

MINUTES

Baltimore County Planning Board Meeting

September 7, 2023

Contents

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

Review of Today’s Agenda

Minutes of the July 20, 2023 Meeting

Item for Introduction

- 1. Greater Middle River Design Guidelines

Item for Discussion and Vote

- 2. Cycle 41 Water Supply and Sewerage Master Plan Amendments

Other Business

- 3. Recent County Council legislation of interest to the Board:
 - a. Bill 47-23 – Zoning Regulations – Uses Permitted in the R.C. 6 Zone – Group Child-Care Centers
 - b. Resolution 20-23 – Modify Designated Community of Arbutus as a Sustainable Community

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. Department of Permits, Approvals, and Inspections (PAI) Policy Manual Updates: *Development Management and Plan Review Policy Manual* and *Zoning Policy Manual***

**Comments by citizens

Adjournment of Public Hearing

**Reconvene Public Meeting of the
Baltimore County Planning Board**

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

Item for Discussion and Vote

1. Department of Permits, Approvals, and Inspections (PAI) Policy Manual Updates: *Development Management and Plan Review Policy Manual* and *Zoning Policy Manual*

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Appendices

- Appendix A** Greater Middle River Design Guidelines and Staff Presentation
Appendix B Cycle 41 Water Supply and Sewerage Master Plan Amendments Staff Report
Appendix C Department of Permits, Approvals, and Inspections (PAI) *Development Management and Plan Review Policy Manual* and *Zoning Policy Manual* and Staff Presentation

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

**Baltimore County Planning Board Meeting Minutes
September 7, 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
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ms. Nancy Hafford, Chair 2. Mr. Peter Arrey 3. Ms. Emily Brophy 4. Ms. Beverly German 5. Mr. S. Chris Haffer 6. Mr. Steven Heint (Arrived at 4:02 PM) 7. Mr. Shafiq Hinton 8. Mr. C. Scott Holupka 9. Mr. Derick Johnson (Arrived at 4:27 PM) 10. Mr. Wayne McGinnis 11. Mr. Howard Perlow 12. Ms. Cathryn Pinheiro 13. Mr. Todd Warren 14. Ms. Cathy Wolfson (Arrived at 4:04 PM) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Mark Heckman

Attending County staff included: Mr. Steve Lafferty, Ms. Ngone Seye Diop, Mr. David Birkenthal, Ms. Alexandra Laham, Ms. Ainsley Jacobs, Ms. Krystle Patchak, Ms. Courtney Rachuba, and Ms. Taylor Bensley, all of the Department of Planning; and Ms. Jeanette Applauso of the Department of Public Works and Transportation.

Review of Today's Agenda

Ms. Bensley reported there were no changes to the Tentative Agenda published August 31, 2023.

Minutes of the July 20, 2023 Meeting

Chairwoman Hafford asked the Planning Board members if they had any changes to the July 20, 2023 Minutes. Hearing none, Chairwoman Hafford called for a motion to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Perlow 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. Haffer, Mr. Heintz, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Mr. Warren. There were no dissenting votes.

Items for Introduction

1. Greater Middle River Design Guidelines

Chairwoman Hafford informed the Board that the first item on the agenda was a presentation by Mr. David Birkenthal of the Department of Planning on the introduction of the Greater Middle River Design Guidelines. She continued that after the presentation, she would call for a motion to set a public hearing on the matter. Chairwoman Hafford then welcomed Mr. Birkenthal.

Mr. Birkenthal introduced himself as the Lead Eastern Sector Planner within the Community Planning Division of the Department of Planning. He explained that the Greater Middle River (GMR) Design Guidelines were authorized by County Council Resolution 2-23, which was passed February 21st, 2023 to allow the Essex/Middle River Civic Council (EMRCC) to draft design guidelines for the area. He showed a map of the guidelines area and noted that the guidelines would be incorporated into the Comprehensive Manual of Development Policies (CMDP) once adopted by Council. Mr. Birkenthal then provided insight on the timeline, explaining that efforts began in 2020 when EMRCC met with community stakeholders and engaged Design Collective to prepare the draft guidelines. He continued and explained that the goals of the GMR Design Guidelines were to encourage consistent, high-quality design that reflected the unique characteristics and precedents of the Greater Middle River area. Mr. Birkenthal then explained that the main components of the GMR Design Guidelines included site design, street design, architectural design, landscape design, and signage design. He concluded his presentation by thanking the Board for their time on the matter and advising he was available for any questions.

Chairwoman Hafford thanked Mr. Birkenthal for his presentation and opened the floor for questions or comments from the Board.

Mr. Haffer had various questions for Mr. Birkenthal, including: if the proposed standards had been reviewed by appropriate fair housing advocate stakeholders; if the proposed standards has been reviewed by home builder stakeholders/developers; the estimated additional cost added to an average new housing unit that complies with the standards; and confirming if the standards impacted all homeowners within the affected area. He then provided real world examples to show the possible impact to existing homeowners with the new standards. Mr. Haffer then asked the following information on community outreach be provided to the Board: a list of all community groups contacted, a list of attendees, their position within

the community association, and the date and duration of the briefing; a copy of the minutes from each of these briefings; a copy of the briefing materials used for each. He stated that the guidelines appeared to be de-facto Homeowners Association (HOA) standards and that he found it hard to believe the communities would support the guidelines if they truly understood what they said. Mr. Birkenthal and Mr. Lafferty explained that many of the questions posed would need to be answered by the Essex/Middle River Civic Council, but that the questions and requests would be forwarded along.

Mr. Perlow stated he was aware of a project in Reisterstown that was well designed but that units could not be made affordable given the design guidelines in place making the homes too expensive. He agreed with Mr. Haffer that the guidelines appeared to be HOA standards. Mr. Perlow stated he was concerned the guidelines would make it tedious for a homeowner to renovate a house, stating he did not want residents to have to wait months for a permit or bureaucratic needs.

Mr. Warren thanked Mr. Haffer for his comments and asked that information returned to the Board focus on the impact to the cost of housing. He stated he was specifically interested in the nominal increase to the cost of a home or a townhome to comply with the guidelines.

Mr. Holupka questioned if the County had ever implemented a set of guidelines with as many restrictions over such a broad area. Mr. Birkenthal stated that the County did not have guidelines covering areas quite as large, and that guidelines were typically for more targeted areas, such as the Hunt Valley Town Center.

Mr. Lafferty noted that the presented guidelines were not drafted or overseen by the County and/or the Department of Planning. He explained that they were brought in by the community and that Planning had reviewed them, offered their best judgement, and were now presenting them to the Board. He reiterated that the dialogue taking place was helpful, but that it would ultimately be on the community advocates to answer the questions in two weeks.

Mr. Perlow questioned if Planning's goal was to have design guidelines all over Baltimore County. Mr. Lafferty reiterated that the County did not draft the guidelines and stated that it was not Planning's intent to have similar guidelines unless they were brought in by community organizations. Chairwoman Hafford stated that she heard about commercial design guidelines relatively regularly.

Ms. Brophy questioned who would be in charge of holding the community accountable on the guidelines. Mr. Birkenthal explained that Planning regularly referred to the CMDP on major developments and would refer to the guidelines then.

Ms. Wolfson asked if the guidelines were enforceable through Code Enforcement, and if the Permits Department would confirm compliance. Mr. Birkenthal stated that Planning would review for compliance when a permit came through the office.

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, September 21, 2023 at 5:00 PM regarding the Greater Middle River Design Guidelines. Ms. Brophy seconded the motion, which passed at 4:23 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heintz, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Chairwoman Hafford reminded the Board that the Public Hearing would be held in-person on September 21, 2023, and noted that the Board was tentatively scheduled to vote on the matter immediately following the Public Hearing.

Item for Discussion and Vote

2. Cycle 41 Water Supply and Sewerage Master Plan Amendments

Chairwoman Hafford noted that the next item on the agenda was the opportunity to further discuss and then vote on the Cycle 41 Water Supply and Sewerage Master Plan Amendments. She continued that the item was first introduced to the Board on June 15th, and a Public Hearing was conducted on July 20th. She stated that staff from the Department of Public Works and Transportation were present to answer questions from the Board during the discussion and before the vote. Chairwoman Hafford asked Ms. Applauso of the Department of Public Works and Transportation if she had any further comments.

Ms. Applauso stated she had no additional comments, but that she was available for questions.

Chairwoman Hafford asked the Board if there were any further questions or comments for Ms. Applauso.

With no further questions or comments for Ms. Applauso, Chairwoman Hafford opened the floor up for discussion among the Board.

Mr. Warren stated that he would like to know what the Board was voting on. Chairwoman Hafford explained that the three recommendations were in the Action Summary.

Ms. Pinheiro asked what the Board approved for the site during the Cycle 40 Amendment. Mr. Lafferty read the previous approval, which was W-1, S-1 for Parcel 155, Parcel 154 (between Parcel 155 and Parcel 141), and Parcel 141; W-3, S-3 for Parcel 154 (above Parcel 155), Parcel 140 Part 1 and Parcel 140 Part 2 with the URDL adjustment deferred at the time. Ms. Pinheiro stated that was the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPWT) recommendation for Cycle 41, with the exception of the URDL adjustment, as that was not part of the Cycle 41 request.

Mr. Perlow stated he agreed with the DPWT recommendation.

Mr. Holupka moved that the Baltimore County Planning Board adopt Staff recommendation and reports for the Water Supply and Sewerage Plan Amendment Cycle 41 Reference Number 23-01 and recommend the following: W-1/S-1 for Parcel 155, Parcel 154 (between Parcel 155 and Parcel 141), and Parcel 141; W-3/S-3 for Parcel 154 (above Parcel 155), Parcel 140 Part 1 and Parcel 140 Part 2. Mr. Haffer seconded the motion.

Ms. Pinheiro asked if it would make more sense to combine Environmental Protection and Sustainability and DPWT recommendations so the site would comply with all Critical Area Requirements. Mr. Perlow stated he accepted that amendment.

Mr. Holupka moved that the Baltimore County Planning Board adopt Staff recommendation and reports for the Water Supply and Sewerage Plan Amendment Cycle 41 Reference Number 23-01 and recommend the following: W-1/S-1 for Parcel 155, Parcel 154 (between Parcel 155 and Parcel 141), and Parcel 141; W-3/S-3 for Parcel 154 (above Parcel 155), Parcel 140 Part 1 and Parcel 140 Part 2; approval of the requested change with the understanding that any redevelopment of the properties will be required to comply with all Critical Area Requirements.

Mr. Lafferty noted that the motion went beyond DPWT’s original recommendation.

Mr. Warren seconded the motion.

Chairwoman Hafford asked the Board for any last discussion on the motion.

Ms. German stated she was unclear on the status of any negotiations between the County and the developers in terms of purchasing the site for a park. She stated that approving the water and sewer requests would give the developers a leg up on what the property was worth. She stated she did not see the rush for approving the request if negotiations were ongoing. Mr. Warren stated that denying the request to keep the property affordable was not legal.

With no further discussion, a roll call vote was conducted and the motion passed at 4:34 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heinl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. Ms. German and Mr. Heinl voted against the motion.

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 47-23 – Zoning Regulations – Uses Permitted in the R.C. Zone – Group Child-Care Centers
- b. Resolution 20-33 – Modify Designated Community of Arbutus as a Sustainable Community

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Chairwoman Hafford called for a motion to adjourn the meeting and noted that the Board would reconvene for a Public Hearing on the Department of Permits, Approvals, and Inspections (PAI) Policy Manual Updates at 5:00 PM. Ms. Pinheiro moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Brophy seconded the motion, which passed at 4:35 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heinl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 PM.

**Baltimore County Planning Board Public Hearing Minutes
September 7, 2023**

Call to Order, Introduction of Board Members

Chairwoman Hafford called the Public Hearing to order at 5:00 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
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ms. Nancy Hafford, Chair 2. Mr. Peter Arrey 3. Ms. Emily Brophy 4. Ms. Beverly German 5. Mr. S. Chris Haffer 6. Mr. Steve Heintl 7. Mr. Shafiq Hinton 8. Mr. C. Scott Holupka 9. Mr. Derick Johnson 10. Mr. Wayne McGinnis 11. Mr. Howard Perlow 12. Ms. Cathryn Pinheiro 13. Mr. Todd Warren 14. Ms. Cathy Wolfson 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Mark Heckman

Attending County staff included: Mr. Steve Lafferty, Ms. Krystle Patchak, Ms. Jenifer Nugent, Ms. Courtney Rachuba and Ms. Taylor Bensley, all of the Department of Planning; and Mr. Pete Gutwald, Ms. Sally Nash, and Mr. Mitch Kellman, all of the Department of Permits, Approvals, and Inspection.

Item for Public Hearing

1. Department of Permits, Approvals, and Inspections (PAI) Policy Manual Updates: *Development Management and Plan Review Policy Manual* and *Zoning Policy Manual***

Chairwoman Hafford welcomed everyone and explained that, on July 20, 2023, Ms. Sally Nash, Deputy Director of the Department of Permits, Approvals, and Inspections introduced the PAI Policy Manual Updates to the Board. She continued that the updates are to the *Development Management and Plan Review Policy Manual* and the *Zoning Policy Manual*. She explained that Ms. Nash, and Mr. Gutwald were in attendance to further present the updated manuals to the Board. She continued that following their presentations, Board members would have the opportunity to ask questions, and then members of the public would have the chance to speak. She noted that immediately following the Public Hearing, the Board would reconvene for a discussion and vote on the matter. She then welcomed Mr. Gutwald and Ms. Nash.

Mr. Gutwald introduced himself as the Director of the Department of Permits, Approvals, and Inspections (PAI). He stated that the current PAI Policy Manuals were adopted between 1992 and 2002 and were in need of update. He explained that the goals of the update were to establish clarity, direction, and expectations for the review process; to bring policies into alignment with current practices; to eliminate reference to processes that no longer existed; to recognize existing codified processes and remove duplicative language; to provide a technical and practical approach to the reader; to research and incorporate best practices; and to complete a comparative analysis with other regulations and manuals, both inside and outside the agency. Mr. Gutwald then provided the timeline of the manual updates – work began in July 2022 with research and analysis, followed by drafting of the documents from September to October of 2022, internal County review from November to December of 2022, and review by an external policy committee from January to May of 2023. He continued that the Planning Board review would take place from July to September of 2023 and then the manuals would move on to County Council for adoption hopefully by the end of the year. Mr. Gutwald then welcomed Ms. Nash, PAI Deputy Director.

Ms. Nash began her presentation by explaining changes sent to and made by the workgroup. The biggest change made to the Development Management and Plan Review Policy Manual were that there were previously two manuals – the Development Management Policy Manual and the Plans Review Policy Manual – that were combined into one. Other major changes included: adding a “Priority Status Review Request” designation; adding descriptions of each of the three PAI review processes; adding language on the Development Review Committee (DRC) and limited exemptions; Minor subdivisions going to DRC and recommending recordation; removing all checklists; stating that all projects, including non-residential, needs to meet current Code; adding traffic impact study standards; and reworking Development Plans Review sections following consultations with Environmental Protection and Sustainability and the Department of Public Works and Transportation. Ms. Nash noted that in instances where the Policy Manual conflicted with the County Code, the County Code overruled the Manuals. She continued that the biggest changes to the Zoning Policy Manual included: adding accessory (in-law) apartments, commercial agriculture buildings, and subordinate in area, extent, or purpose for residential structures or uses to the Accessory Buildings, Structures, and Uses Section; adding electric vehicle charging stations, planned shopping centers, industrial parks, and drive-in clusters to the Manufacturing and Business Section; and adding spirit and intent request letters to the Practices and Procedures Section. Ms. Nash concluded her presentation by thanking the Board for their time and advising she was available for any questions.

Mr. Warren exited the meeting at 5:10 PM.

Chairwoman Hafford thanked Mr. Gutwald and Ms. Nash and opened the floor for comments and questions from the Board.

Mr. Perlow stated he did not understand why the County did not require minor subdivisions to be recorded. Mr. Gutwald and Ms. Nash agreed. Mr. Gutwald explained that the only way for a minor subdivision to be vested was if it was recorded or ground was broken. He stated that requiring minor subdivisions to be recorded would require a Council change, but that it was on PAI’s to do list.

Ms. Nash noted that there was language in the Zoning Policy Manual on electronic vehicle charging stations. She explained that the manual separated out Class I, II, and II chargers, and noted that PAI would be back before the Board in two weeks to present a more detailed report on electric vehicle charging stations.

Mr. Haffer thanked Mr. Gutwald and Ms. Nash for their efforts. He explained that the Board had just been introduced to the Greater Middle River Design Guidelines and questioned if, during their yearlong review, PAI dealt with third-part design standards. Mr. Gutwald explained that the CMDP, which the guidelines would be incorporated into, was different than the PAI Policy Manuals – the CMDP guided design and site layouts, whereas the Policy Manuals explained PAI’s policies.

With no further questions and comments, Chairwoman Hafford began calling on members of the Public who signed up to speak on the matter.

Mr. Steve Smith introduced himself as a developer in the County for over forty years and stated he was speaking on behalf of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA). He explained that he sat on the external committee that reviewed the manuals and that he found it fascinating. He continued that PAI compiled a group of developers, community leaders, architects, and more who had hundreds of years of experience combined. Mr. Smith concluded his comments by stating that he applauded Mr. Gutwald and Ms. Nash for delivering a wonderful end result.

Ms. Renee Hamidi introduced herself as the Chair of the Valleys Planning Commission and stated she was part of the external review committee. She noted that she had a few issues on the manuals. In the Development Management and Plan Review Policy Manual she stated she would like to see all Development Review Committee exemptions posted in the spirit of transparency; that she would like to see all waivers posted so the community would be aware; and that she would like to see better provisions on who was notified of projects. Regarding the Zoning Policy Manual, Ms. Hamidi raised two concerns. First, she stated that Spirit and Intent Letters were like a ticking time bomb and that she would like to see this new policy done away with. Second, she stated that oftentimes, Variances granted as part of a Special Exception run with the land, and explained that she would like the Variances to expire the same way the Special Exceptions do.

There were no other speakers.

With no other speakers, Chairwoman Hafford thanked the members of the public for their attendance and testimony. She explained that the Board would immediately reconvene for a discussion and vote on the matter.

Adjournment of the Public Hearing

Chairwoman Hafford called for a motion to adjourn the Public Hearing. Ms. Pinheiro moved to adjourn the Public Hearing. Ms. Brophy seconded the motion, which passed at 5:28 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 Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

The Public Hearing adjourned at 5:28 PM.

**Reconvene Public Meeting of the
Baltimore County Planning Board**

Call to Order, Introduction of Board Members

Chairwoman Hafford called the meeting to order at 5:28 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	1. Mr. Mark Heckman
2. Mr. Peter Arrey	2. Mr. Todd Warren
3. Ms. Emily Brophy	
4. Ms. Beverly German	
5. Mr. S. Chris Haffer	
6. Mr. Steven Heint	
7. Mr. Shafiq Hinton	
8. Mr. C. Scott Holupka	
9. Mr. Derick Johnson	
10. Mr. Wayne McGinnis	
11. Mr. Howard Perlow	
12. Ms. Cathryn Pinheiro	
13. Ms. Cathy Wolfson	

Attending County staff included: Mr. Steve Lafferty, Ms. Krystle Patchak, Ms. Jenifer Nugent, Ms. Courtney Rachuba and Ms. Taylor Bensley, all of the Department of Planning; and Mr. Pete Gutwald, Ms. Sally Nash, and Mr. Mitch Kellman, all of the Department of Permits, Approvals, and Inspection.

Item for Discussion and Vote

1. Department of Permits, Approvals, and Inspections (PAI) Policy Manual Updates: *Development Management and Plan Review Policy Manual* and *Zoning Policy Manual*

Chairwoman Hafford stated that the Board would have the opportunity to discuss and then vote on the Department of Permits, Approvals, and Inspections Policy Manual Updates. She continued that Mr. Gutwald and Ms. Nash were present to questions from the Board during discussion and before the vote. She then opened the floor for comments and questions from the Board.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Gutwald to explain Spirit and Intent Letters. Mr. Gutwald explained that these letters were not a new policy, but that their inclusion in the Policy Manual was to make their uses finite and more defined. He continued that the purpose of these letters was when something had been approved and there was a minor change. He gave an example of if a homeowner applied for a setback variance for a deck and had it approved by the Administrative Law Judge, but then had to shift the location of the deck three feet to the left because of a utility pole. The letter would confirm that while the new proposal was not exactly what was approved with the variance, it was within the spirit and intent of the approval and was therefore acceptable without a new hearing. Mr. Gutwald continued that he wanted to make Spirit and Intent Letters less flexible and put parameters in place on when and how they can be used. Mr. Johnson questioned if the community received notification of the letters. Mr. Gutwald stated no, not previously or now.

Mr. Arrey commended Mr. Gutwald and Ms. Nash for their efforts. He questioned how often the manuals would be reviewed. Mr. Gutwald stated that they were supposed to be evaluated every three years.

Mr. Haffer questioned who issued Spirit and Intent Letters. Mr. Gutwald confirmed that PAI did. Mr. Haffer asked if they were available online. Mr. Gutwald explained that they were not currently, but that they could be requested via email. He continued that several community members brought that concern up and that PAI was working on making that information, and more, available online. He agreed it was hard to find information online, but reiterated that PAI was actively working with OIT on it.

Mr. Haffer noted concerns mentioned on the lack of posting for some DRC exemptions and asked if that information could also be posted. Mr. Gutwald explained that exemptions that do not require posting are because the changes are not visible – for example, a lot line adjustment. He continued that PAI could look into it, but that the other exemptions are primarily administrative, documenting, and recording.

Ms. Brophy stated that the PowerPoint mentioned all projects needed to meet current code; she questioned if that applied to new development or re-development. Mr. Gutwald explained that that applied to process for all projects, as the Code currently requires applicants to receive modern approvals through the process in which they were originally approved. He explained that many developments from the 1970's and 1980's were approved through the CRG process, but that the process no longer existed. Mr. Gutwald continued that the new manual confirmed applicants would go through the modern process for determining approval, regardless of how they were originally approved.

With no further questions or comments from the Board, Chairwoman Hafford called for a motion. Mr. Holupka moved that the Planning Board is accepting of the Department of Permits, Approvals, and

Inspections (PAI) Policy Manual Updates on the *Development Management and Plan Review Policy Manual* and the *Zoning Policy Manual* and forwards them onto County Council for further review and adoption. Mr. Heintl seconded the motion, which passed at 5:41 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Mr. Haffer strongly recommended as much be available online as possible, whether it be notifications, exemptions, agendas, etc. Mr. Lafferty noted that the County was undertaking significant efforts to update the website, but stated that Planning would mention that in the communication letter to the County Council.

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Chairwoman Hafford called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Brophy moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Wolfson seconded the motion, which passed at 5:45 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, Ms. Pinheiro, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 PM.