

Rolden Community Meeting Minutes

7:30-9:00pm on April 22, 2009

3838 Roland Avenue, basement social room of senior housing building

List of Meeting Attendees

	Name	Address	Email	Phone
1	Tracy Collins	4105 Roland	tracy4collins@yahoo.com	410-243- 4116
2	Cristina Oliveira	4121 Roland	Oliveira@juh.edu	410-235- 2355
3	Bob McCarthy	4015 Roland	Bob@petrafab.com	410-235- 8180
4	AnnElizabeth Murdy	4139 Roland	aemurdy@yahoo.com	410-467- 5476
5	Peggy Hoffman	4016 Roland	hoffmankonsolas@aol.com	410-889- 0573
6	Minas Konsolas	4016 Roland	hoffmankonsolas@aol.com	410-889- 0573
7	Cindy France	4207 Roland	ckfrance@verizon.net	410-366- 6377
8	Greg Dohler	4207 Roland	ckfrance@verizon.net	410-366- 6377
9	Dennis Cardiff	4019 Roland	dcardiff@cpcbcmd.edu	410-366- 7032
10	Robert Pierson	4107 Roland	Rlpierson@verizon.net	410-664- 7157
11	David Thomas	4132 Roland	thomas_david@bah.com	410-467- 2978
12	Dorothy Wickham	4034 Roland	Lightnup828@gmail.com	443-514- 8168
13	Matthew Scott	4200 Roland	matthewscott@comcast.net	410-467- 5975
14	Michael Falk	4200 Roland	mfalk@jhu.edu	410-467- 5975
15	Mike DiPietro	198 Oakdale	dipi1960@aol.com	410-243- 8971
16	Alexandra Weizel	4136 Roland	Aweizel@comcast.net	443-562- 7662
17	Jackie Capecci	4136 Roland	Jcapecci@comcast.net	443-562- 7664

- I. After introductions, Robert Pierson reviewed the work to date which includes;
 - a) Land Use Committee: the communications to date have been through Bob McCarthy
 - b) Revive Rolden Board: Robert Pierson revived Rolden's charter on 4/17/09 so we are now incorporated and in good standing. We can always change the name later.
 - c) Roland Park Civic League: We have been in touch with the Roland Park Civic League. Our contact, Mike DiPietro, said they would wait until RPP has submitted a final proposal (after approval by their board) before responding.

- II. Ann-Elizabeth explained the RPP Parking Plan as it was presented in their March 3rd meeting. RPP has information about their proposal on their website www.rolandpark.org

III. Bob McCarthy summarized the draft of our Rolden Land Use Committee Recommendations which had been passed out for everyone to review. Please refer to Attachment A which is the Land Use Committee's Recommendations.

IV. Summary of Community Discussion:

a) Strongly oppose the inclusion of 4021 Roland Ave in PUD:

i. **Summary** - all but one attendee are very much against this property going into the PUD.

ii. **Discussion Points** - If this were to become a parking lot for staff, Dennis pointed out the increase in noise during shift changes (24/7). Dennis has two tenants upstairs which he would lose in addition to the light and noise in his bedroom being intolerable. Dennis stated that once the property is in the PUD, RPP can do whatever they want. Tracy spoke of the fiscal damage; neighbors trying to sell to individuals at lower value or a sale potentially going to RPP. AnnElizabeth spoke of aesthetic damage - there is no place for a parking lot in the middle of our neighborhood. She also advised that it would be shortsighted to think that RPP's long term goal is only a few more parking places - eventually they would want the spots between the church and 4021 for their expansion. Robert pointed out that Mary Pat Clark, our council woman, has stated that we should not take a position that RPP cannot expand parking at all. Rather we should pick an area of compromise so they will work with us. Michael said that with all the green space they have in the middle of their property, why don't they limit that space to come up with some extra parking spots. Dorothy advised us not to jump to conclusions about what may happen and rather to trust RPP. She was the only individual who took the stance that it wouldn't be the worst thing for 4021 to come down. Dorothy wants to protect the parking along Roland Avenue for her personal use and potential future clients. Dennis explained that RPP has met with him over lunch and been deceptive on several occasions. They initially told Dennis that 4021 would be used for visitors even though they already knew that the house would not pass inspection.

b) Use of Church Property:

i. **Summary** - The group consensus is that ideally the church remains as is with no parking in rear. However, if we have to concede somewhere, we would rather RPP create parking here than at 4021. The group agreed that we should keep this as a negotiation card for later and not give it up too soon

ii. **Discussion Points** - Bob talked about their desire to make the front of this property a turning lane onto Roland Avenue and potentially an access point to their property. Cindy stated that the turning lane would only make it easier for drivers to speed up Roland Avenue. She said that crossing the street and parallel parking is already dangerous. AnnElizabeth doesn't want the church torn down because it's a green space, beautiful old building and an anchor for the neighborhood. Additionally it would wet their appetite for expansion to the next property over. AnnElizabeth believes we should not give this up too easily.

c) Parking on the current RPP Property along the Roland Avenue properties

No objection to these recommendations

d) Covenants with Roland Park Place

No objection to renew and extend these covenants

e) Representation and consensus

We also discussed the process that led us to tonight's meeting, covering issues of inclusion and of the decision-making process. Dorothy asked how we had advertised, and Tracy responded that she put flyers in every mailbox (tenant and otherwise) through 4202. Other people emailed neighbors as they could and emailed all the Elmhurst Nursery parents. Alex suggested that we clarify that we are not a homeowners' association interested in dictating the color of people's shutters, as at least one neighbor stayed home for fear of this very outcome. Dorothy suggested that we mail flyers to property owners who do not live on the street; since she did this a few years ago when seeking her business permit, she agreed to look and see if she still has the addresses. If not, Michael assured us that it is easy to find this information. We also discussed the decision-making process within the group, agreeing that consensus would be ideal but might not always be possible. Dorothy expressed concern that her dissenting voice (about 4021) would not be heard; other participants stressed the importance of presenting a relatively united front to Roland Park Place, while encouraging free and open discussion within our own meetings. Mike D. offered that in the Roland Park Civic League, unanimous votes are common but not universal.

V. Next Steps

- a) Volunteers for the Land Use Committee: Bob, Simeon, Robert & Dennis
- b) Volunteers for the Nominating Committee: Robert & Tracy
- c) Volunteers for the Party Committee: Matthew Scott will host a "block party" in his yard. We will have a neighborhood name contest during the party. The group does not like Rolden or Ham Roll and we need more options than SoRo.

VI. Other Items:

- a) Mission Statement: AnnElizabeth will draft one and route for everyone to review. We don't like "Improvement" in our name as it scares some neighbors from joining. We like the idea of a community association that allows all to be free and unique.
- b) Meeting Space: Peggy Hoffman owns a business on 36th street with an upstairs space that we are welcome to use for future meetings.
- c) Parking Pass: Peggy pointed out that parking on Roland Avenue is tough now and may only get worse. Thus, we should think about pursuing a parking permit street and in the meantime do all we can to protect the existing parking.
- d) Traffic Calming: All agreed too many cars speed up our street making it dangerous. Matthew is going to forward the link to Baltimore City's site on traffic calming measures.

Attachment A

Roland Park Place Parking Plan Rolden Land Use Committee Recommendations April 22, 2009

1. We absolutely oppose the inclusion of 4021 Roland Avenue in the RPP Planned Unit Development.

- a. The use of the property for non-residential purposes will drive a wedge into the block – aesthetically and literally. We think there would be a domino effect on all the value of the surrounding properties and the desirability of the neighborhood.
 - b. The adjacent owners will not want to stay, may also sell to RPP, which could result in additional parking or eventual buildings (“Roland Park Place West”). The entire neighborhood fabric is in jeopardy.
 - c. The intended use as a parking lot would directly abut the house and the Elmhurst Nursery School, which would result in lighting, noise, foot traffic and car pollution, that will be a nuisance and unpleasant. The parking lot would be too close to the school building and yard, where children would be playing.
2. Use of the church property
- a. We want to know the future of the structure - Will or will not need to be demolished with the widening of 40th Street? Does RPP have a use for it?
 - b. If the building is going to come down, then we want a thoughtful design plan that blends into the neighborhood and keeps the corner a gateway to the community.
 - c. Any use of the parking needs to take into account
 - i. Traffic flow
 - ii. Appropriately landscaped to fit in with the rest of the block.
 - iii. Minimize noise and other adverse affects on adjacent properties.
3. Parking on the current RPP Property along the Roland Avenue properties
- a. Proper screening along the entire perimeter of the property, including fulfilling promises of fencing from previous PUD amendments. Privacy fencing is preferred.
 - b. Noise reduction from the HVAC and generator.
 - c. Preventive measures taken to protect trees on adjacent properties.
 - d. Retention of large trees in the proposed parking areas.
 - e. Consideration of adding spaces along the University Parkway and Keswick sides of the property.
4. Covenants with Roland Park Place – Currently there are covenants in place that are binding on Roland Park Place that are due to expire January 1, 2010. We would like these to be renewed and extended.

Other ideas:

Zurich is definitely moving out of their building next to the Rotunda. Follow up to be sure that the Zurich parking lot could not be used by RPP. The garage was financed by the City and they should be held accountable to the needs of the community.