

Item 4 - Correspondence

From: [Bogdan, Grace](#)
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Cc: [Folden, Matthew](#); [Dickel, Stephanie](#)
Subject: FW: 4702 Chevy Chase Drive correspondence
Date: Tuesday, December 8, 2020 8:45:11 AM
Attachments: [3208_001.pdf](#)

Please see the attached correspondence relating to Item #3 (4702 Chevy Chase Drive) for 12/17 Planning Board Hearing.

Thanks!

Grace

From: Jody Kline <jskline@mmcanby.com>
Sent: Monday, December 7, 2020 7:40 PM
To: Bogdan, Grace <grace.bogdan@montgomeryplanning.org>; Folden, Matthew <matthew.folden@montgomeryplanning.org>; Hisel-McCoy, Elza <elza.hisel-mccoy@montgomeryplanning.org>; Dickel, Stephanie <Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org>; Mencarini, Katherine <katherine.mencarini@montgomeryplanning.org>; Sherry Glazer <sherry.glazer@gmail.com>
Cc: Harris, Patricia A. <paharris@lercheearly.com>; Sean Patrick Hughes <sphughes@mmcanby.com>
Subject: FW: Attached Image

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

Please review the attached letter submitted on behalf of the Board and the residents of the 4720 Chevy Chase Drive Condominium regarding the applications related to proposed development at 4702 Chevy Chase Drive.

From: no-reply@mmcanby.com <no-reply@mmcanby.com>
Sent: Monday, December 7, 2020 7:35 PM
To: Jody Kline <jskline@mmcanby.com>
Subject: Attached Image

Law Offices Of
MILLER, MILLER & CANBY
MM&C
CLIENT FOCUSED. RESULTS DRIVEN.

200-B MONROE STREET, ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850 P: 301.762.5212 F: 301.762.6044 WWW.MILLERMILLERCANBY.COM

All attorneys admitted in Maryland and where indicated.

JAMES L. THOMPSON
LEWIS R. SCHUMANN
JODY S. KLINE
JOSEPH P. SUNTUM
ROBERT E. GOUGH

DONNA E. MCBRIDE (DC)
SEAN P. HUGHES (DC)
CATHY G. BORTEN (DC, VA)
MICHAEL G. CAMPBELL (DC, VA)

SOO LEE-CHO (CA)
DAVID A. LUCAS (DC)
DIANE E. FEUERHERD
CHRISTOPHER L. YOUNG (VA)
JAMES T. ROTH (DC)

JSKLINE@MMCANBY.COM

December 7, 2020

Montgomery County Planning Board
2425 Reddie Drive
Wheaton, MD 20902

Re: Sketch Plan #320210010,
Preliminary Plan #120210010;
4702 Chevy Chase Drive

Dear Chair Anderson and Members of the Planning Board,

I am writing on behalf of our client, the Council of Unit Owners of the 4720 Chevy Chase Drive Condominium located adjacent to and immediately west of the proposed structure at 4720 Chevy Chase Drive, Bethesda which is the subject of the applications referenced above scheduled for your consideration on Thursday, December 17, 2020.

The Board of the 4720 Chevy Chase Drive Condominium opposes the development proposal in its present form as shown in the pending sketch plan and preliminary plan. During discussions with members of staff, and with representatives of the applicant, members of the Board of the Condominium have communicated the following concerns:

1. Traffic.

Chevy Chase Drive in front of 4702 and 4720 is approximately only twenty (20) feet wide, curb to curb, with street parking allowed on the north side. The dedication of five (5) feet of additional right of way, which will not result in the widening of Chevy Chase Drive, will not solve the existing traffic conflicts and safety issues that will be compounded by new residences and service vehicular traffic. The existing street does not capably handle the existing traffic flow and an unwidened Chevy Chase Drive will definitely not be able to handle the additional resident and service traffic to the new building at 4720 Chevy Chase Drive. Chevy Chase Drive connects

to Bradley Boulevard in close proximity to its intersection with Wisconsin Avenue from which there will be inevitable backups further blocking vehicle movement on Chevy Chase Drive.

2. Activity Points.

The applicant has concentrated almost all of the activity points for the proposed multi-family building on the limited building frontage on Chevy Chase Drive. Across the narrow front of the building will be: a) an entrance to the underground parking garage; b) the lobby entrance to the building; c) doors and stacking areas for garbage disposal and pick up; and d) all delivery drop-offs and pick-ups. (Only the loading/unloading deck for unit move-ins has been assigned to the rear of the building facing Nottingham Drive which ostensibly will have minimal usage due to the historically low turnover in downtown Bethesda apartment buildings).

Along with the restrictions inherent in the narrow Chevy Chase Drive, the activities described above put too much stress on this section of Chevy Chase Drive to the detriment of the residents of 4720 Chevy Chase Drive as well as other vehicles traveling on this street.

Another point of concern is the recommendation/requirement for the applicant to construct a sidewalk along the north side of Nottingham Drive to its termination at Norwood Local Park. Construction of a new sidewalk adjacent to our clients' property will have a deleterious effect on the mature tree line that separates our client's property from the residential neighborhood to the south thus impairing, or even eliminating, the trees that provide screening and privacy for the 4720 Chevy Chase Drive building. The Board of 4720 Chevy Chase Drive asks that the Planning Board require that the applicant only construct a sidewalk on the north side of Nottingham Drive to the western edge of the 4720 Chevy Chase Drive property. There is a sidewalk on the south side of Nottingham Drive and the only vehicles traveling on Nottingham west of the 4720 property will be to serve two single family residences. The marginal advantages of having a sidewalk on the north side of Nottingham Drive to its terminus are overwhelmed by the likely destruction of mature trees and shrubs that today provide screening and character for both the multi-family and the single family residential dwellings on both sides of Nottingham Drive.

3. Mass of the Proposed Building.

The building proposed for 4720 Chevy Chase Drive maximizes every development standard in the Zoning Ordinance. The proposal does not exceed any particular development standard, and complies with the Design Guidelines but, cumulatively, the scale of the project is pushed from a permitted 1.5 FAR (31,087.5 SF) to a remarkable 4.64 FAR (85,000 SF) by purchasing 53,912.5 square feet of optional method density. The sheer volume of the building raises questions about the use of the Park Impact Payment program particularly for a site located on the perimeter of the central business district.

4. Treatment of West Wall.

The size and positioning of the proposed building, sitting as it does abutting a portion of the common property line with the 4720 Chevy Chase Drive Condominium, results in a seven story blank wall facing our clients' residences. This is the feature of the 4702 building that concerns our clients the most because they are the neighbors most affected by the proposal but they feel that they are the property to which the new building is least sensitive.

The applicant has spoken directly to our clients and has mentioned ideas that they are considering to mitigate the blankness of a seventy (70) foot high wall with no fenestration. But the applicant has also said that it is presently involved with the sketch plan, or "conceptual" stage of the process and that design treatments to address our clients' concerns will not be fully developed until the site plan phase.

In summary despite two meetings to date, the applicant has made no formal concessions to address the concerns of the residents of 4720 Chevy Chase Drive to a) improve the traffic flow situation, b) reduce the activity nodes in the front of the proposed building or c) to relocate or redesign the building to create more separation between the two structures and less starkness in the west wall of the 4702 building. In light of that state of the discussions, and not yet knowing what the west wall of the 4702 Chevy Chase building will look like, the Board and residents of the 4720 Chevy Chase Drive Condominium cannot support the application in its present form.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Residents of the 4720 Chevy Chase Drive Condominium will share their personal opinions with you at your December 17 public hearing.

Sincerely Yours,

MILLER, MILLER & CANBY

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "JODY KLINE". The signature is written in a bold, slightly slanted, sans-serif font. There is a horizontal line above the name, possibly indicating a signature line or a separator.

Jody S. Kline

JSK:sda

cc: Grace Bogdan
Matt Folden
Elza Hisel-McCoy
Stephanie Dickel
Katie Mencarini
Council of Unit Owners, 4720 Chevy Chase
Drive Condominium
Patricia Harris, Esq.

From: [Jacob Isserman](#)
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: Letter regarding 4702 Chevy Chase Drive for Dec 17th Planning Board meeting
Date: Tuesday, December 8, 2020 1:47:14 PM
Attachments: [Isserman Letter Moco Planning Board.docx](#)

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

Dear Planning Board,

I am a Moco resident, and have attached the following letter to be shared with the members of the planning board in advance of the Dec 17th meeting.

Thanks much!

Jake

December 8, 2020

Dear Members of the Montgomery County Planning Board:

I am a resident of Nottingham Drive. I have enjoyed working with our local government agencies and the Design Advisory Panel to help the 4702 Chevy Chase Drive development integrate into our neighborhood in the best possible fashion.


We have made tremendous progress over the past six months and I appreciate the improved treatment of Nottingham Drive including the addition of first floor units and the addition of a sidewalk.

I would like to take this opportunity to bring up an additional concern, with the hope that we can find similar positive solutions.

First, we have discussed parameters from a loading dock management agreement with Winthrop and their attorney, Patricia Harris. We have received positive feedback, but no formal agreement has been made. Perhaps this the correct forum to codify this? Our requests are below:

1. Only moving and freight deliveries will utilize the loading dock--all other service/maintenance vehicles and deliveries--food, mail, and small packages (Fedex, amazon, USPS, etc) will utilize Chevy Chase Drive.
2. Delivery truck size will be limited to those that can fit completely inside the loading dock. SU-30 and smaller (pending a turning study suggests these vehicles can fit).
3. There will be no idling or parking of moving trucks on Nottingham Drive at any time.
4. Access to the dock will only be permitted M-F from 9A-5P. Limit of one move-in per day.
5. The loading dock will be gated and closed when not in use.
6. Condominium management will be responsible for keeping the surrounding area in good order, free of any debris or refuse resulting from moves/deliveries.
7. "No Parking" signs should be posted if moving trucks need the full width of the street for turning.

Thanks so very much,


Jacob Isserman, MD
4614 Nottingham Drive

From: [Bogdan, Grace](#)
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Subject: FW: 4702 Chevy Chase Drive condominium project: proposed sidewalk extension
Date: Friday, December 11, 2020 11:00:00 AM

For item 3 on 12/17 PB agenda.

Thanks!

From: johmariscal@yahoo.com <johmariscal@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 9, 2020 2:13 PM
To: 'Harris, Patricia A.' <paharris@lercheary.com>
Cc: Garland, Hyojung <hyojung.garland@montgomeryparks.org>; Folden, Matthew <matthew.folden@montgomeryplanning.org>; Bogdan, Grace <grace.bogdan@montgomeryplanning.org>; 'Naomi Spinrad' <nspinrad@gmail.com>; 'Janice Soreth' <janice.soreth@gmail.com>; 'Jacob Isserman' <issermanj@gmail.com>; 'Daniel Ben-Zadok' <benzadok@gmail.com>; 'Shelley Rosenberg' <shelros@gmail.com>; 'Michael Zajac' <michaeldzajac@gmail.com>; sbdominick@yahoo.com
Subject: 4702 Chevy Chase Drive condominium project: proposed sidewalk extension

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

Dear Ms Harris:

First let me thank you for maintaining an open line of communication, and listening to the concerns of the neighbors of Nottingham as we sort through the implications for the community of the project you represent. We really appreciate it. Such exchange of views and ideas will undoubtedly result in a better outcome for everybody.

I wanted to address the issue of the extended side walk on Nottingham Dr. The latest version of the plans for the proposed condominium building on 4702 Chevy Chase Dr **includes an extension of the north sidewalk on Nottingham from the west edge of the new condo to the end of Nottingham at the entrance of Norwood Park.** We live at the west end of Nottingham Dr, and we are concerned that in order to build this sidewalk the developer may want to/have to eliminate a row of about 8-9 tall (30 ft +) mature pine trees located toward the end of our street, along the parking area that sits on the back of an existing condominium on 4720 Chevy Chase Dr. These trees are beautiful and, being evergreens, provide year-round privacy for both the existing condo and the residents on the west side of Nottingham drive. We would strongly urge the developer to make every effort preserve these trees and build the side walk by their side. In the unfortunate scenario that these trees cannot be spared during construction, we would like to ensure that new similar trees get re-planted to keep the green environment on this side of the street, and to preserve its privacy. Could you enquire with the developer and let us know what the plan is for these trees in the context of the sidewalk extension?

I am copying both officials from Montgomery Parks and Planning Board as I am unclear as to

who has oversight over tree preservation in cases such as this one.

Sincerely,

Jorge Mariscal
johmariscal@yahoo.com
4624 Nottingham Dr

From: [Gail Poe](#)
To: [MCP-Chair](#); [Bogdan, Grace](#); [Folden, Matthew](#)
Subject: Fwd: Plan for 4702 Chevy Chase Drive, Chevy Chase, MD
Date: Friday, December 11, 2020 3:04:42 PM

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

I am resending the below email because I typed the addresses incorrectly the first time.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Gail Poe <gailpoe@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Dec 11, 2020 at 2:57 PM
Subject: Plan for 4702 Chevy Chase Drive, Chevy Chase, MD
To: <Grace.Bogdan@montgomeryplanning.org>, <Matthew.Folden@montgomeryplanning.org>

I would appreciate your acknowledgement of this email.

I would like to comment on two things: the Bethesda Overlap Plan and the plan for 4702 Chevy Chase Dr., Chevy Chase, MD.

The Bethesda Overlap plan is horrible.

I never understood what it was all about until very recently. Now it is perfectly clear that it was done at the behest of greedy developers with little consideration for the people who already live in this area, many for decades. We are Chevy Chase; **NOT** Bethesda overlay. The planners should have met with our condominium association as well as with other residences affected at locations convenient for the residents, not just county employees. Only sending complex materials and having a couple of meetings is NOT enough. The materials sent by the county usually are too difficult to understand and it is totally inadequate to have meetings at the pleasure of the planners on dates and at locations which suit the planners and not the community.

Bradley Blvd is a natural divider between Chevy Chase North/West and residents south of Bradley. Bradley is a major east-west route and a numbered highway that is a very dangerous road to cross, in spite of the additional pedestrian signs which are much appreciated. Cars speed so excessively that as a pedestrian I usually feel that I don't always have a safe crossing.

The plan for 4702 Chevy Chase Dr. is horrendous. The plan is fatally flawed for several reasons:

- a) No green barrier is between my home (4720 Chevy Chase Dr.) and the new proposed building
- b) The building is allowing for essentially **no** green space (unless you consider a little on the roof with no natural shade covering). This is completely inconsistent with most of the adjacent properties.
- c) Traffic on Chevy Chase Dr. is already almost unbearable. Chevy Chase Dr. is, in effect, a one way street because of the multitude of cars parked and the narrow width of the road.
- d) The proposed number of parking spaces is ridiculous. For our 35 unit condo next door we have 35 assigned spaces and five or six guest spaces. Frequently no guest spaces are available. Every time I have had friends over for the past 10 years I have worried a lot about if they can find a place to park. The other day my daughter was visiting here mid-morning with her one year old baby. There were no parking spaces available. Like it or not, we are an automobile based location. Everyone has at least one car. If there is a two person occupant they more than likely will want two spaces rather than an average of less than one. It is absurd to think that people will not still want/need their cars to commute, visit friends, buy groceries, and go to warehouse stores such as Costco.
- e) Our understanding is that dense housing was being recommended for close to the metro station. This property is NOT close to the metro station.
- f) It appears that the developers managed to pay their way out of usual considerations. For example, there is no provision for low income units.
- g) The building will tower over ours. We have a very non-dense and green environment. This building will definitely decrease our quality of life.
- h) The construction will be a nightmare to us noise-wise and traffic wise. Especially since there is no barrier border between the structure and our building.
- i) The building takes up the entire property, leaving no ground

level outdoor space which is totally inconsistent with the surrounding neighbors

j) The lack of larger units (e.g. at least 1400 sq. ft.) will preclude most families with children. This is also completely inconsistent with our neighborhood.

k) There is a fire station next door to proposed building. The noise will, with no doubt, affect adversely the residents of proposed building.

I know there are other issues but hopefully they will be conveyed by other residents.

It becomes more and more abundantly clear that the county planners have cow-tailed to the developers whose only interest is profit. The county employees obviously do not care at all about the existing residents of our neighborhood. Planners have no difficulty changing our neighborhood into a concrete city like Bethesda has become (but not us)

Who is this plan supposed to benefit? Obviously not the current residents of the neighborhood. Adding up to 70 relatively small units is not going to make an appreciable difference to the stock of housing in the area.

Thank you very much for taking the time to review and understand our concerns.

I sincerely hope that the board does not take this as a done deal. My understanding is that the property developer simply plans to sell the new building to another party. There is too much at stake in terms of the quality of our lives.

Another major question I have is can our community appeal to the county council (if the plans are not sufficiently improved).

Gail Poe

4720 Chevy Chase Drive, **Chevy Chase**, MD

From: [Bogdan, Grace](#)
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Cc: [Folden, Matthew](#); [Mencarini, Katherine](#)
Subject: FW: 4702 Chevy Chase Drive (Plan no. 120210010)
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 8:35:32 AM

Please see the correspondence below for Item #3 on 12/17

Thanks,

Grace

From: Marty Chase <mlchase111@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 13, 2020 12:46 PM
To: Bogdan, Grace <grace.bogdan@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: Fwd: 4702 Chevy Chase Drive (Plan no. 120210010)

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

Hello-

I seems that my email address to Mr. Folden do not go through. Therefore, I would appreciate it if you would consider my objections. Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Marty Chase <mlchase111@gmail.com>
Date: December 13, 2020 at 12:39:02 PM EST
To: mathew.folden@montgomeryplanning.org
Cc: Grace.Bogdan@montgomeryplanning.org
Subject: Fwd: 4702 Chevy Chase Drive (Plan no. 120210010)

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Marty Chase <mlchase111@gmail.com>
Date: December 13, 2020 at 12:07:52 PM EST
To: mathew.folden@montgomeryplanning.org
Subject: Fwd: 4702 Chevy Chase Drive (Plan no. 120210010)

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Marty Chase <mlchase111@gmail.com>
Date: December 13, 2020 at 12:00:49 PM EST
To: mathew.folden@montgomeryplanning.org
Subject: 4702 Chevy Chase Drive (Plan no. 120210010)

Dear Mr. Folden:

As the owner of two properties, 4878 Chevy Chase Drive and 6639 Hillandale Road, that will be directly impacted by the develop plan of 4702 Chevy Chase Drive, please consider my objections.

First, 77 units will inevitably increase traffic in on Chevy Chase Drive. Please note that since Hillandale Road is a state road, the intersection of Chevy Chase Drive and Hillandale Road, which is already dangerous, can only be controlled by a stop sign at Chevy Chase Drive. Indeed, efforts for a stop sign or speed bumps on Hillandale Road have been over ruled by the State. Noteworthy, too, there is a elementary Montgomery County School bus stop at the intersection of Chevy Chase Drive and Hillandale Road.

Second, since the parking for Kenwood Forest 11 residents of Chevy Chase Drive demands "pulling in and backing out," increases in traffic, as is inevitable from the proposed 77 units, presents a daily safety issue for all Kenwood Forest 11 residents of Chevy Chase Drive.

Third, Offutt Lane is a particularly narrow road that would be unsafely burdened by increased traffic, as is inevitable from the 77 proposed units. Noteworthy, a Montgomery County Middle School school bus stop is located at the intersection of Chevy Chase Drive and Offutt Lane.

Forth, Chevy Chase Drive narrows at the intersection of Offutt Lane or in front of 4792 Chevy Chase Drive itself, which is the exit for all residents on the street to enter the already over burdened intersection of Bradley Boulevard and Wisconsin Avenue.

In summary, while I can appreciate the current owner's of

4702 desire to make money by converting the property from a small dental office to a rather large condominium, I do not believe that it's impact is in the best interest of the residents of Chevy Chase Drive. Indeed, I believe that the 100 or more cars that the plan would cause to travel Chevy Chase Drive daily would be a detriment to all.

Thank you for your consideration. I can be reached by email or at 301-951-9516.

Sincerely,

Martha L Chase

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Bogdan, Grace](#)
To: joshualevenson3@gmail.com
Cc: [MCP-Chair](#); [Folden, Matthew](#)
Subject: RE: 4702 Chevy Chase Drive-Sketch Plan Number 320210010
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 1:43:25 PM
Attachments: [image013.png](#)
[image014.png](#)
[image015.png](#)
[image016.png](#)
[image017.png](#)

Good Afternoon Mr. Levenson-

I've provided links the overall development proposal and application materials below. If you have any questions please feel free to reach out to me.

Sincerely,

Grace

Sketch Plan drawing: https://eplans.montgomeryplanning.org/UFS/31978/92320/07-SKETCH-320210010-001.pdf/07-SKETCH-320210010-001.pdf_V3/07-SKETCH-320210010-001.pdf

Sketch Plan application materials: <https://eplans.montgomeryplanning.org/daiclinks/pdoxlinks.aspx?apno=320210010&projname=4702%20Chevy%20Chase%20Drive>

Preliminary Plan application materials:
<https://eplans.montgomeryplanning.org/daiclinks/pdoxlinks.aspx?apno=120210010&projname=4702%20Chevy%20Chase%20Drive>



Grace Bogdan, AICP

Planner Coordinator, DownCounty Planning Division

Montgomery County Planning Department
2425 Reedie Drive, 13th Floor, Wheaton, MD 20902
grace.bogdan@montgomeryplanning.org
o: 301.495.4533



WE'VE MOVED!

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

From: Joshua Levenson <joshualevenson3@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, December 11, 2020 8:56 PM

To: gracebogdan@montgomeryplanning.org; Matthew.Folden@montgomeryplanning.org

Subject: 4702 Chevy Chase Drive-Sketch Plan Number 320210010

Importance: High

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

Hello, my name is Joshua Levenson. I received a public hearing notice from the Montgomery County Planning Board regarding the 4702 Chevy Chase Drive Plan.

Could I be provided with a map in higher resolution that was sent in the notice?

Sincerely,

Joshua Colin Levenson

From: [Naomi Spinrad](#)
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Cc: [Bogdan, Grace](#); [Mencarini, Katherine](#); [Dickel, Stephanie](#); [Folden, Matthew](#); [Joan Barron](#); [shelley \(WSC\)](#); [Daniel Ben-Zadok](#); [Isserman Jacob](#); [Janice Soreth](#); [Jorge Mariscal](#); [Shelley Rosenberg](#); [Michael Zajac](#)
Subject: 4702 Chevy Chase Drive - Chevy Chase West comments for the record
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 1:52:08 PM

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

Dear Chair Anderson, Vice Chair Fani-Gonzalez, and Commissioners Cichy, Paterson, and Verma:

On behalf of the Chevy Chase West Neighborhood Association (CCWNA), I'm writing in regard to the development application for 4702 Chevy Chase Drive.

CCWNA appreciates the ongoing dialog with the applicant regarding the concerns of Nottingham Drive residents, and the generally productive conversation among the applicant, the Design Advisory Panel, and our residents. We have supported Park's desire for a pedestrian connector between Chevy Chase Drive and Nottingham Drive, and are pleased with the applicant's decision to extend the sidewalk on the north side of Nottingham from their property line west to the entrance to Norwood Park. We are also pleased that the applicant responded to DAP concerns about preserving the mini-neighborhood of Nottingham Drive's single-family residences on the south side by placing two unit entrances on Nottingham, and that the trash pickup location has been changed from the original proposal.

There are still some outstanding issues pertaining to use of the loading dock and retention of parking spaces on the south side of Nottingham. CCWNA supports the staff recommendation of a condition for a loading and delivery management agreement, and notes that the site plan, either through this agreement or otherwise, must satisfactorily address parking on Nottingham. Residents have not yet been provided with the turning analysis. Applicant proposes to limit trucks to 30 feet. A drawing in the application documents notes a current area near the Norwood Park entrance on the south side of Nottingham as "Parking Prohibited", and states that "proposed improvements to Nottingham allow for adequate fire and rescue and on-street parking." Adequate parking is not defined. The application states

Currently, on-street parking on Nottingham Drive is located on the south side of the street. The truck turning templates submitted by the Applicant show that on-street parking will need to be removed on the south side of the street to allow trucks to properly maneuver. At this time, it is not determined how many parking spaces will need to be removed, and/or on which side of the street the on-street parking will be relocated. At the time of Preliminary Plan, the roadway sections are confirmed by Staff and DOT, and striping and parking will be finalized at the time of Site Plan. Factors such as sight distance lines, Fire Department Access, and maximizing on-street parking will be taken into consideration when

determining where on-street parking will be relocated. (p. 25)

In proposing 70 units and fewer than the maximum number of allowed parking spaces, as well as no on-site parking for contractors or other visitors to 4702 Chevy Chase Drive, the applicant will be adding significant pressure to existing parking limitations on Nottingham and other streets south of Bradley Boulevard, notably Chevy Chase Drive and Offutt Road. As well, the public parking spaces on Nottingham are used by visitors to Norwood Park; the lot in the park is often unable to accommodate all park visitors. Nottingham residents park in their own driveways and garages.

On-street, public (Parking Lot District), and other paid parking between Norwood Park and Woodmont Avenue is extremely limited, and it is unfair to the larger community to ask that public on-street parking be sacrificed here. CCWNA objects to the elimination of any parking spaces on Nottingham. With that on the record, we are open to discussing any and all options that retain or increase on-street parking on Nottingham Drive.

Our second concern regards the possible loss of the green screen at the western end of the north side of Nottingham. As noted earlier, we appreciate the extension of the sidewalk to the park entrance. However, the application and staff report do not mention landscaping along the extended sidewalk. The pine trees on the north side of the street near the park entrance provide some privacy for residents on both sides of the street. We would like clarification regarding who is responsible for landscaping there - the County, Parks, or the applicant. We recognize that determining whether the trees or roots will be damaged by construction is probably not possible before construction begins. If landscaping is the applicant's responsibility, we ask that sketch plan approval include a condition requiring retention of these trees or that a similar screen be planted after sidewalk construction. If it is the responsibility of the County or Parks, we ask for a commitment to maintain or restore the screen.

We look forward to continuing a collaborative relationship with the applicant through the regulatory and construction processes, and ultimately to an attractive addition to the community.

Thank you for consideration of these comments and concerns.

Sincerely,

Naomi Spinrad

On behalf of the Chevy Chase West Neighborhood Association

CC: Grace Bogdan, Planning

Matthew Folden, Planning

Katie Mencarini, Planning

Stephanie Dickel, Planning Area 1 Regulatory Supervisor

Joan Barron, Co-President, CCWNA

Shelley Yeutter, Co-President, CCWNA

Daniel Ben-Zadok, Jake Isserman, Janice Soreth, Jorge Mariscal,

Shelley Rosenberg, and Michael Zajac, Nottingham Drive residents

From: [Edward Butler](#)
To: [MCP-Chair](#)
Cc: [Lynn](#); [Sherry Glazer](#); [Karen Hoffman](#); [Gail Poe](#); singelmannp@umkc.edu; [Singelmann Maria Elena](#); [Ivonne Butler](#)
Subject: December 17 Hearing on 4702
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 8:39:00 PM

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

I have signed up to offer testimony (quoted below) at the Meeting. If you further info on this matter, I would appreciate your comments.

"As I understand it, the proposed pathway from 4702 to Norwood Park will destroy most if not all the trees lining the rear parking lot of our neighboring residential Building (4720 Chevy Chase Drive). While Montgomery County Parks may be responsible for constructing the pathway, it appears that the pathway is related to 4702 Project which may create more pedestrian traffic to/from the Park. Perhaps there is another rationale, but that seems unlikely since Norwood Drive to the rear of 4702 already has full access to Norwood Park. Regardless, the proposed 4702 already involves removing the line of mature trees separating the 4702 and 4720 buildings. The proposed pathway to the Park would needlessly involve the destruction of more trees which now are an environmental plus and shield residential areas from the Park."

Thank you Ed Butler, 4720 Chevy Chase Drive