



**Old Court / Greenspring
Improvement Association, Inc.**

Dr. Ronald Diener, President
Mrs. Valerie Binder, Vice-President
Larry Carton, Secretary
Mrs. Joanne Warres, Treasurer

Summary of meeting with potential developers of Hidden Waters property on 12/2/15
regarding CZMP issue 2-029

Meeting was held with representatives of Bozzuto Homes, potential developers of Hidden Waters: Thomas Baum, president of Bozzuto Homes Chris Block, Bozzuto V-P Development and David Gildea, of Smith, Gildea and Schmidt, representing Bozzuto Homes, Inc.; and 17 community members, representing 6 neighboring associations and PGCC.

After an introduction, Mr. Baum told us a little about Bozzuto Homes, saying the company is very design oriented, that their intention is to build 50 Villas (townhouse type homes) and a few (15 to 20%) single family homes in a 25 acres gated community marketed to 55 and older residents. This would obviate the need to add children to our schools (not what the Community wants!). In reply to questions, he stated that the price of the villas would be in the \$700 thousand to one million dollar range (this also brought some surprise for such small properties!). He said there was close proximity to shops for older folks to walk to (community pointed out that is not the case; there are no sidewalks, and Old Court is heavily travelled and a dangerous road to walk on). Mr. Baum said that a PUD may be requested once the CZMP is concluded.

In reply to some questions about why they had opted to apply for DR 3.5 zoning across the entire 135 acres, Mr. Baum said they knew they could not build on the area protected by the Environmental easements, but they did not want to create an island on the buildable 25 acres on the east, leading to the request to rezone the entire property. He also admitted that the proximity to the DR 3.5 density of Stevenson Crossing on the western end of the Hackerman property was also a factor. In response to this, it was pointed out that Stevenson Crossing is half a mile away from the proposed area of development and the reasoning, behind its DR 3.5 density was to allow for residents needing to walk to the adjacent Beth Tfiloh synagogue in observance of their religion.

Mr. Baum later added that the zoning of DR 3.5 was requested because it was required for the townhouse type of housing they wish to develop.

Later, after comments about proceeding with a PUD, and in reply to questions as to why they had submitted a CZMP request when Mr. Baum said he wanted a PUD, Mr. Baum said it was a pre-emptive move they made when they realized that the window was closing on submitting CZMP applications. When asked whether they would be willing to withdraw the DR 3.5 application, Mr. Gildea said that this was not legally possible.

When informed that the Community Action Plan clearly established this area for DR 1 zoning, and that the Community would have no objection, and indeed would welcome, development of single family homes in this area, Mr. Baum stated that while they do build single family homes, that had not been their plan or intention.

There followed many questions and statements by the community, who were unanimously opposed to what Mr. Baum was proposing. Mr. Baum changed his arguments repeatedly (at one time saying he did not want age restrictions), and it was obvious he knows little about the area. Mr. Baum at one point said that their intention is to build something on the order of Rockland. A Rockland representative pointed out that there are only 69 homes, some attached and many single family, on 75 acres, so Rockland is built to DR 1 requirements arranged in their current fashion in order to maximize the “open space” within the community. While the meeting was cordial, it was apparent that the whole presentation was “half-baked” and inconsistent.

To emphasize the community’s interest in maintaining DR 1 zoning throughout this area, Phyllis Friedman mentioned that PGCC had filed to downzone the Shapiro property from DR 2 to DR 1 considerably before the Bozzuto CZMP request was filed. In reply to the question of whether they were aware of this request, they said they were not – further showing their lack of knowledge about the community.

Despite various requests to remain with a single family development at DR 1, they seem to be attached to their “villa” concept that would not be permitted at a density of less than 3.5 and unreceptive to reducing the number of dwellings to a DR 1 density and type. The only point of agreement for the evening was the conservation of Mr. Hackerman’s plantings and garden.

As the meeting concluded, Mr. Baum was given a copy of the Community Plan and urged to study it and perhaps return with a proposal that meets its requirements, and which could be the basis for a more fruitful discussion. We think Mr. Baum clearly understands that if he chooses to go with a PUD he will need to work closely with the community, and any future proposal would need to be constructive and be at the current density of DR 1. It is our hope that if the east area is developed, it will be something that everyone can be proud of and be appropriate for the area.

Mical Wilmoth Carton, Recording Secretary
Old Court-Greenspring Improvement Assn., Inc.
3004 Old Court Road, Pikesville, MD 21208
410 486-6420 // OCGSHOA@aol.com