

July 18, 2025

City of Gaithersburg  
800 Rabbitt Road  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

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

### Casey-Rosedale Property

### Third Submission Comment Response (comments issued June 27, 2025)

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

Comments from the third submission review by City of Gaithersburg Staff, received on June 27, 2025, have been included and responded to below for your use during the 3rd 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-1.0 Existing Conditions

1. Temporary access and maintenance easement should look something like this so that all existing utilities and storm drain infrastructure in the existing ROW are included.  
[Response: Updated access and maintenance easement has been provided on Preliminary Subdivision plan sheets. Easement provided in Abandonment Plan exhibit B.](#)

### CG-1.1 Notes & Computations

2. Table 5: Affordable Housing Units  
Need to add in superscript to table  
[Response: Understood, Table 5: Affordable Housing Units has been reformatted to breakdown united part of the annexed parcel and other remaining units outside parcel with the 75% income restricted units reflected on each.](#)
3. Table 7: Parking Calculations – Lot 2: Block B  
These don't add up  
[Response: Lot 2: Block B parking table has been revised / updated to reflect the proposed accurately. Building 9 proposed the breakdown of standard and ADA spaces has been updated to reflect the current layout.](#)
4. Table 7: Parking Calculations – Total Overall Surface Parking  
Check this number again-some of the parking counts on SDP sheets are incorrect  
[Response: Understood, labels on the SPD sheets have been revised / updated and all parking counts have been updated accordingly.](#)
5. Table 8: Bicycle Parking Calculation

Table is missing

Response: Bicycle Parking calculations have been added to the plan.

#### CG-2.0 Zoning Plans

6. Table 1: Property & Zoning Information – Column: Proposed Building Area (SF)  
Fill this column in

Response: Proposed building column has been filled in according to the lot breakdown.

#### SDP-1.0 Overall Schematic Development Plan

7. Does this inlet no longer connect to a pipe? What happens to the water in the dry pond during a storm?

Response: Graphic error, existing SD pipe has been shown on the plan.

8. Check sight lines for pedestrians looking each way from this ramp

Response: EXB-5.3 added to plan set with sight lines for pedestrian crosswalk.

9. Need to look into options for stop control approaching the existing crosswalk; it's confusing to have the stop bar for one direction only.

Response: Stop Bar and / or signage to be provided at site plan for existing crosswalk.

#### SDP-1.1 Schematic Development Plan

10. Where? Show bounds

Response: Label has been updated to show P.U.E with dimension arrows of the 10' bounds.

11. What is this? Add to legend.

Response: Proposed fence with pillars has been added to the sheet legend.

12. Show PUE. City Code does not require BRL/setbacks here.

Response: PUE has been labelled on the plan.

13. Are these bike racks? Add to legend

Response: Bike racks have been added to the sheet legend and label has been added to the plan

#### SDP-1.2 Schematic Development Plan

14. What is this dashed line?

Response: Line is the extents of the proposed wall footer and label has been added to plan to help identify for reference.

15. Is this a fence? Not shown in the legend

Response: Proposed fence with pillars has been added to the sheet legend.

16. What is this??

Response: Features indicated in your comment is proposed bike racks. Sheet legend has been updated, and bike racks have been added.

17. Does this inlet no longer connect to a pipe? What happens to the water in the dry pond during a storm?

Response: Graphic error, existing SD pipe has been shown on the plan.

18. ? this elev  
Response: Existing condition spot elevation has been removed from the plans.
19. City Code does not require BRL  
Response: Understood, BRL has been removed.
20. FSP/clean up comment-Is this an awning/portico? Make sure it is drawn consistently for every entrance, some show sidewalk  
Response: Understood, building canopies have been updated to show column / support location to clarify graphics.
21. Fix these parking space labels  
Response: Understood, parking labels have been updated.
22. Fix this-2 ADA, 2 non ADA-make sure total space numbers on Notes sheet are updated/accurate  
Response: Understood, parking labels within the plans have been updated to reflect accurately.
23. What is this?  
Response: Area in question is detectable warning surface, label has been added to the plan.
24. Where? Show bounds  
Response: Label has been updated to show P.U.E with dimension arrows of the 10' bounds.
25. City code does not require BRL here  
Response: Understood, BRL has been removed.

#### SPD-1.3 Schematic Development Plan

26. Fix these parking space lables.  
Response: Understood, parking labels within the plans have been updated to reflect accurately.
27. What is this dashed line?  
Response: Line is the extents of the proposed wall footer and label has been added to plan to help identify for reference.

#### SPD-1.4 Schematic Development Plan

28. Fix this parking space label-update total parking numbers on notes sheet  
Response: Understood, parking labels within the plans have been updated to reflect accurately.
29. City Code does not require BRL here-only along boundaries that abut residentially zoned lots  
Response: Understood, BRL has been removed.

## 02-WALL PLAN SET

The proposed retaining wall plans have been updated. Walls #1, #2, and #7 have been removed from the set and the walls have been renumbered with this submission. Applicant determined with SHA that these 3 walls and associated perpetual easements would be removed and SHA preference is to provide grading tie outs onto SHA property with temporary grading easements.

### SDP-2.1 Wall Plan and Profile

30. Show footing outline on plans

Response: Wall has been removed from plan and proposed grading has been revised.

31. What is this line?

Response: Wall has been removed from plan and proposed grading has been revised.

32. Is curb this close to wall?

Response: Wall has been removed from plan and proposed grading has been revised.

33. Is this 24-44 or 24-86 base

Response: Wall has been removed from plan and proposed grading has been revised.

34. Footing Dimensions?

Response: Wall has been removed from plan and proposed grading has been revised.

35. Show existing and proposed grade on section

Response: Wall has been removed from plan and proposed grading has been revised.

36. Is wall 1 CIP or Gravity wall. Section to match Drawing #SDP 2.9/2.10 of wall plans

Response: Wall has been removed from plan and proposed grading has been revised.

37. General Comment - On wall sections show:

- Boundary line/LOD
- V/H Scale
- Extend of geogrid
- width of footing
- show / label existing and proposed grade.
- Show correct location of curbs

On Plans:

- Label all lines
- Label geogrid

Response: Walls adjacent to SHA property have been removed from the plan and the proposed grading tie outs have been provided instead. Labels have been added to each plan views. Extend of geogrid has been provided on plan view, only shown on Wall #5.

### SDP-2.2 Wall Plan & Profile

38. Label

Response: Wall has been removed from plan and proposed grading has been revised

39. Correct location of curb

Response: Wall has been removed from plan and proposed grading has been revised

40. Horizontal scale & add vertical scale

Response: Wall has been removed from plan and proposed grading has been revised. Horizontal & Vertical scales have been added to other wall sheets.

#### SDP-2.3 Wall Plan & Profile

41. label

Response: Label has been added to call out footer.

42. Label lines showing extent of geogrid

Response: Proposed walls are Stonestrong and do not require geogrid.

#### SDP-2.4 Wall Plan & Profile

43. Clearly show and label geogrid

Response: Proposed walls are cast in place and do not require geogrid.

#### SDP-2.5 Wall Plan & Profile

This sheet is original Wall #8 and has been renamed to Wall #5. This wall has geogrid label and location called out on plan.

#### SDP-2.9 Wall Details

44. Based on response to comments (pt. 30), wall 1 is a Gravity wall matching stone strong details on SDP2.10 and not CIP

Response: Wall #1 has been removed per meeting with SHA. Please note that sheet 2.9 "Wall Details" is now sheet 2.6.

45. Only wall 1 to 8 shown on plans

Response: Wall numbers and wall heights have been updated.

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

#### CV-2.0 Overall Preliminary Subdivision Plan

46. Show as area to be dedicated to public use

Response: Area has been added to proposed dedication area.

47. Remove proposed PUE from ROW.

Response: PUE has been removed.

48. If utilities are located beyond 10 feet, the PUE will need to be wider

Response: Understood, per coordination with the Dry Utility designer, the 10' PUE is adequate.

49. For the benefit of Lot/Parcel XX, Block A

Response: "For the benefit of lot 2, block A" has been added to the notes.

50. What about proposed construction and maintenance easements for retaining walls 1 & 2?

Response: Walls 1 and 2 have been removed from the design set. Proposed temporary grading easements have been provided.

51. Add parcel or lot identifiers. Example: Parcel A, Block A.

Response: Block and Lot info has been added to the plan.

52. Show areas that will be temporary access and maintenance easements while the new road is being constructed and old road is still being used.

Response: Proposed temporary access easements and SWM Access easements have been added.

#### CV-2.2 Preliminary Subdivision Plan

53. Show areas that will be temporary access and maintenance easements while the new road is being constructed and old road is still being used

Response: Temporary access and maintenance easements added.

#### CV-2.3 Preliminary Subdivision Plan

54. Show as area to be dedicated to public use

Response: Dedication area has been added to the plan.

55. Show areas that will be temporary access and maintenance easements while the new road is being constructed and old road is still being used.

Response: Temporary access and maintenance easements have been added.

#### CV-2.4 Preliminary Subdivision Plan

56. Show areas that will be temporary access and maintenance easements while the new road is being constructed and old road is still being used.

Response: Temporary access and maintenance easements have been added.

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

#### LL-1.0 Overall Landscape & Lighting Plan

57. Add shrubs to legend

Response: All understory planting and further landscape detail will be provided at site plan phase. Understory planting areas have been identified on SDP sheets by hatching areas to help define the spaces in a preliminary manner with tree locations identified throughout the landscape sheets.

58. Add setback circle to the legend items - they look alot like a tree on the plan view

Response: Setback circles have been added to the Landscape Sheet legend as requested.

59. Can bushes or trees be planted here, in case SHA removes the existing vegetation in the ROW?

Response: Additional trees have been proposed in the indicated area to add additional buffer to the SHA ROW. All proposed understory planting will be proposed and further detailed at Site Plan phase and not at preliminary Schematic Development Plan.

60. Can a few more trees be planted here?

Response: An additional row of trees have been proposed along the property line in the indicated area as requested.

61. Additional location trees could be added if needed

Response: Area will be further defined at Site Plan phase to work with the final building architecture, circulations and infrastructure.

#### LL-1.1 Landscape & Lighting Plan

62. Trees proposed on top of drainage pipes may present future maintenance issues, consider shifting drainage design or relocate trees to keep a 5ft offset

Response: The proposed SD depth provides adequate tree planting space / depth for the street trees. The applicant is aware of the maintenance concerns, however the SD offset, and utility clearance is influencing the SD layout.

63. Same comment - tree location above drainage pipes, what is proposed depth of pipes?

Response: The proposed SD depth provides adequate tree planting space / depth for the streets trees. The applicant is aware of the maintenance concerns however the SD offset and utility clearance is influencing the SD layout.

#### LL-1.2 Landscape & Lighting Plan

64. Light located on curb, adjust

Response: Light locations have been adjusted and offset from the proposed curb.

#### LL-1.3 Landscape & Lighting Plan

65. Same comment - tree location above drainage pipes

Response: The proposed SD depth provides adequate tree planting space / depth for the streets trees. The applicant is aware of the maintenance concerns however the SD offset and utility clearance is influencing the SD layout.

#### LL-1.4 Landscape & Lighting Plan

66. Missing inlet/junction being shown here

Response: SD structures have been added and shown in all Landscape plans.

#### LL-1.5 Canopy Cover

67. I measured approx. 78,092 so this # is good

Response: Understood

68. I measured approx. 132,955 so this # is good

Response: Understood

#### LL-2.0 Landscape Notes & Details

69. Repeat comment to note that Shrubs and seed mixes will be required in future submittals

Response: All understory planting and further landscape detail will be provided at site plan phase. Understory planting areas have been identified on SDP sheets by hatching areas to help define the spaces in a preliminary manner with tree locations identified throughout the landscape sheets.

## **05-ARCHITECTURE PLAN SET**

70. There were no comments provided as part of this plan review cycle

## 07-SUPPORT EXHIBIT PLAN SET

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

71. No ADA accessible path from these spaces?

Response: ADA accessible path has been added and delineated on the plans.

72. Would like to see ADA path from each building to one of the amenity spaces.

Response: ADA routes have been added at all buildings from ADA spaces to building entrances.

### EXB-1.2B Service Area and Loading Plan

73. What is this?

Response: Area indicated is ADA warning surface for the ADA parking spaces.

74. This does not show much-what does the service area ("S") in each building include? Not all buildings have designated service areas. Will there be designated parking areas for loading/unloading or can trucks park where ever space is available?

Response: Parking for loading / unloading will be provided as needed with coordination with the property owners. Property owner to determine timing and location of parking spaces to designate for loading operations on a case by case basis.

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

75. Frederick

Response: Legend Label has been updated

### EXB-2.1 Phasing Plan PH1

76. 185

Response: Phase 1 has been updated to reflect 185 proposed units.

77. Check this-I only counted 212 in the parking lots?

Response: Revised parking numbers reflect 237 proposed parking spaces for phase 1.

78. Isn't part of O'Neill in phase 1? Move blue line

Response: Phasing lines have been updated for phase 1 and phase 2.

79. Is fire access on the open space? Indicate on plans.

Response: A note has been added below Building 3 indicating the added driveway connection in the parking lot provide a second fire access route with construction of phase 1.

80. Where is the temporary access road or a secondary access on the Phase One drawings for fire? We will need 2 ways in to the area. -MB(Fire Protection Engineer)

Response: A note has been added below Building 3 indicating the added driveway connection in the parking lot provide a second fire access route with construction of phase 1.

### EXB-2.2 Phasing Plan PH2

81. Doesn't match previous sheet

Response: Chart has been updated so both sheets match and have the accurate number.

82. Check this number-too low

Response: Number is accurately representing proposed layout for phase 2 – refer to sheet CG-1.1 for all proposed parking numbers.

#### EXB-4.1 Proposed Easement Plan

83. Need to show proposed construction and maintenance easements for retaining walls on SHA property (walls 1 & 2).

Response: Walls 1 and 2 have been removed per coordination with SHA and are no longer included with the design.

84. Show 5' construction easement

Response: Wall #2 has been removed, construction easement no longer required.

85. PUE is not 10 feet here-are utilities ok with this?

Response: Yes, the PUE “neck-down” has been coordinated with Dry Utility design team.

86. PUE Show 5' constr. Easement

Response: Wall #1 no longer part of the set, grading easement provided.

#### EXB-4.2 Utility Phase 1

87. Existing Storm Drain connection missing .

Response: Missing pipe section has been added.

88. Show existing and proposed property lines, right-of-way lines, and road-related easements.

Response: Property lines, ROW, PUE and utilities turned on.

#### EXB-4.3 Utility Phase 2

89. What is this sewer stub line for?

Response: This sewer stub allows connection of sewer from Phase 1 construction to the existing main. Sewer section to be removed / abandoned in place during phase 2 construction with relocation of the sewer main.

90. Somehow delineate between phases 1 & 2

Response: Phase 1 & 2 boundaries have been added to the plan to help with delineating between each phase.

#### EXB-5.1 Sight Distance Plan

91. Two parking spaces block sight line. Remove these or push out the curb on the EB receiving leg of O'Neill Dr and check whether that resolves the issue. Also consider a three-way stop with the appropriate W4-4P/aP/bP plaques.

Response: Removal of 2 parking spaces or signage and striping for a 3 way controlled stop intersection will be evaluated with Site Plan design.

#### EXB-5.2 Sight Distance Plan

92. Parking blocks sight line

Response: Evaluation of intersection for 4 way stop control or removal of parking will be evaluated and provided with Site Plan.

93. Parking blocks sight line

Response: Same parking section as previous comment. Evaluation of intersection for 4 way stop control or removal of parking will be evaluated and provided with Site Plan.

**EXB-6.1 Street Profile**

94. Show the street sections

Response: Understood, street sections have been added to the plan.

**EXB-7.0 Proposed Truck Turn Movements**

95. Trash and recycling trucks may also front load, so an additional sheet showing the front of the truck entering the area and then backing out should be included.

Response: Understood, however if the rear load waste management truck circulates around the site than the front load truck will as well.

96. Is this over the curb? Can you put in a mountable curb if needed?

Response: Truck routing has been updated.

**08-FIRE ACCESS PLAN SET**

97. No Comments were provided during this review.

**DESIGN GUIDELINES**

**Sheet 7:**

Might be easier just to label these 1-7 instead of A-G on the graphic.

Response: The graphic has been updated to show numbers instead of letters.

**Sheet 23:**

*Make sure you are good with requirements of 24-8.23 (A) (4). These detail ratio of sign face to base for monument signs.*

Response: We will be in compliance with the requirements of that section of the code.

*Plan says primary and secondary signage, not monument or wall sign-clarify*

Response: The plan has been updated to clarify that the primary signage is freestanding monumental signage, and the secondary signage may be freestanding monumental signage or wall signage.

*Need to specify maximum size (width and height) that you are requesting. If you just leave it as "will exceed current code allowances", then show design aesthetics, typical materials; etc. and add language that final dimensions to be reviewed and approved with sign package at FSP.*

Response: The following note has been added to the guideline, "The proposed wall signage will exceed current zoning code allowances for height and width. Final signage dimensions will be reviewed and approved as part of the sign package during Final Site Plan approval. Signage elements, either as a panel or pin mounted lettering, may be affixed to a wall or fencing structure situated above the retaining wall. The exact location, design, and extent of any requested zoning relief for the signage will be determined during the sign permit review process. Refer to Section 4.50 Fencing & Retaining Walls for proposed wall aesthetics and materials. Signage lettering will match the font used in the primary signage to ensure consistency across the project."

**Sheet 37:**

*Same comment as before, maybe just label with assigned numbers instead of letters.*  
Response: The graphic has been updated to show numbers instead of letters.

**Sheet 41:**

*Make this more flexible to allow something other than basketball*

Response: The reference to “basketball courts” has been removed and replaced with “play courts.”

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

July 22, 2025

City of Gaithersburg  
800 Rabbitt Road  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Re: Casey-Rosedale Property  
Zoning Map Amendment –  
CD Zone with Schematic  
Development Plan  
Z-10030-2025  
3<sup>rd</sup> Submission

### **Casey-Rosedale Property**

### **Third Submission Comment Response (comments issued June 27, 2025)**

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

Comments from the third submission review by City of Gaithersburg Staff, received on June 27, 2025, have been included and responded to below for your use during the 3rd 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.

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

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

1. Are there forest removals associated with these outfalls?  
**Response:** The western most outfall has forest removal associated with it. The two outfalls to the east are not forested, the plan has been updated to reflect the existing forest within the offsite LOD.
2. Will require MDE/USACE joint permit application  
**Response:** Understood, a JPA will be obtained prior to any impact to regulated resources.
3. Ensure all work w/in SVB is included in Environmental Waiver request.  
**Response:** Noted, all work within the SVB is included in the Environmental Waiver request.
4. Duplicate labels of the area  
**Response:** Noted, one of the labels has been deleted to resolve duplicate labels
5. Environmental Information Table: Tract area must include increase in LOD shown for stormwater outfalls work. Total LOD measures 7.28 ac. Recalculate worksheet.  
**Response:** Noted, the Tract area includes the entire project area including any offsite areas included within the LOD and the worksheet has been updated to reflect the correct Tract Area.

6. Environmental Information Table: Need to update this acreage with additional LOD at outfalls work w/in SVB  
Response: Noted, the acreage has been updated to include additional LOD.
7. Stream impacts shown at outfall work along northwest side  
Response: Noted, the linear feet of stream included in the offsite LOD has been added to the site statistics and forest conservation tables.
8. Forest Conservation Table: At 1st outfall work along northwest, it's both sides  
Response: Correct, however, when noting that the average width of stream buffer is 100 ft – we wanted to make it known that the 100ft of stream buffer width was for one side of the stream not both. The average width of stream buffer has been updated to 200ft and it is noted that this is for both sides of the stream.
9. Forest Conservation Statistics: Recalculate once tract area/net tract area is updated to reflect LOD increases.  
Response: Noted, the Tract area includes the entire project area including any offsite areas included within the LOD and the worksheet has been updated to reflect the correct Tract Area.
10. Forest Conservation Statistics: Previous comment not addressed - there are still 18 specimen tree removals shown on plan; are some of these significant trees ( $\geq 24$ )? If so, need to be distinguished from specimen ( $\geq 30$ ).  
Response: Significant and Specimen trees have been distinguished and added to the table.

#### PFCP-1.2 Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan

11. Move tree closer to center of median to provide ample space for root intake on both sides (all trees where applicable)  
Response: All tree locations have been reviewed to give them as much space for root intake as possible, design constraints limits where the locations of these trees can be planted. All trees being taken for forest conservation credit meet the width requirements listed in the City's Tree Manual.

#### PFCP-3.0 Notes & Details

12. Missing grey and orange cell colors, add colors or remove notes  
Response: Cell colors have been added to the table.
13. FCP is not assigned # until Final FCP stage, in which it will be given an ENV #. Can leave this as blank space for now.  
Response: Noted. FCP number has been removed and replaced with blank space.
14. County review?  
Response: The note below forest worksheet has been deleted.
15. Can disregard previous comment - when recalculating worksheet to account for increase in LOD, use formulas provided in worksheet. Was misread on last submittal.  
Response: Noted, the worksheet calculations that were originally used have been utilized.

## 09-TREE VARIANCE REQUEST PACKAGE

16. Please add ST 26 and possibly ST-10 (even if no removal looks like CRZ impacts). there are potential CRZ impacts to ST-1  
Response: Noted, variance trees with CRZs have been added to the variance request.
17. ST 26 is 29.5 DBH as of 2023. This NRI will expire 7/26 this tree will require a variance at the time of removal. Better to include now than come back for revised. I'd suggest looking at similar trees that may fall into this, including CRZ impacts which also require variance.  
Response: Understood, we are going to proceed with the trees that currently meet the definition of a tree needing a variance if impacted. We will review additional impacts as necessary as the project and plans progress.
18. Also, SVB in attachment does not align with SVB shown on NRI  
Response: Noted, the plans have been updated to include the SVB approved on the NRI.
19. I think you have 2 that meet impacts.  
Response: CRZ impacts have been added to the tree variance request.
20. Has nothing to do with request  
Response: Noted, this section has been removed from the variance request.
21. MP doesn't determine density  
Response: Noted, this section has been removed from the variance request.
22. This has nothing to do with the removals or impacts. You decided upon the design: you could go taller and with structured parking and have no variances needed. If citing master plan, better through housing element than land use  
Response: Noted, this section has been removed from the variance request.
23. Remove and revise sections as shown via Track changes  
Response: The sections crossed out and/or in need of revision have been revised.
24. Nice section, I'd emphasize that this is not a market rate project and is self funded therefore there are valid cost constraints to be considered and still meet the the foundation's and City policy goals (wf housing, balanced amenities, enhanced SWM, sense of place/community etc)  
Response: Understood, this section has been emphasized and expanded.
25. Add in trees I identified  
Response: Trees have been added
26. Update  
Response: Noted, the number of variance trees being proposed for removal along with those with CRZ impacts has been updated per comments and to be consistent throughout the package.

27. Delete these as they are not germane to argument. If you cite/attach anything Housing element recommendations and Strategic Plan (<https://www.gaithersburgmd.gov/about-us/mission-vision-values-strategic-plan>)

Response: Noted. The attachments marked for deletion have been deleted.

## 10- ENVIRONMENTAL WAIVER PACKAGE

\*Note – the stream buffer has been updated to reflect what was on the approved NRI per guidance from City review.

28. ESD facilities are designed to meet the 1-year return event, at most. Please revise.  
Response: Revision has been made to correct 1,000-year storm event to 1-year storm event.
29. How will the water quality treatments be increased for offsite areas when the ESDs are managing only onsite impervious?  
Response: Noted, this section has been updated for clarity.
30. The pipe realignment should be included to better direct flows from the outfall pipe than currently exists.  
Response: Noted, this has been clarified in the justification
31. Delete  
Response: Point 4b has been deleted from the text
32. Include existing topo and contours, similar to what is shown in existing conditions.  
Response: Existing topo contours have been included in the Environmental Waiver Exhibit as shown similar to the Existing Conditions exhibit
33. Please add details comparing what is being lost to gain in housing  
Response: Noted, this has been integrated into the statement of justification.
34. There are a lot of statements here that could be consolidated and clarified such as, portions will be abandoned in order to provide the single direct connection, provide pedestrian improvements, etc. It says the roadway will impact the stream buffer, for good or negatively? How is this safer?  
Response: Noted. The paragraph has been consolidated and rewritten for clarity.
35. This could be up in prior paragraph  
Response: Noted, subpoint iii has been incorporated into subpoint ii.
36. Perhaps describe how these are necessary, such as how they will provide improvements to alternatives  
Response: Noted.
37. Impact #2, I would say a roadway connection that improved connection the adjacent....and creation of a storm drain outfall: leave out the word necessary  
Response: Noted, the impact description for Impact #2 has been notated as described above.

38. Impact #3, please describe how removal will be enhanced by installation of better connection to existing infrastructure. In this way you can have a point/counterpoint on each impact description.

Response: Noted, the details of this impact justification have been updated to further explain this point.

39. Are we missing a word at the end of first sentence? Who will manage site?

Response: This paragraph has been reworked for clarity.

40. Could say that the buffer cannot be avoided in order to improve existing conditions by: removal of the existing road, improvement of the connections to Casey, maintain thruway access to Rt 355 and improve runoff conditions. Might be a little more straightforward.

Response: Section 1a of Impact Area 2 has been revised to state the above.

41. Please break this into sentences that are clear and concise like: Encroachment into the buffer has been minimized. Design improvements require some extensions into the buffer but these are offset by the benefits. Additionally, proper grading and construction requires a minor encroachment.

Response: Point #2 has been revised to break up the section into clear and concise sentences as notated above.

42. These changes are needed to comply with fire code and allow for better connection throughout the complex

Response: Noted, this has been included in point #4.

43. Please remove first sentence and just explain that there is a redesign to improve circulation through the community and drainage and community assets

Response: First sentence has been removed, and the redesign to improve circulation through the community and drainage and community assets has been explained.

44. Just state improvements and need for infrastructure

Response: Noted.

45. Earlier explanations imply this will be vegetated and managed, not turf grass? Is it possible to create a buffer of native vegetation? Turf grass does not improve runoff conditions.

Response: The final condition of this area will be mowed and maintained lawn, revegetation is not possible as this area will be utilized for a utility. The existing condition of this area is impervious pavement, therefore by adding pervious lawn, runoff conditions will be improved.

46. Explain that there are no RTE species and the site will be improved by things listed above and that impacts were minimized to MEP

Response: Noted, this has been made clear.

47. Needed in order to improve safe conditions, enhance the development and allow for appropriate infrastructure compliance. Please rework intro sentence

Response: The introductory statement has been reworked as suggested above.

48. Remove the word clearly.

Response: The word "clearly" has been removed from the text.

Casey-Rosedale Property  
Comment Response Submission #3  
Case#: Z-10030-2025

7/22/2025

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