Attachment A Overall Preliminary Plan



CHECKED: P

www.solteszco.com

SIGNED:

TECHNICIAN: AH

OVERALL PRELIMINARY PLAN

	0 100	200	I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THESE DOCUMENTS WERE PREPARED OR APPROVED BY ME, AND THAT I AM A DULY LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND, LICENSE NO. 11194, EXPIRATION DATE: 11-21-2016	
	tax map HS52	zoning category: R-200 / TDR-7	OF MAAL NICHAEL CHAEL	
	wssc 200' sheet 221NW03 221NW04	XXXX:	× + 11 PROVIDE A AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND A	
ł	SITE DATUM HORIZONTAL: VERTICAL:	XXXX:	SONAL ENGLISH	

IVI	ΛΤΤΛΛΙΝ	
		1
		_
		2
		3
		4
		_
		5
		6
		_
		7
		8
		9
	I HEREBY CERTIFY, TO THE BEST OF MY PROFE AND BELIEF, THAT THE PLAN SHOWN HEREON COI SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS AS ADOPTED OCTOBE	ESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, INFORMATION NFORMS WITH THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY R 1961 AND AS AMENDED THEREAFTER.
	SIGNATURE: PRINTED NAME: <u>Thomas Chicca</u> MD. REG. NO. <u>11194</u>	DATE: TITLE: <u>Senior Vice President</u> 1(
PRELIMINARY PLAN 12	20170060	<u> 1" </u>
οπαυγυκύ 3 LA		sheet <u>4</u> of <u>13</u>
OLNEY (8TH) ELECTION DISTRICT, MONTGOMERY CO	DUNTY, MARYLAND	project no. 1454-05-02
4540502\DDEL\Drol Dion\07 DDEL 120170060 004 obt Socio- 100 00	100 ft / in User= klauretti Pl Tdrv= PDF Grev, 150 pltcfa Penth	- TEXT SUB the 11/14/2016 7 10 14 DM

Attachment B

Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan

DEPARTMENT US	E ONLY (E-PLAN	S)					
		FOREST			ORKSHEET		
			Bradfo	rd Landing			
NET TRACT A	REA:						August 2
A. Total tract	area						2
B. Land dedic	ation acres (pa	rks, coun	ty facility,	etc.)			
C. Land dedic	ation for roads	or utilities	s (not being	g constructe	ed by this pla	n)	
D. Area to rer	main in commer	cial agric	ultural proc	duction/use			
E. Offsite Dist	turbance (offsite	e area out	side LOD f	for Greenbri	ar at Norbecl	k Crossin	
F. Net Tract A	Area					=	3
		T	T / / A	A			
LAND USE CA	Input the num	n <i>Trees I</i> nher "1" i	nder the a	<i>llanual</i>) ppropriate l	and use		
	limit to only o	one entry.		ppropriate i	anu use,		
	ARA	MDR	IDA	HDR	MPD	CIA	
	0	0	0	1	0	0	
G Afforestatio	on Threshold				15%	x F =	
H. Conservati	on Threshold				20%	x F =	
EXISTING FOR	REST COVER:						
L Existing for	est cover					=	
J. Area of fore	est above affores	station th	reshold			=	
K. Area of fore	est above conse	ervation th	nreshold			=	
BREAK EVEN	I POINT:						
L Forest rete	ntion above thre	eshold wit	h no mitia:	ation		=	
M. Clearing p	ermitted withou	t mitigatio	on			=	
		tinigatio					
PROPOSED F	OREST CLEA	RING:					
N. Total area	of forest to be o					=	
O. Total area	of lorest to be r	etained				=	
PLANTING RE	QUIREMENTS	:					
P. Reforestati	on for clearing	above cor	nservation t	hreshold		=	
Q. Reforestat	ion for clearing	below cor	nservation t	th reshold		=	
R. Credit for r	etention above	conservat	ion thresho	old		=	
S. Total refore	estation required	k				=	
T. Total affore	station required					=	
U. Credit for la	andscaping (ma	ay not exc	ceed 20% o	of "S")		=	
V. Total refore	estation and affo	prestation	required			=	
W Total refor	estation and aff	orestation	n provided (on-site		=	

AFFORESTATION AREAS		
AREA 'A'	2.09 AC.	
AREA 'B'	2.60 AC.	
TOTAL	4.69 AC.	

GENERAL NOTES:

- THE EXISTING ZONE IS R-200 / TDR-7.
- 2. BOUNDARY INFORMATION IS FROM A SURVEY PREPARED BY SOLTESZ, INC.
- THE PROJECT LIES WITHIN THE OLNEY MASTER PLAN.
- THIS SITE LIES WITHIN THE NORTHWEST BRANCH BACHELOR'S RUN WATERSHED. THIS AREA IS NOT A SPECIAL PROTECTION AREA.
- PEPCO, BELL ATLANTIC, MD., INC., WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO. OF MD., THE CITY OF ROCKVILLE, WASHINGTON SUBURBAN SANITARY COMMISSION AND CABLE TV MONTGOMERY ARE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMPANIES THAT WILL PROVIDE SERVICE TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT.
- THE PROPOSED LAYOUT, PARKING, DRIVEWAYS, BUILDINGS AND UTILITIES ARE APPROXIMATE AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
- NO FLOODPLAIN EXISTS ON SITE.
- THERE ARE NO DESIGNATED HISTORIC SITES ASSOCIATED WITH THESE PARCELS.
- THERE ARE NO KNOWN RARE, THREATENED, OR ENDANGERED SPECIES OCCURING ON THIS PROPERTY.
- 10. EXISTING WATER AND SEWER SERVICE CATEGORIES: W-1/S-1, W-3/S-3, W-6/S-3, AND W-6/S-6. A CATEGORY CHANGE REQUEST HAS BEEN SUBMITTED TO BRING ALL CATEGORY 6 LEVELS OF SERVICE TO LEVEL 3.
- 11. PORTIONS OF NORBECK AVENUE AND BRADFORD ROAD WILL BE ABANDONED.
- 12. A COMBINATION OF SUPER SILT FENCE AND TREE PROTECTION FENCE CAN ONLY OCCUR WITH THE APPROVALS OF BOTH THE M-NCPPC FOREST CONSERVATION INSPECTOR AND THE DPS SEDIMENT CONTROL INSPECTOR.

awing document was p	SOL	TESZ	Rockville Lanham Waldorf Leonardtown Frederick			
al of this dra	Engineering	ROCKVILLE OFFICE 2 Research Place, Suite 100	Soltesz DC, LLC	1	RESUBMISSION TO MNCPPC	
e origina	Surveying Planning Environmental Sciences	Rockville, MD 20850	www.solteszco.com	NO. DATE:	AUG 2016	REVISIONS CAD STANDARDS VERSION: V8 - 2000
Th€		1.301.340.2730 1.301.340.3007	www.soi(cs200.0011	DESIGN	ED:	TECHNICIAN: AH

120170060





MISS UTILITY NOTE

INFORMATION CONCERNING EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES WAS OBTAINED FROM AVAILABLE RECORDS, THE CONTRACTOR MUST DETERMINE THE EXACT LOCATION AND ELEVATION OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES AND UTILITY CROSSINGS BY DIGGING TEST PITS BY HAND, WELL IN ADVANCE OF THE START OF EXCAVATIO CONTACT "MISS UTILITY" AT 1-800-257-7777, 48 HOURS PRIOR TC THE START OF EXCAVATION. IF CLEARANCES ARE LESS THAN SHOWN ON THIS PLAN OR TWELVE (12) INCHES, WHICHEVER IS LESS, CONTACT THE ENGINEER AND THE UTILITY COMPANY BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH CONSTRUCTION. CLEARANCES LESS

OWNER/DEVELOPER/APPLICANT

BROOKFIELD WASHINGTON, LLC 3201 JERMANTOWN ROAD, SUITE 150 FAIRFAX, VA 22030 301-438-2211 CONTACT: CRAIG KAZANJIAN

COVER SHEET

PRELIMINARY FOREST CONSERVATION **BRADFORD'S LANDING**

OLNEY (8TH) ELECTION DISTRICT, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

Q:\14540502\ENGINEER\ENV\FCP\10-FCP-120170060-001.sht Scale= 100.0000 ft / in. User= klauretti

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THESE DOCUMENTS WERE PREPARED OR APPROVED BY ME, AND THAT I AM A D LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LA OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND, LICENSE NO. 11194 , EXPIRATION DATE: 10-15
PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION

ΤΑΧ ΜΑΡ	ZONING CATEGORY:
HS52	R-200 / TDR-7
wssc 200' sheet 221NW03 221NW04	XXXX:
SITE DATUM	XXXX:

HORIZONTAL:

VERTICAL:



Ν		0	_
		TROTTERS GLEN GOLF COURSE	
References and a second			
Norbec	AL WASHINGTON CHRISTIAN ACADEMY		1
		AST REPORT	
		NORBECK	
	LA FREEMALA		
	BARNINGHAM CT -BLACKWATER CT		
88 88 88 77 89 8 8 8 77 89 7		Y MAP	2
		-2000	
n Data Tabla			
n Data Table			
4			
5			3
2			
3			
R ARA, MDR. IDA	HDR, MDP	or CIA.	
0 percent	.,		
5 percent			4
Average Buf	fer 3		
Width (ft.)	125		
Cleared		Planted	
1	-	-	
9	-	-	
9	-	-	5
developmentappl	ication.		
<u>document.</u>			
540502\DOCS\ENV\FS	D_FCP\16-08	308 FC_Data_Table.xls	
EAM BEGIN EAM EPHEMERAL STREAM	WATERS O (Juriediction as lat	F THE US	6
	100 YEAR F	FLOODPLAIN LIMITS	
	NON-TIDAL	WETLANDS BOUNDARY	
	FOREST RE	ETENTION	_
////////	FOREST CL	EARED	
	REFOREST	ATION AREA IS NOT SPECIFIED)	
€ 	TEMP. FOR PERM. FOR ROOT PRU	REST CONSERVATION SIGN REST CONSERVATION SIGN	7
\odot	EXISTING 1		
	TREE SAV (Offset for Clarity SUDED SU		
	(Offset for Clarity SILT FENC (Offset for Clarity		
530	LIMITS OF EXISTING PROPOSE	DISTURBANCE CONTOURS D CONTOURS	
	PROPERT	Y BOUNDARY NT AND SPECIMEN TREE	0
	WITH CRIT (Shown Respectiv	ICAL ROOT ZONE	ď
	SIGNIFICAN TO BE REN (Shown Respective	NT AND SPECIMEN TREE	
	EXISTING		
	PROPOSE	CANOPY EDGE	
xxx	NOISE FEI	NCE	9
		J	
ne Undersigned agrees to e conservation Plan No. <u>120</u> rest planting, maintenance	execute all the f	features of the Approved Final Forest including, financial bonding, applicable agreements.	
eveloper's Name: BROC	OKFIELD WASHING	STON, LLC	
Printer ontact Person or Owner: <u>NEIL I</u>	PATEL		
Printed	JERMANTOWN RC	DAD, SUITE 150, FAIRFAX, VA, 22030	
none and Email: <u>703-2</u>	70-1400 NEIL.PAT	EL@BROOKFIELDHOMES.COM	10
gnature:			
N PLAN		<u> </u>	
6		SHEET1	
		OF 5	
		PROJECT NO.	
PLTdrv= PDF_Grey_150.	pltcfg Pentbl= T	TEXT_SUB.tbl 11/11/2016 1:50:47 PM	

Attachment C Reviewing Agency Approvals



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Isiah Leggett County Executive Al R. Roshdieh Director

November 23, 2016

Ms. Sandra Pereira, Planner Coordinator Area 3 Planning Division The Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission 8787 Georgia Avenue Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-3760

RE: Preliminary Plan # 120170060 Bradford's Landing AMENDMENT LETTER

Dear Ms. Pereira:

In response to subsequent coordination and agreements with the applicants' civil engineers and land planners, this letter is to AMEND several comments contained in the November 14, 2016 preliminary plan review comments letter for this project.

We recommend approval of the plan based on the comments in our previous letter, as modified below:

- 1. All comments in our November 14, 2016 letter remain applicable unless modified by these comments.
- 2. Letter page 3, Design Exception request #2 ("Modification to Tertiary Residential Road Public 50' right-of-way Standard MC-2001.02"):
 - o Delete comment "b" and replace that statement to read:

"On-street parking will NOT be allowed if the pavement width is less than twenty eight (28) feet wide, curb-to-curb."

o Delete comment "c" and replace those statements with:

"The proposed five (5) foot wide concrete sidewalk will be allowed in the areas where the proposed sidewalk is immediately adjacent to the street curbs and on-street parking along Clara Downey Avenue and Bradford Road (plan sheets 7 and 8 of 13). In those areas where there will be no designated on-street parking, the sidewalk should be set back behind a four (4) foot wide lawn panel planted with minor species street trees. In these areas, it may be necessary to grant a two (2) foot wide Public Improvements Easement (if increasing the right-of-way is not feasible).

o delete comment "d" and replace those statements with:

Office of the Director

101 Monroe Street, 10th Floor • Rockville, Maryland 20850 • 240-777-7170 • 240-777-7178 FAX www.montgomerycountymd.gov/dot Located one block west of the Rockville Metro Station



Ms. Sandra Pereira Preliminary Plan #120170060 – AMENDMENT LETTER November 23, 2016 Page 2

"On Clara Downey Avenue between Bradford Road and Public Road "A" (reference plan sheet 7 of 13), provide a five (5) foot wide concrete sidewalk on the north side of the road and an eight (8) foot wide shared use path on the south side of the road as follows:

- North side between Bradford Road and Proposed Alley "C" and between Proposed Alley "D" and Public Road "A:" Since there will not be any designated on-street parking in these areas, locate the sidewalk behind a four (4) foot lawn panel populated by minor species street trees.
- North side between Proposed Alley "C" and Proposed Alley "D:" The sidewalk will be allowed to be adjacent to the street curbs and the proposed four (4) on-street parking spaces.
- South side between Bradford Road and Public Road "A:" Provide a four (4) foot lawn panel populated by minor species street trees and an eight (8) foot wide shared use path. Grant a two (2) foot wide Public Improvements Easement behind the proposed right-of-way line within these limits for the construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of the shared use path.

On Proposed Public Road "B" between Bradford Road and approximately centerline station 19+63 (reference plan sheet 11 of 13), widen the proposed shared use path to ten (10) feet from the face of curb and grant a two (2) foot wide Public Improvements Easement behind the proposed right-of-way line for the construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of the shared use path."

3. We defer to the Planning Department as to when these changes need to be incorporated on the preliminary plan, so long as the Design Exceptions conditions discussed in our November 14th letter and this letter are reflected on the Certified Preliminary Plan.

Thank for your cooperation and assistance regarding these modifications. If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact me at your earliest opportunity.

Sincerely,

miled

Gregory M. Leck, Manager Development Review Office of Transportation Policy

M:/corres/FY17/Traffic/Active/120170060, Bradford's Landing, 112316 MCDOT AMENDMENT ltr.doc

MCDOT OTP

CC:	Neil Patel	Brookfield Washington, LLC
	Phil Isaja	Soltesz Associates
	Lori Walter	Soltesz Associates
	Robert Harris	Lerch, Early & Brewer, Chartered
	Cynthia Bar	Lerch, Early & Brewer, Chartered
	Ed Axler	M-NCPPC Area 3
cc-e:	Atiq Panjshiri	MCDPS RWPR
	Sam Farhadi	MCDPS RWPR
	Marie LaBaw	MCDPS LDS
	Khursheed Bilgrami	MCDOT DTEO
	Patricia Shepherd	MCDOT DTE

Deepak Somarajan



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Isiah Leggett County Executive Al R. Roshdieh Director

November 14, 2016

Ms. Sandra Pereira, Planner Coordinator Area 3 Planning Division The Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission 8787 Georgia Avenue Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-3760

Dear Ms. Pereira:

RE: Preliminary Plan # 120170060 Bradford's Landing

We have completed our review of the revised Preliminary Plan dated October 18, 2016. An earlier version of this plan was reviewed by the Development Review Committee at its meeting on September 19, 2016. 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.

DESIGN EXCEPTION PACKAGE COMMENTS:

We had completed our review of Design Exception request dated October 18, 2016:

- 1. **Modifications to Standard Tertiary Residential Road (MC-2001.01):** The applicant requested following three (3) modifications to the standard MC-2001.01:
 - a. Include 8' hiker/biker trail on the east side of the road and standard five (5) foot sidewalk to the west side of the road. The grass strip on the west side of the road is a non-standard width (5.71') due to the location of the existing right-of-way line that was dedicated by Norbeck Overlook. Bradford Road – Station 2+89.14 to Station 3+90.14.

Office of the Director

Ms. Sandra Pereira Preliminary Plan # 120170060 November 14, 2016 Page 2

- b. Include an 8' hiker/biker trail on the east side of the road and a standard 5' sidewalk on the west side of the road. The grass strip is the standard 5' wide on the west side of the road. Bradford Road – Station 4+40.14 to Station 8+52.14.
- Add sidewalk to both sides of the road: Public Road 'B' Station 13+77.00 to Station 16+86.59

MCDOT Responses: In consideration of a request from the Planning Department, to achieve the Bikeway Master Plan vision to promote pedestrian and bicycle connectivity throughout the site, and in consideration of several existing right-of-way constraints, MCDOT <u>approves</u> to the proposed modifications to Tertiary Residential street standard (MD-2001.01) as follows:

- a. The shared use path should be moved to create a four (4) foot wide curb and lawn panel, in which minor species street trees are to be planted. The rear edge of the shared use path should be located coincident with the outside right-of-way line. A two (2) foot minimum width Public Improvements Easement (to allow for construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of the shared use path) is to be granted on the record plat.
- b. On-street parking will NOT be allowed if the pavement width is less than twenty-eight (28) feet wide.
- c. These modifications (to the plan views and typical sections) should be reflected on the Certified Preliminary Plan.
- d. THESE MODIFICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED TO SET A PRECEDENT.
- Modification to Tertiary Residential Road Public 50' right-of-way Standard MC-2001.02: The applicant requested following five (5) modifications to the standard MC-2001.02
 - a. Change the sidewalk to an 8' hiker/biker path on the north side of the road and change the width of the grass panel on the south side to 5': Clara Downey Avenue Station 18+04.42 to Station 19+20.05 and Station 20+29.94 to Station 21+46.27.
 - b. Add a lane for parallel parking spaces with a 5' sidewalk adjacent to the parking on the north side of the road. Change the width of the grasbs panel behind the curb to 5' on the south side of the road: Clara Downey Avenue Station 15+69.71 to Station 17+23.47.
 - c. Add a lane for parallel parking spaces and an 8' hiker/biker path adjacent to the parking on the north side of the road. Change the width of the grass panel behind the curb to 5' on the south side of the road: Clara Downey Avenue Station 19+31.29 to Station 20+18.69 and Public Road 'A' Station 17+37.33 to Station 19+75.82.

Ms. Sandra Pereira Preliminary Plan # 120170060 November 14, 2016 Page 3

- d. Add a lane for parallel parking spaces on the west side and an 8' hiker/biker path on the east side of the road. Change the width of the grass panel on the west side to 3' and to 2' on the east side of the road: Bradford Road Station 0+68.53 to Station 2+89.14.
- e. Change the sidewalk to an 8' hiker/biker path on the north side of the road and the grass panel to 5' on the south side of the road: Public Road 'A' Station 16+86.59 to Station 17+37.33 and Station 19+75.82 to Station 19+91.63.

MCDOT Responses: In consideration of a request from the Planning Department, to achieve the Bikeway Master Plan vision to promote pedestrian and bicycle connectivity throughout the site, and provide on-street parking – particularly adjacent to the proposed local park - MCDOT *approves* to the modification to Tertiary Residential Street design standard (MC-2001.02) as follows:

- a. The shared use path should be moved to create a four (4) foot wide curb and lawn panel, in which minor species street trees are to be planted. The rear edge of the shared use path should be located coincident with the outside right-of-way line. A two (2) foot minimum width Public Improvements Easement (to allow for the construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of the shared use path) is to be granted on the record plat.
- b. On-street parking will NOT be allowed if the pavement width is less than twenty-nine and one-half (29.5) feet wide.
- c. In the area with on-street parking, the five (5) foot wide concrete sidewalk should be moved to create a four (4) foot wide curb and lawn panel, in which minor species street trees are to be planted. The rear edge of the shared use path should be located coincident with the outside right-of-way line. A two (2) foot minimum width Public Improvements Easement (to allow for construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of the sidewalk) is to be granted on the record plat.
- d. On Clara Downey Road and proposed Public Road 'B,' we do not favor locating the proposed eight (8) foot shared use path immediately adjacent to the curb and on-street parked vehicles. If it is not feasible to increase the right-of-way (or grant a sufficient width Public Improvements Easement) and move the shared use path away from the parked cars (to create a four (4) foot wide lawn panel planted with minor species street trees), the proposed on-street parking should be eliminated.
- e. These modifications (to the plan views and typical sections) should be reflected on the Certified Preliminary Plan.
- f. THESE MODIFICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED TO SET A PRECEDENT.

Ms. Sandra Pereira Preliminary Plan # 120170060 November 14, 2016 Page 4

- 3. **Modifications to standard Secondary Residential Street (MC-2002.02):** The applicant requested following two (2) modifications to the standard MC-2002.02:
 - a. Change the sidewalk to an 8' hiker/biker trail on the west side of the road and a standard 5' sidewalk on the east side of the road. The grass strip on the west side of the road is 5' wide. Public Road 'A' Station 29+22.93 to Station 30+98.85.
 - b. Remove the designated parking from the west side of the road and provide a 16'-6" grass panel instead. Public Road 'A' Station 21+39.72 to Station 22+94.47

Response: MCDOT *approves* the proposed modifications to standard Secondary Residential Street (MC-2002.02) based on the design exception package and shown on the plans.

- Modifications to Primary/Principal Secondary Residential Street (MC-2003.11): The applicant requested following modifications to the standard MC-2003.11:
 - a. Widen the pavement to thirty six (36) feet to accommodate two outbound and one inbound travel lanes.

Response: MCDOT <u>approves</u> the proposed modifications to Primary/Principal Secondary Residential Street (MC-2003.11) based on the design exception package and as shown on the plans, subject to approval of the intersection design by the Maryland State Highway Administration (MSHA).

- 5. Modification of Truncation at corner lots: The applicant submitted modification to Montgomery County Code Section 50-26 (c) (3) – The corner lots at an intersection must be truncated by straight lines joining points 25 feet back from the theoretical property line intersection in each quadrant. In any case where more or less width is needed for safe sight distance or traffic channelization, the Board may specify a greater or lesser cut-off than otherwise required. Any alley intersection or abrupt change in alignment in a block must have the corners cut off and widened sufficiently for safe vehicular turning at the following locations:
 - a. Public Street 'A' and Clara Downey Avenue.
 - b. Clara Downey Avenue and Bradford Road.
 - c. Bradford Road and Doc Berlin Drive.
 - d. Doc Berlin Drive and Public Street 'A'
 - e. Private Road 'A' and Public Street 'A'

Response: MCDOT <u>does not object</u> the curved truncation instead of the straight line. The Planning Board will need to make a finding of the proposed right-of-way will be adequate for vehicle turning movements per section 50-26(e.3) of the County Code.

Ms. Sandra Pereira Preliminary Plan # 120170060 November 14, 2016 Page 5

- Modifications to Tertiary Residential Street public right-of-way Standard (MC-2001.02) and 44' right-of-way Standard (MC-2001.01): The applicant requested the following two (2) modifications to the standards MC-2001.01 and MC-2001.01:
 - a. Super elevated roadway and the lane widths vary from 14' to 10'. The sidewalk is adjacent to the right-of-way and the grass panels vary in width from 6' to 10'. Public Road 'A' Station 8+50 to station 11+10.00.
 - b. The right-of-way transitions from 50' to 44'. The roadway is super elevated and there is sidewalk on both sides of the road. The grass panel widths vary from 5' to 8'. Public Road 'A' Station 11+10.00 to Station 12+67.08.

MCDOT Response: MCDOT <u>approves</u> to the modification to Tertiary Residential Street public right-of-way Standard (MC-2001.02) and 44' right-of-way Standard (MC-2001.01), through the horizontal curve, to continue the existing cross-slope of Coolidge Avenue and minimize impact on existing nearby residential development.

7. **Proposed grates in the sidewalk:** The applicant submitted a request to provide storm drain grates in the sidewalk in order to meet stormwater management requirements.

MCDOT Response: MCDOT <u>does not object</u> the request to provide storm drain grates in the sidewalk. Since the proposed grates are non-standard features, the applicant will need to execute and record a Maintenance and Liability Agreement to allow their installation within the public right-of-way prior to issuance of the right-of-way construction permit. A deed reference for this document is to be provide on the record plat.

8. Modifications to Secondary Residential Street without On-Street Parking (MC-2002.01): The Design Exception package did not request approval to modify our design standard for a Secondary Residential Street (No Designated Parking) to reduce the standard pavement width from twenty six (26) feet to the proposed twenty one and one-half (21.5) feet on Proposed Public Road 'A.' This modification applies to areas of that street without dedicated on-street parking.

MCDOT Response: MCDOT *approves* the proposed reduced pavement width. The proposed modification ties into the areas of proposed on-street parking better with the standard cross-section and provides a traffic calming benefit at the proposed intersections.

Ms. Sandra Pereira Preliminary Plan # 120170060 November 14, 2016 Page 6

PRELIMINARY PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS:

- Necessary dedication for Norbeck Road (MD 28) is required in accordance with the Master Plan. Full width dedication and construction of interior streets.
- 10. Grant necessary slope and drainage easements. Slope easements are to be determined by study or set at the building restriction line.
- 11. Access and improvements along Norbeck Road (MD 28) as required by the MSHA. We defer to the MSHA for the comments regarding state maintained storm drain system along Norbeck Road (MD 28). We also support having the applicant construct a shared use path across their Norbeck Road (MD 28) site frontage and recommend this path be extended to connect with the existing path west of the site.
- 12. Grade establishments for all new public streets and/or pedestrian paths must be approved prior to submission of the record plat.
- 13. Planning Board approval of the preliminary plan with respect to the abandonment petition of existing improved rights-of-way is subject to formal approval by the Montgomery County Council. Applicant must satisfy any Council-mandated conditions of abandonment approval prior to platting the abandoned area.
- 14. We have accepted consultant's storm drain capacity and impact analysis (dated October 21st, 2016). As a result, we are not calling for any improvements to the existing downstream County-maintained storm drain system by this applicant.
- 15. We accept the consultant's conceptual Sight Distances approximations for visibility from the driveways for proposed Lots 17E and 38D on Public Road 'A.'
- 16. The Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was previously reviewed by MCDOT per letter dated June 9, 2016. Based on the reduced traffic projections proposed in the recently revised TIS, we have no further comments. We defer approval of the new document to the MSHA and the Planning Board.
- 17. Private common driveways, alleys, and private streets shall be determined through the subdivision process as part of the Planning Board's approval of a preliminary plan. The composition, typical section, horizontal alignment, profile, drainage characteristics and maintenance and liability of private common driveways, alleys, and private streets, beyond the public right-of-way, shall be approved by the Planning Board during their review of the preliminary plan.

Ms. Sandra Pereira Preliminary Plan # 120170060 November 14, 2016 Page 7

- 18. The owner will be required to submit a recorded covenant for the operation and maintenance of private streets, 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.
- 19. Relocation of utilities along existing roads to accommodate the required roadway improvements shall be the responsibility of the applicant.
- 20. The site is located within the Olney Master Plan area. This policy area is inadequate from transit test and is considered adequate under the roadway test. Therefore; TPAR mitigation fees of 25% of the Transportation Impact Tax is required for this development.
- 21. 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.
- 22. At or before the permit stage, please coordinate with Ms. Stacy Coletta of our Division of Transit Services to coordinate improvements to the RideOn bus facilities in the vicinity of this project. Ms. Coletta may be contacted at 240 777-5800.
- 23. If the proposed development will alter or impact any existing County maintained transportation system management component (i.e., traffic signals, signal poles, handboxes, surveillance cameras, etc.) or communication component (i.e., traffic signal interconnect, fiber optic lines, etc.), please contact Mr. Kamal Hamud of our Transportation Systems Engineering Team at (240) 777-2190 for proper executing procedures. All costs associated with such relocations shall be the responsibility of the applicant.
- 24. Permit and bond will be required as a prerequisite to DPS approval of the record plat. The permit will include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following improvements:
 - a. Street grading, paving, curbs and gutters, sidewalks and handicap ramps, storm drainage and appurtenances, and street trees along Public Roads 'A' and 'B,' Bradford Road, Clara Downey Avenue, Doc Berlin Drive, and Coolidge Avenue site frontages:
 - Proposed Public Road A: Construct modified closed section Primary/Principal Secondary Residential Street between Norbeck Road (MD 28) and Clara Downey Avenue as shown on the plans and addressed in the Design Exceptions of this letter.

Ms. Sandra Pereira Preliminary Plan # 120170060 November 14, 2016 Page 8

> Construct modified closed section Secondary Residential Road section between Clara Downey Avenue and Public Road 'B' as shown on the plans and addressed in the Design Exceptions of this letter.

 Bradford Road: Construct modified closed section Tertiary Residential Road section Clara Downey Avenue and Public Road 'B' as shown on the plans and addressed in the Design Exceptions of this letter.

Improvements to the section of Bradford Road between Clara Downey Avenue and Norbeck Road (MD 28) are dependent on the outcome of the County Council abandonment hearing.

 Clara Downey Avenue: Construct modified closed section Tertiary Residential Road section between Bradford Road and Public Road 'A' as shown on the plans and addressed in the Design Exceptions of this letter.

 Doc Berlin Drive: Construct modified closed section Tertiary Residential Road section between Bradford Road and Public Road 'A' as shown on the plans and addressed in the Design Exceptions of this letter.

 Proposed Public Road B: Construct modified closed section Tertiary Residential Road section between Coolidge Avenue/Summer House Street as shown on the plans and discussed in the Design Exceptions of this letter, transitioning to secondary road sections on Coolidge Avenue and Public Road 'A.'

- Enclosed storm drainage and/or engineered channel (in accordance with the MCDOT Storm Drain Design Criteria) within the County rights-of-way and all drainage easements.
- c. Permanent monuments and property line markers, as required by Section 50-24(e) of the Subdivision Regulations.
- d. Erosion and sediment control measures as required by Section 50-35(j) and on-site stormwater management where applicable shall be provided by the Developer (at no cost to the County) at such locations deemed necessary by 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.

Ms. Sandra Pereira Preliminary Plan # 120170060 November 14, 2016 Page 9

- e. Developer shall ensure final and proper completion and installation of all utility lines underground, for all new road construction.
- 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 this preliminary plan. If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact me at <u>gregory.leck@montgomerycountymd.gov</u> or (240) 777-7170.

Sincerely,

mulul

Gregory M. Leck, Manager Development Review Team Office of Transportation Policy

Cc:	Neil Patel	Brookfield Washington, LLC		
	Robert Harris	Lerch, Early & Brewer, Chartered		
	Cynthia Bar	Lerch, Early & Brewer, Chartered		
	James A. Soltesz	Soltesz Associates		
	Phil Isaja	Soltesz Associates		
	Michael Lenhart	Lenhart Traffic Consulting, Inc		
	Kwesi Woodroffe	MSHA District 3		
	Kipling Reynolds	M-NCPPC Area 3		
	Richard Weaver	M-NCPPC Area 3		
	Edward Axler	M-NCPPC Area 3		
	Preliminary Plan fold	er		
	Preliminary Plan lette	ers notebook		
cc-e:	Atiq Panjshiri	MCDPS RWPR		
	Mark Etheridge	MCDPS WRM		
	Sam Farhadi	MCDPS RWPR		
	Marie LaBaw	MCDPS LDS		
	Kursheed Bilgrami	MCDOT DTEO		
	Kamal Hamud	MCDOT DTEO		

Kyle Hanley

Patricia Shepherd

Deepak Somarajan

M:\Subdivision\DewaniA\120170060 Bradfords Landing\Letter\120170060 Bradford's Landing - 111416 DOT prelim plan review comments ltr.docx

MCDOT DHS

MCDOT DTE

MCDOT OTP



Pete K. Rahn, *Secretary* Gregory C. Johnson, P.E., *Administrator*

Boyd K. Rutherford, Lt. Governor

Larry Hogan, Governor

November 23, 2016

Mr. Ed Axler Montgomery County Planning Department, M-NCPPC 8787 Georgia Avenue Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Axler:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the revised Traffic Impact Study (TIS) prepared by Lenhart Traffic Consulting, Inc., dated October 22, 2016 (received on November 3, 2016), for the **Bradford's Landing – 16APMO016XX** located on MD 28 (Mile Point: 27.79) in Montgomery County, Maryland. The State Highway Administration (SHA) review is complete and we are pleased to respond.

- Proposed access to the 221 townhouse units and 23 single family units is via one (1) full movement site access to MD 28 (Norbeck Road).
- The following intersections were analyzed under existing, background and future conditions:
 - MD 28 (Norbeck Road) & Coolidge Avenue
 - MD 28 (Norbeck Road) & Norbeck Boulevard
 - MD 28 (Norbeck Road) & Bradford Road (To Be Closed)
 - MD 28 (Norbeck Road) & Proposed Full Movement Site Access
 - MD 28 (Norbeck Road) & Wintergate Drive
- The report concludes that the study intersections will continue to operate at acceptable levels of service under future conditions.

Based on the information provided, please note the following comment:

My telephone number/toll-free number is <u>410-545-0400 or 1-800-206-0770</u> Maryland Relay Service for Impaired Hearing or Speech 1.800.735.2258 Statewide Toll Free

Street Address: 707 North Calvert Street • Baltimore, Maryland 21202 • Phone 410.545.0300 • www.roads.maryland.gov

Mr. Ed Axler SHA Tracking No.: 16APMO016XX Page 2 of 2 11/23/2016

District 3 Access Management Comments (Mr. Nour Khudr):

SHA District 3 reiterates our comment that M-NCPPC consider requiring the developer to construct sidewalk improvements to connect the site to East Norbeck Park, given the strong attraction between the residential and park uses.

The SHA concurs with the report findings for this project as currently proposed and will not require the submission of any additional traffic analyses. However, an access permit will be required for all construction within the SHA right of way. Please submit one (1) set of the proposed improvement plans (including a set of hydraulic plans and computations) and a CD containing the plans and all supporting documentation to Mr. Brian Young at 9300 Kenilworth Avenue, Greenbelt, MD 20770, attention of Mr. Kwesi Woodroffe. Please reference the SHA tracking number on any future submissions. Please keep in mind that you can view the reviewer and project status via SHA Access Management Division web page at http://www.roads.maryland.gov/pages/amd.aspx. Please note, if this project has not obtained an SHA access permit and begun construction of the required improvements within five (5) years of this approval, extension of the permit shall be subject to the submission of an updated traffic impact analysis in order for SHA to determine whether the proposed improvements remain valid or if additional improvements will be required of the development. 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 1-800-749-0737 (x7325), or via email at pchoudhury@sha.state.md.us.

Sincerely,

13 27

Brian W. Young, District Engineer, District 3, SHA

BWY/nk

cc: Mr. Matt Baker, SHA RIPD
Mr. Scott Holcomb, SHA TFAD
Mr. Michael Lenhart, Lenhart Traffic Consulting, Inc.
Ms. Elisa Mitchell, SHA TFAD
Mr. David Murnan, SHA District 3 Traffic
Mr. Neil Patel, Brookfield Residential, Neil.Patel@brookfieldrp.com



Department of Permitting Services Fire Department Access and Water Supply Comments

DATE:14-Nov-16TO:Keely Lauretti
Loiederman Soltesz Associates, IncFROM:Marie LaBawRE:Bradford's Landing
120170060

PLAN APPROVED

- 1. Review based only upon information contained on the plan submitted 14-Nov-16 .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.

۵.

*** Parking Restrictions to be reviewed at time of site plane ***

1



DEPARTMENT OF PERMITTING SERVICES

Isiah Leggett County Executive Diane R. Schwartz Jones Director

November 18, 2016

Ms. Lori Walter Soltesz 2 Research Blvd. Rockville, MD 20850

Re: STORMWATER MANAGEMENT CONCEPT Request for Bradford's Landing Preliminary Plan #: NA SM File #: 282158 Tract Size/Zone: 28.74 Total Concept Area: 28.74 Watershed: Northwest Branch

Dear Lori:

Based on a review by the Department of Permitting Services Review Staff, the Combined Stormwater Management Concept/Site Development Stormwater Management Plan for the above mentioned site is **acceptable**. The Stormwater Management Concept proposes to meet required stormwater management goals via 100yr quantity control pond, MicroBioretention, Enhancement of some MicroBioretention for recharge credit, Planters Boxes, and Drywells.

The following items will need to be addressed during the final stormwater management design plan stage:

- A detailed review of the stormwater management computations will occur at the time of detailed plan review.
- 2. An engineered sediment control plan must be submitted for this development.
- All filtration media for manufactured best management practices, whether for new development or redevelopment, must consist of MDE approved material.
- 4. Landscaping shown on the approved Landscape Plan as part of the approved Site Plan are illustrative purpose only and may be changed at the time of detailed plan review of the Sediment Control/Storm Water Management plans by the Mont. Co. Department of Permitting Services, Water Resources Section.

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

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

montgomerycountymd.gov/311

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

255 Rockville Pike, 2nd Floor • Rockville, Maryland 20850 • 240-777-6300 • 240-777-6256 TTY www.montgomerycountymd.gov

240-773-3556 TTY

Ms. Lori Walter November 18, 2016 Page 2 of 2

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 me at 240-777-6340.

Sincerely,

Mark C. Etheridge, Manager Water Resources Section

Division of Land Development Services

MCE: me WJM

cc: C. Conlon SM File # 282158

ESD Acres: 28.74 STRUCTURAL Acres: 0.00 WAIVED Acres: 0.00

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Isiah Leggett County Executive Lisa Feldt *Director*

November 28, 2016

Casey Anderson, Chair Montgomery County Planning Board Maryland National Capital Park & Planning Commission 8787 Georgia Avenue Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

RE: Bradford's Landing, ePlan 120170060, NRI/FSD application accepted on 2/18/2016

Dear Mr. Anderson:

All applications for a variance from the requirements of Chapter 22A of the County Code submitted after October 1, 2009 are subject to Section 22A-12(b)(3). Accordingly, given that the application for the above referenced request was submitted after that date and must comply with Chapter 22A, and the Montgomery County Planning Department ("Planning Department") has completed all review required under applicable law, I am providing the following recommendation pertaining to this request for a variance.

Section 22A-21(d) of the Forest Conservation Law states that a variance must not be granted if granting the request:

- 1. Will confer on the applicant a special privilege that would be denied to other applicants;
- 2. Is based on conditions or circumstances which are the result of the actions by the applicant;
- 3. Arises from a condition relating to land or building use, either permitted or nonconforming, on a neighboring property; or
- 4. Will violate State water quality standards or cause measurable degradation in water quality.

Applying the above conditions to the plan submitted by the applicant, I make the following findings as the result of my review:

- 1. The granting of a variance in this case would not confer a special privilege on this applicant that would be denied other applicants as long as the same criteria are applied in each case. Therefore, the variance <u>can be granted</u> under this criterion.
- 2. Based on a discussion on March 19, 2010 between representatives of the County, the Planning Department, and the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Forest Service, the disturbance of trees, or other vegetation, as a result of development activity is not, in and of itself, interpreted as a condition or circumstance that is the result of the actions by the applicant. Therefore, the variance <u>can be granted</u> under this criterion, as long as appropriate mitigation is provided for the resources disturbed.

255 Rockville Pike, Suite 120 • Rockville, Maryland 20850 • 240-777-0311 • 240-777-7715 FAX www.montgomerycountymd.gov/dep

Casey Anderson November 28, 2016 Page 2

- 3. The disturbance of trees, or other vegetation, by the applicant does not arise from a condition relating to land or building use, either permitted or nonconforming, on a neighboring property. Therefore, the variance <u>can be granted</u> under this criterion.
- 4. The disturbance of trees, or other vegetation, by the applicant will not result in a violation of State water quality standards or cause measurable degradation in water quality. Therefore, the variance can be granted under this criterion.

Therefore, I recommend a finding by the Planning Board that this applicant qualifies for a variance conditioned upon meeting 'conditions of approval' pertaining to variance trees recommended by Planning staff, as well as the applicant mitigating for the loss of resources due to removal or disturbance to trees, and other vegetation, subject to the law based on the limits of disturbance (LOD) recommended during the review by the Planning Department. In the case of removal, the entire area of the critical root zone (CRZ) should be included in mitigation calculations regardless of the location of the CRZ (i.e., even that portion of the CRZ located on an adjacent property). When trees are disturbed, any area within the CRZ where the roots are severed, compacted, etc., such that the roots are not functioning as they were before the disturbance must be mitigated. Exceptions should not be allowed for trees in poor or hazardous condition because the loss of CRZ eliminates the future potential of the area to support a tree or provide stormwater management. Tree protection techniques implemented according to industry standards, such as trimming branches or installing temporary mulch mats to limit soil compaction during construction without permanently reducing the critical root zone, are acceptable mitigation to limit disturbance. Techniques such as root pruning should be used to improve survival rates of impacted trees but they should not be considered mitigation for the permanent loss of critical root zone. I recommend requiring mitigation based on the number of square feet of the critical root zone lost or disturbed. The mitigation can be met using any currently acceptable method under Chapter 22A of the Montgomery County Code.

In the event that minor revisions to the impacts to trees subject to variance provisions are approved by the Planning Department, the mitigation requirements outlined above should apply to the removal or disturbance to the CRZ of all trees subject to the law as a result of the revised LOD.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

Nill

Laura Miller County Arborist

cc: Doug Johnsen, Senior Planner

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

Isiah Leggett County Executive Clarence J. Snuggs Director

November 3, 2016

Ms. Sandra Pereira Area 3 Division Montgomery County Planning Department 8787 Georgia Avenue Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Re: Bradford's Landing Preliminary Plan No. 120170060

Dear Ms. Pereira:

The Montgomery County Department of Housing and Community Affairs (DHCA) has reviewed the above referenced plan and recommends Approval, with the following comments:

- 1. At site plan, please provide an MPDU exhibit showing the location of all MPDUs on a single sheet.
- 2. The MPDUs must have at least 3 bedrooms and 1.5 baths, and every bedroom must be no more than one level away from a full bath.

Sincerely,

Tisa & Schut

Lisa S. Schwartz Senior Planning Specialist

cc: Aaron Harnden, Soltesz

Affordable Housing

S:\Files\FY2014\Housing\MPDU\Lisa Schwartz\Bradford's Landing DHCA Letter_11-3-2016.docx

Common Ownership Communities

Division of Housing

1401 Rockville Pike, 4th Floor • Rockville, Maryland 20852 • 240-777-0311 • 240-777-3691 FAX • www.montgomerycountymd.gov/dhca

240-773-3556 TTY

Multifamily Housing

Landlord-Tenant Affairs

montgomerycountymd.gov/311

6801 Industrial Road Springfield, Virginia 22151

November 23, 2016

Montgomery County Planning Department Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission 8787 Georgia Avenue Silver Spring, MD 20910

Re: Bradford's Landing 2nd Review Project: Bradford's Landing Requestor ID#: 120170060

To whom it may concern,

Per your request, I have reviewed the preliminary plans of "Bradford's Landing", dated October, 2016. There are gas facilities in the area that may be affected by this proposed project; however I will require additional information, as it becomes available, from you in order to complete my review of the following potential conflicts:

- Sheet 5:
 - Proposed storm drain crossing at Station 64+00 As engineering plans are developed, a test pit
 of the existing gas main and profile of the storm drain will be required
 - Note that after the gas main crosses Norbeck Road (after the storm drain crossing), it continues along the side of the road closer to the development. Current plans also show gas main extending on same side after crossing the road
 - Possible service abandonment needed for 3405 Norbeck Road
- Sheet 6:
 - o Possible service abandonments needed for 3501 and 3521

In addition, I will keep the responses to my initial letter on file. The information requested in that letter will also be necessary in future submissions. As-built drawings are available upon request if needed. If you decide to deviate from the plans detailed above, be sure to provide Washington Gas with an updated copy before performing any work. Be advised that updated plans will be subject to a full re-review process. Please use caution when excavating near or paralleling with Washington Gas Facilities. Note that our minimum clearance requirements are 12" vertical and 5' horizontal for underground structures. Be sure to notify "MISS UTILITY" (811) at least 48 hours prior to the start of an excavation for confirmation. Should you have any questions regarding potential conflicts, questions, or concerns, do not hesitate to contact me via the methods listed herein.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN LINCO

SP Engineer II/System Replacement Washington Gas (703) 750-4739 slincoln@washgas.com Attachment D Agency Correspondence

From:	Reynolds, Kipling
Sent:	Tuesday, November 29, 2016 11:02 AM
То:	Pereira, Sandra; Weaver, Richard
Subject:	FW: Bradford Landing W&S Category Change 520160070, WSCCR's 16-OLN-03A & 04A

FYI

From: Soukup, Alan [mailto:Alan.Soukup@montgomerycountymd.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2016 10:57 AM
To: Lori Walter <LWalter@solteszco.com>
Cc: Harris,Robert R. (rrharris@lerchearly.com) <rrharris@lerchearly.com>; Phil Isaja <pisaja@solteszco.com>; Nelson, Katherine <katherine.nelson@montgomeryplanning.org>; Reynolds, Kipling
<Kipling.Reynolds@montgomeryplanning.org>; Conlon, Catherine <catherine.conlon@montgomeryplanning.org>; Boyd, Fred <fred.boyd@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: RE: Bradford Landing W&S Category Change 520160070, WSCCR's 16-OLN-03A & 04A

11/29/16

Hello Lori –

The category change hearing is on schedule for Dec. 7th. My understanding is that the Planning Board's meeting for the category change packet is also on schedule for Dec. 8th. I do not anticipate any scheduling problems at this time; however, I will notify you if any changes occur.

Best regards - Alan *Alan Soukup*, Sr. Planner Water & Wastewater Policy Group - Director's Office Montgomery Co. Dept. of Environmental Protection Suite 120, 255 Rockville Pike Rockville MD 20850-4166 240-777-7716 - fax: 240-777-7715 <u>alan.soukup@montgomerycountymd.gov</u> <u>www.montgomerycountymd.gov/waterworks</u>

From: Lori Walter [mailto:LWalter@solteszco.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2016 10:33 AM
To: Soukup, Alan <<u>Alan.Soukup@montgomerycountymd.gov</u>>
Cc: Harris,Robert R. (<u>rrharris@lerchearly.com</u>) <<u>rrharris@lerchearly.com</u>>; Phil Isaja <<u>pisaja@solteszco.com</u>>
Subject: RE: Bradford Landing W&S Category Change 520160070, WSCCR's 16-OLN-03A & 04A

From:	Boyd, Fred
Sent:	Thursday, December 01, 2016 12:24 PM
То:	Pereira, Sandra
Subject:	bradford's landing category changes

Here is the language from the December 8 staff report on the category change requests for the Bradford's Landing properties. We are recommending approval of both requests.

16-OLN-03A: Guy Hanks

16-OLN-04A: Fortunato & Maria Aroni

Application 16-OLN-03A seeks a water category change from W-6 to W-3; application 16-OLN-04A seeks both a water and a sewer category change, from W-6, S-6 to W-3, S-3. These R-200-zoned properties are within the sewer service envelope of the 2005 Olney Master Plan. Extending service facilitates development consistent with recommendations of the Plan.

Staff Recommendation:	16-OLN-03A: Approve W-3; 16-OLN-04A: Approve W-3, S-3
County Executive Recommendation:	16-OLN-03A: Approve W-3; 16-OLN-04A: Approve W-3, S-3

From:	Soukup, Alan <alan.soukup@montgomerycountymd.gov></alan.soukup@montgomerycountymd.gov>
Sent:	Thursday, October 27, 2016 11:24 AM
To:	Lori Walter
Cc:	Phil Isaja; Lake, Dave; Dizelos, George; Nelson, Katherine; Boyd, Fred; Reynolds, Kipling; Pereira, Sandra; Conlon, Catherine; Pfefferle, Mark
Subject:	RE: Bradford Landing W&S Category Change 520160070, WSCCR's 16-OLN-03A & 04A
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Flagged

10/27/16

Hello Lori –

Our schedule currently includes a hearing for WSCCRs 16-OLN-03A and 16-OLN-04A on Dec. 7, 2016 at 2;30 pm. The Planning Board is tentatively scheduled to consider these requests on the following day, Dec. 8th, at its regular Thursday meeting. I understand that you have a Dec. 15th date for the preliminary plan.

In cases where our timing has been tight, especially with regard to Planning Board actions, DEP has used an expedited approval process to move category changes along ahead of the usual open record used with our public hearings. (As in this case, DEP's hearing record will be left open until Dec. 14th for additional written comments.) That clearly will not work for you requests. We will explain in our hearing notices for Dec. 7th that the record for these two requests will close upon the conclusion of the Planning Board's consideration on Dec. 8th. DEP will then take an "advance action" (prepared in advance) that grants the category change approval ahead of the other category change requests in the administrative packet.

I apologize that our hearing process has been delayed from the schedule planned earlier this summer. However, the current schedule, with an advance action, will hopefully allow your preliminary plan to move forward on the schedule you have explained below. I have copied this message to M-NCPPC staff and ask that they contact me as soon as possible if this creates a problem with the Board's consideration of your plan.

Best regards -

Alan Soukup, Sr. Planner Water & Wastewater Policy Group - Director's Office Montgomery Co. Dept. of Environmental Protection Suite 120, 255 Rockville Pike Rockville MD 20850-4166 240-777-7716 - fax: 240-777-7715 alan.soukup@montgomerycountymd.gov www.montgomerycountymd.gov/waterworks

Working together for a cleaner, greener economically vibrant community

From: Lori Walter [mailto:LWalter@solteszco.com] Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2016 4:14 PM

From:	Quattrocchi, Dominic
Sent:	Tuesday, November 22, 2016 1:00 PM
То:	Pereira, Sandra; Weaver, Richard
Cc:	Gries, William; greg.ossont@montgomerycountymd.gov; ronnie.warner@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject:	Bradford's Landing development and East Norbeck Local Park Connection Through County Owned Property

Ms. Sandra,

Greg Ossant, Deputy Director of Montgomery County's General Services indicated via a phone discussion with Bill Gries on 21NOV2016 that an easement for a hard surface trail connection can easily be granted for the County owned parcel between the proposed Bradford's Landing development and East Norbeck Local Park. Eventual transfer of the land is possible provided M-NCPPC finds appropriate land to swap- both Parks and DGS will have this in mind for future consideration when an appropriate opportunity avails itself.

For now, the applicant should work with the County and Parks to survey and identify an appropriate alignment for the connection. This survey would be used in the easement document. The County's Department of General Services contact person is Ronni Warner who can be reached at: <u>ronnie.warner@montgomerycountymd.gov</u>. Parks staff should include myself, Linda Komes and Marian Elsasser.

Dom

Dominic Quattrocchi, AICP ISA Certified Arborist Park Planner M-NCPPC Parkside Headquarters 9500 Brunett Ave Silver Spring MD 20901 301 650 4361 www.mncppc.org

From: Pereira, Sandra
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2016 2:53 PM
To: Quattrocchi, Dominic <<u>dominic.quattrocchi@montgomeryparks.org</u>>
Cc: Weaver, Richard <<u>richard.weaver@montgomeryplanning.org</u>>
Subject: RE: Bradford's Landing Trial Recommendation Update:

Great, thanks so much!

From:	Matt Baker <mbaker4@sha.state.md.us></mbaker4@sha.state.md.us>
Sent:	Thursday, December 01, 2016 7:59 AM
То:	Pereira, Sandra
Cc:	Aviva Brown; Dorey Uong; Claudine Myers; Axler, Ed; Erica Rigby; kwoodroffe
Subject:	RE: MD 28 (Norbeck Rd) Sidewalk - Draft Plan
Attachments:	MD 28 Map_Revised 08312016.pdf

Sandra-

See comments in **RED** below. Thanks.

District 3-

Sandra's and my conversation below is in regard to a potential improvement to be attached to M-NCPPC's Bradford's Landing permit. It would require that the Bradford's Landing developer complete a shared-use path/ped facility along the north side of MD 28 between the existing Norbeck Crossing development shared-use path and existing paths in East Norbeck Local Park. This would be across MD 28 from District 3's in-development pedestrian projects and, so far as I understand, outside of SHA right-of-way. Thanks.

Matt

From: Pereira, Sandra [mailto:sandra.pereira@montgomeryplanning.org]
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 5:12 PM
To: Matt Baker <MBaker4@sha.state.md.us>
Cc: Aviva Brown <ABrown22@sha.state.md.us>; Dorey Uong <duong@sha.state.md.us>; Claudine Myers
<CMyers1@sha.state.md.us>; Axler, Ed <ed.axler@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: RE: MD 28 (Norbeck Rd) Sidewalk - Draft Plan

Matt, thank you so much for the follow-up.

Per our phone call this morning, please confirm our understanding of the following items:

- 1) The pedestrian improvements described on the email below and highlighted on the attached SHA draft layout have been funded, but an implementation schedule has not been determined yet. Confirmed.
- 2) A separate concept study has been developed for a sidewalk connecting Georgia Ave to Bailey's Lane along the south side of Norbeck Road. This project is not funded. Confirmed. I would say that (2) can be considered a funded breakout of (1) but would ask that Dorey, Claudine, and/or Erica confirm that.
- 3) The pedestrian improvements contemplated by the developer of Bradford's Landing for Norbeck Road include a) extending the shared-use path off-site to the east and connect to the East Norbeck Local Park and to the west to connect with the existing shared-use path along the Greenbriar at Norbeck Crossing frontage, subject to the developer being able to acquire the necessary right-of-way or public use easements from the adjacent property owners along Norbeck Road; b) providing pedestrian signal heads and marked crosswalk(s) across Norbeck Road at the intersection with Norbeck Boulevard (see attached sketch) subject to SHA's approval. We believe that these improvements will enhance pedestrian access and circulation along Norbeck Road, and that they will complement, rather than compete with, both of SHA's projects described in 1) and 2). (a) and (b) are potential

conditions of M-NCPPC's development approval, so far as I understand. I do not believe these are included as part of SHA's Bradford's Landing access permit (#16APMO016XX). But, yes, individual elements, specifically those in SHA right-of-way associated with MD 28 and/or affecting MD 28 traffic operations, will likely be subject to additional SHA approval. I would ask that our District 3 Project Development (Dorey, Claudine, and/or Erica) and District 3 Access Management (Kwesi) confirm this, also.

Thanks in advance for confirming our understanding. Look forward to hearing from you.

Sandra

Sandra Pereira, RLA

Area 3 Coordinator

M-NCPPC Montgomery County Planning Department 8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20910 phone (301) 495-2186 :: fax (301) 495-1306 sandra.pereira@montgomeryplanning.org

From: Matt Baker [mailto:MBaker4@sha.state.md.us]
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 10:46 AM
To: Pereira, Sandra <<u>sandra.pereira@montgomeryplanning.org</u>>
Cc: Aviva Brown <<u>ABrown22@sha.state.md.us</u>>; Dorey Uong <<u>duong@sha.state.md.us</u>>; Claudine Myers
<<u>CMyers1@sha.state.md.us</u>>
Subject: MD 28 (Norbeck Rd) Sidewalk - Draft Plan

Sandra-

Following up on our phone call this morning, I am attaching a <u>draft</u> layout of the proposed MD 28 (Norbeck Road) sidewalk and crossing improvements between Grace House Assisted Living and the western intersection with Baileys Lane. As discussed, the crossing will include a high intensity beacon (HIB)—a flashing light—to advise motorists of pedestrians crossing. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks.

Matt

Matt Baker

Regional Planner, Montgomery County

Regional and Intermodal Planning Division

Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering

State Highway Administration

410-545-5668

mbaker4@sha.state.md.us

Attachment E Citizen Correspondence

From:	Steve Mann <stevendmann@yahoo.com></stevendmann@yahoo.com>
Sent:	Thursday, July 28, 2016 8:08 PM
То:	Pereira, Sandra
Subject:	Re: Enclosed are my concerns regarding the proposed Bradford's Landing
Attachments:	Bradford's Landing (highlight property)B.jpg

Dear Ms. Pereira,

I appreciate the time that you took earlier today to discuss the issues that I have with the Proposed Bradford's Landing. As discussed, I have highlighted key properties and features between Bradford's Rest and East Norbeck Park. I apologize in advance for the crude nature of the highlights as I am an engineer with very little artistic talent. Hopefully it will be obvious that without a substantial pedestrian barrier at the edge of Bradford's Landing, people will use private property as their route to and from East Norbeck Park instead of any paths that might be built at the back of the property for a very lengthy, circuitous route to the park. As an aside, any path at the back of the property will more than likely have to cut down and through a completely forested area currently owned by State Highway. A path can not be built at the front of the property due to lack of right-of-way once East of Bradford's Landing.

Also, regarding the SHA study regarding the widening of MD-28/MD-198, the project manager is Jeremy Beck (JBeck@sha.state.md.us 410-545-8518). The SHA web page regarding the study is here:

http://apps.roads.maryland.gov/WebProjectLifeCycle/ProjectInformation.aspx?projectno=MO8861115

With project documents are here:

http://apps.roads.maryland.gov/WebProjectLifeCycle/ProjectDocuments.aspx?projectno=MO8861115

The studies call for the following (from the Alternatives Public Workshop) :

The access management option adds three access roads:

• North Side - Coolidge Avenue to East Norbeck Park"

SHA has detailed drawings (I didn't see them online but will try to find them) showing the service road on the north side of Norbeck Road from East Norbeck Park to Norbeck Blvd.

I would think that SHA might want to work with the developer as SHA is currently in the process of defining how Norbeck Road will be redesigned to carry a higher traffic capacity.

Sincerely, Steve Mann From: Steve Mann <stevendmann@yahoo.com> To: "sandra.pereira@montgomeryplanning.org" <sandra.pereira@montgomeryplanning.org>; "richard.weaver@montgomeryplanning.org" <richard.weaver@montgomeryplanning.org> Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2016 1:09 PM Subject: Enclosed are my concerns regarding the proposed Bradford's Landing

Dear Ms. Pereira and Mr. Weaver,

Attached is a letter detailing my concerns regarding the proposed Bradford's Landing development to be build in the Olney Master Plan area. I have also attached two jpg files that are pictures of the plans that the developer presented to the community on June 28, 2016. If you would please read and review what I sent I will very much appreciate it. After you review my material I would like to discuss the issues that I have raised with you.

If you have any issues opening or viewing any of the three attachments please contact me so that I can correct the issue.

Sincerely, Steve Mann 301-332-7490

ATTACHMENT E



Steve Mann

3205 Norbeck Road, Silver Spring, MD 20906 • Phone: 301-332-7490 E-Mail: StevenDMann@yahoo.com

July 26, 2016

Ms. Sandra Pereira, Lead Site Plan Reviewer for Area Three Mr. Rich Weaver, Regulatory Review Supervisor

Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission - Montgomery County Planning Department 8787 Georgia Avenue Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Ms. Pereira and Mr. Weaver:

I am writing regarding the proposed development in planning area three, east of Norbeck Crossing and south of the ICC, named Bradford's Landing. On July 22, 2016, I spoke on the phone with Mr. Weaver about my concerns and am now sending them to both of you via this letter/email.

ATTACHMENT E

The Bradford's Landing development representative – The Land Planning and Design Group, Inc. (I'm assuming this as they handed out no contact or plan information at the meeting. I am using the name off of a photo of the plan that I took. That photo is at the bottom of this letter and is provided as an attachment in the email that contains this letter) – had a brief meeting with the community on June 28, 2016, 7:00pm, at Earle B. Wood Middle School, notifying us of their development plan. The "applicant name," from signage on the street for that meeting, was Brookfield Washington, LLC, Craig Kazanjian, 301-438-2211.

A few issues were raised at the meeting that I believe are discussed in the Olney Master Plan, Aspen Hill Master Plan, and zoning ordinance in general, that the developer has not addressed.

Issue 1:

The Olney Master Plan and Aspen Hill Master Plan both explicitly call for Norbeck Road to be a divided highway designed as a (bold emphasis mine)

"green corridor" with **control of access maintained by the use of service roads** where feasible. A shared-use path should also be constructed along the north side of Norbeck Road to complete path connectivity and provide access to East Norbeck Local Park. **Service roads, where feasible along the north side of Norbeck Road,** can also function as a shared-use path. (from Olney Master Plan, p 92)

Based on the Olney Master Plan, the north side of Norbeck Road should have a service road built, as it is perfectly feasible. The service road, ideally, will bring the residents on the north side of Norbeck Road to the traffic light at Norbeck Boulevard, allowing ingress and egress, to and from the very busy state highway MD-28 via a controlled intersection.

Instead of a service road, the developer's concept has one small acceleration and deceleration lane. This does not comply with either the Olney Master Plan or Aspen Hill Master Plan.



Issue 2:

The Olney Master Plan, section titled "#10 Golden Bear Area," calls to

Connect any new housing development to the East Norbeck Local Park through an internal, direct connection for pedestrians and bicycles. (Olney Master Plan p 34 of the pdf version)

The developer does have an arrow on their plan, I'm assuming for bicycle and pedestrian trail, which terminates at the edge of their property in the northeast corner. The property adjacent to this, where the arrow leaves the Bradford's Landing property, is not part of East Norbeck Park. At the present time the path cannot continue to East Norbeck Park. Since this property is unused State property that the State acquired when building the ICC, there is a possibility of working an arrangement with the State for a path to East Norbeck Park.

The developer also has a bike trail parallel to Norbeck Road that terminates at private property, not at East Norbeck Park. There is no way for pedestrian or bicycle traffic to reach East Norbeck Park without physically traveling west in the east bound vehicle lane of the state highway. There are currently no shoulders, no sidewalk/path, and no right-of-way for a path to reach East Norbeck Park along Norbeck Road.

My concern with this plan, that impacts myself and neighbors directly, is that there is no method of controlling the bicycle and foot traffic between Bradford's Landing and East Norbeck Park let alone a reasonable route for a path to East Norbeck Park. The softball fields, soccer field, tennis courts, tot lot, and basketball courts are in the front of East Norbeck Park (south side). A large natural area with a mowed, grass, path around it is in the back. The natural, easiest, straight line, access to East Norbeck Park's heavily used features will be to walk or ride through the open space between the houses in Bradford's Landing on Public Street A at the end of Doc Berlin Drive and/or Clara Downey Avenue. The people going to East Norbeck Park will cross private property with the current Bradford's Landing plan. They will cross the PEPCO right of way, then the church property and finally across private, wooded, residential lots, using backyards as their path to the park. As an owner of one of the private lots, I do not want my peaceful, private, wooded back vard to be a pedestrian thoroughfare for a new, multi-hundred unit, development. The developer should be required to build a substantial fence along their property, keeping people from using the natural, direct, private property route to East Norbeck Park. The fence will ensure that traffic go to the path on Norbeck Road (that can not currently be built once off of Bradford Landing's site) or to the developer's planned bike path at the back of Bradford's Landing. Not doing so will place a substantial burden with regard to use of property, as well as liability, on myself, Maurice Jackson (the other property owner adjacent to East Norbeck Park), the church, and PEPCO. A plan should not be approved without mitigating the large use and liability burdens that Bradford's Landing creates on neighboring properties.

Issue 3:

One of the overall goals of planned zoning is to control density in an orderly manner. To do so, density transitions from high to low. Norbeck Crossing carefully met this goal by, along Norbeck Road, heading east from Georgia Avenue, building condominium buildings then townhouses, then single-family homes. The remaining properties east of that are single-family homes as well as a small church with a single-family home in front of it. Bradford's Landing is proposing transitioning back from single-family homes to townhouses along Norbeck Road so that the overall transition will be condominiums, townhouses, single-family homes, and then back to townhouses (Bradford's Landing). Existing single-family homes will



continue to remain east of Bradford's Landing. By placing townhouses along Norbeck Road, Bradford's Landing reverses the orderly density transition when there is no need to do so. Bradford's Landing should have single-family homes along Norbeck Road, continuing the single-family homes that started with Norbeck Crossing. There are multiple ways to solve this. One being to swap the townhouses along Norbeck Road with the ten single-family homes in the back, east, portion of the plan. The other is to simply develop with single-family homes along Norbeck Road, leaving the remainder of the housing layout more or less intact. This might reduce the density of Bradford's Landing from its current roughly 8.5 units per acre (244 units on 28.8 acres) when the Olney Master Plan recommends 7 units per acre if developed as TDR-7. The developer is pushing the Olney Master Plan to its limits. The Olney Master Plan has no issues against this area not building to the absolute maximum density as it is zoned R-200/TDR-7.

The Olney Master Plan, Aspen Hill Master Plan, and zoning ordinance call for the above points that I brought up, summarized below:

- 1. Service roads on the north side of Norbeck Road.
- 2. A direct connection for pedestrians and bicycles to East Norbeck Park. This should naturally include remedies to ensure that access is not through private property between Bradford's Landing and East Norbeck Park.
- 3. Zoning, in general, calling for a uniform density transition from condominiums, to townhouses, to single-family homes. That transition is already complete and should not be reversed along Norbeck Road.

The developer is making sure to do everything that he can to get the maximum Olney Master Plan density, plus some (based on MPDUs). He should also be held to comply with the rest of the Olney Master Plan. The impacts that will occur to neighboring properties – those between Bradford's Landing and East Norbeck Park – must be taken into account when designing a development.

Below are pictures of the proposed plans – one of the concept plan and another of the frontage improvements - presented to the community on June 28, 2016. I have also attached high-resolution versions to the email containing this letter.

Sincerely,

Steve Mann









From:	Steve Mann <stevendmann@yahoo.com></stevendmann@yahoo.com>
Sent:	Tuesday, November 01, 2016 3:18 PM
To:	Pereira, Sandra; Axler, Ed
Cc:	Jeremy Beck; Weaver, Richard
Subject:	Meeting between Norbeck Road (Rt 28) communities, Park & Planning, and SHA

Sandra/Ed/Jeremy,

The communities along Norbeck Road (state highway Rt 28) would like to have a meeting with Park and Planning regarding the proposed Bradford's Landing development. These communities include Leisure World, Hampshire Village, Sedgwick Homes Association, Longmead Crossing, Sycamore Acres, and others. All are communities that will be impacted by the proposed Bradford's Landing development on Norbeck Road. Is it possible for you, or knowledgeable Park and Planning representatives, to meet with us to discuss the proposed Bradford's Landing?

We would like to discuss issues such as the following:

- Details of the proposed development where lots will be, where roads will be, where sidewalks will be, how the development will access nearby facilities, and similar.
- Euclidean zones is this one that is guaranteed the right to develop at the proposed density?
- Traffic mitigation how do local failing intersections and over-capacity roads impact design?
- Master plan how closely must, or should, the developer follow the master Plan.
- General questions regarding the process that the developer and community go through when creating a new development.

Hampshire Village (3210 Norbeck Road, Silver Spring, MD 20906) has made one of their meeting rooms available to us to meet. We are available as early as Wednesday, November 09 from 7:00pm to 9:00pm if that is possible. If not possible we are open to other times but prefer evenings so that people don't have to take time off of work to attend.

Please feel free to respond by email or phone (301-332-7490)

Sincerely, Steve Mann

From:	Diane Thomas <dfthomas.123@gmail.com></dfthomas.123@gmail.com>
Sent:	Monday, October 24, 2016 10:35 AM
То:	Pereira, Sandra
Subject:	concern about traffic for proposed Bradford's Landing

I live in the area near the Bradford's Landing proposed site, and am concerned about the increase in traffic on Norbeck Road, particularly the backup that starts on Georgia Ave in the evenings with cars turning onto Norbeck Road. I understand that intersection is not taken into account for the traffic study, which makes no sense to me. Could you please direct me to the person who is responsible for the traffic approval of this proposed project?

Thank you.

Diane Thomas

From:	Greg Cassidy <gcassidy2@verizon.net></gcassidy2@verizon.net>
Sent:	Monday, November 28, 2016 3:45 PM
То:	Pereira, Sandra
Cc:	Leslie Backus
Subject:	Bradford's Landing

Ms. Pereira,

My name is Greg Cassidy and I live at 15333 Baileys Lane in Silver Spring. I'm right off of Rt 28 near where Bradford's Landing is going in.

I was at the meeting at Hampshire Village on Nov 9th. Thank you for being there and explaining the development to us.

You said a video could be presented. My wife took one of traffic on Rt 28 in the AM rush hour. Cary Lamari said I should send it to you.

My wife and I both work and will not be able to attend the meeting on Dec 15th. It's 3 minutes long, and can be downloaded at this site.

https://www.dropbox.com/s/7bbzve22fvdwluo/Rt%2028%20AM%20Traffic.wmv?dl=0

If you have any questions you can email me, or contact me at 301-924-4755

Thank you, Greg Cassidy

From:	Greg Cassidy <gcassidy2@verizon.net></gcassidy2@verizon.net>
Sent:	Thursday, December 01, 2016 8:28 PM
То:	Pereira, Sandra
Cc:	carylamari@yahoo.com; Leslie Backus; Greg Cassidy
Subject:	Bradford's Landing
Attachments:	Cassidy letter re Bradford's Landing.docx

Ms. Pereira,

Thank you for getting back to me about the video I sent. I have taken your suggestion and put together my thoughts about the problems the extra density in Bradford's Landing would cause to the traffic on Rt 28. It is attached in a Word file. I very much appreciate you offering to present it during the hearing on Dec 15th.

I am including the link to download the video again if you need it.

https://www.dropbox.com/s/7bbzve22fvdwluo/Rt%2028%20AM%20Traffic.wmv?dl=0

Also, in case you want to pass along a link to someone to view the video without having to download it, it can be viewed on VIMEO:

https://vimeo.com/192368476

Again, if you have any questions you can email me, or contact me at 301-924-4755

Thank you, Greg Cassidy My concerns about Rt. 28/Norbeck Road's overcrowding with 244 housing units being planned at Bradford's Landing. I live on Baileys Lane, across Rt 28 from East Norbeck Park. The accompanying video was taking by my wife on her morning walk.

- The times are shown on the video. Traffic is like this during most of the morning as well as the evening rush hours. This is for a total of 6 to 7 hours every weekday.
- Depending on the congestion at the failed intersection of Rt 28 with Georgia Avenue, traffic is either moving at speed and difficult to impossible to pull out into, or completely stopped, where pulling out is easier, but you are then just sitting with everyone else.
- The stopped traffic shown in the video is from Georgia Avenue to beyond Wintergate Drive, a distance of just over 1 mile.
- There are several developments already that feed onto Rt 28 in this area; Norbeck Crossing, Leisure World, Hampshire Village, and the Baileys Lane neighborhood; as well as Our Lady of Grace Church and East Norbeck Park.
- I now hear that there will <u>not</u> be a traffic light at the road leading out of Bradford's Landing. As the residents of Norbeck Crossing have found, it's difficult and dangerous to try and make a left to head East on Rt 28 during AM rush hour. This many housing units in Bradford's Landing will just encounter the same problem, and add to the danger and risk of accidents.
- Just as METRO has not prevented gridlock getting in and out of DC, The ICC has not alleviated any of the heavy traffic on Rt 28.

My wife and I moved into this neighborhood 30 years ago, to get closer to the edge of suburbia and away from the crowded developments. The area was largely zoned R200. We have steadily watched the traffic on Rt 28 got from random, to consistent, to clogged. And we knew the ICC may come someday, and like it as a quick way to avoid the heavy street traffic.

But this amount of density being proposed at Bradford's Landing does not fit in with the County Master Plan or the Olney Master Plan.

I cannot see how the inclusion of 244 more housing units that feed only onto Rt 28 would not cause even more gridlock. It's said that would generate approximately 150 more trips <u>per hour</u> during the rush hours.

The only thought I have about how this much unprecedented density would not have a severe and damaging effect on traffic on Rt 28 is if a direct interchange with the ICC could be included in the plan.

Thank You.

Greg Cassidy

From:	psmarks2@juno.com
Sent:	Sunday, November 13, 2016 8:08 PM
То:	Pereira, Sandra
Cc:	jking@lwmc.com; bsears@linowes-law.com
Subject:	LEISURE WORLD/BRADFORD LANDING

Sandra

I want to express our appreciation to you and your colleagues for meeting with us last week about Leisure World's issues with the Bradford Landing project. We are following up on the suggestions for further contacts with MCDOT and MDSHA and hope to make progress in that arena.

We are also interested in any progress you make in acquiring the MCG property adjacent to the East Norbeck Park and the Bradford Landing property.

Thank you for your assistance.

Phil Marks

From:	Pereira, Sandra
Sent:	Thursday, November 10, 2016 3:17 PM
То:	'Cristina Sousa'
Subject:	RE: Bradford's Landing Plan#120170060
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Flagged

Dear Ms. Sousa,

Thank you for sharing your concerns with us. As part our review process, we assess compatibility of the proposed development with existing homes. Common measures used to achieve or improve compatibility include landscaping and privacy fences. We agree that such measures should be applied where the new development abuts your property.

Please note that these recommendations are best suited as part of Site Plan review, which includes a landscape plan and is more detailed than a preliminary plan. Currently, the project is undergoing Preliminary Plan review with a tentative Planning Board Hearing date of December 15. It is our understanding that the Applicant (developer) intends to submit the required Site Plan application early in January. We will raise these concerns and recommendations at that time.

Please don't hesitate to contact me should you have further questions or concerns.

Sincerely, Sandra

Sandra Pereira, RLA Area 3 Coordinator

M-NCPPC Montgomery County Planning Department 8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20910 phone (301) 495-2186 :: fax (301) 495-1306 sandra.pereira@montgomeryplanning.org

From: Cristina Sousa [mailto:cristinasousarealestate@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 08, 2016 9:40 AM
To: Pereira, Sandra <sandra.pereira@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: Bradford's Landing Plan#120170060

Hello,

My name is Cristina Sousa, and I am currently living at 3521 Norbeck Rd in Silver Spring MD. I am writing to you today with concerns about the plans for the new development that was recently made public that will be constructed next door to my home.

I was hoping to request that the developer consider planting trees and installing a fence between my property and the town homes that will be built so as to keep the privacy of my home intact, as well as that of the new neighbors.

Since the construction of the other development on the west side of my property (Norbeck Crossing) in the last three years, there has been an increase in the numbers of homes and families moving into my neighborhood, further decreasing the privacy of my family and I once had. Though I understand this is expected with new developments, we are requesting that the new developer could create a barrier similar to what the previous

ATTACHMENT E

developer did. The developers of Norbeck Crossing provided both their new residents and my family with improved privavy between the properties by building a wooden fence and planting a tree line on the development's side.

Please take this in consideration. I have lived in my home for over 14 years, and though new developments are to be expected, I am hoping that the integrity and privacy of my home remain on a similar level.

Thank you,

Cristina Sousa 301 219 3251

Attachment F Noise Analysis Report

ATTACHMENT F



9109 CORONADO TERRACE, FAIRFAX, VA 22031 T [703] 534.2790

October 22, 2016

Neil Patel Brookfield Residential 3201 Jermantown Road, Suite 150 Fairfax, VA 22030

Re: Bradford's Landing Outdoor Traffic Noise Analysis

Mr. Patel:

This report summarizes the outdoor traffic noise analysis for the Bradford's Landing (formerly known as Norbeck Road Properties and Greenbriar at Norbeck Crossing) project in Montgomery County, MD. Indoor traffic noise levels will be evaluated at a later date when the architectural drawings are farther along. STC ratings required by the building code between adjacent townhouses are not covered in this report.

1. Executive summary

A site survey was performed and sound levels were measured in the locations shown in Figure 2 for seven days. Traffic volumes were counted briefly at the end of the survey. The Traffic Noise Model was used to model existing conditions. The output sound levels compared well to the measured sound levels. Traffic forecasts were provided by the Maryland State Highway administration, with additional information gathered from other sources. The Traffic Noise Model was used to predict future noise levels in outdoor recreation areas and at the facades of residences.

The design goals are to ensure that the Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) not exceed 60 dB in usable outdoor areas such as rear yards and tot lots or 45 dB inside residences.

The projected DNL will be as high as 66.2 dB in the rear yard of the most-impacted townhouse lot. In order to reduce noise levels in rear yards we recommend constructing three six- to seven-foot tall walls around townhouse rear yards as located in Figure 11.

The projected DNL will be as high as high as 69.2 dB at the facade of the most-impacted residence. This information can be used in the future to predict indoor traffic noise levels.

2. Introduction

Hush Acoustics LLC was contracted by Brookfield Residential to perform sound level measurements on the site, to model future noise levels, and to design noise barriers, as necessary. This analysis was based on the Bradford's Landing Preliminary Plan drawing prepared by Soltesz dated October 18, 2016. This drawing shows lot and house locations, finished floor elevations of most houses, existing and proposed ground elevations, and the location and elevation of the existing pavement of all nearby roads. The site is located along the south side of Route 200 (the Inter-County Connector), well to the east of Georgia



Avenue (Route 97), and to the north of Norbeck Road (Route 28). A vicinity map is included as Figure 1.



Figure 1. Vicinity Map

Per a conversation with Mr. Mark Pfefferle of Montgomery County Park and Planning staff on December 22, 2006, and with Mr. Josh Penn on February 24, 2012, we understand that Montgomery County uses the 1983 Staff Guidelines to evaluate transportation noise impacts for proposed residential land development. The guidelines provide outdoor DNL criteria as a function of both site location and community type. Per the map, the goal would be 60 dB at the site. However, per Table 2-1 of the guidelines, the DNL goal would be 65 dB along "major highway corridors" and 60 dB typically throughout the county. We had confirmed with a conversation with county staff in 2009 for this site that the goal is 65 dB. However, since the site plan requirement for the adjacent Ryland Homes site was 60 dB, we assumed county staff would use a 60 dB goal for this site as well. Although the Staff Guidelines say the noise level goals apply at the building line, from conversations with county staff we learned that they should be evaluated in usable outdoor areas such as rear and sometimes side yards, as



well as common recreation areas. It was assumed the criteria do not apply on elevated decks or at rearloaded townhouses (since there are no usable outdoor yard areas). The Montgomery County Staff Guidelines also state that the interior noise guideline is a DNL of 45 dB.

3. Site survey

The purposes of the site survey are as follows:

- 1. to collect <u>noise level data</u> on the site. Noise level data are useful for the following reasons:
 - a. to determine how the hourly average sound levels compare to the Day-Night Average Sound Levels (DNL). The DNL is the noise metric used by Montgomery County, MD. However, the Traffic Noise Model (TNM) uses the hourly average sound level. For locations mostly impacted by traffic noise, the relationship between the DNL and loudest hour average sound level is relatively constant. The measured sound levels are useful for determining this relationship.
 - b. to identify any significant non-traffic noise sources.
- 2. to observe <u>traffic conditions</u> such as prevailing speeds, classifications (i.e., percentages of automobiles, trucks, buses, and motorcycles), and directional distributions. Many of these parameters are not well documented in traffic studies. The prevailing speed often differs from the posted speed limit.
- 3. to observe <u>road conditions</u> such as locations and timing of traffic flow control devices (e.g., traffic signals, stop signs, and toll booths), and the pavement type.
- 4. to observe <u>site conditions</u> not represented on the site plan such as the presence and height of existing noise barriers along the road right-of-way.

The purpose of the site survey was not to determine how loud it is at the site. That is performed using the computerized noise modeling discussed below.

3.1 Sound level measurement procedure

Larson Davis model 831 and LxT sound level meters were installed in the locations indicated M1 and M2 in Figure 2 from approximately 12 pm on Wednesday March 2, 2016, through approximately 3 pm on Wednesday March 9, 2016. The sound level meters were programmed to report average, maximum, and minimum A-weighted sound levels during each one-minute interval. For an explanation of A-weighted sound levels see the appendix. The meters were chained to trees and the microphones were attached to poles 27 and 18 feet above the ground at locations M1 and M2, respectively.

3.2 Site observations

The site currently has a few single-family residences with large areas of lawns and some areas of forest, and is generally at a lower elevation than Route 200 (i.e., the Inter-County Connector). The main noise sources on the site are traffic on Route 200 and Norbeck Road. There is also some sound from birds and wind (it was quite windy during set up). Although Georgia Avenue is quite far from the site, it was included to be conservative.

ATTACHMENT F



There is a traffic signal on Georgia Avenue just south of Route 200. There is a traffic signal on Norbeck Road near the site at Norbeck Boulevard. There are no traffic signals on Route 200.



Figure 2. Sound Level Meter Locations

Route 200 has three through lanes of traffic each direction, with an on- and off-ramps for Georgia Avenue. Georgia Avenue has three through lanes of traffic each direction, with a variety of turning lanes at the site. Norbeck Road has one through lane of traffic each direction.

The posted speed limits are 60 mph on Route 200, 50 mph on Georgia Avenue, and 40 mph on Norbeck Road.

3.3 Measured sound levels

Average sound levels during five-minute intervals were calculated based on the measured one-minute average sound levels. Figure 3 presents the resulting five-minute average sound levels. Hourly average sound levels were calculated based on the five-minute average sound levels. Figure 4 presents the hourly average sound levels. The Day-Night Average Sound Levels (DNL) were calculated for each full calendar day. Table 1 presents the DNL and loudest-hour average sound level, and the difference between the two, for each calendar day.

ATTACHMENT F

ACOUSTICS LLC

9109 Coronado Terrace, Fairfax, VA 22031 T [703] 534.2790







Figure 4. Hourly Average Sound Levels



Day, Date	DNL		Loudest-Hou	ur Average	DNL Minus Loudest-Hour	
			Sound	Level	Average	
	M1	M2	M1	M2	M1	M2
Wed, March 02, 2016			66.5	63		
Thu, March 03, 2016	66.7	62.3	66.7	62.6	0.0	-0.2
Fri, March 04, 2016	67.2	63.0	66.9	63.8	0.3	-0.8
Sat, March 05, 2016	64.4	59.6	62.6	56.7	1.9	2.9
Sun, March 06, 2016	63.7	58.9	63.8	59.6	-0.1	-0.6
Mon, March 07, 2016	66.5	61.3	66.9	61	-0.4	0.2
Tue, March 08, 2016	68.1	65.0	68.1	65	0.0	0.0
Wed, March 09, 2016			67.9	64.7		

Table 1. Measured DNL and Loudest-Hour Average Sound Levels, dB

Table 2. Extrapolated Hourly Traffic Volumes and Prevailing Speeds

Time	Lanes	Spee	Auto	Medium	Heavy	Buses	Motor-
		d	S	Trucks	Trucks		cycles
145-155	GA Ave NB to Rt 200 EB	-	276	18	6	6	0
pm	Rt 200 EB to GA Ave NB	43.5	210	6	0	6	0
	Rt 200 EB (w/o ramp to GA NB)	67	912	36	60	0	0
	Rt 200 WB (w/ ramp to GA NB)	65	972	48	36	12	12
200-210	GA Ave SB	44	1200	30	12	6	12
pm	GA Ave NB	47	1284	18	12	12	12
222-232	Norbeck WB	33	606	6	12	6	0
pm	Norbeck EB	37	612	0	36	0	6

3.4 Traffic counts

Traffic volumes were counted during a ten -minute interval for each direction of traffic at the end of the survey on Wednesday March 9, 2016. From these volumes the hourly average traffic volumes were extrapolated. Table 2 presents the extrapolated hourly traffic volumes. Automobiles include pickup trucks, passenger cars hauling trailers, and vans. Medium trucks are six-wheeled cargo vehicles with two axles. Heavy trucks are cargo vehicles with three or more axles. Speeds were determined using a handheld radar gun. The median speeds for dozens of vehicles are listed in Table 2.

3.5 Weather

Weather can affect both the propagation of sound from a roadway, as well as produce sound by rustling leaves or causing wind or rain noise at the microphone. For these reasons, weather conditions were documented during the survey. Hourly weather information was obtained from the website Weather Underground. The following precipitation and wind faster than 10 mph were noted:

- Mar. 2 10-20 mph wind (gusts to 34 mph) from W to NW at the start of the survey to 8:30 pm
- Mar. 4 8-12.7 mph wind (gusts to 18.4 mph) from the N to NW at 12:30 to 4:30 pm



4. Outdoor noise modeling

4.1 TNM overview

In the United States, roadway traffic noise levels are typically analyzed using the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Traffic Noise Model (TNM). The current version is 2.5. The output from TNM is the hourly average sound level at the receivers. The program allows input of the following information:

- Coordinates of selected points along the road centerlines
- Pavement width and type
- Road locations that are elevated (structure roadways)
- Hourly volumes and speeds of autos, medium trucks, heavy trucks, buses, and motorcycles for each road segment
- Locations of traffic flow control devices such as stop signs, traffic signals, and toll booths at the start of roads
- Coordinates and heights of evaluation points (receivers)
- Coordinates of ground elevations in selected locations (terrain lines)
- The default ground type
- Coordinates and height of areas covered with thick evergreen forest (tree zones)
- Coordinates of existing and proposed objects that shield the site such as noise walls and buildings (barriers)
- Coordinates, height and spacing between buildings of rows of buildings which partially shield the site (building rows)

Not used for this project:

• Coordinates and ground material in selected locations (ground zones)

4.2 TNM validation

The traffic volumes and speeds presented in Table 2 were input into TNM. This TNM run is called the validation run. The following roads were used in TNM:

- Three separate roads representing each through lane of Route 200 eastbound
- Three separate roads representing each through lane of Route 200 westbound
- One road representing the ramp from Route 200 eastbound to GA Avenue NB
- One road representing the ramp from GA Avenue NB to Route 200 eastbound
- One road representing all 3 lanes of GA Avenue NB before the traffic signal (the one immediately to the south of Route 200)
- One road representing all 3 lanes of GA Avenue NB after the traffic signal
- One road representing all 3 lanes of GA Avenue SB before the traffic signal
- One road representing all 3 lanes of GA Avenue SB after the traffic signal
- Norbeck Road EB before the traffic signal at Norbeck Blvd



9109 CORONADO TERRACE, FAIRFAX, VA 22031 T [703] 534.2790

- Norbeck Road EB after the traffic signal at Norbeck Blvd
- Norbeck Road WB before the traffic signal at Norbeck Blvd
- Norbeck Road WB after the traffic signal at Norbeck Blvd

The locations and elevations of selected points along each road, and the width of each road, were taken from the Preliminary Plan. Per FHWA guidance all pavement was modeled as "Average." The effects of the traffic signals on Norbeck Road at Norbeck Blvd and on Georgia Avenue just south of Route 200 were included. We performed on-site counts and estimated the percentages of traffic that slowed to 5 mph or less due to the traffic signal to be as follows:

- 50% WB on Norbeck Road
- 46% EB on Norbeck Road
- 27% NB on Georgia Avenue (the same percentage was used on the SB lanes)

One terrain line was added along the southern edge of the ramp from Georgia Avenue NB to Route 200 EB to model the change in elevation between the road and site. Ground elevations were determined from the site plan.

Tree zones were added along Route 200 to the north and east of the site. Ground elevations of the tree zones were determined from the site plan. The trees were assumed to be 50 feet tall.

Barriers were added to represent the existing buildings to the west and south of the site. Ground elevations and building elevations were estimated based on information in the computer program Google Earth.

The default ground type was lawn.

The output sound levels were then compared to the sound levels measured during the traffic counts. Table 3 presents this comparison.

	M1	M2
Measured During Traffic Counts at 1:45 to 1:55 pm	62.8	56.6
TNM Output	63.0	59.3
TNM Minus Measured	+0.2	+2.7

Table 3. Comparison of TNM Validation Run Output and Measured Sound Levels, dB

It can be seen from Table 3 that TNM was conservative, producing sound levels between 0.2 and 2.7 dB higher than were measured. This level of agreement between the modeled and measured sound levels is reasonable and within the accepted level of accuracy of TNM.



4.3 Future traffic conditions

In an e-mail on March 14, 2016, the Maryland State Highway Administration provided the following traffic forecasts:

MD 97 - 0.25 mile north of MD 28:

- 2016 ADT 49,000
- 2036 ADT 53,750

MD 28 – 0.10 mile E of MD 97:

- 2016 ADT 22,850
- 2040 ADT 27,600

In order to use a single future date in the analysis we extrapolated from the SHA data to estimate the ADT on Georgia Avenue for the year 2040. The provided data implies an annual escalation factor of 0.5%. Using this factor, we estimate that the 2040 ADT will be 54,833 on Georgia Avenue.

SHA also provided hourly counts for the 48-hour period from September 1 to 2, 2015, for Georgia Avenue 0.25 miles north of Norbeck Road. From these data we determined the following:

- We used data for 5-6 pm. Route 200 has more traffic in the afternoon than the morning, and it controls noise levels on the site, so we need to use afternoon peak-hour data for Georgia Avenue to be consistent. The 5-6 pm hour has the highest total traffic volume in the afternoon and a high percentage of trucks.
- 5-6 pm included 7.9% of the total daily traffic volume.
- At 5-6 pm, 56.6% of traffic was heading northbound.
- At 5-6 pm, traffic included 1.0% medium trucks, 1.1% heavy trucks, 0.4% buses, and 0.3% motorcycles.

SHA also provided hourly counts for the 48-hour period from September 29 to 30, 2015, for Norbeck Road 0.1 mile east of Georgia Avenue. From these data we determined the following:

- We used data for 8-9 pm since it likely is the loudest hour. It has far more trucks than in the afternoon, and almost as much total traffic as in the afternoon, with more traffic on the westbound lane closest to the site.
- 8-9 am included 8.1% of the total daily traffic volume.
- At 8-9 pm, 65.7% of traffic was heading westbound.
- At 8-9 pm, traffic included 3.1% medium trucks, 2.1% heavy trucks, 0.5% buses, and 0.4% motorcycles.

Additional information was obtained from the document entitled "Travel Characteristics on MD 200 Intercounty Connector (ICC) & Vicinity" dated June 19, 2013, prepared by the Washington Council of Governments. Per Figure 5 entitled "Average Weekday Projections for ICC (by Segment/Direction)" the 2040 volumes are 32,088 westbound and 36,677 eastbound. Per Figure A5 entitled "2040 ICC Volumes by Time Period (3-7 pm)" part (b) entitled "PM Peak," during the 4-hour afternoon rush period there are 14,844 vehicles westbound and 15,173 eastbound. This implies a directional factor of 50.5% westbound in the afternoon. Based on the 48-hour counts for Georgia Avenue, the afternoon peak-hour included 27.6% of the total volume during the afternoon rush period of 3-7 pm. This same



factor was applied to the 2040 Route 200 volumes to estimate future peak-hour volumes of 4,092 EB and 4,183 WB.

Per our traffic counts, it was assumed that the 2040 peak-hour traffic volume on the ramp from Georgia Avenue NB would be 23.3% of the total volume on EB Route 200 (or 953 vehicles). Likewise, per our traffic counts it was assumed that the 2040 peak-hour traffic volume on the ramp from Route 200 to Georgia Avenue NB would be 16.9% of the traffic volume on EB Route 200 (or 691 vehicles).

Per the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the ICC it was assumed that the future traffic would include 4% medium trucks and 2% heavy trucks. Per our traffic counts, it was assumed that traffic would also include 0.6% buses and 0.6% motorcycles. These same percentages were used for the ramps to and from Route 200.

We used the speeds from the validation run of 67 mph EB and 65 mph WB on Route 200, 44 mph SB and 47 mph NB on Georgia Avenue, 33 mph WB and 35 mph EB on Norbeck Road, and 43.5 mph on the ramps to and from EB Route 200.

The resulting forecast traffic volumes and speeds are presented in Table 4.

Lanes	Autos	Medium Trucks	Heavy Trucks	Buses	Motor-	Prevailing Speed (mph)
Ramp GA NB to ICC EB	884	38	19	6	6	43.5
Ramp Rt 200 EB to GA NB	642	28	14	4	4	43.5
Rt 200 EB (not incl. ramp)	2,913	126	63	19	19	67
Rt 200 WB	3,882	167	84	25	25	65
GA Ave SB	1,833	20	21	7	6	44
GA Ave NB	2,389	26	28	10	7	47
Norbeck Rd WB	1,379	46	31	7	6	33
Norbeck Rd EB	719	24	16	4	3	35

Table 4. Year 2040 Loudest-Hour Traffic Volumes

4.4 Future traffic noise modeling

TNM was run using the traffic volumes and speeds presented in Table 4. All parameters from the validation run were retained for the future run, including the following:

- Road locations, pavement types, widths, elevations, and traffic signals
- Default ground type
- Barriers for existing buildings to the east and west
- Terrain line to the south of the ramp from Georgia Avenue NB to Route 200 EB
- Tree zones

The only changes from the validation run, other than the traffic volumes and speeds, were:

• the deletion of some barriers of houses to be removed along Norbeck Road



9109 Coronado Terrace, Fairfax, VA 22031 T [703] 534.2790

- the addition of barriers representing the proposed townhouses
- the addition of terrain lines representing the top and bottom of the proposed retaining wall along the row of northern townhouses
- the addition of building rows representing the proposed single-family houses
- the addition of receivers at the houses and in outdoor recreation areas

The outdoor recreation areas included rear yards of front-loaded townhouses (not rear-loaded townhouses), rear yards of single-family detached houses, a small common recreation area just behind the southern-most row of townhouses, and a large common active recreation area in the middle of the site.

4.5 Future outdoor traffic noise levels

It can be seen from Table 2 that the DNL on weekdays was between 0.8 dB below and 0.3 dB above the loudest-hour average sound level. The future loudest-hour average sound levels were output from TNM. To be conservative, we assumed that in the year 2040 the DNL would be approximately 1 dB greater than the loudest-hour average sound level for locations along both Route 200 and Norbeck Road. This assumption is equivalent to assuming that a slightly higher percentage of traffic would travel on Route 200 and Norbeck Road at night (between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.) than presently do along Route 200.

The resulting year 2040 DNL are presented in Figures 5 through 10. It can be seen from Figures 5 and 8 that the DNL will exceed the limit of 60 dB in some townhouse rear yards along Route 200. Therefore, there is a need for noise barriers to meet the county criteria along Route 200. It can be seen from Figures 6 and 7 that the DNL will not exceed the limit of 60 dB in outdoor areas along Norbeck.



Figure 5. Year 2040 DNL, dB, Contours Five Feet High along Route 200

ATTACHMENT F



9109 CORONADO TERRACE, FAIRFAX, VA 22031 T [703] 534.2790



Figure 6. Year 2040 DNL, dB, Contours Five Feet High along Norbeck Road



Figure 7. Year 2040 DNL, dB, in Rear Yards and Common Recreation Area at Norbeck Road

5. Outdoor highway noise mitigation

As noted above, noise barriers are required to meet the county criteria. We recommend constructing the following three noise walls as shown in Figure 11:

- A seven foot tall wall along the rear yards of townhouse lots 24 to 39 (at the northern side of the site), with perpendicular returns toward the houses. The wall is located at the top of the proposed retaining wall.
- An L-shaped wall along the rear yards of townhouse lots 17 to 23 (at the northern corner of the site) with a height of 6 feet at the rears of lots 17 to 23 and 7 feet for the short leg at the side of



lot 23. Also, it is necessary to re-grade the rear yards of lots 17 to 23 such that the yard elevations are no more than 1 foot higher than the bottom of the noise wall at that lot.

• A small three-legged six-foot tall wall at the rear yards of townhouse 18 and 38 toward the northern corner of the site.



Figure 9. Year 2040 DNL, dB, at Facades of Residences on Top Floor along Norbeck Road

These barriers can consist of noise walls made of a variety of materials such as wood, metal, concrete, and CMU. If a wood noise wall design is selected, we recommend using a design such as the one shown in Figure 12. Whatever wall type is used, it must not have gaps at the ground. Note that we are not



9109 CORONADO TERRACE, FAIRFAX, VA 22031 T [703] 534.2790

structural or geotechnical engineers and are expressing no opinion about the structural or geotechnical strength of any walls that we propose.



Figure 10. Year 2040 DNL, dB, at Facades of Residences on Top Floor along Route 200



Figure 11. Proposed Noise Walls along Route 200

The following appendices provide additional information about acoustical terminology and criteria, and the precision of this analysis. If you have any questions, please contact me at 703/534-2790 or via e-mail at <u>Gary@HushAcoustics.com</u>.

Sincerely,

Fany Ehrlich

Gary Ehrlich, P.E. Principal



9109 Coronado Terrace, Fairfax, VA 22031 T [703] 534.2790



3.5" by 3.5" log

Ground

Partial Transverse Section

Not to scale

Boards and battens overlap log at least 1.5", and nailed or screwed into log with no gap between them and the log





Appendix A – Noise Metrics

There are many different ways to express sound levels, but all ways must have some means of incorporating the three most important aspects of the sound: loudness (level), pitch (frequency), and duration (time pattern). The chosen way to express the sound level is known as the noise metric.

Level. The sound level is almost always expressed in decibels, abbreviated dB. The decibel is a unitless quantity; it is technically based a ratio between the sound pressure and a standard reference pressure. Sound level meters can show the sound level varying with a moving needle or changing electronic display. How quickly this display changes, and therefore how quickly the meter responds to changes in sound level, is called the time weighting network or simply the meter "response." The four most commonly used responses are peak, impulsive, fast, and slow; peak response is the fastest response while slow is the slowest. The peak response is only normally used to evaluate the potential for hearing damage and damage to structures, and is never used to express the annoyance of noise. The impulsive response is only typically used to evaluate loud periodic noises such as pile driving and gun fire. The fast and slow responses are the most commonly used. Fast response is used when the sound level changes relatively rapidly over time as would be the case at a night club or a construction site. Slow response is used when the sound level is relatively steady as would be the case for environmental noise such as near highways, railroads, and airports.

Following are how high A-weighted sound levels are for some familiar sounds (taken from U.S. Environmental Protection Agency documents):

N 7	•
	OICEC.
1 N	01303.

Chain saw operator	103-115 dBA
Heavy truck at 50 feet	85-95 dBA
Motorcycle driver	80-115 dBA
Power lawn mower operator	80-95 dBA
Subway rider	80-90 dBA
Train passenger	72-90 dBA
City bus at 50 feet	70-85 dBA
Waste food disposer	67-93 dBA
Automobile at 50 feet	64-88 dBA
Vacuum cleaner	60-85 dBA
Washing machine	47-73 dBA
Refrigerator	45-68 dBA
Average conversational speech at 1 m	neter:
Inside suburban house	55 dBA
Outdoors in suburban area	55 dBA
Inside urban house	57 dBA
Outdoors in urban area	65 dBA
On a train	66 dBA
On an aircraft	68 dBA

Frequency. The frequency of sound is always expressed in Hertz, abbreviated Hz. The audible frequency range (20 Hz to approximately 15,000 or 20,000 Hz) is typically divided into bands covering one octave,



or one-third of an octave. Each doubling of frequency is defined as one octave. A sound level can then be stated either as a single-value covering the entire audible frequency range, or for a given octave or one-third octave band. When sound levels are stated for the entire audible frequency range, the sound could be filtered to roughly simulate the hearing sensitivity of the average person. There are two commonly-used filter types: A- and C-weighting. An A-weighted sound level is by far the mostcommonly used, and was designed to approximately represent the hearing sensitivity of a person exposed to sounds of moderate loudness. A C-weighted sound level is occasionally used to assess noise from blasting and other loud short-duration sounds and was developed to approximately represent the hearing sensitivity of a person exposed to loud sounds. For environmental noise studies, or for most other purposes as well, it is assumed that the sound level is A-weighted if there is no specific designation otherwise.

Time Pattern. The variation of a sound level over time is perhaps the most complex of the three parameters, and there are a myriad of ways to express this variation. The various ways can be divided into single-event sound levels and long-term sound levels. Examples of "single events" are a train passby, an aircraft overflight, or a gun firing. Single-event sound levels can be based on the maximum sound level reached during the event (abbreviated L_{max}), the total sound energy produced during the event (known as the sound exposure level, or SEL), or the number of times the sound level exceeds a threshold value (known as the number of events above, or NA). Long-term sound levels must be based on sound levels over a given time interval. Common time intervals are one hour and 24 hours. During this time interval the stated quantity could be the average sound level (known as the equivalentcontinuous sound level, or L_{eo}), the amount of time the sound level exceeds a threshold value (known as time above, or TA), or the sound level exceeded any set percentage of the time (known as the statistical sound level; e.g., the sound level exceeded ten percent of the time is written L_{10} , while the sound level exceeded 90 percent of the time is written the L_{90}). One-hour average sound levels, or occasionally onehour statistical sound levels, are used by the Federal Highway Administration and state departments of transportation to express highway noise levels. The sound level exceeded 90 percent of the time, L_{90} , is often considered the background sound level, since it is not significantly affected by loud periodic noise events. 24-hour average sound levels, and occasionally 24-hour statistical sound levels, are typically used to express all forms of transportation noise including highway, aircraft, and railroad noise. The 24-hour average noise level can include some adjustments to account for peoples' increased sensitivity to noise in the evening and at night. The two most common ways to account for this sensitivity is with the Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) and the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). The DNL is just a 24-hour average sound level for a calendar day with 10 dB added to all noise which occurs between 12 a.m. and 7 a.m. and between 10 p.m. and midnight. The CNEL is identical to the DNL but with 5 dB added to all noise which occurs between 7 p.m. and 10 p.m.

Appendix B – Noise Criteria

Noise is unwanted since it causes: (1) hearing damage, (2) annoyance, (3) speech interference, and (4) sleep disturbance. There are various types of noise criteria that revolve around different unwanted causes. The Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) established maximum allowable sound levels in the workplace in an effort to prevent hearing damage. The OSHA limits often become significant in industrial and military settings, as well as for construction workers. In most work and home environments the sound levels are well below the OSHA limits. Most noise criteria relate to the other



three unwanted effects of noise. There are noise criteria at the federal, state, and local levels, and there are also non-regulatory criteria developed by many private and governmental organizations.

Federal Noise Criteria. There are many government agencies that have established noise criteria. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) developed many of the criteria used by other federal agencies. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) established an outdoor noise standard for residential land use. This HUD program lays out three levels for noise. A DNL below 65 dB is "acceptable." A DNL over 65 dB but not exceeding 75 dB is "normally unacceptable." A DNL above 75 dB is "unacceptable." The HUD indoor noise goal is that the DNL not exceed 45 dB inside proposed residences. These limits are typically only evaluated by HUD when the project receives funding from the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has established an outdoor threshold with a DNL of 65 dB, above which residential development is not compatible. The FAA indoor threshold is also a DNL of 45 dB. These limits are typically only evaluated when environmental noise studies (such as environmental assessments or environmental impact statements) are performed in support of a major project, or when existing residences, schools, or churches are sound insulated in FAA-sponsored programs. The Department of the Navy uses similar criteria which are typically only evaluated when environmental noise studies (such as Air Installation Compatible Use Zone, or AICUZ, studies) are completed in support of a major realignment of assets. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) established noise abatement criteria (NAC) for various land uses; the NAC for residential use is an hourly average sound level of 67 dB outdoors and 52 dB indoors. When the sound level approaches or exceeds the NAC a noise impact occurs. The state departments of transportation may define the word "approach" although it is typically considered to be when the sound level reaches within one dB of the NAC.

State Noise Criteria. Many states have established different noise criteria for four purposes: (1) to control noise produced by citizens, (2) to evaluate the compatibility of a proposed land use with respect to environmental noise, (3) to determine if construction of a state-funded noise barrier is warranted along a highway, and (4) to verify that new construction provides adequate acoustical separation between dwelling units of multi-family housing. The first purpose is incorporated into a noise ordinance and is enforceable against the person generating the noise. The Code of Maryland includes such as noise ordinance, while in the state of Virginia the noise ordinances are developed at the local level. Noise ordinances typically limit the maximum A-weighted noise level, and many also limit the maximum noise level in each octave band. The second purpose is incorporated into the environmental noise policy and is enforceable by the state and local (if adopted at the local level) planning and zoning departments. The Code of Maryland also includes such an environmental noise policy, while in most other states such as Virginia it is solely up to the municipalities to develop such a policy. The state of California has a building code requirement that if the outdoor DNL or CNEL exceeds 60 dB, an acoustical analysis shall be performed demonstrating that the indoor DNL or CNEL not exceed 45 dB. Environmental noise policies are almost always expressed in terms of the DNL, with the exception of the state of California which also uses CNEL. The third purpose is incorporated in the noise barrier policy and is used by the state department of transportation. Maryland and Virginia, as well as other states, have such a noise barrier policy. The noise barrier policies are almost always expressed in terms of the hourly average sound level referencing the noise abatement criteria used by the FHWA, although some are expressed in terms of the sound level exceeded during 10 percent of the hour (the L_{10}). The fourth purpose is


incorporated into the state and local building code in the form of a minimum acceptable Sound Transmission Class (STC) or Impact Insulation Class (IIC) rating.

Local Noise Criteria. Many municipalities have established both a noise ordinance and an environmental noise policy. The environmental noise policy is sometimes summarized in a policy plan, comprehensive plan, or similar document, while in other jurisdictions it is not documented at all (outside of in-house planning department memos). The environmental noise policy is sometimes enforceable by ordinance in the case of an overlay zone. Overlay zones are often adopted around airports or military air bases, as is the case for High Point, North Carolina. In some municipalities the state department of transportation noise barrier policy is used to assist determining if a developer applying for a re-zoning must build a highway noise barrier.

Private Noise Criteria. In many cases, there are no applicable regulatory criteria. For example, there rarely is any regulatory limit on noise levels due to plumbing systems, noise levels in classrooms, or noise levels transmitted from one office to another. In these cases it is useful to consider non-binding criteria developed by private and governmental organizations. The American Society of Heating Refrigerating and Air-conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) provides recommendations regarding noise from mechanical systems. The ASHRAE recommendations are typically expressed in terms of the Room Criterion (RC) rating, and formerly were expressed in terms of the Noise Criterion (NC) rating. The American National Standards Institute (ANSI) developed a standard regarding noise levels in schools, and this standard has been adopted into law in some jurisdictions. The World Health Organization (WHO) has developed many noise standards for various purposes. In some cases it is useful to assess what percentage of syllables, words, or sentences would be intelligible in a given noise environment; two noise metrics used for this purpose are called the speech transmission index (STI) and the articulation index (AI). Various textbooks provide guidance on appropriate STI and AI values. There has also been some research into the percentage of people that would be "highly annoyed" or awakened by given noise levels. This research could be cited in the development of a noise criterion.

Appendix C – Precision of Predictions

It is not generally feasible to calculate the precision of a noise level or noise level reduction predictions. Unlike fields such as structural engineering, it is not typical practice to incorporate a specific margin of error in acoustical studies. Where possible, somewhat conservative assumptions were used in the outdoor noise level analysis. However, STC ratings quoted by manufacturers of products such as windows and doors are inherently anti-conservative, since the manufacturer has the option to test products many times and only publish the best rating the product ever achieved. Also, there are a variety of field installation issues which could make the STC ratings of walls be lower than anticipated. These two factors (slightly conservative assumptions used to predict outdoor noise levels, and possibly anti-conservative data used to predict indoor noise levels) may roughly balance each other out. The end result is that our predictions should roughly match future measured sound levels on average, with a statistical variation above and below.

If a general margin of error were desired, it would be advisable to exceed the recommended acoustical performance (often expressed by the STC rating) of walls, windows, and doors by a couple of points. For highway noise analyses, a margin of error could be also incorporated by extending any

ATTACHMENT F



recommended highway noise barriers farther (i.e., shielding a greater angle of view) and a couple of feet higher. If you would like to incorporate a specific margin of error, please let us know and we could revise our analysis.

Note that the noise levels presented in this report are based on the assumption that the rooms are furnished; noise levels in unfurnished rooms will be higher. This effect can account for a 2 to 3 dB difference in many cases.

If a specific proffered commitment is made during the rezoning process for a project regarding the noise level inside residences or in outdoor activity areas, we would recommend incorporating a specific margin of error of approximately 2 dB. While such a margin of error is not routinely included, and would likely increase construction (building and/or noise wall) costs, it could limit liability should noise levels vary slightly from the predictions.

Hush Acoustics LLC does not provide any warranty or guarantee as to the precision of the noise level or noise level reduction predictions or measurements.

Note that we are not structural or geotechnical engineers and are expressing no opinion about the structural or geotechnical strength of any walls that we propose.

Appendix D – Field Testing

As noted above there are local and state environmental noise policies which specify the maximum allowable indoor DNL or CNEL. Typically, there is no requirement for a field test.

Attachment G Abandonment Request

Attorneys at Law 3 Bethesda Metro Center, Suite 460

LERCH EARLY & BREWER

ideas that work

www.lerchearly.com Cynthia M. Bar

Bethesda, MD 20814

Tel. (301) 841-3827 Fax (301) 347-3755 cmbar@lerchearly.com

October 13, 2016

Mr. Michael S. Cassedy Department of Transportation Division of Transportation Engineering 100 Edison Park Drive - 4th Floor Gaithersburg, MD 20878

> Re: Abandonment portions of Bradford Road, Norbeck Avenue and Coolidge Avenue, Montgomery County, Maryland (revised descriptions)

Dear Mike:

We have continued to make refinements in our preliminary plan related to the above abandonment request. In response to comments from Park and Planning staff and DOT we have reduced the portion of Bradford Road for which we are seeking abandonment in order to provide a central spine connection from this road to other planned roads in the proposed subdivision. However the portion of Bradford which connects to Norbeck Road is not desired as it is unnecessary, and too close to the existing Coolidge Avenue and the proposed new street "A" access to Norbeck Road. A small section of Bradford Road to the north is also unnecessary as it does not provide access to anything (the Inter County Connector is the northern boundary of this site). We have also made a small reduction in the area of Norbeck Avenue for which we are seeking abandonment to accommodate this new layout.

Also enclosed is an exhibit which shows the current preliminary plan layout in black and the existing roads in red. I have enclosed revised legal descriptions and exhibits for the area of Bradford Road and Norbeck Avenue for which we seek abandonment. I have also enclosed the descriptions for the section of Coolidge Avenue for which we seek abandonment for your convenience, although these have not changed. I have also enclosed a revised overall sketch which shows all of the areas for which we seek abandonment. Please substitute these descriptions for the descriptions that we filed previously.

If you need any additional information please do not hesitate to contact me. We appreciate your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Cynthin Ber

Cynthia Bar

Cc. Sandra Pereira

2393934.1

ATTACHMENT G

Mr. Michael S. Cassedy October 13, 2016 Page 2

Avinash Dewani

encls.



SOLTESZ, Inc. Project No.: 1454-05-02 Date: October 13, 2016

DESCRIPTION OF PARTIAL STREET ABANDONMENT OF BRADFORD ROAD DEDICATED TO PUBLIC USE BRADFORDS REST (PLAT BOOK 3 PLAT 286) OLNEY (8TH) ELECTION DISTRICT MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

Being two (2) strips or parcels of land hereinafter described in Part One and Part Two, and running, in, through, over and across part of Bradford Road, right of way width varies, and dedicated to public use a subdivision record plat titled "BRADFORDS REST" and recorded in the Land Records of Montgomery County, Maryland, in Plat Book 3 as Plat 286; and being more particularly described in Maryland State Plane Meridian (NAD83/91) as follows:

PART ONE:

Beginning for Part One at a point lying on the westerly right of way line of Bradford Road, right of way width varies, said line also being the South 09°00' East, 427.53 foot line of Lot 18 as shown on the aforementioned subdivision record plat recorded as Plat Book 3 as Plat 286, said point being distant 51.14 feet southeasterly from the common corner between Lot 9 and said Lot 18 as shown said plat, said point having Coordinate values of N=526984.88 feet and E=1292625.70 feet; thence departing said westerly right of way line and running so as to cross and include part of said Bradford Road as now surveyed

- 1.) North 74°01'09" East, 29.71 feet to a point on the easterly right of way line of said Bradford Road said easterly right of way line also being the westerly or South 09°00' east 430.91 foot line of Lot 19 as shown on said subdivision record plat recorded in Plat Book 3 as Plat 286; thence running with and along said easterly right of way of line
- 2.) South 15°58'51" East, 373.31 feet to a point on the northerly or North 81°25" East 1455.53 foot right of way line of Norbeck Road, Maryland Route 28, right of way width varies as shown on State Road Commission (SRC) Plat 1596; thence running with and along part of said northerly right of way line
- 3.) South 80°12'37" West, 29.88 feet to a point at the end of the South 16°04'12" East 24.98 foot right of way line of said Norbeck Road as shown on State

Highway Administration (SHA) Plat 54589; thence running reversely with and along said right of way line as now surveyed

- 4.) North 15°58'51" West, 25.66 feet to a point on the aforementioned westerly right of way line of said Bradford Road as shown on said plat recorded in Plat Book 3 as Plat 286; thence running with and along said westerly right of way line
- 5.) North 15°58'51" West, 344.43 feet to the point of beginning; containing 11,043 square feet or 0.2535 of an acre of land, more or less.

PART TWO:

Beginning for Part Two at a point lying on the westerly right of way line of Bradford Road, right of way width varies, said line also being the South 9°00' East, 561.6 foot line of Lot 3 as shown on the aforementioned subdivision record plat recorded in Plat Book 3 as Plat 286 said point being distant 39.35 feet northwesterly for southeasterly end of said right of way line as shown said plat, said point having Coordinate values of N=527852.15 feet and E=1292377.32 feet; thence running with and along part of said westerly right of way line

- 1.) North 15°58'51" West, 169.82 feet to a point on the fourth (4th) or North 25°21'41" East, 82.41 foot line of Parcel 1, described in a conveyance from Guy A. Hanks, Jr., to State of Maryland by deed dated January 2, 2008, and recorded among the said Land Records in Liber 35412 at Folio 229, and being shown on State Highway Administration (SHA) Plat 57038; thence running reversely with and along part of said line
- 2.) South 25°19'07" East, 8.15 feet to a point at the end of the fourth (4th) or South 73°23'55" West, 29.71 foot line of the Parcel listed as Unknown Owner as shown on SHA Plat 57040; thence running reversely with and along said line as now surveyed
- 3.) North 73°23'32" East, 28.39 feet to a point on the easterly right of way line of said Bradford Road; thence running with and along part of the easterly line of Bradford Road and part of the front line of Lot 11, as shown on the aforementioned plat recorded in Plat Book 3 as Plat 286
- 4.) South 15°58'51" East, 162.10 feet to a point; thence departing said easterly right of way line and running so as to cross and include part of said right of way of Bradford Road as shown on said plat, Plat Book 3 as Plat 286
- 5.) South 74°01'09" West, 29.71 feet to the point of beginning; containing 4,816 square feet or 0.1106 of an acre of land, more or less.

I hereby certify to the best of my professional knowledge, information, and belief that: this metes and bounds description was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that it is in compliance with the requirements set forth in COMAR Title 09, Subtitle 13, Chapter 06, Regulation .12 of the minimum practice for Land Surveyors.

Kenneth L. Dye Property Line Surveyor Maryland Registration No. 556 License Expires: 3/5/2017 Date



SOLTESZ, Inc. Project No.: 1454-05-02 Date: October 13, 2016

DESCRIPTION OF PARTIAL STREET ABANDONMENT OF NORBECK AVENUE DEDICATED TO PUBLIC USE BRADFORDS REST (PLAT BOOK 3 PLAT 286) OLNEY (8TH) ELECTION DISTRICT MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

Being two (2) strips or parcels of land hereinafter described in Part One and Part Two, and running, in, through, over and across part of Norbeck Avenue, thirty (30) foot right of way, and dedicated to public use by a subdivision record plat titled "BRADFORDS REST" and recorded in the Land Records of Montgomery County, Maryland, in Plat Book 3 as Plat 286; and being more particularly described in Maryland State Plane Meridian (NAD83/91) as follows:

PART ONE:

Beginning for Part One at a point lying on the southerly right of way line of Norbeck Avenue, thirty (30) foot right of way, said line also being the South 77°45' East 536.47 foot line of Lot 7 as shown on said plat recorded in Plat Book 3 as Plat 286, said point being distant 16.28 feet northwesterly from the southeaster end thereof, said point having Coordinate values of N=527784.88 feet and E=1292380.82 feet; thence running with and along part of the southerly right of way line of Norbeck Avenue

- 1.) North 84°35'07" West, 42.85 feet to a point; thence departing said southerly right of way line and running so as to cross and include part of said Norbeck Avenue the following two (2) courses:
- 2.) North 74°01'09" East, 22.05 feet to a point; thence
- 3.) 25.90 feet along the arc of a tangent curve deflecting to the right, having a radius of 18.00 feet and a chord of South 64°45'37" East, 23.72 feet, to the point of beginning; containing 245 square feet or 0.0056 of an acre of land, more or less.

PART TWO:

Beginning for Part Two at a point lying on the southerly right of way line of Norbeck Avenue, thirty (30) foot right of way, said line also being the South 77°45' East 536.47 foot line of Lot 7 as shown on said plat recorded in Plat Book 3 as Plat 286, said point being distant 120.61 feet northwesterly from northwesterly end of the first (1st) or North

84°35'07" West, 42.85 foot line described above in Part One, said point having Coordinate values of N=527800.31 feet and E=1292218.09 feet; thence running with and along the southerly right of way line of Norbeck Avenue said right of way

- 1.) North 84°35'07" West, 357.27 feet to a point at the northwesterly corner of said Lot 7 said point also being the southeasterly intersection point between said Norbeck Avenue and Coolidge Avenue as shown on said plat recorded in Plat Book 3 as Plat 286; thence departing said lot corner and running so as to cross and include part of said Norbeck Avenue as shown on said plat recorded in Plat Book 3 as Plat 286 and also with and along the northerly dedication line of Coolidge Avenue as shown a subdivision record plat titled "SUBDIVISION RECORD PLAT, PARCELS 1 AND J, BLOCK A, NORBECK OVERLOOK" and recorded among the aforesaid Land Records as Plat 24669
- 2.) North 84°35'07" West, 47.79 feet to a point at the northeasterly corner of Parcel J, Block A, as shown on said Plat 24669; thence running with and along the northerly line of said Parcel J, Block A, and part of the northerly line of Parcel I, Block A, as shown on said Plat 24669, said line also being part of the southerly right of way line of Norbeck Avenue
- 3.) North 84°35'07" West, 75.97 feet to a point; thence departing said northerly right of way line and running so as to cross and include part of said Norbeck Avenue
- 4.) North 05°24'53" East, 30.00 feet to a point on the northerly line of said Norbeck Avenue, said point also being the southerly common corner between Lot 1 and Lot 2 as shown on said plat recorded in Plat Book 3 as Plat 286; thence running with and along part of said northerly right of way line
- 5.) South 84°35'07" East, 557.60 feet to a point; thence departing said northerly right of way line and running so as to cross and include part of said Norbeck Avenue
- 6.) South 74°01'09" West, 82.24 feet to the point of beginning; containing 15,580 square feet or 0.3577 of an acre of land, more or less.

I hereby certify to the best of my professional knowledge, information, and belief that: this metes and bounds description was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that it is in compliance with the requirements set forth in COMAR Title 09, Subtitle 13, Chapter 06, Regulation .12 of the minimum practice for Land Surveyors.

Kenneth L. Dye Property Line Surveyor Maryland Registration No. 556 License Expires: 3/5/2017 Date



SOLTESZ, Inc. Project No.: 1454-05-02 Date: July 5, 2016

DESCRIPTION OF PARTIAL STREET ABANDONMENT OF **COOLIDGE AVENUE** DEDICATED TO PUBLIC USE **BRADFORDS REST** (PLAT BOOK 3 PLAT 286) AND **NORBECK OVERLOOK** (PLAT 24669) OLNEY (8TH) ELECTION DISTRICT MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

Being a strip or parcel of land hereinafter described running, in, through, over and across part of Coolidge Avenue, right of way width varies, and dedicated to public use by the following two (2) subdivision record plats; the first (1st) being titled "BRADFORDS REST" and recorded in the Land Records of Montgomery County, Maryland, in Plat Book 3 as Plat 286; and the second (2nd) being titled "SUBDIVISION RECORD PLAT, PARCELS I AND J, BLOCK A, NORBECK OVERLOOK" and recorded among the said Land Records as Plat 24669; and being more particularly described in Maryland State Plane Meridian (NAD83/91) as follows:

Beginning for the said strip or parcel of land at the northwestern most corner of Lot 7 as shown on said plat recorded in Plat Book 3 as Plat 286, said point also being the southeasterly intersection point between said Norbeck Avenue, thirty (30) foot right of way, and Coolidge Avenue, right ow way width varies, said point having Coordinate values of N=527834.02 feet and E=1291862.42 feet; thence running with and along part of the easterly right of way line of said Coolidge Avenue said line also being the easterly line of said Lot 7

- 1.) South 15°58'51" East, 131.56 feet to a point; thence departing said easterly right of way line and running so as to cross and include part of said Coolidge Avenue as shown on said plats
- 2.) South 74°01'09" West, 44.50 feet to a point at the easterly common corner between Parcel A, and Lot 56, Block A, as shown on said plat recorded as Plat 24669, said point also lying on the westerly right of way line of Coolidge Avenue; thence running with and along said westerly right of way line
- 3.) North 15°58'51" West, 148.99 feet to a point at the northeasterly corner of Parcel A, Block A, as shown on said Plat 24669 said point also being the northwesterly intersection point between said Coolidge Avenue and Norbeck

Avenue; thence departing said westerly right of way line and running so as to cross and include part of said Coolidge Avenue

4.) South 84°35'07" East, 47.79 feet the point of beginning; containing 6,242 square feet or 0.2535 of an acre of land, more or less.

I hereby certify to the best of my professional knowledge, information, and belief that: this metes and bounds description was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that it is in compliance with the requirements set forth in COMAR Title 09, Subtitle 13, Chapter 06, Regulation .12 of the minimum practice for Land Surveyors.

Date

Kenneth L. Dye Property Line Surveyor Maryland Registration No. 556 License Expires: 3/5/2017



