

MINUTES

Baltimore County Planning Board Meeting

March 2, 2023

Contents

Call to Order, Introduction of Board Members, Pledge of Allegiance, and Announcements

Review of Today’s Agenda

Minutes of the February 16, 2023 Meeting

Item for Introduction

- 1. Sparrows Point Country Club (Country Club Estates) Growth Allocation Requests for Chesapeake Bay Critical Area

Item for Discussion and Vote

- 2. FY 2024 Capital Budget and Capital Program FY 2025-2029

Other Business

- 3. Recent County Council legislation of interest to the Board:
 - a. Bill 5-23 – Vacant Structures
 - b. Bill 6-23 – Zoning Regulations – Minimum Width (Modernizing Townhome Construction Act)
 - c. Resolution 2-23 – Development of Greater Middle River Design Guidelines

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Public Hearing by the
Baltimore County Planning Board

Call to Order, Introduction of Board Members, and Remarks by Chair

Item for Public Hearing

- 1. Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan 2022 (LPPRP)**

**Comments by citizens

Adjournment of Public Hearing

Appendices

- Appendix A** Sparrows Point Country Club (Country Club Estates) Growth Allocation Requests for Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Staff and Applicant Presentations
- Appendix B** Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan 2022 and Staff Presentation

Note: A copy of the appendices is located in the official digital Planning Board files.

**Baltimore County Planning Board Meeting Minutes
March 2, 2023**

Call to Order, Introduction of Board Members

Chairwoman Hafford called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM and welcomed everyone. A roll call to account for the members of the Board was conducted. Through the meeting, the following Board members were:

Present	Absent
1. Ms. Nancy Hafford, Chair 2. Mr. Peter Arrey 3. Ms. Emily Brophy 4. Ms. Beverly German 5. Mr. Mark Heckman 6. Mr. C. Scott Holupka 7. Mr. Derick Johnson 8. Mr. Wayne McGinnis 9. Mr. Howard Perlow 10. Ms. Cathryn Pinheiro 11. Mr. Todd Warren (Arrived at 4:13 PM) 12. Ms. Cathy Wolfson	1. Mr. Steven Heint

Attending County staff included: Mr. Steve Lafferty, Ms. Amy Mantay, Ms. Jenifer Nugent, Ms. Jennifer Meacham, Mr. Kristopher Weaver, Mr. Austin Broderick, Ms. Khadija Smith, Ms. Krystle Patchak, Ms. Courtney Rachuba, Ms. Laura Wolfe, and Ms. Taylor Bensley, all of the Department of Planning; and Ms. Regina Esslinger of the Department of Environmental Protection and Sustainability.

Review of Today’s Agenda

Ms. Bensley reported there were no changes to the Tentative Agenda published February 23, 2023.

Minutes of the February 16, 2023 Meeting

Chairwoman Hafford asked the Planning Board members if they had any changes to the February 16, 2023 Minutes. Hearing none, Chairwoman Hafford called for a motion to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Arrey moved to approve the Minutes as drafted. Ms. Brophy seconded the motion, which passed at 4:02 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Items for Introduction

1. Sparrows Point Country Club (Country Club Estates) Growth Allocation Requests for Chesapeake Bay Critical Area

Chairwoman Hafford informed the Board that the first item on the agenda was the introduction of the Sparrows Point Country Club (Country Club Estates) Growth Allocation Requests for the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area. She stated that the Board would have the opportunity to hear presentations by Ms. Regina Esslinger of the Department of Environmental Protection and Sustainability and Ms. Patricia Malone, the attorney for the applicant. Chairwoman Hafford then welcomed Ms. Esslinger to begin her presentation.

Ms. Esslinger introduced herself as the Manager of Environmental Impact Review in the Department of Environmental Protection and Sustainability (DEPS). She provided a history of the Critical Area designation, explaining that all Critical Area land was mapped into one of three land use categories based upon land use existing in December of 1985. Those categories included: Resource Conservation Area (RCA), Limited Development Area (LDA), and Intensely Developed Area (IDA). She noted that the County was allotted 462 acres of “Growth Allocation” for conversion of one land use category to another. Of that, 79.9 acres of Growth Allocation remained as of the meeting date.

Mr. Warren arrived at 4:13 PM.

Ms. Esslinger then provided information on the Growth Allocation Process and the Growth Allocation Review Committee (GARC). The Growth Allocation Process involved DEPS reviewing the application for completeness, the GARC performing a technical review and preparing an application for the Planning Board, the Planning Board reviewing the application and preparing a recommendation to the Board of Appeals, and the Board of Appeals voting to approve or deny the application. If approved by the Planning Board, DEPS would then forward the application and pertinent information to the State Critical Area Commission, who would render a final decision. The GARC Process included evaluating the application using a specific set of Evaluation Objections, obtaining community input via a Community Input Meeting, and submitting a detailed findings report for each Evaluation Objective. The findings were included in the GARC’s February 3, 2023 report.

After an in depth review of the process, Ms. Esslinger began to describe the project at hand. She explained that the proposal sought the reclassification of 40.72 acres of RCA to IDA and 14.63 acres of LDA to IDA. She then explained the GARC findings for the following objectives: consistency with established County land use policies, plans, and initiatives; adequacy of public facilities and services; fulfillment of unmet needs related to community and economic development policies noted in the Master Plan; anticipated ability of the project to comply with County development regulations; functional compatibility with surrounding areas; meeting or exceeding Critical Area program goals; resource protection objectives; resource enhancement objectives; design quality objectives; and site design features.

Ms. Esslinger concluded her presentation by explaining that the Committee's recommendation was that the Planning Board forward the Country Club Estates Growth Allocation application to the Board of Appeals for approval, subject to the approval conditions in the February 3, 2023 GARC Report. Those conditions included: allocate 40.72 acres of RCA to IDA and 14.63 acres of LDA to IDA Growth Allocation; adhere to the Growth Allocation Request Plan; complete all mitigation and community benefits outlined in applicants' proposal including construction of off-site kayak launches; provide additional planted screening along Schoolhouse Cove; record permanent Critical Area Easements in Land Records to protect all onsite Critical Area buffers, forests, and newly created marsh; record permanent Forest Conservation Easements/Forest Buffer Easements in Land Records to protect forests and buffers on site and outside of the Critical Area; and permanently demarcate easements with signs to deter future encroachment. She then thanked the Board for their time, and turned the presentation over to Ms. Malone.

Chairwoman Hafford then welcomed Ms. Malone.

Ms. Malone introduced herself as the attorney for the project. She introduced Mr. Conor Gilligan, President of Craftsmen Companies, to present the project.

Mr. Gilligan began his presentation with a timeline of events from November 2017 to present to explain the process the development had followed, highlighting that the Development Plan was approved in October 2019. He then provided some information on the property and proposed development. He explained that the site was approximately 270 acres and the applicant was proposing 53 villa homes, 60 single-family homes, 83 twenty-two foot townhomes, and 110 twenty-foot townhomes. He specified that the proceeds from the residential sales would be invested back into the club, totaling around 5.5 million dollars. Mr. Gilligan then described the site mitigations his team was proposing and the proposed Environmental Easements. He also noted that the project proposed additional screening to comply with GARC Recommendation # 9. Mr. Gilligan concluded his presentation by thanking the Board for their time on the matter and advising she was available for any questions.

Chairwoman Hafford thanked Ms. Esslinger, Ms. Malone, and Mr. Gilligan for their presentations and opened the floor for discussion amongst the Board members.

Mr. Perlow questioned who the 106 acres would be conveyed to. Ms. Esslinger responded that the easements would be managed by DEPS, but the land would be owned by Mr. Gilligan and his company.

Mr. Perlow inquired about the price range of the homes. Mr. Gilligan stated that the twenty-foot townhomes would begin around the high 300's, the twenty-two-foot townhomes would begin at the low 400's, and the villas would start around \$100,000 more than the townhomes.

Mr. Holupka asked for clarification on where the townhomes and villas would be located in the community. Mr. Gilligan confirmed on the map where both the villas and townhomes would be located.

Mr. Warren thanked Mr. Gilligan for stepping up and purchasing the property. He questioned the affordability of the homes and asked about the impact to the residents if they had been able to develop more land. Mr. Gilligan replied that the original proposal was less homes than currently proposed, however the units would not have made enough profits to pay off debts. He continued that it was determined at the PUD Community Input Meeting that the proposed number of homes would be a good balance between developing the site and maintaining the world-class golf course and clubhouse facilities. He stated they could have constructed more townhomes, but wanted to offer different product types and price ranges, so there would be a product for everyone. Ms. Gilligan stated he was content with the proposal.

Mr. Heckman asked Ms. Esslinger if it was the committee's opinion that this development was a better environmental solution than the current state of the land. Ms. Esslinger replied yes and stated that the plan would allow for plantings, permanently protected areas, corrected shoreline erosion, addition of storm water management, and 10% pollution reduction.

Mr. Heckman wanted to confirm that the 55 acres of easements was for the entire development, not just the new-dwelling portion. Ms. Esslinger confirmed that and stated the golf course would still remain functional while improving environmental aspects of the site.

Mr. Heckman noted he saw something in the materials that the Growth Allocation had to provide a public benefit, and he questioned what that benefit was. Ms. Esslinger stated that Growth Allocation was not part of the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area designation when it was created; the County's realized that they were locked into the 3-designations and were unable to change them. She continued that the General Assembly recognized there was a need for growth, and came up with the formula. She stated the 1988 standards the state had encoded, which were included in their package, did not speak to public good. Mr. Heckman replied he thought it had to include a public benefit. Ms. Esslinger clarified that the PUD required a community benefit. Mr. Heckman questioned reading something involving the construction of sidewalks. Ms. Malone responded that part of the Growth Allocation evaluation includes community enhancements. Mr. Gilligan stated that there were two parts: first, was the community enhancements within the Growth Allocation, and second, was community benefits which were required by the PUD process. He stated the community benefits included: kayak launch at Battle Grove Park, ADA kayak launch at Edgemere Senior Center, storm water management and improvement, proposed park to be built at Oakleigh Beach, providing public water service to Todd's Inheritance, a financial commitment of relocating a War of 1812 monument, and a contribution for a turf field project at Patapsco High School.

Mr. Heckman asked about the chemicals used for the golf course and if the area had been tested for arsenic. Mr. Gilligan responded that the areas were tested and if the concentration for arsenic was high, that area would be used for recreational use only.

Mr. Arrey asked Mr. Gilligan if he would be able to put in writing the aspects of public good. Mr. Gilligan replied he would.

Ms. German stated she thought the plan was wonderful. She explained that she was a retired Baltimore County Public Schools Principal. She specified she had concerns about the overcrowding at Sparrows Point Middle/High School. She continued that the School Impact Analysis that was conducted for the property was done in 2019, almost 4 years ago. She stated there were plans to build a new school for Sparrows Point Middle/High, but they had not found property yet. She questioned how the committee found no school impact during the study. Mr. Gilligan responded that, as part of the Development Plan approval process, the developer had to complete a capacity study for schools; at that time, the schools met the requirements. He continued that the 2023 budget had allocated \$8 million for the study and design of Patapsco and SPHS and \$750 million for school renovation within the next 6 years. He stated that it would be at least 5 years for full build out and he was confident that in 6 years, the school issues would be addressed by design and planning.

Mr. Holupka reiterated the County had 462 acres of Growth Allocation and about 80 acres was left. He questioned the amount the project would take from the 80 acres left. Ms. Esslinger responded this project would take 55.35 acres. It would use up almost all RCA acres, 4 acres would remain, and around 20 acres remaining in the LDA pot.

Mr. Holupka was curious about Growth Allocation along the County's shoreline as a whole. He questioned how much had gone to Dundalk and Sparrows Point versus the Middle River area. Ms. Esslinger stated at the time of program adoption, half of 462 acres had been put into projects that were already in the developmental pipeline and that the County had not had much Growth Allocation since. She stated the last Growth Allocation project had been 5 years ago in Essex for a project called Waters Landing, which was a much smaller development.

Mr. Holupka mentioned that the country club was privately owned, and asked if there would be public access or if it would be a gated community and private property. Mr. Gilligan responded that there were two entrances off of Wise Avenue – the existing entrance would remain the same, with the first 100 feet being public and beyond that being private; the other entrance off Wise Avenue would be public. Mr. Gilligan noted that the golf course would remain private, stating that every homeowner in the community would be a residential member of the country club with fees included in the Homeowners Association. He concluded that the use of the pool and golf course would be an additional membership offered at a discounted rate.

Mr. Holupka questioned if the homeowners would own the property. Mr. Gilligan responded that every home would be a fee simple ownership. He noted that every homeowner would be a member of the Homeowners Association, and the HOA would be a part of the Property Owners Association. The Property Owners Association would maintain the Country Club and homes.

Ms. Wolfson inquired about the 254 parking spaces for the golf course and anticipating 70 trips a day. She stated it seemed to be an unnecessary amount of parking. Mr. Gilligan agreed with Ms. Wolfson but assured her that the parking was needed to accommodate the clubhouse, which had space for special events and weddings. Ms. Malone noted the parking was existing.

Ms. Wolfson asked if there were plans for a marina. Mr. Gilligan responded there was a 62-slip marina on site to remain.

Mr. Arrey asked what would be the estimated tax revenue for Baltimore County. Mr. Gilligan stated he provided an economic impact analysis as part of the GARC review and that he could provide it to the Board.

Mr. Perlow voiced his support for the project, stating that the Board had seen items like this previously and that they had been successful. He noted that the development could provide housing for Tradepoint Atlantic employees, which he mentioned was an invaluable asset to Baltimore County, and that a project similar to this had been completed in Harford County.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

With no further comments or questions from the Board, Chairwoman Hafford called for a motion to set a Public Hearing. Mr. Holupka moved that the Baltimore County Planning Board set a Public Hearing for Thursday, March 16, 2023 at 5:00 PM for the purpose of receiving constituent testimony on the Sparrows Point Country Club (Country Club Estates) Growth Allocation Requests for the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area. Mr. Warren seconded the motion, which passed at 4:56 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Chairwoman Hafford informed the Board that they were tentatively scheduled to discuss and vote on the matter immediately following the Public Hearing, which, she noted, would be in person.

Due to the in person Public Hearing scheduled to begin at 5:00 PM, Chairwoman Hafford advised the Board that the remaining matters of the Public Meeting would be deferred until the completion of the Hearing. The Public Meeting was paused at 4:57 PM.

**Baltimore County Planning Board Public Hearing Minutes
March 2, 2023**

Call to Order, Introduction of Board Members

Chairwoman Hafford called the Public Hearing to order at 5:02 PM and welcomed everyone. A roll call to account for the members of the Board was conducted. Through the Hearing, the following members were:

Present	Absent
1. Ms. Nancy Hafford, Chair 2. Mr. Peter Arrey 3. Ms. Emily Brophy 4. Ms. Beverly German 5. Mr. Mark Heckman 6. Mr. C. Scott Holupka 7. Mr. Derick Johnson 8. Mr. Wayne McGinnis 9. Mr. Howard Perlow 10. Ms. Cathryn Pinheiro 11. Mr. Todd Warren 12. Ms. Cathy Wolfson	1. Mr. Steven Heintz

Attending County staff included: Mr. Steve Lafferty, Ms. Amy Mantay, Ms. Krystle Patchak, Ms. Courtney Rachuba, Ms. Laura Wolfe, and Ms. Taylor Bensley, all of the Department of Planning; and Ms. Molly Pickel, and Mr. Patrick McDougall of the Department of Recreation and Parks.

Item for Public Hearing

1. Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan 2022 (LPPRP)

Chairwoman Hafford welcomed everyone and explained that, on February 16, 2023, Mr. Bob Smith, Ms. Molly Pickel, and Mr. Patrick McDougall, all of the Department of Recreation and Parks, introduced the Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) 2022. Chairwoman Hafford explained that Mr. McDougall and Ms. Pickel were present to further present the plan, and then the Board would have the opportunity to hear from the members of the public.

Mr. McDougall introduced himself as a Planner III with the Department of Recreation and Parks. He informed the Board that Acting Director Bob Smith sent his regrets for being unable to attend, but that he and Ms. Pickel were present for further information on the LPPRP and then any questions. Mr. McDougall then turned the presentation over to Ms. Pickel.

Ms. Pickel introduced herself as a Planner II with the Department of Recreation and Parks. She began her presentation by explaining that the purposes of the LPPRP were to compile parks and recreation related goals, objectives, and policies, particularly related to capital priorities; to assess the current state of recreation and park facilities; and to maintain funding eligibility with the State of Maryland's Program Open Space. She also explained the components of the LPPRP: an inventory of all preserved land, a level of service and equity analysis, a study of user demand, and recommendations.

Ms. Pickel then presented specific parts of the LPPRP in greater depth. She described the inventory of preserved land, the level of service analysis, the park equity analysis, and how Recreation and Parks collected information on user demand. In regards to outreach, Ms. Pickel highlighted Recreation and Parks' outreach strategies and provided areas that could be improved upon for future LPPRP updates.

Ms. Pickel then described the goals and objectives outlined in the LPPRP. The goals were to acquire a variety of parklands and recreation sites to achieve parkland acquisition goals and meet public needs; develop, enhance, and rehabilitate parks to meet the recreation needs and demands of residents of all ages and abilities; enhance public access to the natural environment; work with DEPS to improve environmental conditions at the County's parks and recreation sites; pursue alternative means for providing recreational opportunities through partnerships with other agencies and organizations; expand opportunities for residents to participate in and experience arts and cultural programs and events, and work to preserve historically and culturally significant sites; and continue to partner with affiliated resident organizations in an effort to enhance public recreation access for Baltimore County residents and visitors.

Ms. Pickel finished her presentation by highlighting the importance of the LPPRP. She explained that the plan would enhance the State of Maryland Department of Natural Resource's understanding of and data on Baltimore County, maintain eligibility for Program Open Space funding, guide decision-making by the Department of Recreation and Parks, and aid other Baltimore County departments, as the LPPRP is an amendment to the Master Plan. Ms. Pickel then thanked the Board for their time on the matter and stated she was available for questions.

Chairwoman Hafford opened the floor for any questions or comments from the Board.

Mr. Warren asked Ms. Pickel to confirm what the darker areas on the map represented on the Levels of Service slide. Ms. Pickel confirmed that the darker areas had a better provision of playgrounds.

Mr. Perlow noted that the survey showed that recreational fields were not a priority and questioned if there was any reasoning as to why that answer came about. Ms. Pickel responded that she believed the previous survey had mostly reached individuals involved in recreational sports, whereas this survey was able to reach a greater amount of people, many of whom were not involved in recreational sports.

Mr. Perlow stated his concerns for the proposed Skate Park and the risks it would bring to the County for any injuries acquired at the sites. He asked if participants would need to sign a waiver or if using the facility would be at their own risk. Ms. Pickel explained she did not believe participants would need to sign a waiver. She continued that the park would have public hours and rules would be the same as the other three skate parks Baltimore County currently has. Mr. McDougall noted that, surprisingly, there were few injuries reported throughout the current skate parks. He stated that Recreation and Parks had tried to make strict rules for skate parks in the past and community members were unhappy and did not utilize the park.

Ms. Brophy noted that, during the presentation, it was stated that approximately 30% of the County's land was preserved. She then asked if this percentage was above or below what was required by the State. Ms.

Pickel explained that the State did not have hard and fast standards on how much land needed to be preserved, but that Baltimore County was under the recommended amount to be provided. Mr. McDougall chimed in that the Land Preservation, Recreation and Parks Plan was entirely tied to open space and guided acquisition. He noted there was a difference between agriculturally preserved land and Program Open Space land, and that all Program Open Space land was open and publicly accessible. He reiterated that the State used to have standards (30 acres per 1,000 population), however the standard was removed prior to the 2017 LPPRP, as the State could not determine why that number had been used. Mr. McDougall then stated that there was no universal or State-wide requirement, but that Recreation and Parks and the Department of Natural Resources often likened it to roads - DPWT was never questioned on how many miles of roads they needed and park space was similar. He then listed various standards other counties used, such as acres per population, percentages of land mass, and proximity-based analysis. Ms. Brophy sought clarification on if this plan related to agriculture preservation. Mr. McDougall answered that it did not, but that Recreation and Parks was required to show agriculturally preserved land in their land inventory analysis.

Mr. McGinnis asked the Department to explain why they chose to build an indoor facility on a farm field several miles south of Hereford as opposed to building on the Senior Center site north of Hereford, between Hereford and Hereford High School. Mr. McDougall stated that the Senior Center site was not large enough to accommodate ball fields. Mr. McGinnis clarified he was asking about an indoor facility only and not outdoor recreational fields. Mr. McDougall responded that the current plan proposed a multi-use facility, similar to the facilities at Sweet Air Park.

With no further comments or questions from the Board, Chairwoman Hafford began calling on members of the public who had signed up to speak on the topic.

Mr. Jeff Budnitz, a volunteer with Recreation and Parks Nature side, a Board member of the Lake Roland Nature Council, and a volunteer at other nature sites, complimented Ms. Pickel and Mr. McDougall on their plan. He stated he had read the plan in full and that he offered his support.

Mr. Rob DeFord, President of Baltimore County Land Trust Alliance, expressed his support for the LPPRP, and stressed the importance of agriculturally preserved land in Baltimore County.

Ms. Renee Hamidi of Valleys Planning Council stated she supported the LPPRP and stressed the importance of agriculturally preserved land in Baltimore County.

Mr. Ned Worthington of Valleys Planning Council and Land Preservation Trust stated he was concerned about the 5-4 vote in the previous Board meeting to defund Land Preservation. He stated the importance of agriculturally preserved land in Baltimore County.

Mr. Larry Fogelson of Neighbor Space recommended revisiting the LPPRP after the Master Plan was completed. He continued that the current LPPRP was in the same template that had been used for decades and suggesting review to bring up to current times. He highlighted it was hard to discern connection between needs and Capital Program projects, as there was no discussion in the plan.

Ms. Wolfson asked Mr. Fogelson if she was correct in reading his handout that Neighbor Space recommended more than a 25% increase in the amount of land preservation and agricultural goals. Mr. Fogelson responded that the State was negotiations to increase Baltimore County's goal for land preservation. Ms. Wolfson clarified that this would be an increase from 80,000 acres to 105,000 acres. Mr. Fogelson responded that was correct.

Ms. Marsha McLaughlin of Neighbor Space, Patapsco Heritage Area, and Baltimore County Green Alliance noted that the social equity analysis was helpful. She continued that her main concerns were that there was no priority setting; she suggested the Board and Recreation and Parks think about setting priorities and performing annual reports for Capital Budget meetings and Town Halls.

Mr. Johnson questioned if Ms. McLaughlin had any thoughts on getting different areas involved. Ms. McLaughlin stated that, though it would be difficult, the committee had to reach out to different communities.

With no other speakers, Chairwoman Hafford thanked Ms. Pickel and members of the public for their participation. She advised that the matter was scheduled for discussion and vote at the March 16, 2023 Planning Board meeting, which, she reminded, would be held in person.

Adjournment of the Public Hearing

Chairwoman Hafford called for a motion to adjourn the Public Hearing. Mr. Holupka moved to adjourn the Public Hearing. Chairwoman Hafford seconded the motion, which passed at 5:50 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

The Public Hearing adjourned at 5:50 PM.

The Public Meeting reconvened at 5:50 PM. All previously present members were in attendance.

Items for Discussion and Vote

- 2. FY 2024 Capital Budget and Capital Program FY 2025-2029

Chairwoman Hafford stated that the next item was the Board’s final recommendation and vote regarding the Fiscal Year 2024 Capital Budget and Capital Program for Fiscal Years 2025 through 2029. She then turned the meeting over to Vice Chairman Holupka, Chair of the CIP Subcommittee.

Vice Chairman Holupka provided highlights on the Board’s involvement in the Capital Improvement Budget and Program process for Fiscal Years 2024 to 2029. He explained that the Board’s involvement began with an in person Citizen Input Meeting on October 20, 2022. On January 19, 2023, County Executive Olszewski made a presentation to the Planning Board on the budget process and his priorities and then, in January and February 2023, the Board heard from representatives of various County agencies on their Capital Budget requests. Vice Chairman Holupka continued and noted that, on February 16, 2023, the Capital Improvement Program Subcommittee heard staff recommendations on the proposed budget; after much discussion, the Subcommittee voted to accept the staff recommendations for the FY 2024 Capital Budget and Five-year Program, and suggested recommendations to be included in the Board’s cover letter to the Director of the Office of Budget and Finance. The transmittal letter included the following project requests, should additional funding become available as part of the Capital Budget and Program: additional funding in Department 204, Storm Drains, for stormwater management facility planning, design and construction in flood prone areas of Oella; \$2.5 million in additional funding in Department 205, Streets and Highways for construction of sidewalks along Old Court Rd from Greenspring Ave to Stevenson Lane and Stevenson Lane to the I-695 and Seven Mile Lane; \$500,000 in additional funding in Department 205, Streets and Highways for planning to provide safe access across Charles Street to Lake Roland; additional funding in Department 209, Community Colleges to the

maximum amount which would be matched by state dollars; and additional funding in Department 213, Schools for an expansion of the indoor facilities at Hereford High School by adding additional gym space. Vice Chairman Holupka then opened up the floor for discussion on the transmittal letter.

Mr. Perlow noted that the letter should read Stevenson Road, not Stevenson Lane.

Mr. McGinnis stated that he did not feel that the concerns of citizens in the North County were being taken seriously and were being ignored. He stated that, every year, the Board had the chance to add items and delete items, and raise issues for the citizens they represent, but that some agencies did not always respond to the Board's concerns. He continued that, when Hereford High School was considered for replacement, the cost was \$120 million; the County instead remodeled the existing school for a cost of \$48 million. Mr. McGinnis stated that the budget proposed several million dollars to replace several high schools in the County, which compared to the numbers for the replacement of Hereford High School. He explained that there was a need and space for additional indoor facilities for Hereford High School, as the demands far exceeded the ability of the space. He stated that, several years ago, the Board voted to include an item in the budget, but that this year's letter simply states the Board "recommends" items be added to the budget. He expressed that, if the Board had the ability to include items in the budget, he would like funds for the gym space be included, not just recommended to be included. Mr. McGinnis requested enough funds to plan for and add additional gym space at Hereford High School. Mr. McGinnis moved that the transmittal letter be amended to say that funds for additional gym space at Hereford High School be added to the budget, rather than recommending the funds be added.

Mr. Holupka asked if the Board could add to the budget without subtracting, and/or if they could only make a recommendation. Mr. Lafferty stated that the legal role of the Planning Board was to make a recommendation to the County Executive on the budget. He stated that the transmittal letter stated that should addition funds be available, the listed out projects should be included. Mr. Lafferty reiterated that the legal role of the Board was to recommend.

Mr. McGinnis questioned if Mr. Lafferty was saying that the Board could not insert budget items. Mr. Lafferty confirmed they could, but that other items would need to be removed to maintain the numbers of the budget. Mr. Lafferty stated that this would still be a recommendation to the County Executive and was not final. Mr. McGinnis stated that there were items on the budget that could be delayed and that the funds of the budget, themselves, were estimates and not set in stone. Chairwoman Hafford stated Mr. McGinnis would need to choose a specific item to remove funds for if he wanted to add funds for Hereford, rather than the current proposal of recommending if funds become available. Mr. Lafferty reiterated the Board's approval of the transmittal letter was a recommendation.

Mr. Perlow recommended the line be amended to state that the Board recommends \$1 million for funding for planning of additional gym space at Hereford High School, should additional funds become available.

Mr. Johnson questioned what the change was. Mr. Holupka stated the change was to add a dollar amount and clarify that the funding was for the planning.

Mr. Warren moved that the transmittal letter be amended to state that the Board recommended adding \$1 million to Department 213, Schools, for planning an expansion of the indoor facilities at Hereford High School for adding additional gym space, as the current space did not adequately accommodate the needs of the high school's physical education program and the recreation needs of the north county residents. Ms. Hafford seconded the motion, which passed at 6:04 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Hearing no further comments or questions, Chairwoman Hafford moved that the Planning Board approve the FY 2024 Capital Budget and Capital Program FY 2025-2029 and accompanying cover letter, as amended by the Board, for transmittal to the Director of the Office of Budget and Finance. Ms. Pinheiro seconded the motion, which passed at 6:05 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Other Business

3. Recent County Council legislation of interest to the Board

Ms. Bensley gave a report on the recent legislation passed by the County Council of interest to the Board, which included:

- a. Bill 5-23 – Vacant Structures
- b. Bill 6-23 – Zoning Regulations – Minimum Width (Modernizing Townhome Construction Act)
- c. Resolution 2-23 – Development of Greater Middle River Design Guidelines

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Chairwoman Hafford called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Pinheiro moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. McGinnis seconded the motion, which passed at 6:08 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 6:08 PM.