

Current Project - Department Review Status

820180190

| Rev Cycle | Group Name | Reviewer Name | Review Status | Review Comments |
|-----------|-----------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| 1 | | | | |
| | ROW PERMITTING | Sam Farhadi sam.farhadi@montgomerycountymd.gov | Revisions Requested | Please see DPS-RPP Eplan comments. |
| | AREA MASTER PLAN | Stephanie Dickel stephanie.dickel@montgomeryplanning.org | Revisions Requested | see markups |
| | COUNTY TRANSPORTATION | | Incomplete | |
| | WSSC | Amy Quant Amy.Quant@wsscwater.com | Recommend for Approval | |
| | COUNTY ARBORIST | Laura Miller laura.miller@montgomerycountymd.gov | Incomplete | |
| | WASHINGTON GAS | James Sheehan WGLMontReviews@enengineering.com | Recommend for Approval | There are WGL facilities in the project limits. See the attached quad map for details. When final plans are available, please provide them to WGL for final review. |
| | SEDIMENT & STORMWATER | Andrew Kohler andrew.kohler@montgomerycountymd.gov | Incomplete | Dave Kuykendall is the plan reviewer. Will need to obtain a SWM concept. |
| | PARK PLANNING | Dominic Quattrocchi Dominic.Quattrocchi@montgomeryparks.org | Revisions Requested | <p>SITE PLAN: 820180190</p> <p>Comments and Questions for Pre-DRC: Site Plan No. 820180190, Westwood Shopping Center (Comments from Montgomery Parks Cultural Resources)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify, delineate, and label on all plans: Neighborhood Park (Springfield) to be dedicated to M-NCPPC; Gateway to Willett Branch from Westbard Avenue to be dedicated to MNCPPC; Stream buffer areas to be dedicated to NCPPC; and Neighborhood Civic Green to remain in private ownership. • Applicant must conduct archaeological assessment and potential testing, if needed, prior to construction in area dedicated as the Neighborhood Park as part of normal due diligence. • The applicant is expected to contribute to any memorialization and related study of the River Road African American community and Moses Cemetery in an amount commensurate with extent of development. <p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: How is the applicant accommodating dogs via either public or private open space? |

Current Project - Department Review Status

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide illustrative drawing for the architecture and neighborhood park to understand materials and elevation • Underground the transformer. <p>Springfield Neighborhood Green Urban Park (Approximately 0.4 acres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall: Applicant should provide a turn key project; the applicant builds and dedicates the park land for the park department's maintenance. This neighborhood park should be one of the key amenities to the residence at the opening of the project. Therefore, this neighborhood park should be designed as much detail as the central civic green space. • Location and design: While this park location has been identified in the sector plan, the interface with proposed building is not adequate at all. Either relocating the park if the interface issue cannot be addressed or redesigning the interface of the building provide appropriate context for the park user. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Could alternative location can be considered, perhaps west of the lobby location where SWM is located? o Applicant should pursue ways to conceal and mitigate the negative appearance and odor of the loading dock / trash (ie backside of the building facing this park) o For example, vegetation buffer such as street trees on the park side, graphic on loading dock door, murals on the building facing park, etc could be considered. • Program: Contemplative neighborhood park function or community garden to serve the residence could be considered. • Comment: Applicant must provide tie in for water and electric. • Question: Where will maintenance access and parking for Parks Department equipment be located? <p>Central Civic Green (Approximately 0.4 acres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Applicant should provide detailed rendering of the Central Civic Green area and building face on the edge facing the neighborhood green for further evaluation. |
| | AREA TRANSPORTATION | Matthew Folden matthew.folden@montgomeryplanning.org | Revisions Requested | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. see comments via changemarks 2. provide an infrastructure phasing plan |
| | HISTORIC PRESERVATION | Rebecca Ballo rebecca.ballo@montgomeryplanning.org | Revisions Requested | Please label all adjacent parcel owners consistently and correctly. note that construction staging should not occur on adjacent parcels that are not part of this development plan. This comment applies for all phases of development. |
| | ZONING & ENFORCEMENT | Laura Bradshaw laura.bradshaw@montgomerycountymd.gov | Recommend for Approval | <p>Do phases 1A, 1B, 1C represent the order in which these will be built?</p> <p>Please provide a Building Height Measuring point along the "front" of the building, at the mid-point of the facade. (Sheet Sp101) Composite Site Plan.</p> |

Current Project - Department Review Status

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | AREA ENVIRONMENTAL | Marco Fuster marco.fuster@montgomeryplanning.org | Denied | Many of the of the previous EP comments (which still apply to the current plan submission) have not been addressed. Please address all unresolved EP changemarks from current and previous review cycles and also provide a corresponding point-by-point response which address the comments. Universally address applicable comments across various sheets and the Preliminary/Site Plans. Significant revisions needed before staff can support the plans. |
| | FIRE & RESCUE | Marie LaBaw marie.labaw@montgomerycountymd.gov | Revisions Requested | 120170170 820180190 WESTWOOD SHOPPING CENTER 1) FD vehicular access shown in conflict with parking spaces. 2) AutoTurn movements shown in conflict with curbs. 3) Minimum allowable exterior radius at a bend in the FD vehicular access path is 50 ft. 4) Where there is 20 ft of pavement, interior radius can be no less than 30 ft. 5) Townhome lots 47-57 shown main side hinge doors beyond 50 and 150 ft distance maximums from fire department vehicular access. 6) Clarify access and labels distances to Lots 1-10. 7) Townhouse sticks must all be accusable and addressed from the same access road. Lot 20 cannot be accessed from a different section of Westbard Ave than lots 9-19. 8) Turning radii are not identified on private alley labeled "HOA Parcel (Phase 2)" 9) If any highrises are proposed, locate FCC for concept review to be finalized at building permit. |
| | STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION | Kwesi Woodroffe kwoodroffe@sha.state.md.us | Recommend for Approval | TIS currently under review. Once approved, any improvements in the SHA r/w or on state roads will be determined. |
| | AREA SITE PLAN | Stephanie Dickel stephanie.dickel@montgomeryplanning.org | Revisions Requested | See markups. Please provide color renderings of each building (every elevation for each building as well). Please provide illustrative color sections/street views of the project. Please continue to coordinate with staff on the townhouse layout and design, multifamily building design, façade treatments, open space, etc. |
| | HOUSING & COMMUNITY AFFAIRS | Lisa Schwartz lisa.schwartz@montgomerycountymd.gov | Revisions Requested | 1. Each of the individual site plans for the development (including this one) must have at least 12.5% MPDUs in order to comply with the phasing requirements of Chapter 25A. Change the words "Overall project" in General Note 10 to "Each site plan". 2. This site plan only includes 11.5% (30) MPDUs. Increase the number of MPDUs by 3 so that the site plan has 12.5% MPDUs. Because the townhouses already include 12.5% MPDUs, the 3 additional MPDUs may be located in the multi-family building. 3. The bedroom mix in the multi-family building has one more one-bedroom MPDU and one less two-bedroom MPDU than required. However, the mix will change |

Current Project - Department Review Status

| | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|---------------------|--|
| | | | | when the three MPDUs are added to the multi-family building. 4. Label the townhouse MPDUs on the 30 scale drawings. |
| | PEPCO | | Incomplete | |
| | PLANNING DESIGN | Paul Mortensen paul.mortensen@montgomeryplanning.org | Revisions Requested | <p>First comment is that it is always very helpful to see the buildings in 3 dimensions with rendered perspectives to fully understand the relationship of elevations to each other, materials being used, and to the final massing and break down of the buildings. We would like to see perspectives of this proposed development, particularly at important streets.</p> <p>Townhouses Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most of the townhouse elevations look good and are well composed. 2. Providing masonry on the side elevation of the first unit of a string of townhouses facing a street or alley is great. Internal alley elevations are out of site from streets and can remain predominantly siding to help reduce cost. 3. Side of townhouses facing a street must have a well composed elevation that is largely masonry similar to front elevations in this development. Use of symmetry, asymmetry, and alignment of windows should be employed to not allow the elevation to look like a collection of random windows. 4. Perhaps the use of porches can be used at certain locations such as important corners and along streets in certain locations to heighten important views and the greater pedestrian experience. Porches add to social interaction within a neighborhood. 5. Front-loaded townhouses are clearly inferior to rear-loaded townhouses as garage doors and driveways dominate the street front and the resulting elimination of street trees kills the pedestrian experience, all in favor of the car. These front-loaded elevations are made even more strange with the awkwardly applied third floor masonry window. Masonry should be designed to represent weight and mass, not a lightweight panel. We would suggest that masonry either fully include or exclude a floor with a continuous horizontal line rather than applying it to elevations as a partial panel. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. To eliminate the need for front loaded garage door units, perhaps the Applicant can create a continuous partially undergrounded, shared garage at these western most townhouses taking advantage of the topography. Inside the structure could include a continuous drive aisle to the west with private garage doors under each unit to the east. Look at the duplexes at 38th Street and Cathedral Avenue in DC as a precedent for this option. Separated first floors and stoops with gardens could be above and in front of the continuous garage. 6. The side elevations with bay windows (C Unit Side Alternative) are strange in that they almost (but not quite) touch the masonry rowlock course above. Perhaps align top of the masonry and the rowlock course with the sills of the window above so there is more masonry above the bay. Alternatively, perhaps create the bay to be |

Current Project - Department Review Status

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>taller so that it overlaps the rowlock course which can be tied into the bay trim design.</p> <p>7. Also at the “C” Unit – perhaps add a window sized panel at the 2nd Floor to create a strong vertical line at the right edge of the elevation.</p> <p>8. We question whether the southernmost townhouses can be accessed for fire from the plaza or alley.</p> <p>Apartment Building Comments, Lot 4, Block A:</p> <p>1. There are several issues with the larger residential building Lot 4, Block A. Of primary concern is that there seems to be 2 backs to this building which both minimize the pedestrian quality of the street facing the park to the north, and facing the townhouses to the west. Although all buildings have fronts and backs, primary and secondary facades, this building appears to have 2 backs that are quite negative to their surrounding environment. That said:</p> <p>a. Why does this building need two primary parking entrance/exits? By reducing this parking access to one entrance/exit (We suggest removing the western exit/entrance), more room can be used for pedestrian-oriented uses on this west façade.</p> <p>b. The drive-through/drop off on the West Elevation takes up approximately one-quarter of the entire street level elevation with the deep, dark spaces and blank wall behind. This kills the pedestrian nature of the sidewalk and creates even more curb cuts for cars. We suggest this drive-through be removed so the lobby and other street activating spaces can face directly onto the sidewalk to help activate it and promote pedestrian energy. Short term/drop off parking and loading can be allowed along the street instead of the drive through and longer-term parking.</p> <p>c. Metal louvers at the parking spaces on the West Elevation also kills the pedestrian quality of this important residential street. At a minimum, these screens should be laser cut metal art panels that allow air into the parking, but also provide public art and interest along the street. Even more ideal, these immediate parking spaces, some of the additional space generated from the removal of the drive through, and removal of one of the additional parking garage entry points could all allow room for small retail shops or 2-story residential units that enter and exit directly onto the street making this street a double loaded Main Street.</p> <p>d. If parking is exposed at the second floor on any elevation, we strongly suggest that it be well screened to completely hide the use behind.</p> <p>e. Are the transformers shown at the outside of the northern elevation above or below grade? We strongly encourage them to be below grade so they don't conflict with the pedestrian sidewalk experience that faces the park.</p> <p>2. In looking at the plans, it seems there is an opportunity to push back the single-story retail wing immediately to the north of the pedestrian passage on the East Elevation. Of the first-floor elevation was aligned with the upper floors, this new space could be a tremendous small plaza used by the adjacent retail or restaurant, and then framed by the larger building and the end wing that projects out to</p> |
|--|--|--|---|

Current Project - Department Review Status

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>Westbard Avenue. The corner retail then has potential for 3 transparent glass walls to the street and plazas. This plaza could also include 1 large specimen tree that could be an iconic identifier of the overall development!</p> <p>Grocery Store Comments, Lot 1, Block A:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please study a building section through the store, parking, townhouses and through the Kenwood Place condominiums to see if additional screening may be needed at the edge of the top floor of the parking garage to minimize the light impacts on the condominiums. 2. The entrance to the store parking garage is the southern terminus of Private Street A, the most important residential street in this development. This elevation on this axis, is a primary piece in the creation of a strong walkable environment which brings character and value to the overall development and the residences. This elevation should be unique, interesting and as important as this axial moment suggests. The garage entrances at Pike and Rose, typically terminating important street and pedestrian route axis are a great example of how these entrances can be embellished with public art and colorful screening. We suggest the applicant create something equally energized. 3. Also, like Pike and Rose, consider graphic art on the expansive service bay garage doors at all service door elevations, especially at the south elevation of Lot 1 Block A. 4. The parking entrance at the service plaza on Westbard Avenue is extremely wide causing the crosswalk at this location to be twice as wide as the crosswalk at the main entry Woonerf street. We understand wide turning radii may be needed for trailer truck access, but we strongly suggest the throat of this Westbard entry be reduced to 24' maximum which should allow 2 trucks to pass each other without conflict. 5. The East Elevation indicates a rigid, integral canopy over the northern first floor retail but awnings, which typically appear more temporary over time, over the central retail facing Westbard Avenue. We would prefer a coherent, constant set of permanent canopies (metal, glass, etc.) along the entire front where weather protection and signage are necessary. <p>Urban Design Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In all highly dense townhouse developments there is a tradeoff between the high density and the minimization of any private yards in favor of communal, focused "public" spaces that the residents can enjoy and celebrate. EYA originally made their mark on this region through the creation of these unique types of townhouse communities in DC and Montgomery County. Dense townhouse strings with tight alleys framed spectacular central spaces that added both economic and social value. Where are those spaces or space in this proposed townhouse arrangement? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. We believe the paved parking entrance plaza to the front-loaded townhouses is not a great pedestrian oriented space but rather a glorified and busy driveway that |
|--|--|--|--|

Current Project - Department Review Status

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>feeds not only the facing front-loaded units, but also the southernmost string of townhouses. We believe this space will not be successful and it further isolates the southernmost townhouses from the greater community.</p> <p>2. The western terminus of the entry plaza Woonerf currently is a couple of garage doors on front-loaded townhouses, which is totally inadequate to the importance of this street and view. Make this terminus important with either a defined space or unique, iconic element.</p> <p>3. Planning Staff has suggested a couple design ideas that promotes the strengthening of the pedestrian realm on Private Street A, provides a meaningful, focused central semi-public space for residents and visitors, creates a terminus to the very important axis of the entry plaza Woonerf, and/or strengthens the connection between the northern sidewalk of the central plaza to the townhouses and possibly the communities to the west. These plan drawings have either been presented to the Applicant already, or are provided in these overall comments from the Planning Department.</p> <p>4. As Private Street A is the “Main Street” of the residential community, it should have a very strong, active and continuous frontage. We suggest that the Lot 6, Block A block have units facing only east and west with a single central alley to strengthen those east and west frontages. (rather than a “T” shaped alley). This configuration would provide a much better backdrop to the small plaza building.</p> <p>5. We do not believe leftover, undevelopable pieces of land should be counted as “public” or “common” open space unless they are designed as focused spaces for people to use and enjoy. Likewise, sidewalks that are necessary for pedestrian circulation and part of the street right of ways should not be counted as open space. Provide common or public open spaces that are primarily used by people.</p> <p>6. Why is the public building within the central plaza considered “public open space”? It is a building.</p> <p>7. It appears that many of the proposed trees within the overall site are either “small” or “medium” sized species. Also, we could not identify from the Planting Legend, what kind of tree is being used for street trees. We strongly suggest that “large” tree species be used at all street tree locations.</p> <p>8. There are many locations within this overall site plan that can accommodate the planting and growth of very large (when fully mature) specimen trees that will create great value, will bring shade to buildings and pedestrians, will provide habitat, and will provide storm water evapotranspiration. The surrounding communities contain a huge variety of these types of enormous trees. We strongly suggest finding locations such as the playground park, the ends of the townhouse strings, the southern end of the site and possibly one or two locations in the plaza to plant these iconic and adored types of community trees that will create a link to the greater community.</p> <p>9. Previous perspective images of the northern park showed an elaborate design of play equipment, sculptures and landscape. The current plan drawings show a very minimal small set of playground equipment and then blank open space. We believe</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

Current Project - Department Review Status

| | | | | |
|--|-------------|---|---------------------|--|
| | | | | <p>there should be space for enjoyment on a lawn, but we also hope there will be much more thought in the development and activation of this park.</p> <p>10. Maybe out of the question, but currently, many residents in the southern single-family neighborhoods walk from the end of Jordan Road across the Kenwood Place driveway to the current shopping mall. Could a stair and trail possibly be located at or near the western terminus of the central plaza road that provides a pedestrian connection to this existing Jordan Road trail and the private condo driveway?</p> |
| | AREA DESIGN | Elza Hisel-McCoy elza.hisel-mccoy@montgomeryplanning.org | Revisions Requested | See markups. As noted, replace "typical" elevations with street elevations for each block. |