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A Resolution to adopt the Hereford Community Plan as part of the Baltimore County Master Plan 1989-2000.

WHEREAS, the Baltimore County Council adopted the Baltimore County Master Plan 1989-2000 on February 5, 1990; and

WHEREAS, the Master Plan calls for the adoption of a community-based Plan for Hereford to provide for growth in a manner which protects and enhances the unique character of the town and is also environmentally responsible; and

WHEREAS, by Resolution adopted March 15, 1990, the Baltimore County Planning Board adopted the Hereford Community Plan dated November 16, 1989 and amended March 5, 1990, to constitute a part of and an amendment to the Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, the County Council held a public hearing on the recommended Hereford Community Plan on June 26, 1990.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND, that the Hereford Community Plan, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof, be and it is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Baltimore County Master Plan 1989-2000 to be a guide for the development of Hereford, subject to such further modifications as deemed advisable by the County Council.
RESOLUTION
Adopting and Recommending the
HEREFORD COMMUNITY PLAN

WHEREAS the Baltimore County 1989-2000 Master Plan calls for the adoption of a community-based Plan for Hereford to "provide for growth in a manner which protects and enhances the unique character of [the] town and is also environmentally responsible"; and

WHEREAS the Hereford Plan Committee, consisting of residents, business owners, and community groups, has been working with extraordinary diligence since 1987, with assistance from County staff, to prepare a Plan for the Hereford area, which is a logical unit for planning within Baltimore County; and

WHEREAS the draft Hereford Community Plan, as submitted on November 16, 1989, addresses the goals in the Master Plan and was the subject of a public hearing by the Planning Board on January 4, 1990; and

WHEREAS the draft Hereford Community Plan has been amended in response to the comments from the public hearing;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to Section 22-12 of the Baltimore County Code, 1978, that the Baltimore County Planning Board hereby adopts the Hereford Community Plan, November 16, 1989, as amended March 15, 1990, to constitute a part of and an amendment to the Baltimore County 1989-2000 Master Plan; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Hereford Community Plan shall be transmitted to the Baltimore County Council for adoption in accordance with Section 523(a) of the Baltimore County Charter.

DULY ADOPTED by vote of the Planning Board this 15th day of March, 1990
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I  INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

In 1987, as a result of concerns expressed by residents, business owners and community groups in the Northern Baltimore County area, Third Councilmanic District Councilman, C.A. "Dutch" Ruppersberger, III, requested an analysis of the commercial village of Hereford. The Office of Planning and Zoning produced a report in September of 1987, entitled, "Hereford a Preliminary Analysis."

The major conclusions of the report called for the following actions: 1) a need for a community plan which would identify the function, form, size and character of Hereford as a rural town center; 2) a set of design standards; 3) new or revised legal controls to guide future growth; and 4) no zoning changes until a community plan is developed.

This Plan completes the actions called for in that report. In the zoning of 1988, the Councilman appointed a citizen group to develop a plan. The group included representatives of the farming community, volunteer fire company, local business association, and surrounding community associations. Later in the year additional representatives were added to represent Hereford-at-large and the Hereford Community Association.

Committee members have met two to three times a month from May 1988 to May 1989 to develop recommendations for a plan. The Committee created three sub-committees (Roads and Traffic, Long Range and Architectural/Design Landscape) to work on specific areas of concern. The Committee held two town meetings, one on August 23, 1988 and the second on May 23, 1989 to present their ideas to the public for review and comment. The Hereford Community Association also held several meetings to provide recommendations to the Hereford Plan Committee.
This plan represents the product of the Committee's dedication and persistent efforts. The Committee struggled over the often conflicting concerns of providing for reasonable growth and economic development and maintaining the rural qualities of the town and surrounding areas. Below is a list of the goals the Committee used to develop this plan.

**HEREFORD PLAN GOALS**

1. To develop a plan that delineates limits of growth and serves the basic needs of the community and tourists.
2. To maintain integrity of the rural area.
3. To create a business center for rural residential and agricultural communities.
4. To geographically concentrate the business community, thus minimizing spot zoning in other parts of the study area and in other areas of the northern County.
5. To address traffic problems which exist in Hereford.
6. To preserve the historical significance of Hereford.
II. LAND USE ANALYSIS
LAND USE ANALYSIS

Hereford is the rural town center for the central part of Northern Baltimore County (Map 1). This distinction is due to both its historic role in the development of Baltimore County (see Section VI) and its strategic location at a major crossroads with a full interchange to I-83.

The 1989-2000 County Master Plan reinforces the role of Hereford as a Rural Town Center and calls for "growth in a manner which protects and enhances the unique character of each town and is also environmentally responsible." This role was implicit in the Hereford Plan goals listed in the previous chapter.

The land use goal for Hereford is to provide for limited appropriate commercial growth in a centralized area that does not exceed environmental constraints. Commercial services are to be limited to serving the needs of Hereford residents, the agricultural community, as well as tourists.

The following land use analysis was conducted to ascertain the amount of commercial land currently available and to determine the need for, and if appropriate, location of, additional commercial zoning. The analysis was based on 1988 and early 1989 information. The method used was to determine the amount of existing commercial and office zoning in Hereford and the amount of commercial zoning not utilized. The next step was to determine projections for commercial demand and to compare this with what is available. The final step of the analysis was to make recommendations for future zoning changes.

The Commercial Rural District (C.R. District) was adopted by County Council on July 5, 1988. The C.R. District provides regulations which serve to: provide for development that can be sustained by the environment; improve the aesthetics of rural commercial development and protect historic features.
For the purposes of this study a reasonable commercial district boundary was determined for Hereford. This boundary was based on existing land use, access of properties, land constraints and the existing zoning. This boundary is indicated on Map 2.

The zoning for that area as indicated on the 1988 Comprehensive Zoning Map is shown in Table 1. There is 48.5 acres of zoning within the commercial rural district overlay. This includes 10.7 acres of rural-residential, 2.8 acres of residential office, 19.6 acres of business local, 15.4 acres of business-major. Commercial areas which are not covered by the commercial district overlay include 4.4 acres of rural-residential, 0.6 acres of residential-office, 6.5 acres of business-local and 16.9 acres of business-roadside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONING</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.R. District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural-Residential (RC 5-CR)</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential-Office (RO-CR)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Local (BL-CR)</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Major (BM-CR)</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural-Residential RC 5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential-Office RO</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Local BL</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Roadside BR</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A land use inventory was conducted in 1988. The results indicated that there was 41 acres of commercial use, 6 acres of institutional use, 22 acres of residential use and 8 acres of vacant land (Table 2).
This survey indicated that in addition to the four acres of rural residential there is 26 acres of commercially zoned land not in commercial use. This includes the properties which were zoned commercial and rural-residential commercial rural in 1988.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2.</th>
<th>HEREFORD RURAL TOWN CENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAND USE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE</strong></td>
<td><strong>ACRES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An assessment of commercial square footage was determined using the 1988 survey information and 1989 building permit information (Table 3). The results indicated that there was approximately 120,875 gross square feet in the commercial core which can be broken down into three categories. The first category is local retail and is estimated to be 38,585 gross square feet. The second, category is local services and medical services which is estimated to be 23,360 gross square feet. The third category is mixed-multi-tenant retail which is estimated to be 58,930 gross square feet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3.</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COMMERCIAL SQUARE FOOTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN HEREFORD, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE</strong></td>
<td><strong>ESTIMATED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Retail (hardware, gasoline, auto supply, food, etc.)</td>
<td>38,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Services &amp; Medical Services</td>
<td>23,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Retail &amp; Office Use and Regional Services</td>
<td>58,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>120,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on 1987 Baltimore County Aerial Photographs (1" = 200')
It is difficult to determine the appropriate amount of commercial and commercially zoned land that will meet existing and future demand and allow for appropriate growth. For the purposes of this plan, it was decided to determine what the range of projected demand for commercially zoned land is for Hereford.

The two projections used to estimate potential demand were the Legg Mason Realty Group and the Regional Planning Council’s (RPC) Round III-A projections. The Legg Mason Realty Group was commissioned by the County to prepare economic forecasts for Baltimore County’s 1989 Master Plan. Their forecast represents an aggressive future growth based upon past growth patterns. The RPC’s figures are based upon a conservative forecast that is tempered by regional patterns and jurisdictional allocations. This accounts for the large discrepancy between the two projections.

The market area for Hereford begins to the north of Hunt Valley, it is bordered on the west by Carroll County and on the north by Pennsylvania. The eastern boundary is the Northeast Market Area (Map 3). This is an area of approximately 150 square miles.

The Legg Mason Study projects an increase of 3407 new people and 1608 new units in this market area by 1995. The Regional Planning Council Round III-A projects 627 new people and 777 new units (Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4. POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD PROJECTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Table 4" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Legg Mason Realty Group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Market Area</th>
<th>1995 III-A*</th>
<th>LMRG**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>93,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>63,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>28,900</td>
<td>157,234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These were extrapolated based on the Regional Planning Council Round III-A Projections.

** Legg Mason Realty Group

Using a projection that assumes the number of people employed in services is proportional to population increase, a projection was derived for additional commercial and office. Given the planning objectives (proposed 1989 Master Plan) of concentrating future commercial and office use for this market area in Hereford, we can adjust typical demand allocations for urban central business districts (50% in central business, 30% in satellite and 20% in other locations, Goodman, 1968) to 70% in rural town centers, 20% in rural villages and 10% in satellite locations.

The two projections indicate for the Northern Market Area a projected range of demand by 1995 for commercial and office between 28,900 gross square feet and 157,234 gross square feet (Table 5). With the assumption stated above that 70% will locate in Hereford, we can project a demand of between 20,230 gross square feet and 110,064 gross square feet depending on the extent of population growth in the area.
The amount of commercially zoned land presently available has the potential to yield 116,741 gross square feet (Table 6). Existing commercial buildings on small lots in Hereford have an average floor area ratio (F.A.R.) of 0.06. The C.R. District zoning regulations permit a 0.2 F.A.R. There are 18 acres of existing commercially zoned land that are in residential use on small lots. If this entire acreage were to be converted to commercial it would yield 47,045 gross square feet at a F.A.R. of 0.06 and 156,816 gross square feet at a F.A.R. of 0.20. Larger projections based on F.A.R. of 2.0, 3.0 or 4.0 are not realistic due to physical site constraints of the small lot size and requirements for onsite wells and sewage disposal.

It is easier to project the potential buildout of the 8 acres of vacant land. This acreage is in two larger parcels. Using the F.A.R. of 0.20 which is the C.R. District limitation, these locations could provide for an additional 69,696 gross square feet of commercial and office in Hereford.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>GROSS SQUARE FOOTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Residential Lots</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>47,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Lots</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>69,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116,740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the above projections indicate there is presently sufficient zoning to meet the projected demand, they do not give an indication as to the type of development that may be needed to satisfy the projected demands. As has been discussed, Hereford's commercial services can be classified into local retail, local service and medical, and mixed retail and regional services. The local retail and to certain extent local service building size is between 1,000 and 5,000 gross square feet. The mixed retail and office-regional buildings are between 10,000 and 20,000 square feet.
In summary, review of the commercial core indicates that there are numerous additional opportunities for conversion of small residential properties to small commercial uses. The opportunity for the larger multi-tenant development is restricted to two sites of which only the property located near I-83 has good access. Thus, there may be the long term need to provide for additional commercial zoning.

The area most suitable for future commercial development is north of Mt. Carmel Road and bounded by I-83 on the west, the existing commercial zoning on the east and the limits of the existing C.R. District to the north. The area is shown on Map 4. This area was selected in order to concentrate present and future growth of commercial.

The commercial zoning was increased in the 1988 Comprehensive Zoning Process and this Plan calls for some expansion in 1992 with the addition of remaining residential within the proposed C.R. District. What is listed as future commercial is intended to be that area where growth should ultimately be directed. In addition to not rezoning this area in the near future, the rezoning should be phased so as to provide for limited controlled growth.

The objective with respect to future commercial growth is to try to maintain the compact nature of Hereford. To achieve this it is recommended that there be no commercial expansion to the north or south along York Road. The western boundary of commercial should continue to be the I-83 interchange. Expansion of commercial to the east should be in concert with the potential Mt. Carmel Road expansion.

There is currently a wide range of private services available in Hereford (Table 7). The range of public and institutional services is less broad (Table 8) but an important addition was the Hereford Branch of the Baltimore County Public Library System in 1988.
### TABLE 7.
HEREFORD RURAL CENTER
LIST OF PRIVATE SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEDICAL</th>
<th>BANKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>CONVENIENCE STORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical</td>
<td>SUPERMARKET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>DRY CLEANER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiropractor</td>
<td>VIDEO RENTAL &amp; SALES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapist</td>
<td>RESTAURANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>Breakfast &amp; Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>CARRYOUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodontic</td>
<td>CRAFT/CLOTHES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW OFFICE</td>
<td>Antiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETERINARY</td>
<td>Floral Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIQUOR</td>
<td>Stained Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO REPAIR</td>
<td>Consignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEED STORE</td>
<td>AUTO PARTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARDWARE</td>
<td>SERVICE STATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE</td>
<td>ACCOUNTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBER SHOP</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION OFFICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REALTOR</td>
<td>MANUFACTURERS REPRESENTATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER-OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8.
HEREFORD RURAL CENTER
LIST OF PUBLIC/INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIBRARY</th>
<th>AMBULANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHURCHES</td>
<td>STATE PARK LAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST OFFICE</td>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE STATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LONG RANGE POTENTIAL COMMERCIAL AREAS
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It is difficult to project the demands for new types of services. The alternative was to identify services which were not desired due to noise, odors, environmental constraints, and protection of residential properties. This list is indicated in Appendices D and E. A specific legal mechanism to prevent these uses is not recommended at this time. The list is advisory.

The C.R. District was designed to allow rural areas to develop services either unique to or in keeping with the rural character of Northern Baltimore County rural town centers, and are not intended to supply the complete range of services one would find in an urban area. The services here are the ones which provide safety, convenience and reduced trips, while servicing the rural residential and agricultural communities.

The Hereford Shopping Center and the BR areas located on the north and south sides of Mt. Carmel Road east of I-83 are currently zoned BR. They do not contain historic structures, and are composed of larger commercial uses including a grocery store, drug store, offices, bank, service station, fuel oil office and terminal, as well as a large, newly expanded SHA complex. They are proposed for inclusion in the CR District for environmental reasons, not for protection of historic buildings of the commercial core. It is expected that they need to be expanded, upgraded, renovated, sold and replaced as time passes. They should be viewed from primarily environmental standards, and less from the point of view of compatibility with the smaller scale buildings of the commercial core. These sites are currently in conformity with the existent BR Zone, and the intent of the CR District in not to convert them to the CR site standards.

**ACTIONS**

1) Map the C.R. District boundary (Map 2).

2) Consider rezoning the remaining residential properties within the C.R. District Boundary at the request of the property owner for the C.R. District overlay.

3) Map the long term consideration to amend the C.R. District boundary (Map 4).
III. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS
4) Consider changes to the C.R. District when necessary if the proposed project is compatible with all components of this plan, in particular to the site design guidelines, and if the lots have frontage on York and Mt. Carmel Roads as documented on the April 1, 1987 State Department of Assessments and Taxation property map (Number 22).

5) Consider rezoning to C.R. District all commercially zoned parcels within the proposed C.R. District boundary at the earliest appropriate time.

6) Concentrate commercial zoning for the Northern area in Hereford or other rural villages. Discourage commercial zoning along roads outside of these areas.

7) The services listed in Appendix D should be discouraged from locating in Hereford.

8) Encourage the location of services listed in Appendix E.
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

The Hereford study area is located outside the planned service area for water and sewer as documented in the Baltimore County Water Supply and Sewerage Plan 1980-1990. The no planned service area is designated to the areas defined as rural and agricultural areas in the Baltimore County Master Plan 1979.

The environmental goals for the rural and agricultural areas include land use and resource protection components. The land uses were addressed in other sections of the Plan. The resource protection concerns focus on protection of groundwater and surface water. The emphasis for the protection of the water resources is to protect both existing and future public water sources.

The protection of surface water is provided through stormwater management and sediment control. These measures are required on proposed development plans with exemptions given to projects which disturb less than 5,000 square feet. The small parcel size, goal of adaptive reuse of existing buildings and the standard requirements for a certain number of parking spaces put severe constraints on being able to meet the requirements to provide stormwater management. This is generally not an issue on larger sites, greater than 2 acres, because there is enough space to locate an onsite stormwater management system.

The Department of Environmental Protection and Resource Management is the County agency with authority and responsibility for stormwater management. The Engineering Services Division reviews plans and makes site by site determinations.

The issue of stormwater management is further complicated by the three ridge lines in Hereford (Map 5). Although this is advantageous in that the runoff is dispersed, it precludes consideration of a single regional system. In addition, there is a lack of suitable outfalls for the commercially zoned areas.

The existing surface drainage systems in Hereford are old and should be investigated for adequacy.
The greatest immediate concern, from a resource protection standpoint, is groundwater. The small lot sizes with existing water supply and sewage systems that in a significant number of instances do not meet current standards makes the continued provision of potable groundwater an important issue. Furthermore, the small lot sizes in conjunction with placement of surrounding wells and septic systems, in many cases, leaves inadequate area for sewage disposal system repair. Potable water quantity has not been a major concern in the past, but with redevelopment, and greater parking requirements, provisions must be made to assure adequate well recharge. The location of three ridges in Hereford complicates this issue.

The three ridges in Hereford represent critical recharge areas where the groundwater system receives no significant increase in volume from upgradient locations (Map 5). Essentially it is that area associated with the top of the groundwater divide. Decreases in groundwater recharge due to increased impervious surface area should be avoided to ensure continued availability of groundwater to individual supply wells.

Groundwater quality was evaluated in the older commercial core along York Road. It was found that there are levels of concern for chlorides and nitrates. Although these levels do not pose an immediate health hazard, they raise the issue of long-term viability of existing wells, the concern for increasing impervious surfaces, and the concern for uses such as: dry cleaning facilities, furniture strippers and refinishing, car washes, restaurants, and beauty salons.

In summary, the environmental constraints in Hereford require greater consideration. The fostering of Hereford as a Rural Center with even limited growth presents conflict with meeting all environmental standards for well location, septic reserve, stormwater management, and limits on impervious surfaces. The consideration should include the following project studies:
(A) improvements to surface water drainage systems, (B) cost and operational feasibility of a community well system, (C) policies to link size of septic reserve area to permitted uses, (D) policies on impervious surface increases, (E) feasibility of community fire cisterns, and (F) feasibility of a community parking area. Much of this information is available but needs to be tailored to the specific scenario that exists in Hereford.

ACTIONS

1) The County Department of Public Works should prepare an engineering analysis of Hereford's surface drainage systems. In the event that a determination is made that improvements are necessary, these should be programmed into the Baltimore County Capital Improvement Program.

2) Survey existing groundwater sources for quality and quantity. Identify potential well protection areas in the event that remediation of individual sites is necessary.

3) Locate by field survey all water and sewer systems. Couple this information with hydrogeologic conditions in the area to determine future requirements for assuring groundwater protection.

4) Investigate a comprehensive environmental strategy which should include consideration of programming projects into the Baltimore County Capital Improvement Program.

5) Require water balance assessment as part of the development information submitted by the developer in critical recharge zones (Map 5).

6) Provide for groundwater recharge zones in any critical yield area.

7) Require distributed infiltration for all storm water runoff.

8) Require the use of water conservation devices (i.e., low-flush toilets, low water use faucet adaptors, etc.).

9) Identify land uses not suitable from quality or quantity perspectives.
IV ROADS AND TRAFFIC
ROADS AND TRAFFIC

Hereford is located at the intersection of Maryland 45 (York Road), Maryland 137 (Mt. Carmel Road) and Maryland 138 (Monkton Road). It is within a mile of I-83 the (Baltimore-Harrisburg Expressway) with a full interchange.

Concerns regarding increased traffic and need for road improvements were expressed for locations in Hereford. Other concerns were raised for intersection improvement and pedestrian safety.

The first area of concern for road improvements was Mt. Carmel Road between I-83 and York Road (Map 6). The 1988 traffic counts show an increase in average daily trips (ADT) from 6370 in 1986 to 8600 in 1988 (Table 9). State Highway Administration projections for these roads are doubling in 20 years or five percent a year. The projection for 2006 is 12,000 ADTs.

The second major area of concern for road improvements was for York Road between Mt. Carmel and Monkton Roads. The ADTs for 1986 were 7500 and are projected to be 15,000 by 2006. In this area, the east-west traffic mixes with the north-south traffic. A solution to this problem is to connect Mt. Carmel and Monkton Roads to the east of York Road. This would eliminate the "dog leg" route and reduce congestion on York Road. Although this project is not currently recommended for inclusion in County-State road improvement plans, a conceptual alignment is shown on Map 7.

In both these areas it is evident that although traffic levels do not currently justify major projects, improvements will be necessary to maintain acceptable traffic flows. The State Highway Administration has plans for widening both Mt. Carmel and York Roads to an ultimate four lane section. Although this would reduce congestion, it would have other impacts. A planning study would provide for an opportunity to balance the needs of traffic flow with other concerns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAFFIC COUNTS</th>
<th>Average Daily Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East - West Mt. Carmel Road</td>
<td>6400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Road North</td>
<td>5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Mt. Carmel Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Road South</td>
<td>7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Mt. Carmel Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East - West Monkton Road</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Road South</td>
<td>5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Everett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated

To reduce the demand for road improvements, and to plan for more efficient road usage, the use of shared driveways for commercial properties is recommended.

The intersection of Mt. Carmel Road, the entrance to the shopping center, and the north bound exit ramp of I-83 was identified by residents as an area of concern for safety and potential accidents. This intersection should be studied for alternatives to correct the hazard.

The citizens have requested and been assured that a traffic signal will be installed at the intersection of Mt. Carmel and York Roads. This signal will be particularly important during the school year when school buses must use the intersection.

It is recommended that the speed limit be set a uniform rate throughout Hereford. This will eliminate the present inconsistency of limits.

There is concern for pedestrian safety and convenience both in the center of Hereford and in the area of the high school. It is recommended that there be an investigation of the need, feasibility, and cost of sidewalk improvements.

For the area of the high school several improvements are recommended. These include additional off street parking, no parking signs, flashing caution lights and reduced speed limits.
**ACTIONS:**

The following list of traffic and road projects should be addressed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>NEED</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carmel Rd improvements</td>
<td>Project Planning Study by the State Highways Admin. to consider future road improvements, access points, &amp; streetscape improvements.</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkton Rd realignment</td>
<td>Review development plans for conflict with proposed alignment.</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carmel Rd, I-83, shopping Center intersection</td>
<td>Project Planning Study by the State Highways Admin.</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carmel &amp; York Rds intersection</td>
<td>Installation of traffic light.</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety in Hereford</td>
<td>Construction of flashing warning lights</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction of speed limit.</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of additional offstreet parking.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uniform speed limit.</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need, feasibility, cost of sidewalk improvement.</td>
<td>Begin studies in 1991 and incorporate in CIP as necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V SITE DESIGN AND ARCHITECTURE
SITE DESIGN & ARCHITECTURE

Hereford dates to the middle 1700's and was a thriving community by 1797. The entire town predates the concept of setbacks. The inns and houses were located along the "turnpike" purposefully close to traffic. The structures were located on small lots (one lot deep) with the fronts facing existing roads. The buildings were small, of a residential scale, and presented a rural main street appearance.

Recent construction of commercial buildings has begun a process of altering the historic coherence of the town's site design. The new construction has been of buildings that are of greater than 10,000 square feet and have involved the combination of two or more lots. The buildings have been located to the rear of the site or in the middle rather than close to the road. Although these changes have been at a key location, the corner of York Road and Mt. Carmel Road, the remainder of the older portions of Hereford have not yet been changed.

On July 5, 1989, the Baltimore County Council adopted amendments to the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations establishing new regulations for the Commercial Rural District (BCZR 259.3). These regulations include restrictions on bulk, setbacks, landscaping, parking, signage and architecture. The regulations limit development by right to a size of 8,800 square feet, a floor area ratio of 0.20 and a height of 30 feet. The front setback is to be not less than 15 feet from the street right-of-way and not more than the average of the setbacks of adjacent buildings. Parking is to be located in a manner appropriate and consistent with adjoining development and must be within the C.R. District. Other requirements will be discussed later in the plan.
FIGURE 1
RURAL COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS
The C.R. District regulations are important in providing a scale of commercial buildings appropriate to rural areas (Figure 1). These take into consideration additional site design constraints such as those for on-site septic disposal and wells. They also provide for the protection of important aesthetic and historic features.

The C.R. District zoning regulations (BCZR 259.3) require that proposed buildings can exceed the bulk standards (8,800 square feet and 0.20 F.A.R.) "only when the proposed development is in compliance with site design guidelines and performance standards which are part of a duly adopted Master Plan for the district." These guidelines will be used in the review of proposed building projects that seek to exceed the bulk standards in order to assure that the proposed structure will be compatible with the desired architectural and site design character.

**ACTIONS**

Guidelines are provided that are unique to Hereford's site design. These should be used for the review of proposals which exceed the bulk standards of commercial projects in Hereford. They are advisory only for new structures which meet the bulk standards as provided for in BCZR 259.3.c.1.

A) **Present a Residential Atmosphere.** - To accomplish this new buildings should be compatible in size, scale and mass with existing buildings, excluding the two newer commercial buildings in the vicinity of York and Mt. Carmel Roads.

B) **Rhythms of Building Spacing Should be Maintained.** - There is an existing pattern of paired buildings followed by a space before the next set of paired buildings. This pattern should continue, taking into account the constraints of well, septic and stormwater management locations.

C) **Structure of Two Stories or Less.** - Building height is restricted by the C.R. District to 30 feet at the top of roof and this statement reinforces that protection.
FIGURE 2
ARCHITECTURAL ILLUSTRATION
D) Front of Buildings Facing the Street - The buildings in Hereford are characterized by their linear appearance. The front of nearly every building faces the street. Although this may not be achievable on every site due to other constraints, architectural treatments can achieve the same effect. Parking should be located at the rear and side of buildings.

E) Porches are to be Linear in Appearance - Porches are a consistent feature on the older buildings in Hereford. They should be considered for new construction. An example of this style is shown in Figure 2.

F) Roofs are to be Cross Gable with a Moderate Pitch Roof Compatible with Surrounding Structures. - See Figure 2.

G) Windows are to be Symmetrical and Proportional to Wall Space. - See Figure 2.

H) Window Type and Materials are to be Compatible with the Front Facade and the Historic and Architectural Character of the Buildings. - Exterior storm windows and doors should be visually unobtrusive. Aluminum should be painted in an appropriate manner.

I) Stylistic Trim Using Cornices, Scroll Work and the Like is Encouraged. - See Figure 3.

J) Exterior Materials are to be Natural in Appearance. - Preference is to be given to wood, wood siding, stone, brick and stucco. Second choice should include vinyl or aluminum siding that simulates wood siding.

K) Color should be compatible with the Atmosphere of the Village. - Colors should be compatible with the village atmosphere and/or typical of the period from which the architectural style was developed.

L) Mechanical Systems Should be Installed in Places Where They Will be Visually Unobtrusive. - Audio/video antenna and mechanical equipment are examples of these systems.

M) Dumpsters should be located at the rear or side of the site and must be screened.
FIGURE 3
STYLISTIC TRIM
N) Small Litter Receptacles, Benches and Other Street Furniture should be of materials and design compatible with the architecture of rural center, i.e., wooden or wrought iron benches.
VI PROTECTION OF LOCALLY IMPORTANT BUILDINGS
PROTECTION OF LOCALLY IMPORTANT BUILDINGS

The earliest documented development in Hereford was associated with the lands of John Merryman. The early structures, such as Foster's Meeting House, built in 1797, are outside the existing Hereford commercial area in the vicinity of Marble Hill and Piney Hill Road. The old route of the "Middle Road" to York, Pennsylvania was along Piney Hill Road rather than the present route.

North of Hereford there was only a trail to Southern Pennsylvania as the heavy wagon trail turned west to Middletown Road to avoid the Gunpowder River valley and stream crossing (Clemens and Clemens, 1983).

The construction of the York Turnpike in 1810 created the town of Hereford as we now know it. An 1850 map documents the existence of the rural village of Hereford. The services available to the turnpike travelers and local residents alike included lodge halls, churches, post office, blacksmith, inns, butcher, undertaker, dentist, barber and for a brief time a newspaper (Clemens and Clemens, 1983).

Many of the buildings in Hereford were constructed between 1840 and 1930. A survey by the Baltimore County Office of Planning and Zoning in 1980 found much of the town was essentially intact in its old core. This is no longer the case. As indicated previously, construction of new commercial buildings and the demolition of several older buildings has changed the old core.

The issue of historic preservation is a very sensitive one. The local Community Association must be involved in making this determination. Therefore, any consideration of individual historic listing or district listing is at the discretion of the property owners in accordance with Baltimore County Code 22-150 and other applicable criteria.
The guidelines for preservation of individual buildings were developed by the Committee. Buildings of local significance were determined to be those constructed prior to 1900. These are shown on Map 8.

**ACTIONS**

1) Proposed development that requires a special exception as indicated in BCZR 259.3.B. on sites containing a building of local significance must consider the reuse of that building or incorporation of the structure into the proposed project, except:
   A) when the building is not structurally sound,
   B) when it is not economically feasible to utilize the structure for the proposed commercial intent, or
   C) when the structure is not conducive for public service use.
   The decision to grant the special exception will be made by the Zoning Commissioner as part of the special hearing process.

2) Appendix B provides design guidelines for the appropriate restoration of buildings in the C.R. District.
VII PLANTING DESIGN & LANDSCAPE VIEWS
PLANTING DESIGN AND LANDSCAPE VIEWS

The natural and planted vegetation in Hereford is varied and without consistent design. Each building, old and new, has its own landscape design. The exception to this is the presence of large shade trees along the roads and on adjacent properties. These trees have been impaired through the maintenance of utility lines, age, and other factors.

The topography of Hereford is such that there are only a few places where significant views are possible from the road. These are along the south side of Mt. Carmel Road and to the west of the buildings on York Road south of Mt. Carmel Road, as shown on Map 9.

ACTIONS

1) The tree-lined corridor should be restored along York Road through the following:
   A) conduct an inventory of the existing street trees and determine the condition of these trees;
   B) prepare a design for the planting of replacement street trees; and
   C) seek CIP funding for the replacement of the street trees.

2) Prepare a landscape plan for Mt. Carmel Road in association with the Special Study Project Traffic Plan as referenced in the Roads & Traffic section of this report.

3) Review proposals for new buildings to encourage the protection and preservation of large healthy trees.

4) Review proposals for new buildings in the areas indicated on Map 9 to maximize the preservation or enhancement of views.

5) In addition to complying with the Baltimore County Landscape Manual, all projects should follow these guidelines:
   A) Consideration for utilities:

In developing any landscape plan consideration must be
given to existing and planned utilities. This can be accomplished by care in species selection and planting location.

B) Safety and security:

In order to promote safety and security, low shrubbery should be used under windows, around doorways, and as borders between parking areas and roadways. All such plantings are to be maintained so that they do not become a safety hazard.

C) Maintenance:

All landscaping is to be maintained in accordance with good horticulture practices.

D) In general, all landscaping in Hereford is to be done and maintained in a fashion to preserve and promote the village atmosphere, while providing a safe and secure environment for residents and visitors.
VIII SIGNAGE & LIGHTING
SIGNAGE AND LIGHTING

There is no consistent or typical style of signage in Hereford. There are locations where signage is appropriately done (Figure 4). Lighting is minimal except in the areas adjacent to I-83 and in association with the library.

The C.R. District regulations provide for strict controls on signage and lighting (BCZR 259.3.C.7). These include a limit of one stationary attached sign that does not project more than 6 inches from the building and does not have a surface area exceeding 8 square feet. There can be one free-standing sign with a surface area of no more than 25 square feet per side. In addition the sign must be landscaped and the location approved by the Director of the Office of Planning and Zoning. No sign can be illuminated unless approved by the Zoning Commissioner after a Special Hearing.

Requests to exceed the standards imposed by the C.R. District for illumination or number of stationary signs should include a comprehensive sign plan. The plan should be in conformance with Appendix C. The plan would show a linkage between the sign design and the facade of the buildings. If additional stationary signs are permitted there should be a step down in size permitted. A bonus of up to a 25% increase in the free-standing sign could also be considered.

ACTION
1) The recommendations listed in Appendix C are guidelines for the review of proposed signage and lighting in Hereford.
2) In consideration of a variance to sign and lighting regulations, these guidelines should be used as standards.
FIGURE 4
HEREFORD LIBRARY SIGNAGE
IX DEVELOPMENT POLICIES & IMPLEMENTATION
DEVELOPMENT POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION

The actions recommended in each section is summarized below. Also included is the agency or agencies responsible for implementing the action.

The development process, with its lengthy review requirements for items such as occupancy permits and setback variances, can act as a disincentive for the accomplishment of the plan goals. It is necessary, therefore, to consider some changes to the development review process for C.R. District projects. This should be studied and proposed changes implemented.

There is also a need to review and change other circumstances which act as disincentives for providing appropriate rural commercial development. One area, for example, is to investigate lowering the assessment for property taxes to insure that property with a commercial district overlay is valued appropriately.

The Economic Development Commission has identified Hereford as a Revitalization Area. The Commission has assisted landowners and developers in exploring various financial packages which might be available. This action is necessary in order to encourage developers to build commercial projects which are more appropriate to rural areas.

IMPLEMENTATION

ACTIONS
1) Economic Development will continue to assist in marketing the area and provide economic assistance to local businesses which wish to expand. Hereford has been recognized as a Revitalization Area so that businesses may take advantage of the available programs to improve and restore its economic vitality.
2) An implementation coordinator should be designated to assist businesses in the development process. The District imposes a set of standards that are complicated but flexible. It is necessary that an individual familiar with the Hereford Community Plan and the area meet with developers and assist them in getting through the process.

3) Set up an implementation group to assure implementation of the plan. The group should consist of County and State Agencies including, but not limited to, Office of Planning and Zoning, Department of Environmental Protection and Resource Management, Department of Public Works, Economic Development Commission, and State Highways Administration and which will include input from citizen advisory groups.

4) Hereford has a number of older buildings which do not meet current setback regulations and other zoning regulations. A standardized, streamlined process that permits improvements to these old buildings needs to be developed.

5) Review and propose changes to other circumstances which act as disincentives to achieving appropriate rural commercial development.

6) To provide for monitoring of the implementation of this plan an implementation schedule is provided in Table 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Analysis and Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare recommendations for Hereford C.R. District boundaries</td>
<td>Hereford Committee &amp; Office of Planning and Zoning</td>
<td>Complete - see Land Use Analysis &amp; Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare recommendations for long term considerations for Hereford C.R. District boundaries</td>
<td>Hereford Committee &amp; Office of Planning and Zoning</td>
<td>Complete - see Land Use Analysis &amp; Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare list of services that should be discouraged or encouraged in the Hereford C.R. District</td>
<td>Hereford Committee &amp; Office of Planning and Zoning</td>
<td>Complete - see Land Use Analysis &amp; Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic &amp; Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a Project Planning Study for Mt. Carmel Rd between I-83 &amp; York Rd to consider future road improvements, access points, &amp; streetscape improvements</td>
<td>State Highway Administration, Dept. of Public Works &amp; Office of Planning and Zoning</td>
<td>Initiate in 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a Project Planning Study to consider the designation of an alignment for an extension of Mt. Carmel Rd to connect with Monkton Rd &amp; to consider designation of alignment as a Master Plan Road</td>
<td>State Highway Administration, Office of Planning and Zoning &amp; Implementation Group</td>
<td>Initiate in 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install a traffic light at Mt. Carmel &amp; York Rds</td>
<td>State Highway Administration</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take measures to provide for pedestrian safety and convenience</td>
<td>State Highway Administration, Balti. Co. School Board, Office of Planning and Zoning &amp; Dept. of Public Works</td>
<td>Begin studies in 1991 and incorporate in CIP as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Design &amp; Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare performance standards &amp; design guidelines</td>
<td>Hereford Committee &amp; Office of Planning and Zoning</td>
<td>Complete - see Site Design &amp; Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Buildings of Local Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designate buildings which should be considered of local significance for the application of BCSR 259.3.B.3</td>
<td>Hereford Committee &amp; Office of Planning and Zoning</td>
<td>Complete - see Protection of bdgs. of local significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide advisory guidelines for use in restoring or rehabilitating bdgs.</td>
<td>Hereford Committee &amp; Office of Planning and Zoning</td>
<td>Complete - see Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage &amp; Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare guidelines to be used in considering a variance to C.R. District signage &amp; lighting regulations</td>
<td>Hereford Committee &amp; Office of Planning and Zoning</td>
<td>Complete - see Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting Design &amp; Landscape Views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a plan to restore the tree-lined corridor along York Rd. Program funds for planting into the Capital Improvement Program.</td>
<td>MD Dept. of Natural Resources, Dept. of Environmental Protection &amp; Resource Management, Office of Planning and Zoning &amp; Dept. of Public Works</td>
<td>Initiate in 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a landscape plan for Mt. Carmel Rd between I-83 &amp; York Rd</td>
<td>Office of Planning and Zoning</td>
<td>In association with Traffic &amp; Roads Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designate significant view areas</td>
<td>Hereford Committee &amp; Office of Planning and Zoning</td>
<td>Complete - see Planting Design &amp; Landscape Views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop guidelines for landscape plantings</td>
<td>Hereford Committee &amp; Office of Planning and Zoning</td>
<td>Complete - see Planting Design &amp; Landscape Views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Constraints &amp; Limitations</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Works</td>
<td>Initiate in 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare an engineering analysis of Hereford’s drainage system</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Works</td>
<td>Seek to incorporate in CIP following engineering studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program improvements if necessary into Capital Improvement Program</td>
<td>Dept. of Environmental Protection &amp; Resource Management</td>
<td>Complete – see Environmental Constraints &amp; Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey existing groundwater sources for quality &amp; quantity</td>
<td>Dept. of Environmental Protection &amp; Resource Management</td>
<td>Complete – see Environmental Constraints &amp; Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate by field survey all water &amp; water systems</td>
<td>Dept. of Environmental Protection &amp; Resource Management</td>
<td>Complete – see Environmental Constraints &amp; Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate need, cost &amp; operational feasibility of community well system</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Works, Office of Planning &amp; Zoning, Dept. of Environmental Protection &amp; Resource Management</td>
<td>Begin studies in 1991 &amp; incorporate in CIP as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate need, cost &amp; operational feasibility of community fire cistern system</td>
<td>Fire Dept. &amp; Office of Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>Begin studies in 1991 &amp; incorporate in CIP as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate feasibility of setting specific standards for septic reserve based on usage</td>
<td>Dept. of Environmental Protection &amp; Resource Management</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate need, cost &amp; operational feasibility of community parking lot</td>
<td>Economic Development Commission, Office of Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>Begin studies in 1991 &amp; incorporate in CIP as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare future water &amp; sewer requirements to assure groundwater protection</td>
<td>Dept. of Environmental Protection &amp; Resource Management</td>
<td>Complete – see Environmental Constraints &amp; Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify land uses not suitable from quality or quantity perspective</td>
<td>Dept. of Environmental Protection &amp; Resource Management</td>
<td>Complete – see Environmental Constraints &amp; Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Policies &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>Developers &amp; Landowners</td>
<td>On Going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers of proposed projects should first meet with the Dept. of Environmental Protection &amp; Resource Management to determine the site’s environmental constraints. After this meeting but before preparing a site plan, the developers should meet with the Office of Planning &amp; Zoning to assure compliance with the C.R. Site Design Standards.</td>
<td>Economic Development Commission</td>
<td>Complete – see Economic Development Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for economic incentives by designation as revitalization area</td>
<td>Office of Planning and Zoning</td>
<td>To be designated after adoption of Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish an implementation process</td>
<td>Office of Planning and Zoning &amp; Dept. of Public Works</td>
<td>Initiate in 1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A
HEREFORD PLANNING COMMITTEE

Mark Bilger, Hereford Volunteer Fire Company
Dr. Harold Burton, Hereford-at-large
Joe Driver, Freeland Community Association
Jim Edmunds, Greater Sparks - Glencoe Community Council
Vernon Foster, Agricultural Community
George Gemmill, Maryland Line Area Association
Lucy Ikeler, Citizens Alliance of Northern Baltimore County Cochair Phase I
Ruth B. Mascari, Greater Sparks - Glencoe Community Council
Wayne McGinnis, Agricultural Community
Dr. Richard W. McQuaid, Maryland Line Area Association
Horace Palmer, Hereford-at-large
Glenn Peabody, Citizens Alliance of Northern Baltimore County Cochair Phase I
Donald Pearce, Hereford Community Association
Frank Purdum, Freeland Community Association
Kelley Rice, Hereford Volunteer Fire Company
Marion V. Runkles, III, Wiseburg Community Association
Randy Shelley, Vice Chairperson, Phase II
Nancy M. Smith, Wiseburg Community Association, Secretary, Phase I
Thelma Thompson, Secretary, Phase II
Carl J. Yarema, Hereford Business Association
Eleanor Yarema, Chairperson, Phase II
Dr. Gordon Zorn, Hereford Business Association
Appendix B
SUGGESTED GUIDELINES FOR ARCHITECTURAL RESTORATION

A. Architectural Elements

1. Windows and Doors: Existing windows and doors including the window sash, glass, lintels, frames, molding, shutters, and steps, should be retained and repaired whenever possible. If a new window or door must be used, it should be of a compatible material to the front facade. Changing the size or arrangement of window panes, muntins and rails where they contribute to the historic and architectural character of the building is discouraged. Inappropriate window or door features on significant facades are discouraged.

2. Storm Windows: Exterior storm windows and doors may be installed if they are visually unobtrusive, do not cause damage to existing frames, and can be removed in the future. Storm windows should match the trim color. Mill-finished aluminum can be painted to match.

3. Porches and Steps: Porches and steps which are appropriate to the building and the site should be retained. The original material and architectural features of porches and steps should be retained whenever possible.

4. Roofs: The original roof shape should be preserved. All architectural features which give the roof its essential character should be preserved or replaced in a compatible manner.

5. Architectural Metals: Architectural metals should be cleaned when necessary with an appropriate method that does not abrade the surface.

6. Masonry Surface and Repointing: Original masonry should be retained whenever possible, without applying any surface treatment, including paint. When repointing of mortar joints is absolutely necessary, old mortar should be duplicated in composition, color, texture, method of application and joint profile. The surface cleaning of structures shall be undertaken with the gentlest means possible.
7. Walls, Fences and Railings: Removal or replacement with inappropriate material or design is discouraged, where these are historically or architecturally important elements of the design and character of the structure and district.

B. Wood Frame Buildings: Architectural features such as cornices, brackets, window and door molding and details, clapboard, weatherboard, shingles and other wood siding are essential and parts of the character and appearance of frame buildings, should be retained and preserved whenever possible. Frame buildings should not be resurfaced with new materials which are inappropriate for the building or which will cause deterioration of the original structure.

C. Structural Systems: Existing foundations should not be disturbed with new excavations that could undermine the structural integrity of the building.

D. Mechanical Systems: Exterior cables, i.e., electrical, telephone and cable TV, should be installed in places where they will be visually unobtrusive. Audio/video antenna and mechanical equipment, i.e., air conditioning and solar panels, should be placed in as inconspicuous a location as possible.
Appendix C
DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR LIGHTING AND SIGNAGE

LIGHTING
Purpose - To provide visual affordability, to insure proper protection and security, to promote and maintain public safety.

A. Signage Restrictions
1. May be lit only during hours open for business.
2. All flood and spot lights on ground level are to reflect only on signs or points of interest. Light beams may not cross or interfere with any line of vision or sight view of pedestrians and vehicular traffic.
3. Light source must be covered with reflecting shield and meet safety guidelines as stated under Illumination of Signage.
4. Wattage addressed under Illumination of Signage.

B. Parking Lots Lighting Specifications
1. Pole lights not to exceed 25 (twenty-five) feet.
2. Illumination not to exceed 1-2 (one to two) candle feet at most distance point on lot.
3. Illumination to be reduced after business hours or 11 p.m., but to maintain adequate security.

C. General Lighting
1. Particular care and planning are to be afforded the entire property area in order to eliminate crime spots and to maintain public safety.
2. Important areas for proper illumination are streets, sidewalks, stairwells, walkways, paths, and parking areas.
3. Security lighting to be maintained after business hours and 11 p.m.
SIGNAGE

Purpose - To reflect Hereford's unique character heritage, to provide for pedestrian and traffic safety, and to identify public buildings, emergency centers, consumer needs, tourist information, and other points of interest.

A. Design and Placement of Signage

1. Types
   a. Wall - that attached directly to wall
   b. Projecting - attached to wall and projecting out (usually at a 90° angle)
   c. Free standing (own support, anchored to ground)

2. Simplicity
   a. Key factor to good design and legibility
   b. Bold, easy, recognized symbols and clear crisp lettering
   c. Enhances area of location

3. Color
   a. Background
   b. Contrasting letters
   c. Emphasis (borders, motifs, shading for dimensions)

4. Message
   a. Keep simple for rapid comprehension by public
   b. Pictures, symbols, logos add individuality and character

5. Size
   a. Keep in scale with viewer location and speed
   b. Scaled to building
   c. Blend with architectural design

B. Material and Construction of Signage

1. Durable and weatherproof

2. Natural and man-made materials that blend/complement and are attune to building design

3. Recognized business items and figures may be used as a sign, e.g., barber pole, a red cross, fire engine, food item, animals, etc., and Historical designated items.
C. Illumination of Signage

1. Projecting signs may be illuminated by concealed lighting at top of sign, reflecting down on sign, with a shield covering sources of light.

2. Free standing and wall mounted signs may be illuminated by:
   a. Shielded, safety protected light at ground level - must be stationary, grilled covered and tamper proof. Source must be concealed. Not to exceed 300 watts on any one side.
   b. Enclosed soft glow internal illumination. Not to exceed 50 candle foot power illumination level - Max. of 5 amps per unit.

3. No flashing, rotating or moving parts except for example types stated in B-3.

D. Simplicity of Design

1. No more than 3 (three) different type styles of lettering shall be used on same sign (to avoid cluttered appearance).

2. No more than 2 (two) different signs per building (attached and projecting).

3. No more than 3 (three) styles allowed on a multiple use building.

4. One free standing sign - not to include safety, traffic or public signs.

5. Small enter and exit signs may be used on doors or placed near main roads if traffic patterns warrant.

6. Color must be compatible, in good taste and complement design of building.

7. Message
   a. Adequately identify service, usage or activities.
   b. Promote safety and comfort for well-being of users from street, road and highway.
   c. Maintain character of surroundings.
E. Size to be kept in scale with building, viewer, location and speed

1. Wall/individual letters - scaled to building placement space. Not to cover any architectural detail.
2. Multiple use building - 2'x3' wall mounts allowed for each user entrance.
3. All free standing signs and spotlights are to be integrated with plantings and must be set back from road as to not interfere with sight view and right of way of pedestrian or motorist.
4. Free standing signs not to exceed 25 (twenty-five) sq. feet per side.
5. Projecting signs - at least 10 (ten) feet above pedestrian walkway.
6. No sign together with supporting frame work shall exceed 10 (ten) feet in height above ground level.
7. Small exit and enter signs at road side not to exceed 1 (one) foot by 2 (two) feet.
8. No letters, symbols or advertising items allowed above building roof line (cornice).

F. All Others

1. Temporary signs may remain up to 30 days. Exception may be construction signs, County permits or any government related usage, to be removed when project is completed.
2. All abandoned or discontinued signs shall be removed from premise within 30 (thirty) days by owner.
3. Special events may be posted up to 30 days ahead of event and removed at closing of event.
4. Window to remain free of signs except for temporary signs - blocking no more than 1/3 (one-third) of surface. Temporary signs to remain posted no longer than 30 days. Excluding small open and closed signs.
5. Small, low profile signs with business hours and credit card acceptance may be inconspicuously posted on door or window.

6. Non-conforming signs (existing before regulation) shall conform with current standards when replacing, painting or major repairs are needed.

G. Prohibited Signs

1. Billboards or flashing light signs.

2. Portable or trailer type

3. Streamers, pennants, ribbons, spinners and etc., only on a limited basis for special announcements, advertising or events no longer than 30 (thirty) days.

4. String lights only as part of holiday celebration.

5. No sign except for traffic, regulatory or informational sign shall use the words "STOP", "CAUTION", or "DANGER", none shall incorporate red, amber or green lights resembling traffic signals or resemble stop or yield signs in shape or color.

6. No sign that constitutes a hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic because of intensity or direction of illumination.

7. All signs shall be kept in a state of good repair and maintenance.

8. Permits and fees are according to County requirements.
Appendix D
INAPPROPRIATE USES

NOTE: These businesses are inappropriate due to one or more of the following concerns - water, sewerage, traffic, pollution, appearance and safety.

**Business Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dry Cleaning Plant</th>
<th>Storage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arcade</td>
<td>Boat Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>Sludge Disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Parking Lot</td>
<td>Laundromat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Boarding</td>
<td>Heliport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Grove</td>
<td>Kennel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Plant</td>
<td>Auto Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Commercial Killing</td>
<td>Race Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Landfill</td>
<td>Shooting Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Transmitting/Receiving</td>
<td>Antennas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusement Devices</td>
<td>Trailer Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motel/Motor Court</td>
<td>Truck Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Auto Sales</td>
<td>Tavern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Underground Gases</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-Thru Restaurant</td>
<td>Car Wash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td>MAP SECTION*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Station</td>
<td>2, 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Citizens Center</td>
<td>2, 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Center</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Health Center</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Foods</td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors (Light)</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumber Supply</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumber Supply-Primary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Market</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycle Center</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Art Salon</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin Operated Rides</td>
<td>1, 2, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Swimming Pool</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photomat</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Center</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Station</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and Breakfast</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Killing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Map_
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