

Joint Hearing - MCC & PC  
CTAM-9739-2024  
Ex 12

**From:** [Barr, Stuart R.](#)  
**To:** [Rob Robinson](#); [Gregory Mann](#)  
**Cc:** [Wallace, Scott C.](#); [Nancy Regelin](#); [Hummel, Phillip A.](#); [Matthew Gordon \(mgordon@sgnlaw.com\)](#); [Barr, Stuart R.](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Retool Comments  
**Date:** Monday, March 4, 2024 1:07:59 PM  
**Attachments:** image001.png

---

**This email is from an EXTERNAL source. Please use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.**

Rob/Greg – thank you for your leadership on Retool, and thanks for taking comments from this group. I think Phil’s, Scott’s, and Matt’s comments are excellent, and I support them. Additionally, for now, I would add:

- FAR -- Clarify that an applicant can use gross tract area for density purposes (allow use of dedications) – would be consistent with Montgomery County (Matt covered this in more depth in his email).
- Section 24-7.5 – surface parking. If it’s not already clear somewhere, make clear when changes to a surface parking area have to comply with the new standards, particularly things like the 30% canopy coverage for parking areas. Ideally, applicants would be able to propose changes to existing surface parking areas under either the current or new standards (their choice) – this would allow maximum flexibility. If proposed changes to surface parking have to comply with new standards, then only the portion that is proposed to change should have to comply (i.e., the entire parking facility, including unchanged portions, shouldn’t have to be brought up to current standards).
- Building lot coverage in the E-1/E-2 zones – consider increasing building lot coverage from 50% to either 70% or 75%. This would make the E-1/E-2 zones consistent with the other non-residential zones.
- Section 24-6.5 – Outdoor Storage – all existing outdoor storage that is consistent with an approved site plan should be grandfathered and shouldn’t have to meet the new standard unless it’s proposed to be changed.
- Drive-throughs and pick up/dropoff spaces should be as flexible as possible given retail trends.
- Waivers, exceptions, variances, alternative compliance, etc. are a good thing from the development community’s perspective and should be allowed throughout the new ZO. We don’t know everything and can’t intelligently predict everything, so we shouldn’t stymie a good idea in the future.

Thanks for the consideration --- Stuart

---

**Stuart R. Barr, Attorney**  
Lerch, Early & Brewer, Chtd. rise to every challenge  
7600 Wisconsin Ave | Suite 700 | Bethesda, MD 20814  
T 301-961-6095 | F 301-347-1771 | Cell 571-213-2354  
[sbarr@lercheearly.com](mailto:sbarr@lercheearly.com) | [Bio](#)

Attention: This message is sent from a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you received this communication in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message and any attachments. Thank you.  
[www.lercheearly.com](http://www.lercheearly.com)

[Subscribe to the Zoned In blog](#)

---