

June 06, 2025

City of Gaithersburg  
800 Rabbitt Road  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Re: Casey Rosedale  
Design Guidelines

Laura Mehfoud,

Thank you for your first review of the Design Guidelines for Rosedale, received via email on May 1, 2025. We've carefully reviewed your comments and prepared responses for your consideration. A revised version of the Design Guidelines, updated to reflect these responses, is also included for your reference. We appreciate your thoughtful feedback and continued collaboration.

Comments from the first submission review have been included and responded to below:

Design Guidelines Comments:

1. Sheet 2 (Revised Sheets 20-23):  
Signage standards? If you want anything different from what is allowed in our sign ordinance, put it in the DG  
**Response:** Comment addressed and revised as noted. A signage sheet has been added to the design guidelines. Materials, signage standards, and precedent imagery has been added to convey design intent.
2. Sheet 7:  
Change 'fostering' to 'foster'  
**Response:** Comment addressed and revised as noted. 'Fostering' has been revised to 'foster'.
3. Sheet 8:  
Not all sidewalks have red dots  
**Response:** Comment addressed and revised as noted. Red dots delineating secondary pedestrian sidewalks on-site have been added to all internal sidewalks.
4. Sheet 9:  
Revise 'side' to 'sides'  
**Response:** Comment addressed and revised as noted. 'Side' has been revised to 'sides'.
5. Sheet 20 (Revised Sheet 24):
  - 1) What about trellis as shown in SDP?  
**Response:** Comment addressed and revised as noted. Trellis/ pergola precedent imagery has been shown. Materials such as aluminum or pressure treated wood will be used.
  - 2) No trees?  
**Response:** Comment addressed and revised as noted. Open space landscaping description has been revised to include shade and flowering trees that will be located around sidewalks, open lawn areas, and active amenity spaces to encourage pedestrian comfort and define outdoor spaces.

6. Sheet 22 (Revised Sheet 26):
  - 1) Need more definitive language here- things like sidewalks are required, other things like benches “may” be included but not code requirement.  
**Response:** Comment addressed and revised as noted. More definitive language has been included. The O’Neill drive streetscape will contain streetscape elements like lighting, street trees, and bike racks to contribute to a safe and attractive user experience.
  - 2) Don’t need stormwater treatment facilities details in DG?  
**Response:** Comment addressed and revised as noted. Stormwater treatment facility precedent imagery and detail has been removed from design guidelines.
7. Sheet 25 (Revised Sheet 29):
  - 1) Materials for modular fencing?  
**Response:** Comment addressed and revised as noted. Modular fencing to be aluminum with protective coating. Black in color.
  - 2) Retaining wall precedents/materials?  
**Response:** Comment addressed and revised as noted. Retaining wall materials and precedents have been added. Depending on the structural needs and the constraints of specific wall locations, retaining wall types could be brick veneer, poured in place concrete, Keystone Retaining Wall System, or Stone Strong Pattern Blocks. Wall color to complement site architecture.
8. Sheet 26 (Revised Sheets 30-31):

General comment – See comments on landscape plan – make sure plant palette matches landscape plan.  
**Response:** Comment addressed and revised as noted. Tree palette has been revised to match the landscape plan tree palette. Precedent images have been revised to reflect landscape plan shade trees, ornamental trees, and evergreen trees.
9. Sheet 34-35:

Foundation plantings are not shown on landscape plan.  
**Response:** Comment addressed and revised as noted. Building foundation landscape zones or areas have been added in the design guidelines and has been identified with a hatch on the landscape plan.
10. Sheet 36:
  - 1) Show larger plan again with park spaces labeled.  
**Response:** Comment addressed and revised as noted. A larger plan has been added before the amenity area enlargements on Sheets 36-37.
  - 2) Is seating provided?  
**Response:** Comment addressed and revised as noted. Seating is provided in amenity areas #1 & #2. Rendering has been revised so that seating under tree canopies is more visible.

11. Sheet 41 (Revised Sheets 38-43):

What is the difference between “pocket parks” and “seating areas”? If there are key differences in amenities provided, need to clarify that.

**Response:** Comment addressed and revised as noted. For clarification purposes, all amenity areas, including pocket parks and seating areas, have been renamed Amenity Areas #1-#7. Amenity areas include seating as noted within the design guideline descriptions. Amenity area descriptions are provided within the design guidelines, including expected activities or programming.

Please feel free to reach out to me with any questions and I can set up a virtual meeting if you'd like to meet to discuss any of the plan items in detail.

Sincerely,  
Rodgers Consulting, Inc.

Jeff Lynch, P.E.  
Senior Engineer  
240.912.2121

Cc:  
Randall Rentfro, Rodgers Consulting  
Amanda Stamper, Rodgers Consulting  
Brian Fields, City of Gaithersburg

June 06, 2025

City of Gaithersburg  
800 Rabbitt Road  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Re: Casey-Rosedale Property  
Zoning Map Amendment –  
CD Zone with Schematic  
Development Plan  
2<sup>nd</sup> Submission

### **Casey-Rosedale Property**

### **Second Submission Comment Response (comments issued May 1, 2025)**

#### **Case #: Z-10030-2025**

Comments from the first submission review by City of Gaithersburg Staff, received on May 1, 2025, have been included and responded to below for your use during the 2<sup>nd</sup> review of the Casey-Rosedale Property Schematic Development Plan. Comments have been included by plan set and broken out by sheet upon which comment was received.

## **01-CASEY ROSEDALE SDP PLAN SET**

### **CG-1.1 Notes & Computations**

1. Don't call them MPDUs if they are not going to be regulated under the City's MPDU program. Call them "income restricted".  
[Response: MPDU has been replaced with income restricted. See Table 5, Sheet CG-1.1.](#)
2. A lot of these [Table 7: Parking Cals] are wrong-revise chart and recalculate required parking for all three lots.  
[Response: See Sheet CG-1.1 for revised Table 7. A parking waiver is requested in accordance with Section 24-7.6 \(A\) of the COG Code to reduce the parking spaces required for Block A. The number of parking spaces proposed is in excess of demand and the site is within 1,500 feet of an existing transit stop on Frederick Ave \(MD Rte 355\). See Sheet CG-1.1 and Parking Demand Analysis.](#)
3. Where are the bicycle spaces on the plans?  
[Response: Bicycle parking has been added to the plan near buildings and amenities.](#)

### **CG-2.0 Zoning Plan**

4. Update parcel boundaries to show post-abandonment and dedication boundaries and update the associated areas in the table below. This exhibit should be showing that the proposed development does not exceed the FAR limits for each area.  
[Response: Areas updated in table.](#)

5. Show the abandoned area of O'Neil Drive as another color, label it as such, and add Max FAR of 3.0, existing zone None, and proposed zone CD. Also add to the chart below.

Response: Abandonment area of O'Neill Dr and Nancy Pl provided in hatched purple. Abandonment exhibit and areas provided on EXB-1.3.

6. Drafting error? Remove

Response: Removed.

7. Add three columns [Table 1] for FAR, maximum building area, and proposed building area.

Response: See Table 1 on Sheet CG-2.0 for FAR and building area information.

8. As an alternative to the comments shown here, add a new "Proposed Property & Zoning Plan" and put these comments on that sheet, leaving this sheet (existing property & zoning plan) as it is, except with proposed zoning removed from the property labels and table.

Response: Existing zoning areas maintained and abandonment area added for O'Neill Dr and Nancy Pl.

#### SDP-1.0 Overall Schematic Development Plan

9. How are moves handled-do moving trucks park anywhere? What about delivery vehicles?

Response: A Service Area & Loading Plan was added; see Sheet EXB-1.2B.

#### SDP-1.1 Schematic Development Plan

10. Label street typology and provide cross section in SDP plan set

Response: Street typology and cross sections have been added.

11. Why is there a sidewalk here and nowhere else in the parking lot? Just because of landscaping?

Response: Additional sidewalks have been added throughout the parking lot.

12. Any space for additional sidewalk connections?

Response: Additional sidewalks have been added throughout the parking lot.

13. Is this a fence? Add to legend

Response: Retaining walls have been added to the legend.

14. Show PUE

Response: PUE is now shown.

15. Is there a reason for this crosswalk to be so far from the intersection? We would prefer that it be directly in line with the sidewalk so that eastbound right turns will see pedestrians in the roadway.

Response: Location of crosswalk will be finalized during completion of State Highway Plans. Crosswalk was placed further from the intersections to avoid the on-ramp and existing storm drains.

16. Label accessible paths from ADA parking to the ADA accessible doors and label elevators or ADA accessible units (typical comment-all sheets)

Response: SDP has been revised to provide more information about accessible routes.

#### SDP-1.2 Schematic Development Plan

17. Sidewalk connection here?

Response: Sidewalk connections have been revised.

18. What is this?

Response: Sidewalk connections have been revised.

19. Clean up sidewalk connections.

Response: Sidewalk connections have been revised.

20. City Code does not require BRL here

Response: BRL has been removed in this area.

#### SDP-1.4 Schematic Development Plan

21. Add sidewalk

Response: Additional sidewalks have been added throughout the parking lot.

#### SPD-1.3 Schematic Development Plan

22. Make BRL label more clear.

Response: BRL and other labels have been revised for legibility on all sheets.

23. Any space for sidewalk connection here?

Response: Additional sidewalks have been added throughout the parking lot where possible. Placement of sidewalks is constrained by storm water management needs.

## 02-WALL PLAN SET

#### SDP-2.0 Wall Location Plan

24. General Comment

- Show footing outline for all walls
- Show extent of Geogrid on
- Show typical section of walls including dimensions, geogrid, property line, LOD, easements

Response: The proposed footings have been added to plans. The extent of footings for gravity wall / geogrid has been shown. Typical wall sections have been provided for each wall, per City request.

25. [Update wall 2 drawing number to] SDP 2.2

Response: The wall 2 drawing reference has been provided, per City comment.

26. Is this a fence?

Response: Yes, the line work with question is a proposed fence.

27. Checklist needs to be filled out

Response: The retaining wall checklist(s) have been filled out, per request.

#### SDP-2.1 Wall Plan & Profile

28. Is footing beyond boundary line? SHA permit required.  
Response: Yes, the footing falls within SHA property and a permit will be required. A proposed 5' construction and maintenance easement has been shown.
29. Show footing outline. Is footing in PUE?  
Response: The retaining wall footing has been provided and is clear of PUE.
30. Show correct Profile for CIP wall.  
Response: This wall is to be a gravity retaining wall and additional details have been provided on sheet SDP 2.10

#### SDP-2.2 Wall Plan & Profile

31. Show extent of geogrid.  
Response: The gravity wall footing has been added to the plan, per City comment. There is no geogrid proposed for wall 1.
32. Show footing outline  
Response: The wall footing has been added to the plan, per City comment
33. Show typical section of this wall including dimensions, geogrid, property line, LOD, easements.  
Response: Typical retaining wall sections have been provided, per City comment.

#### SDP-2.3 Wall Plan & Profile

34. Show footing outline and extent of geogrid.  
Response: The wall footing has been added to the plan, per City comment
35. Repeat comment: Show typical section of this wall including dimensions, geogrid, property line, LOD, easements.  
Response: Typical retaining wall sections have been provided, per City comment.

#### SDP-2.4 Wall Plan & Profile

36. Repeated comment [wall]  
Response: See SDP-2.0 Wall Plan & Profile - comment response #24.
37. Points to nothing.  
Response: The label and leader has been updated, per City comment.

#### SDP-2.5 Wall Plan & Profile

38. Repeated comment [wall].  
Response: See SDP-2.0 Wall Plan & Profile - comment response #24.

#### SDP-2.6 Wall Plan & Profile

39. Repeated comment [wall].  
Response: See SDP-2.0 Wall Plan & Profile - comment response #24.

#### SDP-2.7 Wall Plan & Profile

40. Does geogrid extend beyond LOD?  
Response: Yes, the footing falls within SHA property and a permit will be required.

### SDP-2.8 Wall Plan & Profile

41. Show north arrow

Response: A north arrow has been added to the plan, per City comment.

## **03-CASEY ROSEDALE SUBDIVISION PLAN SET**

### CV-2.0 Overall Preliminary Subdivision Plan

42. This area should either be deeded to the City or dedicated to public use (as was shown on the original Plat 9308)

Response: A label has been added to plan for the existing r/w Plat 9308 Rosement Sec.3

43. Conservation easement cannot overlap WSSC easement. Also, trees for forest conservation cannot be planted too close to existing and proposed pipes.

Response: The forest conservation and WSSC easement have been updated removing overlap.

44. Add 10 foot PUE on this side of O'Neil Drive

Response: Applicant proposes a single side roadway PUE, pending approval from service providers as such. Should the Utility providers require additional PUEs they will be provided as necessary.

45. Show other side of easement boundary

Response: The other side of the easement here follows the existing property line.

46. Why does the storm drain easement end here?

Response:

47. Add bearing and distance (N 49-11-43 E, 10.0 feet?)

Response: The property line bearing and distance has been added to plan, per City comment.

48. Remove this line

Response: The line has been removed, per City comment.

## **04-LANDSCAPE & LIGHTING PLAN SET**

### LL-1.0 Overall Landscape & Lighting Plan

49. Add this gray hatch to legend.

Response: The easement hatch has been added to the Landscape Plan legend.

50. A check LOD line- looks like a contour line...

Response: LOD linetype is corrected.

51. Add missing line type [to legend]

Response: Missing match-line had been added to the Landscape Plan legend.

52. Add shrubs, annual beds and ground cover to legend.

Response: Shrubs, annual beds and ground cover have been added to the Landscape Plan legend.

#### LL-1.1 Landscape & Lighting Plan

53. Will need to provide 5' distance between trees and utilities.

Response: Trees have been shifted 5' from all utilities.

54. Comparing to sheet SDP 1.2 his LOD is different. Concept site plan should be used as the base plan for this submittal.

Response: LOD has been corrected.

#### LL-1.5 Canopy Cover

55. My calculation shows about 79,157 SF which assuming your tree canopy is accurate is a little less than the 30% requirement. This is beyond the scope for this submittal but I'm noting it so that you are aware you may be under the required canopy coverage and can think about this as design progresses.

Response: Areas of parking lots and tree canopy have been updated to reflect design changes. See Sheet LL-1.5.

#### LL-2.0 Landscape Notes & Details

56. While many of these notes appear to be from the COG tree manual/landscape checklist, let's separate them out into an individual list from the other items in these notes.

Response: Notes have been separated into General Notes (from FOG Tree Manual) and planting notes. See Sheet LL-2.0.

57. Typically done by Miss Utility, not the contractor.

Response: See Sheet LL-2.0, Planting Note 7 for correction.

58. See City of Gaithersburg's tree manual, no stakes are required unless it is very windy.

Response: Planting notes and details have been updated to remove stake requirement. See Sheet LL-2.0.

59. Shrubs and seed mixes will be required in future submittals.

Response: Acknowledged.

60. See City of Gaithersburg tree manual- tie's are only required in windy conditions.

Response: Planting notes and details have been updated to remove stake requirement. See Sheet LL-2.0.

## **06-PRELIMINARY FOREST CONSERVATION PLAN SET**

#### PFCP-1.0 Overall Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan

61. If this is existing canopy edge (per legend), how is this not a forest removal area? This applies in several places on plan.

Response: The forest area shown is based on the forest stand delineation done at the time of the NRI/FSD. The areas where existing canopy is shown did not meet the definition of a forest either through width, size or density when being assessed during the NRI/FSD.

62. Land use is Residential

Response: Noted, the land use has been updated.

63. Indicate how you intend to meet remaining 4.01 ac of mitigation requirement  
Response: Noted, a note has been added indicating how we intend to meet the mitigation requirement.
64. Forest clearing or grading w/in Stream Valley Buffer will require an Environmental Waiver per Sect 25 of the City's Environmental Standards for Development, and City Code  
Response: Noted. An environmental waiver has been submitted.
65. Add existing/proposed storm drains to legend.  
Response: Noted, existing and proposed storm drains have been added to the legend.
66. Sheet PFCP-3.0 tree table shows 49  
Response: Noted. Tree quantities have been updated to be consistent.
67. Sheet PFCP-3.0 tree table shows 18 Ensure all Medium trees have min. 7' planting strip, and all Large trees have min. 8' planting strip within medians and along paved areas. Ensure appropriate spacing away from buildings. Ensure best mgmt practices for tree spacing per tree sizes. Indicate how you intend to meet  
Response: Noted, all trees being utilized for forest credit meet the appropriate planting strip width and ensure best management practices for tree spacing.
68. "There are 11 specimen trees removals shown in Sheet PFCP-3.0 tree table AND 18 for removal shown on Plan per legend ""Specimen Tree Removals"". Resolve inconsistencies. If some of what's shown on plan is Significant tree removal, make distinction."  
Response: Noted. Tree quantities have been updated to be consistent.
69. There are 7 specimen trees shown as retained on Sheet PFCP-3.0 tree table and on Plan.  
Response: Noted. Tree quantities have been updated to be consistent.
70. Please show and label retaining walls on plans as applicable.  
Response: Noted. The retaining walls have been labeled.
71. Add "Proposed" assuming none are existing.  
Response: Noted, legend has been updated.
72. Why dividing and overlapping LOD lines?  
Response: The LOD lines have been cleaned up.
73. Ensure all Medium trees have min. 7' planting strip, and all Large trees have min. 8' planting strip within medians and along paved areas. Ensure appropriate spacing away from buildings. Ensure best management practices for tree spacing per tree sizes.  
Response: Noted, all trees being utilized for forest credit meet the appropriate planting strip width and ensure best management practices for tree spacing.
74. Add comma between planting and establishing.  
Response: A comma has been added.

### PFCP-3.0 Notes & Details

75. A Clearance (5.82) greater than convs threshold (3.4) is 2.42 ac  
Response: Noted. The forest conservation worksheet has been updated.
76. 6.87 ac with corrected  
Response: Noted. The forest conservation worksheet has been updated.

## **07-SUPPORT EXHIBIT PLAN SET**

### EXB-1.1 Contextual Plan

77. Not open space-office  
Response: Land use has been corrected.

### EXB-1.2A On-site Circulation Plan

78. Casey Community enter-institutional  
Response: Land use has been corrected.
79. Are all green sidewalks ADA compliant? Is there an ADA accessible route from each building to the central green space? Show on exhibit.  
Response: Exhibit 1.2A has been revised to provide more information about accessible routes.

### EXB-1.3 Right-of-Way Abandonment Existing

80. Yellow dash is difficult to see-make access easement areas easier to distinguish. Include exhibit with future temporary access easements in Abandonment application.  
Response: The yellow dash has been replaced with 'blue', to be more legible. The Abandonment & Easements sketch and description(s) have been provided as part of this submission.

### EXB-1.4 Right-of-Way Proposed

81. Provide concurrence with PUE stakeholders that south side of O'Neill only is acceptable.  
Response: Understood.
82. This chart [Table 3] should be on EXB-1.3 SG.  
Response: The table noted has been moved and provided on EXB-1.3, per request.

### EXB-2.0 Overall Phasing Plan

83. Indicate which Phase the road will be constructed.  
Response: A portion of Oneil Dr., up to the first intersection will be constructed in phase one, and the remaining proposed road will be constructed Phase two.

### EXB-2.1 Phasing Plan PH1

84. Need temporary Fire secondary access to phase 1 parking lot  
Response: A temporary secondary access connecting the new phase one development to the existing access, has been provided, per City request.

### EXB-3.0 Open Space & Amenities Area Plan

85. Take out some of the graphic detail to make it a general sport court-could be basketball, pickleball, etc.  
Response: Graphic detail have been reduced.

#### EXB-4.1 Proposed Easement Plan

86. "This storm drain is being replaced? Storm drain/construction easements? "  
Response: Yes, the storm drain is being replaced at these locations and new storm drain systems are proposed. Proposed stormdrain easements have been shown, per City comment.
87. "Provide a Preliminary Storm Drain Plan showing phasing, off-site connections, abandonment, etc."  
Response: Refer to EXB- 4.0, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3.
88. Provide a Preliminary Utility Plan showing phasing, off-site connections, abandonments, etc.  
Response: Refer to EXB- 4.0, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3.

#### EXB-5.1 Sight Distance Plan

89. Provide sight distance this side also (eastbound traffic).  
Response: The sight distance plan has added an eastbound analysis, per request.

#### EXB-6.1 Street Profile

90. Label Entrances.  
Response: The street profile has added labels for each proposed intersections at street entrances.

#### EXB-7.0 Proposed Truck Turn Movements

91. Over curb  
Response: The proposed fire apparatus turning analysis has been updated, per the Pierce Arrow Ladder truck avoiding possible conflicts.
92. Are these parked cars going to be hit? [2x]  
Response: The proposed fire apparatus turning analysis has been updated, per the Pierce Arrow Ladder truck avoiding possible conflicts.
93. Rotate truck  
Response: The proposed fire apparatus turning analysis has been updated, per the Pierce Arrow Ladder truck.

## **08-FIRE ACCESS PLAN SET**

#### FDA-1.0 Overall Fire Access Plan

94. "The movements look tight to me and they are running up over the curbs. Not good especially when 10 years from now there is vegetation and other obstructions. Will have to widen the street or provide some other means to access the site. Also have to provide a secondary access during construction."  
Response: The proposed fire apparatus turning analysis has been updated, per the Pierce Arrow Ladder truck. Fire department access route is proposed at 23' wide having a minimum 25' inside turning radius. A secondary FDA access route has been provided during the phased construction.

95. Shall use the Pierce Arrow Ladder truck (attached) as specified by the City of Gaithersburg and Montgomery County for Fire Department access,  
[Response: The proposed fire apparatus turning analysis has been updated, per the Pierce Arrow Ladder truck.](#)

## SUPPORTING PLAN SETS AND REPORTS

96. Road Abandonment: Add new exhibit showing temporary access easements for phase 1  
[Response: Road abandonment sketch and description updated to include temporary access easements for phase 1.](#)
97. Traffic Impact Study: [See separate Comment Response letter from Wells Associates for Traffic Impact Study comments and responses.](#)
98. Design Guidelines: [See separate Comment Response letter for Traffic Impact Study comments and responses included with 2<sup>nd</sup> submission package to City of Gaithersburg.](#)

Let us know if you have any questions or if you would like to meet to discuss any of the plans or design elements.

Sincerely,  
Rodgers Consulting, Inc.



Jeff Lynch, P.E.  
Senior Engineer  
240.912.2121

Cc:  
Randall Rentfro, Rodgers Consulting  
Amanda Stamper, Rodgers Consulting  
Brian Fields, City of Gaithersburg