

MINUTES

Baltimore County Planning Board Meeting

November 21, 2024

Contents

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

Review of Today’s Agenda

Minutes of the November 7, 2024 Meeting

Other Business

- 1. Report from the November 14, 2024 Meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission
- 2. Recent County Council legislation of interest to the Board:
 - a. Bill 80-24 – Zoning Regulations – Office Buildings in the Residential-Office (R-O) Zone
 - b. Bill 81-24 – Zoning Regulations – Converted Builder Show House

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. Reisterstown Main Street Streetscape Action Plan**
- 2. Reisterstown Main Street Design Guidelines**

**Comments by Citizens

Adjournment of Public Hearing

Appendices

- Appendix A** Reisterstown Main Street Streetscape Action Plan Report and Presentation
- Appendix B** Reisterstown Main Street Design Guidelines Report and Presentation

**Baltimore County Planning Board Meeting Minutes
November 21, 2024**

Call to Order, Introduction of Board Members

Chair Holupka 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. Mr. C. Scott Holupka, Chair2. Mr. Peter Arrey3. Ms. Emily Brophy, Vice-Chair4. Ms. Beverly German (Arrived at 4:01 PM)5. Mr. S. Chris Haffer6. Mr. Mark Heckman7. Mr. Steven Heint8. Mr. Shafiq Hinton9. Mr. Wayne McGinnis10. Mr. Jon Schulman11. Mr. Todd Warren12. Ms. Cathy Wolfson	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Mr. Derick Johnson2. Ms. Raquel Muñeses3. Ms. Cathryn Pinheiro

Attending County staff included: Mr. Steve Lafferty, Ms. Amy Mantay, Ms. Ngone Diop, Jes Godinez, Ms. Krystle Patchak, and Ms. Courtney Rachuba, all of the Department of Planning.

Chair Holupka reminded the Board that the votes for the updated Landscape Manual and the updated Open Space Manual, had been postponed tentatively until January 16th, so that the County could get additional input from community members.

Review of Today's Agenda

Ms. Patchak reported there were no changes to the Tentative Agenda published November 14th, 2024.

Minutes of the November 7, 2024 Meeting

Chair Holupka asked the Planning Board members if they had any changes to the November 7th, 2024 Minutes. Hearing none, Chair Holupka called for a motion to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Warren 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. Heckman, Mr. Heint, Mr. Hinton, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Schulman, Mr. Warren and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Other Business

1. Report from the November 14, 2024 Meeting of the Landmarks Preservation Commission

Ms. Patchak gave a report on the major actions of the November 14th, 2024 Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting.

2. Recent County Council legislation of interest to the Board:

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

- a. Bill 80-24 – Zoning Regulations – Office Buildings in the Residential-Office (R-O) Zone
- b. Bill 81-24 – Zoning Regulations – Converted Builder Show House

Chair Holupka reminded the Board that in January, they would begin the Capital Budget presentations and meetings. He continued that the first meeting would be January 16th and there was no meeting on January 2nd. He stated at the January 16th meeting, the County Executive, or the Acting County Executive would be presenting the Capital Budget. He explained the Department of Public Works and Transportation would be presenting their budget at that meeting, and the Board would also have the votes on both the Landscape and Open Space Manual.

Chair Holupka stated that before the adjournment of the meeting, he wanted to take a moment to recognize a few of the Board Members with Citations from the County Executive, which thanked them for their dedication to the Board throughout the years.

After giving each Board member their citation, Chair Holupka gave them a moment to speak.

Ms. Wolfson stated that the Board had been an incredible education for her, and that it had been wonderful working with the Board Members and County Staff. She urged the Board to protect the URDL and to build up and not out.

Mr. McGinnis mentioned that he represented the Northern part of Baltimore County, where most of the agriculture is located. He continued that the farms in Baltimore County contributed to a major part of the foods consumed within the County. He mentioned that the farms included poultry, angus cattle, corn, and soy beans. He explained that the corn and soy beans are delivered to Lancaster, PA to be turned into feed for the animals on the farms, and supplies are delivered to the local grocery stores throughout the County. He stressed the importance of maintaining the agricultural areas within Baltimore County. He continued that there was over 100,000 acres that had been converted to agricultural land, and that the residents of Baltimore County were lucky to have such a close food source.

Mr. Warren thanked Chair Holupka, and stated he had already spoke at the November 7th meeting.

Mr. Perlow also thanked Chair Holupka and stated he already had spoke at the October 17th meeting.

Chair Holupka once again thanked the Board Members for their service and mentioned that the Board would be losing a great deal of experience and wisdom.

Mr. Lafferty thanked the Board members on behalf of the County Executive and the Planning Department staff. He agreed with Chair Holupka that the Board would be losing years of understanding, and knowledge. He continued that the departing members had shown enormous and extraordinary service to the County; to their own commitments; and the communities they represented. He explained that he believed that the diverse perspectives that they each had brought to the Board was a trademark of the Planning Board, which allowed for a real commitment to the residents of the County both present and future. He personally thanked Mr. Howard Perlow for visiting the meeting, as well as Ms. Nancy Hafford for joining in to honor the Board Members that she served alongside, during her tenure as Chairwoman.

Mr. McGinnis wanted to add that after the war of 1812, Baltimore County had become overcrowded, and most of the families had moved out of Maryland to other places with cheaper land, and that had not changed in over 200 years.

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Chair Holupka called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Wolfson moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Brophy seconded the motion, which passed at 4:11 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heintl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Schulman, Mr. Warren and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 4:11 PM.

**Baltimore County Planning Board Public Hearing Minutes
November 21, 2024**

Call to Order, Introduction of Board Members

Chair Holupka 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
1. Mr. C. Scott Holupka, Chair	1. Mr. Derick Johnson
2. Mr. Peter Arrey	2. Ms. Raquel Muñeses
3. Ms. Emily Brophy, Vice-Chair	3. Ms. Cathryn Pinheiro
4. Ms. Beverly German	
5. Mr. S. Chris Haffer	
6. Mr. Mark Heckman	
7. Mr. Steven Heintl	
8. Mr. Shafiq Hinton	
9. Mr. Wayne McGinnis	
10. Mr. Jon Schulman	
11. Mr. Todd Warren	
12. Ms. Cathy Wolfson	

Attending County staff included: Mr. Steve Lafferty, Ms. Amy Mantay, Ms. Ngone Diop, Jes Godinez, Ms. Sydnie Cooper, Ms. Jenifer Nugent, Ms. Krystle Patchak, and Ms. Courtney Rachuba, all of the Department of Planning.

Item for Public Hearing

1. Reisterstown Main Street Streetscape Action Plan**

Chair Holupka stated that the first Public Hearing on the agenda was on the Reisterstown Main Street Streetscape Action Plan. He explained that the item was first introduced to the Board on November 7th, 2024 with a presentation by Ms. Sydnie Cooper of the Department of Planning. He continued that Ms. Sydnie Cooper along with Crystal Micriotti and Vicky Almond of the Reisterstown Improvement Association were in attendance to further present the Action Plan to the Board. Chair Holupka noted that

after the presentation, the Board would have an opportunity to ask questions, and then members of the public would have the opportunity to speak on the matter. He then welcomed Ms. Cooper, Ms. Micriotti, and Ms. Almond.

Ms. Cooper introduced herself as the Community Planner for District 2, and introduced Main Street managers Vicky Almond and Crystal Micriotti. She then turned the presentation over to both Ms. Almond and Ms. Micriotti.

Ms. Almond introduced herself and Ms. Micriotti and began the presentation. She informed the Board about the relevant background information, and stated that the projects dated back to the 1970's. She continued that Resolution 44-24 had been passed by County Council on October 7th, 2024, which requested the Planning Board to review the documents. She explained that the Reisterstown Improvement Association (RIA) awarded MD DHCD Main Street Improvement Program Operating Assistance Grant in 2022 and 2023 to create a Streetscape Action Plan and Design Guidelines. She mentioned that the Streetscape Action Plan was to be adopted as an amendment to the Master Plan 2030. Ms. Almond spoke about the timeline and process, led by the Neighborhood Design Center which included all areas of the community and visionary workshop results. She noted that this resulted in a final draft, which was reviewed by several County agencies, who made requests for edits. These edits were completed and Resolution 44-24 was passed on October 7th, 2024. Next, Ms. Almond spoke about the selection of both the NDC and Access, as the chosen consultants and presented their credentials to the Board.

Continuing on, Ms. Almond presented the Comprehensive Community Engagement phase activities, which had been completed from January to May of 2023. She noted that all groups were asked to share their thoughts and suggestions on various subjects that related to the Street Scape Design. She continued that there were several Town Hall meetings; separate workshops for non-profits, business owners, property owners, and youth from local high schools; and surveys that were listed for several weeks in the Monday mailer. Ms. Almond then discussed the Existing Street Scape Analysis which consisted of road issues; commercial and small business; high speed; parking; pedestrian safety; below average tree canopy; building materials; building use; zoning; sub-districts; and architectural language. She explained that the subdistricts consisted of three areas which included the North, Central and South Districts. She noted where the beginning of each district was located, and what attributed to the definition of the areas. Ms. Almond discussed the goals and actions for the subdistricts which included pedestrian safety; enhancement of the arts and cultural activities; connectivity; and development. She noted that the slide that included a more detailed list of the comprehensive goals and actions, with timelines; individuals responsible in the respective districts; and the funding source. Ms. Almond concluded her presentation and discussed the Retail Market Analysis which showed neighboring Main Streets and their analysis.

Ms. Almond asked Ms. Micriotti if she had anything further to add. Ms. Micriotti replied, no.

Ms. Almond stated that Mr. Tom Pilon from St. John Properties was in attendance and he had some concerns he wanted to discuss.

Chair Holupka asked the Board if there were any questions for Ms. Almond or Ms. Micriotti.

Mr. Warren stated that he loved Reisterstown and questioned about an essential parking area. He wondered if the County could acquire land to address the parking issues. He noted that the area did not fully support commerce. Ms. Almond replied that it was addressed in the Design Guidelines that would be presented at the second Public Hearing of the evening. She noted that parking would be situated in the back of buildings, as the front was designated for historic purposes, on Main Street. She explained that the Reisterstown Methodist Church had allowed parking for activities, and they were actively trying to identify different areas. Mr. Warren asked if it was Merritt or St. Johns property located across the street.

Ms. Almond replied that it was St. Johns. She explained that Merritt was too far South, and they had looked for more walkability, and safety for the pedestrians. She noted that the area had the new addition of a Horse Breeders Association, that had brought many people to the area, and that parking lot was utilized when needed.

Ms. Wolfson asked if there was information on traffic calming, and the protection of pedestrians in the plan. Ms. Micriotti replied that the Design Guidelines included some possible options. She continued that they had met with the State Highway Administration (SHA), and they had worked on new ideas for slowing down traffic. Ms. Wolfson stated that the SHA had great ideas. Ms. Almond mentioned that they tried to avoid blinking lights, and large signs. She continued that they had worked on pedestrian crossways that included smaller signs; and worked with the Police Department when large events were held.

There were no further questions from the Board.

With no further questions from the Board, Chair Holupka began calling on members of the public, who signed up to speak.

Tom Pilon introduced himself as the Executive Vice President for St. Johns Properties. He explained that his company owned the Reisterstown Business Center, located at Main Street and Business Center Drive, situated in the Central District of the Plan. He apologized in advance and stated that his company had just been notified about the Plan, recently. He continued that the business were members of RIA and often were approached for various reasons, including to utilize their parking area for events such as the Farmer's Market and the Blooming Arts Festival. He stated he was not aware of the Plan, but he had reviewed the Plan and wanted several items to be removed or modified. He discussed Goal 2.6 that referenced shared parking; and stated that it would cause liability issues. He mentioned Goal 3.1, that referenced business certifications that required collection of lease terms, and stated that it was considered sensitive data that clients would not be willing to share. Continuing on, he spoke on Goal 3.3, which established core hours through standardized lease language, and noted that the business was unable to include third parties in lease negotiations. Mr. Pilon addressed Goal 3.9 which referenced rezoning that recommended removing BR from the Central District; and stated that it would cause a split zone for the property, which could put the property at risk to be downzoned. Moving on to 4.11, which referenced existing parking lots with placemaking elements, he mentioned that the property did not wish for this to be a requirement. Mr. Pilon moved to goal 5.3, which referenced installation of town commons on the property, and stated they had acquired the property for development purposes and were not interested. He finished on Goal 6.1, which discussed eliminating the center turn lane from Chatsworth Avenue to Bond Avenue, and mentioned that the property had large truck traffic and it could cause issues for tenants of the property.

Patsy Malone introduced herself as the Land Use Council for St. Johns property, and she was accompanied by Mr. Pilon. She reiterated that both her and Mr. Pilon were just made aware of the Plan when it was passed by Council in October. She asked the Board for time for her and Mr. Pilon to discuss matters with the community members that were present, or for a postponement of the vote.

There were no additional speakers.

Chair Holupka stated that there would be a small adjournment after the Public Hearing when Ms. Malone and Mr. Pilon could discuss matters with attending community members.

2. Reisterstown Main Street Design Guidelines **

Chair Holupka stated that the second Public Hearing was on the Reisterstown Main Street Design Guidelines. He explained that the item was also first introduced to the Board on November 7th, 2024 with a presentation by Ms. Sydnie Cooper of the Department of Planning. He continued that Ms. Cooper along with Ms. Micriotti, and Ms. Almond, were in attendance to further present the Design Guidelines to the Board. He noted that following the presentation, Board members would have a chance to ask questions, and then members of the public would have the opportunity to speak on the matter. He once again welcomed Ms. Cooper.

Ms. Cooper again introduced Ms. Almond and Ms. Micriotti.

Ms. Almond stated that she appreciated all of the work by the Baltimore County Council, all of the Departments in Baltimore County, and community partners who had been working on the Plan for a long time. She mentioned that Ms. Mantay, Deputy Director of the Department of Planning, was the first Main Street Manager many years ago, and who began the Main Street Plan.

Ms. Almond began the Design Guidelines presentation with background information, which had been passed by County Council as Resolution 44-24, on October 7th, 2024, and requested for review by the Planning Board. She continued that the process had been started in the 1970's and was RIA led initiative. She noted that grants had been awarded; and design guidelines were to be incorporated into the Comprehensive Manual of Development. She then discussed the timeline process which began in January and went through May of 2023. She noted that there had been community engagement led by NDC and focus groups, which led to a final draft reviewed by the Planning Department. She discussed that edits were requested and completed; and the Resolution was passed in October. She explained that the consultants selected were NDC and Access, both recommended by Main Street America, and Maryland DHCD. MS. Almond mentioned that several methods of community engagement had been completed January through May 2023, which included visioning workshops; and passive boards.

Ms. Micriotti added that they held meetings for business and property owners at their business round table; youth workshop; surveys; and a separate workshop at the Maryland Horse for Non-Profits.

Ms. Almond explained the goals for the Design Guidelines were to encourage high quality designs consistent with the historic character. She stated that the Town had been established in 1758 on the National Register of Historic Places, and that they wanted to provide design for new and existing buildings. She noted that the main components were the district style; parking structures; materials used for building; lighting; signage; and street presence. She commented that all new construction and renovation should align with the established character, of Reisterstown. This included landscaping of front yards; parking lots and garages located in the rear of buildings; and appropriately screened front porches. She continued and stated that new structures should contribute to the charming, walkable, and pedestrian friendly environment.

Ms. Micriotti stated that they discouraged options from business owners such as blinking, rotating or revolving lights; and improper placed or sized signage, by offering new incentives through available grant funds.

Ms. Almond discussed the sites which included a small coffee shop named Reister's daughter, located at the corner of Cockeys Mill Rd and Main Street.

Chair Holupka thanked Ms. Micriotti, and Ms. Almond for their presentations, and then opened the floor for questions from the Board.

Mr. Haffer questioned the communication conflict between community members and St. Johns property. Ms. Almond responded that they were unaware that St. Johns did not know about the Plan. She reiterated that they had regular communications with the community over the years in the forms of emails; newsletters; both directly and in general. Mr. Haffer then asked if time was of the essence or could the vote be deferred until there could be more discussion. Ms. Almond replied that there was no rush and they would welcome the opportunity to speak with Mr. Pilon.

Ms. Brophy asked if there was a grace period on when the existing businesses would need to start conforming to new guidelines. Ms. Micriotti replied that the existing buildings would not be impacted by the guidelines, and that they were more for future businesses. She continued that the businesses come to them for Façade Improvement Grants and they were required to have them approved, through the Maryland Historic Trust Review.

Mr. Warren stated that he agreed with the idea to give more time for communication between Mr. Pilon and community members. He continued that he supported the idea, but wanted the time for St. Johns Properties and community members to come to an agreement. Ms. Almond replied that they wanted St. Johns Property on board with them, and felt that it had been a miscommunication issue.

Mr. Haffer asked for confirmation on which two issues Mr. Pilon had spoke about. Ms. Malone stated there were two potential issues, one from each Plan.

With no speakers, Chair Holupka opened the floor up for any additional questions or comments, from the Board.

With no additional questions or comments, Chair Holupka concluded the second and final Public Hearing of the evening. He noted that following the adjournment of the Public Hearing, the Board would have a ten-minute recess for Mr. Pilon, Ms. Malone, Ms. Almond, and Ms. Micriotti time to discuss the issues at hand, then would reconvene to vote on both matters.

Mr. Haffer asked if during Mr. Pilon, Ms. Malone, Ms. Almond, and Ms. Micriotti's discussion, if they could come up with a timeline for when they could solve the issues.

Adjournment of Public Hearing

Chair Holupka called for a motion to adjourn the Public Hearing. Mr. Warren moved to adjourn the Public Hearing. Ms. Brophy seconded the motion, which passed at 5:33 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heinl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Schulman, Mr. Warren and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

The Public Hearing adjourned at 5:33 PM.

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

Chair Holupka called the meeting to order at 5:40 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. Mr. C. Scott Holupka, Chair 2. Mr. Peter Arrey 3. Ms. Emily Brophy, Vice-Chair 4. Ms. Beverly German 5. Mr. S. Chris Haffer 6. Mr. Mark Heckman 7. Mr. Steven Heinl 8. Mr. Shafiyq Hinton 9. Mr. Wayne McGinnis 10. Mr. Jon Schulman 11. Mr. Todd Warren 12. Ms. Cathy Wolfson 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Derick Johnson 2. Ms. Raquel Muñeses 3. Ms. Cathryn Pinheiro

Attending County staff included: Mr. Steve Lafferty, Ms. Amy Mantay, Ms. Sydnie Cooper, Ms. Krystle Patchak, Ms. Ngone Diop, Ms. Jenifer Nugent, Jes Godinez and Ms. Courtney Rachuba, all of the Department of Planning.

Items for Discussion and Vote

1. Reisterstown Main Street Streetscape Action Plan
2. Reisterstown Main Street Design Guidelines

Chair Holupka began the meeting by stating that the Board would have the opportunity to discuss and vote on the Reisterstown Streetscape Action Plan. He continued that staff from the Department of Planning were in attendance to answer any further questions from the Board during their discussion, and before the vote. He then opened the floor for any additional questions from the Board.

Mr. Lafferty stated that the two parties who had discussed issues during the recess, had agreed to a postponement of the vote.

Ms. Almond stated that to finalize any outstanding issues, and for the respect of Mr. Pilon and St. Johns properties, they agreed to a postponement of the vote. She believed that they could be concluded within the next two weeks.

Mr. Warren called for a motion to vote on both Plans at the next regularly scheduled Board meeting in January. Mr. Heckman seconded the motion which passed at 5:43 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heinl, Mr. Hinton, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Schulman, Mr. Warren and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

Chair Holupka reminded the Board that the next Board meeting would be on January 16th, 2025 with a presentation by the Acting County Executive to kick off the Capital Improvement Program process. He noted that the January 2nd meeting had been canceled. He once again thanked Ms. Wolfson, Mr. Warren, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Perlow, and Ms. Hafford for their service.

Adjournment of the Board Meeting

Chair Holupka called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Brophy moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Wolfson seconded the motion, which passed at 5:44 PM with affirmative votes being cast by Mr.

Arrey, Ms. Brophy, Ms. German, Mr. Haffer, Mr. Heckman, Mr. Heint, Mr. Hinton, Mr. McGinnis, Mr. Schulman, Mr. Warren and Ms. Wolfson. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 5:44 PM.