

MINUTES

Baltimore County Planning Board Meeting

November 2, 2023

Contents

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

Review of Today’s Agenda

Minutes of the October 19, 2023 Meeting

Item for Introduction

- 1. Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan

Item for Discussion and Vote

- 2. Electric Vehicles (EV) Charging Stations Report (Council Resolution 14-23)

Other Business

- 3. Recent County Council legislation of interest to the Board:
 - a. Bill 69-23 – Building Improvement Loan Fund
 - b. Bill 74-23 – Zoning Regs. – Uses Permitted – Manufacturing, Light (M.L.) Zone and Manufacturing, Heavy (M.H.) Zone
 - c. Resolution 32-23 – Baltimore County Council Structure Review Workgroup

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Appendices

- Appendix A Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan
- Appendix B Electric Vehicles (EV) Charging Stations Report
- Appendix C Short Term Rentals Report and Staff Presentation

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

Baltimore County Planning Board Meeting Minutes
November 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	1. Mr. S. Chris Haffer
2. Mr. Peter Arrey	2. Mr. Howard Perlow
3. Ms. Emily Brophy	3. Ms. Cathryn Pinheiro
4. Ms. Beverly German	
5. Mr. Mark Heckman	
6. Mr. Steven Heint	
7. Mr. Shafiq Hinton (Arrived at 4:09 PM)	
8. Mr. C. Scott Holupka, Vice Chairman	
9. Mr. Derick Johnson (Arrived at 4:19 PM)	
10. Mr. Wayne McGinnis	
11. Mr. Todd Warren	
12. Ms. Cathy Wolfson	

Attending County staff included: Mr. Steve Lafferty, Ms. Amy Mantay, Ms. Courtney Rachuba, and Ms. Taylor Bensley, all of the Department of Planning; Ms. Jessie Bialek and Mr. Mitchell Phillips of the Department of Public Works and Transportation; Mr. Pete Gutwald and Ms. Sally Nash of the Department of Permits, Approvals, and Inspections; Ms. Jennifer Aiosa and Mr. Seth Blumen of the Sustainability Office; and Mr. Brad Kroner of the Office of Government Affairs.

Review of Today’s Agenda

Ms. Bensley reported there were no changes to the Tentative Agenda published October 26, 2023.

Minutes of the October 19, 2023 Meeting

Chairwoman Hafford asked the Planning Board members if they had any changes to the October 5, 2023 Minutes. Hearing none, Chairwoman Hafford called for a motion to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Warren moved to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Arrey seconded the motion, which passed at 4:02 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heint, Mr. Holupka, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Item for Introduction

1. Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan

Chairwoman Hafford informed the Board that the next item on the agenda was a brief presentation by Ms. Jessie Bialek on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. She continued that after the presentation, she would call for a motion to set a public hearing on the matter. She then welcomed Ms. Bialek.

Ms. Bialek introduced herself as the Bicycle and Pedestrian Planner from the Department of Public Works and Transportation. She began her presentation with some background information on Baltimore County’s planning of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, which began with the 2010 Master Plan. The current proposed plan provided updates to the Eastern Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Plan from 2006 and

the Western Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Plan from 2012. The new plan, which would include areas outside the URDL, reflected the changing development patterns and increased enthusiasm around active transportation in the County. Ms. Bialek discussed that the plan served as a guiding document and showed the most impactful locations to implement future bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. She mentioned that it identified policies and physical barriers to complete streets and active transportation, provided new policies, and delivered prioritized bike and pedestrian improvement projects for the County. Continuing on, she explained the Plans framework which had been broken down into sequential steps. These steps were to establish Plan vision and goals; document existing conditions; identify roles and responsibilities of key partners to implementation; and to prioritize recommendations.

Ms. Bialek noted that, throughout the planning process, input had been collected from community members and stakeholders around the County, and was crucial in developing the Plan's vision and goals. She then discussed the goals of increasing safety; ensuring equity; expanding access and connectivity; enhancing public health; protecting the environment; collaborating with partners; and creating economic growth. She noted that seven "pop up" events were held, one in each of the Councilmanic Districts, and three virtual meetings to solicit feedback. She discussed the results from an online survey and interactive web map, which resulted in 60% of survey respondents stating they did not feel safe, and worried about being hit by a vehicle when biking or walking. Ms. Bialek continued that the top themes that emerged from respondents were increased safety; ensured equity; expanded access and connectivity; and promote low stress facilities. Ms. Bialek then explained that DPWT used a network approach to enhance the overall goals; it took into account the existing conditions analysis and public engagement efforts, which led to the network draft being aimed to recommend connected, comprehensive, and low-stress facilities for people of all ages and abilities. She then shared the implementation plans for each goal, which were listed starting from most important, to least important. Ms. Bialek thanked the Board for their time and stated she would be available for any questions.

Chairwoman Hafford thanked Ms. Bialek for her presentation and opened up the floor for questions or comments from the Board.

Mr. Hinton entered the meeting at 4:09 PM.

Mr. Holupka questioned if Baltimore County worked with Baltimore City to propose connections. Ms. Bialek explained that the team received all of Baltimore City's GIS data to look at all possible connections.

Mr. Holupka asked if there was a recommendation to connect the NCR Trail to Baltimore City. Ms. Bialek explained that there was, and that she had applied for a grant for a feasibility study to determine if connection was possible.

Ms. Brophy noted that Ms. Bialek mentioned "pop up" events and questioned what that was. Ms. Bialek explained that the team went to various locations on the weekends when people were likely to be out walking and/or biking to solicit random feedback. Ms. Brophy asked if there was information on how many responses came out of that, and Ms. Bialek advised the information was provided in the Appendix.

Ms. Wolfson asked if there was a map to show the proposed routes. Ms. Bialek explained that there was a StoryMap online that showed all existing and proposed routes, as well as a static map within the plan that showed the same.

Mr. Warren questioned if connections were proposed in the area of Security Square Mall, and Ms. Bialek advised there were.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

With no further questions or comments, Chairwoman Hafford called for a motion to set a Public Hearing. Mr. Holupka moved that the Baltimore County Planning Board set an in person public hearing regarding the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan for Thursday, November 16th, 2023 at 5:00 PM. Mr. Warren seconded the motion, which passed at 4:12 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heintz, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Item for Discussion and Vote

2. Electric Vehicles (EV) Charging Stations Report (Council Resolution 14-23)

Chairwoman Hafford informed the Board that the second item on the agenda was the opportunity to further discuss and then vote on the Electric Vehicles Charging Stations Report, which was presented to the Board following Council Resolution 14-23. She continued that the item was first introduced to the Board on September 21st, and a Public Hearing was conducted on October 5th, and that staff from the Department of Planning; the Department of Permits, Approvals, and Inspections; and the Sustainability Office were present to answer any questions from the Board during the discussion and prior to the vote. Chairwoman Hafford then asked Mr. Steve Lafferty of the Department of Planning and Ms. Sally Nash of the Department of Permits, Approvals, and Inspections if they had any comments before the Board discussed.

Mr. Lafferty thanked Chairwoman Hafford and the Board and wanted to acknowledge that Ms. Sally Nash, Mr. Pete Gutwald, Mr. Seth Blumen, Ms. Jennifer Aiosa, and Mr. Brad Kroner were present and all had a part in developing the report. He thanked Ms. Brophy for the written comments and questions and explained that the workgroup had tried to provide additional information in response. He explained that the County had been trying to anticipate the changes that they would see on electric vehicles throughout the state, country and within Baltimore County, and noted that progress needed to be forward thinking. He discussed the issue of parking, stating it was a complicated issue; the workgroup did not have a clear recommendation to the Board as to what could be done, and there were many different ways to look at the percentages needed. Mr. Lafferty continued that there had been several concerns about the possibility of fires caused from the EV chargers, and referenced a recent story by WBAL, where the State Fire Marshall indicated that the incident of electric vehicle fires were minimal. Continuing on, he explained that the real threat of fires would be indoors if you had an e-bike or e-skateboard in a house or garage, and noted that open air did not pose as much of a threat. He discussed that there had been no incidents of chargers catching fire, and only one incident of an electric vehicle catching fire in the entire State. He continued that the National Firefighters Association had been looking carefully into garages, and there probably needed to be some reconsideration about parking and structure. Mr. Lafferty stated he appreciated the Fire Chief for Baltimore County and her staff for being able to provide information that was brought to the Board, and explained that the Chief had recently attended a National Conference and the number one discussed concern was potential EV fires. Mr. Lafferty thanked Mr. Blumen for the research he had done, and continued that research would still be ongoing as they plan for the next 5 to 10 years. He mentioned to the Board that the workgroup was willing to work with any recommendations the Board may have, and reminded them that the report should reflect any of their concerns. He ended stating that he was available for questions or comments from the Board.

Mr. Johnson entered the meeting at 4:19 PM.

With no further comments, Chairwoman Hafford opened the floor up for discussion among and questions from the Board.

Mr. Warren stated he had two comments: the first was that the Fire Department was not currently able to handle electric vehicle fires, so he wished to ask Council to give them more funds for training and resources; the second was that most of the electric vehicle fires were in garages, and normal drywall did not stop those fires from spreading, so he would like information added on more protective building materials.

Mr. McGinnis stated he believed the current optimism was overblown and that the power grid would not be able to handle an entire fleet of electric vehicles. He continued that the true cost of charging an electric vehicle was more than what was shown because they were currently government-supported. Mr. McGinnis stated that charging required people's time and that it would not be a sustainable long-term solution. He stated he would not trust an electric bus, truck, or long-range vehicle, and that many people did not want to spend the money to buy something they would have to spend time recharging. He reiterated that he believed the proposal was premature, and that he did not believe electric vehicle sales would significantly increase.

Mr. Holupka stated that he appreciated Mr. McGinnis' concern, but that the Board was not forcing residents to purchase electric vehicles; instead, they were ensuring chargers were available for those who wished to use them.

Mr. Brophy thanked Mr. Lafferty for providing additional information on her questions raised at a previous meeting. She explained that she understood the County's needed to be prepared as electric vehicle registration increased, but that the County was not there yet in terms of demand. She continued that she would like to see the parking standards chart lowered and to possibly make minimums a gradual increase from 2025 until 2035 so the standards did not change overnight. She concluded her comments by stating the current proposed parking standards chart was too high for the current County registration of electric vehicles.

Mr. Heckman questioned if the parking standards chart was cumulative. Ms. Brophy replied that the Board did not get a direct answer on that, but that they could make that amendment. Mr. Heckman asked if the chart was intended to be cumulative. Mr. Lafferty replied that the chart was not intended to be cumulative, but rather total. He explained that each jurisdiction's approach had been vastly different, so the workgroup opted to over-anticipate needs. He continued that lowering the ratios on the proposed parking chart would be more consistent with surrounding jurisdictions.

Mr. Warren noted that the State passed legislation requiring that, by 2030, all new vehicles sold be electric vehicles. It was then clarified that the legislation was by 2035.

Mr. Lafferty noted additional recently passed State legislation, which required all new single family attached and detached homes to be electric vehicle capable. He noted that these chargers would likely be Level 1 and Level 2 chargers added to the garage, not freestanding.

Mr. Gutwald, the Director of Permits, Approvals, and Inspections (PAI), noted that the majority of in-home chargers were a Level 2, which was equivalent to a dryer.

Mr. Warren questioned what would happen if an electric vehicle caught on fire, and where in the report that could be addressed. Mr. Gutwald advised that the information would better be suited in the Fire Code.

Ms. Brophy stated she would like to propose graduated ratios for the proposed parking standards chart, but wanted to confirm the implementation would be realistic.

Ms. Wolfson requested public charging stations be shielded by bollards.

Mr. Lafferty reminded the Board that the report was theirs to pass onto Council as a recommendation, so it was important to provide guidelines to show Council what the Board intended.

Ms. Brophy asked if the Board was comfortable proposing graduated increases to the proposed parking ratios once every three years from now until 2035 when the legislation Mr. Warren mentioned earlier in the meeting would go into effect.

Mr. Johnson questioned if the proposed parking standards chart could instead be based on need. Ms. Brophy advised that, in that case, the report would consistently need to come back before the Board.

Mr. Gutwald advised that updating the proposed parking standards every three years would be a logistical nightmare. He advised that the easiest process for PAI would be to determine a minimum for now and state that the minimum should be X% by 2035; this would make the increases easier to administer.

Mr. Holupka noted that the Board was only proposing minimums, and reminded the Board that if demand was high, more could and would be installed. He stated that, because of this, he preferred to err on the low end.

Ms. Brophy proposed the chart be amended to be 5% cumulative EV capable, ready, and installed by 2025, and 20% cumulative by 2035.

Mr. Heckman stated that he wanted the standards to be simple so everyone knew what to expect. He noted that, in Howard County, the standards were the same regardless of the proposed use.

Mr. Hinton agreed with Mr. Holupka's comments that the Board was only recommending a minimum, but stated he would prefer to see it be a bit higher, possibly 15%.

Ms. Jennifer Aiosa, the County's Chief Sustainability Officer, stated that the big lesson the County had learned in trying to install electric vehicle chargers was that electrical capacity needed to be considered as early as possible. She continued that the State legislation for new homes required them to have the capacity to install chargers, not to physically install them. Ms. Aiosa noted that, in the County's efforts to install EV chargers at libraries and senior center, the capacity was not always there, and, as such, she encouraged the Board to think of the capacity needed.

Mr. Holupka noted that the capacity was an additional cost up front for something that may or may not be needed down the road. He stated he understood the need to be ready, but warned of overcommitting.

Ms. Brophy stated she proposed cumulative minimums of 5% by 2025 and 20% by 2035, noting that the standards would be the same for all uses. Mr. Warren questioned if the minimums were for EV capable, ready, or installed, and Ms. Brophy replied that they would be cumulative and determined by the project and market demand. Mr. McGinnis questioned if the Board would differentiate between residential and commercial uses, and Ms. Brophy advised no, as it would make the standards simpler to understand.

With no further questions or comments from the Board, Chairwoman Hafford called for any amendments.

Ms. Brophy moved that the proposed parking standards chart be amended to state that proposed standards were 5% cumulative – including EV ready, capable, and/or installed – by 2025, and 20% cumulative by 2035. Mr. Warren seconded the motion, which passed at 4:44 PM with affirmative votes being cast by

Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heidl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Mr. Warren moved that language be added to the report to provide the Baltimore County Fire Department adequate training and equipment to be able to put out electric vehicle fires. Mr. Holupka seconded the motion, which passed at 4:45 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heidl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Ms. Wolfson moved that language be added to the report to state that any public station, regardless of location on public or private property, be shielded by bollards. Mr. Warren seconded the motion, which passed at 4:46 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heidl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Ms. Brophy moved that language be added to state that, as part of the report, the Baltimore County Fire Code be reviewed due to additional heat put off by electric vehicle fires and additional equipment needed to put them out. Mr. Warren seconded the motion, which passed at 4:47 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heidl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

With no further questions or comments, Chairwoman Hafford called for a motion on the report.

Mr. Holupka moved that the Planning Board approved the Electric Vehicles Charging Stations Report as amended, and recommended it be forwarded onto the County Council for further review and consideration. Mr. Warren seconded the motion, which passed at 4:49 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heidl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, 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 69-23 – Building Improvement Loan Fund
- b. Bill 74-23 – Zoning Regs. – Uses Permitted – Manufacturing, Light (M.L.) Zone and Manufacturing, Heavy (M.H.) Zone
- c. Resolution 32-23 – Baltimore County Council Structure Review Workgroup

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 4:51 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heidl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 4:51 PM.

**Baltimore County Planning Board Public Hearing Minutes
November 2, 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, Chair2. Mr. Peter Arrey3. Ms. Emily Brophy4. Ms. Beverly German5. Mr. Mark Heckman6. Mr. Steven Heint7. Mr. Shafiq Hinton8. Mr. C. Scott Holupka, Vice Chairman9. Mr. Derick Johnson10. Mr. Wayne McGinnis11. Mr. Todd Warren12. Ms. Cathy Wolfson	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Mr. S. Chris Haffer2. Mr. Howard Perlow3. Ms. Cathryn Pinheiro

Attending County staff included: Mr. Steve Lafferty, Ms. Amy Mantay, Ms. Jennifer Nugent, Ms. Courtney Rachuba, and Ms. Taylor Bensley, all of the Department of Planning; Mr. Pete Gutwald and Ms. Sally Nash of the Department of Permits, Approvals, and Inspections; and Mr. Brad Kroner of the Office of Government Affairs.

Item for Public Hearing

1. Short Term Rentals Report (Resolution 13-23)**

Chairwoman Hafford welcomed everyone and explained that, on October 19th, 2023, Mr. Steve Lafferty of the Department of Planning introduced the Short Term Rentals Report to the Board. She explained that Resolution 13-23, Planning Board – Short Term Rentals, requested the Planning Board conduct a review of the growing trend and proliferation of short term rental properties in the County and consider recommendations for possible legislation to integrate this short term guest housing option into the County’s laws, regulations, and policies for such use. She continued that following the presentations, Board members would have the opportunity to ask questions, and then members of the public would have the chance to speak. She then welcomed Mr. Lafferty.

Mr. Lafferty thanked Chairwoman Hafford, and then began his presentation on Resolution 13-23, which requested that the Baltimore County Planning Board conduct a review of the growing trend and proliferation of Short Term rental properties in the County and considered recommendations for possible legislation to integrate the short term guest housing option into the County’s laws, regulations, and policies for such use. He continued by showing examples of short term rental companies and real properties associated with those companies located throughout the County. Mr. Lafferty gave a brief overview of the issues and concerns associated with short term rentals, including character impact on neighborhoods; non-compliance with rental registration laws; and the possibility that homes would be

used as a party venue, resulting in additional traffic, trash and noise. He then explained to the Board the County's current practices for rental properties, and mentioned that the Department of Permits, Approvals and Inspections handled complaints and regulated rental licenses. He noted that the County did not have complete information on the number and location of Short Term rentals. Mr. Lafferty continued on and referenced Section 13-7-132 of the Baltimore County Code, which explained the details of Unruly Social Gatherings, and that it applied to the property owner or responsible person who conducted, permitted, allowed or condoned such gatherings. Moving forward with the presentation, he discussed the four jurisdiction's that had already passed legislation that established Short Term Rental Registration Programs. Those jurisdictions were Montgomery, Prince Georges and Anne Arundel Counties, and Baltimore City. He mentioned common themes that had emerged among the four jurisdictions which included the creation of a Short Term rental registration system, number of day limitations, requiring the owner to be within a certain distance of the rental, limitations on the number of guests allowed, and parking minimums. Mr. Lafferty concluded his portion of the presentation by discussing questions that were answered from the Office of Law, which were available in the report. He then welcomed Ms. Sally Nash.

Ms. Nash began by offering Recommendation #1, which was to Implement Granicus Software – Host Compliance. She described in detail the Granicus Software which would allow the County to acquire address identification, automate systemic capture of listing screenshots, and establish a rental unit record. He continued that as of November 2022, Baltimore County identified 662 listings, which represented 554 unique rental units. Ms. Nash discussed Baltimore County's Short Term Rental Market Details, which included the median nightly rate, listing types, unit types, and the County's Year over Year Growth over the past year. She explained that it was the County's intentions to have the Granicus Software fully implemented by January 2024, and to collect data for one year to inform future policy and legislation. Ms. Nash moved along with Recommendation #2, which was to Consider Legislation to Establish Registration Process and Regulations. She then explained the licensing and registration requirements and host requirements and limitations, which were available in the report. She noted that failure to comply with all processes and regulation's, could result in suspension or revocation of a license. Ms. Nash thanked the Board for their time and stated that she and Mr. Lafferty were available for any questions from the Board.

Chairwoman Hafford thanked Mr. Lafferty and Ms. Nash for their presentation and opened up the floor for questions from the Board.

Ms. Brophy asked what the definition of a short term rental was. Ms. Nash responded that it was a rental rented for less than 30 days.

Mr. Heidl mentioned that he knew people who purchased properties specifically for the purpose of renting them out, and that State tax laws required them to be rented out for a minimum number of nights a year. He stated that a limit to the number of days would be counterintuitive. Ms. Nash responded that the report proposed a 180 day maximum for un-hosted rentals, but that the Board could recommend that number be increased or decreased. She also noted that it could be reviewed when they had more data from the Granicus software.

Mr. Warren agreed with Mr. Heidl and stated that while that could be the policy from this point forward, it was possible existing rentals may need to be grandfathered in.

Mr. Johnson stated he had a concern with rentals being regulated to the point that people could call the police if someone was having an outdoor barbeque, and wanted to know if this was a frequent occurrence. Ms. Nash replied that there were only handful of properties that had repeat offenses, and that there was no

record where Cord Enforcement had issues more than one Violation. She continued that they receive complains anecdotally, but that they had never reached the courts.

Mr. Lafferty explained that they had reached out to the Police Department and a loud backyard barbeque would not be considered unruly. He continued that it was predominantly college students that has thirty or more people in an apartment, making noise all hours of the night. He mentioned that one of the recommendations of the report was for people to abide by the Social Host Ordinance.

Mr. Heckman noted that the report recommended registering and inspections to confirm that the rental was safe and secure, and questioned if this opened the County up to being liable. Ms. Nash replied that rental licenses currently required inspections and confirmation of smoke detectors, hot water, no exposed wires, etc. by a State Inspector, and that the report simply require the same for short term rentals. She noted that by current law, once past the inspection, it was the tenant's responsibility to ensure everything worked when the property was being rented.

Mr. Holupka questioned if short term renters would actually check the status of a smoke detector. Ms. Nash responded that a recommendation could be that a managing agent check that, but that the current law stated it was the tenant's responsibility.

Mr. McGinnis discussed that his grandson explored a property for short term rentals, but decided against it due to burdens of snow removal, hurricanes, etc.

Ms. Nash noted that there were restrictions preventing someone from having both a long term and short term rental.

Mr. Hinton questioned if the Social Host Ordinance was successful. Mr. Lafferty explained that it started as a pilot program in Towson, and the communities found it to be highly successful so the program was expanded County-wide. Mr. Hinton stated that he had concerns that only a few communities were worried about change, and by broadening it to the entire County, it would make hardships on communities that did not have the same concerns. Mr. Lafferty replied that that was one of the reasons the workgroup proposed gathering a year's worth of data before any changes were made; this would allow the workgroup to understand the flow. He noted that, at the same time, if people were renting a property out, it should be registered with the County.

Chairwoman Hafford stated that she had a friend that participated in a home exchange, and questioned if that would be considered a short term rental if there was no money being exchanged. Ms. Nash replied that it would be exempt if the home was not advertised.

With no further questions and comments, Chairwoman stated she would begin calling on any speakers who signed up to speak. There were no speakers signed up.

With no speakers and no additional questions from the Board, Chairwoman Hafford thanked everyone for their attendance.

Adjournment of the Public Hearing

Chairwoman Hafford called for a motion to adjourn the Public Hearing. Mr. Warren moved to adjourn the Public Hearing. Mr. Heintl seconded the motion, which passed at 5:32 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Warren, and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

The Public Hearing adjourned at 5:32 PM.
