

**Baltimore County Planning Board
Special Meeting**

June 29, 2023 – 4:00 PM

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

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

Present	Absent
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Ms. Nancy Hafford, Chair2. Mr. Peter Arrey3. Ms. Emily Brophy4. Ms. Beverly German5. Mr. S. Chris Haffer (Arrived at 4:10 PM)6. Mr. Mark Heckman7. Mr. Steven Heintz8. Mr. Shafiq Hinton9. Mr. C. Scott Holupka10. Mr. Derick Johnson11. Mr. Wayne McGinnis12. Mr. Howard Perlow13. Ms. Cathryn Pinheiro14. Mr. Todd Warren15. Ms. Cathy Wolfson	

Attending County Staff included: Mr. Steve Lafferty, Ms. Amy Mantay, Ms. Jennifer Meacham, Ms. Jenifer Nugent, Ms. Krystle Patchak, Ms. Courtney Rachuba, and Ms. Taylor Bensley, all of the Department of Planning.

Item for Discussion and Vote

1. Baltimore County Master Plan 2030

Chairwoman Hafford stated that the meeting was a **Special Meeting** to further deliberate and then vote on Master Plan 2030. She continued that the item was first introduced to the Board on May 4th, 2023, and a virtual Public Hearing was conducted on May 18th, 2023. On June 1st, June 8th, and June 15th, the Board had the opportunity to discuss the Plan and proposed changes. She mentioned that before she opened the floor for discussion, she would turn it over to the Department of Planning for additional comments. She then welcomed Mr. Lafferty and Ms. Mantay.

Mr. Lafferty thanked the Board, Department of Planning and other agencies for their hard work in putting together the Master Plan 2030. He especially wanted to commend Ms. Mantay and Ms. Meacham, as they were the front runners on developing the Master Plan. Mr. Lafferty reiterated that the County's goal was focused on redevelopment as it was essential to the County's future growth.

Chairwoman Hafford thanked the Department of Planning, and asked if there were any outstanding comments or questions. There were no other questions or comments from the Board.

With no further questions or comments, Chairwoman Hafford called for a motion on Master Plan 2030. Ms. Brophy moved that, in accordance with Section 32-2-201 of the Baltimore County Code, the Baltimore County Planning Board adopt the Baltimore County Master Plan 2030 Draft presented May 5th, 2023 with amendments as of June 29th, 2023, and refer the Plan to the Baltimore County Council for further consideration and adoption. Ms. Wolfson seconded the motion. Chairwoman Hafford then called for any amendments to the Plan.

Amendment 1:

Ms. Pinheiro moved to remove all hyperlinks to websites outside of the Master Plan 2030 StoryMaps from all Master Plan 2030 StoryMaps and to place them in a Resource page on the Master Plan 2030 Hub. Mr. Warren seconded the amendment, which passed at 4:14 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heidl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Ms. Wolfson voted against the amendment.

Amendment 2:

Mr. Holupka moved to add a statement about the new Resources page on the Master Plan 2030 Hub in the Overview, How the Plan is Used (OV.4) after the section starting: “Main topic headings can be found in the Table of Contents of this StoryMap”. The added statement was as follows:

A Resource Page has been located on the Master Plan 2030 Hub. This page provides additional information on many of the topics in the Plan.

Mr. Arrey seconded the amendment, which passed at 4:15 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heidl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson.

Amendment 3:

Mr. Holupka moved to add the following statements in the Master Plan 2030 Overview, Introduction (OV.2) after the paragraph starting with “Several mandates...”:

Section 32-4-102(a) of the Baltimore County Code indicates that development “shall conform” to the Master Plan and any adopted community plans. The purpose of the Master Plan 2030 is to encourage and even incentivize growth and development within those areas deemed most suitable for retrofitting – Core Retrofit Areas.

However, growth and development may occur anywhere within the URDL and in certain areas outside of the URDL where zoning would permit it.

Incentivizing growth in certain areas does not mean growth outside of those areas is inconsistent with the Master Plan 2030.

Ms. Brophy seconded the amendment, which passed at 4:17 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heidl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr.

Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Ms. Wolfson voted against the amendment.

Amendment 4:

Ms. Pinheiro moved to add the following statements in the Master Plan 2030 Overview, How the Plan is Used (OV.4) after the first paragraph in that section:

Development activity in the Core Retrofit Areas, like all development, will require the requisite infrastructure to support this new approach. While these Core Retrofit Areas must be the primary focus for development and investment over the next decade, development activity is permitted outside these areas and will continue based on the market and other opportunities.

Mr. Warren seconded the amendment, which passed at 4:19 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Ms. Wolfson voted against the amendment.

Amendment 5:

Ms. Pinheiro moved to add the updated version of the Commonly Used Terms that had been amended to include only terms and definitions, and removed links to sources, as source information can be found on a separate resource page. Mr. Warren seconded the amendment, which passed at 4:20 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Ms. Wolfson voted against the amendment.

Amendment 6:

Mr. Holupka moved to revise Livable Built Environment Goal 1, Action 1 (LBE1.1) to read as follows:

Baltimore County's Urban-Rural Demarcation Line (URDL) was established over fifty years ago and has not been systematically reviewed for at least four decades. Prior to beginning work on the next Master Plan, the Planning Board and staff should conduct a comprehensive review of the Urban-Rural Demarcation Line (URDL) to determine whether it has contributed to past racial and economic segregation and it is still meeting the current and future needs of Baltimore County and the Baltimore region.

Mr. Warren seconded the amendment.

Mr. Heckman questioned if the text was being added to the existing goal or if it was replacing it. Mr. Holupka stated it would replace the existing goal. Mr. Heckman suggested it be added. Mr. Holupka asked Mr. Heckman if he would like to make that motion.

Mr. Heckman moved to revise Livable Built Environment Goal 1, Action 1 (LBE1.1) to read as follows:

Goal 1, Action 1: Create a redevelopment framework that reinforces the existing Urban-Rural Demarcation Line (URDL) and focuses on redevelopment strategies through community planning policies. Baltimore County's Urban-Rural Demarcation Line (URDL) was established over fifty years ago and has not been systematically reviewed for at least four decades. Prior to beginning work on the next Master Plan, the Planning Board and staff should conduct a comprehensive

review of the Urban-Rural Demarcation Line (URDL) to determine whether it has contributed to past racial and economic segregation and it is still meeting the current and future needs of Baltimore County and the Baltimore region.

Mr. McGinnis stated that the Board did not know if that information had been considered. Mr. Holupka replied that he was not aware of any comprehensive study done in the past forty years to study the impact.

Mr. Warren seconded Mr. Heckman's amendment. The amendment passed at 4:28 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heint, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. Mr. McGinnis voted against the amendment.

Amendment 7:

Ms. Brophy moved to revise Livable Built Environment Goal 1, Action 2 (LBE1.2) to read as follows:

Evaluate the current Planned Unit Development (PUD) process to assess its success and ensure it is transparent, clearly articulates eligibility requirements, conveys tangible community benefits and ensures a higher quality development.

Mr. Arrey seconded the amendment, which passed at 4:31 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heint, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Ms. Wolfson voted against the amendment.

Amendment 8:

Ms. Pinheiro moved to remove Livable Built Environment, Goal 1, Action 5 (LBE1.5). Mr. Warren seconded the amendment, which passed at 4:32 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heint, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Ms. Wolfson voted against the amendment.

Amendment 9:

Ms. Pinheiro moved to remove Livable Built Environment, Goal 1, Action 8 (LBE1.8). Mr. Warren seconded the amendment, which passed at 4:33 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heint, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Ms. Wolfson voted against the amendment.

Amendment 10:

Mr. Heckman moved to revise Livable Built Environment Goal 1, Action 8 (LBE1.8) to read as follows:

The Planning Department and the Planning Board shall create a task force to study the current Comprehensive Zoning Map Process (CZMP) and recommend improvements to make it more effective and easier for retrofitting communities as proposed in the Growth Framework.

Ms. German seconded the amendment.

Mr. Warren stated he was under the impression the Board was removing any mention of conducting CZMP every ten years. Mr. Heckman confirmed that was true, but that the amendment suggested the Board review the process.

The amendment passed at 4:35 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Ms. Wolfson voted against the amendment.

Amendment 11:

Mr. Heckman moved to add a new action to Livable Built Environment, Goal 2, Action 9 (LBE2.9) to read as follows:

In support of encouraging the new development of attainable housing consistent with retrofitting communities as proposed in the Growth Framework, the Baltimore County Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) shall identify and pool currently available Baltimore County, State and Federal incentives and resources available to residents and developers. In addition, DHCD, in concert with other County departments, shall identify and propose potential new incentives, which may include additional financial assistance, new infrastructure and public improvements as well as administrative support which may include streamlining and expediting County approvals processes.

Mr. Warren seconded the amendment.

Mr. McGinnis stated he objected to this action, as it would incentivize people to move to places for free, increase density, and drive out people who currently live in those areas.

Mr. Haffer confirmed if this was a new action or if it would replace an existing action. Mr. Heckman stated it was a new action.

Ms. German questioned if the Planning Board had the authority to tell another department what to do. Chairwoman Hafford stated that she did not believe they did, as the Board was advisory. Mr. Holupka stated that the amendment was encouraging DHCD to do this, not requiring them to.

Mr. Lafferty noted that the Board could chose to omit calling out an agency and could instead say "Baltimore County shall...". Mr. Arrey and Ms. German stated they liked that change. Mr. Warren and Mr. Heckman stated they wanted the agency left in so there was greater accountability and the action would not get lost in the umbrella of Baltimore County agencies.

Mr. McGinnis questioned if the language was "shall" or "may". Mr. Holupka stated it said "shall". Mr. Heckman said he wanted to leave it as that because he wanted DHCD to complete the action.

Mr. Arrey reiterated he did not believe the amendment needed to mention DHCD.

The motion passed at 4:45 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, and Ms. Wolfson voted against the amendment.

Amendment 12:

Mr. Holupka moved to add a new action Livable Built Environment, Goal 3, Action 10 (LBE3.10) to read as follows:

Work with the MTA, Baltimore City and County communities to establish an east to west transit service, a “Red Line”, that runs from west of Security Square Mall in Woodlawn into Trade Point Atlantic and possibly Essex.

Mr. Warren seconded the amendment.

Ms. Brophy questioned who would work with MTA. Mr. Lafferty stated it would be Planning, the Department of Public Works and Transportation, and the Administration. He advised that the Board could amend the amendment to say “The County Government shall...”.

Mr. Arrey asked if there was already coordination between the County, City, and State, and stated he felt the action was unnecessary. Chairwoman Hafford stated that the Master Plan was currently silent on the Red Line, and that this action would address that. Mr. Arrey stated that whether or not the Red Line is mentioned, there would be coordination between the County, City and State.

Mr. Johnson stated he did not feel comfortable adding this action in without a real chance to look at it. He noted that it was not mentioned at any of the Work Sessions.

Mr. Holupka amended his motion. He moved to add a new action Livable Built Environment, Goal 3, Action 10 (LBE3.10) to read as follows:

The County shall Work with the MTA, Baltimore City and County communities to establish an east to west transit service, a “Red Line”, that runs from west of Security Square Mall in Woodlawn into Trade Point Atlantic and possibly Essex.

Mr. Warren seconded the amendment. Mr. Heckman seconded the amendment as amended, which passed at 4:52 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heinl, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, and Ms. Wolfson voted against the amendment.

Amendment 13:

Mr. Holupka moved to revise Responsible Regionalism, Goal 2, Action 1 (RR2.1) to read as follows:

Collaborate with Baltimore City, state and Baltimore County communities to establish a transit service that runs from west of Security Square Mall east into Trade Point Atlantic and potentially into Essex.

Mr. Haffer stated that the amendment seemed redundant and unnecessary.

Ms. Brophy seconded the amendment, which passed at 4:55 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. Mr Haffer, Mr. Heinl, and Mr. Johnson voted against the amendment.

Amendment 14:

Ms. Brophy moved to revise Resilient Economy Goal 3, Action 2 (RE3.2) to read as follows:

Implement the recommendations from the Report in Response to county Council Resolution 12-20 “Agricultural Buildings for Value Added Agriculture”, September 2020 including new zoning definitions, adaptive reuse, changes in the County’s review process and agricultural building exemptions.

Mr. Lafferty stated that the report was from 2020 on agricultural buildings and value added agriculture. He explained that the items in the motion were categories reviewed in the report, which was never fully adopted by the County Council. He notes that there were three different zoning definitions depending on use in the report.

Mr. Holupka confirmed that the motion would replace the existing Resilient Economy Goal 3, Action 2 (RE3.2). Mr. Lafferty confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Warren stated he wanted to implement the plan Wally Lippencott, a former Department of Planning Northern Sector Planner, did.

Ms. Wolfson stated that the motion would implement unevaluated regulations rather than studying them first. Mr. Warren stated that the regulations were already studied, they were simply not acted on. He stated that the focus would be on using land outside the URDL to generate economic value.

Mr. Holupka questioned if Council accepted the report. Mr. Warren stated he did not know if the plan ever went before Council for adoption.

Mr. Heckman seconded the amendment, which passed at 5:00 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heintz, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Ms. German and Ms. Wolfson voted against the amendment.

Amendment 15:

Mr. Holupka moved to revise the first statement in the Growth Framework, A New Approach to Growth (GF3) “Where Should Retrofitting Occur?” to read as follows:

The Department of Planning has identified the most "retrofit-worthy" locations throughout Baltimore County using a data-driven process based on a number of geographic, social and economic determinants.

And to add the following statements:

Additional analysis was completed by the Planning Dept to remove sites that were too small to fit the redevelopment philosophy or not appropriate for redevelopment. Examples of sites not appropriate for redevelopment include sites owned by state or community colleges, Baltimore County park or school sites, or BGE utility sites.

Mr. Warren seconded the amendment, which passed at 5:03 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heintz, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Amendment 16:

Ms. Pinheiro moved to add the following statements to Growth Framework Place Types (GF5) after the statement “The Master Plan 2030 Place Types Map provides general recommendations for land use based upon the Vision Framework goals and actions, as well as the retrofit analysis described above.”:

In particular, the map identifies areas deemed most suitable for retrofitting. Growth and development within these areas should be encouraged and even incentivized. However, development may occur anywhere within the URDL and in certain areas outside of the URDL where zoning would permit it.

Incentivizing growth in certain areas does not mean growth outside of those areas is inconsistent with the Master Plan 2030. The map is conceptual and intended to reflect future land use patterns that would support the land use objectives of Master Plan 2030. The map does not identify land use of individual properties or parcels. The Place Types map will provide general direction for County land use decisions, and may be amended as needed through Community Plans or Small Area Plans.

Mr. Heckman seconded the amendment.

Mr. Lafferty stated that, the last paragraph read “Incentivizing growth in certain areas does not mean growth outside of those areas...”; he asked for clarification if Ms. Pinheiro meant growth or development outside those areas. Ms. Pinheiro confirmed she meant development in general. Mr. Lafferty asked if she was okay with rewording it. She confirmed she was.

Ms. Pinheiro moved to add the following statements to Growth Framework Place Types (GF5) after the statement “The Master Plan 2030 Place Types Map provides general recommendations for land use based upon the Vision Framework goals and actions, as well as the retrofit analysis described above.”:

In particular, the map identifies areas deemed most suitable for retrofitting. Growth and development within these areas should be encouraged and even incentivized. However, development may occur anywhere within the URDL and in certain areas outside of the URDL where zoning would permit it.

Incentivizing growth in certain areas does not mean development outside of those areas is inconsistent with the Master Plan 2030. The map is conceptual and intended to reflect future land use patterns that would support the land use objectives of Master Plan 2030. The map does not identify land use of individual properties or parcels. The Place Types map will provide general direction for County land use decisions, and may be amended as needed through Community Plans or Small Area Plans.

Mr. Heckman seconded the amendment as amended, which passed at 5:06 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heinl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Ms. Wolfson voted against the amendment.

Amendment 17A:

Ms. Pinheiro moved to revise the Growth Framework Place Types (GF5) descriptions for Established Neighborhood to read as follows:

Areas within the URDL not within Connected Neighborhood and Nodes consist of a mix of established commercial, industrial, and residential areas. Although much of this area is already developed, there is still opportunity for new and infill development and redevelopment. The neighborhoods are served with public water and sewer service.

Primary Land Use: Commercial, Industrial, and Low or Medium Density Residential

Secondary Land Use: Civic/Institutional; Open Space; Limited Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

Mr. Heidl seconded the amendment.

Mr. Lafferty stated that motions 17A and B, 18, and 19 were alternatives to one another and one needed to be decided on. Ms. Mantay noted that 17A and 17B were originally provided by Ms. Pinheiro, with 18 and 19 introduced by Mr. Heckman. She mentioned that there was a slight difference in the definition of Nodes and Connected Neighborhoods. Mr. Heckman agreed with Ms. Pinheiro's suggestion but tried to provide a more detailed and specific definition for Connected Neighborhoods vs. Established Neighborhoods. He clarified that Established Neighborhoods were meant to be primarily residential, and should not encourage industrial or commercial. He mentioned that the Department of Planning had received comments concerning the loss of character in the neighborhoods and that any significant changes should be avoided. Ms. Pinheiro stated areas like York Road already had an extreme amount of commercial and industrial. She noted that one would have to travel ½ a mile or more to arrive at any residential and the current map already showed that. Mr. Heckman agreed some corridors were included; however, they were the nodes.

Mr. Haffer stated that the only difference between the motions were Mr. Heckman's additional statement referring to not substantially changing the area within the next decade. Ms. Pinheiro noted she did not want to commit anything to ten years.

Mr. Warren explained the Plan was built around a 15-minute city and it may change dramatically.

Mr. Heckman stated he could remove the words "next decade" and replace them with "in immediate future".

Ms. Wolfson noted that Ms. Pinheiro's quoted industrial and Mr. Heckman's did not. Ms. Pinheiro mentioned that was the reason she wanted the definition for industrial included in the Commonly Used Terms sheet. She wanted to clarify that industrial did not mean the size of Trade Point Atlantic. Ms. Wolfson noted that Trade Point Atlantic was indeed industrial. Ms. Pinheiro exclaimed she did not want to limit anything without evaluation of the site.

Mr. Johnson suggested that Mr. Heckman remove the "higher density" in his motion. Mr. Heckman responded that he did not want to suggest that it needed to be higher density, it could be low or middle and was concerned Ms. Pinheiro's motion sounded like the Board was encouraging higher density.

Mr. Heidl seconded the amendment as amended. Chairwoman Hafford called for a roll call. Affirmative votes were cast by Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heidl, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Dissenting votes were cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, and Ms. Wolfson. The amendment failed to pass at 5:22 PM.

Amendment 17B:

Ms. Pinheiro moved to revise the Growth Framework Place Types (GF5) descriptions for Connected Neighborhood to read as follows:

Areas connecting Established Neighborhoods and Nodes, that consist of a mix of commercial, industrial, and residential areas, where higher density new or infill development or redevelopment could occur, including a variety of housing types such as detached single-family, townhomes and apartments. These places contain the population needed to support the Node which they surround.

Primary Land Use: Commercial, Industrial, and Medium and High-Density Residential

Mr. Heintl seconded the amendment.

Ms. Brophy wanted to clarify that 17A was consistent with 18 and both were equivalent to amendment 19. Chairwoman Hafford stated, yes.

Chairwoman Hafford called for a roll call. Affirmative votes were cast by Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Dissenting votes were cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, and Ms. Wolfson. The amendment failed to pass at 5:23 PM.

Amendment 18:

Mr. Heckman moved to revise Place Type – Established Neighborhoods to read as follows:

Areas within the URDL, not within Connected Neighborhoods and Nodes consist of a mix of established commercial and residential uses. Although much of this area is already developed, there is some limited opportunity for new and infill development and redevelopment. However, the nature and character of these neighborhoods should not substantially change in the near future. The neighborhoods are currently served with public water and sewer service.

Ms. Wolfson seconded the amendment.

Ms. Pinheiro questioned if the amendment could say “residential areas” instead of neighborhoods. Mr. Heckman stated he was accepting of that change.

Mr. Arrey suggested the sentence starting with “however” be removed because there is no knowledge if they would change. Mr. Heckman stated that was the intention of the motion, that the residential neighborhoods should not substantially change, as the goal was to preserve the character.

Mr. Lafferty stated Ms. Pinheiro’s motion only focused on residential. Ms. Pinheiro agreed that it was more important to focus on the preservation of residential, but there was also a need for commercial redevelopment.

Ms. Wolfson asked if the Board was excluding the transition to residential from vacant commercial in the established neighborhoods. Mr. Heckman responded no. Mr. Lafferty stated those uses would be allowed.

Mr. Heckman amended his motion. He moved to revise Place Type – Established Neighborhoods to read as follows:

Areas within the URDL, not within Connected Neighborhoods and Nodes consist of a mix of established commercial and residential uses. Although much of this area is already developed,

there is some limited opportunity for new and infill development and redevelopment. However, the nature and character of these residential neighborhoods should not substantially change in the near future. The neighborhoods are currently served with public water and sewer service.

Ms. Brophy seconded the amendment as amended, which passed at 5:33 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heidl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Amendment 19:

Mr. Heckman moved to revise the Place Type – Connected Neighborhoods to read as follows:

Areas connecting Established Neighborhoods and Nodes, that consist of a mix of commercial and residential areas, where infill redevelopment could occur including a variety of housing types such as detached single-family, townhomes and apartments. These places contain the population needed to support the Node which they surround.

Ms. Wolfson seconded the amendment, which passed at 5:35 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heidl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Amendment 20:

Ms. Pinheiro moved to revise Growth Framework Place Types (GF5) graphics for the Place Types and the PDF overview table for the Place Types to be consistent with revised definitions. Mr. Heidl seconded the amendment, which passed at 5:36 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heidl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Amendment 21:

Ms. Pinheiro moved to revise the map image in the Growth Framework Place Types (GF5) to include the entire 415 acres of the LaFarge Quarry in the Special Use place type designation.

Mr. Warren seconded the amendment.

Mr. Lafferty questioned the intention of the amendment. He continued that when the Department of Planning mapped the area for the Plan, the entire site had not been determined for industrial usage. Ms. Pinheiro stated she thought it was important to provide the entire site.

Mr. Arrey mentioned that LaFarge should not only be one use. He continued that, to his knowledge, it had been mapped that way because the PUD only showed warehouses on part of the property. He questioned why it should be deemed as Special Use and was concerned what that would do to the property and area as a whole.

Ms. Pinheiro stated she wanted to add LaFarge fully but did not remember asking for it to be Special Use. Mr. Lafferty explained he felt that only part of the property was important to be Special Use, which consisted of industrial, office, commercial, and warehouse. He noted the Department of Planning felt that

the original mapping was accurate in having part designated as Established Neighborhood versus Ms. Pinheiro requesting entire site as Special Use. Ms. Pinheiro stated it did not have to be Special Use, she just wanted the map to show the entire 415 acres.

Ms. Pinheiro amended her motion. She moved to have the map show entire 415-acre site, with no change in the designation. Mr. Warren seconded the motion, which passed at 5:44 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heint, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Mr. Heckman and Ms. Wolfson voted against the motion.

Amendment 22A:

Mr. Holupka moved to add statements to the Growth Framework Place Types (GF5), Special Use to read as follows:

In the southwestern part of the county, University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC) has a substantial presence. This highly rated public university is recognized for IT research, innovation and commitment to diversity and equity. Located on 5340 acres west of the Beltway and next to both Catonsville and Arbutus, UMBC has expanded its community outreach and has established a facility, with the popular Ocha Mocha café, in Arbutus. UMBC is also home to bwtech@UMBC Research and Technology Park.

The University also recently took ownership of the 200-acre Spring Grove property situated north of the current campus. No specific plans have been presented for this site that also contains state operated psychiatric services and County owned homeless persons' shelter and recreational facilities.

Mr. Warren mentioned that he wanted it to say that it encouraged development.

Mr. Arrey questioned the purpose of the motion. Mr. Holupka stated that the idea was to include UMBC like they did with Tradepoint Atlantic. Mr. Lafferty noted that the motion came as a recommendation from the Public Hearing. He continued that the area was unique and created exciting opportunities. Mr. Arrey asked if UMBC was used as an example. Mr. Lafferty responded, yes. Mr. Warren noted that the area also picked up a 200-acre parcel that would give the ability to expand. He requested a change to add at the end that the Board encouraged development at the previous mental hospital.

Mr. Haffer asked what the check and balance was to UMBC being given Special Use. Mr. Lafferty stated that since it was a state institution, it was not bound by zoning and could be designated for many uses, including shopping centers, apartments, research facilities, etc. He mentioned that they had been a good partner. Mr. Haffer stated there was no difference between the current state and if it was given Special Use. Mr. Lafferty replied, correct. He continued that it had just highlighted the fact that this was a unique situation in that part of the County.

Mr. Warren withdrew his concern and reiterated he just wanted to make sure it was encouraging development of previous mental hospital.

Mr. Heint seconded the amendment, which passed at 5:54 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heint, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Amendment 22B:

Mr. Hinton exited the meeting at 5:54 PM.

Mr. Holupka moved to add “Technology Uses” to the Growth Framework Place Types (GF5) Special Use graphic and overview table. Mr. Arrey seconded the amendment, which passed at 5:55 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heint, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes. Mr. Hinton was absent for the vote.

Amendment 22C:

Mr. Holupka moved revise the Growth Framework Place Types (GF5) Special Uses definition to read as follows:

Includes certain industrial, manufacturing and research, technology and innovation areas but may include limited other uses, including retail. By their function, they require their operation to be separate (except those with similar characteristics). Currently, this designation applies to the Tradepoint Atlantic (TPA) site, to the property commonly referred to as “Lafarge Quarry” (LaFarge) and to University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC).

Mr. Arrey questioned if TPA needed to be removed from the motion, as it was removed from an earlier motion. Mr. Holupka and Ms. Pinheiro agreed no site represented the motion more than TPA and stated it should be left in.

Mr. Heckman seconded the amendment, which passed at 5:58 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heint, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes. Mr. Hinton was absent for the vote.

Amendment 23:

Ms. Pinheiro moved to add the following statement to the Growth Framework Land Uses Processes (GF6):

Where land use terms are defined or explained in the County Code or BCZR, those are the definitions that are followed in this document.

Ms. Wolfson seconded the amendment, which passed at 5:59 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heint, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes. Mr. Hinton was absent for the vote.

Amendment 24A:

Ms. Pinheiro moved to revise sections of the Growth Framework Land Use Processes (GF6) regarding CZMP to read as follows:

This should place over the course of ten years, in alignment with the decennial Census and Master Plan process. Ideally, changes to zoning should occur through the Comprehensive Zoning

Map Process (CZMP) after the adoption of a Master Plan, and following the recommendations included therein.

The Comprehensive Zoning Map Process (CZMP) occurs every four years and enables members of the public to submit requests for zoning changes to any piece of land in Baltimore County regardless of ownership of the land. With the frequency of the CZMP, the Council should have the ability to make updates to the Master Plan as needed to keep pace with changing needs and trends.

Mr. Perlow stated he was under the impression the Board had already removed the 10-year requirement. Ms. Pinheiro responded, yes. She continued that is what it should have been, removing the 10-year. Ms. Brophy confirmed it was to remove the first paragraph. Ms. Pinheiro stated that the motion should only be the second half:

The Comprehensive Zoning Map Process (CZMP) occurs every four years and enables members of the public to submit requests for zoning changes to any piece of land in Baltimore County regardless of ownership of the land. With the frequency of the CZMP, the Council should have the ability to make updates to the Master Plan as needed to keep pace with changing needs and trends.

Mr. Warren seconded the amendment, which passed at 6:03 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, and Mr. Perlow. Ms. German voted against the amendment. Mr. Hinton was absent for the vote.

Amendment 24B:

Ms. Pinheiro moved to remove all remaining content in the Growth Framework Land Use Processes (GF6) section regarding CZMP beginning with “Rezoning every four years...” through and including “...into under resourced planning activities.” Mr. Warren seconded the amendment, which passed at 6:06 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Ms. Wolfson voted against the amendment. Mr. Hinton was absent for the vote.

Amendment 25A:

Mr. Heckman moved to add the following statements to Growth Framework Land Use Processes (GF6) regarding CZMP:

Study Comprehensive Zoning Map Process (CZMP)

The CZMP and Cycle Zoning process should be evaluated and updated. The Planning Department and the Planning Board should undertake a comprehensive study to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the current CZMP and Cycle Zoning process and, if appropriate, develop and evaluate options to the current CZMP and Cycle Zoning process including the timing of and frequency of the processes.

Mr. Arrey seconded the amendment, which passed at 6:08 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes. Mr. Hinton was absent for the vote.

Amendment 25B:

Ms. Brophy moved to revise Vision Framework, Livable Built Environment Goal 1, Action 8 to read as follows:

The Planning Department and the Planning Board shall create a task force to study the current Comprehensive Zoning Map Process (CZMP) and Cycle Zoning Process and make recommendations where the process may have opportunities for improvement to make it more effective and easier for retrofitting communities as suggested in the Growth Framework.

Mr. Warren seconded the amendment, which passed at 6:10 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes. Mr. Hinton was absent for the vote.

Amendment 26A:

Ms. Pinheiro moved to revise Growth Framework Development Processes (GF7) to remove language recommending changes to the Planned Unit Development Process and to read as follows:

Many of the development manuals used today were created decades ago and need to be updated in order to reflect modern-day development practices. The definition and application process for a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) needs to be more clearly specified. The Planned Unit Development (PUD) process needs to be evaluated for its successes, transparency, clear articulation of eligibility requirements, community benefits and ensuring a higher quality development is achieved at project end.

Planned Unit Development Process

A Planned Unit Development (PUD) is development that may propose residential, recreational, industrial and/or commercial elements. The approval process for a PUD is similar to that of other land development projects, except that the County Council must determine that the PUD will achieve substantially higher-quality development than a conventional development and provide a public benefit that would otherwise not be obtained. This determination is made after having received input from County agencies and from the community following a community meeting and a public hearing.

Mr. Heckman mentioned that the amendment states the Board will review, but thought stating there should be a PUD task force, would be a clearer statement. Ms. Mantay responded that was amendment 26C.

Mr. Arrey seconded the amendment, which passed at 6:13 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Ms. Wolfson voted against the amendment. Mr. Hinton was absent for the vote.

Amendment 26B:

Ms. Pinheiro moved to add the statement to the Growth Framework Development Processes (GF7) after the sentence “PUDs are only permitted within the Urban Rural Demarcation Line URDL”:

With the ability for the Council to approve uses and densities not otherwise permitted by the underlying zoning, the PUD Process has proven to be a valuable tool to allow for development and redevelopment in this mature jurisdiction.

Mr. Lafferty cautioned the Board against using terms like "valuable", as there were questions on the effectiveness and success of the PUD process. He questioned if the word valuable was needed in the motion. Mr. Warren agreed that the word "valuable" needed to be included. Ms. Wolfson, Mr. Arrey, and Ms. German all stated they agreed that "valuable" was not needed. Mr. Arrey questioned if "valuable" could be removed. Chairwoman Hafford stated that there was a motion on the floor, and it needed a second and a vote.

Mr. Warren seconded the amendment, which passed at 6:16 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Brophy, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Dissenting votes were cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, and Ms. Wolfson. Mr. Hinton was absent for the vote.

Amendment 26C:

Ms. Pinheiro moved to revise the section of the Growth Framework Development Processes (GF7) to read as follows:

The PUD process should be reviewed comprehensively by the Planning Board, along with the impacts of the omission of the Planning Board in the approval process. The Planning Board should study the existing process and make recommendations to make it easier for retrofitting communities, as suggested in the Growth Framework.

Mr. Warren seconded the amendment, which passed at 6:18 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. Ms. Wolfson voted against the amendment.

Chairwoman Hafford called for any additional amendments. The Board had none.

With no further amendments from the Board, Chairwoman Hafford conducted a roll call on the original motion to approve Master Plan 2030 Draft presented May 5th, 2023 with amendments as of June 29th, 2023. The motion passed at -- PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. Mr. Hinton was absent for the vote. There were no dissenting votes.

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Chairwoman Hafford thanked the Planning Board and the Department of Planning for their time and dedication to Master Plan 2030. She reminded the Board that the next Board meeting would be in person on Thursday, July 20th.

Chairwoman Hafford called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Johnson moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Brophy seconded the motion, which passed at 6:23 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. Mr. Hinton was absent for the vote. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 6:23 PM.