



## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Marc Elrich  
*County Executive*

Christopher Conklin  
*Director*

January 7, 2021

Ms. Angelica Gonzalez, Planner Coordinator  
Upcounty Planning Division  
The Maryland-National Capital  
Park & Planning Commission  
2425 Reedie Drive, 13<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Wheaton, MD 20902

RE: Preliminary Plan & Design Exceptions  
Preliminary Plan No. 12020110  
Ashford Woods  
**REVISED**

Dear Ms. Gonzalez:

We have completed our review of the revised preliminary plan and design exceptions uploaded to eplans on October 6, 2020. Previous versions of this plan and design exceptions were reviewed by the Development Review Committee (DRC) at its meeting on February 18, 2020. 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

1. Sidewalks - The applicant is proposing sidewalks only on one side of the street for this development. Along portions of the streets, there are no sidewalks on either side that are located in the right-of-way. In addition, the streets in this development are proposed as public. The applicant states that they have an impervious cap which they are trying to remain under and in order to do so, they are not proposing sidewalks on both sides of the street.

**Office of the Director**

101 Monroe Street 10<sup>th</sup> Floor · Rockville Maryland 20850 · 240-777-7170 · 240-777-7178 FAX  
[www.montgomerycountymd.gov](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov)

*Located one block west of the Rockville Metro Station*

MCDOT Response: Based on the density of this development, **MCDOT does not recommend the streets be public without sidewalks on both sides of the street.** The proposed roads in the development do not add capacity to the overall network. In addition, since the sidewalks are on the opposite side of the front-loaded townhouses, we are concerned that pedestrians will be crossing mid-block in an unsafe manner. Therefore, MCDOT recommends the Planning Board approve the streets to be privately owned and maintained. Traffic calming should be installed on the roads using the County Code Section 49-30 as a guide to install them. All other County Code and AASHTO standards for the roads should be met, including but not limited to sight distance, horizontal and vertical curve.

If the Planning Board decides to approve the roads with sidewalks on both sides, we recommend that the right-of-way be expanded to include a five-foot wide sidewalk, the proposed sidewalks shown on the plan be reduced to five feet and a one-foot maintenance strip be included in the right-of-way or in a Public Improvement Easement (PIE). Also, we continue to recommend a driveway length from the property line (or the back of sidewalk) to the face of front-loaded garages be a minimum of 20 feet. This would ensure that vehicles will not obstruct the sidewalk.

2. The following design exceptions are based on if the streets are public. If the streets become private, the design exceptions below are not needed.
  - a. A-1 - Modification of Context Sensitive Road Section – Streets A, B & E: The applicant is proposing to modify MCDOT Standard No. MC-2002.02 from a 60-foot right-of-way to a 44-foot right-of-way for Street A (Station 0+00 to Station 2+00), Street B (Station 0+00 to Station 2+15.54) and Street E (Station 5+31.88 to Station 6+53.20, Station 10+97.38 to Station 12+18.88). The applicant is proposing the following street section:
    - 1-foot maintenance strip
    - 6-foot sidewalk
    - 8-foot tree panel
    - 10-foot travel lane
    - 11-foot travel lane
    - 8-foot tree panel
  - b. A-2 - Modification of Context Sensitive Road Section – Street E: The applicant is proposing to modify MCDOT Standard No. MC-2002.02 from a 60-foot right-of-way to a 44-foot right-of-way for Street E (Station 6+53.20 to Station 7+28.65 & Station 10+13.49 to Station 10+97.38). The applicant is proposing the following street section:
    - 1-foot maintenance strip
    - 6-foot sidewalk
    - 7-foot tree panel

- Two (2) -11-foot travel lanes
  - 8-foot tree panel
- c. A-3 - Modification of Context Sensitive Road Section – Street E: The applicant is proposing to modify MCDOT Standard No. MC-2002.02 from a 60-foot right-of-way to a 44-foot right-of-way for Street E (Station 7+28.65 to Station 10+13.49). The applicant is proposing the following street section:
- 6-foot tree panel
  - 8-foot parking
  - Two (2) 11-foot travel lanes
  - 8-foot tree panel
- d. B-1 - Modification of Context Sensitive Road Section – Street A: The applicant is proposing to modify MCDOT Standard No. MC-2002.02 from a 60-foot right-of-way to a 50-foot right-of-way for Street A (Station 2+00 to Station 30+35.56). The applicant is proposing the following street section:
- 1-foot maintenance strip
  - 6-foot sidewalk
  - 6-foot tree panel
  - 8-foot parking (or additional 8-foot tree panel where parallel parking is not provided)
  - 10-foot travel lane
  - 11-foot travel lane
  - 8-foot tree panel
- e. D-2 - Modification of Context Sensitive Road Section – Street B: The applicant is proposing to modify MCDOT Standard No. MC-2002.02 from a 60-foot right-of-way to a 53-foot right-of-way for Street B (Station 5+18.54 to Station 8+25.00). The applicant is proposing the following street section:
- 1-foot maintenance strip
  - 6-foot sidewalk
  - 5-foot tree panel
  - 8-foot parking (or additional 8-foot tree panel where parallel parking is not provided)
  - 10-foot travel lane
  - 11-foot travel lane
  - 12-foot tree panel
- f. E-1 - Modification of Context Sensitive Road Section – Street F: The applicant is proposing to modify MCDOT Standard No. MC-2002.02 from a 60-foot right-of-way to a 37-foot right-of-way for Street F (Station 1+37.80 to Station 5+31.88). The applicant is proposing the following street section:
- 1-foot maintenance strip

- 6-foot sidewalk
  - 8-foot parking (or 8-foot tree panel where parallel parking is not provided)
  - 10-foot travel lane
  - 11-foot travel lane
  - 1-foot maintenance strip
- g. F-1 - Modification of Context Sensitive Road Section – Street F: The applicant is proposing to modify MCDOT Standard No. MC-2002.02 from a 60-foot right-of-way to a 34-foot right-of-way for Street F (Station 0+00 to Station 1+37.80). The applicant is proposing the following street section:
- 1-foot maintenance strip
  - 6-foot sidewalk
  - 5-foot tree panel
  - 10-foot travel lane
  - 11-foot travel lane
  - 1-foot maintenance strip

MCDOT Response: MCDOT **approves the travel lane widths, tree panel widths and the 1-foot maintenance strip for the street sections** listed above (A-1, A-2, A-3, B-1, D-2, and F-1). We recommend the Planning Board require the applicant to install sidewalks on both sides of the street for all streets in this development. If a sidewalk is not located within the right-of-way, then we recommend a PIE as discussed above.

- h. C-1 - Modification of Context Sensitive Road Section – Street A: The applicant is proposing to modify MCDOT Standard No. MC-2002.02 from a 60-foot right-of-way to a 54-foot right-of-way for Street A (Station 30+35.56 to Station 34+14.00). The applicant is proposing the following street section:
- 2-foot maintenance strip
  - 5-foot sidewalk
  - 14-foot tree panel
  - 10-foot travel lane
  - 11-foot travel lane
  - 6-foot tree panel
  - 5-foot sidewalk
  - 1-foot maintenance strip
- i. D-1 - Modification of Context Sensitive Road Section – Streets B, C & D: The applicant is proposing to modify MCDOT Standard No. MC-2002.02 from a 60-foot right-of-way to a 53-foot right-of-way for Street B (Station 2+15.54 to Station 5+18.54) and the entire lengths of Streets C & D. The applicant is proposing the following street section:
- 1-foot maintenance strip

- 5-foot sidewalk
- 6-foot tree panel
- 8-foot parking (or additional 8-foot tree panel where parallel parking is not provided)
- 10-foot travel lane
- 11-foot travel lane
- 6-foot tree panel
- 5-foot sidewalk
- 1-foot maintenance strip

MCDOT Response: MCDOT **approves** the Design Exceptions for sections for C-1 and D-1. The applicant's proposed section will reduce impervious area while maintaining walkability and meeting minimum ADA standards. While these two sections of road have sidewalks on both sides of the street, they cannot remain public if they are not contiguous to other public road. Therefore, if the other roads are private, then these roads will need to be private.

#### Planning Board Waivers

3. Planning Board to make a finding for reduced centerline radius:
  - a. The applicant is proposing 100' centerline radii on Street A, a secondary street, beginning at stations 15+09 and 21+56. MCDOT has reviewed the design for safety and determined that the proposed radii meet AASHTO minimum design standards for 20 mph speed. MCDOT supports a Planning Board waiver for a reduction in the required 150' radius for a secondary street classification.
  - b. The applicant is proposing 100' and 126' centerline radius on Street E, a secondary street, beginning at stations 6+70 and 9+05, respectively. MCDOT has reviewed the design for safety and determined that the proposed radii meet AASHTO minimum design standards for 20 mph speed. MCDOT supports a Planning Board waiver for a reduction in the required 150' radius for a secondary street classification.
  - c. Waiver for lots on a private right-of-way, if necessary.

#### Significant Plan Review Comments

4. Transit Easement - The applicant proposes to reduce the transit easement along their frontage. MCDOT supports the reduction in width. Final width should be evaluated further at the site plan stage. The easement should be shown on the record plat. The PUE in relation to the transit easement will be determined at the site plan stage.
5. Abandonment of Transit Easement - Prior to the permit stage, the applicant must file for abandonment of the necessary portion of the existing transit easement. Contact Mr. Eric Willis,

MCDOT Property Acquisition Chief, at 240-777-7255 or [eric.willis@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:eric.willis@montgomerycountymd.gov) for the process.

6. The Traffic Study was reviewed and approved by MCDOT in a letter dated December 4, 2020. MCDOT had the following major comment:  
Traffic Signal - Prior to release of the 10th building permit, all conduit necessary to support the eventual signalization of the site entrance at Snowden Farm Parkway and Frederick Road (MD 355) must be installed and approved by the Montgomery County Department of Transportation and Maryland State Highway Administration. Plans for the implementation of this conduit, along with detailed, engineered traffic signal plans, shall be provided for review and approval by MCDOT and MSHA with the application for access permit. The traffic signal must be installed and operational prior to the issuance of the 270th building permit for the site. In the event a traffic signal is not approved, a comparable alternative or payment shall be determined by the Planning Director, with input from MCDOT.
7. The applicant must satisfy the 2018 Bicycle Master Plan requirements along the site's Frederick Road (MD 355) frontage, which includes a shared use path, bikeable shoulders and all related items, by entering into a participation agreement with MCDOT to design and construct these facilities as approved by MCDOT.
8. Relocation of utilities along existing roads to accommodate the required roadway improvements shall be the responsibility of the applicant.
9. The preliminary plan shows front-loaded garage townhomes on the streets. The associated street trees and driveway details, such as driveway length (from the right-of-way line to the garage structure), width and spacing will be reviewed and finalized at the site plan stage to ensure they meet the MCDPS minimum requirements.
10. MCDOT recommends that all driveways on public streets for front-facing townhomes be a minimum of 20' from the garage door to the right-of-way line.

#### Standard Plan Review Comments

11. Provide dedication necessary for all frontage improvements along Frederick Road (MD 355).
12. We defer to MSHA for all access to Frederick Road (MD 355).
13. Provide full width dedication and construction of all interior public streets.
14. Provide a 10-foot wide Public Utility Easement (PUE) along all street frontages. An alternative to this PUE, if necessary, will be determined at site plan stage.
15. A Public Improvements Easement (PIE) may be necessary along the proposed streets in this development in order to accommodate the sidewalk and maintenance easement. Prior to submission of the record plat, the applicant's consultant will need to determine if there is enough right of way to permit this sidewalk and maintenance easement. If not, the applicant

will need to either dedicate additional right of way or execute a Declaration of Public Improvements Easement document. That document is to be recorded in the Land Records of Montgomery County, with the liber and folio referenced on the record plat. Unless otherwise noted, the Public Improvements Easement is to be a minimum width of the sidewalk and one-foot maintenance strip not in the right-of-way with the overlapping Public Utilities Easement being no less than the width of the PIE plus the ten (10) foot wide.

16. Grant necessary slope and drainage easements. Slope easements are to be determined by study or set at the building restriction line.
17. No steps, stoops, or retaining walls for the development are allowed in County right-of-way.
18. The storm drain analysis was reviewed and accepted by MCDOT. No improvements to any downstream, county-maintained facilities are required with this project.
19. 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.
20. Grade establishments for all new public streets and/or pedestrian paths must be approved by MCDPS prior to submission of the record plat.
21. 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.
22. Provide on-site handicap access facilities, parking spaces, ramps, etc. in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.
23. Trees in the County rights of way – spacing and species are 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.
24. Posting of a right-of-way permit 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 (if the roads are approved as public):
  - A. Street grading, paving, curbs, gutters, storm drain & appurtenances, sidewalks, handicap ramps, and street trees along all public streets.

**NOTE: The Public Utilities Easement is to be graded on a side slope not to exceed 4:1.**

- B. Permanent monuments and property line markers, as required by Section 50-4.3(G) of the Subdivision Regulations.
- C. 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.

- D. 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 me at [william.whelan@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:william.whelan@montgomerycountymd.gov) or (240) 777-2173.

Sincerely,

*William Whelan*

William Whelan, Engineer III  
Development Review Team  
Office of Transportation Policy

Sharepoint/transportation/director's office/development review/WhelanW/120200110 Ashford Woods - MCDOT Review Letter REVISED 010721.docx

cc: Plan letters notebook

cc-e:	Michael Natelli	Ashford Woods, LLC.
	Phil Isaja	Soltesz
	Keely Lauretti	Soltesz
	Brandon Fritz	Soltesz
	Chris Van Alstyne	MNCP&PC
	Sam Farhadi	MCDPS RWPR
	Marie LaBaw	MCDPS FRS
	Mark Terry	MCDOT DTEO
	Kutty Menon	MCDOT DTEO
	Kamal Hamud	MCDOT DTEO





DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Marc Elrich  
*County Executive*

Christopher R. Conklin  
*Director*

December 4, 2020

Mr. Chris Van Alstyne, Transportation Planner Coordinator  
Up-County Division  
The Maryland-National Capital  
Park & Planning Commission  
8787 Georgia Avenue  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-3760

RE: Ashford Woods  
Traffic Impact Study Review &  
Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

Dear Mr. Van Alstyne:

We have completed our review of the revised Local Area Transportation Review and Transportation Policy Area Review (TIS) report and Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis (TSWA) dated November 19, 2019 and updated February 17, 2020, prepared by The Traffic Group. Total development evaluated by the analysis includes:

- 364 townhomes

Based on the TIS and TSWA reports, we offer the following comments:

**Adequacy Determination**

1. The study indicates that the proposed development generates more than 50-peak hour person vehicular trips; therefore, the motor vehicle system adequacy is required. The pedestrian, bicycle and transit adequacy tests are not required since the development generates fewer than 50-peak hour trips for each of these tests.

**Motor Vehicle System Adequacy**

1. The subject development is required to meet the Local Area Transportation Review (LATR) test for motor vehicle system adequacy. The LATR test for the Clarksburg Town Center (Orange) policy area uses the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology with an average vehicle delay

**Office of the Director**

---

101 Monroe Street 10<sup>th</sup> Floor · Rockville Maryland 20850 · 240-777-7170 · 240-777-7178 FAX

[www.montgomerycountymd.gov](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov)

*Located one block west of the Rockville Metro Station*

standard of 63 seconds per vehicle. The consultant studied four (4) intersections, including two (2) future intersections of site-access roads with Frederick Road (MD 355)/Florence Street and Frederick Road (MD 355)/Snowden Farm Parkway.

2. Per the report, all of the study intersections will continue to operate within the HCM average vehicle delay standard of 63 seconds per vehicle

### **Pedestrian and Bicycle Impact Statement**

1. The consultant provided a Pedestrian and Bicycle Impact Statement which listed the pedestrian, bicycle infrastructure for the studied intersections and roads. There is no transit infrastructure in this immediate area.
2. The consultant identified the general location of existing and proposed sidewalks and bike paths within the study area. However, the consultant neither provided a map of these items nor identified the condition of the existing facilities. We recommend the report be updated to address these concerns.
3. The consultant did not provide a street light inventory. We recommend the report be updated to address this item.

### **Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis**

1. The consultant performed a signal warrant analyses for the following intersections:
  - a. Street A, the site-access road with Frederick Road (MD 355) and Snowden Farm Parkway;

Consultant's recommendation: In the report, the consultant does not recommend a traffic signal be installed since none of the warrants are met under the assumption that the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed > 40 mph posted speed.

MCDOT Recommendation: MCDOT, along with MSHA and MNCP&PC staff, reviewed the signal warrant analysis at this location and determined that, based upon safety and engineering judgement, a traffic signal is required. In subsequent communication between these agencies and the consultant, the consultant agrees with and supports our conclusion. The applicant will need to submit the detailed/engineered traffic signal plans to MCDOT and MDSHA for review and approval at the access permit stage. The signal must be installed and operational prior to issuance of the 270th building permit.

- b. Street B, the site-access road with Frederick Road (MD 355) and Florence Street.

Consultant's recommendation: The consultant does not recommend a traffic signal be installed since none of the warrants are met under the assumption that the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed > 40 mph posted speed.

MCDOT Recommendation: MCDOT **agrees** with the consultant's conclusion that a traffic signal is no warranted at this intersection.

### **SUMMARY**

1. The findings of the LATR have been accepted. We **agree** with the consultant's conclusion that all four (4) study intersections will continue to operate within the HCM average vehicle delay standard of 63 seconds.
2. We **disagree** with the consultant's conclusion in the report that a traffic signal is not warranted at the intersection of Street A, the site-access road with Frederick Road (MD 355) and Snowden Farm Parkway. MCDOT, along with MSHA and MNCP&PC staff, reviewed the signal warrant analysis at this location and determined that, based upon safety and engineering judgement, a traffic signal is required. The applicant will need to submit the detailed/engineered traffic signal plans to MCDOT and MDSHA for review and approval at the access permit stage. The signal must be installed and operational prior to issuance of the 270th building permit. Since the release of the latest update of this report, the consultant now agrees with our conclusion. The consultant should update this section of the report noting that they agree with our conclusion.
3. We **concur** with the consultant that the pedestrian, transit and bicycle adequacy tests are not required.
4. The consultant should update the report to provide a map of the bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and identify the condition of the existing facilities.
5. The consultant should update the report to provide a street light inventory.

Mr. Chris Van Alstyne  
Ashford Woods  
TIS/TSWA  
December 4, 2020  
Page 4

Thank you for the opportunity to review this report. If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact me at [william.whelan@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:william.whelan@montgomerycountymd.gov) or at (240) 777-2173.

Sincerely,

*William Whelan*

William Whelan, Engineer III  
Development Review Team  
Office of Transportation Policy

[SharePoint/transportation/directors office/development review/WhelanW/120200110 TIS - MCDOT Review 120420.docx](#)

cc: SharePoint\Correspondence

cc-e: Joe Caloggero	The Traffic Group
Phil Isaja	Soltesz
Angelica Gonzalez	MNCP&PC
Sandra Pereira	MNCP&PC
Kwesi Woodroffe	MDSHA District 3
Mark Terry	MCDOT DTEO
Kutty Menon	MCDOT DTEO
Kamal Hamud	MCDOT DTEO
Rebecca Torma	MCDOT OTP



Larry Hogan  
Governor  
Boyd K. Rutherford  
Lt. Governor  
Gregory Slater  
Secretary  
Tim Smith, P.E.  
Administrator

December 10, 2020

Mr. Joseph Caloggero  
The Traffic Group  
9900 Franklin Square Drive, Suite H  
Baltimore, MD, 21236

Dear Mr. Caloggero:

The Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA) has received the revised Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis (TSWA) from The Traffic Group and follow up comments on December 2, 2020. The TSWA was revised as requested with 50% of the north site access right turns reassigned to the south site access right turns. The warrant analysis only accounts for the proposed Ashford Woods development and not the approved Snowden Farm Parkway trips or future traffic volumes.

The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MdmUTCD) governs analysis for, and installation of traffic control signals in the State. The Manual stipulates nine (9) warrants for consideration to determine the need for a traffic control signal. It is noted that only Warrant 1 – Eight-Hour Minimum Volume Warrant of the MdmUTCD was assessed in this analysis. A side street volume of 52 vph is required for the eight (8) hours to satisfy this warrant.

The TSWA shows that a total of four (4) hours meet conditions of Warrant 1- Condition B. When the other hours that did not meet the 52 vehicles per hour (vph) threshold are analyzed, it is apparent that several hours are only a few cars away from meeting the conditions. The following was noted:

- 2:00pm and 3:00pm are 6 cars away,
- 4:00pm is one car away, and
- 6:00pm is 4 cars away from the 52 vph threshold required to meet that warrant for signalization.

Based on the observations above, the State conducted further analysis and determined that the intersection satisfies conditions of Warrant 1 of the MUTCD and comes close to satisfying Warrant 2 of the MdmUTCD if 80% of the assigned vehicles at the north access use the south access to make a right turn. Eight (8) hours of the Eight-Hour Volume Warrant conditions are satisfied while three (3) hours of the Four-Hour Volume Warrant conditions are also satisfied. One additional hour comes close to meeting conditions of the Four-Hour Volume Warrant.

Mr. Caloggero  
SHA Tracking No.: 19APMO038XX  
Page 2 of 3  
December 10, 2020

The State anticipates that a minimum of 50% of trips from the north site access will utilize the south site access if that access is signalized. At other sites with a similar scenario, we have typically observed a higher percentage of vehicles use the signalized entrance particularly where the number of gaps of adequate length to enter the mainline traffic stream is limited. Based on the results of our internal analysis, we have determined that a traffic signal is warranted, justified and should be installed at this intersection.

In addition to the volume related findings, the State notes the need for safe ingress and egress to and from the site. The current AADT along MD 355 is 10,482 with a posted speed of 45 mph. Given the traffic volumes proposed to be generated by this development site, the analysis pointed to the need for interruption of continuous flow along MD 355 to allow site related traffic safely onto MD 355 particularly during the peak periods. Installation of a traffic signal fulfills that need.

In conclusion, the State, along with Montgomery County DOT and Montgomery County Planning supports the installation of a full traffic control signal at this intersection. Installation of pedestrian facilities including ADA ramps, accessible pedestrian signals (APS) and countdown pedestrian signals (CPS) are required. The State supports the current schedule and phasing for installation of the traffic control signal as proposed by the County. MDOT SHA reserves the right to request that the signal be installed prior should the State, at its sole discretion, determine that construction of the traffic signal should be advanced.

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 1-800-876-4742 (x7347) or via email at [kwoodroffe@mdot.maryland.gov](mailto:kwoodroffe@mdot.maryland.gov).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Erica Rigby", followed by the word "for" in a smaller font.

Erica Rigby,  
Acting District Engineer, District 3, SHA

ER/kw

cc: Mr. Derek Gunn, Acting Deputy District Engineer  
Mrs. Tania Brown, SHA – Access Management  
Ms. Angelica Gonzalez – Montgomery County  
Planning  
Mr. Michael Natelli, Natelli Communities  
Mr. Alvin Powell, SHA – District 3 Traffic

Mr. Caloggero  
SHA Tracking No.: 19APMO038XX  
Page 3 of 3  
December 10, 2020

Mr. Mark Terry – MCDOT  
Ms. Rebecca Torma – MCDOT  
Mr. Chris Van Alstyne – Montgomery County Planning  
Mr. Kwesi Woodroffe, SHA – Access Management

**From:** Schwartz, Lisa <Lisa.Schwartz@montgomerycountymd.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 21, 2020 1:30 PM  
**To:** Gonzalez, Angelica <angelica.gonzalez@montgomeryplanning.org>  
**Subject:** RE: DHCA review of Ashford Woods Preliminary Plan No, 120200110

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Hi Angelica,

We have been working with the applicant. The applicant has addressed our comments to our satisfaction, and DHCA recommends Approval of the current plan.

Lisa

*Lisa S. Schwartz*

Manager, Affordable Housing Programs Section

Montgomery County DHCA

1401 Rockville Pike, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor

Rockville, MD 20852

Work: 240-777-3786

Fax: 240-777-3691

[lisa.schwartz@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:lisa.schwartz@montgomerycountymd.gov)

[www.montgomerycountymd.gov/mpdu](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/mpdu)

**From:** Gonzalez, Angelica <[angelica.gonzalez@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:angelica.gonzalez@montgomeryplanning.org)>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 16, 2020 9:23 AM  
**To:** Schwartz, Lisa <[Lisa.Schwartz@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:Lisa.Schwartz@montgomerycountymd.gov)>  
**Subject:** DHCA review of Ashford Woods Preliminary Plan No, 120200110  
**Importance:** High

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]**

Good morning Lisa,

I hope all is well with you. I am the lead reviewer for the Ashford Woods Preliminary Plan Application No. 120200110 and the final submission of the plans is under review for a Dec. 17 Planning Board date. You're comments are attached from the initial review along with the revised plan and the applicants response letter for your reference. Can you confirm if the applicant has addressed your comments and what your recommendation is on this case? Should you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me.



What is the tentative Planning Board Date? (enter date -->)	<b>Thursday, December 17, 2020</b>
Posting of Staff Report =	<b>Monday, December 7, 2020</b>
Date Peer of Staff Report Will Occur (Wednesday) =	Wednesday, November 25, 2020
Date Staff Report Due to Peer Review	Thursday, November 19, 2020
Date Staff Report Due to Supervisor	Friday, November 13, 2020
<b>Date Staff Report Sections Due to Lead Reviewer</b>	<b>Friday, November 6, 2020</b>
<b>Letters/Memos from reviewing Agencies =</b>	<b>Monday, November 2, 2020</b>
ePlans Comments Due	<b>Monday October 19, 2020</b>
<small>Final Application Withdrawal for Review Agencies</small>	<small>Monday, August 24, 2020</small>

Stay safe and well,  
Angelica



**Angelica P. Gonzalez**  
**Planner Coordinator**  
 Upcounty Division  
[Angelica.Gonzalez@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Angelica.Gonzalez@montgomeryplanning.org)  
 301.495.4583

   

**WE'VE MOVED!**

THE NEW PARK AND PLANNING HEADQUARTERS IS NOW LOCATED AT  
 2425 REEDIE DRIVE, WHEATON, MD 20902

Take 10 minutes to be counted now – visit: <https://2020census.gov/>



For voting related information,  
 visit/Para obtener información  
 relacionada con votar, visite:  
[www.777vote.org](http://www.777vote.org)



**STAY SAFE**

[montgomerycountymd.gov/COVID19](http://montgomerycountymd.gov/COVID19)

For COVID-19 Information and resources, visit: [www.montgomerycountymd.gov/COVID19](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/COVID19)