

Mission Helper Update: Filing by Developer

1 message

William Meyer < williamkmeyer@gmail.com>

Tue, Jul 13, 2021 at 1:54 PM

Neighbors: We had our last Zoom meeting with the developer Chestnut Partners (Ross Norris) and the attorney (Patsy Malone) on June 8. During that meeting, we offered various alternatives and ideas that Norris said he would consider; and Malone assured us that the developer had not filed anything yet and promised to let us know when they did. I learned on Friday that the developer filed a proposed Plan with the County six days later, on June 14.

I spent Monday visiting and talking to various County planning officials about what they filed. Here's what I have learned and done so far:

- I was told that Chestnut Partners filed a "Material Amendment" to the existing County Review Group ("CRG") Plan. There is some confusion between the Development Management Office and the Department of Planning about the proper process to be followed, but ultimately, an Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") will most likely gather information from various agencies about the proposal and make a decision. That decision can be appealed to the Board of Zoning Appeals, and later to court.
 - Here is a link to what they filed. The Mission Helper proposal is on page 4 and appears to be the same as we were shown in the March Zoom meeting -- six buildings, 40 units, no limit on residents. None of the ideas we presented at the last Zoom meeting are reflected in the drawings.
- The neighborhood Advisory Board -- a group of selected neighbors who in 1988 negotiated and executed the Restrictive Covenant Agreement ("RCA") that is at the heart of this matter -- has agreed to retain me as its attorney (at no cost) to represent it in these proceedings. That way, I can appear before the various agencies handling this proposal and present your views. Thank you, Advisory Board (O'Donovan, Fitzpatrick, Ashley, Mittenthal, Arbelaez/Montuenga, and Sexton households).
- Here is what Ms. Malone told me today about the filing and lack of notice:

- the official development and zoning submittals related to this project have <u>not</u> been filed. The submittal made in June is a pre-requisite called a "check-print" required by Baltimore County in order to make the actual development submittal. As promised during our last meeting, I will let you know when our actual submittals have been made. In fact, we are required to send copies of the development submittal to all adjacent property owners, and a copy will also be sent to you as legal counsel for the Board of Advisors. Further, the property will be posted with notice of any scheduled public hearing on both submittals. [I have asked Ms. Malone to notify us about all required filings, "pre-requistes" or not.]
- We should have an opportunity to submit our side of the story to the ALJ. There will certainly be one or more public hearings, and we have a good case for limiting the density to the agreed-upon cap of 54 additional residents and use of the land as a continuing care facility. There are also serious traffic issues, and good case law which supports us. I am taking steps to make sure that we can be heard.
- I am also working with the Ruxton-Riderwood-Lake Roland Improvement Ass'n and the West Towson Ass'n to coordinate our response. They have been very supportive so far.

I will continue to update you as I learn more, but as always please call, email, or visit to discuss. Thanks.

--

Bill Meyer 410-818-3892

williamkmeyer@gmail.com

More info: www.MHneighbors.com