Mr. Andrew M. Bradshaw, P.E.
Johnson Bernat Associates, Inc.
205 N. Frederick Ave., Suite 100
Gaithersburg, MD 20877

February 27, 2019

Re: COMBINED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT CONCEPT/SITE DEVELOPMENT STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN (Phase 1) and a CONCEPT PLAN (Phase 2) for Westwood Shopping Center
Preliminary Plan #: 120170170
Site Plan #: 820180190
SM File #: 282495
Tract Size/Zone: 16.55Ac./CRT-2,5,2.0,1.5,&1.0
Total Concept Area: 16.34 Ac.
Lots: A-4
Parcel(s): 360
Watershed: Little Falls Branch

Dear Mr. Bradshaw:

This conceptual package seeks approval for four phases of development. These are Phase 1, Phase 2A, Phase 2B and Phase 2C.

Phase 1: DPS understands this phase of the project will be seeking a combined Preliminary Plan/Site Plan approval. As such, this stormwater management conceptual approval for Phase 1 will be a Combined Stormwater Management/Site Development Plan approval.

Based on a review by the Department of Permitting Services Review Staff, the Combined Stormwater Management Concept/Site Development Plan for the above-mentioned Phase 1 is acceptable. The stormwater management concept proposes to meet required stormwater management goals via ESD to the MEP with green roof, micro-bioretention, permeable pavement, enhanced filters, and structural filtration treatment.

The following items will need to be addressed during the detailed sediment control/stormwater management plan stage for Phase 1:

1. During the detailed plan review phase, additional locations for incorporation of pervious paving must be provided wherever possible, such as for parking stalls. This may allow for reduction of structural treatment volumes.

2. All Micro Bioretention practices shall include 24-inches of stone below the invert of the underdrain pipe to encourage additional recharge.

3. A detailed review of the stormwater management computations will occur at the time of detailed plan review.
4. An engineered sediment control plan must be submitted for this development.

5. All filtration media for manufactured best management practices, whether for new development or redevelopment, must consist of MDE approved material.

6. You must use the latest MCDPS design criteria at the time of plan submittal.

7. There is to be no dead storage in the vault systems.

8. Provide flow splitters to all vaults.

9. The swales and grading to divert offsite drainage to MB-2 & 4, located behind building 8 & 9, must be located on a separate HOA parcel. The swales may not be located on the lots. The swales must be grassed.

10. Placement of fences in back yards of building 8 & 9 must be above the 10-year flow of the swale and out of the HOA parcel.

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

**Phase 2:** DPS understands this phase of the project will be seeking a combined Preliminary Plan approval at this time and will be submitted for Site Plan approval at a later date. As such, this stormwater management conceptual approval for Phase 2, which includes Phase 2A, Phase 2B and Phase 2C, will be a Stormwater Management Concept approval only.

1. **Prior to Planning Board approval of the Site Plan for and part of Phase 2, this stormwater management concept must be formally revised and an approved Site Development Plan (SDP) Approval letter must be issued by DPS. If the Site Plan will be approved in stages, the Site Development Plan revision submittal must specifically refer to the appropriate phase.**

2. Based on a review by the Department of Permitting Services Review Staff, the stormwater management concept for the above-mentioned **Phase 2** is acceptable. The stormwater management concept proposes to meet required stormwater management goals via ESD to the MEP with micro-bioretention, permeable pavement, enhanced filters, and structural filtration treatment. **As currently proposed, Phase 2A (the realignment of Westbard Avenue) will include a waiver of part of the stormwater management requirement for that phase. Phases 2B and 2C show full stormwater management compliance with no waiver necessary.**

3. For Phase 2A you must continue to look for ways of providing additional ESD and structural treatment, with the goal of achieving full stormwater management compliance, and reflect these in the stormwater management concept revision to be submitted at the time of Site Plan application. Any proposed treatment located within the public right-of-way must be acceptable to MCDOT.

4. All Micro Bioretention practices shall include 24-inches of stone below the invert of the underdrain pipe to encourage additional recharge.

5. There is to be no dead storage in vault systems.
6. Provide flow splitters to all vaults.

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

   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 David Kuykendall at 240-777-6332.

Sincerely,

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

MCE: CN282495 Westwood Shopping Center.DWK

cc: N. Braunstein
SM File # 282495
February 28, 2019

Mr. Matthew Folden, Planner Coordinator
Area 1 Planning Division
The Maryland-National Capital
Park & Planning Commission
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-3760

RE: Preliminary Plan No. 120170170
Westwood Shopping Center
Traffic Impact Study
Traffic Signal Warrant Study

Dear Mr. Folden:

We have completed our review of the Local Area Transportation Review and Transportation Policy Area Review dated June 14, 2018, and Traffic Signal Warrant Study dated June 18, 2018. Both reports were prepared by Wells + Associates. As noted in your transmittal letter, this study was prepared in accordance with the 2013 LATR Guidelines and 2012-2016 Subdivision Staging Policy. Total development evaluated by the analysis includes:

**PHASE I:** the redevelopment of the existing grocery store/retail center located on the west side of Westbard Avenue allow for the construction of up to:

- 127,480 square feet of retail space
- 42,494 square feet of restaurant space
- 5074 square feet of office space
- 190 multi-family apartment building
- 72 townhouse dwelling units

**PHASE II** includes the redevelopment of the Manor Care facility, a gas station, a surface parking lot and the Westwood II office/retail building located on the east side of Westbard Avenue allowing for the construction of up to:

- 5,000 square feet of retail
- 220-unit multi-family apartments
- 32 townhomes

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
We offer the following comments:

**Local Area Transportation Review (LATR)**

1. We defer to the Maryland State Highway Administration for comments regarding state-maintained roadways, including River Road (MD 190) and Massachusetts Avenue (MD 396).

2. For Access Point 17 on Page 59, there are no lane uses shown. However, Page 61 shows volumes in this corresponding location. We recommend the report be updated to resolve this inconsistency.

3. We accept the consultant's conclusion that post-development Critical Lane Volumes for the studied intersections will not exceed the congestion level threshold of 1,600 CLV for the Bethesda-Chevy Chase policy area.

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Impact Statement (PBIS)**

1. The consultant provided an evaluation of the pedestrian, bicycle and transit infrastructure for the studied intersections and roads. The report identified the location of sidewalk ramps for each pedestrian intersection. However, it did not state if any of the sidewalks are encumbered by overhead utilities, grates, etc. We recommend the report be updated to address this concern.

2. Page 79 notes that the presence of nearby bikeshare facilities. It should also note that this site has been recommended for two (2) new bikeshare stations within the project limits.

**Transportation Policy Area Review (TPAR)**

1. Appendix A, Page A20 includes email communication between M-NCP&PC and the consultant which documents that TPAR mitigation payments are no longer being collected.

**Traffic Signal Warrant Study**

1. The consultant provided a Traffic Signal Warrant Study for the intersections of the future realigned Westbard Avenue and Ridgefield Road, Westbard Avenue and future Street A (Westbard Circle), and Westbard Avenue and future Street A (south site access) for both existing and total traffic conditions.

2. "This signal warrant study is an update to the submitted signal warrant study dated March 22, 2017, to reflect a revised development program and access configuration as well as additional supplemental analysis requested during the LATR scoping and review process for informational purposes."

3. A thirteen (13) hour turning movement count was conducted on May 17, 2018 at the intersection of Westbard Avenue/Ridgefield Road.
4. At the time Westbard Avenue is realigned, the applicant is responsible for the removal of the existing traffic signal and conduits at the intersection of Ridgefield Road and Westbard Avenue. The applicant is also responsible for providing conduit at both intersection 11 and 17 as shown in the TIS. This conduit will need to be installed with the realigned Westbard Avenue.

5. Future Westbard Avenue and Ridgefield Road intersection

Consultant’s recommendation: Does not recommend a traffic signal be installed since none of the warrants are met for either phase 1 or full-buildout. Furthermore, based upon these results, the consultant recommends that the existing traffic signal be removed when the intersection is redesigned.

MCDOT Recommendation: MCDOT reviewed the analysis for a traffic signal at this location and determined that we cannot definitively deny or recommend a traffic signal at this location. The applicant will be required to provide conduit at this location. Between six months and one year after issuance of the use and occupancy certificate for the commercial building, the applicant must submit a traffic signal warrant study for this and Westbard Avenue and Street “A” intersection to MCDOT. If the traffic signal(s) is warranted, the applicant will be required to construct and install the signal, at their expense.

6. Future Westbard Avenue and future Street A (Westbard Circle) intersection

Consultant’s recommendation: Does recommend a traffic signal be installed since Warrant 1B is met with full buildout.

MCDOT Recommendation: MCDOT reviewed the analysis for a traffic signal at this location and determined that we cannot definitively deny or recommend a traffic signal at this location. The applicant will be required to provide conduit at this location. Between six months and one year after issuance of the use and occupancy certificate for the commercial building, the applicant must submit a traffic signal warrant study for this and Westbard Avenue and Street “A” intersection to MCDOT. If the traffic signal(s) is warranted, the applicant will be required to construct and install the signal, at their expense.

7. Future Westbard Avenue and future Street A (south site access) intersection

Consultant’s recommendation: Does recommend a traffic signal be installed since Warrant 1A, 1b and 1c are met with full buildout.

MCDOT Recommendation: MCDOT recommends a traffic signal be installed with the first phase of development. The traffic signal should be operating prior to issuance of the use and occupancy certificate for the commercial building.

**SUMMARY**

1. The findings of the LATR were accepted. We concur with the vehicular-related findings of
adequacy, but request the following additional information:

a. Please clarify the inconsistency between Pages 59 and 61 regarding Access Point 17 as discussed above in Comment 4 of the LATR section of this letter.

2. We concur with the applicant finding that no TPAR payment is required.

3. We offer the following comments regarding the Traffic Signal Warrant Study:

a. We recommend the applicant install a box and two 4-inch conduits for the traffic signals at the realigned Westbard Avenue and future Ridgefield Road and realigned Westbard Avenue and Street A (Westbard Circle) prior to MCDOT taking over the maintenance of the roads.

b. The developer shall be responsible for the removal of the existing traffic signal and conduit at the intersection of existing Westbard Avenue and Ridgefield road. Timing of this will be determined at the permit stage.

c. We recommend the applicant complete a new traffic signal warrant study at the future Westbard Avenue intersections with Ridgefield Road (realigned) and Street A (Westbard Circle).

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

Sincerely,

Rebecca Torma-Kim, Manager
Development Review Team
Office of Transportation Policy

cc: Letters notebook

cc-e: Sam Stiebel, Equity One (Northeast Properties), LLC
Andrew Bradshaw, Johnson Bernat Associates, Inc.
Erin Girard, Linowes and Blocher, LLP
Kwesi Woodroffe, SHA District 3
Nancy Randall, Wells + Associates
Kamal Hamud, MCDOT DTEO
William Whelan, MCDOT OTP
March 4, 2019

Mr. Matthew Folden, Planner Coordinator
Area 1 Planning Division
The Maryland-National Capital
Park & Planning Commission
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-3760

RE: Preliminary Plan No. 120170170
Westwood Shopping Center
Revised

Dear Mr. Folden:

We have completed our review of the revised preliminary plan uploaded to eplans on January 14, 2019. A previous version of this plan was reviewed by the Development Review Committee (DRC) at its meeting on July 17, 2018. 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 Montgomery County 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.

Design Exceptions Requested by Applicant

The preliminary plan application was submitted on December 20, 2016 and is governed by the 2012-2016 Subdivision Staging Policy and Subdivision Regulations in effect prior to February 2017 (when the current Subdivision Regulations became effective).

1. A - Special Paving Materials in the Public Right-of-Way: The applicant requests to use specialty pavers and/or pavement for the sidewalks along the site’s frontage on Westbard Avenue. Non-standard materials will be used to enhance the streetscape and help foster a sense of place, and unify the project design, bringing a more inviting aesthetic to the general public, as outlined in the July 2016 Westbard Sector Plan. More
specific details will be identified at the site plan stage. All non-standard improvements will be installed and maintained by the applicant under the County’s standard License and Maintenance Agreement.

**MCDOT Response:** The Design Exception package did not include a plan showing location or details of the proposed special paving materials. Instead, the applicant proposes to address the details at site plan stage. As a result, MCDOT **does not approve** this Design Exception at this time. The Department of Permitting Services (DPS) reviews site plans and will coordinate the review with MCDOT for any special pavers in the right-of-way.

2. **B-1 - Right-of-Way Truncation Reduction (Street A [Westbard Circle] to Westbard Avenue):** The applicant is seeking a waiver from the standard truncation requirement for the two (2) intersections of private Street “A” (Westbard Circle) on Westbard Avenue. Under section 50-26 (c)(3) of the old County Code (the applicant submitted a preliminary plan prior to the Chapter 50 rewrite becoming effective), the right-of-way of corner lots at an intersection are required to be truncated by straight lines joining points 25 feet from the theoretical property line intersection in each quadrant.

**MCDOT Response:** This truncation is not required since it is the intersection of a private road with a public road.

**B-2 - Right-of-Way Truncation Reduction (Westbard Avenue to Relocated Westbard Avenue):** The applicant is seeking a waiver from the standard truncation requirement for the new intersection of Westbard Avenue with the relocated Westbard Avenue. Under section 50-26(c)(3) of the old County Code, the right-of-way of corner lots at an intersection are required to be truncated by straight lines joining points 25 feet from the theoretical property line intersection in each quadrant.

**MCDOT Response:** The old County Code states that the 25-foot truncation at the intersection of two streets must be shown, unless the Planning Board determines that a different amount is needed for safe site distance or traffic channelization. **MCDOT does not recommend** the Planning Board waive the truncation requirement. This area is needed for the potential traffic signal poles and related equipment. This truncation waiver for the Lot 15, Block G property can be re-evaluated if the applicant applies for abandonment.

3. **C - Minimum Tangential Centerline Between Curves:** The applicant is seeking a waiver from the minimum tangent lengths between curves on Westbard Avenue as referenced in section 50-26(d). The applicant proposes no tangent between two horizontal curves at Station 6+00 and less than a 100-foot tangent at the tie-in to Ridgefield Road.
MCDOT Response: MCDOT recommends the Planning Board waive the required 100-foot tangent requirement between curves. Based on the posted speed limit, the centerline radius of the road at 297 feet and the Westbard Sector Plan, we determined that the reduced tangent will not have a detrimental effect on the road.

4. **D – Median Length:** The applicant is seeking a waiver from section 50-26 of the County Code which requires the distance median breaks to be no closer than 600 feet for arterial or major highways. The applicant is proposing a median break separation of approximately 215 feet on Westbard Avenue, which is classified as a Business District street.

MCDOT Response: MCDOT believes that this requirement is for arterial roads and major highways. Since Westbard Avenue is classified as a Business District street, this provision in Section 50-26(c)(2) does not apply.

5. **E. Modification of Context Sensitive Road Section:** The applicant is proposing to modify MCDOT Standard No. MC-2005.04 from a 112-foot right-of-way to a varying right-of-way between 110-120 feet. The Sector Plan suggests two (2) travel lanes in each direction, with the southbound lane used as parking during non-peak hours, a six-foot median, a separated five-foot bike lane, landscape buffer and minimum 13-foot sidewalk. The reduced median along with four travel ways, which deviates from the typical section, allows for wider sidewalks, dedicated bikeways and is consistent with the Sector Plan.

MCDOT Response: MCDOT **approves** this Design Exception. The applicant is proposing to implement the street section in the Westbard Sector Plan.

6. **F. Stormwater Management Devices in the Public Right-of-Way:** The applicant is proposing installation of micro-bio retention planters within portions of the public right-of-way.

MCDOT Response: A Design Exception is not required to install stormwater management in the County right-of-way for any road. The final details of the stormwater management will be approved by DPS and coordinated with MCDOT at the permit stage.

7. **Dry Utilities in the Public Right-of-Way:** The applicant is proposing to allow the existing overhead utilities to remain above ground, consistent with the Sector Plan, for their frontage portion of Westbard Avenue that will not be realigned.

MCDOT Response: MCDOT requires applicants to underground all utilities for new road construction. The portion of Westbard which is being realigned, from River Road to
Street A (Westbard Circle), will need the applicant to underground all utilities.

Significant Plan Review Comments

8. Prior to certified preliminary plan, the applicant shall work with MCDOT and MDSHA to design the travel lanes and proposed island at the intersection of Westbard Avenue and River Road an additional receiving lane on southbound Westbard Avenue.

9. The applicant must submit a signal warrant analysis to MCDOT for the future realigned Westbard Avenue intersections with Ridgefield Road and Street A (Westbard Circle) at least six months after and no later than one year after the issuance of the use and occupancy certificate for the commercial building (lot 1, block A) and realigned Westbard Avenue is opened. Prior to record plat for the commercial building, the applicant will bond for the traffic signal at both locations. If MCDOT determines that a signal is warranted, then the applicant will construct and install the traffic signal(s) in accordance with MCDOT specifications.

10. Prior to right-of-way permit, the applicant will evaluate the existing mid-block crosswalk on Westbard Avenue to determine the appropriate location. If it remains or is relocated, the applicant shall construct it prior to opening the realigned Westbard Avenue.

11. For the portion of Westbard Avenue that is to be realigned, the applicant must underground all utilities.

12. At the time Westbard Avenue is realigned, the applicant is responsible for the removal of the existing traffic signal and conduits at the existing intersection of Ridgefield Road and Westbard Avenue.

13. At the time Westbard Avenue is realigned, the applicant shall provide conduits at all proposed signalized intersections (Westbard Avenue at realigned Westbard Avenue and both intersections of Westbard Avenue at Street A (Westbard Circle)).

14. Prior to issuance of the Use and Occupancy Certificate for the 55th townhouse unit for Site Plan 820180190, the Applicant must construct and dedicate to public use the realigned Westbard Avenue, as illustrated on the Certified Preliminary Plan. In conjunction, the Applicant must:
   a. Meet all design standards imposed by all applicable road codes; and
   b. Secure a County Council resolution abandoning the portions of existing Westbard Avenue/ Ridgefield Road rights-of-way that are no longer needed for transportation purposes.
15. Prior to use and occupancy certificate for the commercial building, the applicant must file for the abandonment associated with the Westbard Avenue realignment with MCDOT.

16. The applicant may provide off-peak parking on the southbound side of Westbard Avenue in accordance with the Westbard Sector Plan. Once installed, the off-peak parking can be re-evaluated and removed by MCDOT at any time, based on operational issues.

17. Coordinate with Ms. Beth Dennard of MCDOT Commuter Services Section (240-777-8384, or beth.dennard@montgomerycountymd.gov) regarding the following TDM comments:

   A. Traffic Mitigation Agreement: No draft was submitted but is still recommended. Commuter Services provides services in and outside of Transportation Management Districts. Although the project is not located in a TMD, it is strongly recommended that the Applicant submit a draft TMAg and execute the agreement prior to issuance of any building permits for conformance with the Westbard Sector Plan (2.3.5 Transportation Demand Management). The Sector Plan recommends TDM as a part of any development in the Westbard area and a TMAg is the binding mechanism for ensuring that a project implements TDM strategies. A TMAg would ensure the ability to interact with office and retail store building managers to provide information to employees, and to residents, for conducting outreach events and surveys to collect commuter information. To obtain a copy of the most recent template for mixed use development, contact Sande Brecher or Beth Dennard in Commuter Services (they are both reachable at 240-777-8380).

   The draft TMAg should reflect the phased nature of the project and include (but not be limited to) the following mix of TDM provisions:

   - Information Displays (permanent and real-time information in multi-family, retail and office buildings)
   - Car Sharing Spaces
   - Electric Vehicle Charging Stations
   - Live Near Your Work
   - Bicycle Facilities
   - Space for Bikesharing or Other Mobility Devices

   B. Bikesharing or Space for Other Mobility Devices:

   The 2 spaces shown as bikeshare stations along Westbard Avenue must be suitable for bikeshare. Suitability primarily means that dimensions are 54’ x 7’ (formerly 53’ x 7’), the space receives 4 – 6 hours of solar exposure. Applicant
must provide conduit to provide power in the event of insufficient solar access.

The County maintains full discretion to install, operate, move, relocate or discontinue service of a bikeshare station based on review and analysis of usage, performance, or budget. If the County does not provide a bikeshare station in the space, the Applicant must install racks, repair stations, or other suitable facilities and equipment for the orderly storage of mobility devices in that space. Applicant must pay for the preparation of the space and allow access to service and bikeshare related equipment.

The applicant must pay the capital cost for the preparation of the space and for other facilities and equipment.

The Applicant will be required to work with MCDOT to promote bikeshare at Project.

C. Transit Hub:

Prior to certified preliminary plan, coordinate with Deanna Archev of Transit Services (240) 777-5828, and Beth Dennard of Commuter Services regarding dimensions and amenities for a Transit Hub on both sides of Westbard Avenue. Amenities will include, but not be limited to, technology, such as “Next Bus” or similar program and a covered shelter.

D. Parking:

For each phase, clearly show the locations and number of spaces for car sharing and electric vehicles. The preference is to have some located on street or publicly accessible locations.

Standard Plan Review Comments

18. We defer to MSHA for access and improvements to River Road (MD 190).

19. Provide necessary dedication along Westbard Avenue in accordance with the Sector Plan.

18. In all underground utility installations, install identification tape or other “toning” device approximately 2’ above the utility.

20. Grade establishments for all new public streets and/or pedestrian paths must be approved prior to submission of the record plat.
19. In any private development project, prohibit the use of CMP or CMP Arches for any road that will be transferred to Montgomery County for maintenance.

21. The storm drain analysis was reviewed and deemed acceptable to MCDOT. No improvements are needed to the downstream public storm drain system, unless relocation due to abandonment is required.

22. Size storm drain easement(s) prior to record plat. No fences will be allowed within the storm drain easement(s) without a revocable permit from the Department of Permitting Services and a recorded Maintenance and Liability Agreement.

23. The private streets shall be determined through the subdivision process as part of the Planning Board’s approval of the preliminary plan. We defer to the Planning Board for the typical section, horizontal alignment, profile, access locations, sight distances, landscaping, lighting, drainage characteristics and maintenance beyond the public right-of-way. Private streets shall be designed to business district roadway structural standards.

24. The sight distance study has been accepted. A copy of the accepted Sight Distance Evaluation certifications form is enclosed for your information and reference.

25. Provide a minimum five-foot wide continuous clear path (no grates) along all public streets.

26. Provide on-site handicap access facilities, parking spaces, ramps, etc. in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

27. This project falls within the Bicycle Pedestrian Priority Area (BPPA). Therefore, all driveways should be at-grade with the sidewalk and then drop down to meet the street elevation.

28. Contact Mr. Dan Sanayi of our Traffic Engineering Design and Operations Section at (240) 777-2190 for proper executing procedures regarding the existing and proposed street lights, signing, and/or pavement markings. All costs associated with such relocations or new installations shall be the responsibility of the applicant.

29. Contact Mr. Kamal Hamud of our Transportation Systems Engineering Team at (240) 777-2190 for proper executing procedures regarding the existing and proposed County maintained transportation system management component (i.e., traffic signals, signal poles, handboxes, surveillance cameras, etc.) or communication component (i.e., traffic signal interconnect, fiber optic lines, etc.). All costs associated with such relocations or new installations shall be the responsibility of the applicant.
30. Coordinate with Mr. Wayne Miller of our Division of Transit Services for any disruption to the existing bus stop locations and facilities in the vicinity of this project. Mr. Miller can be contacted at wayne.miller2@montgomerycountymd.gov or 240-777-5800.

31. Trees in the County rights of way – spacing and species to be in accordance with the applicable MCDOT standards. Tree planning within the public right of way must be coordinated with DPS Right-of-Way Plan Review Section.

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

A. Curbs, gutters, storm drain and appurtenances, sidewalks, handicap ramps and street trees along realigned Westbard Avenue and Ridgefield Road.

B. Interim roadway improvements as shown on the certified preliminary plan along Westbard Avenue with Ridgefield Road and River Road.

C. Permanent monuments and property line markers, as required by Section 50-24(e) of the Subdivision Regulations.

D. Developer shall ensure final and proper completion and installation of all utility lines underground, for all new road construction.

E. 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.

F. The developer shall provide street lights in accordance with the specifications, requirements, and standards prescribed by the MCDOT Division of Traffic Engineering and Operations.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this sketch 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.
Mr. Matthew Folden  
Preliminary Plan No. 120170170  
March 4, 2019  
Page 9

Sincerely,

Rebecca Torma, Manager  
Development Review Team  
Office of Transportation Policy

Enclosures (3)

Sharepoint/transportation/director's office/development review/WhelanW/120170170 Westwood Shopping Center  
/120170170 Westwood prelim plan.docx

cc: Plan letters notebook

cc-e:  Sam Stiebel       Equity One (Northeast Portfolio), LLC  
       Kevin Johnson      Johnson Bernat Associates  
       Andrew Bradshaw    Johnson Bernat Associates  
       Erin Girard        Linowes and Blocher, LLP  
       Kwesi Woodroffe    MSHA District 3  
       Sandra Brecher     MCDOT CSS  
       Beth Dennard       MCDOT CSS  
       Deanna Archey      MCDOT DTS  
       Sam Farhadi        MCDPS RWPR  
       Marie LaBaw        MCFRS  
       Mark Terry         MCDOT DTEO  
       Vince Subramaniam  MCDOT DTEO  
       Wayne Miller       MCDOT DTS  
       William Whelan     MCDOT OTP
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION
DEPARTMENT OF PERMITTING SERVICES

SIGHT DISTANCE EVALUATION

Facility/Subdivision Name: Westwood Shopping Center
Preliminary Plan Number: 1-20170170

Street Name: Westbard Avenue
Master Plan Road Classification: Business

Posted Speed Limit: 25 mph

Street/Driveway #1 (Entrance 5)

- Sight Distance (feet)
  - Right: 330'
  - Left: 200'
- OK? Yes

Comments:

Street/Driveway #2

- Sight Distance (feet) OK?
- Right
- Left

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 (45)</td>
<td>325'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major (55)</td>
<td>400'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 50</td>
<td>475'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 55</td>
<td>550'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: AASHTO

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:

PLS/P.E. MD Reg. No.

Montgomery County Review:

☑ Approved
☐ Disapproved:

By: [Signature]

Date: 02/14/19

Form Reformatted: March, 2000
SIGHT DISTANCE EVALUATION

Facility/Subdivision Name: Westwood Shopping Center

Preliminary Plan Number: 1- 20170170

Street Name: Westbard Avenue

Master Plan Road Classification: Business

Posted Speed Limit: 25 mph

Street/Driveway #1 (Entrance 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sight Distance (feet)</th>
<th>OK?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right 275</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left 300</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: 

Street/Driveway #2 (Entrance 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sight Distance (feet)</th>
<th>OK?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right 265</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left 300</td>
<td>yes</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 Posted Speed</td>
<td>150'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary - 30</td>
<td>200'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business - 30</td>
<td>200' Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary - 35</td>
<td>250'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial - 40</td>
<td>325'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major - (45)</td>
<td>400'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major - (55)</td>
<td>475'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>550'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: AASHTO

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: 16148

PLS/P.E. MD Reg. No.

Montgomery County Review:

□ Approved

□ Disapproved:

By: [Signature]

Date: 02/14/2000

Form Reformatted: March, 2000
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION
DEPARTMENT OF PERMITTING SERVICES

SIGHT DISTANCE EVALUATION

Facility/Subdivision Name: Westwood Shopping Center

Street Name: Westbard Avenue

Posted Speed Limit: 25 mph

Street/Driveway #1 (Entrance 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sight Distance (feet)</th>
<th>OK?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right 275</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left 600</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Street/Driveway #2 (Entrance 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sight Distance (feet)</th>
<th>OK?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right 315</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left 450</td>
<td>yes</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</td>
<td>325'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>400'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major - 50</td>
<td>475'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>550'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: AASHTO

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:

PLS/P.E. MD Reg. No.

Montgomery County Review:

☑ Approved

☐ Disapproved:

By: [signature]

Date: 02/14/19

Form Reformatted: March, 2000
October 26, 2018

Ms. Erin E. Girard
Linowes and Blocher LLP
7200 Wisconsin Avenue
Suite 800
Bethesda MD 20814

RE: Declaration of Allowable Credits
Westbard Avenue

Dear Ms. Girard:

This letter is responding to your request dated July 16, 2018, for a Declaration of Allowable credits for the realignment of Westbard Avenue and related improvements. We received your request and after reviewing it, we have the following comments:

1. As this is a Declaration of Allowable Credits, the amount of the credit will be determined at the time that certification of a credit is request with proper documentation.

2. DOT can only issue development impact tax credits using bonded amounts per the Department of Permitting Services or invoices with canceled checks.

3. When you submit your Development Impact Tax Credit request, provide a spreadsheet identifying each eligible improvement and specifying the costs of each item based on bonded amount or invoices with canceled checks.

4. **Request:** Realignment of Westbard Avenue, as well as other transportation improvements proposed along Westbard Avenue, as reflected in Preliminary Plan No. 120170170 and detailed in the letter dated July 16, 2018 and plans dated October 19, 2018 (attached).
   a. **Cross-Section X-X ("A-A" and "B-B" in plans dated October 19, 2018) included as "Exhibit A:"** Right-of-way widening from 70 feet to 117 feet, a new eastbound lane added. The revised road section would also include a new seven-foot-wide separated bike path along the west side of Westbard Avenue, to the south of proposed realignment.
**MCDOT Response:** The entire cross section from River Road to where the third travel lane is dropped is eligible for credit. The right-of-way is **not eligible** for credit per County Code 52-47(b)(5).

b. Cross-Section “Y-Y” (“C-C” on plans dated October 19, 2018) included as “Exhibit A”: Introducing a new seven-foot separated bike path along the west side of Westbard Avenue, to the south of the proposed realignment.

**MCDOT Response:** The separated bike path is **not eligible** for credit per County Code 52-39. There is an existing sidewalk and green panel in the current location. The 13-foot wide sidewalk and the 7-foot wide green space is **eligible** for credit. The right-of-way is **not eligible** for credit per County Code 52-47(b)(5).

If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact myself at rebecca.torma@montgomerycountymd.gov or (240) 777-2118.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Torma, Manager
Development Review Team
Office of Transportation Policy

Sharepoint/DOT/director's office/development review/Rebecca/developments/bethesda/westbard.docx

Cc: Chris Conklin, MCDOT
SCALE: 1" = 10'
FACING RIVER ROAD
PUBLIC ROADWAY
WESTBANK AVENUE
PROPOSED
SECTION A-A.
August 23, 2018

Mr. Matthew Folden
Montgomery County Planning Department
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Folden,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) prepared by Wells and Associates, dated December 6, 2016, revised March 22, 2017, for the Westwood Shopping Center – SHA Tracking No. 16APMO032XX, on MD 190 (River Road), Mile Point: 14.83, in Montgomery County, Maryland. The State Highway Administration (SHA) review is complete and we are pleased to respond.

- Proposed access to the mixed-use development is via multiple full movement site access points to Westbard Avenue, connecting to MD 190 (River Road).

- The following off-site intersections were analyzed under existing, background and future conditions:

  o MD 396(Massachusetts Avenue) & Sangamore Road
  o MD 396(Massachusetts Avenue) & Cromwell Drive
  o MD 396(Massachusetts Avenue) & Westbard Avenue
  o MD 396(Massachusetts Avenue) & Little Falls Parkway
  o MD 396(Massachusetts Avenue) & Falmouth Road and Baltimore Avenue
  o MD 190(River Road) & Springfield Drive
  o MD 190(River Road) & Westbard Avenue
  o MD 190(River Road) & Ridgefield Road
  o MD 190(River Road) & Kenwood Station Shopping center Entrance
  o MD 190(River Road) & Little Falls Parkway
  o MD 190(River Road) & Westbard Avenue
  o Westbard Avenue & Ridgefield Road
  o Westbard Avenue & Westbard Circle
  o Ridgefield Road & Old Westbard Avenue

- The report concludes that the study intersections will continue to operate at acceptable levels of service under future conditions.
Based on the information provided, please address the following comments in a point-by-point response:

**Travel Forecasting and Analysis Division (Jim Yang):**

1. No comments.

The SHA concurs with the report findings for this project as currently proposed and will not require the submission of any additional traffic analyses. However, an access permit will be required for all construction within the SHA right of way. Please submit one (1) set of the proposed improvement plans (including a set of hydraulic plans and computations) and a CD containing the plans and all supporting documentation to the Access Management Division at 9300 Kenilworth Avenue, Greenbelt, MD 20770, attention of Mr. Kwesi Woodroffe. For electronic submissions create an account with our new online system [https://mdotsha.force.com/accesspermit](https://mdotsha.force.com/accesspermit). Please reference the SHA tracking number on any future submissions. Please keep in mind that you can view the reviewer and project status via SHA Access Management Division web page at [http://www.roads.maryland.gov/pages/amd.aspx](http://www.roads.maryland.gov/pages/amd.aspx). Please note, if this project has not obtained an SHA access permit and begun construction of the required improvements within five (5) years of this approval, extension of the permit shall be subject to the submission of an updated traffic impact analysis in order for SHA to determine whether the proposed improvements remain valid or if additional improvements will be required of the development. If you have any questions, or require additional information, please contact Mr. Kwesi Woodroffe at 301-513-7347, by using our toll free number (in Maryland only) at 1-800-749-0737 (x7347), or via email at kwoodroffe@sha.state.md.us or shaamdpermits@sha.state.md.us.

Sincerely,

Andre Futrell,
District Engineer, District 3, SHA

AF/ar
cc:
Rola Daher (OPPE - TFAD)
Erin Girard (Linowes-Law)
Scott Holcomb (TFAD - MO Co.)
Nancy Randall (Wells & Associates)
Andy,

Conceptually, the layout of the intersection at River Road (MD190) and Ridgefield Road as shown in the Site Plan #820180190 and the relocation of Westbard Avenue as shown in the Preliminary Plan #120170170 for the Westwood Shopping Center is acceptable, subject to MDSHA reviewing and approving detailed engineering plans associated with an Access Permit, prior to any construction in the State Highway R/W.

Thanks, Kwesi

Kwesi Woodroffe
Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration
District 3 Access Management
Regional Engineer
9300 Kenilworth Avenue, Greenbelt, MD
301-513-7347
KWoodroffe@sha.state.md.us

Kwesi, Per our phone conversation, please confirm via email that conceptually MDSHA is OK with the proposed layout of the intersection at River Road (MD190) with existing Ridgefield Road as shown in the Site Plan #820180190 and the relocation of Westbard Avenue as shown in the Preliminary Plan #120170170 for the Westwood Shopping Center. MDSHA will still require detailed engineering plans associated with an Access Permit prior to any construction in the State Highway R/W.

Matt other than confirmation from Kwesi, please us know if anything additional is required from MDSHA to be included in the Staff Report.

Thanks
-Andy

Andrew M. Bradshaw, P.E.
Project Manager
Erin,

Please work with your team and the specific agency reviewers, as listed below, to address concerns raised in the current (final) submittal. I think many of these comments can be addressed through the provision of some clarifying information on your part, the absence of which may delay the respective agency letters.

1. MD SHA (Kwesi Woodroffe):
   2. SHA is awaiting a submittal of detailed engineering plans for the improvements taking place in the state r/w.

Matt

Matthew Folden, AICP | Planner Coordinator
Montgomery County Planning Department | Planning Area 1
8787 Georgia Avenue | Silver Spring, MD 20910
301.495.4539 | matthew.folden@montgomeryplanning.org
Folden, Matthew

Good morning Matt,

My apologies for not getting back to you sooner; still going through all my emails and voicemails.

The applicant will be responsible for any stabilization needed due to stream work associated with their development. Will the stabilization be required to extend past their frontage?

SHA doesn’t have any mechanisms for cost sharing unless there is an SHA project planned for the area. I did some preliminary research and couldn’t find any projects that were planned here (I will check with our Highway Hydraulics Division to confirm), so construction will be required.

An Access Permit will be required for an signal/roadway work in the state r/w that may be needed to mitigate for the traffic being generated by the development. If the stabilization is required prior to the Access Permit work, it can be handled under a District Office (DO) Permit; these are handled by our District 3 Utility Office. The applicant’s engineer will need to submit plans for the stream and stabilization work to our District 3 Utility Engineer, who will distribute to Highway Hydraulics for review. Once approved, a DO Permit will be issued so the work can be done.

Let me know if you have any additional questions or if you’d like to discuss further.

Thanks, Kwesi

Kwesi Woodroffe
Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration
District 3 Access Management
Regional Engineer
9300 Kenilworth Avenue, Greenbelt, MD
301-513-7347
KWoodroffe@sha.state.md.us

Hi Kwesi,

What is the status of the forwarded e-mail, below?
Thanks,

Matt

Matthew Folden, AICP | Planner Coordinator
301.495.4539 | matthew.folden@montgomeryplanning.org

From: Folden, Matthew
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2018 2:34 PM
To: 'kwoodroffe@sha.state.md.us' <kwoodroffe@sha.state.md.us>
Cc: Dickel, Stephanie <Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org>; Hisel-McCoy, Elza <Elza.Hisel-McCoy@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: Westwood Shopping Center - MD SHA Coordination

Hi Kwesi,

Two outstanding issues for MD SHA as you begin to review the most recent submittal for the subject project:

1. What is the status of your coordination with Hydraulics as it relates to any potential stabilization work along the eastbound River Road shoulder (this was outlined in my previous e-mail to you on 12/4/18)?

2. The applicant is proposing reconstructing the Ridgefield Road/ River Road intersection to accommodate large trucks. This redesign proposes a channelized right-turn and a new island for pedestrian crossing/ signal equipment. Please let me know if this reconfiguration is satisfactory.

Thanks,

Matt

Matthew Folden, AICP | Planner Coordinator
Montgomery County Planning Department | Planning Area 1
8787 Georgia Avenue | Silver Spring, MD 20910
301.495.4539 | matthew.folden@montgomeryplanning.org
DATE: 14-Feb-19
TO: Andrew Bradshaw - abradshaw@jba-inc.net
    Johnson Berent Associates
FROM: Marie Labaw
RE: Westwood Shopping Center - Preliminary Plan
    120170170

PLAN APPROVED

1. Review based only upon information contained on the plan submitted 14-Feb-19. 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.

*** Parking restrictions required at site plan ***
DATE: 14-Feb-19
TO: Andrew Bradshaw - abradshaw@jba-inc.net
    Johnson Bernat Associates
FROM: Marie LaBaw
RE: Westwood Shopping Center Phase 1
    820180190

PLAN APPROVED

1. Review based only upon information contained on the plan submitted 14-Feb-19. 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.
820180190 Westwood Shopping Center
Contact: Sam Farhadi at 240 777-6333

We have reviewed site and landscape plans files:

“07-SITE-820180190-SP-100.pdf V8” uploaded on/ dated “12/11/2018”,
“08-LL-820180190-L5-102.pdf V4” uploaded on/ dated “12/11/2018” and

The followings need to be addressed prior to the certification of site plan:

1. Curb radii/ turning movements:
   a. Provide the minimum curb radii that will accommodate the site traffic.
   b. Provide truck turning movement for all access points and (especially right
turn) movements;
2. Provide public sidewalk:
   a. to ADA standards (minimum five feet wide) and label it accordingly (modify
   general note 13 on the cover sheet to include ROW area);
   b. when outdoor seating café is proposed, minimum 6’ clear sidewalk is needed;
   c. ensure all handicap ramps are shown, have receiving ramps and are aligned
   with them (modify general note 13 on the cover sheet and delete the part
   “where indicated”);
   d. Public and private sidewalks when adjacent each other need to have the
   physical limits of maintenance provided or PIE/ ROW for the additional
   sidewalk is needed.
   e. Do not provide lead walks into the road.
3. Street trees (sheet L5-101):
   a. Provide two different approved minor species trees (due to existing OH wire
   along the site frontage) along the site frontage including trees in SWM areas.
   b. Ensure street trees do not have conflict with handicap ramps.
   c. Modify the provided pavement strips so additional street trees can be
   provided. Keep minimum of 5’ between them and street trees.
4. MCDOT Commuter Services Section comments:
   a. Traffic Mitigation Agreement (TMAg): Commuter Services provides services
   in and outside of Transportation Management Districts. Although not located
   within a TMD, it is critical that Commuter Services have the ability to inform
   residents, employees and visitors at the Project about options and have the
   ability to promote alternatives to single occupancy auto commuting. Prior to
   issuance of any building permit by DPS, the Applicant must execute a TMAg
   with the Department of Transportation and the Planning Board.
   b. Bikesharing: For the Phase I site plan, label the bikeshare station. MCDOT
   must review and approve the locations prior to site plan certification.
Ms. Stephanie Dickel  
Area 1 Division  
Montgomery County Planning Department  
8787 Georgia Avenue  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910  

Re: Westwood Shopping Center  
Site Plan No. 820180190  

Dear Ms. Dickel:  

The Montgomery County Department of Housing and Community Affairs (DHCA) has reviewed the above referenced plan and recommends Approval.  

At certified site plan, the applicant will need to provide DHCA with the MPDU and market-rate unit bedroom mix for the multi-family building, schematic architectural drawings showing the proposed locations of MPDUs, and the MPDU unit layouts.  

Sincerely,  

Lisa S. Schwartz, Acting Manager  
Affordable Housing Section  

cc: Andrew Bradshaw, JBA Inc.