

From: [Soo Lee-Cho](#)
To: [Robeson Hannan, Lynn](#); [Clayborne, Mariah](#); [Mencarini, Katherine](#)
Cc: [Johnson, Nana](#); [Guisao-Ospina, Jony](#); [William Rogers](#); [Patrick La Vay](#); [Ji Young Cho](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL]RE: CU 17-12/CU 26-01
Date: Friday, January 30, 2026 1:17:32 PM
Attachments: [image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[CU Cover Sheet.pdf](#)
[CU Site Plan.pdf](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Ms. Robeson Hannan,

I am writing to provide an update/status of the several follow up items expected from the Applicant in this matter.

First, we have further conferred with KCSC staff and confirmed that an amendment for additional signage will not be requested/required at this time. The Applicant appreciates the additional time afforded to further consider this issue.

In addition, as discussed at the end of the hearing, the Cover Sheet and Site Plan of the conditional use plan set have been revised with an updated Development Standards table (Cover Sheet) and labeled to show locations of the short-term bike rack and the existing long-term bike locker (Site Plan). The Applicant requests that the attached plan sheets replace **Exhibits 8a** and **8c** in the record. Hardcopies of both will be sent to OZAH by the Applicant's engineers, MHG.

Finally, we will be submitting a further revised Statement of Justification (SOJ) that will incorporate updated image excerpts from both the above attached Cover Sheet and Site Plan as well as provide additional information on 1) how many people drive to the senior academic classes and 2) how the classes will continue to be operated in conjunction with service appointments to avoid parking issues. The updated SOJ will be provided no later than Tuesday, February 3rd to both OZAH and Planning Staff for review. The further revised SOJ will replace **Exhibit 25** in the record.

Thank you. Hope everyone has a nice (albeit chilly) weekend.

Soo



Exhibit 30
OZAH Case No: CU 17-12A

Soo Lee-Cho

BREGMAN, BERBERT, SCHWARTZ & GILDAY, LLC

7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 800 West

Bethesda, Maryland 20814

301-656-2707 x5902 **PHONE** | 301-961-6525 **FAX** | 301-318-3884 **MOBILE**

Email: sleecho@bregmanlaw.com

www.bregmanlaw.com

From: Robeson Hannan, Lynn <Lynn.RobesonHannan@montgomerycountymd.gov>

Sent: Friday, January 23, 2026 12:02 PM

To: Clayborne, Mariah <mariah.clayborne@montgomeryplanning.org>; Mencarini, Katherine <katherine.mencarini@montgomeryplanning.org>

Cc: Soo Lee-Cho <sleecho@bregmanlaw.com>; Johnson, Nana <Nana.Johnson@montgomerycountymd.gov>; Guisao-Ospina, Jony <Jony.Guisao@montgomerycountymd.gov>; William Rogers <wrogers@bregmanlaw.com>

Subject: [EXTERNAL]RE: CU 17-12/CU 26-01

Mariah, most of my questions were addressed at the public hearing, so you don't have to respond (there is no new lighting proposed so 6.4.4.E doesn't apply.)

This case will be recaptioned CU 17-12-A. There is a prior modification permitting a wall sign, but it was a minor modification so I believe the designation of A for this major amendment is appropriate.

At the hearing, we left the record open for (1) an updated table showing compliance with the Zoning Ordinance and (2) more information on how many people will drive to the senior academic classes. The Applicant agreed to submit these by January 30, 2026. Mr. Rogers/Ms Lee-Cho, please submit this to staff as well for their files.

The Applicant is considering an amendment to the conditional use to add a sign. They plan to let us know by January 30, 2026 if they will go ahead with this amendment. Because this is a possibility, I've left the record open until March 2, 2026 so they can submit a design and get comments from Staff. If the Applicant decides to proceed with the sign, kindly forward your recommendation on the sign before January 30, 2026 so the Applicant has a chance to respond to your comments. Of course, if you need additional time, feel free to let me know.

Thanks for your work on this case.

Best,

Lynn Robeson Hannan
Hearing Examiner

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hi Lynn,

I hope all is well and that you are warm too! Thank you so much for your feedback and questions regarding the Conditional Use. I genuinely appreciate the thoroughness and attention to detail.

I am in the process of reviewing the questions and should have answers for you soon. Could you please let me know if there is a specific deadline for the responses? I will prioritize this and get on it right away, but I thought it would be helpful to know if there's any flexibility with the timing.

Thanks again for your assistance!

Best,

Mariah Clayborne

Planner II

East County Division

Montgomery County Planning Department

2425 Reedy Drive 13th Floor

Wheaton, MD 20902

O: (301) 495-4535

Mariah.clayborne@montgomeryplanning.org



From: Robeson Hannan, Lynn <Lynn.RobesonHannan@montgomerycountymd.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2026 2:47 PM

To: Mencarini, Katherine <katherine.mencarini@montgomeryplanning.org>; Clayborne, Mariah <mariah.clayborne@montgomeryplanning.org>

Cc: Soo Lee-Cho <sleecho@bregmanlaw.com>; Johnson, Nana <Nana.Johnson@montgomerycountymd.gov>; Guisao-Ospina, Jony <Jony.Guisao@montgomerycountymd.gov>

Subject: CU 17-12/CU 26-01

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

Good afternoon and I hope all are warm.

As always, thanks for your assistance with the Staff Report.

A few items/questions on this case:

1. I propose to issue an order formally recaptioning the case to CU 17-12-A, following the Board of Appeals numbering system for modifications. Ms. Lee-Cho, if you have an objection, please let me know.
2. A condition of the first CU approval required the Applicant to abandon the old SE for a medical office before obtaining a use and occupancy permit. It appears that this has not been done. I proposed to retain that condition from the former CU approval, and hopefully, it can be met on this go-around.
3. Is there a photometric plan? How do we know that new lighting meets the requirements of 6.4.4.E.? Has it been measured.
4. I don't see the Traffic Statement in the record for some reason. I propose to add it.
5. Is there a bicycle parking space on the site.
6. The original CU had a condition requiring appointments for daytime visitors. Given the traffic statement, shouldn't that condition be continued with this application? Should there be a limit on the number of appointments per day (e.g., "X" per day)?

Thanks again for your recommendation and stay warm!

Best,

Lynn Robeson Hannan
Hearing Examiner

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Bregman Law. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.