

# Appendix 5

Community Outreach, 2008 and 2010 meeting minutes



Green Space Guidelines for the Silver Spring Central Business District

# Green Space Plan for the Silver Spring CBD – Outreach Site “Progress Place” and Ripley Site

---

May 9, 2008, 11 am, Teleconference between John Marcolin  
And Mel Tull, of Silver Spring Urban District

## Meeting Minutes

→ Mel Tull expressed various concerns:

### 1. Process:

- a. Mel expressed the opinion that the Green Open Space Plan would result in the opening up of the Sector Plan which would result in property owners being required to designate their property as green space, driving down the value of their investment.
- b. The lag time involved in developing the Green Open Space Plan would slow down development in the recommended areas.

### 2. Content

- a. Mel was concerned that Progress Place would be displaced at that there was no other good site in the CBD.
- b. Progress Place would have to be included in the program. But be incorporated in such a way that the green space would not become a loitering place for the homeless that would drive away patrons.
- c. Mel stated that the Silver Spring Urban District sees Downtown Silver Spring as one leg of a three pronged approach to retail in Silver Spring, the area around Studio Plaza and Ripley District being the other two. They believe that Fenton Village needs additional height in order to make feasible the development needed. In Ripley they see the frontage along Georgia Avenue between Bonifant St. and the fire station as potential for new retail development (They question the scheme we show that fronts a large green space on a section of Georgia Ave). The retail should include national “Big Box” stores mixed with smaller local or regional retailers. The big box would provide an anchor and regional draw that would help the local retail stores. Big Box retail, such as *Crate and Barrel*, *Bed Bath and Beyond*, was mentioned.

### 3. Next Steps

- a. Expressed concern that the time required to get to a final plan would be long.
- b. Getting owner and community consensus would be difficult.

→ MNCPPC Staff responded to these concerns:

### 1. Process

- a. Staff was tasked with identifying potential site for large green open space in the CBD. At this time, staff is not encouraging the opening up of the Sector Plan. The draft is simply a

study at this time that staff is presenting to the community, including property owners, to which many of which are responding positively.

- b. Regarding the concern about driving down property values, staff responded that at least two owners that were contacted are interested in discussing the favorable aspects of the draft plan for their properties in terms of a long term vision that would improve the value of their properties.
- c. Regarding increasing lag time for the development process in recommended areas, the plan at this point is simply a draft with no regulatory power over any project that may be submitted for the SS CBD.

## 2. Content

- a. Staff responded that progress place could stay on site or be re-located; it was too early to say what the specific plans would be.
- b. Staff agreed that Progress Place could be incorporated in the design in such a way in a new joint-venture development so that it would not hinder the successful use of a green space or associated retail uses. However, that was far out into the future and that a larger hurdle was the formation of team of land-owners that could work together for the success of a joint venture project.
- c. Staff agreed that retail is need in Fenton village, but did not agree that it required ZTA amendments for additional height. Staff agreed with Mel regarding retail use in Ripley, but stated that is really the purview of the developer(s). The graphic image shown was not a proposal, but meant to act as a vision for what a green space in the Ripley District could look like. It is not intended to rule out other potential scenarios.

## 3. Next Steps

- a. Staff reiterated that process would follow typical path of community outreach and that the new project submittals for recommended areas would not be affected, but it would be encourage by staff that applicant take into consideration the Green Open Space Plan's recommendations.
- b. Staff stated that already two owner in two different areas have expressed positive feedback.

# Green Space Plan for the Silver Spring CBD – Outreach Site “Montgomery County Parking Lot 3”

---

May 5, 2008, 11 am, MNCPPC Atrium conference room  
In attendance: Bob Hillerson (Property Owner), Bob Dalrymple (Attorney),  
Robert Kronenberg, John Marcolin, Sandra Pereira, Elza Hisel-McCoy

## Meeting Minutes

→ The Property Owner expressed various concerns:

### 1. Process

Lack of awareness about the Green Space Plan until it was discussed with the Planning Board on April 24, 2008. Staff should have brought this study to the Property Owner’s attention since the study:

- a) identifies his property as a priority site for a potential large green space,
- b) makes specific recommendations illustrated through 3-D graphics,
- c) The Owner has already been working on a development scheme for the site (“Studio Plaza”), which differs from the “potential layout” presented in the study.

### 2. Content

- a) Images – Future development of the site will be expected to follow the “potential layout” images presented in the study. The community will assume this is what will get built and will most likely demand it.
- b) Density – Because the potential layout does not max out density on site, the scheme would never be financially viable. The proposal for Studio Plaza (as stated by the Property Owner) would exceed the standard 60-90 feet as prescribed by the Fenton Village Overlay Zone. The proposal is assuming a greater height of 143 feet, and counting on a ZTA, which was not contemplated in the conceptual images produced by Staff. Staff did not have the opportunity of reviewing a plan by the applicant for his vision of the site.
- c) Green Space – as shown, the green space is too large, further preventing the scheme from maxing out on the needed density to make it financially viable.
- d) Parking – the recommendation to have underground parking dramatically increases cost for the project since underneath the site is all bedrock.

### 3. Next Steps

How will this study affect the proposal for Studio Plaza in terms of community outreach and timeline?  
Will it delay the approval process for Studio Plaza?

→ MNCPPC Staff responded to these concerns:

### 1. Process

Staff was tasked with this study by the Chairman of the Montgomery County Planning Board. This draft study was produced internally without any public outreach up to this stage. On April 24, 2008, Staff received approval from the Planning Board to circulate the draft study for public review and comment.

Staff now will initiate the process of public outreach, in which Staff will meet with as many Property Owners and Civic Groups and Associations as possible to discuss the plan.

## 2. Content

The images presented are conceptual only. They illustrate a visionary concept for the sites and they help to visualize potential layouts. They will be further developed during the next phase of this study. The concerns associated with density and the green space are linked to the images and the misconception that these images establish the final layout.

## 3. Next Steps

This study should not delay the “Studio Plaza” project, rather it should foster collaboration between MNCPPC staff and potential developers to achieve a layout that meets the needs of the community, the recommendations of the Green Space Plan and the developer’s goals. Studio Plaza should proceed its normal course to submission and during the review process, Staff might make suggestions consistent with the Green Space Plan recommendations.

Lastly, Staff recommended that the Property Owner prepare a letter of response to the Draft Plan with his concerns.

# Green Space Plan for the Silver Spring CBD – Outreach Site “Lots South of Ripley District”

---

**May 14, 2008, 1:30 pm, MNCPPC Atrium conference room  
In attendance: Charles K. Nulsen III and Jonathan Meyers  
with Washington Property Company (Property Owner), &  
MNCPPC staff – Robert Kronenberg, John Marcolin, Sandra Pereira**

## Meeting Minutes

The meeting started with a brief overview of the process and recommendations on the Green Space Plan for the Silver Spring CBD. Staff explained that the site identified as “Lots South of Ripley District” was approved by the Board to be discussed as a priority site for a potential large green space. Staff has now initiated the process of public outreach, in which Staff will meet with as many Property Owners and Civic Groups and Associations as possible to discuss the Draft Plan.

➔ The Property Owner offered several comments and suggestions:

### 1. General

- a) The potential layout for “Lots South of Ripley District” is perceived as positive for this area. It will not negatively impact the 1050 Ripley Street project, which will be presented to the Planning Board in the next few weeks. The green space envisioned is understood to be an asset for the surrounding properties.
- b) Property Owner is willing to compromise to achieve a greater good. However, in order to give in something they need something in exchange. It was clearly stated that in order to provide the type of green space that the county envisions, the county needs to provide an incentive (density/height) for the proposed projects.

### 2. Content

- a) The potential layout resembles the concept presented in the old master plan for this area. Additional coordination might be useful.
- b) The potential layout needs coordination with the Road Plan for the Ripley District.
- c) The dimensions of the block south of the green space needs to be adjusted, it seems too large.
- d) A green space on Georgia Avenue will liven up the street and draw people in.
- e) Progress Place needs to be addressed urgently.
- f) Parking garage on the north side of the green space is problematic because it acts as a barrier between the Core area and South Silver Spring. Besides, it is underused and all new developments will provide parking anyways. Ideally, it should be demolished in order to create a visual connection between the green space and the Core area, and to provide activating uses fronting onto Georgia Avenue.

➔ MNCPPC Staff responded to these comments:

- Staff will follow-up with the Road Plan for the Ripley District

- Staff will follow-up with the old master plan for this area and compare the recommendations
- Staff will revise the drawings to show accurate block dimensions
- Staff will outreach to the other property owners

# Green Space Plan for the Silver Spring CBD – Outreach Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee

---

**May 15, 2008, 3:30 pm, Discovery Communications Headquarters Building conference room  
In attendance: 3 members, 20 people in audience including Gary Stith and Mell Tull  
John Marcolin (JM), Sandra Pereira (SP)**

## Meeting Minutes

Staff was invited to attend the monthly meeting of the Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee and present the Green Space Plan for the Silver Spring CBD. Because of a mis-coordination, the agenda for the meeting failed to include the Staff's presentation. Nonetheless Staff still presented, but the time allocated for discussion and comments was very reduced. Gary Stith suggested that Staff present again to the Committee at a later time when more officers are present. Below is a summarized account of the questions and comments that followed the presentation.

1. At the Giant/ Blairs parking lot site, where is parking accommodated? Your images do not show any parking and yet this parking lot is currently heavily used.  
JM: In our recommendations, the parking is not visible because it is intended to be underground below the green area, or in structured parking facilities.
2. In whose land is the green space at the Ripley District site being proposed?  
The land belongs to different owners, which requires some coordination efforts.
3. The ranking for the Lee and Cohen Properties should have a score of 1 for the category of "ease of implementation."  
JM: Staff will consider your suggestion.
4. How long will it take to implement the Green Space Plan and its recommendations? How long will it be until these drawings are built?  
SP: These drawings are conceptual only. They help to visualize what could happen at each of the priority sites, but not what will necessarily happen. This plan sets long-term recommendations, which will get implemented as the sites come in for redevelopment. This approach has no specific timeframe, but rather it is market driven.









































