

## Item 8 - Correspondence

**From:** [Stephan Faherty](#)  
**To:** [MCP-Chair](#)  
**Subject:** BLOOM MONTGOMERY VILLAGE ADMENDMENT #82017013b  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 29, 2020 7:59:35 PM  
**Attachments:** [greensidestreet.docx](#)

---

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

Dear Mr. Anderson,

I, along with several of my neighbors, have previously submitted letters asking that the Planning Board amend the plan for area 5 of the former golf course. We feel that our request is logical, a cost savings to the developer, and will result in an improved quality of life for the existing residents and new residents.

As I stated, we have submitted our requests before. We received a standard response that our comments will be noted. A notation is one thing. Action by the Planning Board on our behalf is another.

Kindly take the time to read my attached letter and act on the suggested redesign of area five as described in the letter. **Current, as well as, new residents will benefit.**

Increasing the density of MPU's and constructing units that are only 16 feet wide will only serve to create another area such as the development across the street from the Village car wash. That development is just one of several within the Village that this mistake has been made. Please do not allow the mistake to be repeated.

The overall density of the development is more than the Village can handle. You are adding nearly 1,000 additional vehicles to the Village's under developed infrastructure.

There are many other points that I could bring into focus however, since area five is preparing for construction, let's address it now.

Thank You,

Stephan T. Faherty

**Stephan T. Faherty**  
**19745 Greenside Ter**  
**Montgomery Village, MD 2086**  
**301-569-0764**  
**stfaherty@comcast.net**

Office of the County Executive  
Marc Elrich, County Executive  
101 Monroe St.  
Rockville, MD 20850

CC: Craig Rice, Montgomery County Councilmember  
Casey Anderson, Chairman, Montgomery County Planning Board

August 19, 2020

Dear Sir,

As the initial phase of construction begins on the former Montgomery Village Golf Course, I ask that you reconsider the construction of the street that will pass through Areas 4 & 5. The proposed streets are to connect Rothberry with Montgomery Village Avenue and Stewartown Road. Both streets, Rothberry to Montgomery Village Avenue and Rothberry to Stewartown Road only takes into consideration the desires of the developer and not the impact on existing home owners. The existing home owners purchased their homes because of their location, especially those who border the former golf course. Now with the blessing of the Montgomery County Council and Planning Board, the developer has approval to create streets that will pass within ninety feet of existing homes and a tot lot. The approved street through Area 5 will have to be constructed through an area that is prone to flooding.

By allowing construction to continue as approved, the County has:

- Not taken into consideration the impact to the lifestyle of the current residents.
- Submitted the current residents to additional pollution from auto emissions. Residents will not be able to open their windows without being subject to County approved pollution.
- Montgomery Village Avenue and Stewartown Road is subject to 24/7 traffic noise. Autos and trucks that disrupt the neighborhoods with near constant boom, boom, boom of radios being played so loudly that they can be heard a block or more away. Another noise pollution.
- Vehicle with modified exhaust systems whose operators find personal satisfaction in seeing how loud and disruptive they can be. It is my guess, that some of these vehicles have cut outs installed in their exhaust systems. Cut outs, effectively disable the

standard exhaust system and allows the vehicle to be operated with open exhaust headers. At times, the area sounds like a NASCAR or Indy Car race.

- The approved street passing the rear of Greenside Terrace passes within ninety feet of the rear of the properties. The residents are expected to accept the disturbances as planned by the developer and approved by Montgomery County. No consideration was given to existing residences.
- Montgomery Village Avenue and Stewartown Road are drag strips. By completing the proposed street, the County will have provided a County sanctioned road racing course. Who will have to endure the noise and disruption? The residents, not the County Council members or the developer.

The proposed street behind Greenside Terrace is a carbon copy of the famous Alaskan bridge to nowhere. The engineering cost involved to construct the street do not equate to the alleged benefit of the street.

We all acknowledge that the County and developer intend to push forward with the development process, with total disregard of existing residents. I support the development of the golf course. Not the propose density, but the basic concept.

To show some consideration to the residents of Greenside Terrace, I propose that instead of constructing an unneeded street, make the area behind Greenside a cul-de-sac. The cul-de-sac will make life for the existing residents of Greenside a little more pleasant and will make new homes more valuable. Something that I know will make the developer and County coffers happier.

Also, reduce the number of proposed units behind Greenside Terrace. It appears that the number of units has been increased from the initial seventeen to twenty seven. Cramming twenty seven units into that area will only serve to create an area that will be a duplication of the area across the street from the village car wash. Atlantic Reality is showing good judgment in their approach to redeveloping the outdated Village Center. They are taking the most positive approach taken in Montgomery Village since the early 1980's.

I acknowledge that Montgomery Village residents have neither the political influence nor the financial resources that the members of Columbia Country Club have, and used, when they were able to force WAMATA to alter the planned purple line route. However, we should have a say in what impacts our environment. The same as Columbia Country Club did.

I am asking that the County delay development of Areas 4 and 5 until such time that the approved air, noise, and ecological damage proposed by the developer and approved by the County Planning board and Council can be logically readdressed, with consideration of existing neighborhoods.

Regards,

Stephan T. Faherty