

Bethesda Downtown Design Advisory Panel

Meeting Minutes

PROJECT: Hampden East

DATE: June 24, 2020

*The **Hampden Lane** 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 and 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

Hyojung Garland, Parks Staff

Emily Balmer, Area 1 Principal Administrative Assistant

Applicant Team

Robert Dalrymple, Attorney

Matt Gordon, Attorney

Daryl South, Developer

Janel Kausner, Developer

Robert Sponseller, Architect

Xijue Wang, Architect

Jonathan Bondi, VIKa

Members of the Public

Alexander McSpadden



Discussion Points:

Staff: At Sketch Plan we want to focus on the massing and Design Guidelines, this project's options include several upper floors of the building that project over lower floors of the building, this has been an important issue the DAP has been dealing with so we want to be sure the DAP addresses that part of the design.

Base and building setbacks

- What is the grade change between Montgomery and Hampden?
 - *Applicant Response: Hampden Lane is 84 feet which is our measuring point, and adds another floor as you move to Montgomery Lane, so 94 feet on Montgomery Lane, a 10-foot change.*
- How can you justify an 8 story base when the DG recommends otherwise?
 - *Applicant Response: Through setbacks, sculpting, expression of programming, mediating through architecture*
- The single-story retail at the base seems odd in its highlighted detachment from the residential podium. Could it be more integral to the podium? Could the base elevation be a couple stories rather than just 1 so it has a stronger presence facing the rarely used plaza across North Lane? Hopefully this project will provide more life to this plaza but providing a little more height to the first story could help.

Cantilever

- I'm impressed with the project but concerned about the cantilevers proposed. Can you summarize them?
 - *Applicant Response: We are doing a cantilever between the office and residential option, focusing on the southwest corner over to the property line about 8 feet. It becomes a cantilever because we are expanding the sidewalk zone and pushing in the retail. We can pull it back however we felt the strong expression added to the project and is common to all three options. The other 'cantilevers' within the upper stories are more about modulation and will not affect public space.*
 - *Staff: Many of the cantilevers we've seen in the past were to capture additional FAR, which is different from cantilevers that are purposeful for architectural design, if you can explain and justify the difference that would be helpful.*
 - *Applicant Response: It is not about FAR, mostly about creating an interesting corner and celebrating these program elements through sculpting. This corner will be seen from the south, west, and Wisconsin and will be enhanced and provide interesting and changing views. In this early stage of design, offsets are exaggerated to heighten the design point. As we progress, the sculpting could be better expressed through a change in materials and possibly less cantilever.*
- The vertical arrangements of the program pieces is really great, the issue of overhangs have not received great public response and is a great touchpoint, especially with the Planning Board and may not result in a positive public response. The corner seems a bit overly



complicated and I believe there may be other ways of simplifying and doing it without an architectural overhang.

- Hampden Lane is a very narrow street and the overhang may create a compression of space. The view from Wisconsin Ave will signal something special, but also something heavy hanging over public space. I suspect pulling it back may make it more palatable moving forward.
- I think the relationship is very important and agree the prominence of the overhang is a problem on Hampden. It seems that the separation of the retail at the base is so pronounced. Is this separation warranted? Almost too equal, wondering if a stronger base is a way of easing the need for a cantilever from Wisconsin. But I agree that the corner is very important.
 - *Applicant response: I agree, perhaps we can mesh these uses a bit, but I think the sculpting to some extent is still necessary. I think this outdoor seating is most viable at this corner location.*
- The retail is being pushed back from the build to line to allow additional sidewalk for café zones which we would want. The suggestion is to push the cantilever back.
- The cantilever seems like it could work without being so heavy, perhaps 5-6 feet not 8 feet. I really like the idea of pushing and pulling and having the separation and I am confident this could be pulled off.

Rear Façade

- The neighbor to the east articulated their adjacent façade rather significantly by making the tower separation wider at the ends and more narrow in the middle. You chose to do a flat façade at this separation. Might you want to consider something a little less harsh to reflect what is happening on the neighboring façade.
 - *Applicant Response: Noted.*

Loading

- I wish MCDOT would allow you to split the access between Hampden Lane and Montgomery Lane. We are not supportive of the consolidated loading as it will become a less desirable pedestrian environment.
 - *Applicant Response: I agree, Hampden Lane is one of the nicer streets and it would be great to have more retail there especially with the plaza across the street. Montgomery Lane does not get as much foot traffic.*
- There may be an opportunity to combine access for both projects and a coordinated effort between the two properties could solve this problem.

Public Comments

One member of the public attended, but no comments provided

Panel Recommendations:

At Sketch Plan a straw vote is taken to determine whether the Project is on track to receive at least 10 points for design excellence. The Panel voted 5-0 that the Project is on track with the following comments to be addressed at Site Plan:



- a. Further development of the base articulation, including how it relates to the public spaces across East and Hampden Lanes;
- b. Continue to develop the design to address the use of building overhangs based on the comments above;
- c. Further refine the relationship between the rear facades;
- d. Study the potential for shared access between the two buildings with clear preference for split access between Montgomery and Hampden.





DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Marc Elrich
County Executive

Christopher R. Conklin
Director

September 18, 2020

Ms. Grace Bogdan, Planner Coordinator
Down County Planning Division
The Maryland-National Capital
Park & Planning Commission
2425 Reedie Drive
Wheaton, MD 20902

RE: Sketch Plan No. 320200070
Hampden East

Dear Ms. Bogdan,

We have completed our review of the revised Sketch Plan dated of August 21, 2020. An earlier version of this plan was reviewed by the Development Review Committee at its meeting on August 4, 2020. 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 in the package for record plats, storm drain, grading or paving plans, or application for access permit. Include this letter and all other correspondence from this department.

1. Pay the Montgomery County Department of Transportation plan review fee in accordance with Montgomery County Council Resolution 16-405 and Executive Regulation 28-06AM ("Schedule of Fees for Transportation-related Reviews of Subdivision Plans and Documents").
2. Roads: Improvements to County maintained rights-of-way will be determined at the preliminary plan stage following review of the plan related documents.
 - a. Montgomery Lane:

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

Ms. Grace Bogdan
Sketch Plan No. 320200070
September 18, 2020
Page 2

- i. Per the Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan, Montgomery Lane is classified as a Business District and a minimum 70-foot right-of-way. Provide typical section for Montgomery Lane.
 - ii. Per the Bicycle Master Plan, two-way separated bike lanes are proposed on the south side of Montgomery Lane (CIP #P500119). To accommodate the separated bike lanes, additional right-of-way or easement may be needed. The ultimate cross section for the roads will be determined at the preliminary plan stage.
 - b. East Lane:
 - i. Per the Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan, East Lane is classified as Business District with a minimum 50-foot right-of-way. Provide typical a section for East Lane.
 - ii. Remove the layby and locate the proposed curb further west to provide narrower lanes and a wider tree panel.
 - iii. No bicycle facilities are proposed for this section of Wisconsin Avenue.
 - c. Hampden Lane:
 - i. Per the Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan, Hampden Lane is classified as a Business District with a minimum 60-foot right-of-way.
 - ii. No bicycle facilities are proposed.
- 3. Vehicular Access to the site:
 - a. MCDOT **accepts** the applicant's proposal for having the two access points on Hampden Lane, with the garage being separate from the loading, as shown on the sketch plan.
 - b. MCDOT **does not** support vehicular access from Montgomery Lane due to the proposed separated bike lanes.
- 4. ***At the preliminary plan*** stage:
 - a. Show all existing topographic details (paving, storm drainage, driveways adjacent and opposite the site, sidewalks and/or bikeways, utilities, rights of way and easements, etc.) on the preliminary plan.

Ms. Grace Bogdan
Sketch Plan No. 320200070
September 18, 2020
Page 3

- b. Show proposed driveway entrances and existing entrances adjacent and opposite to the subject site clearly on the plan.
 - c. Submit a completed, executed MCDOT Sight Distances Evaluation certification form, for all existing and proposed site entrances onto County-maintained roads, for our review and approval.
 - d. Submit a storm drain study if any portion of the subject site drains to the Montgomery County public storm drain system.
 - e. The applicant needs to submit a truck circulation plan for review. This plan should delineate the proposed movements on-site between the anticipated access locations, the proposed truck loading spaces, and the proposed dumpsters.
5. Upgrade pedestrian facilities at intersections along the site frontage and at adjacent intersections to comply with current ADA standards.
6. We recommend standard 25-foot property truncation at the intersections.
7. Design all access points to be at-grade with sidewalk, dropping down to street level between the sidewalk and roadway.
8. Doors are not allowed to swing into the right-of-way.
9. No steps, stoops, retaining walls or other structures, including buildings, are allowed in the county rights-of-way.
10. Transformers or electrical vaults may not be allowed in the county right-of-way.
11. Provide a minimum 5-foot continuous clear pathway (no grates) along all public streets that is ADA compliant.
12. A minimum 3-foot width must be maintained between the vehicular access point and property line to ensure a minimum 6-foot refuge area should the neighboring property redevelop, and to prevent encroachment on the rights of adjacent properties.
13. The proposed Streetscapes shall be per the Bethesda Streetscape Plan.
14. The applicant should be mindful that the Bethesda UMP is currently in development and may go into effect in 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.

Ms. Grace Bogdan
 Sketch Plan No. 320200070
 September 18, 2020
 Page 4

15. Curb radii for intersection type driveways should be sufficient to accommodate the turning movements of the largest vehicle expected to frequent the site.

16. Traffic Mitigation Agreement (TMAG) Comments

Prior to the issuance of any building permits by MCDPS, the applicant will need to work with this Department to execute a Traffic Mitigation Agreement. Contact MCDOT for a copy of the most recent TMAg template for residential use. Coordinate with Ms. Sandra Brecher, Chief of Commuter Services Section. Ms. Brecher may be contacted at 240-777-8383. The TMAg may include but not be limited to the following:

Applicability of Bill 36-18 Provisions:

The project is located in the Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan area, which is in the Red Subdivision Staging Policy Area and the Bethesda Transportation Management District. The project proposes to develop 525,000 square feet. A new development in a Red Policy Area with more than 40,000 gsf must submit a Project-Based Level 3 Results Plan. A Project-based TDM Results Plan requires a commitment by the owner or applicant to achieve a base NADMS that is 5% higher than the District's goal as well as related commuting goals at that project. The Plan must be submitted and approved by MCDOT prior to issuance of any building permit from the Department of Permitting Services.

Level 3 Results Plans require the following:

- Appoint a Transportation Coordinator
- Notify the Department of the Coordinator's contact information within 30 days of receipt of final U&O certificate
- Provide space in the project for the promotion of TDM (see additional comments below);
- Display TDM-related information in highly visible location(s)
- Identify specific TDM actions to be implemented in order to achieve 5% above the Bethesda commuter goal of 55% NADMS, or, 60% NADMS;
- Commit funding to achieve if the project has not actually achieved the goal within 6 years of final occupancy
- Additional and/or Substitution of Strategies: If strategies initially selected by the owner or applicant do not result in the project achieving goals by 6 years after final occupancy, revisions to the plan or strategies initially selected may be required

Ms. Grace Bogdan
 Sketch Plan No. 320200070
 September 18, 2020
 Page 5

- Additional Funding: Commit funding if the project does not achieve the goal within 6 years of final occupancy. Provide higher additional funding if the project has not achieved the goal within 8 years of final occupancy
- Conduct independent monitoring to determine if the project is meeting its goals, until the project's goals are achieved

Displays and Communication of TDM Information

Use of the multiple non-auto modes of transportation accessible to employees, independent residents and visitors at the Project can be facilitated by readily visible and accessible information about options. To enable outreach to Project employees, independent residents and, visitors, etc.:

- Incorporate display space into the lobby for bus schedules and transportation-related promotional materials
- Provide a monitor to display Real Time Transit Information in the lobby.

TDM Strategy Options to Support Use of Non-Auto Mobility Devices

Use of personal and shared bicycles or micro-mobility devices will connect employees and independent care residents to the Bethesda Metro for work- and non-work-related trips and will also assist in meeting the project's NADMS commuter goal. Therefore, the project should consider choosing one or more strategies that support bicycles and dockless vehicles (i.e., membership subsidies, space for storage of dockless vehicles, etc.) as part of its Level 3 TDM Results Plan.

17. 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 (to be determined at preliminary plan stage):
 - a. Improvements to the public right of way will be determined at the preliminary plan stage based on a review of the additional information requested earlier in this letter.
 - b. Enclosed storm drainage and/or engineered channel in all drainage easements.
 - c. Underground utility lines.
 - d. Bethesda Streetscaping.
 - e. Street lights.
 - f. Street trees in amended soil panels.

Ms. Grace Bogdan
 Sketch Plan No. 320200070
 September 18, 2020
 Page 6

g. Permanent monuments and property line markers.

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 Team engineer for this project at william.whelan@montgomerycountymd.gov or (240) 777-7170.

Sincerely,

William Whelan

William Whelan, Engineer III
 Development Review
 Office of Transportation Policy

SharePoint\Transportation\Director's Office\Development Review\WhelanW\320200070 Hampden East – MCDOT review letter 091820.docx

cc: Correspondence folder FY 2020

cc-e: Jonathan Bondi	VIKA, Inc.
Robert Dalrymple	SGRW Law, P.C.
Vincent Ho	MCDOT DTEO
Mark Terry	MCDOT DTEO
Sam Farhadi	MCDPS RWPR
Patricia Shepherd	MCDOT DTS
Wayne Miller	MCDOT DTS
Sandra Brecher	MCDOT OTP
Beth Dennard	MCDOT OTP