

WORK SESSION – JUNE 30, 2026, 4 P.M.

FOR

**BALTIMORE COUNTY COUNCIL AGENDA
LEGISLATIVE SESSION 2026, LEGISLATIVE DAY NO. 14
JULY 6, 2026 6:00 P.M.**

**CEB = CURRENT EXPENSE BUDGET
BY REQ. = AT REQUEST OF COUNTY EXECUTIVE**

- A. CALL OF BILLS FOR FINAL READING AND VOTE**
Bill 62-26 – Mr. Patoka – Zoning Regs. – Permitted Use Conditions in the Business, Major (B.M.) Zone
Bill 64-26 – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – General Provisions – Gender-specific Terms
Bill 65-26 – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – Permits, Licenses, and Business Regulation – Food Trucks – Definitions and Prohibitions
Bill 66-26 – Mr. Marks – Designation of Design Review Areas – Honeygo Gateway Commercial Revitalization District
- B. BILLS FOR FIRST CONSIDERATION**
Bill 67-26 – Mr. Ertel - Zoning Regulations – Uses Permitted in the D.R. 5.5 Zone – Event Venue
- C. APPROVAL OF FISCAL MATTERS/CONTRACTS**
1. Contract – Hollins Organic Products, Inc. – Yard waste recycling services
 2. Contract – Sustainable Generation, LLC – Composting equipment – Eastern Sanitary Landfill
 3. Contract – Othram, Inc. – Genetic testing services for DNA
 4. Contract of Sale – Tinta Mohamed – Acquisition of drainage/utility easement area – 4534 Silver Spring Road, 21128
 5. Contract of Sale – Columbia Capital, LLC – Acquisition of drainage/utility easement – 1465 Mohrs Lane, 21220
 6. Budget Appropriation Transfer – Police Department – \$4,067,222
- D. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS**
1. Reappointment – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – Baltimore County Soil Conservation District Board – Eric Haddaway
 2. Appointment – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – Advisory Committee for Public School Capacity – Carolann Sharpe
 3. Appointment – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – Baltimore County Ethics Commission – Lauren Kallins
 4. Reappointment – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – Police Accountability Board – Scott Richman
 5. Res. 16-26 – Mr. Jones – Approval of review of PUD – Harmony Garden
 6. Res. 19-26 – Mr. Ertel – Property Tax Exemption – BLIND – Delphina M. Sevier
 7. Reappointment – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – Baltimore County Animal Hearing Board – Zoey Robinson-Bureski
 8. Reappointment – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – Baltimore County Animal Hearing Board – Jacqueline Scotto

**BALTIMORE COUNTY COUNCIL
NOTES TO THE AGENDA
LEGISLATIVE SESSION 2026**

*Issued: June 25, 2026
Work Session: June 30, 2026
Legislative Day No. 14: July 6, 2026*

The accompanying notes provide analysis of unaudited information obtained from the Administration and other sources; most notes for Administration-submitted agenda items are prepared primarily by the Office of the County Auditor, while most notes for Council-initiated agenda items are prepared primarily by the Office of the Legislative Counsel to the County Council.



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY AUDITOR

BALTIMORE COUNTY COUNCIL

July 6, 2026

NOTES TO THE AGENDA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LEGISLATIVE SESSION	
Witnesses	ii
<u>BILLS – FINAL READING</u>	
Bill 62-26	1
Bill 64-26	3
Bill 65-26	5
Bill 66-26	7
<u>BILLS – FOR FIRST CONSIDERATION</u>	
Bill 67-26	8
<u>FISCAL MATTERS</u>	
FM-1	*
FM-2	*
FM-3	*
FM-4	9
FM-5	9
FM-6	13
<u>MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS</u>	
MB-5 (Res. 16-26)	17
APPENDIX	
None	

* Addendum

AGENDA
BALTIMORE COUNTY COUNCIL
LEGISLATIVE SESSION 2026, LEGISLATIVE DAY NO. 14
July 6, 2026 6:00 P.M.

CEB = CURRENT EXPENSE BUDGET
BY REQ. = AT REQUEST OF COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Page

CALL OF BILLS FOR FINAL READING AND VOTE

COUNCIL

1 Bill 62-26 – Mr. Patoka – Zoning Regs. – Permitted Use Conditions in the Business, Major (B.M.) Zone

BRAD KRONER, DEPUTY LEGISLATIVE OFFICER, EXECUTIVE OFFICE

3 Bill 64-26 – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – General Provisions – Gender-specific Terms

PETE GUTWALD, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF PERMITS, APPROVALS & INSPECTIONS

5 Bill 65-26 – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – Permits, Licenses, and Business Regulation – Food Trucks – Definitions and Prohibitions

COUNCIL

7 Bill 66-26 – Mr. Marks – Designation of Design Review Areas – Honeygo Gateway Commercial Revitalization District

BILLS FOR FIRST CONSIDERATION

COUNCIL

8 Bill 67-26 – Mr. Ertel - Zoning Regulations – Uses Permitted in the D.R. 5.5 Zone – Event Venue

APPROVAL OF FISCAL MATTERS/CONTRACTS

TONY RUSSELL, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION

- * 1. Contract – Hollins Organic Products, Inc. – Yard waste recycling services
- * 2. Contract – Sustainable Generation, LLC – Composting equipment – Eastern Sanitary Landfill

MAJOR WES FISHER, POLICE DEPARTMENT

- * 3. Contract – Othram, Inc. – Genetic testing services for DNA

JON HERBST, CHIEF, REAL ESTATE COMPLIANCE

- 9 4. Contract of Sale – Tinta Mohamed – Acquisition of drainage/utility easement area – 4534 Silver Spring Road, 21128
- 9 5. Contract of Sale – Columbia Capital, LLC – Acquisition of drainage/utility easement – 1465 Mohrs Lane, 21220

COLONEL MATTHEW GORMAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

- 13 6. Budget Appropriation Transfer – Police Department – \$4,067,222

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

COUNCIL

- 17 1. Reappointment – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – Baltimore County Soil Conservation District Board – Eric Haddaway
- 2. Appointment – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – Advisory Committee for Public School Capacity – Carolann Sharpe
- 3. Appointment – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – Baltimore County Ethics Commission – Lauren Kallins
- 4. Reappointment – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – Police Accountability Board – Scott Richman
- 5. Res. 16-26 – Mr. Jones – Approval of review of PUD – Harmony Garden
- 6. Res. 19-26 – Mr. Ertel – Property Tax Exemption – BLIND – Delphina M. Sevier
- 7. Reappointment – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – Baltimore County Animal Hearing Board – Zoey Robinson-Bureski
- 8. Reappointment – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – Baltimore County Animal Hearing Board - Jacqueline Scotto

** Addendum

Bill 62-26

Council District(s) All

Mr. Patoka

Zoning Regs. – Permitted Use Conditions in the Business, Major (B.M.) Zone

Bill 62-26 adds conditions to the approval of warehouses and compartmentalized warehouse establishments under certain conditions in the Business, Major (B.M.) Zone.

The Baltimore County Zoning Regulations define a “warehouse” as a building or part of a building used or intended to be used primarily for the following:

- the storage of goods or chattels that are to be sold retail or wholesale from other premises or sold wholesale from the same premises;
- the storage of goods or chattels to be shipped on mail order;
- the storage of equipment or materials to be used or installed at other premises by the owner or operator of the warehouse; or
- for similar storage purposes.

"Warehouse" does not include a truck terminal, at which any storage is minor, transitory, and merely incidental to the purpose of facilitating transportation of goods or chattels. "Warehouse" also does not include a retail establishment whose primary purpose is for the sale of goods or chattels stored on the premises. However, this definition does not exclude purely incidental retail sales in warehouses. In general, warehouses are permitted in the Office Technology (O.T.) Zone, the Business, Local (B.L.) Zone, and the B.M. Zone under certain circumstances.

The Zoning Regulations also define a sub-type of warehouse for self-storage, known as a “compartmentalized warehouse establishment.” The Regulations define this type of warehouse as a building consisting of individual, small, self-contained units that are leased or owned for self-service storage of business or household goods. However, outside of its definition, compartmentalized warehouse establishments are only mentioned in the Zoning Regulations twice as prohibited uses in the Service Employment (S-E) Zone and the Mixed Use (M.U.) Overlay District, respectively. In other words, compartmentalized warehouse establishments are not permitted in any zone. However, the Administration advises that, in general, self-storage facilities

are authorized under the definition of a warehouse rather than compartmentalized warehouse establishments.

Bill 62-26 adds a special use condition to warehouses and compartmentalized warehouse establishments in the B.M. Zone. Specifically, the bill would prohibit those uses if they are located along or on a [Maryland Scenic Byway](#). Currently, Maryland has 18 designated scenic byways that encompass 2,487 miles of road. The following scenic byways are located in whole or in part in Baltimore County.

- The Star-Spangled Banner Byway, along MD 295 in Halethorpe and continuing through Baltimore City to North Point Road in Dundalk;
- The Historic National Road, along Frederick Road in Catonsville;
- The Falls Road Byway, along Falls Road from the City-County line to the Carroll County-Baltimore County line;
- The Horses and Hounds Byway, along several roads in northern Baltimore County;
- The Mason and Dixon Byway, along several roads in northern Baltimore County; and
- The Baltimore Historic Charles Street, along Charles Street in Towson.

At the request of the bill's sponsor, the Council voted at its June 1, 2026 legislative session to extend the vote on Bill 62-26 until its legislative session on July 6, 2026.

A proposed amendment states that the prohibition of warehouses and compartmentalized warehouse establishments along Maryland Scenic Byways does not apply to properties within the Reisterstown Commercial Revitalization District.

With the affirmative vote of five members of the County Council, Bill 62-26 will take effect 14 days after its enactment.

Mr. Ertel (By Req.)

Executive Office

General Provisions – Gender-Specific Terms

Bill 64-26 requires the County Code to use gender-neutral terms. The bill also directs the publisher of the County Code to correct gender-specific language to gender-neutral language in consultation with the County’s Office of Law. See Exhibit A.

The County Code contains a mix of gender-specific language and gender-neutral language. Examples of gender-specific terms include “his” and “he,” “her” and “she,” “chairman,” “Councilman,” “fireman,” and “policeman.” Examples of gender-neutral terms include “they” and “their,” “chair” or “chairperson,” “Councilmember” or “Councilperson,” “firefighter,” and “police officer.”

Currently, the General Provisions Article of the County Code specifies that, except where the construction would be unreasonable, whenever one gender is used, the other gender is also intended. Bill 64-26 adds a new requirement that the County Code use gender-neutral terms. The bill also directs the publisher of the County Code, in consultation with and subject to the approval of the County Attorney, to correct any terminology from gender-specific to gender-neutral. Also, the publisher must adequately describe any such correction in an editor’s note attached to the affected Code section.

With the affirmative vote of five members of the County Council, Bill 64-26 will take effect 14 days after its enactment.

Executive Summary

This Gender-specific terms legislation will replace certain gender-specific terms in the County Code (chairman, vice-chairman, councilman, fireman, policeman, and salesman) with their gender-neutral counterparts. It will achieve consistency with the Code's current use of such gender-neutral terms.

Prepared by: Executive Office

Mr. Ertel (By Req.)

Department of Permits, Approvals and Inspections

Permits, Licenses, and Business Regulation – Food Trucks – Definitions and Prohibitions

Bill 65-26 broadens the definition of “food truck” and repeals certain prohibitions for food trucks relating to trailers or other accessory attachments. See Exhibit A.

Currently, a food truck is defined as a self-contained and self-propelled mobile vehicle that sells food from the curb side of the vehicle to customers on the curb side of a public street. Bill 65-26 would amend this definition to state that a food truck is a mobile facility that sells food and is a mechanically, electrically, manually, or otherwise propelled vehicle operating on land or water that moves as part of its routine operation. In other words, the definition is broadened to encompass alternative forms of propulsion for a food truck and food trucks that can operate on water.

Under the current law, a food truck operator must be licensed by the County. In order to maintain their licenses, food truck operators must adhere to certain restrictions, such as not parking on sidewalks or private property without permission of the property owner. The law currently prohibits a licensed food truck operator from attaching a trailer or other accessory attachment to their food truck, unless that attachment is a canopy or menu display. Bill 65-26 repeals this prohibition.

With the affirmative vote of five members of the County Council, Bill 65-26 will take effect 14 days after its enactment.

Executive Summary

The Administration is requesting support for legislation to update the definition of “food truck” in the Baltimore County Code so that it is more closely aligned with that in the Health Department regulations. Currently, the code requires that food trucks are “self-propelled mobile vehicles” that do not include trailers or other attachments.

These updates will ensure that there is not a conflict between the BCC and what the Health Department defines as a “Mobile Food Service Facility,” which is considered, “a food service facility which is a mechanically, electrically, manually, or otherwise propelled vehicle operating on land or water that moves as part of its routine operation in accordance with Baltimore County Zoning Regulations.”

Prepared by: Department of Permits, Approvals and Inspections

Mr. Marks

Designation of Design Review Areas – Honeygo Gateway Commercial Revitalization District

Bill 66-26 removes the designation of the Honeygo Gateway Commercial Revitalization District as a Design Review Area for residential development.

Under § 32-4-204 of the County Code, the Council may designate areas of the County in which development is subject to review by the Design Review Panel. These areas are called Design Review Areas. When an area is designated as a Design Review Area, certain development within the area is subject to review so long as that area is described by map in the Comprehensive Manual of Development Policies. The Council may require the Design Review Panel to review non-residential development under § 32-4-204(c), residential development under § 32-4-204(d), or both.

In 2021, with the passage of Resolution 67-21, the Council established the Honeygo Gateway Commercial Revitalization District. Later in 2021, the Council enacted Bill 59-21 which designated the Honeygo Gateway Commercial Revitalization District as a Design Review Area for both residential and non-residential development. Currently, there are five areas that are designated as Design Review Areas for residential development, with all areas except the Honeygo Gateway Commercial Revitalization District being residential communities. Bill 66-26 removes the designation of the Honeygo Gateway Commercial Revitalization District as a Design Review Area for residential development under § 32-4-204(d) and retains the designation for non-residential development under § 32-4-204(c).

Bill 66-26 also provides that the Department of Planning shall remove the map of the Honeygo Gateway Commercial Revitalization District, as amended, from the Comprehensive Manual of Development Policies in accordance with the provisions of the bill.

With the affirmative vote of five members of the County Council, Bill 66-26 will take effect 14 days after its enactment.

Bill 67-26

Council District(s) All

Mr. Ertel

Zoning Regulations – Uses Permitted in the D.R. 5.5 Zone – Event Venue

Bill 67-26 permits an event venue or a similar establishment by right in the Density Residential (D.R.) 5.5 Zone under certain circumstances.

Currently, certain event-related and social uses are permitted in some D.R. zones. Specifically, community buildings, swimming pools, commercial beaches, golf courses, country clubs and other similar civic, social, recreational, or educational uses, including certain tennis facilities, are permitted by special exception. For some older buildings in D.R. zones, approval for their use as event venues, clubs, and other social gathering places was granted prior to the establishment of the D.R. zones, and in some cases, prior to the implementation of the modern Zoning Regulations. However, those historic uses are not reflected in the current D.R. Zoning Regulations.

Bill 67-26 permits a property in the D.R. 5.5 Zone that was granted approval for use as a private club on or before March 30, 1955 to be used as a private club, catering hall, or event venue as of right.

With the affirmative vote of five members of the County Council, Bill 67-26 will take effect 14 days after its enactment.

FMs-4 & 5 (2 Contracts)

Council District(s) 5

Office of Law – Real Estate Compliance Division

Acquisition of Drainage/Utility Easements – 4534 Silver Spring Road, 21128 and 1465 Mohrs Lane, 21220

The Administration is requesting approval of two contracts to acquire easement access spanning, in total, approximately 1.599 acre for \$217,780 for the Gunpowder to White Marsh Sewer System Improvement project. FM-4 is a \$120,980 contract with Tinta Mohamed for easement access (0.831 acre) located at 4534 Silver Spring Road in Perry Hall; the property is zoned DR-1 (Density Residential – 1 unit per acre). FM-5 is a \$96,800 contract with Columbia Capital, LLC for easement access (0.768 acre) located at 1465 Mohrs Lane in Middle River; the property is primarily zoned BM (Business Major). The easements will be used for drainage and utility easements and temporary construction areas. See Exhibits A and B.

Fiscal Summary

Funding Source	Combined Purchase Price	Notes
County ⁽¹⁾	\$ 217,780	⁽¹⁾ Capital Projects Fund – Metropolitan District. ⁽²⁾ Includes \$55,000 to compensate for adverse impacts to certain site improvements.
State	--	
Federal	--	
Other	--	
Total	<u>\$ 217,780</u> ⁽²⁾	

Analysis

Descriptions of the two acquisitions are as follows:

FM-4 – 4534 Silver Spring Road

The Office advised that the County’s appraisal consultant, Everett Benfield Advisors, completed

an appraisal of the property effective June 6, 2023, recommending a value of \$72,490. A subsequent appraisal of the property effective September 9, 2025 recommended a value of \$102,200, reflecting additional impacts to mature trees and site improvements and temporary construction easement requirements. The Office advised that following negotiations, the County and the property owner agreed to a final acquisition price of \$120,980. According to the Office, the negotiated amount reflects compensation for impacts associated with the easement acquisition and temporary construction activities.

The total 0.831-acre property to be acquired, including both the drainage and utility easement (0.596 acre) and temporary construction area (0.235 acre), is part of a larger 2.219-acre parcel that is residentially improved with a detached dwelling and other site improvements.

FM-5 – 1465 Mohrs Lane

The County's appraisal consultant, Everett Benfield Advisors, completed an appraisal of the property effective February 4, 2026, recommending a value of \$96,800. After review and analysis, the County's review appraiser concurred with the appraisal, recommending the respective amount as just compensation for the acquisition. The Office advised that the property owner accepted the County's offer.

The total 0.768-acre property to be acquired, including both the drainage and utility easement (0.602 acre) and temporary construction area (0.166 acre), is part of a larger 19.451-acre parcel that is unimproved.

The Office advised that the purpose of the Gunpowder to White Marsh System Improvement project is to make the County's sewer infrastructure more resilient and sustainable and reduce the possibility of overflow of raw sewage into the environment. The Office further advised that 78 acquisitions are needed for this project, including approximately 24 that require Council approval; the proposed contracts represent the eighth and ninth acquisitions requiring Council approval. The Department of Public Works and Transportation advised that, between FY 2016 and FY 2026, \$211.4 million has been allocated for this project in the Capital Budget, including \$205.5 million for construction and \$5.9 million for design, permitting, and property acquisition.

County Charter, Section 715, requires Council approval of real property acquisitions where the purchase price exceeds \$5,000.

Executive Summary

PROGRAM TITLE: Gunpowder PS to White Marsh PS

PROJECT NO.: 01-077-7275

FISCAL MATTER: Contract of Sale

PROPERTY OWNER: Tinta Mohamed

LOCATION: 4534 Silver Spring Road
Perry Hall, Maryland 21128

CONSIDERATION: \$120,980.00

PURPOSE OF PROJECT: This contract is for the purchase of Drainage and Utility Easement Area of 25,948 sq. ft. and Temporary Construction Easement Area of 10,238 sq. ft.

LIMITS OF PROJECT: 4534 Silver Spring Road
Perry Hall, Maryland 21128

Prepared by: Office of Law – Real Estate Compliance Division

Executive Summary

PROGRAM TITLE: Gunpowder PS to White Marsh PS

PROJECT NO.: 01-077-7275

FISCAL MATTER: Contract of Sale

PROPERTY OWNER: Columbia Capital, LLC

LOCATION: 1465 Mohrs Lane
Middle River, Maryland 21220

CONSIDERATION: \$96,800.00

PURPOSE OF PROJECT: This contract is for the purchase of 26,215 sq. ft. Drainage and Utility Easement Area and 7,215 sq. ft. of Temporary Construction Easement Area.

LIMITS OF PROJECT: 1465 Mohrs Lane
Middle River, Maryland 21220

Prepared by: Office of Law – Real Estate Compliance Division

FM-6 (Budget Appropriation Transfer)

Council District(s) All

Police Department

BAT – Police Department

The Administration is requesting retroactive approval of an FY 2026 inter-agency General Fund budget appropriation transfer (BAT) totaling \$4,067,222 from various programs within the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPWT), Organizational Contributions, Local Share, and the Office of Law to the Police Department’s Operations Bureau program. The Department advised that the funds were needed to offset increased costs for overtime, callback, and retiree payouts. See Exhibit A.

Fiscal Summary

<u>Transfer From</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Current General Fund Appropriation</u>	<u>General Fund Transfer Amount</u>	<u>Adjusted General Fund Appropriation</u>
067-6701	DHCD – General Administration Housing & Community Development	\$ 5,248,150	\$ (2,000,000)	\$ 3,248,150
070-7605	DPWT – MRF Operations	7,280,155	(700,000)	6,580,155
059-5902	Organizational Contributions – General Grant Program	4,515,460	(500,000)	4,015,460
066-6601	Local Share – Special Fund Matching Expend	14,100,703	(317,222)	13,783,481
070-7602	DPWT – Refuse Collection	48,739,750	(300,000)	48,439,750
011-1101	Office of Law – General Legal Services	5,908,651	(100,000)	5,808,651
011-1105	Office of Law – Workers Compensation	1,189,565	(100,000)	1,089,565
011-1102	Office of Law – Legislative Relations	734,920	(50,000)	684,920
			<u>\$ (4,067,222)</u>	
<u>Transfer To</u>				
015-1506	Police Department - Operations Bureau	\$ 151,740,456	\$ 4,067,222	\$ 155,807,678

Analysis

Source of Funds

The Office of Budget and Finance advised that funds totaling \$4,067,222 were available within several agencies, including DHCD (\$2,000,000 due to unexpended funds from the emergency SNAP supplemental appropriation), DPWT (\$1,000,000 due to vacancies and less-than-anticipated spending on operational supplies), Organizational Contributions (\$500,000 due to unexpended funds from the emergency SNAP supplemental appropriation), Local Share (\$317,222 due to unexpended contingency funds), and the Office of Law (\$250,000 due to vacancies).

Use of Funds

The Department advised that the \$4,067,222 was used to offset increased costs for retiree payouts due to a higher-than-anticipated number of personnel retiring, as well as for overtime and callback due to increases in public demonstrations, events, high-resource demanding incidents, and vacancies resulting from retirements.

This proposed BAT affected ongoing spending subject to the Spending Affordability Committee's FY 2026 spending guideline, resulting in the FY 2026 budget as amended being approximately \$10.2 million over the guideline.

County Charter, Section 711(b), provides that "[i]nter-agency transfers in a current expense budget between offices, departments, institutions, boards, commissions, or other agencies of the county government may be made during the last quarter of the fiscal year and then only on the recommendation of the county executive and with the approval of not less than a majority of the total number of county council members established by this Charter." The proposed BAT is being presented after the close of FY 2026 and therefore requires retroactive approval.

Executive Summary

The FY26 Police Department Budget is expecting a deficit. There are several contributing factors including;

- A large number of retirees has far exceeded our planned payouts for the fiscal year. This was reported previously, but has grown by millions of dollars in the final pay periods of the year.
- An increase in public demonstrations, community events, several high resource demanding incidents, and retirements resulting in vacancies has led to an increase in Overtime and Callback costs.

A budget appropriation transfer in the amount of \$4,067,222 is needed to offset these costs. This will assist the Department in closing the year in a positive financial position.

Prepared by: Police Department

MB-5 (Res. 16-26)**Council District(s) 4**

Mr. Jones

Approval of Review of PUD – Harmony Garden

Resolution 16-26 approves the review of a proposed Planned Unit Development (“PUD”) in the fourth Councilmanic District.

The first step in the PUD review and approval process requires that a PUD application be submitted to the Councilmember in whose District the proposed PUD is to be located. Next, the applicant must hold a post-submission community meeting. This meeting is similar to the community input meeting that is required during the development review and approval process, except the post-submission community meeting is required at the beginning of the process, prior to the adoption of a resolution approving the further review of the PUD. The applicant must give three weeks’ notice of the meeting and post the property. Notice must be mailed to adjoining property owners and community associations that represent the area.

At the meeting, the applicant must provide information about the plan, allow questions and comments, maintain a record, compile minutes of the meeting, and forward the minutes to the Councilmember and to the Department of Permits, Approvals and Inspections (“PAI”). Community residents and organizations may also provide written comments to the Councilmember. In addition, the Councilmember may require the applicant to hold another post-submission meeting.

The applicant must also send copies of the PUD application to PAI, which must then transmit copies of the application to the appropriate reviewing agencies, which, in turn, must provide a preliminary written evaluation of the PUD proposal to the Councilmember.

Once these procedures are completed to the satisfaction of the Councilmember, and if the Council finds that the proposed site is eligible for review, the Council, by adoption of a resolution that has additional advertising and posting requirements, may approve the continued review of the PUD according to the County’s development review and approval process. Only after all of the aforementioned steps have concluded may the adopting resolution be introduced.

Resolution 16-26 avers that the applicant has complied with all of these procedural steps. In the proposed PUD project known as “Harmony Garden,” an application was filed by Frederick Hamilton, LLC (“Applicant”) for review and approval of a 15.33± acre site within the Urban Rural Demarcation Line zoned predominately Office-Residential (OR)-2, with a small area zoned Density Residential (D.R.) 5.5 and Business Major-Commercial, Community Core (B.M.-C.C.C.), off Liberty Road with frontage on Old Court Road and Church Lane in the Randallstown area of the 4th Councilmanic District (the “Property”).

The project would redevelop the currently unimproved site with up to 182 dwelling units with a combination of approximately 24’ wide and 50’ deep 2 over 2 units and 20’ wide by 42’ deep townhomes, as indicated in the schematic representation of the proposed PUD that was filed with the PUD Application. According to the resolution, the project, which is being proposed on land that has been zoned OR-2 for decades and still remains undeveloped, would help address housing production targets for the State and Baltimore County referenced in annual reporting by the Department of Housing and Community Development.

The Applicant proposes a capital improvement benefit in accordance with § 32-4-242(b)(6) of the Baltimore County Code in the amount of \$30,000 to Baltimore County to be used to create a fully walkable and accessible sidewalk from the project’s access onto Church Lane to Liberty Plaza to the neighboring shopping center, with any portion thereof remaining to be used for a capital project identified by the Councilmember in whose district the proposed PUD is located, such as the construction of the proposed Randallstown Recreation Center at 8212 Liberty Road property, Stevenswood Park, or Rockdale Park as the Department of Recreation and Parks suggested in its preliminary comments regarding the PUD.

The resolution also states that the County Council strongly encourages that any of the anticipated approximately \$300,000 to \$400,000 in open space waiver fees not allocated to Neighborspace of Baltimore County in accordance with Baltimore County Code § 32-6- 108(f)(3) be allocated to the projects identified by the Department of Recreation and Parks in its preliminary comments regarding the PUD.

At the request of the resolution’s sponsor, the Council voted at its June 1, 2026 legislative session to extend the vote on Resolution 16-26 until its legislative session on July 6, 2026.

Upon its passage by the County Council, Resolution 16-26 will be forwarded to the Department of Planning and the Department of Permits, Approvals and Inspections for further processing.