

December 20, 2024

Ms. Laura Mehfoud
City of Gaithersburg
31 South Summit Avenue
Gaithersburg, MD 20877

**Re: 101 Lakeforest Boulevard
DRT Comments: Z-9928-2024
VIKA Project # VM5050089C**

Dear Ms. Mehfoud,

Thank you for your review and comments on the 101 Lakeforest Boulevard project Concept Plan located in the City of Gaithersburg, Maryland. We have received your comments dated August 24, 2023, and offer the following responses:

Economic Development Comments:

EVALUATION - Staff finds the following:

1. Changing from the existing (General Commercial) to proposed uses (primarily residential) on the parcels at 481 North Frederick Avenue and 101 Lakeforest Boulevard will reduce the land area available to attract new commercial uses to Gaithersburg.

Applicant Response: Please see the enclosed letter addressed to the City of Gaithersburg Mayor and Council and Planning Commission of even date herewith for inclusion in the joint public hearing record for the above-captioned matter.

2. The two office buildings to be demolished have reached the point of economic obsolescence, but the proposed uses are not consistent with the location's characteristics.

- The Frederick Avenue Corridor's high traffic count and area demographics have attracted, and continue to attract, new commercial investment, particularly retail, as evidenced by the investments made by national Real Estate Investment Trusts.
- Office-to-residential conversions are popular news stories, but the fundamental regulatory issue is a dramatic change of land use. Each situation is unique.

Applicant Response: Same as the response to # 1 above.

3. The proposed retail space, identified as 7000-20,100 square feet, mid-block, does not exploit the site location's strong commercial-retail characteristics.

- For reference, at Downtown Crown, Coastal Flats has 7712 square feet; Harris Teeter has 53,518 square feet.
- The proposed space cannot be easily divided to attract multiple retail tenants.

Applicant Response: Same as the response to # 1 above.

4. When compared with other proposed multifamily construction approved by the City but not yet built, the location is not competitive and, if built, less likely to hold value over time.

The City's development pipeline has nearly 7000 unbuilt multifamily units, many of which are located



in established mixed-use areas, buffered from high volume automobile traffic and proximate to desirable commercial and recreational amenities.

Applicant Response: Same as the response to # 1 above.



5. Only if appropriate uses are identified in the predevelopment phase does a proposed strategy for aging, obsolete office buildings address two opportunities for the City,

- (a) Prevention of vacancy and blight via applicable regulatory tools;
- (b) Creation of locations for new investment in a land-locked city.

- Approval of regulatory changes that are not consistent with market forces and location characteristics, such as requested in this application, will delay – not expedite – redevelopment.

Applicant Response: Same as the response to # 1 above.

6. The City has a recent history of enabling office building redevelopment through adaptive reuse and demolition, demonstrating the feasibility of protecting economic opportunity for residents while still addressing the question of re-use.

Applicant Response: Same as the response to # 1 above.

RECOMMENDATION

A meaningful increase in the applicant's commercial square footage could address the City's economic development objectives of providing land area for business activities and preserving the commercial assessable tax base.

Applicant Response: Same as the response to # 1 above.

Alternatively, a second development program – an "Option 2" – that exploited the location characteristics and market demand could enable faster redevelopment.

Applicant Response: Same as the response to # 1 above.

AHP Review:

Strongly encourage more 2BDR units since there is a higher demand for larger units. The MPDU plan has two different # for the 2BR (103 or 102)

Applicant Response: The correct number is 103 and the cover sheet has been corrected.

BRT Review:

We reviewed the Gateway Lakeforest developer plans that you shared with us, and we don't have any significant comments.

Attached are the two exhibits with the developer's pdf plan approximately referenced into the BRT roadway plans. The proposed BRT improvements are shown in red. The developer's curb is similar to our proposed project curblines. The developer also shows more buffer between curb and sidewalk than the BRT plans show.

Applicant Response: The Applicant will request cadd to reflect the linework and match Stantec's designs.

Architectural Set comments:

Tab sheet

City code does not allow [compact spaces]

Applicant Response: We will omit the compact parking spaces and replace them standard parking spaces.



These parking numbers do not match the cover page parking charts-cover page has only 649 residential spaces provided-are some of these spaces meant to cover required parking for 702 Russell?
Applicant Response: Please see updated chart on Tabulation sheet

A-1.0 sheet

Why is this commercial access needed? Are residents allowed to use this entrance? [Lakeforest Blvd]
Applicant Response: Both commercial parking and residential parking access are in this location.

Clarify who this access is for-commercial trucks or public? [Lakeforest Blvd]

Applicant Response: The access of Lakeforest Blvd is for parking access for both commercial and residential use. We provide a loading area for commercial trucks elsewhere on the site.

If only 7,000 sq. ft. is used, what happens to the other 13,000 sq. ft.?

Applicant Response: The other 13,000 sf will remain to be leased as retail area.

Why are there 2 loading docks for only 20,000 sq. ft. of retail? Could one be removed to improve the pedestrian experience and visual appeal?

Applicant Response: The Final Site Plan will clarify, but a grocery store may require two spaces for adequate service. Applicant chooses to show two at this time.

A-2.0 sheet

Consider moving some or all of these amenity spaces to the MD 355 side, to activate that major street and move residential units off major street first level. A better approach would be to make this the retail/commercial area and put these uses on the lower level.

Applicant Response: The Applicant has relocated these to the MD 355 side. See revised Architectural plans.

A-4.0 sheet

Consider moving some or all of these amenity spaces to the MD 355 side, to activate that major street and move residential units off major street first level. A better approach would be to make this the retail/commercial area and put these uses on the lower level.

Applicant Response: Applicant has relocated clubroom and fitness amenity spaces to 355 side.

Consider using this dead space as a mini hardscape park or dog park on the top floor of the garage

Applicant Response: The Applicant will consider in the future, but the main courtyard serves as the private amenity.

A-6.0 sheet

What is this? Is there a part of the building not shown on the plans? [left side of NW elevation]

Applicant Response: The Applicant has corrected this.

This area needs better treatment/activation, especially since this is fronting the 10 ft shared use path [center of NW elevation]

Applicant Response: Landscape plans are updated to incorporate more seating and landscaping.

What is this? [right side of SW elevation]

Applicant Response: The Applicant has corrected this.

A-7.0 sheet



What is this? [right side of NE elevation]

Applicant Response: The Applicant has corrected this.

Is this the actual mural? The mural should be higher up, so it is visible. Or placed on the other side of the building (on a more visible facade) [SE elevation right side]

Applicant Response: The mural illustrated is a representative of a piece that could be incorporated on those walls. The Applicant has revised the location to create more visibility.

A-9.0 sheet

Signage to direct people to retail space? [view looking east from 355]

Applicant Response: The Applicant will incorporate signage on the building facing 355.

This is a focal corner. The entrance should be treated better. [view looking east from 355]

Applicant Response: The Applicant has revised the design to respond to this concern.

Office building users will see this-add better treatment [view looking west from service alley 1]

Provide a view looking down the driveway towards the loading docks [view looking west from service alley 1]

Applicant Response: Applicant has added this view to the set.

Any outdoor seating or street furniture here to further activate? [view looking south from Lakeforest blvd]

Applicant Response: Landscape plans have been updated to incorporate more seating and landscaping.

It doesn't look like mural will be visible from 355-consider moving it up higher on the elevation (see arrows). Focus more on more visible elevations. [view looking north from 355]

Applicant Response: The Applicant has adjusted the location for better visibility.

Can you provide views of both buildings- MF and existing 702 Russell? How will shared use path look in front of 702 Russell? [bottom of sheet]

Applicant Response: The Applicant has provided this per request.

A-11.0 sheet

See separate comments "Guardian AHP Review 10.4.24" [residential unit tab lower left]

Applicant Response: This has been corrected.

Design Guidelines Comments

Applicant Response: The Applicant appreciates the comments on the Design Guidelines and will address these and resubmit them at the time of Final Site Plan.

Landscape Set comments:

L112

Show existing trees and note if they're staying.

Applicant Response: Plans are updated to reflect existing trees

Show proposed plants.

Applicant Response: Plans are updated to show proposed plants

L400

Is there enough lighting on the shared use path along Lakeforest Blvd?

Applicant Response: Existing street lights are to remain as is. We will work with these parameters as



we finalize the photometric design and calculations at the of FSP.

L411

rhododendron's will do better in part shade.

Applicant Response: Plans are updated to reflect the changes

L600

Check city of Gaithersburg's tree manual for both planting details (references no staking unless it is windy), and there is a details checklist needed for final submittal

Applicant Response: Plans are updated to reflect the changes

can be invasive, change species. [Japanese Holly in master plant schedule]

Applicant Response: Plans are updated to reflect the changes

L601

This can be a FSP detail, but note Code section 24-6.2 Outdoor Lighting:

Applicant Response: Understood. The Applicant will seek to address this at the time of FSP.

(F) Maximum illumination levels. Maximum luminance levels from all interior and exterior light sources shall not exceed one-half (0.5) foot-candles at the property boundary.

Applicant Response: Understood. The Applicant will seek to address this at the time of FSP

(H) Pedestrian Level Lighting

(1) Light fixtures for sidewalks, walkways, trails, and bicycle paths, shall provide at least 0.5 foot-candles of illumination per fixture, with an average of one and one-half (1.5) foot-candles of illumination across the entire surface which is being illuminated.

(2) Pedestrian lighting fixtures mounted on any pole, wall, or other structure must have a minimum height of twelve (12) feet and maximum height of fourteen (14) feet above grade.

Applicant Response: We will work with these parameters as we finalize the photometric design and calculations at the time of FSP.

PFCP comments:

PFCP-1 sheet

Inconsistent w/ worksheet/data table [note 1]

Applicant Response: Note 1 has been corrected to match the table.

Note #20 says no specimen trees found [note 22 stricken]

Applicant Response: This has been corrected to match the NRI.

Note #20 says no specimen trees found [note 21]

Applicant Response: This has been corrected to match the NRI.

Use City's worksheet (see City Tree Manual) and revise calcs with corrected land use category (C-2) and conservation threshold (15%) [PFCP worksheet]

Applicant Response: Forest Conservation worksheet has been replaced with the City's worksheet and corrected land use category.

Will review after calcs revised [afforestation/reforestation credit table]

Applicant Response: Understood.



Revise quantities/credit as needed per worksheet revisions [tree canopy credit summary table]

Applicant Response: Tree canopy credit summary table has been updated to reflect the changes on the plans, additional fee in lieu is required.

Use the City's land use categories/thresholds; this property is land use C-2 (General Commercial). [C and 15% in PFCP resource data table]

Applicant Response: Land Use categories/thresholds have been corrected. Zoning will be changed through a rezoning application to CD from C-2.

Include signature [at seal]

Applicant Response: The signatures have been added.

PFCP-2 sheet

Proposed conditions symbology is not clear on plan and/or match legend and is cut off in some places. Show all proposed conditions shown on SDP, use symbology shown on SDP.

Applicant Response: Plan and legend have been reconciled and aligned with the SDP.

Proposed sidewalk? Does not match legend.

Applicant Response: Paving hatches have been restored to the plan.

Planting strip too narrow - must be min 6-8' for medium trees

Applicant Response: Planting strips on Lakeforest Blvd. and North Frederick Avenue has been adjusted to 6' as measured from the back of curb, trees have shifted in these areas from Major Street Trees to Minor Street Trees. The planting strip for Service Alley 2 cannot be adjusted without affecting the retaining wall siting, the trees for this area have been shifted to ornamental trees.

Too close to water line, recommend min 10' away from underground utilities

Applicant Response: We have held 10' from underground utilities wherever possible. In areas where this is not possible, we hold at 9' minimum from underground utilities. We can consider species with deep taproots in this area at time of Final FCP to reduce conflict between the utilities.

Most trees planting strip too narrow - must be min 8' for large trees

Applicant Response: Planting strips on Lakeforest Blvd. and North Frederick Avenue has been adjusted to 6' as measured from the back of curb, trees have shifted in these areas from Major Street Trees to Minor Street Trees. The planting strip for Service Alley 2 cannot be adjusted without affecting the retaining wall siting, the trees for this area have been shifted to ornamental trees.

Are all of these trees too close to the existing (and proposed) sewer and water lines to be counted toward forest conservation?

Applicant Response: We have confirmed that 5' is the absolute minimum spacing (per email correspondence with Lisa Bledsoe 11/22). The trees in this area range from 9' to 10' feet from the subsurface utilities.

Floating tree labels - need to show all existing trees/removals (>=12"); can use separate sheet if needed. Include existing trees table.

Applicant Response: Existing trees have been reconciled with the NRI, which showed multi-stem trees that may be less than 12" DBH. Existing trees intended for removal have been identified with an "X". Existing tree table from the approved NRI has been added to the coversheet.

Too close to utility

Applicant Response: Tree has been shifted to hold 5' from the storm drain inlet.



Need to show all existing trees >=12" (across whole site) and indicate which to be removed.

Applicant Response: Existing trees have been reconciled with the NRI, which showed multi-stem trees that may be less than 12" DBH. Existing trees intended for removal have been identified with an "X".

Not in legend. Proposed water line?

Applicant Response: Proposed retaining wall has been added to the legend.

Not in legend. Planting beds?

Applicant Response: Proposed structural bioretention has been added to the legend.

Most trees this side - planting strip too narrow; must be min 8' for large trees

Applicant Response: Planting strips on Lakeforest Blvd. and North Frederick Avenue has been adjusted to 6' as measured from the back of curb, trees have shifted in these areas from Major Street Trees to Minor Street Trees. The planting strip for Service Alley 2 cannot be adjusted without affecting the retaining wall siting, the trees for this area have been shifted to ornamental trees.

Tract Area on Sheet 1 states 3.98 ac and 6.49 ac: LOD at 30-scale measures 5.22 ac. Resolve acreage discrepancies and revise all worksheet calculations/planting requirements accordingly.

Applicant Response: All notes, tables, and calculations have been revised to reflect the tract area + offsite LOD additions (5.22 Ac.)

Retaining wall comments:

Show LOD as per plans. Note LOD cannot be wall [section 2]

Applicant Response: LOD location has been revised by civil engineer and approximate location of LOD, which now coincides with property line has been shown in section 2.

Dimensions for footer? [section 2]

Applicant Response: Final design and detailing of the segmental wall is delegated to the contractor and the delegated submittal is then reviewed by SOR. Footing size will be determined during final design.

Specify tieback length [section 2]

Applicant Response: Final design and detailing of the segmental wall and tiebacks is delegated to the contractor and the delegated submittal is then reviewed by SOR. Tieback length will be determined during final design.

Review minimum requirements for SDP from Checklist. Provide all that are applicable [section 2]

Applicant Response: Section 2 has been updated.

Easements from adjacent property needed [section 1]

Applicant Response: The Applicant will comply with this at the time of FSP.

Must be complete before final site plan approval. Is this geogrid? [section 1]

Applicant Response: Final design and detailing of the segmental wall and tiebacks is delegated to the contractor and the delegated submittal is then reviewed by SOR. Frequently the tieback is achieved with geogrid.

Dimensions for footer [section 1]

Applicant Response: Final design and detailing of the segmental wall is delegated to the contractor and the delegated submittal is then reviewed by SOR. Footing size will be determined during final design.



Final wall design and construction drawings must be complete before city approval of final site plan (as per checklist requirement) [section 1]

Applicant Response: Understood. Final design and detailing of the segmental wall is delegated to the contractor and the delegated submittal is then reviewed by City.

??? LOD cannot be in wall [section 1]

Applicant Response: LOD location has been revised by civil engineer and approximate location of LOD, which now coincides with property line has been shown in section 1.

Show extent of tiebacks on plan [plan]

Applicant Response: Tiebacks are anticipated along the entire length of the segmental wall. Final design and detailing of the segmental wall and tiebacks is delegated to the contractor and the delegated submittal is then reviewed by SOR.

Show Centerline with stationing, Show footing outline, Show Modular block components with details of product type and dimensions [plan]

Applicant Response: Final design and detailing of the segmental wall is delegated to the contractor and the delegated submittal is then reviewed by SOR.

SDP comments:

C100 sheet

Should this be higher (152,910 sq. ft.)? What if rezoning happens but new apartments are not built - will the 2 existing office buildings totaling 98,730 sq ft be non-conforming because total site is >75,000 sq ft? [zoning table, sq ft of commercial]

Applicant Response: The Applicant has made the change.

Show calculation based on full site-6.5 acres [SDP limit of 3.98 acres]

Applicant Response: The Applicant has made the change.

Check these- Don't match drawing [bldg. setbacks table]

Applicant Response: These have been corrected.

Need to add in total impervious surface [tabulations]

Applicant Response: Impervious area has been added per comment for Phase 1 and the balance.

show breakdown of multi-family building and existing office building [FAR and bldg. coverage]

Applicant Response: This is now provided, per request.

Consider adding child day care and adult day care as two additional uses allowed. Are these for 702 Russell as well? Some uses in this category in the new code may not be appropriate (e.g. funeral home) Be more specific in which uses are allowed Separate these two uses so there is no implication that both have to be done together (each use should be listed separately) [non-residential potential uses table]

Applicant Response: Except for Integrated Light Manufacturing, Art and Cultural Centers and Educational Institutions, the remaining potential nonresidential uses are identified using the use category titles set forth in Section 24-4.1 of the Zoning Ordinance to ensure all uses thereunder are allowed at the subject properties. We believe that severing the titles of these use categories may cause future confusion because those uses on the plan list will deviate from the verbiage of the Zoning Ordinance and it will be unclear which uses under the use category are allowable. Child and adult day care are included within the retail and personal service use category.



Should provide development summary for Building B, even if nothing is changing. Include stories [development summary table]

Applicant Response: Existing conditions for 702 Russell have now been added to the development summary.

Must round up [residential parking table]

Applicant Response: The Applicant has made this change.

Which use are you classifying this as in our parking chart? 1/300 is no longer the requirement for office-it is 1/500, in which case you are well over-parked. Could parking be reduced? Maybe to add more amenity space. Show parking provided on each lot [commercial parking table]

Applicant Response: The parking rate has been revised to 1/500 and the adjustment has lowered the provided parking.

Show parking required and provided on each lot [total parking]

Applicant Response: This is now provide, per request.

This should be based on # of spaces provided (910/12) [bicycle spaces]

Applicant Response: This has been corrected and the formulas is calculating on the provided parking at 1/12.

Good to have EV spaces, but they are not required in City parking ordinance-clarify table

Applicant Response: Applicant feels this is a necessity.

Not required per the new City parking ordinance [motorcycle spaces]

Applicant Response: Applicant feels this is a necessity.

C101 sheet

Show easement boundary [ingress/egress & water & sewer]

Applicant Response: The existing easements have been added to the plan.

C102

The minimum sidewalk width is 6' [south side of bldg. – service alley1]

Applicant Response: Sidewalk has been changed to 6' wide.

Is this sufficient? Why is this exit radius smaller than the enter radius of 25'? [355 and service alley 1]

Applicant Response: Both radii are now 25'.

Will need a SHA Access Permit for new entrance [355 & service alley 1]

Applicant Response: Applicant acknowledges and understands the comment.

Is this the SHA center baseline? Need a label. [355 centerline]

Applicant Response: The line shown is a centerline of the 120' existing right of way and a label has been added.

Show distance from centerline to property line. Dedication along MD 355 may be required for the BRT project. [77' dimension]

Applicant Response: SHA indicated no additional R/W would be needed to implement the BRT design. The 120' R/W is what is recommended, and the Applicant reflects 60' - half of the roadway R/W exists today.



Must provide public access easement for the portion of the sidewalk on private property [355 sidepath]

Applicant Response: Applicant understands and acknowledges the comment.

Label width of sidewalk [355 sidepath]

Applicant Response: The sidewalk has been labeled as a 10' shared use path.

Need PIE for public sidewalk [355 sidepath]

Applicant Response: Applicant understands and acknowledges the comment.

What is happening where the existing sidewalk is? Landscaping? [lawn panel at 355]

Applicant Response: Correct. Please review sheet L400.

Could square off and just do BRLs, then label setbacks on all sides [west side of bldg.]

Applicant Response: The Applicant has left the design as is and will refine at time of FSP.

Show proposed (or existing) crosswalks [355 at LFB]

Applicant Response: The crosswalks have been added as requested.

At the Lakeforest Blvd. / MD 355 corner, show the proposed improvements consistent with the MD 355 BRT latest plans.

Applicant Response: The Applicant will request cadd to reflect the linework and match Stantec's designs.

Show limits of existing WSSC easement and indicate whether it will be retained or terminated Why only 2 feet? Put entire sidewalk in PIE. [NW corner of bldg.]

Applicant Response: The easement will be eliminated, as water & sewer lines will be relocated out in the Lakeforest Boulevard right of way. Applicant will provide PIE for the portion of the sidewalk that is on private property.

Is WSSC OK with moving the water and sewer lines out of a private easement and into the public right of way? [NW corner of bldg.]

Applicant Response: WSSC will review the alignment as part of their Hydraulic Planning Analysis. It is typical for public water and sewer lines to be located in the right of way and not on private property as it will give easier access to maintain the lines without prohibiting the property. There should be no objection from WSSC to relocate the line into the right of way.

Is this curb cut radius sufficient for commercial trucks entering the garage? [LFB garage entry/exit]

Applicant Response: There are no trucks planned to *enter* the garage from Lakeforest Boulevard.

need 3' wide leadwalk off of sidewalk-is this a required exit? [middle of north side of bldg.]

Applicant Response: This has been changed to a lead walk, with stairs within the building.

show crosswalks [garage entry/exit on LFB]

Applicant Response: The crosswalks have been added to the plan.

Reconfigure the Lakeforest Boulevard median to prevent straight and left movements out of the garage. Allow left in from WB Lakeforest Boulevard. Driveway on opposite side to be left in, right in, right out. [LFB at median break]

Applicant Response: The Applicant has suggested edits to the median to channelize turning movements at this intersection after meeting with DPW's Brian Fields and Doug Smith. This will be finalized at time



of FSP.

Why is the enter radius only 15' but the exit radius is 35'? [service alley 2 at LFB]

Applicant Response: Please review truck movements to see the reason. Trucks leave the site and turn right on Lakeforest Boulevard.

Is this section of water line being removed? [LFB at service alley 2]

Applicant Response: Yes, the portion of the water and sewer that is currently located on the property will be removed after the new line is constructed in the street.

Lakeforest Blvd. intersection improvements will need to be coordinated with the Lakeforest Redevelopment project and the City's Russell Avenue project

Applicant Response: The Applicant understands and acknowledges the comment and will continue to coordinate with the City at Final Site Plan. Please review intended truck movements to accommodate planned vehicle circulation for this site in mind.

Provide 10-foot PIE along the Russell Avenue frontage

Applicant Response: 10-foot PIE added along Russell Avenue

General comment: need easements or declarations that provide maintenance and ingress/egress access across driveways and sidewalks for both properties. Also need easements or declarations for any shared parking. May need similar maintenance and access easements or declarations for any stormwater management and storm drain infrastructure that is shared among the two properties. If existing declarations cover some or all of these items, please provide a copy of the recorded instrument.

Applicant Response: The Applicant will comply with this request at time of FSP. Both properties are owned by the Applicant.

Private Service Alley 2 does not comply with the City's Road Code as a "Commercial Service Road" in a number of ways:

- 1. Provide two 11-foot travel lanes*
- 2. Provide 3-foot minimum sidewalk buffer*
- 3. "Retail loading and trash" lane not permitted*
- 4. No on-street parking permitted*

Applicant Response: Applicant worked with DPW to get the two Service Alleys as modified Commercial Service Roads at Concept Plan review. Two 11' lanes, a 6' sidewalk. The handicap spaces fronting 702 Russell are needed to service the existing tenants of the building. Due to this unique situation the Applicant suggests conditioning the approval to implement a commercial service road section at the time of the next phase. The existing improvements on the east side of this driveway are not being edited at this time.

Need to modify this intersection layout. Drivers going eastbound on Service Alley 1 headed towards Russell Avenue are going to shift left in advance of the curve to go around the bulbout, potentially into oncoming traffic going around the curve towards MD 355 (the truck turning movement diagram illustrates this concern). [intx of service alley 1 & 2]

Applicant Response: Applicant team discussed this comment with DPW staff. Cadd has been obtained and will be incorporated for the signature set t reflect the improvements planned.

The City's Russell Avenue project will rebuild this sidewalk [project frontage along Russell]

Applicant Response: The Applicant understands and acknowledges the comment. Cadd has been obtained of the correct design and will be incorporated in the signature set.



Add double yellow lines and turn arrows to indicate only two lanes are here [entry/exit at Russell]

Applicant Response: A subsequent discussion with DPW staff rendered this comment null & void. It will be a right in, left in & right out.

Reduce curb radius [at south side of Russell entry/exit]

Applicant Response: This was discussed with DPW staff post DRT and Applicant noted WB-67 inbound is being studied to turn left into the site from Russell. Please review truck movements to see the radius needed for WB-40 movements exiting the site onto Russell Avenue. That radius exists and can be evaluated at the time of PH2.

The City's Russell Avenue project will rebuild this intersection to allow left-in, right-in, and right-out movements only

Applicant Response: The Applicant understands and acknowledges the comment and will continue to coordinate with the City at Final Site Plan. Please review intended truck movements to accommodate planned vehicle circulation for this site in mind.

Need easement or declarations to allow maintenance by both property owners

Applicant Response: The Applicant will comply with this at the time of FSP.

Sidewalk appears too narrow here with utility boxes partially on top

Applicant Response: Due to complications, this sidewalk has been removed from the design. Pedestrians will use the south sidewalk, across the driveway.

Provide 3-foot minimum sidewalk buffer per the Road Code

Applicant Response: The Applicant has chosen to remove this portion of the sidewalk to eliminate several issues. Circulation along the south side of the project for pedestrians will be via the 6' sidewalk south of the Service Alley. To provide ample soil for the vegetated wall on the south side of the building and to prevent sight distance issues with garage traffic, the pedestrians are encouraged to use the other side of the street. This is consistent with the Road Code recommendations for sidewalk on one side of the section.

Prefer to shift garage entry further away from curve

Applicant Response: The garage configuration does not allow this. Activity is split between LFB and here.

Need to provide space on the alley for moving trucks and short-term deliveries, and call it out on the plans

Applicant Response: The Applicant has planned for this at the commercial loading dock on the east side of the building and has now labeled this.

Consider moving the sidewalk next to the building rather than next to the alley, to provide a better pedestrian experience

Applicant Response: The Applicant has chosen to remove this portion of the sidewalk to eliminate several issues. Circulation along the south side of the project for pedestrians will be via the 6' sidewalk south of the Service Alley. To provide ample soil for the vegetated wall on the south side of the building and to prevent sight distance issues with garage traffic, the pedestrians are encouraged to use the other side of the street. This is consistent with the Road Code recommendations for sidewalk on one side of the section.

C105 sheet



Does everyone enter the residential space through the parking garage? If so how will ambulance service access patients and egress out. MB [355 at LFB]

Applicant Response: The residents will have access to the residential floors from parking garage, and from the residential building entrance located at the intersection of Lakeforest Blvd and MD355. The ambulance can access patients from parking garage level G1 and the residential building entrance on Level R1.

Will need complete mill and overlay of Lakeforest Blvd eastbound (curb to curb) due to utility work [service alley 2 at LFB]

Applicant Response: The Applicant acknowledges the comment.

C106 sheet

Will drivers try to turn left out of the garage here? [garage entry/exit at LFB]

Applicant Response: The left turn movement has been added to the plans.

Reconfigure median to prevent straight and left movements from garage [LFB garage entry/exit]

Applicant Response: The Applicant has suggested edits to the median to channelize turning movements at this intersection after meeting with DPW's Brian Fields and Doug Smith. This will be finalized at time of FSP.

Add crosswalk [service alley 2 and LFB]

Applicant Response: The crosswalk has been added per request.

Should these show two-way traffic? [bank drivethrough]

Applicant Response: There are existing spaces that can be accessed but this is a bank and the lanes are primarily east bound.

Will residents try to turn left out of the garage then cut thru here to get to Russell? DPW is OK with this movement, subject to changing the intersection [south of 702 Russell at service alley 1 & 2]

Applicant Response: The Applicant acknowledges the response from DPW.

Show two-way traffic [702 Russel lot east side]

Applicant Response: This has been corrected.

Prefer to move crosswalk away from curve. Add pedestrian connection/crosswalk [at residential loading]

Applicant Response: The crosswalk has been relocated per request.

Are left out movements from the garage prohibited? Prefer to not direct all outbound traffic to MD 355 [parking garage entry exit on service alley 1]

Applicant Response: The left turn movement has been added to the plans.

General comment: show crosswalks and implied crosswalks at all driveways and alleys

Applicant Response: The crosswalks have been added per request.

C108 sheet

General comment: show crosswalks and implied crosswalks at all driveways and alleys

Applicant Response: The crosswalks have been added per request.

Show all right of way dedication

Applicant Response: There is no dedication required per DPW and SHA review.



Show existing ingress-egress easement and label as "to be terminated"

Applicant Response: The easement and label have been added per request.

"new lot 2" This lot probably needs to be included in the new plat even if there are no boundary changes, because there will likely need to be new easements (ingress/egress, retaining wall maintenance, private storm drain, etc.) or new declarations/covenants that need to be referenced on the plat.

Applicant Response: The Applicant will comply with this at time of FSP and record plat.

Add 10' PIE

Applicant Response: The Applicant has added a 10' PUE on 355, LFB and Russell and a PIE has been provided for the portion of public sidewalk on private property.

Consider establishing a new subdivision name (like Gateway Lakeforest or Lakeforest Gateway) or using a block letter to distinguish this from the other Montgomery Village plats

Applicant Response: The Applicant will consider this at time of FSP and record plat.

Show existing ingress-egress easement and indicate whether it will remain, be modified, or be terminated

Applicant Response: The easement and label have been added per request.

PMS-1 sheet

Provide crosswalk here. Move stop bar back 4' [garage entry/exit at LFB]

Applicant Response: The stop bar has been relocated per request.

Move crosswalk away from curve. Provide sidewalk and crosswalk connection [residential loading/trash]

Applicant Response: The crosswalk has been relocated per request.

City project will install crosswalk [Russell entry/exit]

Applicant Response: The Applicant acknowledges the comment.

Turning movement comments:

C107.1 sheet

Over the curb and very close to the street light [both 'in' views]

Applicant Response: The apron has been adjusted. The light is 20' tall and will be evaluated at FSP.

C110 sheet

Show truck movement for this entrance

Applicant Response: There are no planned truck entering this location. Loading docks are not accessed in this area. There is a short-term drop off on Service Alley 2 at the commercial loading dock.

WSSC Comments on Utility Plan, C105 sheet

No structures (including trees) can be build over existing 20' wide WSSC easements.

Show and label existing WSSC Easements (L05077, F706; L05126, F428; L05095, F357)

Applicant Response: The existing easements L05077, F706; L05095, F357; L05516, F597 have been labeled. This easement will be abandoned when the lines are relocated into the right of way.

For water pipelines 12-inch and smaller in diameter, provide a minimum separation from a building or dwelling the greater of the following: fifteen (15) feet horizontal separation or distance on a 1:1



slope from the bottom of the foundation of the existing or proposed building or dwelling to the bottom edge of the pipeline trench.

Applicant Response: The existing waterline is being relocated into Lakeforest Blvd and will result in a separation of approximately 30' from the proposed building.

Must be addressed prior to preliminary plan approval (i.e., WSSC needs to do a second review prior to plan approval)

Applicant Response: Understood.

Submit an Excavation Support System (ESS) Plan to WSSC for review. Your project involves subsurface features such as an underground parking garage and deep excavation which will require tiebacks in the area of existing or proposed WSSC mains. This ESS Plan submission should be made at the time of design plan submission. If, however, the excavation support work will be done before the design plan submission, it will be necessary to submit the plan as a Non-DR Plan to WSSC. No work should be done in the vicinity of WSSC mains until the ESS Plans have been reviewed by WSSC. If no ESS Plans are required for the project, the engineer should provide a letter from the Project Structural Engineer certifying that the building does not require it.

Applicant Response: Understood: At the time that construction documents are prepared for the building, excavation support and the water and sewer relocation, the appropriate plans will also be prepared to submit for WSSC review.

Loop policy: Water loop will be required to provide a second feed for system outage. This will be determined with WSSC Hydraulic Planning Analysis.

Applicant Response: A WSSC HPA will be submitted for review. There is currently no waterline shown in Russell Ave to connect to but we will coordinate with WSSC during the HPA review.

1. WSSC comments are made exclusively for this plan review based on existing system conditions at this time. We will reevaluate the design and system conditions at the time of application for water/sewer service.
2. Coordination with other buried utilities:
 - a. Refer to WSSC Pipeline Design Manual pages G-1 and G-2 for utility coordination requirements.
 - b. No structures or utilities (manholes, vaults, pipelines, poles, conduits, etc.) are permitted in the WSSC right-of-way unless specifically approved by WSSC.
 - c. Longitudinal occupancy of WSSC rights-of-way (by other utilities) is not permitted.
 - d. Proposed utility crossings of WSSC pipelines or rights-of-way that do not adhere to WSSCs pipeline crossing and clearance standards will be rejected at design plan review. Refer to WSSC Pipeline Design Manual Part Three, Section 3.
 - e. Failure to adhere to WSSC crossing and clearance standards may result in significant impacts to the development plan including, impacts to proposed street, building and utility layouts.
 - f. The applicant must provide a separate Utility Plan to ensure that all existing and proposed site utilities have been properly coordinated with existing and proposed WSSC facilities and rights-of-way.
 - g. Upon completion of the site construction, utilities that are found to be located within WSSCs rights-of-way (or in conflict with WSSC pipelines) must be removed and relocated at the applicant's expense.
3. Forest Conservation Easements are not permitted to overlap WSSC existing or proposed easements. Potential impacts to existing Forest Conservation Easements (due to proposed water and/or sewer systems) must be reviewed and approved by County staff.
4. Unless otherwise noted: ALL extensions of WSSCs system require a request for Hydraulic Planning Analysis and need to follow the System Extension Permit (SEP) process. Contact WSSCs Permit Services Section at (301) 206-8650 or visit our website at MASTER - HPA Checklist for ePlan.xlsx



(wsscwater.com) for requirements. For information regarding connections or Site Utility (on-site) reviews, you may visit or contact WSSCs Permit Services Section at (301) 206-4003.

Applicant Response: WSSC Design Guidelines are being used for clearances and crossings. We will be filing an HPA for review and then upon its approval, the SEP process will begin.

WSSC - WATER COMMENTS Created by: Karem Carpio On: 10/16/2024 01:41 PM

Existing water mains and service connections are not shown on the plan. Water and sewer lines as well as proposed connections need to be included on the plan in order for WSSC to be able to comment. This site is currently being served by existing and active water connections.

If easements are required, their limits and locations must be shown. See WSSC 2017 Pipeline Design Manual Part Three, Section 2; easements and Construction Strips.

Realign water service connection(s) to avoid environmental, storm water management facilities, ESD Devices, other utilities, landscaping, tree boxes and structures or paving impacts for future maintenance.

Applicant Response: The plans have been updated to clearly show the existing water and sewer lines, along with their existing easements. Notes have also been added to the plans to highlight the relocation and abandonments that we are proposing.

Existing water mains shown on plan should be labeled with correct pipe size, material and WSSC contract number.

Applicant Response: Water mains labeled with correct pipe size, material and WSSC contract number.

Show and label easement limits on plan for all existing and proposed water mains.

Provide proper protection of water supply where water main is below or parallel to sewer main, building drain, sewer house connection or septic field and when pipe crosses other utilities.

Revise the plan to realign any water pipeline that conflicts with large storm drains, culverts, deep side ditches, etc. Maintain the required horizontal clearances from other utilities, retaining walls, sediment traps, street lights, paving, etc. See WSSC 2017 Pipeline Design Manual Part Three, Section 3; Pipeline Crossings and Clearances.

Applicant Response: The plans have been updated to clearly show the existing water and sewer lines, along with their existing easements. This plan is proposing the relocation of the water and sewer lines to avoid conflicts with the proposed development. An HPA will be submitted for review and the SEP process will be submitted for WSSC review.

There is a 10-inch diameter water mains located on or near this property. WSSC records indicate that the pipe material is Ductile Iron (DI) and Cast Iron (CI). Prior to submittal of Phase 2 System Integrity review, it is the applicant's responsibility to test pit the line and determine its exact horizontal and vertical location as well as to verify the type of pipe material. The applicant's engineer is responsible for coordinating with WSSC for monitoring and inspecting test pits for this project.

Water pipelines 12-inch and smaller must have the greater of: a minimum of 15 feet horizontal separation from any building or dwelling or a 1:1 slope from the bottom of the foundation of the existing or proposed building to the bottom edge of the pipeline trench.

Applicant Response: The plan has been updated to show pipe materials, easements and labels. As part of this project, the water and sewer line will be relocated and prior to SEP plan submission, the appropriate test pits will be conducted for connections, crossings, etc.

Existing sewer mains and service connections are not shown on the plan. Sewer mains as well as proposed connections need to be included on the plan in order for WSSC to be able to comment. This site is currently being served by existing and active sewer connections.

Applicant Response: Existing sewer mains and service connections within site have been shown and highlighted.



The site has an existing sewer house connection built to the property line. A plumbing permit will be required to build the on-site hook up and activate the connection(s). Contact the WSSC Permit Services Unit at (301) 206-4003 for information or visit www.wsscwater.com

If easements are required, their limits and locations must be shown. See WSSC 2017 Pipeline Design Manual Part Three, Section 2: Easements and Construction Strips.

Applicant Response: Understood. When construction documents (SEP and/or SUP) are prepared, plumbing permits for new connections and abandonments will be applied for.

For sewer pipelines 12-inch and smaller in diameter, provide a minimum separation from a building or dwelling the greater of the following: 15 feet horizontal separation or a distance on a 1:1 slope from the bottom of the foundation of the existing or proposed building or dwelling to the bottom edge of the pipeline trench.

Applicant Response: This project is proposing the relocation of the sewer line to avoid horizontal separation concerns with the proposed development. This will be reviewed again with the HPA and then the SEP plans and coordinated with WSSC to meet the design guideline requirements.

Existing sewer mains shown on plan should be labeled with correct pipe size, material and WSSC contract number.

Applicant Response: Existing sewer mains labeled with pipe size, material and WSSC contract number.

Realign sewer service connections to avoid environmental, storm water management facilities, ESD Devices, other utilities, landscaping, tree boxes and structures or paving impacts for future maintenance. See WSSC 2017 Pipeline Design Manual Part Three, Section 3; Pipeline Crossings and Clearances.

Applicant Response: Understood. The water and sewer mains are proposed to be relocated to avoid conflicts. Service connections are placed and will be adjusted as the plan progresses to make sure proper clearances are held.

Show and label easement limits on plan for all existing and proposed sewer mains.

Revise the plan to realign any sewer pipeline that conflicts with large storm drains, culverts, deep side ditches, etc. Maintain the required horizontal clearances from other utilities, retaining walls, sediment traps, street lights, paving, etc. See WSSC 2017 Pipeline Design Manual.

When establishing roadway grades, ensure design provides the required cover and clearances for proposed sewers that cross over bottomless arch bridges.

Applicant Response: Plans show the existing and proposed sewer lines. The relocation of the sewer, into the street, will help avoid conflicts. The pipeline design manual requirements will be used and reviewed as we prepare and WSSC reviews the HPA and then the SEP.

OUTSIDE METERS - 3-inch and larger meter settings shall be furnished and installed by the utility contractor in an outside meter vault. Show and label vault and required WSSC easement. WSSC prefers an outside meter in a vault, however and indoor meter may be allowed under certain conditions. See WSSC 2021 Plumbing & Fuel Gas Code 112.5.7 & 603.4.1

Applicant Response: The proposed building will be contained in a single lot with a single connection. Due to the urban site with limited setbacks, existing utilities in the right of way and as coordinated with WSSC in similar projects, it's our intent to provide an inside meter.

A single water/sewer service connection for two or more buildings in a single lot/parcel requires a covenant. Should the property be subdivided or sold in the future, individual water/sewer connections for each building will be required.



Applicant Response: This project will subdivide so there is one lot, one building and a single water connection. If a second sewer connection is needed, due to the size of the building, we will process a variance with WSSC for their review and approval.

WSSC easements must be free and clear of other utilities, including storm drain systems, ESD devices, gas, electric, telephone, CATV, etc., except for allowed crossings designed in accordance with the WSSC 2017 Pipeline Design Manual. Landscaping and hardscaping are also not allowed without approval. Under certain conditions (and by special request) the items listed above may be permitted within the WSSC easement. However, this will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and if allowed, will require execution of a special agreement and/or Hold Harmless Agreement between WSSC and the developer.

Applicant Response: Understood. The proposed development will relocate the water and sewer line into the street and remove existing WSSC easements. For any easements that remain or are generated, the design engineer will coordinate clearance and other requirements with WSSC for their review and approval.

Private Street & Alley Easement Requirements. Service mains proposed for this project are located in roadways that are or may be private. Private water and sewer mains are preferred in private streets and alleys. If the applicant desires public water and sewer mains in these private streets and alleys, then the following criteria must be met:

- All separation requirements in the WSSC 2017 Pipeline Design Manual (PDM) must be met.
- A 10-foot Public Utility Easements (PUE) shall be provided on both sides of the private street - and/or alley or space within the private street will be provided to assure PDM separations are met and limiting utility crossings of the WSSC water and sewer lines.
- Blanket easements for other utilities (gas, electric, telephone, CATV, fiber optic, etc.) within the private street and/or alley parcel will not be allowed. The HOA documents shall not provide for a blanket easement across and under a private street and/or alley parcel.
- Dry utilities are to be in the PUE or as described above. No dry utilities are to be placed within the WSSC easement for public water and sewer except to cross perpendicular to the public water and sewer mains.
- The storm drain system located in a private street and/or alley containing public water and sewer mains shall also be public and maintained by the County.

WSSCs minimum easement width for a normal (14-inch diameter or less) pipeline (water or sewer at normal depth) is 20 feet. When both water and sewer (normal diameter and depth) are installed in the same easement, the minimum width is 30 feet. Installation of deep or large water/sewer will require additional easement width.

Applicant Response: It's the intent of this development to relocate the existing water and sewer line into the street and remove existing WSSC easements. Water and sewer connections for the proposed building will be provided through connections from the public line in the street. There are currently no plans to propose service mains on private property.

The minimum horizontal clearance from a building to the outside diameter of a WSSC pipeline is 15 feet. The minimum spacing between adjacent buildings with both water and sewer lines between them must be 40 feet. In some cases where connections, fire hydrants, or deep water/sewer lines are involved, additional easement width is required.

Applicant Response: It's the intent of this development to relocate the existing water and sewer line into the street to avoid these types of clearance concerns.



Balconies or other building appurtenances must not encroach within WSSC easements. Water/Sewer pipeline alignment should maintain a minimum 5-foot horizontal clearance from storm-drain pipeline/structures and other utilities. Review of plan submitted does not meet these requirements. Owner must convey gratis to WSSC easement on property for proposed or future water/sewer facilities with easement shown on recorded plat. Delineate and label the easement with applicable horizontal width shown on plan.

Applicant Response: The proposed plan shows the existing water and sewer mains to be relocated and the easements abandoned.

An Environmental Site Assessment report may be required for the proposed site.

Applicant Response: The applicant will follow WSSC requirements as the HPA and SEP plans are prepared and submitted to WSSC for review.

If blasting is proposed within 200 feet of WSSC buried infrastructure, WSSC notification is required per COMAR 29.06.01.10. B (2) at the time of the Countys Development Review Committee (DRC) process. This Blasting Plan submission should be made at the time of design plan submission. If, however, the blasting work will be done before the design plan submission, it will be necessary to submit the plan as a Non-DR Plan to WSSC. No blasting work should be done within 200 feet of WSSC mains until the Blasting Plans have been reviewed by WSSC. (Montgomery County projects only) Follow WSSC Demolition/Abandonment procedures to obtain a County Raze Permit. Note: Failure to obtain an SDC fixture credit permit inspection prior to the removal of existing fixtures will result in the issuance of Basic Credit Only. To obtain System Development Charge (SDC) credits for existing plumbing fixtures, an SDC Fixture Count Inspection MUST be completed by a WSSC Regulatory Inspector BEFORE REMOVAL OF FIXTURES OR DEMOLITION of the structure. The inspection requires a permit which can only be obtained through a WSSC Registered Master Plumber. SDC Fixture Credit Procedures are available at the WSSC Permit Services website.

Applicant Response: Blasting is not expected for this project.

Any grading change in pipe loading (including but not limited to proposed fill or excavation), adjustment to manhole rims, fire hydrant relocations, placement of access roads or temporary haul roads, temporary sediment control devices, paving construction or construction related activity of any kind over an existing WSSC water or sewer main or within an existing WSSC right-of-way requires advance approval by WSSC. Any proposed public street grade establishment plan (GEP) with an existing WSSC water or sewer main of any size located within the existing or proposed public street right-of-way requires WSSC approval directly on the original GEP prior to approval of the GEP by the County Department of Public Works and Transportation. Any work (design, inspection, repair, adjustment, relocation or abandonment of existing WSSC facilities) is done at the sole expense of the applicant/builder/developer. Contact WSSC Relocations Section at (301) 206-8672 for review procedures and fee requirements.

Applicant Response: Understood. After HPA approval, the SEP will be prepared and submitted for WSSC review and approval.

See WSSC 2017 Pipeline Design Manual, Part Three, Section 5 & Section 11.

Show and label all existing nearby water and/or sewer service connections that may be impacted by the proposed development.

Applicant Response: Additional labels have been added to the plans for review.

WSSC facilities/structures cannot be located with a public utility easement (PUE) however WSSC pipelines may cross over a PUE. Revise the plan to relocate any pipeline, valve, fire hydrant, meter vault and any other WSSC facilities/structures outside of the PUE.



Applicant Response: Understood. At this time, the plans follow WSSC guidelines with structures located in the right way and there is no PUE. As the project moves forward, the locations of WSSC facilities will be adjusted and located to avoid these types of conflicts, if they appear.

WSSC - HYDRAULIC COMMENTS Created by: Karem Carpio On: 10/16/2024 01:52 PM
Submit a Hydraulic Planning Analysis package for review.

Applicant Response: The HPA is being prepared for submission.

Site Utility System reviews are required for projects with proposed water connections greater than 2-inch or sewer connections greater than 4-inch. Contact the WSSC Permit Services Section at (301) 206-8650 for submittal requirements or view our website.

Applicant Response: Understood. The HPA will be submitted and then an SEP and SUP plan will be submitted for WSSC review.

A 10-inch water main is available to serve the proposed site. Contact the Permit Services Section at (301) 206-8650 for details regarding applying for service connections or visit our website.

A 8-inch gravity sewer main is available to serve the proposed site. Contact the Permit Services Section at (301) 206-8650 for details regarding applying for service connections or visit our website. The sewer main alignment should be revised to avoid deep and/or shallow sewer.

Applicant Response: We will apply for the appropriate service connections at the time of SEP plan preparation.

If elevations do not allow gravity sewer, onsite pumping with ejector or grinder pumps may be required for sewer service.

Applicant Response: Understood. Thanks,

Projects projected to generate over 100,000 gallons per day base sanitary flow require special review per SP ENG 11-01 by the WSSC Planning Group. This special review is performed during the Hydraulic Planning Analysis and will determine if downstream improvements will be required.

Applicant Response: The HPA is being prepared for WSSC review.

Projects within sewer basins that experience projected 2-year design storm sewer overflows will be modeled to determine whether they are upstream of these overflows. WSSC standard procedure ENG 11-01 may require sewer system improvements to alleviate these overflows, of which this project may become dependent on. This special review is performed during the Hydraulic Planning Analysis and will determine if downstream improvements or dependencies will be required.

Applicant Response: The HPA is being prepared for WSSC review.

To determine the current Service Category or request a change, contact the Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection at (240) 777-7716.

Applicant Response: These properties are S-1 and W-1 (Public service approved w/ access to main)

+++++

Thank you for your comments and suggestions. We believe the above responses adequately address your comments. If you need any additional information, please contact our office.

Sincerely,
VIKA Maryland, LLC



Ian P. Duke

Ian P. Duke
Senior Associate

Enclosures

Z:\50000-50500\50089_DOCUMENTS\PLAN ARCHIVE\AGENCY SUBMISSIONS\COG\Schematic Development Plan\2024-1031
DRT comments\VM50089C Comment Response Letter_2024-1101.docx

