: Revise the first sentence of the first guideline under section “5.4.1.1 Connection  
175       Elements” as follows:

177 1. Public/Private Streets - [The size of existing public rights-of-way] Existing pavement  
178 widths should not be expanded (except to provide on-street parking and in-road  
179 bikeways), ensuring that crossing distances are minimized for pedestrians and that  
180 drivers do not speed.

181  
182 Page 103: Revise the first and second paragraphs under section “6.5 Implementation Advisory  
183 Committee” as follows:

184  
185 This Plan supports the creation of an advisory group to address its implementation. The  
186 formation of any new advisory group should be staffed by the Planning Department in  
187 close coordination with the [Ashton Alliance] civic/neighborhood groups within the  
188 Ashton area.

189  
190 This advisory group would work in coordination with [the Ashton Alliance (or successor  
191 group) and] the Regional Services Center that covers the area of a project by providing  
192 specific community and redevelopment expertise. It would also serve as an interface  
193 between community members, county agencies, and developers in implementing  
194 recommendations of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan. This new group should be  
195 structured to include representatives from the various constituencies interested in  
196 successful implementation of the Plan. Notification and participation in the development  
197 review process should occur at the earliest stage of the process.

198  
199 Page 105: Revise “Lead Agency” in row seventeen of “Table 3. Capital Improvements Program”  
200 by replacing “MCDGS” with “M-NCPCC”.

201  
202  
203 **General**  
204

205 All illustrations and tables included in the Plan will be revised to reflect the District Council  
206 changes to the Planning Board Draft of the Ashton Village Center Sector Plan (December 2020).  
207 The text and graphics will be revised as necessary to achieve and improve clarity and consistency,  
208 to update factual information, and to convey the actions of the District Council. Graphics and  
209 tables will be revised and re-numbered, where necessary, to be consistent with the text and titles.

210  
211  
212 This is a correct copy of Council action.

213  
214  
215  
216 

---

Selena Mendy Singleton, Esq.  
217 Clerk of the Council