DATE: 10-Jan-19
TO: Eduardo Intriglio - EIntriglio@maserconsulting.co
Maser Consulting, PA
FROM: Marie LaBaw
RE: Primrose School, Layhill Property
120180250

PLAN APPROVED

1. Review based only upon information contained on the plan submitted 10-Jan-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.
Ms. Emily Tettelbaum, Senior Planner  
Area 2 Planning Division  
The Maryland-National Capital  
Park & Planning Commission  
8787 Georgia Avenue  
Silver Spring, MD 20910-3760

RE: Preliminary Plan No. 120180250  
Primrose at Layhill

Dear Ms. Tettelbaum:

We have completed our review of the revised preliminary plan dated December 20, 2018 and reviewed by the Development Review Committee at its November 20, 2018 meeting. 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 (DPS) 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.

**Significant Plan Review Comments**

1. The roadway for Queensguard Road shall include the following cross section and shown on the certified preliminary plan:

   **From North to South (70-foot right-of-way):**
   - Existing Two (2)-foot wide buffer to remain
   - Existing Four (4)-foot wide sidewalk to remain
Existing Twelve (12)-foot wide lawn panel to remain
Restriping the existing pavement section to the following:
  ▪ Eleven and a half (11.5)-foot wide travel lane
  ▪ Ten and a half (10.5)-foot wide left turn storage lane
  ▪ Fourteen (14)-foot wide travel lane
Proposed Nine (9)-foot wide lawn panel
Proposed Five (5)-foot wide sidewalk
Proposed Two (2)-foot wide buffer

2. The proposed 10-foot by 2-foot Monument sign on Layhill Road (MD 182) right-of-way will need approval from Maryland State Highway Administration (MDSHA).

3. The applicant will need to construct the proposed ten-foot wide shared use path along their Layhill Road (MD 182) street frontage at their cost. The shared use path will need to be installed prior to issuance of the use and occupancy permit.

4. The Traffic Impact Study (TIS) letter was issued on June 2, 2018. In addition to the letter, an email dated December 14, 2018, was issued based on applicant’s response letter dated December 5, 2018.

5. **Storm Drain Analysis: INCOMPLETE:**
   i. At permit stage, submit storm drain and/or flood plain studies with computations to Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services (MCDPS) for review and approval. We have the following comments based on the revised storm drain analysis uploaded on eplans on December 5, 2018:
      a) Provide headwater elevation and a profile of the culvert to make sure the runoff does not topple the roadway.
      b) Provide storm drain capacity calculations based on the actual slope of the existing storm drain pipes.
      c) Analyze the capacity of the existing downstream public storm drain system and the impact of the post-development ten (10) year storm runoff on same. The DPS may require improvements to the existing public storm drain system based on the review of the storm drain report.
      d) **Note:** ESD cannot be used to determine the runoff coefficient for storm drain analysis.
   ii. The portion of the site draining to Layhill Road (MD 182) or any storm drain/inlet relocations along Layhill Road (MD 182) shall be approved by MDSHA.
Standard Plan Review Comments

6. Access and improvements along and Layhill Road (MD182)) as required by the MDSHA.

7. The sight distance study has been accepted and attached along with this letter.

8. We recommend that the applicant coordinate with Ms. Patricia Shepherd of our Transportation Engineering Section regarding the bike lanes along the property frontage. Ms. Shepherd can be reached at 240-777-7231 or at patricia.shepherd@montgomerycountymd.gov.

9. Relocation of utilities along existing roads to accommodate the required roadway improvements shall be the responsibility of the applicant.

10. The Forest Conservation shall not extend into the Slope Easements and the Public Utility Easements.

11. Permit and bond will be required as a prerequisite to MCDPS approval of the record plat. The permit will include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following improvements:
   a. Street grading, paving, striping, sidewalks and handicap ramps, storm drainage and appurtenances, and street trees along Queensguard Road as approved in this letter and should include the following.

   From North to South (70-foot right-of-way):
   • Existing Two (2)-foot wide buffer to remain
   • Existing Four (4)-foot wide sidewalk to remain
   • Existing Twelve (12)-foot wide lawn panel to remain
   • Restriping the existing pavement section to the following:
     ▪ Eleven and a half (11.5)-foot wide travel lane
     ▪ Ten and a half (10.5)-foot wide left turn storage lane
     ▪ Fourteen (14)-foot wide travel lane
   • Proposed Nine (9)-foot wide lawn panel
   • Proposed Five (5)-foot wide sidewalk
   • Proposed Two (2)-foot wide buffer

   b. Enclosed storm drainage and/or engineered channel (in accordance with the MCDOT Storm Drain Design Criteria) within the 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 MCDPS 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 MCDPS.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this preliminary plan. If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact Mr. Deepak Somarajan, our Development Review Engineer for this project at deepak.somarajan@montgomerycountymd.gov or at (240) 777-7170.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rebecca Torma, Manager
Development Review Team
Office to Transportation Policy

Enclosures:  Sight Distance Form (1)
Sight Distance Exhibit (1)

cc:  Jamili and Murgesh Majmudar  Layhill Property, LLC
     Eduardo Intriglio  Maser Consulting
     Jody Kline  Miller, Miller & Canby
     Letters notebook

cce:  Atiq Panjshiri  MCDPS RWPR
      Sam Farhadi  MCDPS RWPR
      Devang Dave  MCDOT DTEO
      Khursheed Bilgrami  MCDOT DTEO
      Mark Terry  MCDOT DTEO
      Patricia Shepherd  MCDOT DTE
      Kwesi Woodroffe  MDSHA District 3
      Deepak Somarajan  MCDOT OTP
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION
DEPARTMENT OF PERMITTING SERVICES

SIGHT DISTANCE EVALUATION

Facility/Subdivision Name: Primrose Layhill

Street Name: Queensguard

Posted Speed Limit: 25 mph

Street/Driveway #1 (Private Entrance)

  Sight Distance (feet)  OK?  Right  785  Yes  Left  200  Yes

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 - 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]
[Date: 12/05/18]

Montgomery County Review:

[Approved]
[Disapproved]

By:
[Date: 01/03/19]

Form Reformatted: March, 2000
April 25, 2019

Ms. Emily Tettelbaum, Senior Planner
Area 2 Planning Division
The Maryland-National Capital
Park & Planning Commission
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20910-3760

RE: Preliminary Plan No. 120180250
Primrose at Layhill
AMENDED LETTER

Dear Ms. Tettelbaum:

This letter is to amend the comments contained in our January 3, 2019 preliminary plan review letter.

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 (DPS) 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.

**Significant Plan Review Comments**

1. All previous comments in our January 3, 2019 letter remain applicable unless modified below.

2. Comment #1:
   
   Original Language:
   
   *The roadway for Queensguard Road shall include the following cross section and shown on the certified preliminary plan:*

   **From North to South (70-foot right-of-way):**
   
   - Existing Two (2)-foot wide buffer to remain
   - Existing Four (4)-foot wide sidewalk to remain
Existing Twelve (12)-foot wide lawn panel to remain
➢ Restriping the existing pavement section to the following:
  ▪ Eleven and a half (11.5)-foot wide travel lane
  ▪ Ten and a half (10.5)-foot wide left turn storage lane
  ▪ Fourteen (14)-foot wide travel lane
➢ Proposed Nine (9)-foot wide lawn panel
➢ Proposed Five (5)-foot wide sidewalk
➢ Proposed Two (2)-foot wide buffer

shall be revised to the following:

The roadway for Queensguard Road shall include the following cross section and shown on the certified preliminary plan:

From North to South (70-foot right-of-way):

➢ Existing Two (2)-foot wide buffer to remain
➢ Existing Four (4)-foot wide sidewalk to remain
➢ Existing Twelve (12)-foot wide lawn panel to remain
➢ Restriping the existing pavement section to the following:
  ▪ Eleven and a half (11.5)-foot wide right turn lane
  ▪ Ten and a half (10.5)-foot wide through/left turn lane
  ▪ Fourteen (14)-foot wide travel lane
➢ Proposed Nine (9)-foot wide lawn panel
➢ Proposed Five (5)-foot wide sidewalk
➢ Proposed Two (2)-foot wide buffer

3. Comment #11 (a):
   a. Street grading, paving, striping, sidewalks and handicap ramps, storm drainage and appurtenances, and street trees along Queensguard Road as approved in this letter and should include the following.

From North to South (70-foot right-of-way):

➢ Existing Two (2)-foot wide buffer to remain
➢ Existing Four (4)-foot wide sidewalk to remain
➢ Existing Twelve (12)-foot wide lawn panel to remain
Restriping the existing pavement section to the following:

- Eleven and a half (11.5)-foot wide travel lane
- Ten and a half (10.5)-foot wide left turn storage lane
- Fourteen (14)-foot wide travel lane

Proposed Nine (9)-foot wide lawn panel
Proposed Five (5)-foot wide sidewalk
Proposed Two (2)-foot wide buffer

shall be revised to the following

From North to South (70-foot right-of-way):

- Existing Two (2)-foot wide buffer to remain
- Existing Four (4)-foot wide sidewalk to remain
- Existing Twelve (12)-foot wide lawn panel to remain
- Restriping the existing pavement section to the following:
  - Eleven and a half (11.5)-foot wide right turn lane
  - Ten and a half (10.5)-foot wide through/left turn lane
  - Fourteen (14)-foot wide travel lane

Proposed Nine (9)-foot wide lawn panel
Proposed Five (5)-foot wide sidewalk
Proposed Two (2)-foot wide buffer

Thank you for the opportunity to review this preliminary plan. If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact Mr. Deepak Somarajan, our Development Review Engineer for this project at deepak.somarajan@montgomerycountymd.gov or at (240) 777-7170.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Torma, Manager
Development Review Team
Office to Transportation Policy
Enclosures: (0)

cc: Letters notebook

cc-e: Eduardo Intrigio
      Jody Kline
      Atiq Panjshiri
      Sam Farhadi
      Devang Dave
      Khursheed Bilgrami
      Mark Terry
      Patricia Shepherd
      Kwesi Woodrffe
      Deepak Somarajan

      Maser Consulting
      Miller, Miller & Canby
      MCDPS RWPR
      MCDPS RWPR
      MCDOT DTEO
      MCDOT DTEO
      MCDOT DTE
      MCDOT DTE
      MDSHA District 3
      MCDOT OTP
June 12, 2018

Mr. Eduardo Intrigio, P.E.
Maser Consulting, P.A.
22375 Broderick Drive, Suite 110
Sterling, VA 20166

Re: COMBINED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT CONCEPT/SITE DEVELOPMENT STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN for Primrose Layhill Preliminary Plan #: 120180250 SM File #: 282828 Tract Size/Zone: 3.61/R-200 Total Concept Area: 3.61ac Lots/Block: N/A Parcel(s): A Watershed: Northwest Branch

Dear Mr. Intrigio

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 the use of micro bioretention.

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.

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

4. This concept approval is for lot # 1. The future development of proposed outlot # 2 will require a separate stormwater management concept approval from DPS and a preliminary plan of subdivision approval from MNCPPC.

This list may not be all-inclusive and may change based on available information at the time.
June 12, 2018
Mr. Eduardo Intrigio
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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 Thomas Weadon at 240-777-6309.

Sincerely,

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

MCE: TEW

cc: N. Braunstein
    SM File # 282828

ESD: Required/Provided 5254 cf / 5417 cf
PE: Target/Achieved: 1.51'/1.56'
STRUCTURAL: N/A
WAIVED: N/A
December 21, 2018

Mr. Eduardo Intragiio
Maser Consulting, P.A.
22375 Broderick Drive, Suite 110
Sterling VA 20166

Re: Stormwater Management CONCEPT RECONFIRMATION for Primrose Layhill
SWM Concept #: 282828

Dear Mr. Intragiio:

Your request for a stormwater management reconfirmation for the above site has been evaluated. The original approved SWM concept dated June 12, 2018 is hereby reconfirmed. Please adhere to all conditions required as part of that approval.

1) This reconfirmation includes proposed improvements within the Montgomery County and SHA Rights of Way and the elimination of the previously proposed outlet. The proposed improvements within the County Right of Way will require ESD to the Maximum Extent Practicable, designed to County standards. The proposed improvements within the SHA Right of Way will require Stormwater Management approval from SHA prior to inclusion on your sediment control plans for this project.

If you have any questions regarding these actions, please feel free to contact Thomas Weadon at 240-777-6309.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

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

Cc: SM File #: 282828