

From: [Penny](#)
To: [Gatling, Tsaiquan](#)
Cc: [Dickel, Stephanie](#); [Mencarini, Katherine](#)
Subject: 4824 Edgemoor Lane and question as to why there is no public session by developer to let the community know about complete change in nature of developemnt?
Date: Tuesday, February 14, 2023 4:22:36 PM

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

Hi. In addition to my earlier questions, I am also wondering why, with this radical proposal for hotels and co-living units - meaning 4 singles up to 8 people if they are couples, per unit - is not subject to a requirement to notify the public and have a public meeting to explain what they are intending in detail.

The overall increased density of people living in the building coupled with the transient nature of the short-term hotel units and co-living units, indicates a complete change of intent for the building from that about which the public was informed, not just the adjacent Chase but for the surrounding buildings, the Edge and Edgemoor across the street and the townhouse community on the same block of Edgemoor lane. Originally and as approved it was a 76 unit condo building.

Is there any chance the developer can be required now, with the co-living proposal added to a hotel room proposal, to hold a public forum to show the new design (additional south and west windows and many additional balconies) and discuss the new nature of the building? I think the surrounding community deserves a public forum to ask questions, as well as a new mailing so people know what is going on here. The Planning Board hearing is scheduled soon and this should be addressed soon.

Thank you,
Penny Dash

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

From: Gatling, Tsaiquan <tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org>
To: Penny <pennydash@verizon.net>
Cc: Dickel, Stephanie <Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org>; Mencarini, Katherine <katherine.mencarini@montgomeryplanning.org>
Sent: Fri, Feb 10, 2023 1:22 pm
Subject: RE: 4824 Edgemoor Lane

Good Afternoon Penny,

I am reaching out to inform you that the Applicants for 4824 Edgemoor have updated plans and documents which you can find online at DAIC:

[4824 Edgemoor - Site Plan 82021004A](#)

[4824 Edgemoor - Preliminary Plan 12020007A](#)

Thank you,
Tsaiquan Gatling

Tsaiquan Gatling

Planner III, DownCounty Planning
Montgomery County Planning Department
2425 Reedie Drive, Wheaton, MD 20902
Tsaiquan.Gatling@montgomeryplanning.org
p: 301.495.2116

From: Penny <pennydash@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2023 4:18 PM
To: Gatling, Tsaiquan <tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org>
Cc: Dickel, Stephanie <Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org>; Mencarini, Katherine <katherine.mencarini@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: Re: 4824 Edgemoor Lane

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

How can I keep up to date on any changes the Applicant may make to its Application for Amendment to 4824 Edgemoor Lane? I am interested in any type of changes they may now and in the future propose.

Penny Dash

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

From: Gatling, Tsaiquan <tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org>
To: Penny <pennydash@verizon.net>
Cc: Dickel, Stephanie <Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org>; Mencarini, Katherine <katherine.mencarini@montgomeryplanning.org>
Sent: Wed, Jan 25, 2023 10:57 am
Subject: RE: 4824 Edgemoor Lane

Ms. Dash,

We appreciate your feedback here as well as in your letter dated January 24, 2023. We are preparing a response to your concerns. The Applicant has currently requested an extension through March 16, 2023 to further work through the proposal for this amendment. We are still working with the Applicant on their proposal and intend to provide a response based on the latest revisions and anticipate gaining more information in that within the next couple of weeks. A Planning Board hearing for this Application is now expected to be held on March 16, 2023.

Thank you,
Tsaiquan

Tsaiquan Gatling

Planner III, DownCounty Planning
Montgomery County Planning Department
2425 Reedie Drive, Wheaton, MD 20902
Tsaiquan.Gatling@montgomeryplanning.org
p: 301.495.2116

From: Penny <pennydash@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2023 10:08 AM

To: Gatling, Tsaiquan <tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org>
Cc: Dickel, Stephanie <Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org>; Mencarini, Katherine <katherine.mencarini@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: 4824 Edgemoor Lane

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

Mr. Gatling,

Thank you for your quick response to my email about the amendment to 4824 Edgemoor Lane. Regarding the traffic study provided by Wells + Associates, I would like an explanation as to how a building with 25 more units, and 65 units potentially made into hotel units will generate only 2 additional AM trips and no additional PM trips than the previous building.

Also, please explain how the existing use is now generating 8 PM trips as opposed to 6 PM trips in the previous traffic studies. Using the original existing trips, both AM and PM increases are now at 49. This is too close to 50. Also, at the time of Site Plan approval, there were two eastbound lanes on Edgemoor at the intersection with Woodmont. The current site plan is only showing one, exacerbating the congestion at the exit to the Chase garage and at the intersection. This is a significant change which should be addressed by Area Transportation. It seems evident that an LATR study is warranted.

I appreciate your attention to this matter.

Penny Dash

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

From: Gatling, Tsaiquan <tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org>
To: Penny <pennydash@verizon.net>
Cc: Dickel, Stephanie <Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org>; Mencarini, Katherine <katherine.mencarini@montgomeryplanning.org>
Sent: Wed, Jan 18, 2023 1:16 pm
Subject: RE: 4824 Edgemoor Lane

Ms. Dash,

Thank you for your email. As part of our review of the drawings and documents submitted by the Applicant for this amendment, Planning Staff provided comments to the Applicant in our online submission system and requested that the Applicant revise the drawings based on public feedback and our comments as discussed at the public DRC Meeting. Although there is no specific document for this request for revisions, I have included a list of Staff's Transportation review comments as an attachment to this email.

The transportation comments noted some inconsistencies between the plan sheets and some clarification questions on the parking calculations. The site access and circulation were previously approved are not proposed to change. The Site Plan Amendment is limited to the change in units (and potential to convert some to short-term hotel rentals), change in bicycle parking and vehicle parking within the onsite garage. The Applicant is subject to the previous approvals.

As it relates to Fire Access, Marie LaBaw (Marie.LaBaw@montgomerycountymd.gov) simply commented "Plan was approved 12/24/2020. Any changes resulting from the DRC process shall be submitted to Marie LaBaw, DPS for review." given that the revisions to the previous approval are expected to be

limited to internal changes. One of the comments found in the attached document includes an Area Transportation comment regarding correcting an apparent conflict with a Fire and Rescue connection and an accessible walkway, however the Applicant responded that this was due to a graphical inconsistency. This project is still set for a Planning Board Hearing on 2/16. To my knowledge, an address change has not been discussed as a part of this amendment application.

Thanks again,
Tsaiquan

Tsaiquan Gatling

Planner III, DownCounty Planning

Montgomery County Planning Department

2425 Reedie Drive, Wheaton, MD 20902

Tsaiquan.Gatling@montgomeryplanning.org

p: 301.495.2116

From: Penny <pennydash@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 11:50 AM
To: Gatling, Tsaiquan <tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org>
Cc: Dickel, Stephanie <Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: 4824 Edgemoor Lane

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

Hi. I am an owner at the adjacent building to the above-referenced new development, which has a Application for Amendment pending before the Board.

It has come to my attention that you have asked Area Transportation for a "Revision Request" , and I would like to know specifically what issues are being addressed? May I have a copy of this Revision Request? Alternatively, can you explain the content? The Chase garage sits next to the development and with the new bicycle lane removing one of the two Edgemoor lanes east, our exit from the garage relies on NO vehicles stopping outside the adjacent Edgemoor development's lobby. If you have read the extensive file of comments from the community you will be aware that we have repeatedly raised this as a major concern, not only for ourselves, but for any commuter using Edgemoor trying to drop off Metro passengers across the street (Woodmont) from the new development.

Relatedly, can also provide me with a copy of the Revision Request that was submitted to Fire and Rescue from Marie LaBaw? This is also a major issue for the community because,we have asked to have the address changed to a Woodmont address to move approaching vehicles to Woodmont, which is better able to accommodate a vehicle stopped to ascertain where is the loading dock or pull-off space. Although former Chair Anderson orally endorsed this idea at the site plan hearing in March, 2021, he omitted any mention of it in the written Resolution. Any address change was contingent on obtaining approval from Fire and Rescue and I would like to know if this change is a part of the pending Revision Request to Fire and Rescue? If not, I'd still like to know what it is about. IF you do not have access to this, could you provide me with Ms. LaBaw's email address?

I appreciate your prompt attention to this matter as the hearing is scheduled for February 16, 2023. Is that still the date?

Penny Dash

From: [Katie Spidalieri](#)
To: [Gatling, Tsaiquan](#)
Subject: 4824 Edgemoor Lane re: Public notice requirements and project amendments
Date: Wednesday, February 15, 2023 8:16:30 PM

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

Dear Tsaiquan,

I hope you are well. I am a resident at The Chase in Bethesda. I have four sets of questions about the proposed development for 4824 Edgemoor Lane and the preliminary plan and site plan amendments submitted to the county on February 8, 2023.

- Does Montgomery County have public notice requirements for preliminary plan and site plan amendments? If so, what are those public notice requirements and what is the supporting legal citation in the county's ordinance or regulations?
 - Is there a minimum or maximum distance or other requirement to whom said notice must be provided (e.g., residences on the same block, within one mile)?
 - Is there a county requirement that mandates a minimum amount of time between when a completed application is submitted/accepted and when project proposals can be heard at a Planning Board public meeting?
 - Is there a county requirement that mandates a maximum amount of time between when a completed application is submitted/accepted and when any public notice must be provided?
 - In addition, is there a county requirement that mandates a minimum amount of time between when any public notice is provided and when project proposals can be heard at a Planning Board public meeting?
 - When the developer for 4824 Edgemoor Lane previously submitted different preliminary plan and site plan amendments in fall 2022, I received a notice letter via regular mail from the developer's law firm; however, I only found out about the February 8 preliminary plan and site plan amendments second hand and have not received any formal notice from the developer. Given the *significant* changes to these amendments between the fall and now, I am concerned that there may not be sufficient public notice before the March 16 Planning Board meeting; previously, the public had more than 30 days to be notified about and review the fall 2022 amendments.
- Are affected members of the public able to request a community meeting with planning staff and/or the developer for preliminary plan and site plan amendments? If so, what are the requirements, procedures, and/or timing considerations affecting such a potential request?
- Can you provide me with the legal citation for the county's criteria or requirements against which preliminary plan and site plan amendments are evaluated by the Planning Board and staff? Alternatively, if said requirements or

guidelines are found in external policies or guidance, can you please provide me with a copy of the relevant documents or direct me to where they are on the county's website?

- In terms of classifying different types of residential units in the county's zoning and land use code, how would the county classify both the 65 short-term or hotel units and the 22 "co-living units" included in the developer's February 8 proposal?
 - As described in the February 8 proposal, would either or both of these types of units be subject to Montgomery County's [short-term residential rentals regulations](#) (where I presume the developer or eventual owner of the proposed building/hotel-apartments-hybrid building [whatever it would be classified in terms of a residential or commercial building?] would be subject to these requirements)?

I am happy to answer any follow up questions.

Thanks in advance for your assistance!

--

Cordially,

Katie Spidalieri

--

Cordially,

Katie Spidalieri

From: neilsgoldstein@verizon.net
To: [Gatling, Tsaiquan](#)
Subject: 4824 Edgemoor Lane, Plan Amendments, Plan Number 12020007A
Date: Friday, February 17, 2023 1:43:47 PM

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

Mr. Gatling,.

One of the proposals in the subject amendment is to add windows to the planned western wall.

It should be noted that the developer's western wall is less than 4 feet from the western wall of The Chase, immediately next to it. That will make construction and maintenance of the mural very difficult, to say the least. It will also decrease the amount of space for the mural since the bottom floors of the proposed building will be hidden from sight.

Nor will pedestrians or commuters headed east on Edgemoor Lane be able to see the mural from the street. Trees and walls on Edgemoor Lane will block the view.

The proposal to add windows to the developer's wall would result in a smaller, less contiguous, mural. It will not be as aesthetically pleasing as it might have been without the additional windows.

For the reasons stated above, the allocation of public benefit points should be recalculated downward. The mural, under these conditions, will not be as much of a benefit as it might have been before the proposed addition of windows.

Respectfully,
Neil Goldstein

From: robertswallach@verizon.net
To: [Gatling, Tsaiquan](#)
Subject: 4824 Edgemoor Lane
Date: Friday, February 10, 2023 5:26:18 PM

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

Mr. Gatling,

I have reviewed the latest revised Site Plan submission for the above-referenced development project. The previously approved project was limited to 76 condominium units. It also had between 62 and 65 parking spaces within the building. The latest plan includes up to 111 rental units and between 45 and 46 parking spaces. Of the 111 units, 22 will be co-living units, 65 will be short-term rental units, and 24 long-term standard units.

The Traffic Impact Statement has a chart indicating peak hour trips. The PM peak hour trips in the current revised design is exactly the same number of trips generated (55) as the Traffic Impact Statement from the previous plan (55). Given that there are 34 more units, given that the co-living units will have more residents per unit than typical units, and given that parking has been reduced by 17 to 19 spaces, it is difficult to understand how there could be no impact on the PM peak trips. The AM Peak Hour Trips has increased from 47 to 53, reflecting the increased occupancy, so why is there no change to the PM trips? Also, as I asked in a previous email, please explain how the existing PM Peak Hour Trips changed from 6 in the originally improved TIS to 8 in the latest version.

On another subject, the Loading Management Plan justifies the lack of on-site staff to assist with loading by among other things, that “as a condominium, after initial sales, the move-in/move-out rate is expected to be very low.” The building is no longer a condominium, and with the short-term and co-living units, the loading dock will be heavily used. Therefore, if more than one delivery or pick-up vehicle in in the loading area, one will block the other unless one blocks the parking drive aisle. One more question related to loading. Are the delivery and pick-up vehicles intended to back out across the bicycle lane and into the oncoming traffic? There is no room to turn around in the loading area.

Thank you in advance for responding to these concerns.

Robert S. Wallach, AIA
8517 Whittier Blvd.
Bethesda, MD 20817
240|417|9602

Letter to Planning Board January 2023

There are many issues with the Amendment to the planned construction of a 12-story building on the 8,000 sq. ft. plot of land located at 4824 Edgemoor Lane. This letter concerns itself only with two of those issues: the proposed plan's negative effect on traffic safety at and near the site and the developer's response to the Bethesda Downtown Plan Design Guidelines.

Traffic Safety

The County has **never** allowed a residential garage on the west side of Woodmont to exit directly onto Woodmont Ave without the aid of a traffic light, all the way from Rockville Pike to Wisconsin Ave. That decision is a necessary one and there is no need to make an exception in this case. It would create a traffic situation which, inevitably, will lead to an accident.

The developer would have us believe that adding 36 units to the proposed building would not increase the number of person trips attempting to exit the garage during morning peak hours. The requirement for a formal traffic study is 50 person trips. With the addition of 36 units, this limit will be exceeded. The proposed addition of 36 units is an increase of 47% in the total number of units. An increase of 47% to the previously estimated number of person trips during the AM peak hours results in an estimated 63 person trips greater than the current estimate of AM peak hours person trips, thereby exceeding the 50-person trip limit and should trigger a Local Area Transportation Review.

Moreover, there is no line of sight from the proposed garage site to the corner of Woodmont & Edgemoor, as shown here by Figure 3 from the developer's original application. The proposed building will block that view since it is built up to the property line on Woodmont.



Additionally, transportation guidelines require that **the distance from a garage exit to the corner intersection be a minimum of 100 feet**. The developer is proposing a **40 foot distance**, not a minor difference. This will not allow either the turning vehicle nor the vehicle trying to exit the garage sufficient time to safely merge onto Woodmont Ave. In fact, during AM peak hours, vehicles may not even be able to exit the garage at all, due to traffic backups and the fact that exiting vehicles are driving perpendicular to the flow of Woodmont traffic. Buses exiting the Metro depot and turning left onto Woodmont will more quickly result in traffic backing up on Woodmont, especially the double (accordion) buses which are 80' long.

The result of this design will significantly reduce the amount of time drivers exiting from the proposed garage location have to react to those vehicles attempting to merge onto Woodmont from Edgemoor.

In addition, when the two-way bike lane is constructed on the eastbound lane of Edgemoor, vehicles attempting to exit The Chase garage on Edgemoor will not be able to see bikers nor pedestrians heading west on Edgemoor since the proposed building will jut out 10' closer to Edgemoor thereby blocking the driver's view of pedestrians and bikers.

Bethesda Downtown Plan Design Guidelines

Almost every guideline and County staff recommendations pertinent to this proposed construction has either been ignored, exempted, or waived. The developer, in fact, has stated at a public hearing, that the guidelines are merely "arbitrary" numbers and has demonstrated an utter disregard for County guidelines.

These are some of the guidelines that County staff has developed for Downtown Bethesda after many, many hours of effort. They were not developed lightly. Included with them are the developer's proposal.

Building Form Guideline

The Bethesda guidelines state that a step-back of between 15 – 20 feet should be provided at the base of the building on a Neighborhood Local Street (Edgemoor), and between 10 and 15 feet on a Downtown Mixed-Use Street (Woodmont). There is an exception for buildings under 120 feet tall on Woodmont, but there is no exception on Edgemoor. The developer has ignored this guidance and has provided no step-back on either street.

Building Placement Guideline

The Guidelines call for the Build to Line to be 15 – 20 feet from the curb. The developer is using a design of less than 12 feet.

Tower Separation Guidance

Per the Guidelines separate tower floors at least **45 to 60 feet** from the side and rear property lines

Avoid building towers to the property line creating blank party walls that are imposing on the pedestrian environment. Where existing tower buildings are built close to the property line, new developments should provide the separation distance from the side and rear property lines. The developer has a tower separation of **less than 34 feet** from the proposed tower to the tower of the neighboring property (The Chase)

Servicing, Access, and Parking

Design to minimize conflicts between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists

Locate loading and servicing within the interior of a building at the rear wherever possible.

Provide loading spaces for pickup and drop-off where feasible. The developer has provided **no drop-off**.

During the review process, a condition was created by Staff requiring a **Loading/Delivery Management Plan** from the developer, including an on-site delivery manager. It has not been forthcoming. With the proposed addition of 36 units, it is even more urgent that this Plan be created and submitted for comment and approval. If up to 65 of the units are hotel-style, the problem of managing deliveries becomes even more critical.

The guideline **for the distance from a garage exit to the corner intersection is 100'**. The developer is proposing a **distance of 40'**, not a minor difference. This will not allow either the turning vehicle nor the vehicle trying to exit the garage sufficient time to safely merge onto Woodmont Ave. In fact, during AM peak hours, vehicles may not even be able to exit the garage at all, due to traffic backups and the fact that exiting vehicles are driving perpendicular to the flow of Woodmont traffic. Buses exiting the Metro depot and turning left onto Woodmont will more quickly result in traffic backing up on Woodmont, especially the double (accordion) buses which are 80' long.

In summary, the dangerous outcomes of the developer's currently proposed traffic plan should be avoided at all costs. The lives of neighborhood residents and commuters are at stake. Those lives should take precedence over the developer's economic goals.

The developer has not taken seriously, nor even attempted to abide by, the guidelines that County staff has worked so hard to develop and publish. These guidelines were developed with the health and safety of Montgomery County residents foremost in mind. To allow the developer to treat them as they have is an insult to all of us.

The problems noted above are due to the building site just not being appropriate for the developer's intentions. A 120-foot high, 112-unit building cannot, and should not, be built on an 8,000 square foot piece of property. There is no good location for service, parking, nor drop-offs. It makes the Woodmont/Edgemoor intersection extremely dangerous. **The Planning Board should not approve this Amendment.**

From: robertswallach@verizon.net
To: [Gatling, Tsaiquan](#)
Subject: RE: 4824 Edgemoor Lane
Date: Friday, February 17, 2023 8:04:44 AM

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

Mr. Gatling

I need to correct my bedroom calculations from my email of yesterday. I should have gone back to check if they had any 2-bedroom units in the original design. The drawings aren't clear, but the best I can tell is that there were 22 2-bedroom units and 54 1-bedroom units, for a total of 98 bedrooms. For the new plan, not having a layout drawing, we should probably assume the short-term rentals are 1-bedroom units, because there is no space in the building for larger units. Then they would constitute 65 bedrooms. Let's assume 15 co-living units are 3-bedroom and 7 are 4-bedroom. That adds up to 73 bedrooms. Let's assume the 24 standard units are 1-bedroom units. In this scenario, the total number of bedrooms would be 162 or a 64% increase. How that relates to the number of occupants is hard to estimate. Let's say we use a factor of 1.5 for the one-bedroom units, 2.5 for the 2-bedroom units, and 1.25 for the co-living units. Then there would have been a population of 136 in the original application, and 225 in the current application for an increase of 89 occupants or 65%. That is a significant change.

Robert S. Wallach, AIA
8517 Whittier Blvd.
Bethesda, MD 20817
240|417|9602

From: robertswallach@verizon.net <robertswallach@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2023 12:13 PM
To: 'tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org' <tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: RE: 4824 Edgemoor Lane

Mr Gatling,

Thanks for talking with me yesterday. I have a follow-up question and comments related to the latest amendment for the above-referenced project.

In the Statement of Justification, the developer has listed the requirements for short-term rentals, with the note that they are understood and will be complied with. What is not clear is how they could be used if occupied by the Owner. Are they renting out bedrooms? Or are they only going to be rented out 120 days in a year? They are also talking about 22 co-living units of 3 and 4 bedrooms each. This means a common area with kitchen and living room with bedrooms occupied by separate non-affiliated renters. I don't know what the limitations are under current zoning, but in the densest zone in the Zoning Code they are limited to 87 per acres. The project is only 0.18 acres, so the limit would be 15 units. Are the short-term rentals similar to co-living units and the Owner will occupy one bedroom and will rent out the other bedrooms and share the common areas? Can you provide a

detailed explanation of how this works, and how it complies with the Zoning Code?

This will have a major impact on the population of the building. One could calculate the population density as follows: 22 co-living units @ 3.5 bedrooms each = 77 bedrooms; 65 rental units @ 2 bedrooms each (if occupied by Owner) = 130 bedrooms; plus 24 standard units for a total of 231 bedrooms. If I leave out the rental units, it would be 166 bedrooms. The original application had 76 units averaging 870 square feet, so all were either studios or one-bedrooms for a total of 76 bedrooms. So even the smaller calculation would be more than double the initially approved 76 bedrooms. This is a major change which has not been addressed in the Statement of Justification, and as stated before, not acknowledged in the Traffic Impact Study.

The entire Amendment has been handled by Planning as a minor change, but as the SOJ's keep coming out with more changes, in my opinion, it is now a major change and should go back before the DAP. Please let me know if you agree with this.

Robert S. Wallach, AIA
8517 Whittier Blvd.
Bethesda, MD 20817
240|417|9602

From: robertswallach@verizon.net <robertswallach@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2023 5:26 PM
To: 'tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org' <tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: 4824 Edgemoor Lane

Mr. Gatling,

I have reviewed the latest revised Site Plan submission for the above-referenced development project. The previously approved project was limited to 76 condominium units. It also had between 62 and 65 parking spaces within the building. The latest plan includes up to 111 rental units and between 45 and 46 parking spaces. Of the 111 units, 22 will be co-living units, 65 will be short-term rental units, and 24 long-term standard units.

The Traffic Impact Statement has a chart indicating peak hour trips. The PM peak hour trips in the current revised design is exactly the same number of trips generated (55) as the Traffic Impact Statement from the previous plan (55). Given that there are 34 more units, given that the co-living units will have more residents per unit than typical units, and given that parking has been reduced by 17 to 19 spaces, it is difficult to understand how there could be no impact on the PM peak trips. The AM Peak Hour Trips has increased from 47 to 53, reflecting the increased occupancy, so why is there no change to the PM trips? Also, as I asked in a previous email, please explain how the existing PM Peak Hour Trips changed from 6 in the originally improved TIS to 8 in the latest version.

On another subject, the Loading Management Plan justifies the lack of on-site staff to assist with loading by among other things, that "as a condominium, after initial sales, the move-in/move-out rate is expected to be very low." The building is no longer a condominium, and with the short-term and co-living units, the loading dock will be heavily used. Therefore, if more than one delivery or

pick-up vehicle in in the loading area, one will block the other unless one blocks the parking drive aisle. One more question related to loading. Are the delivery and pick-up vehicles intended to back out across the bicycle lane and into the oncoming traffic? There is no room to turn around in the loading area.

Thank you in advance for responding to these concerns.

Robert S. Wallach, AIA
8517 Whittier Blvd.
Bethesda, MD 20817
240|417|9602

From: [Penny](#)
To: [Gatling, Tsaiquan](#)
Cc: [Dickel, Stephanie](#); [Mencarini, Katherine](#)
Subject: Re: 4824 Edgemoor Lane
Date: Tuesday, February 14, 2023 11:24:21 AM

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

Thank you for keeping me informed.

Can you help me understand why in the August 3, 2022, Statement of Justification, the developer say that they want to convert up to 65 units as "short-term hotel rentals" but in the new Feb 8, 2023 submission they state up to 65 units "will be short term rentals." They have omitted the word "hotel". Is this in any way significant? Are they changing their request for these 65 units in any way? Is something other than a typical hotel room booking or airbnb rental envisioned? It is curious they dropped the word, "hotel."

Additionally, do you have any renderings as to their new proposal to add windows to their south facade, as well as the west facade and any renderings for the additional balconies? This request is very inscrutable without additional drawings. Were any submitted to the Planning Department? If they are recorded in the DAIC can you direct me to where to find it?

Finally, can you give me additional information on "co-living" arrangements? Are there any in Montgomery County and if so, where? Are any in development in the County? What is the County guidance for approving the adult dorm living arrangements?

Any assistance you can provide would be appreciated by the Chase community. I assume your office needs this type of information as well to process the developer's request for Amendments.

Thank you.

Penny Dash

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

From: Gatling, Tsaiquan <tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org>
To: Penny <pennydash@verizon.net>
Cc: Dickel, Stephanie <Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org>; Mencarini, Katherine <katherine.mencarini@montgomeryplanning.org>
Sent: Fri, Feb 10, 2023 1:22 pm
Subject: RE: 4824 Edgemoor Lane

Good Afternoon Penny,

I am reaching out to inform you that the Applicants for 4824 Edgemoor have updated plans and documents which you can find online at DAIC:

[4824 Edgemoor - Site Plan 82021004A](#)

[4824 Edgemoor - Preliminary Plan 12020007A](#)

Thank you,
Tsaiquan Gatling

Tsaiquan Gatling

Planner III, DownCounty Planning

Montgomery County Planning Department

2425 Reddie Drive, Wheaton, MD 20902

Tsaiquan.Gatling@montgomeryplanning.org

p: 301.495.2116

From: Penny <pennydash@verizon.net>

Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2023 4:18 PM

To: Gatling, Tsaiquan <tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org>

Cc: Dickel, Stephanie <Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org>; Mencarini, Katherine <katherine.mencarini@montgomeryplanning.org>

Subject: Re: 4824 Edgemoor Lane

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

How can I keep up to date on any changes the Applicant may make to its Application for Amendment to 4824 Edgemoor Lane? I am interested in any type of changes they may now and in the future propose.

Penny Dash

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

From: Gatling, Tsaiquan <tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org>

To: Penny <pennydash@verizon.net>

Cc: Dickel, Stephanie <Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org>; Mencarini, Katherine <katherine.mencarini@montgomeryplanning.org>

Sent: Wed, Jan 25, 2023 10:57 am

Subject: RE: 4824 Edgemoor Lane

Ms. Dash,

We appreciate your feedback here as well as in your letter dated January 24, 2023. We are preparing a response to your concerns. The Applicant has currently requested an extension through March 16, 2023 to further work through the proposal for this amendment. We are still working with the Applicant on their proposal and intend to provide a response based on the latest revisions and anticipate gaining more information in that within the next couple of weeks. A Planning Board hearing for this Application is now expected to be held on March 16, 2023.

Thank you,
Tsaiquan

Tsaiquan Gatling

Planner III, DownCounty Planning

Montgomery County Planning Department

2425 Reddie Drive, Wheaton, MD 20902

Tsaiquan.Gatling@montgomeryplanning.org

From: Penny <pennydash@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2023 10:08 AM
To: Gatling, Tsaiquan <tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org>
Cc: Dickel, Stephanie <Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org>; Mencarini, Katherine <katherine.mencarini@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: 4824 Edgemoor Lane

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

Mr. Gatling,

Thank you for your quick response to my email about the amendment to 4824 Edgemoor Lane. Regarding the traffic study provided by Wells + Associates, I would like an explanation as to how a building with 25 more units, and 65 units potentially made into hotel units will generate only 2 additional AM trips and no additional PM trips than the previous building.

Also, please explain how the existing use is now generating 8 PM trips as opposed to 6 PM trips in the previous traffic studies. Using the original existing trips, both AM and PM increases are now at 49. This is too close to 50. Also, at the time of Site Plan approval, there were two eastbound lanes on Edgemoor at the intersection with Woodmont. The current site plan is only showing one, exacerbating the congestion at the exit to the Chase garage and at the intersection. This is a significant change which should be addressed by Area Transportation. It seems evident that an LATR study is warranted.

I appreciate your attention to this matter.

Penny Dash

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

From: Gatling, Tsaiquan <tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org>
To: Penny <pennydash@verizon.net>
Cc: Dickel, Stephanie <Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org>; Mencarini, Katherine <katherine.mencarini@montgomeryplanning.org>
Sent: Wed, Jan 18, 2023 1:16 pm
Subject: RE: 4824 Edgemoor Lane

Ms. Dash,

Thank you for your email.

As part of our review of the drawings and documents submitted by the Applicant for this amendment, Planning Staff provided comments to the Applicant in our online submission system and requested that the Applicant revise the drawings based on public feedback and our comments as discussed at the public DRC Meeting. Although there is no specific document for this request for revisions, I have included a list of Staff's Transportation review comments as an attachment to this email.

The transportation comments noted some inconsistencies between the plan sheets and some clarification questions on the parking calculations. The site access and circulation were previously approved are not proposed to change. The Site Plan Amendment is limited to the change in units (and potential to convert some to short-term hotel rentals), change in bicycle parking and vehicle parking within the onsite garage. The Applicant is subject to the previous approvals.

As it relates to Fire Access, Marie LaBaw (Marie.LaBaw@montgomerycountymd.gov) simply commented "Plan was approved 12/24/2020. Any changes resulting from the DRC process shall be submitted to Marie LaBaw, DPS for review." given that the revisions to the previous approval are expected to be limited to internal changes. One of the comments found in the attached document includes an Area Transportation comment regarding correcting an apparent conflict with a Fire and Rescue connection and an accessible walkway, however the Applicant responded that this was due to a graphical inconsistency. This project is still set for a Planning Board Hearing on 2/16. To my knowledge, an address change has not been discussed as a part of this amendment application.

Thanks again,
Tsaiquan

Tsaiquan Gatling

Planner III, DownCounty Planning

Montgomery County Planning Department

2425 Reddie Drive, Wheaton, MD 20902

Tsaiquan.Gatling@montgomeryplanning.org

p: 301.495.2116

From: Penny <pennydash@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 11:50 AM
To: Gatling, Tsaiquan <tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org>
Cc: Dickel, Stephanie <Stephanie.Dickel@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: 4824 Edgemoor Lane

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

Hi. I am an owner at the adjacent building to the above-referenced new development, which has a Application for Amendment pending before the Board.

It has come to my attention that you have asked Area Transportation for a "Revision Request" , and I would like to know specifically what issues are being addressed? May I have a copy of this Revision Request? Alternatively, can you explain the content? The Chase garage sits next to the development and with the new bicycle lane removing one of the two Edgemoor lanes east, our exit from the garage relies on NO vehicles stopping outside the adjacent Edgemoor development's lobby. If you have read the extensive file of comments from the community you will be aware that we have repeatedly raised this as a major concern, not only for ourselves, but for any commuter using Edgemoor trying to drop off Metro passengers across the street (Woodmont) from the new development.

Relatedly, can also provide me with a copy of the Revision Request that was submitted to Fire and Rescue from Marie LaBaw? This is also a major issue for the community because, we have asked to have the address changed to a Woodmont address to move approaching vehicles to Woodmont, which is better able to accommodate a vehicle stopped to ascertain where is the loading dock or pull-off space. Although former Chair Anderson orally endorsed this idea at the site plan hearing in March, 2021, he omitted any mention of it in the written Resolution. Any address change was contingent on obtaining approval from Fire and Rescue and I would like to know if this change is a part of the pending Revision Request to Fire and Rescue? If not, I'd still like to know what it is about. IF you do not have access to this, could you provide me with Ms. LaBaw's email address?

I appreciate your prompt attention to this matter as the hearing is scheduled for February 16, 2023. Is that still the date?

Penny Dash

From: [BEN GITLOW](#)
To: [Gatling, Tsaiquan](#)
Subject: Fwd: 4824 Edgemoor Lane, Bethesda
Date: Saturday, February 25, 2023 4:35:06 PM

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

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

From: BEN GITLOW <b.gitlow@comcast.net>
To: "mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org" <mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org>, "tsaiquan.gatling@montgomeryplanning.org" <tsaiquan.gatlin@montgomeryplanning.org>
Date: 02/25/2023 3:06 PM
Subject: 4824 Edgemoor Lane, Bethesda

February 25, 2023

To: Montgomery County Planning Board
mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org
tsaiquan.gatlin@montgomeryplanning.org

From: Joan Gitlow, 7500 Woodmont Avenue, Bethesda, MD 20814

Re: Proposed construction, 4824 Edgemoor Lane

I am a condo owner at The Chase. My unit does not face the proposed building, nor do I have a car, so the garage exit problems do not directly impact me. However, I am seriously concerned about the effectiveness of the Planning Board in managing development in Bethesda.

I will not list each amendment to the original proposal since others have done that. I believe there have been EIGHT requests for exemptions to the Planning Board guidelines. This project has changed so substantially from the original proposal, one can only assume that the developer realized the original plan was not viable, perhaps because of the restrictive nature of the location and the size of the lot. I would guess that left two choices, either abandon the project altogether or seek approval for changes to improve profitability.

Which leads me to question the decisions and, indeed, the function of the Planning Board. The County has Guidelines for construction and development that are crucial to protecting this region and promoting appropriate growth. This developer has chosen a very small lot. To compensate for that, there have been variances that negatively impact the

area, i.e. reducing spacing between towers by ten feet, increasing the number off units from 77 to 111, failure to provide adequate and safe drop-off space, reducing sidewalk setback, plus many more.

The County Guidelines are written to address serious safety requirements as well as beneficial growth and should be firmly held. I believe it is vital to the community that any amendments to an approved proposal that have negative impact be given limited and carefully considered approval only.

The Board's first consideration must be community welfare and safety.

This proposal is out of compliance in too many ways to be granted final approval.

Sincerely,

Joan Gitlow