Development Review Division
Montgomery County Department of Park and Planning

CHECKLIST  Site Plan / Project Plan Review

Plan #: 8-20060310  Name: Montgomery Industrial Park
Zone: I-1/10 Mile  Tract Area: 1.69 acres  Proposed Use: Hotel
Number of Units: 104 rooms  Square Footage: 67,750
Development Method: 59.0.3  Other:

Referral Comments:

M-NCPPC
Transportation  CE  4/10/06
Environmental  CB  4/10/06
Community Planning  PH  4/10/06
Historic Planning  NA
Park Planning  NA
Research/Housing  NA

Other Agencies
SHA  NA
DPS (SWM)  OK  4/10/06
DPS (Traffic)  SN  5/7/06
Public School  NA
Utility  DISC  4/10/06
Fire & Rescue  Capt. F.  5/29/06
DPW & T  SN  5/7/06

Development Standards / Requirements

☑ Zoning Requirements
☑ Development Data Table
☑ Recreation Calculation
☐ MPDU Calculation
☐ TDR Calculation
☐ Timing/Phasing Conditions

Building Restriction Lines
Building Height
Master Plan Conformance

Prior Approvals
☐ Development Plan
☑ Preliminary Plan
☐ Prior Site Plan Approvals
☐ Record Plat
☑ Special Exception

Community Input
☐ Civic Association
☐ Individuals

Supervisor Review  Ma  6/30/06
Chief Review  Rob  6/1/06
BOARD OF APPEALS
for
MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Stella B. Werner Council Office Building
100 Maryland Avenue
Rockville, Maryland  20850
(240) 777-6600
www.montgomerycountymd.gov/content/council/boa/board.asp

Case No. S-2656

PETITION OF BAYWOOD HOTELS, INC.

OPINION OF THE BOARD
(Opinion Adopted April 5, 2006)
(Effective Date of Opinion: April 28, 2006)

Case No. S-2656 is an application for a special exception, pursuant to Section 59-G-2.33 of the Montgomery County Code, for a hotel. The Hearing Examiner for Montgomery County held a hearing on the special exception on January 30, 2006, closed the record in the case on March 20, 2006, and on March 21, 2006 issued a Report and Recommendation for approval of the special exception.

The subject property is Lot 39, WesTech Business Park Subdivision, located at 2200 Broadbirch Drive, Silver Spring, Maryland, 20904, in the I-1 Zone.

Decision of the Board:  Special Exception Granted, Subject To Conditions Enumerated Below.

The Board of Appeals considered the Hearing Examiner's Report and Recommendation at its Worksession on April 5, 2006. After careful consideration, and review of the record in the case, the Board adopts the Report and Recommendation and grants the special exception subject to the following conditions:

1. Petitioner shall be bound by all of its testimony and exhibits of record, and by the testimony of its witnesses and representations of counsel identified in the Hearing Examiner's Report, and in this opinion.

2. Petitioner must comply with any conditions set by the Department of Permitting Services in approving the site's Stormwater Management
3. There must be no encroachment into the wetland buffer areas except for necessary stormwater management outfalls, as approved by DPS.

4. Petitioner must not disturb or in any way interrupt the groundwater monitoring wells at the site and must allow access for monitoring.

5. Petitioner's hotel shall not exceed 104 rooms, which is equivalent to 34,118 square feet of general office use, and a staff of 25.

6. Petitioner shall install a bus shelter on Broadbirch Drive in the vicinity of the hotel. The precise location and details of the bus shelter should be determined at the time of site plan review, and any necessary amendment to the special exception site plan shall be forwarded to the Board of Appeals as an administrative modification request.

7. If, at the time of site plan review, the Petitioner is required to provide for additional sidewalks, handicapped ramps and crosswalks, any necessary amendment to the special exception site plan shall be forwarded to the Board of Appeals as an administrative modification request.

8. No more than five scheduled deliveries of goods may be made to the hotel per week.

9. Petitioner must obtain sign permits from the Department of Permitting Services and file them with the Board before erecting any signs. A modified special exception site plan should be submitted at that time showing the locations and dimensions of any signs.

10. Petitioner must obtain and satisfy the requirements of all licenses and permits, including but not limited to building permits and use and occupancy permits, necessary to occupy the special exception premises and operate the special exception as granted herein. Petitioner shall at all times ensure that the special exception use and premises comply with all applicable codes (including but not limited to building, life safety and handicapped accessibility requirements), regulations, directives and other governmental requirements.

11. If the Site Plan approved by the Planning Board at Site Plan Review differs materially from the Special Exception Site Plan (Exhibit 49(a) approved by the Board of Appeals, Petitioner must file the Site Plan with the Board of Appeals and request an administrative modification
of the Special Exception Site Plan to coincide with the Site Plan approved by the Planning Board.

On a motion by Caryn L. Hines, seconded by Wendell M. Holloway, with Angelo M. Caputo and Donna L. Barron, Vice-Chair in agreement, and Allison Ishihara Fultz, Chair Ishihara Fultz, Chair necessarily not participating, the Board adopted the following Resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Appeals for Montgomery County, Maryland that the opinion stated above is adopted as the Resolution required by law as its decision on the above-entitled petition.

Donna L. Barron
Vice-Chair, Montgomery County Board of Appeals

Entered in the Opinion Book
of the Board of Appeals for
Montgomery County, Maryland
this 28th day of April, 2006.

Katherine Freeman
Executive Director

NOTE:

Any request for rehearing or reconsideration must be filed within fifteen (15) days after the date the Opinion is mailed and entered in the Opinion Book (See Section 59-A-4.63 of the County Code). Please see the Board's Rules of Procedure for specific instructions for requesting reconsideration.

Any decision by the County Board of Appeals may, within thirty (30) days after the decision is rendered, be appealed by any person aggrieved by the decision of the Board and a party to the proceeding before it, to the Circuit Court for Montgomery County, in accordance with the Maryland Rules of Procedure.
into the parcel, as both are shown on the drawing attached to the July 1, 1991 Environmental Planning Division memorandum, shall be permitted and shall be accompanied by compensatory protection of an approximately equal area outside the stream buffer to be delineated by staff approval of a grading plan prior to building permit for the parcel so affected

3. Conditions of DEP stormwater management concept dated 4-8-91

4. Access and improvements as required to be approved by MCDOT

5. Necessary easements
MEMO TO: Michael Ma, Supervisor
Development Review Committee, MNCPPC

FROM: David Kuykendall
Senior Permitting Services Specialist
Water Resources Section, MCDPS

SUBJECT: Stormwater Management Concept Plan/100-Year Floodplain Review
Site Plan # 820060310, Montgomery Industrial Park
Project Plan #
Preliminary Plan # 1-97038, DPS File # 218278
Subdivision Review Meeting of April 10, 2006

The subject plan has been reviewed to determine if it meets the requirements of Executive Regulation 7-02AM for stormwater management and Executive Regulation 138-92 AM for a 100-year floodplain. The following summarizes our findings:

SM CONCEPT PLAN PROPOSED:
☒ On-site: ☑ CPv ☑ WQv ☑ Both
☐ CPv < 2cfs, not required
☒ On-site/Joint Use ☑ Central (Regional): waived to West Farm
☐ Existing ☑ Concept Approved May 27, 2005
☐ Waiver: ☑ CPv ☑ WQv ☑ Both
☐ Approved on
☐ Other

Type Proposed:
☐ Infiltration ☑ Retention ☑ Surface Detention ☑ Wetland ☑ Sand Filter
☐ Separator Sand Filter ☑ Non Structural Practices ☑ Other

FLOODPLAIN STATUS: 100 Year Floodplain On-Site ☑ Yes ☒ No ☐ Possibly
☐ Provide source of the 100 Year Floodplain Delineation for DPS approval:
☐ Source of the 100-Year Floodplain is acceptable.
☐ Submit drainage area map to determine if a floodplain study (> or equal to 30 acres) is required.
☐ Dam Breach Analysis: ☐ Approved ☐ Under Review:
☐ 100-Year Floodplain study: ☐ Approved ☐ Under Review:

SUBMISSION ADEQUACY COMMENTS:
☐ Provide verification of Downstream notification.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
☒ Approve ☐ as submitted ☑ with conditions (see approval letter)
☐ Incomplete; recommend not scheduling for Planning Board at this time.
☐ Hold for additional information. See below
☐ Comments/Recommendations:

cc: Steve Federline, Environmental Planning Division, MNCPPC

bII DRC site plan 03/01
DEPARTMENT OF PERMITTING SERVICES

May 27, 2005

Mr. Scott D. Roser
Macris, Hendricks & Glascock, P.A.
9220 Wightman Road, Suite 120
Montgomery Village, MD 20886-1279

Re: Stormwater Management CONCEPT Request for Baywood Hotel (Montgomery Industrial Park)
Preliminary Plan #: N/A
SM File #: 218278
Tract Size/Zone: 1.69 acres / I-1
Total Concept Area: 1.69 acres
Lots/Block: Lot 39
Parcel(s): Part of Parcel CCC West Farm Technology Park
Watershed: Paint Branch

Dear Mr. Roser:

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 consists of on-site channel protection measures via the existing West Farm Regional Pond; on-site water quality control via installation of a hydrodynamic water quality unit; and onsite recharge via direction of a portion of the roof runoff to recharge wells.

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

1. Prior to permanent vegetative stabilization, all disturbed areas must be topsoiled per the latest Montgomery County Standards and Specifications for Topsoiling.

2. A detailed review of the stormwater management computations will occur at the time of detailed plan review.

3. An engineered sediment control plan must be submitted for this development.

4. Bypass the roof runoff around the proposed water quality facility. Do not allow roof runoff to enter the storm drain system above the proposed water quality unit. Water quality for the roof runoff will be provided by our wet storage on the existing Regional Pond. This will provide more efficient treatment of the vehicular impervious areas on the subject property.

5. Recharge roof runoff directly. Do not use the-crossover/overflow-structure. Additional storm drain piping will likely be necessary.

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

Exhibit H
Payment of a stormwater management contribution in accordance with Section 2 of the Stormwater Management Regulation 4-90 is not required.

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 Mark Etheridge at 240-777-6338.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard R. Brush, Manager
Water Resources Section
Division of Land Development Services

cc: R. Weaver
    S. Federline
    SM File # 218278

ON -ON: Acres: 1.69
QL - ON: Acres: 1.69
Recharge is provided
Vic, Piera,

This location looks good for a future bus shelter installation by our ad shelter company. Thanks.

Jeff Dunckel
Manager - Passenger Facilities Unit
Division of Transit Services
Department of Public Works and Transportation
Montgomery County, Maryland
office: (240) 777-5826
fax: (240) 777-5801

-----Original Message-----
From: Bryant, Vic [mailto:vibrate@mhgpa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 17, 2006 3:41 PM
To: Dunckel, Jeff; Piera.Weiss@mnccpc-mc.org
Subject: westech Baywood Hotel Bus Stop

Jeff

Is this location Ok? Please let Piera and me know. Thanks.

Vic Bryant
V.P. of Planning and Land. Arch.

Macris, Hendricks and Glascock, PA
9220 Wightman Rd, Suite 120
Montgomery Village, MD 20886
p. 301.670.0840
f.301.948.0693
vbryant@mhgpa.com
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MAR
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND TR.
DEPARTMENT OF PERMITTING SERVICES

SIGHT DISTANCE EVALUATION

Facility/Subdivision Name: Montgomery Industrial Park
Street Name: Broad Birch Drive
Posting Speed Limit: 30 mph
Street/Driveway #1 (Proposed Driveway)
Sight Distance (feet) Right 350+ Left 380+

Street/Driveway #2 (Existing Driveway)
Sight Distance (feet) Right 350+ Left 350+

Comments:

GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification or Posted Speed (use higher value)</th>
<th>Required Sight Distance in Each Direction*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary - 25 mph</td>
<td>150'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary - 30</td>
<td>200'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business - 30</td>
<td>200'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary - 35</td>
<td>250'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial - (45)</td>
<td>325'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major - (55)</td>
<td>400'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>475'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>550'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: AASHTO

Sight distance is measured from an eye height of 3.5' at a point on the centerline of the driveway (or side street) 6' back from the face of curb or edge of traveled way of the intersecting roadway where a point 2.75' above the road surface is visible. (See attached drawing)

ENGINEER/ SURVEYOR CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this information is accurate and was collected in accordance with these guidelines.

[Signature]
Date: 5/17/06

PLS/P.E. MD Reg. No. 21774

Montgomery County Review:

- Approved

- Disapproved:

By: [Signature]
Date: 5/17/06

(Reformatted: March, 2000)
Weiss, Piera

From: Navid, Sarah [Sarah.Navid@montgomerycountymd.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 17, 2006 10:14 AM
To: Weiss, Piera
Cc: Bryant, Vic; Cheung, Joseph; Eapen, Cherian
Subject: Montgomery Industrial Park - Baywood Hotel - Site Plan 820060310

Piera,

We have reviewed the proposed site plan dated 5/16/2006 and concur with the plan with the following comments:

1) The lead sidewalks and ramp configurations at the two driveways should be similarly designed; MCDPS will provide specific details at permitting review.
2) The left turn maneuver from the drop-off area (Porte Cochere) area should be verified with a turning template; otherwise it can be signed for "Right Turn Only".
3) The sight distance along Broadbirch Drive from each driveway had been provided and approved (we will forward you the certification).

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding our comments.

Sarah Navid

Right-of-Way Permitting & Plan Review
Department of Permitting Services
tel. 240-777-6304
fax 240-777-6339
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Memo Required?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>04/10/06</td>
<td>Transportation Planner</td>
<td>Cherian Eapen</td>
<td>Ext</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Prior DRC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev. Rev. Planner</td>
<td>Plera Weiss</td>
<td>Ext</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Number(s)</td>
<td>820060310</td>
<td>Zone</td>
<td>I-1 / CHR Overlay Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Name</td>
<td>Montgomery Industrial Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name, Representative, or Attorney</td>
<td>Springwood Holding, LLC c/o Baywood Hotels, Inc. – Kurt Blorstad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Macris, Hedricks &amp; Glascock, P.A. – Paul Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Holland &amp; Knight – Patricia Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Area</td>
<td>Fairland/White Oak</td>
<td>Parcel or Lot Numbers</td>
<td>Lot 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Type</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size/Number of Units</td>
<td>104 rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Lots</td>
<td>1 to 1</td>
<td>Phasing</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSSC Map No(s)</td>
<td>215NE03 &amp; 216NE03</td>
<td>Tax Map No(s)</td>
<td>KQ 342 &amp; KQ 343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **ADEQUATE PUBLIC FACILITIES**

   **Existing Land Use/Occupied House(s)**

   Prior approval for Baywood Hotels As S-2656 On
   For Westtech Industrial Park As 1-97038 On
   For As On
   For As On

   a. **Policy Area Transportation Review** *Required to be tracked by County Council*

   If not a Rural Policy Area, remaining staging ceiling capacity negative? Jobs no HU's

   b. **Proposed traffic mitigation program:**

   Required/optional participation in TMO for Not in West Farm TMAg> Comment #1 I-3 Zone No!

   c. **Local Area Transportation Review**

   Traffic study required Done at Prel. Plan
   Traffic statement required No* Submitted on *07/14/05
   Traffic study/statement completion date Letter sent
   Submitted by STS-Nelson

   **Key Transportation Issues**

   1. Widen the existing 4-foot-wide sidewalk to the required 5 feet wide along Broadbirch Drive, and add an industrial roadway.

   2. Provide a handicapped ramp from the sidewalk in front of the main entrance to the proposed hotel.

   3. Coordinate with DPWT to place and provide a bus shelter along Broadbirch Drive.

   4. Provide 1 inverted-U bike rack at the main entrance and 4 bike lockers at the employee's entrance, instead of 5 bike racks.

5. **
II. RIGHT-OF-WAY DESIGNATION/USE

Roadway(s) | Broadbirch Drive
---|---
Functional Roadway designation | Industrial (I-9)
Required right-of-way | 80 feet

X Dedicated as shown on plan | 80 feet
Additional dedication for

X Designated bikeway as Class/Side of Road | PB-65, Class II

X Sidewalk | Existing 4 feet, Need 5 feet*

Rustic Road

---

Roadway(s)

Functional Roadway designation

Required right-of-way

Dedicated as shown on plan
Additional dedication for
Designated bikeway as Class/Side of Road
Sidewalk
Rustic Road

Provide roadway connection to
Provide sidewalk connection to
Abandonment needed for
Place in reservation for
Place in easement (transit/roadway) for

X Two lead-in sidewalks are provided from Broadbirch Drive

---

Sight distance adequate? | Yes | No
---|---|---
From | At Preliminary Plan Review
X
Transit service routes? | Ride-On | Metrobus | C-7 & Z-6 See Comment #2 | None
Broadbirch Drive
Transit service routes? | Ride-On | Metrobus | None

Transit service routes? | Ride-On | Metrobus | None

---

COMMENTS:
As an I-1 zoned property, Traffic Mitigation Agreement is not required associated with the existing West Farm Traffic Mitigation Agreements.

* Upgraded pedestrian facilities are needed due to the heavy pedestrian volumes generated to/from the nearby offices and by hotel guests to/from the nearby retail uses.
TO:  Piera Weiss  
Development Review Division

SUBJECT: Plan # 8-06031 , Name Montgomery Industrial Park  
DRC date: Monday, April 10, 2006

The above-referenced plan has been reviewed to determine if it meets requirements of the Guidelines for Environmental Management of Development in Montgomery County, and other county regulations that may apply. The following recommendations are made for the DRC meeting:

SUBMITTAL ADEQUACY
X Plan is complete. 

EPD RECOMMENDATIONS:
X Hold for the following Revisions/Additional Information before scheduling for Planning Board:

1. Show how the groundwater monitoring well on the site will be visible and accessible for the monitoring required by the Maryland Department of the Environment. (Will the monitoring well have a marked cap in the parking lot that will be visible?)

NOTE: The subject site is exempt from forest conservation plan requirements under the grandfathering provision. (Chapter 30A-5(k) for plans approved before 7/1/1991.

SIGNATURE: Candy Sunnag  
Environmental Planning Division  
DATE: 4/4/06

cc:  engineer/applicant

Reminder: Address your submissions/revisions to the Reviewer who completed the Comments sheet.  
Put the Plan numbers on your cover/transmittal sheets.

DRCPRinWord: rev 4/13/00
### WSSC Comments on Items for April 10, 2006
#### Development Review Committee Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Number</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Substantial Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 820060310   | Montgomery Industrial Park | **WATER AVAILABLE**<br>An existing 12-inch water main in Broadbirch Drive abuts the subject property. A connection can be made directly to this main to obtain water service.<br><br>**SUBMIT ON-SITE PLAN**<br>Submit on-site plans for installing new water lines greater than 2-inches (to the One-Stop-Shop). A professional engineer registered in Maryland must prepare plans. Plans must conform to W/S Design Standards.<br><br>**HYDRAULIC INFORMATION REQUIRED**<br>For commercial, industrial or public type buildings, to include apartment designs, fire sprinkler system hydraulic data, including estimated flow rate in gallons per minute and building top and lowest floor elevations, are required by WSSC.<br><br>**PUBLIC SEWER MAIN EXTENSION REQUIRED**<br>A public sewer extension in Broadbirch Drive is required to provide sewer service to this project. Accordingly, a system extension permit must be obtained from the Development Services Group.<br><br>**HYDRAULIC PLANNING ANALYSIS REQUIRED**<br>To begin the process of obtaining a system extension permit, a detailed hydraulic planning analysis must be performed. Submit hydraulic planning analysis request form, hydraulic modeling fee and 4 copies of 200' scale sketch for WSSC to perform modeling.<br><br>**COMPLETE ENVIRONMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE AND CONDUCT CONTAMINATION DATABASE SEARCH**<br>You must complete and submit an Environmental Questionnaire. A contamination database search, conducted pursuant to ASTM Standard E-1527, is also required under one of the following options:<br><ol><li>You may submit the database search conducted by a professional in good standing, and complete the enclosed Database Search Summary; or</li><li>You may request WSSC to conduct the database search at least 30 days prior to the submission of the Review for System Integrity Package and submit a Database Search Fee, currently $100.00. A
Database Search Request Form is enclosed for your convenience; or

3. You may submit a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) report conducted in accordance with ASTM Standard E-1527 by a professional in good standing.

You are encouraged to provide this information as early as possible, but it must be submitted no later than with the design package for review purposes. WSSC reserves the right to require additional investigations. At your request, WSSC may provide conditional approval of your design prior to complete resolution of contamination concerns if you accept any and all risks associated with such conditional approval. In all cases, release for service will not be issued until all contamination impacts are completely resolved.
1. PLAN APPROVED.

   a. Review based only upon information contained on the plan submitted on 5-29-06. Review and approval does not cover unsatisfactory installation resulting from errors, omissions, or failure to clearly indicate conditions on this plan.

   b. Correction of unsatisfactory installation will be required upon inspection and service of notice of violation to a party responsible for the property.

cc: Department of Permitting Services
b. Recommendation: Designate all radii of all turns on fire department access roads in opaque green.

4. FD Access Roads connecting to roadways shall be provided with curb cuts extending at least 0.6 m (2 ft) beyond each edge of the fire lane.

5. The angle of approach and departure for any means of access shall not exceed 8 degrees.

6. Provide locations of Fire Hydrants and Key for Symbol.

7. PLAN NOT APPROVED. RESUBMIT PLAN THAT INCORPORATES COMMENTS 1-6.

Problems- 1) Show turning radius @ entrance.

2) Confirm that the building will be fully sprinklered.

3) Confirm 13'6" vertical clearance @ entrance.
May 25, 2006

Mr. Derick P. Berlage, Chairman
Montgomery County Planning Board
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Re: Waiver of Perimeter Landscape Area
Baywood Hotel, Site Plan 8-06031

Dear Chairman Berlage and Members of the Board:

On behalf of the applicant, Baywood Hotels, we request Planning Board approval of a waiver for the above mentioned project. The waiver would be for the perimeter landscape area for a parking facility adjoining property other than a public right-of-way (Zoning Ordinance Section 59-E-2.72).

The subject Site Plan provides a perimeter landscape strip of 4 feet in width as required by Section 59-E-2.72 of the Zoning Ordinance. However, there is an additional requirement that this strip be planted with a minimum of one shade tree for every 40 feet of lot perimeter. This requirement applies to a 153 foot portion of the 227 foot long eastern property line. Due to the grade difference between our site and the adjacent property and an existing wetland buffer that straddles the common property line, a retaining wall is required in this area. Unfortunately, the retaining wall precludes the Applicant from planting shade trees in close proximity to the wall. While the Applicant is providing the equivalent of one shade tree for every 40 feet (i.e. the 153 foot long portion of the eastern property line requires 4 trees and the applicant is providing 4 trees), the existence of the retaining wall prevents the trees from being located 40 feet on center. Instead, the Applicant proposes that one tree be planted at either end of the subject row of parking and two additional trees be planted between the wetland buffer and the dumpster area further to the south.

While the proposed Site Plan does not strictly comply with the perimeter landscaping requirement, the surrounding existing conditions mitigate the need for this requirement. More specifically, the wetlands and wetlands buffer itself is vegetated and provides additional screening. Similarly, the embankment of a stormwater management pond located on the
adjacent property also further screens the parking facility. In addition, the retaining wall itself acts to screen parked cars from the adjacent property. Given the difficulty in meeting the specific requirements of the perimeter landscaping provision, and the fact that the proposal mitigates the need for the landscaping, we respectfully request your approval of the waiver.

Thank you for your attention to this request. If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to call.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul Newman
Principal