DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

December 21, 2017

Mr. Elza Hisel-McCoy, Master Planner
Area 1 Planning Division
The Maryland-National Capital
Park & Planning Commission
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-3760

RE: Administrative Subdivision Plan
No. 60170070
8911 & 8915 Burdette Road

Dear Mr. Hisel-McCoy:

We have completed our review of the Design Exception request dated November 21, 2017. This request includes amending the MCDOT preliminary plan letter dated August 23, 2017. We recommend approval of the design exception and amending the MCDOT preliminary plan letter with following comments:

All Planning Board Opinions relating to this plan or any subsequent revision, project plans or site plans should be submitted to the Department of Permitting Services in the package for record plats, storm drain, grading or paving plans, or application for access permit. This letter and all other correspondence from this department should be included in the package.

**NOTE:** All comments from the preliminary plan letter dated August 23, 2017, are applicable unless modified below.

The applicant requests relief from Comment 11.a. through a design exception for Burdette Road.

- **Comment #11. a: Original Language:** Permit and bond will be required as a prerequisite to DPS approval of the record plat. The permit will include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following improvements:

  Street grading, paving, curb, gutter, five (5) foot concrete sidewalk and street trees along Burdette road site frontage, in accordance with MCDOT design standard no. MC-2003.10

Office of the Director
101 Monroe Street 10th Floor · Rockville Maryland 20850 · 240-777-7170 · 240-777-7178
FAX
www.montgomerycountymd.gov
Located one block west of the Rockville Metro Station
Applicant's Request: The design exception requests that street grading, paving, curb & gutter, and the five-foot concrete sidewalk requirements be waived. We believe that the MC-2003.10 street standard is out of context for the existing conditions in place for the 1.2 mile stretch of Burdette Road at the subject property location. Burdette Road is an existing Principal/Secondary Residential Street and for most of its length, there is no public sidewalk and no concrete curb and gutter (only occasional sections of asphalt curb). The road is an open section and the standard calls for a closed section road. Improving the street section for the subject property's 175-foot length would be out of context with the remaining 1.2-mile length. Lastly, the improvement would require multiple trees to be removed to accommodate the street section. The result of the design exception maintains the consistency of Burdette Road for the approximately 1.2-mile length between River Road (MD Route 190) and Bradley Boulevard (MD Route 191).

MCDOT Response: We recommend approval of the design exception request as proposed by the applicant. This exception will be consistent with other development along the street. The applicant will continue to dedicate the right-of-way (Comment #1 of our letter). The dedicated right-of-way will allow MCDOT in the future to construct the road to a current standard. Lastly, the applicant has two "monument pillars" which will be in the proposed right-of-way. These pillars are on each side of the existing driveway, which is being removed and a new driveway added. MCDOT will not allow the pillars to remain and they must be removed prior to record plat.

As part of the design exception approval, MCDOT is amending the following comments in our attached August 23, 2017 review letter as follows:

- **Comment #2: Original Language:** Label and dimension existing & proposed right-of-way paving.  
  The comment is amended as follows: Label and dimension existing right-of-way and paving.

- **Comment #11. a:** This condition is now eliminated with the design exception approval.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the design exception request. If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact Mr. William Whelan our Development Review Area Engineer for this project at (240) 777-2173 or at william.whelan@montgomerycountymd.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Rebecca Torma, Acting Manager  
Development Review Team  
Office of Transportation Policy

Sharepoint/DOT/Director's office/development review/Whelan/burdette road revised letter.docx

cc:  
Jan Evans  
Owner  
Donald Rohrbaugh  
Site Solutions, Inc.  
Erin Girard  
Linowes and Blocher  
Preliminary Plan folder  
Preliminary Plan letters notebook

cc-e:  
Sam Farhadi  
MCDPS RWPR  
William Whelan  
MCDOT OTP
August 23, 2017

Mr. Elza Hisel-McCoy, Supervisor
Area 1 Planning Division
The Maryland-National Capital
Park & Planning Commission
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-3760

RE: 8911 & 8915 Burdette Road
Administrative Subdivision
Plan No. 620170070

Dear Mr. Hisel-McCoy:

We have completed our review of the administrative subdivision plan dated June 2, 2017. This plan was reviewed by the Development Review Committee at its meeting on August 8, 2017. We recommend approval of the plan subject to the following comments:

All Planning Board Opinions relating to this plan or any subsequent revision, project plans or site plans should be submitted to the Department of Permitting Services in the package for record plats, storm drain, grading or paving plans, or application for access permit. Include this letter and all other correspondence from this department.

1. Dedicate necessary right-of-way along Burdette Road frontage per the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Master Plan.

2. Label and dimension existing & proposed right-of-way and paving.

3. Grant necessary slope and drainage easements. Slope easements are to be determined by study or set at the building restriction line.

4. Relocation of utilities along Burdette Road to accommodate the required roadway improvements, if necessary, is the responsibility of the applicant.
5. The proposed common driveway apron needs to be constructed with Fire Department-compliant driveway returns and paved a minimum of twenty (20) feet wide within the public right-of-way. Extend the twenty (20) foot wide paved driveway into the site as necessary to satisfy emergency vehicle access requirement.

6. The private common driveway shall be determined through the subdivision process as part of the Planning Board’s approval of a preliminary plan. The composition, typical section, horizontal alignment, profile and drainage characteristics of the private common driveway, beyond the public right-of-way, shall be approved by the Planning Board during their review of the preliminary plan.

7. The record plat must reflect a reciprocal ingress, egress and public utilities easement for the common driveway.

8. The sight distance evaluation is acceptable and is included with this letter.

9. The storm drainage study is incomplete. Any necessary improvements to existing, downstream County-maintained systems can be determined at the record plat stage.

10. If the proposed development will alter any existing street lights, signing, and/or pavement markings, please contact Mr. Dan Sanay of our Traffic Engineering Design and Operations Section at (240) 777-2190 for proper executing procedures. All costs associated with such relocations shall be the responsibility of the applicant.

11. Permit and bond will be required as a prerequisite to DPS approval of the record plat. The permit will include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following improvements:

A. Street grading, paving, curb, gutter, five (5) foot concrete sidewalk and street trees along Burdette Road site frontage, in accordance with MCDOT design standard no. MC-2003.10 (Primary/Principal Secondary Residential Street – No Designated Parking), per comment number 1.

NOTE: The Public Utility Easement is to be graded at a side slope not to exceed 4:1.

B. Enclosed storm drainage and/or engineered channel, if needed as a result of the future review of the storm drain capacity and impact analysis, are to be designed in accordance with the MCDOT Storm Drain Design Criteria within County rights-of-way and all drainage easements.
C. Permanent monuments and property line markers, as required by Section 50-24(e) of the Subdivision Regulations.

D. Erosion and sediment control measures as required by Section 50-35(j) and on-site stormwater management where applicable shall be provided by the Developer (at no cost to the County) at such locations deemed necessary by the Department of Permitting Services (DPS) and will comply with their specifications. Erosion and sediment control measures are to be built prior to construction of streets, houses and/or site grading and are to remain in operation (including maintenance) as long as deemed necessary by the DPS.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this preliminary plan. If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact William Whelan, our Development Review Area Engineer for this project at william.whelan@montgomerycountymd.gov or (240) 777-2173.

Sincerely,

Gregory M. Leck, Manager
Development Review Team

620170070 8911 and 8915 Burdette Road - MCDOT final plan review ltr.docx
Enclosures (sight distance certification)

cc: Jan Evans
    Donald Rohrbaugh Site Solutions, Inc.
    Jeffrey Lewis Site Solutions, Inc.
    Erin Girard Linowes and Blocher
    Matthew Folden M-NCP&PC
    Preliminary Plan folder
    Preliminary Plan letters notebook

cc-e: Sam Farhadi MCDPS RWPR
      Marie LaBaw MCDPS Land Development
      William Whelan MCDOT OTP
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION
DEPARTMENT OF PERMITTING SERVICES

SIGHT DISTANCE EVALUATION

Facility/Subdivision Name: BRADLEY HILLS GROVE
Preliminary Plan Number: 6-20170070

Street Name: BURDETTE ROAD
Master Plan Road Classification: Principal Secondary

Posted Speed Limit: 25 mph

Street/Driveway #1 (PROP. DRIVEWAY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Sight Distance (feet)</th>
<th>OK?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Street/Driveway #2 (N/A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Sight Distance (feet)</th>
<th>OK?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification or Posted Speed (use higher value)</th>
<th>Required Sight Distance in Each Direction*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary - 25 mph</td>
<td>150'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary - 30</td>
<td>200'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business - 30</td>
<td>200'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary - 35</td>
<td>250'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial - 40 (45)</td>
<td>350'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major - 50 (55)</td>
<td>475'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>550'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sight distance is measured from an eye height of 3.5' at a point on the centerline of the driveway (or side street) 6' back from the face of curb or edge of traveled way of the intersecting roadway where a point 2.75' above the road surface is visible. (See attached drawing)

ENGINEER/ SURVEYOR CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this information is accurate and was collected in accordance with these guidelines.

Signature: [Signature]

[Signature]

Montgomery County Review:

☑ Approved

☐ Disapproved:

By: [Signature]

Date: 08/22/17

Form Reformatted: March, 2000
January 18, 2018

Mr. Michael Devine  
Site Solutions, Inc.  
19508 Amaranth Drive, Suite A  
Germantown, MD 20874

Re: COMBINED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT CONCEPT/SITE DEVELOPMENT STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN for Bradley Hills Grove, 8911 and 8915 Burdette Road  
Preliminary Plan #: 620170070  
SM File #: 283064  
Tract Size/Zone: 2.61 ac  
Total Concept Area: 2.61 ac  
Lots/Block: Bradley Hills Grove Lot 13 and Part of Lot 17, Block B  
Parcel(s): N/A  
Watershed: Cabin John Creek

Dear Mr. Devine:

Based on a review by the Department of Permitting Services Review Staff, the stormwater management concept for the above-mentioned site is acceptable. The stormwater management concept proposes to meet required stormwater management goals via eight (8) drywells and one (1) bioswale.

The following items will need to be addressed during the detailed sediment control/stormwater management plan stage:

1. A detailed review of the stormwater management computations will occur at the time of detailed plan review.

2. An engineered sediment control plan must be submitted for this development.

This list may not be all-inclusive and may change based on available information at the time.

Payment of a stormwater management contribution in accordance with Section 2 of the Stormwater Management Regulation 4-90 is not required.

This letter must appear on the sediment control/stormwater management plan at its initial submittal. The concept approval is based on all stormwater management structures being located outside of the Public Utility Easement, the Public Improvement Easement, and the Public Right of Way unless specifically approved on the concept plan. Any divergence from the information provided to this office; or additional information received during the development process; or a change in an applicable Executive Regulation may constitute grounds to rescind or amend any approval actions taken, and to
reevaluate the site for additional or amended stormwater management requirements. If there are subsequent additions or modifications to the development, a separate concept request shall be required.

If you have any questions regarding these actions, please feel free to contact Jean Kapusnick, PE at jean.kapusnick@montgomerycountymd.gov or 240-777-6345.

Sincerely,

Mark C. Etheridge, Manager
Water Resources Section
Division of Land Development Services

MCE: jak

cc:     N. Braunstein
       SM File # 283064

PE: Target/Achieved: Lot 1: 1.2"/1.21", Lot 2: 1.6"/1.6", Lot 3: 1.0"/1.01"
STRUCTURAL: 0.0 cf
WAIVED: 0.0 ac.
DATE: 04-Jan-18
TO: Don Rohrbaugh - dwr@esimd.net
    Site Solutions, Inc.
FROM: Marie LaBaw
RE: 8911 & 8915 Burdette Road
     6120170070

PLAN APPROVED

1. Review based only upon information contained on the plan submitted 04-Jan-18. Review and approval does not cover unsatisfactory installation resulting from errors, omissions, or failure to clearly indicate conditions on this plan.

2. Correction of unsatisfactory installation will be required upon inspection and service of notice of violation to a party responsible for the property.
Burdette Road has a varying pavement width. It is no less than 20 feet wide along the property frontage and is up to 22 feet wide. No parking is permitted on either side of the road.
1. Gross Tract Area: 2.86 Acres (124,519 sq.ft.) - Per Deed Records
2. Area of Proposed R/W's & Easements: 0.87 Ac. (Cat. I Conservation Easement)
3. Net Tract Area: 2.93 Acres
4. Zoning: R-200
5. Planning Area: Bethesda-Chevy Chase
6. Area of Existing Forest Cover: 1.10 Ac.
7. Watershed: Cabin John Creek (State Use I, I-P)
8. This property is not located within a Special Protection Area.
9. There is no evidence of non-tidal wetlands on or adjacent to the subject property. There are no hydric soils, no observed hydrophytic plants and no wetland hydrology characteristics present on or adjacent to the subject property.
10. The subject property is located in Flood Zone X per FEMA Panel 24031C0345D. There is no mapped 100-Year Floodplain on or adjacent to the subject property.

Note that most of this area of forest will not actually be cleared, but will not be considered Forest Save for purposes of reforestation calculation.

Ex. 20" Water Line
Ex. 8" Sanitary Sewer Line
Prop. 4" Sanitary Sewer House Connection
Prop. 1-1/2" - 2" Water House Connection

MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND
4/13/2018

SITE SOLUTIONS, INC.
Planning   Landscape Architecture   Engineering   Surveying
19508 Amaranth Drive         Suite A
Germantown, Maryland   20874-1211

EX. FH
M/H #058M
280

2066 D-PLOT DATE
Vicinity Map
Scale: 1"=2000'

Forest Clear Area
To be placed in Category I Conservation Easement

Area of Off-Site L.O.D. = 3,120 sq.ft. or 0.07 Ac.

0.87 Ac. (37,800 sq.ft.)

Forest Save Area

Note:
Remove dead and dying trees in this area.
### Specimen & Significant Tree Action Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Action/Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Quercus rubra</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>6,362 s.f.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quercus rubra</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4,072 s.f.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quercus alba</td>
<td>White Oak</td>
<td>28&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5,542 s.f.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quercus rubra</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4,072 s.f.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Quercus rubra</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>36&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>9,161 s.f.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
<td>32&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7,238 s.f.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
<td>35&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>8,659 s.f.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
<td>35&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>8,659 s.f.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4,072 s.f.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
<td>33&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7,698 s.f.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Quercus rubra</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>34&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>8,171 s.f.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Save (Impacted) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quercus rubra</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>25&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4,418 s.f.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Quercus rubra</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>36&quot;</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>9,161 s.f.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Save (Impacted) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4,072 s.f.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
<td>35&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>8,659 s.f.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Remove **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
<td>43&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>13,070 s.f.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Remove **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
<td>28&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5,542 s.f.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quercus alba</td>
<td>White Oak</td>
<td>29&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5,945 s.f.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
<td>34&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>8,171 s.f.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Remove **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
<td>28&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5,542 s.f.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
<td>31&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>6,793 s.f.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Remove **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
<td>56&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>22,167 s.f.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Remove **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Forest Conservation Data Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Total afforestation required</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED FOREST CLEARING</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREAK EVEN POINT</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Existing forest cover (excluding floodplain)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Area of forest above afforestation threshold</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Forest Cover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Total tract area</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Existing forest cover (excluding floodplain)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Existing forest cover (including floodplain)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Clearing permitted without mitigation</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Total tract area that exceeds forest conservation threshold</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Net tract area (tract area less forest conservation area)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Existing forest cover (excluding floodplain)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Area of forest above afforestation threshold</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Existing forest cover (including floodplain)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Clearing permitted without mitigation</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Area of forest above afforestation threshold</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Tract Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Total tract area</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Existing forest cover (excluding floodplain)</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Existing forest cover (including floodplain)</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Clearing permitted without mitigation</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Total tract area that exceeds forest conservation threshold</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Net tract area (tract area less forest conservation area)</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Forest Conservation Worksheer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Total afforestation required</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED FOREST CLEARING</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREAK EVEN POINT</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Existing forest cover (excluding floodplain)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Area of forest above afforestation threshold</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lot Information

- **Lot 13 & Part of Lot 17, Block B** / Tax Map GP341, WSSC Grid #211NW07
- **8921 Burdette Road**
- **Lot Size & Part of Lot 13, Block B**, Tax Map GP341, WSSC Grid #211NW07
- **3522 Burdette Road**
- **Lot Size & Part of Lot 13, Block B**, Tax Map GP341, WSSC Grid #211NW07
May 18, 2018

Casey Anderson, Chair
Montgomery County Planning Board
Maryland National Capital Park & Planning Commission
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

RE: 8911 and 8915 Burdette Road, ePlan 620170070, NRI/FSD application accepted on 2/13/2017

Dear Mr. Anderson:

All applications for a variance from the requirements of Chapter 22A of the County Code submitted after October 1, 2009 are subject to Section 22A-12(b)(3). Accordingly, given that the application for the above referenced request was submitted after that date and must comply with Chapter 22A, and the Montgomery County Planning Department ("Planning Department") has completed all review required under applicable law, I am providing the following recommendation pertaining to this request for a variance.

Section 22A-21(d) of the Forest Conservation Law states that a variance must not be granted if granting the request:

1. Will confer on the applicant a special privilege that would be denied to other applicants;
2. Is based on conditions or circumstances which are the result of the actions by the applicant;
3. Arises from a condition relating to land or building use, either permitted or nonconforming, on a neighboring property; or
4. Will violate State water quality standards or cause measurable degradation in water quality.

Applying the above conditions to the plan submitted by the applicant, I make the following findings as the result of my review:

1. The granting of a variance in this case would not confer a special privilege on this applicant that would be denied other applicants as long as the same criteria are applied in each case. Therefore, the variance can be granted under this criterion.

2. Based on a discussion on March 19, 2010 between representatives of the County, the Planning Department, and the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Forest Service, the disturbance of trees, or other vegetation, as a result of development activity is not, in and of itself, interpreted as a condition or circumstance that is the result of the actions by the applicant. Therefore, the variance can be granted under this criterion, as long as appropriate mitigation is provided for the resources disturbed.
3. The disturbance of trees, or other vegetation, by the applicant does not arise from a condition relating to land or building use, either permitted or nonconforming, on a neighboring property. Therefore, the variance can be granted under this criterion.

4. The disturbance of trees, or other vegetation, by the applicant will not result in a violation of State water quality standards or cause measurable degradation in water quality. Therefore, the variance can be granted under this criterion.

Therefore, I recommend a finding by the Planning Board that this applicant qualifies for a variance conditioned upon meeting all ‘conditions of approval’ pertaining to variance trees recommended by Planning staff, as well as the applicant mitigating for the loss of resources due to removal or disturbance to trees, and other vegetation, subject to the law based on the limits of disturbance (LOD) recommended during the review by the Planning Department. In the case of removal, the entire area of the critical root zone (CRZ) should be included in mitigation calculations regardless of the location of the CRZ (i.e., even that portion of the CRZ located on an adjacent property). When trees are disturbed, any area within the CRZ where the roots are severed, compacted, etc., such that the roots are not functioning as they were before the disturbance must be mitigated. Exceptions should not be allowed for trees in poor or hazardous condition because the loss of CRZ eliminates the future potential of the area to support a tree or provide stormwater management. Tree protection techniques implemented according to industry standards, such as trimming branches or installing temporary mulch mats to limit soil compaction during construction without permanently reducing the critical root zone, are acceptable mitigation to limit disturbance. Techniques such as root pruning should be used to improve survival rates of impacted trees but they should not be considered mitigation for the permanent loss of critical root zone. I recommend requiring mitigation based on the number of square feet of the critical root zone lost or disturbed. The mitigation can be met using any currently acceptable method under Chapter 22A of the Montgomery County Code.

In the event that minor revisions to the impacts to trees subject to variance provisions are approved by the Planning Department, the mitigation requirements outlined above should apply to the removal or disturbance to the CRZ of all trees subject to the law as a result of the revised LOD.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

Laura Miller
County Arborist

cc: Marco Fuster, Senior Planner
JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT
FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SUBDIVISION PLAN NO. 620170070

I. INTRODUCTION

Applicants, Jan Evans and Steven Heflin (the “Applicants”), by their attorneys, Linowes and Blocher LLP, submit this Administrative Subdivision Justification Statement to demonstrate conformance of the proposed plan with all applicable review requirements and criteria. The subject property is located at 8911 and 8915 Burdette Road in Bethesda, contains a land area of approximately 124,519 square feet (approximately 2.86 acres), and is comprised of Lot 13 and a Part of Lot 17, Block B, Bradley Hills Grove Subdivision as shown on Tax Map GP 341 (the “Property”). The Property is zoned R-200 and is subject to the recommendations of the 1990 Bethesda-Chevy Chase Master Plan (the “Master Plan”).

Applicants are submitting this Administrative Subdivision Plan (the “Application”) to create 3 lots to allow for the retention of an existing single-family house and the construction of two new detached houses in the R-200 zone pursuant to Section 6.1.C of Chapter 50 of the Montgomery County Code (the “Subdivision Regulations”) effective February 13, 2017.

II. BACKGROUND

On August 15, 2005, Applicants acquired the Property, which is more specifically known as Lot 13, Block B (comprised of 79,411 square feet) and an approximately 45,108 square foot part of Lot 17, Block B of the Bradley Hills Grove Subdivision. Lot 13 and Lot 17, Block B are depicted on Plat No. 1264, which was recorded among the Land Records of Montgomery County on July 20, 1940. According to information from the Maryland State Department of Assessments and Taxation (“SDAT”), Lot 13, Block B is improved with a detached house
constructed in 1960. An aerial image of the approximately 45,108 square foot portion of Lot 17, Block B shows it contains a tennis court.\(^1\)

The purpose of the Application is to replat the Property to allow for the construction of two new detached houses. As shown on the Administrative Subdivision Plan submitted with the Application, one detached house is intended to be constructed on a new 24,118 square foot lot ("Lot 1") carved out of the existing Lot 13, Block B. The existing detached house at 8911 Burdette Road will be located on a new 40,431 square foot lot ("Lot 2") consisting of a different portion of Lot 13, Block B. The second new detached house is planned to be constructed on a new 59,970 square foot lot ("Lot 3") carved out of the remainder of Lot 13, Block B and consolidated with the 45,108 square foot part of Lot 17, Block B. The two new detached houses proposed to be located on Lots 1 and 3, along with the existing detached house on Lot 2, will be accessed from a shared driveway off of Burdette Road.

III. CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL

Section 50.6.1.C of the Subdivision Regulations sets forth the findings the Planning Director must make in approving an administrative subdivision plan for the creation of up to three lots for detached houses in any residential zone. The analysis below details how the Application satisfies the required findings:

1. the lots are approved for standard method development;

\(^1\) Applicants also own 8921 Burdette Road, which is more specifically known as an approximately 43,559 square foot part of Lot 17, Block B of the Bradley Hills Grove Subdivision and adjacent to the Property. 8921 Burdette Road, which according to SDAT records is improved with a detached house constructed in 1948, is not included in the Application.
As shown in the Application, proposed Lot 1, Lot 2, and Lot 3 all adhere to the R-200 standard method development standards of Section 59.4.4.7.B of the Montgomery County Zoning Ordinance.

2. **written approval for any proposed well and septic area is received from the Department of Permitting Services, Well and Septic Section before approval of the plat;**

This section is inapplicable to the Application as the Property is served by public water and sewer service and is designated in the W-1 and S-1 categories.

3. **any required road dedications and associated public utility easements are shown on the plat and the applicant provides any required improvements;**

The Master Plan classifies Burdette Road between Bradley Boulevard and River Road, which includes the location of the Property, as a Principal Secondary Road with a minimum right-of-way width of 70 feet and an ultimate pavement width of 26 feet. Master Plan, pg. 129. The Master Plan endorses widening Burdette Road and improving it to a primary standard only “as needed.” Master Plan, pg. 117. According to the Master Plan, the reclassification of Burdette Road is made “with the expectation that no widening will be necessary unless the purpose is to facilitate safe, local access and circulation.” Master Plan, pg. 123. In light of the Master Plan’s assumption to maintain current conditions, the adequacy of the existing roadway, and the Application’s *de minimis* impact on traffic, dedications for widening and improving Burdette Road are not necessary. Applicants will coordinate with County agencies to ensure that any necessary public utility easements are shown on the plat.

4. **the requirements for adequate public facilities under Section 4.3.J are satisfied before approval of the plat; and**

There are adequate public facilities to support and service the Property in accordance with Section 50.4.3.J of the Subdivision Regulations. The Property is located in the
Bethesda/Chevy Chase Policy Area, which is categorized as an Orange Policy Area under the 2016 – 2020 Subdivision Staging Policy (the “SSP”). As demonstrated in Lenhart Traffic Consulting, Inc.’s May 8, 2017 Traffic Statement submitted with the Application, the proposed subdivision generates fewer than 50 peak-hour person trips and is therefore exempt from Local Area Transportation Review under the SSP. Therefore, roads and transportation facilities are adequate to support the Application.

There are also adequate public school facilities to support Applicants’ proposed subdivision. The Property is served by Burning Tree Elementary School, Thomas W. Pyle Middle School, and Walt Whitman High School. The results of the FY 2018 schools test confirm there is sufficient projected school capacity in the relevant test year as measured in accordance with the SSP.

As noted above, the Property is served by public water and sewer and is classified in the W-1 and S-1 categories. Public water and sewer mains currently serve the Property, which will be adequate to serve the proposed subdivision. Dry utilities including electricity, gas, and telephone are also available to the Property. Finally, police stations, firehouses, and health clinics are all adequate to serve the Property under the SSP, as there is no evidence that the Application will generate a local area problem.

5. *forest conservation, stormwater management, and environmental protection requirements are satisfied before approval of the plat.*

The Application also satisfies all environmental protection requirements. The Application includes a proposed forest conservation plan demonstrating compliance with the requirements of Chapter 22A of the Montgomery County Code. Applicants have also submitted a stormwater management concept plan that conforms with all State and local stormwater regulations, and will continue to coordinate with Department of Permitting Services on all
required sediment and erosion control and stormwater management approvals leading up to the recordation of the plat for the Property.

IV. CONCLUSION

As explained above and detailed in the submitted materials, the Application satisfies all of the findings that the Planning Director must make to approve an Administrative Subdivision Plan under Section 50.6.1.C of the Subdivision Regulations. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Planning Director grant approval of the Application, which will permit the creation of three lots in the R-200 zone.

Respectfully submitted,

LINOWES AND BLOCHER LLP

By: ________________________________
    Erin E. Girard
    7200 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 800
    Bethesda, Maryland  20814
    (301) 961-5153
    (301) 654-2801 (facsimile)
    egirard@linowes-law.com

By: ________________________________
    Phillip A. Hummel
    7200 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 800
    Bethesda, Maryland  20814
    (301) 961-5149
    (301) 654-2801 (facsimile)
    phummel@linowes-law.com

Attorneys for Applicants