

November 10, 2025

City of Gaithersburg  
800 Rabbitt Road  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

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

### Casey-Rosedale Property

### Fourth Submission Comment Response (comments issued October 10, 2025)

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

Comments from the fourth submission review by City of Gaithersburg Staff, received on October 10, 2025, have been included and responded to below for your use during the 5<sup>th</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. Table 1: Property & Zoning Information  
Update this to reflect survey. Make sure to redo all calculations in subsequent tables, including FAR.  
[Response: The Net Tract Area has been updated and all calculations in subsequent tables have been updated accordingly.](#)
2. Table 4: Project Data Table  
9.43%  
[Response: The updated percentage for the useable open area is 9.83% based on the updated net tract area of 14.62 acres and adjusted tract area of 15.17 acres.](#)

### CG-2.0 Zoning Plans

3. Update this to match survey, recalculate max building area.  
[Response: Net tract area has been updated and the max building area has been updated accordingly.](#)

## 02-WALL PLAN SET

### SDP-2.3 Wall Plan and Profile

1. Match clear distance between top of top block and sidewalk with section.  
[Response: The wall 3 section has been updated to the proper distance from top block to sidewalk.](#)

2. How will this section be maintained.

Response: Maintenance agreements with HOA will be determined at final site plan. Final landscaping plans will account for maintenance considerations in this narrow strip.

#### SDP-2.6 Wall Plan & Profile

3. We need to see fence details which include fence height (min 42”), width of gap (less than 4”), post size, rails etc. That drawing on pg 30 of design guidelines has no details.

Response: Fence details will be provided with Final Site Plan. Any fence proposed will have a minimum height of 42 inches and a gap width of less than 4 inches.

4. This is the image from the design guidelines referenced in the response letter. This shows no details and gap looks larger than 4”.

Response: The image in the design guidelines is schematic only and not meant to represent a specific fence type for installation. Fence details will be provided with Final Site Plan.

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

#### CV-2.0 Overall Preliminary Subdivision Plan

1. See comments on SD easements on easement exhibit.

Response: Easements have been adjusted to avoid overlap with other easements and trash facilities.

2. See comments on overlapping easements on easement plan.

Response: Easements have been adjusted to avoid overlap with other easements and trash facilities.

3. Make sure this plan matches easement exhibit.

Response: Preliminary Subdivision plan and easement exhibits match.

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

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

1. Sidewalk and Asphalt hatching not shown on landscaping sheets as indicated on comment response (should match page SDP 1.0 for example). Please fix this at final.

Response: Understood, hatching will be added for sidewalks and roads at Final Site Plan.

2. At final please provide more details on what’s happening here – the comment response was very confusing.

Response: Understood, Final Site Plan will provide more clarity for the understory plantings.

#### LL-1.5 Canopy Cover

3. We can pass these through for schematic but at final please show all trees to be more centrally located in planting area.

Response: Understood, where feasible trees will be centered in planting areas at Final Site Plan.

## 05-ARCHITECTURE PLAN SET

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

## 06-PRELIMINARY FOREST CONSERVATION PLAN SET

### PFCP-1.0 Overall Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan

1. Comment response states that surveyed forest boundary lines should be considered accurate rather than “canopy edge” line shown – there is no other forest line shown on plans. Add surveyed forest boundary throughout site and indicate in the legend which is surveyed and which is based on aerial imagery.  
Response: The forest lines denoting forest retain and forest remove are what have been surveyed and denote the edge of forest. The legend has been updated to clarify this. Also, a note has been added for clarity in the general notes section.
2. What is this line.  
Response: This line has been turned off.
3. What is this line.  
Response: This line has been turned off.
4. Increase to existing forest should be previous submittal (6.35 ac) plus 0.07 ac (to include offsite LOD on east side).  
Response: The offsite LOD changed since the last submittal – this is what resulted in the change in the amount of existing forest. When all the existing forest is added it totals 6.39 acres.
5. Shows 18 in table (Sheet 7).  
Response: Table on sheet 7 has been updated, this number is correct.
6. Shows 7 in table (Sheet 7).  
Response: Table on sheet 7 has been updated, this number is correct.

### PFCP-2.0 Forest Mitigation Plan

7. Shift away a couple ft from proposed SW feature.  
Response: Noted, this tree has been shifted 5ft away from the stormwater facility.
8. Large trees need 8-ft planting strip.  
Response: Noted, the trees have been shifted out of the 6-ft planting strip into an at minimum 8-ft planting strip.
9. If attempting to retain variance tree w/ root pruning, remove ‘X’ and make note on plan here.  
Response: Tree is being proposed for removal, the table has been updated to reflect this and is consistent with the tree variance request.
10. Small tree symbol is not consistent size.  
Response: The small tree symbol has been added to the legend, the change in size denotes different species that will be determined at final engineering.

11. Update table as needed after addressing comments on cover sheet.  
Response: The table did not need to be updated as trees were shifted to maintain the amount of credit originally presented.

#### **PFCP-3.0 Notes & Details**

12. If plan is to retain w/ root pruning, do not indicate "phase removal".  
Response: This tree is being proposed for removal, and the table has been updated to reflect that.
13. Grey and orange were removed; add back to table.  
Response: Noted, the color has been added back to the table.
14. Recalculate as needed after addressing comments in table on cover sheet.  
Response: See comment response above, the table did not need to be recalculated.

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

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

1. Legend missing.  
Response: Legend has been updated and sheet Number fixed.

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

2. Images of vehicles are still backwards (also on EXB-6.1).  
Response: The vehicle images have been switched to show the correct incoming / outgoing vehicle condition per lane on both exhibits.

#### **EXB-2.1 Phasing Plan PH1**

3. Fix this label – should be that these spaces are reserved for phase 1 tenants.  
Response: Label has been corrected.

#### **EXB-2.2 Phasing Plan PH2**

4. 81  
Response: The parking count for this area has been updated to 81 spaces.
5. 34  
Response: The parking count for this area has been updated to 34 spaces.
6. 5  
Response: The parking count for this area has been updated to 5 spaces.
7. 11  
Response: The parking count for this area has been updated to 5 spaces.
8. Label blocks on plan just to make it clear  
Response: Lot and block labels have been added to plan view for clarity.
9. 166  
Response: The parking count for this area has been updated to 166 spaces.

10. 19  
Response: The parking count for this area has been updated to 19 spaces.
11. 1.48  
Response: The parking ratio for this area has been updated to 1.48.
12. Add note – phase 1 construction limit has 212 spaces. Lot 1 Block A will have 213 spaces after full build out of phase 2.  
Response: The note has been added and the number of spaces for Lot 1 Block A for Phase 2 has been updated to 213.
13. What is this additional 5 spaces?  
Response: 5 spaces on the adjacent O’Neill Dr Right of Way where the sidewalk connects to the right of way.
14. Buildings 4-6  
Response: Label has been changed to refer to buildings rather than lot and block.
15. 144  
Response: The parking count for this area has been updated to 144 spaces.
16. 1.29  
Response: The parking ratio for this area has been updated to 1.29.
17. Buildings 1-3  
Response: Label has been changed to refer to buildings rather than lot and block.
18. 235  
Response: The parking count for this area has been updated to 235.

#### EXB-4.1 Proposed Easement Plan

19. Will need to determine applicable easements for maintenance and construction at final site plan. May just need temporary construction easement on City property if they are maintained by City.  
Response: Understood, maintenance responsibility and easement language will be determined at Final Site Plan.
20. Proposed storm drain easm’t overlaps into existing WSSC easm’t sg  
Response: This is unavoidable because of the location of existing storm drain that needs to tie into the proposed line. The existing storm drain and sewer easements overlap.
21. Overlapping easements.  
Response: PUE adjusted to allow for adjacent and not overlapping easement in this area.
22. Can’t have dumpster enclosure in easement.  
Response: The storm drain layout and easement have been updated to avoid the dumpster.

23. This portion may need to be maintained by property owner, not City as it carries water from parking area. Can be determined at FSP.

Response: Understood, maintenance responsibility of storm drain will be determined at Final Site Plan.

24. Make sure all trash enclosures are out of easements.

Response: All PUEs / Storm easements have been updated to not conflict with proposed trash enclosures.

25. Make sure this plan matches preliminary subdivision set.

Response: The preliminary subdivision plan and easement exhibits now match.

26. Where is this?

Response: The "Existing SD Easement to Remain" hatch has been removed from the legend.

#### EXB-4.2 Utility Phase 1

27. Show paving tie-in sg

Response: Temporary curb and gutter to connect phase 1 entrance to existing O'Neill Drive has been added.

#### EXB-5.0 Sight Distance Plan

28. Should be left only (also on other sheets).

Response: The through-left lane indicator has been changed to a left only.

29. The state will want to see that this meets AASHTO intersection sight distance standards (14.5' back), although that should affect only the right turn out on red.

Response: AASHTO standard sight distance will be provided for State Highway review with the Access Permit Plan review/submission during Site Plan.

## 08-FIRE ACCESS PLAN SET

#### FDA-1.0 Fire Access Plan

1. There must be 2 means of access to all occupied buildings during all phases of construction per the Fire Marshal.

Response: FDA-3.0 has been added to show the 2 means of access for Phase 1.

2. Can you just add a sheet to this plan that shows the 2 means of access for phase 1? And include note that both access routes will be kept open and clear through construction (same note you have on the supporting exhibits).

Response: FDA-3.0 has been added to show the 2 means of access for Phase 1. The note from the support exhibit has been added to FDA-3.0.

## DESIGN GUIDELINES

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

Casey-Rosedale Property  
Comment Response - Submission #5  
Case#: Z-10030-2025

11/11/2025

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