The Avondale project was reviewed by the Bethesda Downtown Design Advisory Panel on July 22, 2020. The following meeting notes summarize the Panel’s discussion, recommendations regarding design excellence, and the exceptional design public benefits points. The project is in the Sketch Plan stage and will need to return to the Design Advisory Panel at the time of Site Plan to review comments provided and determine final vote for design excellence. Should you have any additional questions and/or comments please feel free to contact the Design Advisory Panel Liaison.

Attendance:

Panel
George Dove
Karl Du Puy
Rod Henderer
Damon Orobona
Qiaojue Yu
Paul Mortensen, ex officio member, Senior Urban Designer in the Director’s Office

Staff
Gwen Wright, Planning Director
Elza Hisel-McCoy, Area 1 Division Chief
Stephanie Dickel, Area 1 Regulatory Supervisor
Grace Bogdan, Planner Coordinator
Cristina Sassaki, Parks Planner
Hyojung Garland, Parks Planner
Emily Balmer, Area 1 Administrative Assistant III

Applicant Team
Soo Lee Cho, Miller, Miller & Canby
Kevin Park, SJ Investment Corp
Brett Swiatocha, Perkins Eastman DC Perkins
Pat La Vay, Macris Hendricks and Glascock, P.A.

Discussion Points:
Staff: The Panel reviewed this Project in June and raised concerns that being the first redevelopment on the block, it should set the tone on the street. The Panel requested the Applicant to take a holistic look of the street’s urban design and redevelopment. The Sketch Plan stage focuses on massing and urban design with regard to the Design Guidelines and more specific issues to be addressed at Site Plan.

- At the last meeting, you said the lobby entrance needed to project from the facade to accommodate fire access but now you are showing it in the middle?
  - Applicant Response: Yes, at one point we only looked at relocating the curb line to conform to the Master Plan, but we were able to extend the curb and make it tie in without disturbing private property, so we’ve been able to straighten the curve and extend the curb out to Wisconsin Ave.

- I really appreciate that you have taken the time to explore the options, it is going to make our decision making and discussions much easier. This will be a model for other submissions to explore other ideas for the context rather than one site. I am very impressed.
- You are not showing the curb cuts in the renderings, rather a continuous grass strip. I assume curb cuts will be present?
  - Applicant Response: You are correct, there will be curb cuts that we did not include in the rendering.
- I find Option 2 and 3 acceptable, I think the larger stepback is not necessary if you have a proper setback at the base.
- I think the better solution is Option 3. We all know the street will redevelop and pulling the face back all the way to the ground allows the space to be fully recognized and acknowledge the existing houses. It implies a base while scaling the building down. I like the build-to-line getting pulled back, which the future redevelopment will also have to honor.
- I like the larger setback at the ground, having the buildings farther back just seems better for this street and I have a huge prejudice against Option 2, where it has a huge setback and it bumps back out. My only suggestion for Option 3 is that the two-story base is actually a layer that projects out (only inches or even a foot) so rather being a negative space it is a positive projected layer and more seen.
- Option 3 is an anti-base kind of base, and it will have a strong impact of the overall façade.
- I think we all can agree that Option 3 is the best massing, and other minor features to be determined at Site Plan.
- I think it is much better and the street will certainly benefit. It is more compatible, acknowledging the housing will change over time, this will set the proper precedent.

Panel Recommendations:

The Panel voted 5-0 that the Project is on track to meet the minimum 10 design excellence points with the following to be addressed at Site Plan:

a. Further develop Option 3 with the larger build-to-line and provide further detail on the relationship and treatment between base and upper floors as to how the massing is expressed.
The Avondale project was reviewed by the Bethesda Downtown Design Advisory Panel on June 24, 2020. The following meeting notes summarize the Panel’s discussion, recommendations regarding design excellence, and the exceptional design public benefits points. The project is in the Sketch Plan stage and will need to return to the Design Advisory Panel at the time of Site Plan to review comments provided and determine final vote for design excellence. Should you have any additional questions and/or comments please feel free to contact the Design Advisory Panel Liaison.

Attendance:

Panel
George Dove
Karl Du Puy
Rod Henderer
Damon Orobona
Qiaojue Yu
Paul Mortensen, ex officio member, Senior Urban Designer in the Director’s Office

Staff
Robert Kronenberg, Deputy Director
Elza Hisel-McCoy, Area 1 Division Chief
Stephanie Dickel, Area 1 Regulatory Supervisor
Grace Bogdan, Planner Coordinator
Jonathan Bush, Planner Coordinator
Emily Balmer, Area 1 Principal Administrative Assistant

Applicant Team
Soo Lee Cho, Attorney
Kevin Park, Developer
Brett Swiatocha, Architect
Pat La Vay, Engineer

Members of the Public
Sandy Silverman

Discussion Points:
Context and Compatibility

- Such a small site you have here, did the development group look to assemble additional properties?
  - **Applicant Response:** We were interested in assembling more lots to make it more scalable and have approached the adjacent property owners many times, but they were not interested in selling.

- Unfortunately for this project, the master plan looks to a street not as a space between buildings but a dividing line between the mass and zones on the north and south side. The zones and heights allowed on each side are completely different.

- What discussions were had with the bank tower property to the south for possibly sharing the use of the alley for service and parking access to your site?
  - **Applicant Response:** We have not yet had a chance to sit down with them but do anticipate doing so shortly. We are intending to follow through although our brief phone conversation did not seem overly optimistic.

- You need a more coordinated urban design plan for this street. Being the first developer on this street, this Project will set the tone and this ground floor plan does not fulfill that job. The idea of making gestures to two story buildings seems counterintuitive so I think you need to design a holistic building in and of itself. The fragmented ownership is really problematic, especially leaving one parcel essentially undevelopable to the west of your site. Really looking forward to a more coordinated effort at this street to help evaluate your specific project.

- Compatibility not too much a concern with existing buildings as they will likely be redeveloped but this design needs to think about what will be here along the street in the future.

- Solving your problem for entry and parking access is not going to solve the entire street. The street needs to be solved first. A coordinated urban design for this street has to be established before we have a building that addresses the problem of the street. Otherwise we will have a strange selection of buildings solving problems on a piecemeal basis rather than a coordinated design. Locating a lobby because of the fire access is not a solution.

Base & Lobby

- Projecting the entrance lobby over the build to line by several feet is not the right tone to set for the street.

- You have set back the side elevation at the west. How do you plan to handle the party wall to the east?
  - **Applicant Response:** It is a less than ideal scenario but felt necessary to build to the eastern property line to keep the project viable. We are exploring materials, articulation, texture patterns to express the façade rather than a uniform blank wall. We have also considered a public art expression but the location facing a dead-end street is not great, especially with the high potential for future redevelopment to block it.
• The building type and mass for the zone across the street should be considered in the design of buildings on this side of the street. You need to follow the form for the Neighborhood Residential Street in the guidelines with a 2 to 3 story base and a clear setback above that must be maintained. Remove the lobby intrusion, and maintain the setbacks from the street are ultimately important.
• As handsome as the articulation is it is problematic from a planning point of view.
• The base is much more solid than I expected it to be. Have you considered moving the lobby to the middle? As drawn the base seems conflicted and heavy compared to the rest of the building
  • Applicant Response: Yes, the building is a bit symmetrical and it does seem ideal to put the lobby in the middle, however the fire access requirements are driving the location of the lobby. We’ve been working through this challenge. The street itself is challenging from an access standpoint due to the dead-end condition.
• Perhaps the slot in the middle is more prominent than what it needs to be, if narrowed it will not be so symmetrical
• I like the two-story base rather than three stories. Three stories would result in ‘pants too high’
• The stepback above the base is also half of what is recommended in the guidelines, and that is another problem. The stepback is supposed to be 15’ and they are proposing 8’
  • Applicant Response: The units would be too squeezed with the double loaded condition and would not be a viable project.
• We are talking about a base and a tower but is there a need for a base at all? If there was a solution that did not provide the full base would other panel members consider the deviation? I think architects need to explore.
  • Applicant Response: The street type does require the base and stepback.
• Staff: We have serious concerns as outlined in the staff memo and provided those comments as part of DRC.

Tower
• This mass is so large in this context. Ideally this building would have a 2-3 story base with a single loaded tower setback behind, with the corridor facing the alley and the units facing north. That design would be more sympathetic to the neighborhood, but obviously you would lose some density.

Public Comments
• Mr. Sandy Silverman
  It is a complicated challenge given the divided zoning. Perhaps a solution is the no-base option. Moving the lobby would be an improvement. I appreciate the Panel’s comments

Panel Recommendations:

The Panel requested to see the project again with incorporation of the Panel’s comments prior to voting. Issues the applicant should address:
a. Develop a diagrammatic overall vision for the urban design of the future redeveloped street as a starting point to set the context for this design.

b. Explore options to reduce the overall bulk and better conform the massing to the Design Guidelines, including:
   
   a. The massing and articulation of the base itself and its relationship to both the existing conditions on the street and the envisioned future context;
   
   b. The massing of the tower;
   
   c. The Applicant is encouraged explore all options that may provide a solution, including a building that does not have a base if the plane of the building aligns better with the rest of the street.
Mr. Mark Hollida  
MHG, PA  
9220 Wightman Road, Suite 120  
Montgomery Village, MD 20886

Re: STORMWATER MANAGEMENT  
CONCEPT for  
The Avondale  
Address: 4526 and 4530 Avondale Street  
Preliminary Plan #: Sketch Plan and Preliminary Plan 320200050/120200220  
SM File #: 285977  
Tract Size: 11,230 sq.ft. or 0.26 ac  
Total Concept Area: 14,240 sq.ft. or 0.33 ac  
Zone: CR-1.5, C-0.25, R-1.5, H-70  
Lots/Block: 20 and 21/George Bradley Subdivision  
Watershed: Lower Rock Creek/Class I

Dear Mr. Hollida:

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 Green Roof and Microbioretention. A quantity waiver is being requested for volume not able to be treated in either ESD or Structural measures.

1. This list may not be all-inclusive and may change based on available information at the time. Prior to Planning Board approval of the Site Plan, this stormwater management concept must be formally revised, using the established SM number, 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. Prior to Site Development Plan approval, the applicant will be required to demonstrate that the authorizing agency has determined that the downstream public storm drain system is adequate or can be upgraded to collect and convey the ten year runoff from the development.

This list may not be all-inclusive and may change based on available information at the time.
This 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 Mary Fertig at 240-777-6340 or at mary.fertig@montgomerycountymd.gov.

Sincerely,

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

MCE: MMF

cc: N. Braunstein
    SM File # 285997

ESD: Required/Provided 2,701 cf / 1,567cf
PE: Target/Achieved: 2.6" / 1.51"
STRUCTURAL: N/A
WAIVED: QN Waiver
September 28, 2020

Mr. Matthew Folden, Planner Coordinator  
Down County Planning Division  
The Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission  
2425 Reedie Drive  
Wheaton, MD  20902

RE: Preliminary Plan No. 120200220  
Sketch Plan No. 320200050  
The Avondale

Dear Mr. Folden:

We have completed our review of the revised preliminary and sketch plans uploaded to eplans on September 16, 2020. A previous version of the plans was reviewed by the Development Review Committee at its June 9, 2020 meeting. We recommend approval for the plan based 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. Include this letter and all other correspondence from this department.

Significant Plan Review Comments

1. Avondale Street is classified as Primary Residential Street with a proposed 60-ft right-of-way (ROW). Necessary dedication in accordance with the master plan.

2. Final design and details of the curb transition on the east side of the garage entrance from proposed to existing to be approved at Permit Stage by DPS with consideration of signing and marking plan.
3. **Sight Distance:** A Copy of the accepted Sight Distance Evaluation certification is enclosed for your information and reference.

   a. **Garage Entrance:** Avondale Street is classified as a Primary Residential Street and the sight distance is approved per the following reason(s):

      i. The sight distance looking left meets the minimum requirements per the road classification with no parking along frontage of the property as proposed by the applicant.

      ii. The sight distance looking right does not meet the requirements per the road classification due to the existing cars parked (permit parking) along the street. We agree on the sight distance of 150-ft to the right based on the following reasons:

         - The posted speed on Avondale Street is 25 mph and the sight distance complies to posted speed requirements.
         - Avondale Street is a dead-end street to the right of the proposed driveway with existing permit parking along both sides of the street which acts as traffic calming measure.
         - Existing “No Parking” to the right of the proposed driveway as shown in the plan will remain in place.

   b. **Loading Space:** The sight distance meets the minimum requirements per the road classification and is approved per the following reason(s):

      i. Existing street parking west of loading space to be removed per DPS Fire and Rescue requirements as shown in the plan.

   c. No parking along frontage of the property as proposed by the applicant. The line of sight for the proposed driveways should not be blocked by any proposed obstructions such as proposed trees, street light poles or traffic signs. At the permit stage, the applicant should work with DPS to make the necessary modifications to the locations of the items mentioned in order to meet the sight distance requirements for the proposed driveways.

**Standard Comments**

1. The owner will be required to submit a recorded covenant for the operation and maintenance of any private storm drain systems, and/or open space areas prior to MCDPS approval of the record plat. The deed reference for this document is to be provided on the record plat.

2. **Storm Drain Analysis:** The storm drain analysis was reviewed and is acceptable to MCDOT. No improvements are needed to the downstream public storm drain system for this plan.
3. Construct Bethesda streetscaping standards along Avondale.

4. Design all access points to be at-grade with sidewalk, dropping down to street level between the sidewalk and roadway.

5. No steps, stoops, balconies or retaining walls for the development are allowed in county right-of-way. No door swings into county ROW either.

6. Applicant should be mindful that the Bethesda UMP is currently in development and is anticipated to go into effect in late 2020. This project may potentially be subject to UMP Fees depending on where it is in the development process upon the UMP’s Council Approval.

7. 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.

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

9. Posting of the right-of-way bond is a prerequisite to DPS approval of the record plat. The right-of-way permit will include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following improvements:
   a. Curbs and gutters, ADA compliant sidewalks and handicap ramps, storm drainage and appurtenances, and street trees along Avondale Street.
   b. Construct Bethesda Streetscaping along the site’s Avondale Street street frontage.
   c. 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.
   d. Permanent monuments and property line markers, as required by Section 50-24(e) of the Subdivision Regulations.
   e. Erosion and sediment control measures as required by Montgomery County Code 19-10(02) 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. 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 these preliminary and sketch plans. If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact myself for this project at brenda.pardo@montgomerycountymd.gov or at (240) 777-7170.

Sincerely,

Brenda M. Pardo
Brenda M. Pardo, Engineer III
Development Review Team
Office to Transportation Policy

Attachments: Approved Sight Distance Study
cc: Correspondence folder FY 2021
cc-e: Patrick La Vay MHG
      Grace Bogdan MNCPPC
      Mark Terry MCDOT DTEO
      Thomas Tyree MCDOT DTEO
      Atiq Panjshiri MCDPS RWPR
      Sam Farhadi MCDPS RWPR
      Rebecca Torma MCDOT OTP
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION  
DEPARTMENT OF PERMITTING SERVICES  

SIGHT DISTANCE EVALUATION

Facility/Subdivision Name: Bradley Subdivision  
Preliminary Plan Number: 1-20200220

Street Name: Avondale  
Master Plan Road Classification: Primary Residential

Posted Speed Limit: 25 mph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street/Driveway #1</th>
<th>Street/Driveway #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Name: Garage Entrance</td>
<td>Loading Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Condition</td>
<td>Proposed Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street No: 1</td>
<td>Street No: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Sight Distance (feet) OK?</td>
<td>Right Sight Distance (feet) OK?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right 179' Yes*</td>
<td>Right 250' Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left 250' Min Yes*</td>
<td>Left 250' Min Yes*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:  
* See Sight Distance Exhibit for Proposed Condition Sight Lines after tree removal  
and partial parking elimination. 25mph/150' deemed acceptable from street's dead end to the right.  
See Notes and Graph Attached

GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification or Posted Speed</th>
<th>Required Sight Distance (use higher value) 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) Arterial</td>
<td>400'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Major - 50</td>
<td>475'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ (55) Major</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 and that these documents were prepared or approved by me, and that I am a licensed Professional Engineer under the laws of the State of Maryland, License No. 14979, Expiration Date 07/02/2022

[Signature]  
Date: 9/22/20

Montgomery County Review:

[ ] Approved  
[ ] Disapproved:

By: Brenda M. Pardo  
Date: 09/28/20
NOTE: Avondale is a dead end street with a Posted Speed of 25 mph.
The Master Plan Indicates Avondale Street is Primary Residential; however, all streets within the Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan also have a Target Speed of 25 mph (Footnote 1, P.40 Bethesda Downtown Plan) The re: Lined Sight Distance for 25 mph is 150'.

SIGHT DISTANCE AVONDALE STREET LOADING SPACE

SIGHT DISTANCE AVONDALE STREET GARAGE EXIT
DATE: 30-Sep-20
TO: Patrick LaVay - plavay@mhgpa.com
     Macris, Hendricks & Glascock
FROM: Marie LaBaw
RE: The Avondale 12020(220)

PLAN APPROVED

1. Review based only upon information contained on the plan submitted 22-Sep-20. 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.

NOTE: THIS FIRE ACCESS PLAN IS PRELIMINARY. A FINAL APPROVAL BY MCDPS FIRE ACCESS & WATER SUPPLY (INCLUDING A PERFORMANCE BASED DESIGN MEMO IF APPLICABLE) WILL BE REQUIRED AT THE TIME OF SITE PLAN, SHOWING THE PROPOSED BUILDING FLOOR PLANS & ELEVATIONS. PERFORMANCE BASED DESIGN APPROVAL WILL BE REQUESTED FOR LESS THAN 15 FEET OF CLEAR ACCESSIBLE AREA ON THE WEST & SOUTH SIDES OF THE BUILDING.
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SUBDIVISION BETHESDA
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AVONDALE
ON-SITE GREEN COVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREEN AREA</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>SOIL DEPTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLANTING AREA 1</td>
<td>307 SF</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANTING AREA 2</td>
<td>30 SF</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANTING AREA 3</td>
<td>40 SF</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN ROOF 1</td>
<td>243 SF</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN ROOF 2</td>
<td>247 SF</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN ROOF 3</td>
<td>325 SF</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWM PLANTER 1</td>
<td>554 SF</td>
<td>27&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWM PLANTER 2</td>
<td>57 SF</td>
<td>27&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>4,603 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAPHIC SCALE
(IN FEET)
1 inch = 20 ft.
THE AVONDALE
4526 & 4530 AVONDALE STREET
SKETCH PLAN #320200050

1. THE PROPERTY IS ZONED CR-1.5, C-0.25, R-1.5, H-70 AND IS LOCATED WITHIN THE BETHESDA DOWNTOWN PLAN AND BETHESDA CR-1.5 C-0.25 R-1.5 H-70 ZONE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS.

2. A SIMPLIFIED NRI/FSD & FOREST CONSERVATION EXEMPTION FOR THE PROPERTY WAS APPROVED ON APRIL 3, 2020 UNDER CR-1.5 C-0.25 R-1.5 H-70 ZONE: CR-5.0 C-4.0 R-4.75 H-110 EX. USE: HIGH-RISE OFFICE.

3. THE PROPERTY IS NOT IDENTIFIED IN THE LOCATION ATLAS AND INDEX OF HISTORICAL SITES, NOR IS IT IDENTIFIED IN THE NEW RESIDENTIAL BUILDING LOT TERMINATION (REQUIRED IN CR ZONE): CRN-0.75 C-0.0 R-0.75 H-45 EX. USE: MULTI-UNIT RES.

4. PARKING REQUIREMENTS ARE BASED ON 60 EFFICIENCY & ONE-BEDROOM UNITS, THE 80% BETHESDA OVERLAY.

5. A HYDRAULIC PLANNING ANALYSIS FOR THIS DEVELOPMENT WAS REVIEWED BY WSSC UNDER PLAN # DA6945Z20 AND SERVICES UNDER PLAN #285977.

6. PROPERTY LINES AND LOT/PARCEL ARE SUBJECT TO ADJUSTMENT AT THE TIME OF SUBDIVISION RECORD PLAT.

7. UNLESS SPECIFICALLY NOTED ON THIS PLAN DRAWING OR IN THE PLANNING BOARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL, THE BUILDING BUILDING LOT TERMINATION (REQUIRED IN CR ZONE): CRN-0.75 C-0.0 R-0.75 H-45 EX. USE: MULTI-UNIT RES.

8. THE EXISTING WATER AND SEWER MAINS ARE AVAILABLE AND ADEQUATE FOR SERVICING THE PROJECT.

9. UNLESS SPECIFICALLY NOTED ON THIS PLAN DRAWING OR IN THE PLANNING BOARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL, THE BUILDING

10. A SIMPLIFIED NRI/FSD & FOREST CONSERVATION EXEMPTION FOR THE PROPERTY WAS APPROVED ON APRIL 3, 2020 UNDER CR-1.5 C-0.25 R-1.5 H-70 ZONE: CR-5.0 C-4.0 R-4.75 H-110 EX. USE: HIGH-RISE OFFICE.

11. THE PROPERTY IS ZONED CR-1.5, C-0.25, R-1.5, H-70 AND IS LOCATED WITHIN THE BETHESDA DOWNTOWN PLAN AND BETHESDA CR-1.5 C-0.25 R-1.5 H-70 ZONE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS.

12. MAJOR PUBLIC FACILITIES (CR ZONE)401

13. A PARK IMPACT PAYMENT CONTRIBUTION AT THE APPLICABLE RATE PER SF OF APPROVED BOZ DENSITY GROSS POINTS PROPOSED = 20 OF THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT


15. BELOW GRADE SPACES (B) = 20 SPACES

16. STRUCTURED PARKING 2020 30 SPACES

17. MAXIMUM VEHICLE PARKING SPACES ALLOWED MINIMUM PARKING2010 20 SPACES

18. MINIMUM BICYCLE PARKING SPACES REQUIRED 30 SPACES

19. MINIMIZE CONFLICTS BETWEEN VEHICLES, PEDESTRIANS, AND CYCLISTS AND REDUCE THE VISUAL IMPACTS QUALITY BUILDING & SITE DESIGN PER CR INCENTIVE GUIDELINES, UP TO 20 POINTS IS APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT SEEKS TO

20. POINTS PROPOSED = 15 POINTS EXCEED ENERGY-EFFICIENT STANDARDS FOR THE BUILDING TYPE BY 17.5%.

21. DIVERSITY OF USES AND ACTIVITIES AS SHOWN POINTS PROPOSED = 15 POINTS

22. STRUCTURED PARKING 2020 20 SPACES

23. MINIMUM PARKING2010 24 SPACES

24. MAXIMUM VEHICLE PARKING SPACES ALLOWED MINIMUM PARKING2010 20 SPACES

25. MINIMUM BICYCLE PARKING SPACES REQUIRED 30 SPACES

26. MINIMIZE CONFLICTS BETWEEN VEHICLES, PEDESTRIANS, AND CYCLISTS AND REDUCE THE VISUAL IMPACTS QUALITY BUILDING & SITE DESIGN PER CR INCENTIVE GUIDELINES, UP TO 20 POINTS IS APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT SEEKS TO

27. POINTS PROPOSED = 15 POINTS EXCEED ENERGY-EFFICIENT STANDARDS FOR THE BUILDING TYPE BY 17.5%.

28. DIVERSITY OF USES AND ACTIVITIES AS SHOWN POINTS PROPOSED = 15 POINTS

29. STRUCTURED PARKING 2020 20 SPACES

30. MINIMUM PARKING2010 24 SPACES

31. MAXIMUM VEHICLE PARKING SPACES ALLOWED MINIMUM PARKING2010 20 SPACES

32. MINIMUM BICYCLE PARKING SPACES REQUIRED 30 SPACES

33. MINIMIZE CONFLICTS BETWEEN VEHICLES, PEDESTRIANS, AND CYCLISTS AND REDUCE THE VISUAL IMPACTS QUALITY BUILDING & SITE DESIGN PER CR INCENTIVE GUIDELINES, UP TO 20 POINTS IS APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT SEEKS TO

34. POINTS PROPOSED = 15 POINTS EXCEED ENERGY-EFFICIENT STANDARDS FOR THE BUILDING TYPE BY 17.5%.

35. DIVERSITY OF USES AND ACTIVITIES AS SHOWN POINTS PROPOSED = 15 POINTS

36. STRUCTURED PARKING 2020 20 SPACES

37. MINIMUM PARKING2010 24 SPACES

38. MAXIMUM VEHICLE PARKING SPACES ALLOWED MINIMUM PARKING2010 20 SPACES

39. MINIMUM BICYCLE PARKING SPACES REQUIRED 30 SPACES

40. MINIMIZE CONFLICTS BETWEEN VEHICLES, PEDESTRIANS, AND CYCLISTS AND REDUCE THE VISUAL IMPACTS QUALITY BUILDING & SITE DESIGN PER CR INCENTIVE GUIDELINES, UP TO 20 POINTS IS APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT SEEKS TO

41. POINTS PROPOSED = 15 POINTS EXCEED ENERGY-EFFICIENT STANDARDS FOR THE BUILDING TYPE BY 17.5%.

42. DIVERSITY OF USES AND ACTIVITIES AS SHOWN POINTS PROPOSED = 15 POINTS

43. STRUCTURED PARKING 2020 20 SPACES

44. MINIMUM PARKING2010 24 SPACES

45. MAXIMUM VEHICLE PARKING SPACES ALLOWED MINIMUM PARKING2010 20 SPACES

46. MINIMUM BICYCLE PARKING SPACES REQUIRED 30 SPACES

47. MINIMIZE CONFLICTS BETWEEN VEHICLES, PEDESTRIANS, AND CYCLISTS AND REDUCE THE VISUAL IMPACTS QUALITY BUILDING & SITE DESIGN PER CR INCENTIVE GUIDELINES, UP TO 20 POINTS IS APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT SEEKS TO

48. POINTS PROPOSED = 15 POINTS EXCEED ENERGY-EFFICIENT STANDARDS FOR THE BUILDING TYPE BY 17.5%.

49. DIVERSITY OF USES AND ACTIVITIES AS SHOWN POINTS PROPOSED = 15 POINTS

50. STRUCTURED PARKING 2020 20 SPACES

51. MINIMUM PARKING2010 24 SPACES

52. MAXIMUM VEHICLE PARKING SPACES ALLOWED MINIMUM PARKING2010 20 SPACES

53. MINIMUM BICYCLE PARKING SPACES REQUIRED 30 SPACES

54. MINIMIZE CONFLICTS BETWEEN VEHICLES, PEDESTRIANS, AND CYCLISTS AND REDUCE THE VISUAL IMPACTS QUALITY BUILDING & SITE DESIGN PER CR INCENTIVE GUIDELINES, UP TO 20 POINTS IS APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT SEEKS TO

55. POINTS PROPOSED = 15 POINTS EXCEED ENERGY-EFFICIENT STANDARDS FOR THE BUILDING TYPE BY 17.5%.

56. DIVERSITY OF USES AND ACTIVITIES AS SHOWN POINTS PROPOSED = 15 POINTS

57. STRUCTURED PARKING 2020 20 SPACES

58. MINIMUM PARKING2010 24 SPACES

59. MAXIMUM VEHICLE PARKING SPACES ALLOWED MINIMUM PARKING2010 20 SPACES

60. MINIMUM BICYCLE PARKING SPACES REQUIRED 30 SPACES

61. MINIMIZE CONFLICTS BETWEEN VEHICLES, PEDESTRIANS, AND CYCLISTS AND REDUCE THE VISUAL IMPACTS QUALITY BUILDING & SITE DESIGN PER CR INCENTIVE GUIDELINES, UP TO 20 POINTS IS APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT SEEKS TO

62. POINTS PROPOSED = 15 POINTS EXCEED ENERGY-EFFICIENT STANDARDS FOR THE BUILDING TYPE BY 17.5%.

63. DIVERSITY OF USES AND ACTIVITIES AS SHOWN POINTS PROPOSED = 15 POINTS

64. STRUCTURED PARKING 2020 20 SPACES

65. MINIMUM PARKING2010 24 SPACES

66. MAXIMUM VEHICLE PARKING SPACES ALLOWED MINIMUM PARKING2010 20 SPACES

67. MINIMUM BICYCLE PARKING SPACES REQUIRED 30 SPACES

68. MINIMIZE CONFLICTS BETWEEN VEHICLES, PEDESTRIANS, AND CYCLISTS AND REDUCE THE VISUAL IMPACTS QUALITY BUILDING & SITE DESIGN PER CR INCENTIVE GUIDELINES, UP TO 20 POINTS IS APPROPRIATE FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT SEEKS TO

69. POINTS PROPOSED = 15 POINTS EXCEED ENERGY-EFFICIENT STANDARDS FOR THE BUILDING TYPE BY 17.5%.

70. DIVERSITY OF USES AND ACTIVITIES AS SHOWN POINTS PROPOSED = 15 POINTS