

Attachment F

From: [Cara Tenenbaum](#)
To: [Graham, Tamika](#)
Subject: Holy Cross Development/Strathmore Road
Date: Monday, July 18, 2022 3:20:04 PM

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

Ms. Graham,

Thank you again for your time last week. As discussed, there are some key flaws with the evaluation of the Holy Cross site. And I would also make clear that neither I nor anyone else in the neighborhood is against the development. Rather, we are concerned that the traffic mitigation efforts are not sufficient, and put the neighborhood feel of Garrett Park Estates at risk.

First of all, the Holy Cross site already creates an inordinate amount of traffic daily, which the County is well aware of, because there is a police officer at the entrance on school days. Adding a development without addressing the traffic it creates is piling problem on top of problem. Ideally, school traffic could be re-routed to an entrance off Strathmore Avenue. Barring that, other options should be addressed. There appear to be none proposed. This is a glaring omission and does not serve the people of the County well.

Second, the amount of traffic cutting through both Flanders Avenue and Stillwater Avenue needs to be addressed. There are other areas in the county where thru-traffic is prohibited during certain hours. A similar measure would be incredibly helpful to address the quantity and speed of cars on those roads, especially when our children are walking to/from schools and school buses. In Bethesda, there are roads where traffic cannot cut through neighborhoods during certain hours. This would have to be strictly enforced, but if it can be done elsewhere in the County, I am certain it can be done in our neighborhood.

Third, I am concerned that Strathmore Road will eventually have to be widened, and that will come from the median separating the family houses from the main road. If that is a possibility, I would like it to be addressed now so that the widening comes from the Holy Cross property, not that which keeps our neighborhood safe, especially the children walking to and from school.

I would be happy to talk to you or any of your colleagues at your convenience about any of these issues.

Best,
Cara

Graham, Tamika

From: Sanders, Carrie
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2022 10:32 AM
To: Graham, Tamika; Folden, Matthew
Subject: FW: St. Angela Plan

-----Original Message-----

From: jacobs913 <jacobs913@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, October 29, 2022 10:47 AM
To: Sanders, Carrie <carrie.sanders@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: St. Angela Plan

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

Dear Ms. Sanders;

As a 30 year resident of Garrett Park, I have watched the tremendous increase of traffic along Strathmore Avenue. Between the hours of 3:00 p. m. And 6:00 p.m., Monday-Friday, it is very difficult to make a left turn without going to the traffic light. At those mentioned times, 3 schools are dismissing students . They exit by bus, car and walking along Strathmore. Coming from Rockville Pike or Connecticut Avenue also is congested. The thought of adding 100 + new residences, or as many as 200 more vehicles on this road is disturbing. Strathmore Avenue is a 2- lane road that is a major thoroughfare between Connecticut Ave. and Rockville Pike, already overloaded with traffic. Unless an alternate road is provided for these new residences, the traffic will become a complete hazardous nightmare.

I had a resident from Symphony Woods stop at my home asking how she could get to Rockville Pike without making a left turn out of her community. Residents living there have found the left turn in the morning causes a back-up in their community. This occurred several years ago! I cannot imagine tearing down existing homes to widen the road, and therefore I hope that you will take a serious look at this problem. You may have examined it before the work force returned after Covid, and it needs to be re-examined.

Thank you for your consideration,

Donna Jacobs
10913 Clermont Ave.
Garrett Park, MD 20896

Graham, Tamika

From: Arthur Ribeiro <ardasilva@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2022 9:32 AM
To: Graham, Tamika
Subject: Update on 4910-4920 Strathmore Avenue Development

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

Tamika,

I hope you are doing well, and that all the drama at the Montgomery County Planning Department hasn't affected you too much.

I'm writing because I had a few questions on this development, particularly after the extension that was granted by the Planning Board yesterday.

1. One of the reasons for the extension was that SHA "requested further study of the Strathmore Avenue corridor". Can you please elaborate on this? Is there more information on exactly what they're studying? Does it have to do with the increase in expected traffic? Or with the placement of the traffic light?

2. The second reason had to do with DPS needing more time to review stormwater management plans. This is actually one of my key concerns with this development. I noticed that in the plans, it appears like the street opposite Stillwater Avenue, on the development, will be higher than Strathmore Avenue, meaning the water will drain back towards Strathmore and towards my home (5101 Strathmore). The service road in front of my house typically floods even during relatively minor rainy days (like today), so when there's a huge storm, the problem is a major concern. The reason for this is that the stormwater drainage into the stream that starts at the end of the service road in front of my house is pretty clogged. My concern is that it will be unable to handle more stormwater that is currently in the plans to come from this development. Can you please share with me the results of DPS' review of the stormwater management plan once they are concluded?

I was surprised that given these two very significant issues, and not to mention the disruption that may have come from the resignation of the last Planning Board, that the extension requested here was for only one month. It appears like this will require much more time to analyze and resolve.

Finally, could you please provide a summary of what has happened since the Development Review Committee meeting in July with respect to this development? It would also be helpful if you could provide a schedule of what to expect going forward.

Many thanks,
Arthur

Graham, Tamika

From: MCP-Chair
Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 12:58 PM
To: Graham, Tamika; Findley, Steve
Cc: Sanders, Carrie
Subject: FW: 4910/4920 Strathmore 120220160 820220220

Good afternoon Tamika and Steve,

Please see comments below. Mr. Martin also called to follow up and to discuss their objections ahead of the deadline for comments (Dec 15). Mr. Martin said there is some urgency and asked for a call back at: 301-946-8810 or 301-946-8811.

Thanks,

Catherine Coello, Administrative Assistant

The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Montgomery County Chair's Office
2425 Reedie Drive, Wheaton, MD 20902
Main: 301-495-4605 | Direct: 301-495-4608
www.MontgomeryPlanningBoard.org

From: George Martin <georgemartinjr@verizon.net>
Sent: Sunday, December 4, 2022 5:36 PM
To: MCP-Chair <mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org>
Cc: Brandon Fritz <bjfritz@gmail.com>; George Martin <marting@me.com>; David fitz-Patrick <frfitzpat@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: 4910/4920 Strathmore 120220160 820220220

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

In response to your PUBLIC NOTICE to us of the December 15th deadline for comments on the proposed development adjoining our property (Church of the Holy Cross, 4900 Strathmore Avenue), we need the immediate attention of the County to address the intrusive impact that this project will have on us. My name is George C. Martin, Jr., and I have been representing interest of the parish for over ten years where our primary concern was with the flooding of our property by the State of Maryland (SHA). With the flooding issue with the State still unresolved, unless we have the oversight of the County, we will have yet another government agency failing to protect our interest.

As you are aware, the primary structural element of this development is the Brandywine Senior Living, which will loom over our property unless serious attention is paid to the scale of this building in relationship to our structures and ground conditions. Granted, to soften the impact of the proposed structure will be a challenge, but that is the burden of the developer. Unless the fundamental element of scale is examined, simply planting an assortment of trees and plants, does not begin to address the problem.

It is our position that the applicant for the pending zoning approval has not only failed to take this matter seriously, but seems to have gone out of their way to avoid showing the scale of the Brandywine retaining wall and structure, in proposing their screening solution. It would seem that the counsel for the developer is hoping that the clock will run out for comment on this issue as their minimal effort to really deal with our concerns, go unaddressed. To prove my point, I

have included below a note to our engineer (KIM Engineering) of this apparent impasse, and by reference, my son's comment on the inadequacies of the developer's presentation to deal with the screening.

George C. Martin Jr.
Managing Member

Martin Industrial LLC
P.O. Box 565
Garrett Park, MD 20896
301-946-8811
georgecmartinjr@verizon.net

Begin forwarded message:

From: George Martin <georgecmartinjr@verizon.net>
Subject: Re: 4910/4920 Strathmore 120220160 820220220
Date: December 2, 2022 at 5:36:00 PM EST
To: Brandon Fritz <BrandonFritz@kimengineering.com>
Cc: Karen Carpenter <karencarpenter@kimengineering.com>, David fitz-Patrick <frfitzpat@gmail.com>, George Martin <marting@me.com>

Brandon,

I met with Fr. Fitz-Patrick yesterday primarily on the ADW/SHA matter, and while I did not have sufficient time to go into detail on the screening issue, it was his desire, and mine, to hand over to his successor, this matter. However, in saying that, and in order to accommodate Erin's schedule, I do wish to comment on the attachments sent to us. It was for that reason that I asked my son to visit the site in order to exam what was presented to us as to serving the purpose intended.

We found that the attachments which you sent to us today were utterly inadequate for representing a realistic view of what we at HC may have to endure. You have seen earlier today my son's report on what has been presented to us. George taught at CUA's School of Architecture for many years, and is a registered architect, and design builder.

As you may recall, I have on three occasions asked you to have the developer(s) provide to us a overlay of the screening/structures in support for the adequacy of what they propose. Even an east elevation of Brandywine (HC west viewing) and Strathmore line drawings would also help to serve this purpose. The developer should be embarrassed to have thought that such a presentation would support their argument as to the adequacy of screening HC. We do not wish to refer this matter to MC, so please advise Erin how this can be resolved.

George