

BLOOM MV	DRC COMMENTS	AGENCY	
Preliminary Plan 120170150	January 24th, 2017	MCDOT	
		Printed on 6/7/2017	
Reviewer: Deepak Somarajan			
#	COMMENTS	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE	MCDOT'S RESPONSE
1	<p>1. Comments are uploaded and on preliminary plan</p> <p>Note the following revised comment regarding Bikeshare: The Montgomery Village Master Plan encourages increased options for mobility and connectivity by all modes including biking. Bikesharing is an important component of that effort. The Project's private street network, coupled with many existing as well planned trails and pedestrian connections, offers unique opportunities to enhance multimodal links. Bloom MV will be improving connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists by providing missing links to the Montgomery Village Shopping Center (Centerway and Montgomery Village Avenue) and to other destinations in the area. Two bikeshare stations were recommended as part of the redevelopment of the Montgomery Village Shopping Center (Sketch Plan 320170020, reviewed June 2016). That shopping center is approximately .7 miles from Bloom Area 1, at the southern end of the Project. It is approximately 1.5 miles from Area IV at the northern end of the Project and just over one mile from the edge of Area VI at the eastern end of the Project. Thus bikeshare in each of these areas would be at an ideal distance to encourage use of biking to this retail destination, as well as to a number of other activity centers in Montgomery Village as bikeshare expands.</p>	<p>We would like to note that the proposed number of dwelling units passes the LATR test without mitigation. The applicant proposes up to two bikeshare stations located in the MVF park in Area I and in Area IV along pedestrian routes in central areas (final location not determined yet in Area IV because of slope and geometric issues). Further, the applicant will work with MCDOT to promote use of bikesharing among residents and visitors. Specific maintenance commitments will be negotiated under any necessary transportation demand management agreement.</p>	<p>MCDOT do not agree with the applicant's response. The need for Bikeshare is not related to the LATR.</p>
2	<p>2. Recommendation: Provide at least one 19-dock bikeshare station in each of the Project's six Areas. A typical bikeshare station requires a site that is 53' by 12' in size with four to six hours of solar exposure per day. These stations should be located in areas adjoining or proximate to bike/ped trails and thus should be able to readily connect to bike lanes on Watkins Mill and the shared use path on Montgomery Village Avenue. These stations would connect to the redeveloped Montgomery Village Shopping Center and eventually to other activity centers including offices the Gaithersburg branch library on Montgomery Village Avenue. Ultimately stations may also be located at destinations such as other office locations, Lakeforest Mall and the Lake Forest Transit Center to enable connections to jobs and transit.</p>		<p>Please refer to Applicant's response to Line Item #47. We accept the Applicant's provision of 2 bikeshare stations, one located at the MVF park in Area I and one in Area IV. Please show the location of both the bikeshare stations on the preliminary plan.</p>
3	<p>Consistent with comments provided for other redevelopment projects in this area, when bikeshare becomes operational in the Montgomery Village area, the Project will be required to pay the capital cost of stations on the Project site and five (5) years of operating expenses. Applicant will take other actions in concert with MCDOT to promote use of bikesharing among residents, employees and visitors at the Project.</p>		<p>Please see Line item # 2.</p>
4	<p>Significant Comments:</p>		
5	<p>1. Per the Montgomery Village Master Plan: Roadway:</p>	<p>Understood; all roadways are designed to the required right-of-way & with the necessary number of lanes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stewartown Road (MA-298) is classified as a two (2)-lane Minor Arterial 		
7	<p>Roadway with a proposed fifty-six 56-ft right-of-way between Montgomery Village Avenue and Watkins Mill Road and seventy (70)- ft right-of-way between Montgomery Village Avenue and Goshen Road.</p>		
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Montgomery Village Avenue (A-295) is classified as a four (4)-lane Arterial Roadway with a proposed right-of-way of one hundred (100)-ft. 		
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arrowhead Road (P-19) is classified as a two (2)-lane Primary Residential 		
10	<p>Roadway with a proposed right-of-way of seventy (70)-ft.</p>		
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Watkins Mill Road (A-17) is classified as a four (4)-lane Arterial Roadway with a proposed right-of-way of eighty (80)-ft. 		
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Per the Appendix1 : Transportation Analysis: Intersection improvements recommended at the following intersections: 		

BLOOM MV	DRC COMMENTS	AGENCY	
Preliminary Plan 120170150	January 24th, 2017	MCDOT	
		Printed on 6/7/2017	
Reviewer: Deepak Somarajan			
#	COMMENTS	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE	MCDOT'S RESPONSE
13	Montgomery Village Avenue & Stewartown Road:		
15	› Construct a northbound left-turn lane on Montgomery Village Avenue.	A separate northbound left-turn lane will be provided within the median on Montgomery Village Avenue at the Stewartown Road intersection when Stewartown Road extended is constructed.	We agree with the applicant's response on providing the left turn lane within the median on Montgomery Village. The revised preliminary plans do not reflect it.
16	› Construct a southbound right-turn lane on Montgomery Village Avenue.	A separate southbound right-turn lane on Montgomery Village Avenue at the Stewartown Road is not necessary for capacity. The intersection is anticipated to operate well within the congestion standard with buildout of all six areas of the proposed Bloom Montgomery Village application and with trip diversions associated with the Watkins Mill interchange at I-270. Further, a separate northbound right-turn lane is not provided for existing Stewartown Road and a right-turn lane would increase the crossing distance for pedestrians. Therefore, a separate right-turn lane is not recommended at this intersection. Dedication will be provided in case it is determined in the future that the lane is necessary.	We do not agree with the Applicant's response that the southbound right turn is not necessary. The TIS was based on 2001 SHA study for the Watkins Mill Interchange which is outdated. Once the traffic counts are revised based on the recent study, we will revisit the comment. The revise preliminary plan shows additional right-of-way dedications for the right turn lane. Does this include lawn panel, and ped/bike facility? How was the length and the width of the dedication for the right turn lane determined?
17	Watkins Mill Road and Crested Iris Drive I (future) Stewartown Road:		
18	› Construct a northbound and southbound left-turn lanes on Watkins Mill Road.	Northbound and southbound left-turn lanes on Watkins Mill Road at the Crested Iris Drive/Stewartown Road Extended intersection will be provided in the existing two-way left turn lane. We would like to discuss with staff, however, how to maintain safe pedestrian crossing.	We agree with the applicant's response on providing a northbound and southbound left turn lane within the existing two-way left turn lane on Watkins Mill Road. The revised preliminary plans do not reflect the left turn lanes and the pedestrian crossing at the intersection.
19	› Construct a northbound right-turn lane on Watkins Mill Road.	A separate right-turn lane on Watkins Mill Road to the Stewartown Road extended is not necessary for capacity. The subject intersection is anticipated to operate well within the congestion standard with buildout of all six areas as proposed. Further a separate right-turn lane would increase the crossing distance for pedestrians. Therefore, a northbound separate right-turn lane is not recommended.	We do not agree with the Applicant's response that a separate right turn is not necessary. The TIS was based on 2001 SHA study for the Watkins Mill Interchange which is outdated. Once the traffic counts are revised based on the recent study, we will revisit the comment. The revise preliminary plan shows additional right-of-way dedications for the right turn lane. Does this include lawn panel, and ped/bike facility? How was the length and the width of the dedication for the right turn lane determined?

BLOOM MV	DRC COMMENTS	AGENCY	
Preliminary Plan 120170150	January 24th, 2017	MCDOT	
		Printed on 6/7/2017	
Reviewer: Deepak Somarajan			
#	COMMENTS	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE	MCDOT'S RESPONSE
20	Bikeway & Pedestrian Connectivity:		
21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Montgomery Village Avenue: Shared use path on the eastern side and tie into existing shared use path built on the eastern side along the Lake Whetstone between Stedwick Road and Lake Shore Drive. 	Shared use paths will be provided on the subject property and any frontage associated with the property where the existing rights-of-way, easements, and slopes allow. We will work with MNCPPC & DOT staff to ensure connectivity is provided appropriately, but are opposed to providing additional trails & paths off-site due to the extensive environmental and park improvements proffered.	Noted. The preliminary Plan should reflect the shared use path.
22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stewartown Road: Shared use path should be constructed on southern side between Watkins Mill Road and Montgomery Village Avenue. Existing sidewalk on the southern side between Montgomery Village Avenue and Goshen Road should be upgraded to shared-use path. 	There is a proposed 10' shared use path connecting Watkins Mill Road to Montgomery Village Avenue. Due to the park trail system being provided, we are opposed to providing additional paths along the existing length of Stewartown Road, which would require significant grading of steep slopes, tree removal, and additional fill in the floodplain.	We agree with the proposed shared use path on the new Stewartown Road. On existing Stewartown Road, we have not seen any analysis that convinces us that the existing sidewalk could not be widened as envisioned in the master plan. If public agencies agree to allow the 8-ft shared use path along the Private Street as shown Area VI (Sheet PP-12) instead of the master plan recommended path, access easment and maintenance/liability issue need to be resolved.
23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Watkins Mill Road: Shared-use path constructed on east side south of Stedwick Road South and on the west side north of Club Lake Road. Missing and substandard segments on Watkins Mill Road north of Stedwick Road south should be constructed on the west side. In lieu of a shared-use path, separated bike lanes should be evaluated at the time of implementation. 	Shared use paths will be provided on the subject property and any frontage associated with the property where the existing right-of-way, easements, and slopes allow. We will work with MNCPPC & DOT staff to ensure connectivity is provided appropriately, but are opposed to providing additional trails & paths off-site due to the extensive environmental and park improvements proffered.	Noted. The preliminary Plan should reflect the shared use path.
24	2. Show necessary dedication along Montgomery Village Road, Watkins Mill Road and existing and proposed Stewartown Road in accordance with the Master Plan.	Dedication will be provided along Montgomery Village Avenue and Watkins Mill Road to accommodate future potential turn lanes. The applicant is not constructing the turn lanes at this time.	Refer to previous comments regarding the turn lanes on Montgomery Village and Watkins Mill Road.

BLOOM MV	DRC COMMENTS	AGENCY	
Preliminary Plan 120170150	January 24th, 2017	MCDOT	
		Printed on 6/7/2017	
Reviewer: Deepak Somarajan			
#	COMMENTS	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE	MCDOT'S RESPONSE
25	3. Since the intersection improvements as recommended in the Master Plan Appendix (See Comment#1) are directly related for access to this development, we believe the preliminary plans must reflect your client construct these (and related any pedestrian safety improvements).	As noted in the previous responses, separate right-turn lanes on Watkins Mill Road and Montgomery Village Avenue are not necessary for capacity purposes and are not recommended as they would increase the crossing distance for pedestrians. Dedication, however, will be provided per response #24.	Refer to previous comments regarding the turn lanes on Montgomery Village and Watkins Mill Road.
26	4. Show existing right-of-way and pavement width on the plan for Montgomery Village Road, Watkins Mill Road, Arrowhead Road and existing and proposed Stewartown Road. The project is subject to Executive Regulation No. 31-08AM (Context Sensitive Road Design Standards) and show all the existing roadways meet them.	Existing rights-of-way and pavement widths will be shown. As these roads were built before Executive Regulation No. 31-08AM and are not being rebuilt by this proposal, we do not anticipate they will meet the new standards and the applicant will not be required to upgrade them.	We agree on the existing roads but the proposed Stewartown Road shall meet the context sensitive standards. The proposed Stewartown roadway cross section to accommodate the SWM facilities in the right-of-way is still under review.
27	5. The existing sidewalk on the south side of existing Stewartown Road should be converted to shared use path (per the Master Plan) from Montgomery Village Avenue to the subject property boundary.	There is a proposed 10' shared use path connecting Watkins Mill Road to Montgomery Village Avenue. Due to the park trail system being provided, we are opposed to providing additional paths along the existing length of Stewartown Road, which would require significant grading, tree removal, and additional fill in the floodplain.	We have not seen any analysis that convinces us that the existing sidewalk could not be widened as envisioned in the master plan. If public agencies agree to allow the 8-ft shared use path along the Private Street as shown Area VI (Sheet PP-12) instead of the master plan recommended path, access easment and maintenance/liability issue need to be resolved.
28	6. The shared use path along Montgomery Avenue (per the master plan) along property frontage should be the responsibility of the applicant and should be reflected on the plans.	Shared use paths will be provided on the subject property and any frontage associated with the property where the existing right-of-way, easements, and slopes allow. We will work with MNCPPC & DOT staff to ensure connectivity is provided appropriately, but are opposed to providing additional trails & paths off-site due to the extensive environmental and park improvements proffered.	Noted. The revised preliminary plan does not reflect them.
29	7. Comments for the Design Exception Package dated December 2, 2016 was provided to the applicant on January 6, 2017.	The design exception comments received via email are being addressed.	The revised Design Exception is being reviewed. Also see Initial comments on the Design Exception below.
30	8. Traffic Impact study is still under review.	We will respond and work with you on any questions you may have.	The TIS and the signal warrant study are still under review.

BLOOM MV	DRC COMMENTS	AGENCY	
Preliminary Plan 120170150	January 24th, 2017	MCDOT	
		Printed on 6/7/2017	
Reviewer: Deepak Somarajan			
#	COMMENTS	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE	MCDOT'S RESPONSE
31	9. The sight distances study is still under review.	We will respond and work with you on any questions you may have.	The sight distance to the following were not provided: 1. The new proposed entrance on Area -1. 2.The sight distances for the entrances on proposed Stewartown road. The roadway classification for proposed Stewartown Road along the entire package is inconsistent. It is referred as Primary Residential on Sight Distance forms and Tertiary on Monumental Entrance Design Exception. <u>The provided sight distance for the Street entrance close to the intersection does not meet the sight distance requirements.</u>
32	10. MCDOT believes that the close proximity of the proposed Private Street (Parcel 'C') with the intersection of Watkins Mill Road/Stewartown Road as shown in the plans may pose a traffic operations safety concern. We need the queuing analysis on Stewartown Road, sight distance study and the proposed traffic control features at the location.	A queue of only one to two vehicles is anticipated on Stewartown Road at Watkins Mill Road during either the AM or PM peak hours with buildout of the six areas and traffic diversions associated with the I-270/Watkins Mill Road interchange. A sight distance study is being provided for the proposed private street (Parcel C). The sight distance is adequate for the road classification.	We did not see any queueing analysis included in the TIS or with the Design Exception submission. How are you anticipating the queue on Stewartown at Watkins Mill? Please provided supporting documents. The sight distance for the proposed entrance does not meet the requirements . We do not agree with the Applicant's findings. The median is also designed per the Tertiary Standards which is not acceptable.
33	11. Is proposed Stewartown Road build by the applicant entirely as some plans show a break in the roadway at the PEPCO right-of-way?	Stewartown Road will be built entirely through the PEPCO right-of-way.	The Sheet PP-03 shows a discontinuity in the proposed Sterwartown Road within the PEPCO right-of-way
34	12. At the Concept Plan stage, there was discussion about the need for traffic signal warrant analyses on Stewartown Road at the Montgomery Village Avenue and Watkins Mill Road intersections. What is the status of these studies?	Traffic signal warrant studies for both the Stewartown Road intersections with Montgomery Village Avenue and Watkins Mill Road are submitted with the site plan application.	The TIS and the signal warrant study are still under review.
35	13. Storm Drain Analysis: INCOMPLETE	A revised storm drain analysis with additional information is provided.	Storm Drain is under review.
36	• Provide a plan showing the proposed storm drain and the existing storm drain systems in the vicinity as it is difficult to read from the Drainage Area Map.	The storm drain is shown at a larger scale on the Preliminary Plan layout sheets for each area. They are also shown on the site plan at 1"=30'. A 30-scale inset has been added to the drainage area map (DAM) for Study Points 9 and 11 for clarity.	
37	• Study Point -1:		
38	› Drainage Area Map: Based on the contours, the off-site Residential 1/3 Acre Lots drains away from the site to an existing storm drain system on Gravier Court and ultimately outfalls into proposed Culvert No.1. The Tc path and the computations should be revised.	The drainage divides and computations have been revised to show the smaller drainage area.	

BLOOM MV	DRC COMMENTS	AGENCY	
Preliminary Plan 120170150	January 24th, 2017	MCDOT	
		Printed on 6/7/2017	
Reviewer: Deepak Somarajan			
#	COMMENTS	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE	MCDOT'S RESPONSE
39	• Study Point -9:		
40	› Computations: Based on the report the existing 21-inch storm drain pipe at 2.70% slope is undersized. The existing 24-inch storm drain pipe slope is unknown. The report shows the slope assumed to be 2%. Provide HGL computations and storm drain profile to show that the discharge does not back up.	Field topography has been obtained for the existing storm drain system. Due to the shallow depths of the yard inlets in the existing system, storm drain is now proposed in Montgomery Village Avenue to connect to the existing system. HGL computations and storm drain profiles have been provided on sheet 3 of the drainage area map.	
41	• Study Point -11:		
42	› Computations: Based on the report the existing 15-inch storm drain pipe at 0.83% slope and 18-inch pipe at 0.91% is undersized. Provide HGL computations and storm drain profile to show that the discharge does not back up.	Field topography has been obtained for the existing storm drain system. Due to the shallow depths of the yard inlets in the existing system, storm drain is now proposed in Montgomery Village Avenue to connect to the existing system. HGL computations and storm drain profiles have been provided on sheet 3 of the drainage area map.	
43	› Provide spread computation for existing inlet on Montgomery Village Avenue downstream from Parcel 'Z' and Parcel 'R'.	The spread computations for these inlets has been provided, along with spread computations for the existing sump inlet on Montgomery Village Avenue. An additional inlet has been proposed adjacent to the sump inlet to reduce the spread below 8'.	
44	14. At or before the permit stage, please coordinate with Ms. Stacy Coletta of our Division of Transit Services to coordinate improvements/relocation to the RideOn bus facilities in the vicinity of this project. Ms. Coletta may be contacted at 240 777-5800.	It is understood that the engineer must coordinate with Ms. Stacy Coletta regarding improvements/relocation of the Ride-On Bus facilities at or before the permit stage.	OK
45	15. At or before Preliminary plan coordinate location of the bike path with Ms. Patricia Shepherd of our Division of Transportation Engineering at patricia.shepherd@montgomerycountymd.gov or at 240-777-7231 for Bikeways.	Patricia Shepard will be contacted and coordination will be continuous between Planning, Parks, & DOT to finalize an appropriate circulation system for all users.	OK

BLOOM MV	DRC COMMENTS	AGENCY	
Preliminary Plan 120170150	January 24th, 2017	MCDOT	
		Printed on 6/7/2017	
Reviewer: Deepak Somarajan			
#	COMMENTS	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE	MCDOT'S RESPONSE
46	16. At or before preliminary plan stage, please coordinate with Mr. Mark Terry of our Division of Traffic Engineering & Operations to coordinate Traffic Operations and Traffic Impact Study. Mr. Bilgrami may be contacted at 240 777-2190.	Mr. Terry and/or Mr. Bilgrami will be contacted.	OK
47	17. Transportation Demand Management and Transit related comments: As presented in the Concept Plan, at full build-out this development will be able to support an intra-development "satellite" bikeshare system. Bikeshare can reduce the number of auto trips made between the six areas of the project. Additionally, given the growing level of interest in bikeshare from the City of Gaithersburg and surrounding developments, there may be significant demand for the amenity in the area in the near future. At Preliminary Plan show an intra-bikeshare network with at least 2 stations per area. For questions regarding bikeshare, contact Sandra Brecher at (240) 777-8383. Spaces shown for bikeshare should be for typical sized stations of 19 docks, and 53 feet by 12 feet in dimension.	We would like to note that the proposed number of dwelling units passes the LATR test without mitigation. The applicant will provide 2 bikeshare stations: one located in the MVF park in Area I and one in Area IV along pedestrian routes in central areas. Exact locations will be determined at site plan in coordination with MNCPPC & DOT. Further, the applicant will work with MCDOT to promote use of bikesharing among residents and visitors. Specific maintenance commitments will be negotiated under any necessary transportation demand management agreement.	We accept the Applicant's provision of 2 bikeshare stations, one located at the MVF park in Area I and one in Area IV. Please show the location of both the bikeshare stations on the preliminary plan.
48	18. In any private development project, prohibit the use of CMP or CMP Arches for any road that will be transferred to Montgomery County for maintenance.	All new culverts will be concrete. There are no proposed CMP or CMP arches. Any existing CMP culverts or pipe systems which are outside the limits of construction and are to remain will not be upgraded.	OK
49	19. Adjacent Projects shall not overlap construction easements or slope easements intended to benefit a MCDOT Project, with a Forest Conservation Easements, where the construction or slope easements would be overlaid and rendered useless by the Forest Conservation Easement.	There are no proposed Forest Conservation Easements overlapping MCDOT slope or construction easements. In fact, because all proposed forest planting will be in land dedicated to parks, there will be no forest conservation easements. If Forest Conservation is provided in easements, we will ensure they do not conflict with other easements.	Noted.
50	Bloom MV: Ride On routes 56 and 64 run through here and there are 12 bus stops that would be affected. Since the project looks like it will be done in phases, we should be able to shift service to the next location during construction. I also don't anticipate us adding any additional amenities at any of these locations, but please have the standard comment added about coordinating with DOT-Transit on bus stops in the area.	Noted; we will work with DOT-transit during permitting and construction.	OK
51	Standard Comments:		
52	1. The owner will be required to submit a recorded covenant for the operation and maintenance of any private 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.	A recorded covenant will be provided by the owner.	OK
53	2. Size storm drain easement(s) prior to record plat. No fences will be allowed within the storm drain easement(s) without a revocable permit from the Department of Permitting Services and a recorded Maintenance and Liability Agreement.	Storm Drain Easements will be sized prior to record plat. Preliminary storm drain easements have been shown on the plan where needed.	OK
54	3. Relocation of utilities along existing roads to accommodate the required roadway improvements shall be the responsibility of the applicant.	Any necessary revisions for proposed improvements are shown on the plans.	OK

BLOOM MV	DRC COMMENTS	AGENCY	
Preliminary Plan 120170150	January 24th, 2017	MCDOT	
		Printed on 6/7/2017	
Reviewer: Deepak Somarajan			
#	COMMENTS	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE	MCDOT'S RESPONSE
	Additional DOT Comments per Email Coordination with Traffic Consultant		
1	Although we did not make the comment at concept plan, we agree with Park and Planning staff that a traffic signal warrant analysis is required at the intersections of Watkins Mill at Crested Iris/Stewartown Road, and Stewartown at Montgomery Village Avenue.	Traffic signal warrant studies for both the Stewartown Road intersections with Montgomery Village Avenue and Watkins Mill Road are submitted with the site plan application.	Who is the author of these comments?
2	Please explain why you are requesting to stripe all four legs of the Watkins Mill /Crested Iris Drive/Stewartown Road intersection.	Although the intersection would operate under two-way (east-west) stop control unless a traffic signal is warranted, the proposed striping recognizes the existing refuge and the anticipated increase in pedestrian activity with the site development. Thus, the Applicant will coordinate with DOT on the appropriate pavement markings at this intersection.	Who is the author of these comments?
3	Please provide additional reasoning for justification of not installing a separate northbound left turn lane other than taking away parking.	The LATR traffic study shows a separate northbound left-turn lane on Watkins Mill Road. The two-way-left-turn-lane would be restriped as separate left turn lanes, both northbound and southbound.	Who is the author of these comments?
	Comments Not Addressed from the DRC comments provided		
1	We recommend all roads in the development should be publicly maintained; any proposal for private roads needs a stronger justification that demonstrates why public streets are infeasible. Street along the proposed townhouses may be private.		Provide justification for Private Streets per Chapter 50.
	Design Exception Comments- Not Addressed-		
1	Design Exception Request A-1 (Modification to MCDOT Suburban Minor Arterial Road Section)		The initial submission had a design exception request for Modified roadway standard but was not addressed in the revised document submitted. We need the design exception package to include this item.
2	Design Exception Request A-2 (Modification to Monumental Entrance)		The revised Monument Entrance Detail submitted is Incomplete as it does not show all the necessary dimensions. The revised detail is addressed for a Tertiary Street and Stewartown Road is classified as a Minor Arterial. Our interpretation of the master plan is to allow the road to be designed to a Secondary horizontal and vertical criteria. The plan as presented does not achieve those goals and therefore we do not approve the Monumental Entrance at this time.

BLOOM MV	DRC COMMENTS	AGENCY	
Preliminary Plan 120170150	January 24th, 2017	MCDOT	
		Printed on 6/7/2017	
Reviewer: Deepak Somarajan			
#	COMMENTS	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE	MCDOT'S RESPONSE
	Additional DOT Comments:		
1	The preliminary plans submitted does not reflect the existing and proposed sidewalk, handicap ramps, tree lawns and other details at the intersections. Please provide blow up of all the intersection with the above details.		
2	Provide the material used for the proposed sidewalk and the shared use path on proposed Stewartown Road. The plans show two different hatch patterns on the proposed sidewalk and shared use path with no Legend on the sheet.		