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A RESOLUTION of the Baltimore County Council requesting the Baltimore County Planning Board to prepare a Middle River Road Community Plan.

WHEREAS, the County Council recognizes that portions of the Middle River Road area in the Sixth Councilmanic District have a mix of residentially and commercially zoned properties; and

WHEREAS, the County Council recognizes that the properties in this area, bounded by Route 40, Ebenezer Road, the Windlass Run, Bengies Road and Martin Boulevard, are impacted by development pressures; and

WHEREAS, the County Council recognizes the need to explore ways to strengthen the existing residential character of this portion of the Middle River Road area while not damaging the commercial vitality of the area; and

WHEREAS, the County Council believes that a comprehensive evaluation and review of this portion of the Middle River Road area, combined with sufficient public input, is necessary in order to prepare, consider and adopt a Plan for the reasonable future development of this portion of the Middle River Road area consistent with the Master Plan and in the best interest of the public.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND, that the Baltimore County Planning Board be and it is hereby authorized, pursuant to Sections 26 123 and 26 124 of the Baltimore County Code, to prepare a Middle River Road Community Plan as a revision and update to the Master Plan, which will serve as a guide for the future development of properties in the Middle River Road area which is depicted on the attached map, and to recommend implementing legislation and programs, including recommendations for land use controls such as overlay districts and design guidelines for the future development of the area, and to report its findings and recommendations and proposed Plan to the County Council.
READ and PASSED this 19th day of April, 2004.

BY ORDER

Thomas J. Peddicord, Jr.
Secretary

ITEM: RESOLUTION 40-04
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Section I: Introduction

Resolution and Advisory Group Process

In April 2004, County Council Resolution Number 40-04 was introduced by Sixth District Councilmember Joseph Bartenfelder requesting the Planning Board to prepare a Middle River Road Community Plan. The resolution recognized the need to explore ways to strengthen the existing residential character of the Middle River Road community. It also recognized the need for a comprehensive evaluation and review for the reasonable future development of the area. In response, the Office of Planning embarked on a partnership with representatives of the community to develop a plan that encompassed their goals and objectives, and could be adopted as an amendment to the Master Plan 2010. Eight citizens representing various components of the community came together to form the core advisory committee.

From there, the advisory committee, along with other community members and county staff went to work on identifying issues, developing a vision statement, and studying pipeline and potential development in detail. They also met with representatives from various county departments to better understand the development process, and conducted research in order to formulate a blueprint for how they wanted their community to grow and evolve.

The final product is a community plan that will act as a tool for stakeholders who are charged with making decisions for the area, and will include recommendations that will function as a policy guide by which to judge development proposals and propose planning initiatives. Zoning, land use and development were examined in detail, and recommendations for future land use and zoning were developed.

Chronology of Area Planning Efforts

Several planning efforts that encompass parts of the Middle River Community Plan (MRCP) have been undertaken previously, and included as amendments to Master Plan 2010. Previous planning efforts are listed in Table 1.

This plan created by Resolution 40-04 is intended to supplement the recommendations made in previous plans, and in the case of conflict, supersede any previous planning efforts. The Middle River Community Plan Area is shown on Map 1.

| Table 1 |
|------------- |----------- |
| Plan | Date of Adoption |
| Eastern Baltimore County Revitalization Strategy | July 1, 1996 |
| Community Conservation Plan for Essex-Middle River | July, 1996 |
| Windlass Run/Bird River Road Area Community Plan | January 4, 1999 |
| Middle River Employment Center Area Plan, Part One | February 22, 2000 |
| Middle River-Bird River Area Plan | January 22, 2002 |
VISION STATEMENT

One of the first items of business before the advisory committee was the development of a vision statement. The vision should evolve, grow, and adapt as times change. Following is the vision statement, and associated goals and objectives developed by the eight member advisory team:

The Middle River Community Plan Area will be a community that offers a diverse blend of high quality housing, employment, educational and recreational opportunities in place prior to or concurrent with development commencing; and incorporates the following goals:

- Locate a mix of high quality housing near White Marsh Blvd and Campbell Blvd
- Locate light industry along White Marsh Blvd between Windlass Run and Eastern Avenue that will provide employment opportunities for area residents
- Develop a centrally located community park that will provide opportunities for both passive and active and passive recreation
- Develop a new elementary school to reduce school overcrowding
- Improve walkability in the plan area by constructing a system of walkways and bikeways that will provide connectivity between visual and community focal points
- Design new development and redevelopment that will be high quality and compatible with the communities in the plan area

ANALYSIS OF ISSUES

Upon establishing a clear vision statement, the advisory team pursued analysis of seven issues of critical importance facing the community. Listed below are the issues considered by the advisory team and a brief description of the factors that were evaluated:

Development, Land Use, and Zoning–The committee examined the amount of development that can be expected, based on current zoning and land use, in addition to an analysis of anticipated development based on proposed zoning and land use changes. Their study looked at options for the most reasonable use of the land in the plan area, given the assumption that substantial development will occur as a result of several new roads opening up, proximity to the waterfront, and infill development potential.

Public Works–The committee examined the ability of the current and proposed infrastructure (roads, water and sewer, schools) to handle projected pipeline development and be staged appropriately in order to avoid adverse conditions of congestion and excess capacity.

Existing and projected school conditions are among the issues examined by the plan.
Recruitment and Parks—The committee conducted an assessment of existing parkland, both active and passive, and the projected shortage that could become even more severe as development increases over the build-out period.

Police and Fire Protection—The committee examined how projected build-out could present issues in police coverage and workload due to significant changes in population or land use.

Design Compatibility and Historic Preservation—The committee reviewed the amount of planned development in the area and how it could potentially change the character of the community in either a positive or negative way. They considered compatibility and consistent review of both major and minor developments – factors that can enhance the future desirability and quality of life in the community, and avoid negative development patterns.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities—The committee conducted an analysis of how connectivity could be improved for automobile, bicycle and pedestrian activity to improve circulation both within the community and to adjacent communities.

Environmental Protection—The committee studied the extent to which pipeline development will affect the ratio of impervious surface, and ultimately what that will mean for water quality of the Middle River Community.
Section II: Analysis of Issues

This portion of the plan describes the existing conditions and base data that will be used to formulate recommendations. A brief historical description will help establish the context of past growth patterns and how that relates to the current discussion of growth.

Much of the area’s development dates back to World War II and was built to house the thousands of workers employed at the Glenn L. Martin aircraft factory. The housing is modest in scale and construction materials, and in some cases is beginning to show signs of age and deterioration. Over the past several decades came the decline in industry, and the associated decline in working class population that called Middle River home. During this period, the community began to lose its sense of direction. More recently, with the renewed interest in traditional communities and the asset of the waterfront, the area has seen the upswing in both public and private investment. Several high-quality mixed-use developments are planned and/or under construction. There is a generous amount of residential units in the development pipeline, that is, submitted into the county development process, but not yet constructed. Both citizens and developers recognize that it is the older structures that give the area character, and the newer developments that enhance the market and help spur other investment.

The MRCP area is located in eastern Baltimore County. It has an approximate total size of 3,115 acres or 4.87 square miles. The planning area is bounded by Ebenezer Road to the North, Windlass Run/Bengies Road/Wampler Road to the East, Martin Boulevard to the South and Pulaski Highway to the West. See Map 2.

Population

The Middle River Community Plan area is located within three 2000 U.S. Census Tracts. To perform the demographic analysis for the Middle River Community Plan, three census tracts in Census 2000 – 4513.00, 4514.00, and 4517.01 – are selected to represent the community planning area. See Map 3. Since 2000, the Middle River community has become one of the most dynamic in Baltimore County. This can be attributable to its proximity to the waterfront, the White Marsh growth area, and the new, 3.8-mile extension of White Marsh Boulevard. The proposed Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) initiative associated with Aberdeen Proving Ground will stimulate greater interest in the area.

The area now has approximately 5,000 housing units. See Table 2.
Middle River Community Plan

Both Census Tracts 4513.00 and 4517.01 have experienced a slight or moderate increase respectively in housing units. Most of the new housing units in these two census tracts are single-family detached (SFD) and single-family attached (SFTH) See Table 3.

The most significant change has taken place in Census Tract 4514.0. In 2005, more than one thousand apartment units at the former Victory Villa Gardens Apartments were razed to pave the way for redevelopment. The new Miramar Landing community, after being fully built, will consist of 100 senior apartments at Park View, plus 584 townhouses and 156 single-family homes at the Miramar Landing Villas by Ryland Homes.

Census 2000 indicated that there were 13,710 residents in the Middle River community. Since then, population has grown by 385 people together in Census Tracts 4513.00 and 4517.01.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract</th>
<th>Census 2000</th>
<th>New Units</th>
<th>Razed Units</th>
<th>Net New Units</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4513.00</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4514.00</td>
<td>3,198</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>-702</td>
<td>2,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4517.00</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Totals</td>
<td>5,640</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>-598</td>
<td>5,042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source 2000 Census and Baltimore County Building Permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract</th>
<th>4513.00</th>
<th>4514.00</th>
<th>4517.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached (SFD)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Semi-Detached</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached (SFTH)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment (APT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source 2000 Census and Baltimore County Building Permits
**Existing Land Use**

The planning area contains a mixture of land uses, with the majority of land classified as undeveloped. A total of 39.8 percent of the planning area is undeveloped, with 18.5 percent being classified as pipeline residential and 21.2 percent being vacant. Pipeline projects are development projects that have been submitted into the County development process, but have not yet been built. A large amount of the undeveloped land lies adjacent to Windlass Run where the extensions of White Marsh Boulevard and Campbell Boulevard will provide future access. Residential uses are concentrated on the west side of the planning area. Residential land use occupies 33.8 percent of the planning area, or approximately 1,052 acres. Single family detached housing occupies 847 acres. Single family attached housing occupies 94 acres and consists mostly of townhouses. Single family attached housing is primarily located near Middle River Road, south of Bird River Road. Multifamily housing accounts for 111 acres. Table 4 shows the acreage of the various land use classifications and their percentage of the total planning area. Map 4 shows the existing land use pattern.

The multi-family housing developments are located along Middle River Road, Bird River Road, Wampler Road, and Compass Road. 8.5 percent of the land is classified as institutional. There are 4 public and 1 private schools in the planning area. Holly Hill Memorial Gardens occupies approximately 100 acres of land. Other institutions in the planning area include Our Lady Queen of Peace Church, Middle River Assembly of God, Victory Villa Community Church, a veteran memorial post, a fire and rescue station, and an ambulance rescue company. Commercial and industrial land uses make up 5.9 percent of the planning area. Business and industrial sites are

**Table 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Classification</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% of Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Office</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Residential</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights-of-way</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County-owned</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowners Association (HOA)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

March 2007 Land Use
The Middle River Community offers a variety of housing types ranging from farmhouses and bungalows to modest ranchers and newly constructed single family units.

Rights-of-way occupy 9.9 percent of the planning area. This land use category includes all roads, railroads, and transmission lines. Power transmission lines run along the northern portion of the plan area. Major roads in the area include White Marsh Boulevard, Pulaski Highway, Ebenezer Road, Bird River Road, Middle River Road, Martin Boulevard, Wampler Road, Reames Road and Compass Road.

Existing Zoning

The planning area contains a mixture of residential, industrial, and commercial zoning classifications. Table 5 shows the acreage and percentage of the planning area represented in each zoning classification.

The majority of the planning area (79.6 percent) is zoned Density Residential, with all six DR zoning classifications represented. High-density DR zoning is concentrated south of Bird River Road and west of Wampler Road. This area is predominantly zoned DR 16, DR 10.5 and DR 5.5 and contains several apartment complexes and townhouse communities. Most of the land located within these zones is already built out.

Lower density residential zones (DR 3.5, DR 2, and DR 1) cover 40.9 percent of the total planning area, or 1,273 acres of land. Some of the land located within these zones remains undeveloped.

173 acres of land, or 5.5 percent, is zoned for commercial usage. The majority of the commercial zoning is located along Pulaski Highway, Middle River Road, Martin Boulevard, Wampler Road, Riverton Road, and Magnolia Avenue.
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Industrial zoning occupies 14.8 percent or 462 acres of the plan area. Some ML-IM zoning exists on the northwest side of the study area and is undeveloped, except for land occupied by part of the Sleepy Hollow Mobile Home Park. Two small ML-IM zoned areas exist on Bird River Road. On the corner of Bird River Road and Middle River Road is a packaging shop, zoned ML-IM. A plumbing business and auto service shop is located near White Marsh Farms and is also zoned ML-IM.

11.1 percent of the planning area, or 344 acres, is zoned RC 3. This land is located in the northeast part of the area. The RC 3 classification is used to foster agricultural and residential uses while maintaining a rural character. Map 5 shows the current zoning.

The differences between the land use acreage map and the zoning acreage map can be defined by the large amount of land that is currently vacant. There are small instances where the land use does not match the zoning category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% of Planning Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR 1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR 2</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR 3.5</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR 5.5</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR 10.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR 16</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC 2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC 3</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC 5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Office</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL-AS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL-C CCC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM-C CCC</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-AS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-IM</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH-IM</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH-IM-M43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML-AS</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML-IM</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML-IM-M43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baltimore County Zoning Map, October 2004
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Public Works

PUBLIC WATER AND SEWER

The MRCP area is located mostly within the Urban-Rural Demarcation Line (URDL). A portion of the plan area to the north is outside of the URDL. See Map 2. Land within the URDL is considered urban and either has or can be provided with public water and sewer connections. Land located outside of the URDL is considered rural, and is served by private well and septic systems. Public water and sewer connections are provided outside of the URDL to correct health issues only, which are indicated by failing well and septic systems. Currently, the water and sewer system serving the existing development in the MRCP area is adequate based upon Baltimore County standards.

The Baltimore County Department of Public Works uses a coding system to identify and distinguish both water and sewer designations. Maps 6 and 7 show the existing water and sewer designations, respectively.

PUBLIC ROADS

Functional Road Classification

The 1992 Federal Highway Functional Classification Map for the Baltimore Urbanized Area classifies roads as principal arterials, minor arterials, collectors, and local roads.

- **Freeways-Expressways** link large population or employment centers. They are intercounty or interstate oriented and accommodate long travel lengths. These roadways can be stratified into the following subclasses: (1) interstate, (2) other freeways and expressways, and (3) **Other Principal Arterials** (with partial or no control of access).

- **Minor arterials** provide a lower level of mobility while placing more of an emphasis on land access than principal arterials. These roadways typically provide a link to the collector roadway system, but ideally they do not penetrate identifiable residential neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water &amp; Sewer Designation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1/S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3/S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5/S5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6/S6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W7/S7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing Water Designations

[Map showing various roads and water designations]
Collectors provide for both land access and traffic circulation within residential, commercial, and industrial areas. Collector roads may provide service to important traffic generators such as schools and parks.

Local roads serve to provide direct access to individual land uses.

White Marsh Boulevard extended from Pulaski Highway to Eastern Highway is classified as a Freeway-Expressway. Pulaski Highway is classified as Other Principal Arterial. Middle River Road, Martin Boulevard, Ebenezer Road and proposed Campbell Boulevard are classified as Minor Arterials. Bird River Road, Compass Road and Vincent Road are classified as Collectors. All other roads within the MRCP area are classified as local.

Certain roads, perhaps because of their width or layout give the appearance of being designed for a higher than posted speed. Compass Road was identified as a road where excessive speeds are impacting the quality of life for the homeowners.

Level of Service at Signalized Intersections

Level of service (LOS) is a means of quantifying traffic flow by assigning letter grades A through F to a given location. Following is a brief description of the respective levels of service:

- LOS A – Free traffic flow.
- LOS B – Stable traffic flow, occasional delays at traffic signals.
- LOS C – Stable traffic flow, moderate delays at traffic signals.
- LOS D – Approaching unstable traffic flow, frequent delays at traffic signals.
- LOS E – Unstable traffic flow, signal back-ups.
- LOS F – Unacceptable, forced traffic flow.

Basic Services

The signalized intersections of Ebenezer Road and Pulaski Highway, and Middle River Road and Pulaski Highway are the lowest ranked signalized intersections in the study area. State Highway Administration is making construction improvements for the Pulaski Highway and Ebenezer Road intersection. Construction is expected to be complete by May 2007. Improvements for the Pulaski Highway and Middle River Road intersection have been designed. State Highway Administration will advertise the construction contracts in June 2007, with construction to start in September 2007.

Transportation Planning

The Transportation Projects and Studies section of the Master Plan 2010 identifies three road projects in the MRCP area.

- White Marsh Boulevard Extended from Pulaski Highway to Eastern Boulevard *
- Campbell Boulevard from Philadelphia Road to White Marsh Boulevard Extended *
- Transverse Road extended to Bird River Road

Projects with an asterisk are funded in either the Baltimore County’s Capital Improvement Program or the Maryland Department of Transportation’s Consolidated Transportation Program. Transverse Road extended to Bird River Road is expected to be constructed as part of a residential development project at the developer’s expense.

White Marsh Boulevard was constructed by the Maryland State Highway Administration and opened.
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Level of Service at Signalized Intersections
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signalized Intersection</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Date Tested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin Boulevard/Riverton Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>02/04/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Boulevard/Middle River Road</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>03/27/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Boulevard/Compass Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>02/28/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle River Road/Compass Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>08/20/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle River Road/Bird River Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>03/07/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle River Road/Pulaski Highway</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11/16/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebenezer Road/Pulaski Highway</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>11/14/06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for service in October 2006. Baltimore County is responsible for constructing Campbell Boulevard. A preferred alignment has been selected for the section between Philadelphia Road and Pulaski Highway and will consist of upgrading Philadelphia Road to Mohrs Lane and upgrading Mohrs Lane from Philadelphia Road to Pulaski Highway. Once the environmental permits are obtained, construction documents will be prepared for two separate phases. Phase I extends from Philadelphia Road to Pulaski Highway. Phase II extends from Pulaski Highway to Bird River Road. The final phase, Bird River Road to White Marsh Boulevard Extended, is expected to be constructed as development along the alignment takes place.

STORM DRAINS

There is one project funded in Baltimore County’s Capital Improvement Program for storm drains in the MRCP study area. The project is called Victory Villa Storm Drain Improvements, which includes two separate projects, both of which are in the design phase. The Tourque Way/Chandelle Road Project will address home, property, and road flooding and has an estimated cost of $300,000. Construction for this is expected to begin construction in June 2007.

The Right Rudder Court/Compass Road Project which will also address home, property, and road flooding has an estimated cost of $500,000. Stormwater runoff from the area behind Middle River Baptist Church is causing flooding to homes and property and Strut Court, Right Rudder Court and Compass Road. Icing is also occurring at the intersections of Compass Road and Right Rudder and Strut Court.

The work will consist of construction of a berm and/or swale along the property line between the properties of Middle River Baptist Church and properties on Right Rudder and Strut Court. Along with the berm and/or swale, storm drains will be constructed in Strut Court, Right Rudder Court and Compass Road. The existing 18” storm drain that runs from Compass Road to an existing concrete box storm drain at Middle River Middle School will be replaced with a 27” or 30” drain. This project has an anticipated advertisement date of September 2007.
Public Schools

The MRCP area is served by the following Baltimore County public schools: Glenmar, Martin Boulevard, Victory Villa, Orems and Middlesex Elementary Schools, Middle River Middle School, and Kenwood, Perry Hall and Eastern Tech High Schools.

There are two methods of measuring capacity in the Baltimore County Public School system. The State of Maryland capacity threshold is an absolute 100%. According to the State measurement system, Orems Elementary School, Kenwood High School and Perry Hall High are operating over capacity. See Tables 8-10.

Baltimore County Government uses 115% as a capacity threshold for its Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO). The 115% threshold allows cost effective measures to be used to address temporary fluctuations in student population. The APFO specifies limitations on new development should County infrastructure fail to achieve minimum levels of service. Baltimore County’s APFO can be found in the County Code under Article 32 Title 6. Using the 115% threshold, only Kenwood High School is over capacity.

Concerns related to overcrowding and the potential impact of planned developments on the long-term enrollment picture in the northeast area of Baltimore County make it crucial to develop short-term and long-term strategies. The strategies for addressing overcrowding at Kenwood High School include the reconfiguration of space at Eastern Technical High School to add 120 seats, which has already taken place and construction of a 404 seat addition at Kenwood High School. This seat addition should be open for the 2008-2009 school year. $2.0 million for engineering was added to the FY 2008 budget request for a 400 seat addition at Loch Raven High School. The seat additions at Kenwood High School, Eastern Technical High School and Loch Raven High School address the need for an additional high school in the Northeast and Central areas of the county.

While the Baltimore County Public School (BCPS) system owns various vacant sites for potential elemen-
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...and middle schools, no high school sites remain in the BCPS site bank. The Board of Education has developed a long term strategy to increase their site bank inventory should additional schools be needed. The physical condition of the schools and the ability to utilize the latest technology in the educational curriculum is also a concern.

School projects recently completed, currently underway or funded include:

- Victory Villa ES - Parking Lot was Resurfaced at a cost of $150,000. Restroom modifications were completed at cost of $229,427. Windows and blinds were replaced.
- Middle River MS – Major maintenance and systemic renovations totaling $2,328,000 were completed in 2006.
- Eastern Technical HS – A Technical Lab was converted into 4 classrooms at a cost of $435,533. Roof replacement is underway. Ceiling in an activity room was replaced.
- Perry Hall HS – A corridor was enclosed to facilitate student movement at a cost of $633,820. The cooling tower was replaced at a cost of $351,768. The boiler was also replaced.
- Kenwood HS – 404 seat addition under construction.
- Vincent Farm ES – New school under site development and construction.

Recreation and Parks

PARKLAND ACREAGE NEEDS

In order to estimate parkland acreage needs, the Department of Recreation and Parks uses the Maryland Department of Planning’s (MDP) guideline of providing 30 acres of parkland per thousand citizens. The 30 acres per thousand citizens goal does not specify the types of parks, open spaces, or recreation sites that should be provided. Instead, different types of lands are counted at various “rates” towards the acreage goal. Parks with recreational facilities, or which are slated for construction in the near future count 100% (e.g., a 30-acre park counts as 30 acres towards the goal). School-recreation centers count at a rate of 60% (thus, a 30-acre school-recreation center would count as 18 acres towards the goal). Finally, undeveloped/natural parks and open space, which have no form of recreational facility, may be counted at a rate of only one-third (so an unimproved 30-acre open space would count as only 10 acres towards the goal).

Based on the MRCP’s existing estimated population of 14,095, a total of 422.9 creditable acres of...
parkland would be needed to meet MDP’s recreation guidelines for the residents of the study area. The amount of existing parkland acreage is calculated by summing the creditable acreage of neighborhood and community parks and open spaces within the study area, plus a share of applicable regional and countywide park acreage (e.g., in the case of the study area, a portion of the nearby Eastern Regional Park is counted towards the acreage goal). An analysis of existing parkland determined that the study area is served by 244.2 creditable acres of parkland, resulting in a shortage of 178.7 acres of parkland within the area.

The most recent analysis for the County as a whole, within the 2005 Baltimore County Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan (LPPRP), indicates that there are 19 acres of parkland per thousand citizens based on year 2005 population. The figure for the Middle River Study Area is 15.9 acres per thousand citizens. This means that the study area has significantly less parkland for its population than Baltimore County as a whole. Because the acreage goal is largely based on population, any population growth that occurs in the area will increase the need for parkland.

EXISTING RECREATION AND PARKS-RELATED NEEDS

The Recreation and Parks Community Supervisors for the Middle River and Bengies-Chase communities (the study area overlaps both of these community/recreation council boundaries) were asked to give their professional assessments for their communities’ recreational needs. The following is a summary of their input.

The Middle River and Bengies-Chase communities are in need of additional indoor recreation facilities such as gymnasiums and activity rooms. Numerous programs cannot be offered as a result of a lack of facility space. Community centers are needed to serve indoor recreation programs.

There is a need for a skatepark and a sand volleyball court within the area. There is a need for a 90’ ball diamond to serve older age groups of youth baseball, as well as growing demand for adult baseball. Additional ball diamonds would be needed to accommodate program growth that would result from increased area population. Few of the facilities listed could feasibly be constructed on existing Baltimore County-owned property in the Middle River and Bengies-Chase communities or the study area in particular. The proposed Vincent Farms elementary School Recreation Center Site will, when complete, provide a number of indoor and outdoor recreational facilities that will help to meet community recreation needs. Based on the needs expressed by the Community Supervisors and the general lack of sites on which such facilities could be constructed, additional site(s) would need to be acquired to enable the development of most of the needed facilities.

Both Community Supervisors concur that neighborhood parks should be provided for newly developing residential areas situated in parts of the study area that are still somewhat rural or sparsely developed. Such parks would typically feature facilities such as playground/tot lot apparatus and picnic tables, as well as open grassy areas.
The recreational facility needs identified above are supported by the general goals and objectives of the 2005 Baltimore County Land Preservation Parks and Recreation Plan (LPPRP). Most of these recommendations are also listed as priority capital projects within the LPPRP. The Department of Recreation and Parks promotes the concept of providing safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle access via bike lanes, trails, paths, sidewalks, etc., especially in conjunction with the adopted Eastern County Bicycle and Pedestrian Access Plan.

**Police**

The MRCP area is located in the Essex Precinct in Eastern Baltimore County. Currently, police service to the MRCP area is functioning well. Twenty-five percent of Essex’s patrol resources are allocated to the MRCP area. The MRCP area generated 17.0% of the Essex precinct service demand during 2005. For 2006 Police response times for patrol units responding to calls within the MRCP area range from a high of 12.57 minutes for Post 1144 during daylight shift to a low of 6.66 minutes for Post 1127 during midnight shift. See Maps 10 and 11. Police response times tend to be higher for Post 1127 due to its relatively large coverage area (12.07 square miles). The large coverage area for Post 1127 reflects lower service demand for areas located in the MRCP area. Overall, police response times for patrol units responding to calls within the MRCP area are generally comparable to response times for the Essex precinct.

Serious crimes, as defined by the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting System, have been declining in the MRCP area since 1999. The MRCP area had a high of 63.9 serious crimes per 1,000 residents in 1999. See Table 11. In 2005, the MRCP area had 45.2 serious crimes per 1,000 residents. By comparison, the Essex precinct had 48.7 serious crimes per 1,000 residents in 2005. Countywide stats for serious crimes for 2005 were 39.3 per 1,000 residents. A total of 616 serious crimes were reported in the MRCP area during 2005, down over 18% from the 2003 total of 758 serious crimes reported in the MRCP area.

**Fire**

The Baltimore County Fire Department provides fire protection, emergency medical and emergency rescue to the Middle River Area. The department includes more that 1,000 paid emergency response personnel and more than 2,000 citizens volunteer in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11</th>
<th>Part 1 Crimes per 1,000 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 Violent Crime Total</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 Property Crime Total</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Part 1 Crime</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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the fire service as active responders, fundraisers and support personnel. Though volunteer companies are independent, private corporations, Baltimore County has a true joint fire service, with dedicated career and volunteer responders working together at emergency scenes every day on behalf of our citizens.

The Middle River Area has 3 medics, 1 truck, 1 rescue squad, and 3 fire engines. All requests for service calls are handled by the 911 center located in Towson, Maryland. The largest demand for service is emergency medical. When the closest medic unit is not available, the department will send a fire engine with trained personnel as a first responder. The department has mutual aid agreements with all the surrounding Counties and Baltimore City, so service would not be interrupted even if a large incident occurred.

Historic

Baltimore County law requires that the Landmarks Preservation Commission compile a County Inventory of structures that “potentially may be of significant historical, architectural, archeological, or cultural value.” The core of the County Inventory has traditionally been the Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties (MIHP) compiled by the Maryland Historical Trust (MHT), the State’s official historic preservation agency. New properties can be added to the County Inventory from time-to-time as they are brought to the Commission’s attention.

The LPC may also, after notice and public hearing, place Inventory properties on the Preliminary Landmarks List, subject to final approval by the County Council. (Note: Placement on the Final Landmarks List renders a property owner eligible for a County historic property rehabilitation tax credit.) Currently there are no properties within the study area that are on the Landmarks List.

Being on the County Inventory means that applications for demolition permits will be referred to the LPC for final determination. The Commission will hold a public hearing and will either vote to approve the demolition request, or to place the structure on the Preliminary Landmarks List.

Listed in Table 12 are the properties in the Plan area that are already on the County Inventory. They are identified with a MIHP/BA number. Also listed are several others that may be eligible for the Inventory. The latter were identified from a quick field survey, based on their architectural character, but without conducting any in-depth historical research.

New Preservation Law

On April 19, 2007, the Baltimore County Council enacted Bill 26-07, which codified the process of bringing demolition requests for County Inventory structures before the LPC. The bill, however, placed a term limit on this process. Accordingly, as of April 29, 2010, all regulatory functions for properties on the County Inventory will cease. That is, structures on the County Inventory will no longer be protected.

Late 19th century farmhouses, found throughout the community, may be eligible for the MIHP Inventory.
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Historic Properties
For this reason, communities are strongly encouraged to nominate those structures to the Preliminary Landmarks List that they believe fit at least one of the five criteria for landmarks listing. (To qualify for landmarks listing a structure must contribute to the architectural, or historical heritage of the county, state, or nation because of any one of the following:

1) It is associated with a personality, group, event, or series of events of historical importance; 2) It is a distinctive example of a particular architectural style or period; 3) It is a good example of the work of a noted architect or master builder; 4) It is a work of notable artistic merit; 5) It has yielded and may be likely to yield information or materials important in prehistory or history.)

### Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Register/MHT#</th>
<th>Estimated Date of Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9925 Bird River Rd</td>
<td>BA 3171</td>
<td>1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10003 Bird River Rd</td>
<td>BA 3170</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10300 Bird River Rd</td>
<td>BA 2814</td>
<td>1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10317 Bird River Rd</td>
<td>BA 2815</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10411 Bird River Rd</td>
<td>BA 2816</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10641 Bird River Rd</td>
<td>BA 2818</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811 Ebenezer Rd</td>
<td>BA 2825</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5819 Ebenezer Rd</td>
<td>BA 2826</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821 Ebenezer Rd</td>
<td>BA 2827</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5905 Ebenezer Rd</td>
<td>BA 2829</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5706 Keithley Rd</td>
<td>None yet</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 Martin Blvd</td>
<td>BA 2843</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10410 Vincent Farm Rd</td>
<td>BA 2837</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10521 Vincent Farm Rd</td>
<td>None yet</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10603 Vincent Farm Rd</td>
<td>BA 2839</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10607 Vincent Farm Rd</td>
<td>BA 2840</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>924 Wampler Rd</td>
<td>None yet</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1016 Wampler Rd</td>
<td>None yet</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Protection

#### WATER QUALITY PROTECTION

The MRCP extends over three major watersheds: the Bird River, the Back River and the Middle River. See Map 13. Baltimore County is obligated to address the water quality resulting from runoff that discharges from the County’s storm drain system. This requirement arises from Baltimore County’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. This permit obligation comes from the 1972 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, also known as the Clean Water Act. The legislation requirement is administered by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency through the Maryland Department of the Envi-
In land use terms, the main cause for poor water quality is impervious surfaces. Impervious surfaces include: rooftops of buildings, sidewalks and, in particular, the surfaces related to the automobile. Impervious surfaces are areas that water can no longer soak into and benefit from the soil’s natural filtration processes. Impervious land cover increases the velocity of stormwater runoff and allows pollutants to directly enter the stream system. Roads and parking lots generate the highest pollutant loads. Runoff constituents from these surfaces such as metals and petroleum by-products are also typically poorly controlled or reduced by stormwater management.

Tables 13 and 14 list the existing impervious surface levels for the three major watersheds and their associated subwatersheds within the MRCP. These impervious cover percents were calculated for the existing conditions in the MRCP using the County’s geographic information system (GIS). The County’s GIS contains mapped data layers for the footprint of buildings and roads/parking and watershed boundaries. See Map 14 the existing subwatershed impervious surface conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13</th>
<th>Existing Watershed Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watershed</td>
<td>Total Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back River</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird River</td>
<td>2,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle River</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14</th>
<th>Existing Watershed Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subwatershed</td>
<td>Total Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowpens Run</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkhead Creek</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeygo Run</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle River</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Briens Run</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Marsh Run</td>
<td>1,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windlass Run</td>
<td>1,061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section III: Development Potential

In order to assess the impact potential development will have on public infrastructure, the location, building type and number of units must be known. Using Baltimore County’s Geographic Information System (GIS), planning staff developed several alternatives on the likely development potential of the MRCP area. Several meetings were spent on the methodology, which included tabulating residential development already in the pipeline, identifying vacant and underutilized parcels, aggregating them together and applying full and likely densities to specific areas.

Several scenarios were created for the level of future residential development. The first scenario creates the level of future residential development based on existing zoning. The second scenario is based on staff recommendations prompted by the zoning requests raised during the 2004 Comprehensive Zoning Map Process (CZMP) and county wide growth management outlined in the Master Plan 2010. The last scenario is based on development proposals for the areas associated with zoning requests during the 2004 Comprehensive Zoning Map Process.

Future residential development founded on the existing zoning becomes the base which each successive scenario is built on. Pipeline development projects, existing land use and the zoning information are the main sources of data used to calculate the development potential. Existing land use and zoning information has already been discussed in this section. Pipeline development is defined as development that has been submitted into the County development process, but has not yet fully built.

This includes plans not yet approved and plans approved, but not yet built. See Table 15 for a current list of pipeline projects.

Map 15 shows their location within the MRCP area. A total of 1,044 units are currently in the development pipeline. Approximately 400 of those units are replacements within the Miramar Landing development. The pre-existing development, Victory Villa Gardens, which was demolished in order to develop Miramar, consisted of approximately 400 units. Therefore, while Miramar accounts for 846 new units, approximately 400 of those units will replace homes that previously existed.

Next, the remaining vacant and underutilized parcels within the MRCP were inventoried using the existing land use map. Vacant parcels have no structures built on them, while underutilized parcels may have a structure built, but because of existing zoning and their size, may have additional subdivision potential. For the purposes of this plan, parcels were divided into pods. A pod may be one parcel, but it may also be multiple contiguous parcels, which when combined, afford greater development potential. Therefore, multiple contiguous parcels, whether vacant or not, are combined for study purposes to show additional development potential. Map 16 shows the potential development pods.

The newly constructed development of Miramar Landing replaces outdated, underutilized townhouses.
## Table 15

### Approved Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Proposed Units</th>
<th>Units to be Built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10100 Bevans Lane</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gambrill Property</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grantleigh Station</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Greenfields @ White Marsh</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Greenwood Manor</td>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Laubach Property</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Miramar Landing</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jack Powell Property</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gerald D. Sherman Property</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sterling Reserve</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tito Inc., Property</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wellman Property</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Windlass Run</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>994</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Plans in Process (Not Yet Approved)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Proposed Units</th>
<th>Units to be Built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Byrnes Property</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Daisy Woods</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daisy Woods</td>
<td>SFSD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Eichberg Property</td>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Norman Marley Property</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Newton Property</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Still Meadows</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>White Marsh Run</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overall Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,044</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The development potential for each pod is then calculated by applying an assigned realized density factor for each zoning classification. This factor is an average of actual historic build out for that specific zone countywide. For example, Density Residential 2 (DR 2), while allowing up to 2 houses per acre of land, typically builds out at an average of 1.18 houses per acre. Applying the realized density to each potential pod yields 967 potential units for the MRCP area. When the 967 potential units are added to the 1,044 units from the pipeline projects, the total residential units for the MRCP area is 2,011. This potential residential unit count is what currently exists under the existing zoning within the MRCP area. This will be called Potential Development Scenario A.

The second scenario is based on staff recommendations prompted by several zoning requests raised during the 2004 Comprehensive Zoning Map Process (CZMP) and additional requests raised during the community plan effort. The requests made during the 2004 CZMP have a substantial impact in the change in density. Examples include a zoning request to change RC 2 to DR 3.5 and a zoning request to change DR 2 to DR 5.5. Map 17 identifies all the requests made through the community plan effort.

Please note that Petition F shown on Map 17 is not shown on subsequent tables or maps due to it being entirely commercial in nature. Based on all the zoning requests, staff developed a zoning proposal for analysis based on information presented by various county agencies at the advisory group meetings. Map 18 shows the composite of the staff’s zoning proposal. The composite was developed to taper down from higher density zoning near the growth center to the lower density near the rural area of the plan area, to fully utilize the county’s infrastructure investment and to avoid pockets of inconsistent zoning. Map 19 identifies the proposed zoning for the area near the triangle of Vincent Farm Road, Ebenezer Road and Bird River Road. The proposed zoning changes from RC 2, RC 3, and RC 5 to DR 1. Map 20 identifies the proposed zoning for the area along future Campbell Boulevard. The proposed zoning changes are from DR 1 and DR 2 to DR 3.5. Map 21 identifies the proposed zoning around the Campbell Boulevard and White Marsh Boulevard intersection. The proposed zoning changes are from DR 2 to BL and DR 3.5.

The first step in calculating the new potential development is to remove the potential units based on the existing zoning from the area within the zoning proposals. The realized density is then applied to the zoning associated within the zoning proposals. The potential development associated with the zoning proposals is 323 more units than the existing zoning, for a total of 1,290 units. When added with the 1,044 units from the pipeline projects, the total residential units under this scenario is 2,334. This will be called Potential Development Scenario B.

The third scenario builds on Scenario B with specific development proposals on land within the zoning proposals. The MRCP advisory team had the advantage of reviewing conceptual development plans for each rezoning petition during a presentation at a March 16, 2005 meeting. See Map 17.

Please note that Petition F shown on Map 17 is not shown on subsequent tables or maps due to it being entirely commercial in nature. Based on all the zoning requests, staff developed a zoning proposal for analysis based on information presented by various county agencies at the advisory group meetings. Map 18 shows the composite of the staff’s zoning proposal. The composite was developed to taper down from higher density zoning near the growth center to the lower density near the rural area of the plan area, to fully utilize the county’s infrastructure investment and to avoid pockets of inconsistent zoning. Map 19 identifies the proposed zoning for the area near the triangle of Vincent Farm Road, Ebenezer Road and Bird River Road. The proposed zoning changes from RC

### Description of the Developer’s Proposed Development Projects:

- **Petition A**: 417 unit mixed-housing-type residential community along Campbell Boulevard
- **Petition B**: Mixed-use development (commercial and residential). Sixty condominiums and 21,000 square feet of commercial space
- **Petition C**: 145 unit mixed-housing-type residential community along White Marsh Boulevard. This project is a joint effort by three separate
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landowners and three separate developers. Two of the land owners have already gotten county approval for developing their land independently.

Petition D  45 unit single family detached residential community along Campbell Boulevard
Petition E  48 unit single family detached subdivision along Ebenezer Road. Part of land has been purchased by Baltimore County for developing Vincent Farm Elementary School.
Petition G  123 unit single family detached subdivision along Campbell Boulevard

Most of the development proposals are obtainable with the zoning proposals outlined in Scenario B. However, the densities are higher than the realized densities used in the analysis. In order to achieve the higher level density, the development would utilize the Planned Unit Development. This approval process allows creativity to mix unit types and address area requirements in return for improvements in site design and architectural quality. One of the development proposals is based on zoning that was requested under the 2004 CZMP. For this scenario we substitute the unit total from the development proposal with the unit total develop for the zoning proposals in Scenario B. This generates a unit count of 1,355. When this is added to the 1,044 units from the pipeline projects, the total residential units under this scenario is 2,399. This will be called Potential Development Scenario C.

The table 16 compares the different alternatives for assessing the level of potential development in the MRCP area. Scenario A represents the level of potential residential development using the existing zoning. Scenario B represents the level of potential residential development, if the proposed zoning changes are implemented and developed through the traditional development process. Scenario C represents the level of potential residential development, if the proposed zoning changes are implemented and developed through either a Planned Unit Development or a Renaissance Redevelopment Project. This scenario closely represents the level of residential units presented by the developers to the advisory group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Scenario B</th>
<th>Scenario C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Development</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Units with Existing Zoning</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units from Existing Zoning on Items 1-3</td>
<td>-450</td>
<td>-450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units from Proposed Zoning on Items 1-3</td>
<td>773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units from Developer's Proposals on Items A-G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>2,011</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>2,399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16
Section IV:
Recommendations

Vision Statement

The Middle River Community Plan area will offer a diverse blend of high quality housing, employment, and educational and recreational opportunities with supporting infrastructure in place prior to or concurrent with their openings. New residential communities will be focused along White Marsh Boulevard and Campbell Boulevard to ensure minimum vehicular impact on local roads within the community. Industry concentrated along White Marsh Boulevard between Windlass Run and Eastern Avenue will provide employment opportunities. A centrally located community park will provide opportunities for both active and passive recreation. Vincent Farm Elementary School will be constructed to address new students, which will also provide additional recreation opportunities. A system of walkways and bikeways will connect residential areas, recreation areas and employment areas. New residential development will be well designed and minimize impacts to the environment.

The 2004 CZMP zoning requests for this area initiated the discussion among the existing community, business interests, and county agencies as to what the appropriate type and level of development should take place in the area. After thorough examination of the issues, a clear consensus on the type and level of growth has not been reached. For some of the recommendations, the Advisory Group members could not reach a consensus among themselves or with positions expressed by the county staff.

As the recommendations are presented, these differences of opinion will be expressed from both viewpoints in order to present the complete discussion with the Advisory Group. There is an expectation that as the community plan moves toward adoption, the discussion of the issues with the Planning Board and the County Council will be able to unite all interests toward a common goal that strengthens the community.

Zoning Map Amendments

The main issue separating the position of some members of the advisory group position from the staff position is what the future appropriate zoning designations should be for the MRCP area. The difference of opinion between the two perspectives can be summarized by the approach on how to address some of the existing areas of concern.

To quickly summarize, if zoning items 1 through 3 are approved, the number of residential units will increase by about 320 units more than using the existing zoning. If alternative development processes are used
with the zoning items, the residential units could increase by close to 400 units more than using the existing zoning.

An advisory group consisting of 8 representatives from the community was instrumental in providing feedback to the planning staff. Their preference is the zoning items identified as 1 through 3 should not be approved. Their position is that the area population is currently overstressing the existing and planned infrastructure. The public investment that is taking place should be focused on addressing existing deficiencies and raise the level of support for the current residents before any new residents are added through new development. They also state that a more localized perspective should be applied to growth management. New development within the existing community has started to change the character of the community. That development includes new housing types, changing demographics, and new neighborhood norms.

The advisory group feels as though the proposed zoning will ultimately put too much stress on the current and proposed infrastructure. With the level of current development underway, it will be hard to gauge how future development will impact the MRCP study area until the development in the pipeline is completed. The following are some of the concerns expressed by the advisory group in their opposition to the zoning recommendations.

- The influx of new students associated with the proposed development will overstress the capacity of the school facilities. A new elementary school is being constructed, but there is also a concern at the middle school and high school level.

- The level of service designation at the intersections of Middle River Road and Pulaski Highway, (F) and Ebenezer Road and Pulaski Highway, (D); indicates the current road network will not be able to handle the traffic associated with the proposed development.

- Adequate level of parkland acreages will not be met with the proposed level of development under Maryland Department of Planning’s guideline of 30 acres of parkland per 1,000 people.

- Members of the advisory group felt that the proposed housing would not be comparable to the housing stock that is currently in the area. Retaining the existing zoning would more likely keep the character similar to the existing single family detached structures.

- The proposed development under the existing zoning will negatively impact the Windlass Run and Cowpens Run subwatersheds. The zoning recommendations will only further degrade these watersheds with the additional impervious surface associated with additional housing units.

The county planning staff recommends the zoning issues identified as 1 through 3 should be approved. The overall effect is the zoning issues will increase the
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By concentrating on the Master Plan 2010 goals and the specific recommended actions, the Middle River Community Plan will create a stable pace of growth and stimulate new private investment that will create a stronger, more vibrant community.

Baltimore County has a long history of using the URDL as a land management strategy. By planning for the majority of development to occur within its urban areas, where public services are more economically provided, the most efficient use is made of tax dollars. Baltimore County and the State of Maryland have invested over $67 Million to construct the extension of White Marsh Boulevard. The construction of this road was intended to provide access to industrially zoned land and the potential for 15,000 jobs with family supporting wages. Over the next decade, developers expect to build 5 million square feet of office, flex/office, warehouse, and industrial space, in addition to 400,000 square feet of stores and two hotels along the White Marsh Boulevard corridor.

The addition of water and sewer service along the White Marsh Boulevard sets the stage for new economic growth to take place that will benefit the MRCP area and the county as a whole. The Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) has created an even greater sense of urgency to complete the investment of infrastructure and to capture jobs in the MRCP area.

BRAC is a function of the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) that recommends the closing, consolidating, and expansion of military installations throughout the U.S. In November 2005 a new round of recommendations were made by BRAC, affecting more than 800 military installations. This round of recommendations is the largest BRAC implementation to date. Maryland is one of the very few states to experience a significant net gain from the 2005 BRAC. The state anticipates growing as a result of expansion of the four military installations, including Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG) in Harford County,

New development should be compatible with the existing character of the community.

number and allow a variety in housing types in the MRCP area. Staff’s recommendation is based on a number of factors that will be discussed in follow up sections. Baltimore County’s Master Plan 2010 outlines specific goals that are designed to create healthy communities. These goals are applicable to the MRCP area and are listed below.

❖ Ensure adequate supply of jobs providing family supporting wages by addressing the critical needs of employers.
❖ Preserve the county’s significant investment in its established communities by reinvesting resources to maintain all aspects of community life.
❖ Ensure that new development and redevelopment is of high quality and compatible with its surroundings.
❖ Continue to safeguard environmental resources, particularly in watershed areas.
❖ Provide quality parks and recreation opportunities for all citizens.
❖ Promote the identification, protection, and restoration of historic resources.
Fort George Meade in Anne Arundel County, Andrews Air Force in Prince George’s County, and Bethesda National Naval Medical Center in Montgomery County. A total 60,000 jobs are expected to move into Maryland from expansion of the above four installations. APG and Fort Meade would each receive the largest growth. The full implementation of the 2005 BRAC is due September 2011.

Baltimore County is anticipated to gain households as well as indirect and induced employment from the 2005 BRAC. Southeast Baltimore County is among one of the essential areas in Maryland where significant BRAC growth could occur.

BRAC will take place in several phases throughout the state: New households will be created by 2015; whereas job growth will continue into the 2015-2020 period to reflect induced employment lagging behind creation of new households in prior phases. According to RESI, a research arm of Towson University, for Baltimore County, about one half of non-embedded contractors are scientific and technical services. Management of companies and enterprises, transportation and warehousing, and remediation services also are main components of non-embedded employment in the county. Scientific, technical, and remediation services are core industries for indirect employment. Employment in health care and social services, retail trade, and accommodation and food services are expected in Baltimore County from the induced effect of BRAC.

The types and salary grades of future employment will have implications on social service programs, business development and recruitment, workforce training, transportation improvements, and education in southeast Baltimore County.

In addition to maximizing the county’s infrastructure and placing less development pressure on rural areas, focusing development within the URDL has additional benefits. One important benefit within and adjacent to the MRCP area is known as “live where you work.” The construction of residential communities adjacent to White Marsh Boulevard and Campbell Boulevard will provide housing opportunities for the MD 43 Employment Center projects proposed for White Marsh Boulevard between the Windlass Run and Eastern Avenue. Providing high quality housing options will enhance the ability of the Baltimore County Department of Economic Development to attract high quality manufacturing tenants. Manufacturing tenants provide family supporting jobs and demand other business services that produce secondary economic growth. An example of this was demonstrated by the recent announcement by BGE Home. In early January 2007, BGE Home, a Constellation Energy subsidiary, announced that the company would relocate its headquarters and warehouse, approximating 200 jobs to the Baltimore Crossroads @ 95.

The timing of the proposed development associated with the zoning changes is critical to the quality of life as this community grows and evolves. For most major subdivisions it take approximately one and one half to two years from the concept plan submittal until the first occupancy permits are issued. The lag time for these developments to get approved and for new residents to move in will provide additional time for infrastructure under construction and planned to be completed.

Land Use and URDL

The MRCP area is mostly urban in that the majority of the land area is contained within the URDL. However, a triangular area roughly bounded by Ebenezer, Vincent and Bird River Roads is mostly outside of the URDL. This area averages a residential build out density of one house per acre or DR 1, which is an urban zoning density. Furthermore, historical septic failures have led to most of the area requiring
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sewer service for health reasons. The proposed location of the Vincent Farm Elementary School within this area requires water and sewer service. Based on the zoning recommendations associated with zoning request 1, the URDL should be moved to reflect the new zoning. See map 22 for the proposed location of the URDL.

A new proposed land use map reflects the adoption of the zoning issues and the URDL relocation. The cumulative changes are illustrated on Map 23, the proposed land use map.

**Public Works**

Public Water and Sewer Designation Recommended Actions

- All properties within the URDL as proposed by this plan should have their water and sewer designation be changed to (W-3, S-3), be served either by water and sewer within the 6-year Capital Program period or (W-1, S-1), as currently having service. The proposed water and sewer service area designations are shown on Maps 24 and 25.

The fundamental purpose of designating a portion of Baltimore County as urban is to indicate presence of or the intention to provide public water and sewer service. The Baltimore County Master Plan 2010 and the 10-Year Baltimore County Water Supply and Sewerage Plan have a complementary relationship. When either plan is updated or amended, the complementary plan is automatically updated by reference. Adoption of this plan by the County Council as an amendment to Master Plan 2010 will automatically amend the 10-Year Water Supply and Sewerage Plan to incorporate the recommended changes to the water and sewer area designations in the planning area.

**SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE**

On July 26, 2005, the Department of Justice, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Maryland Department of the Environment announced a major Clean Water Act settlement with Baltimore County. Combined with a joint federal-state settlement against the City of Baltimore, this settlement is designed to prevent chronic sewage overflows to local waterways, including the Chesapeake Bay.

Development that is constructed and placed “online” with the Baltimore County sewer system in areas that are at capacity may result in additional overflows of raw sewage into local waterways. Interceptors and force mains are particularly susceptible to overflows during rain events when additional water infiltrates the system. During the period of the consent decree, Baltimore County’s sewage system will be monitored for compliance. If sewage overflows the sanitary system and adds to the quantities that served as a baseline for the consent decree, then Baltimore County faces additional fines for the additional overflow.

The MRCP study area is dependent upon four pumping stations to convey sewage to the city-owned Back River Wastewater Treatment Plant, which has adequate capacity for the proposed development recommended by this plan. Map 26 shows, schematically, the pumping stations and pipes that will service the development proposed by the MRCP. It does not show the treatment plant, which is off the map to the southwest. Two of the four pumping stations conveying sewage to the treatment plant from the study area require upgrades and/or replacements in order to service the proposed developments envisioned for MRCP area and beyond.

Ideally, sewage systems function by gravity. But when topography is such along the path of a sewage line that gravity won’t work, pumping stations must
Middle River Community Plan

The White Marsh pumping station is under construction.

be constructed. The White Marsh pumping station, located on Reames Road, is close to capacity and will need to be completely replaced. The Stemmers Run pumping station, located outside of the study area, but still an important link in the conveyance chain, will have a secondary pumping station constructed to augment the existing station.

Connecting the pumping stations are force mains, which are pipes under pressure from the pumping station. A new 42" diameter force main, paralleling the existing 42" force main between the White Marsh and Stemmers Run pumping stations will need to be constructed. A 54" diameter force main, paralleling the existing 48" force main between the Stemmers Run Pumping station and the Back River Neck Treatment Plant will also need to be constructed.

Finally, a 24" interceptor will need to be constructed from the Windlass Run Pumping Station south along Windlass Run, to provide conveyance to development parcels proposed along and off of White Marsh Boulevard. Interceptors tie in multiple subdivision hook-ups and convey them to either pumping stations or treatment plants. In this case, the Windlass Run interceptor will convey sewage by gravity from the development areas to the Windlass Run Pumping Station. This project is scheduled to be complete one year after the acquisition of all necessary right-of-ways. Therefore, it is important to ensure that infrastructure improvements occur prior to occupancies of additional major development approvals within the MRCP area.

**SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE RECOMMENDED ACTIONS**

- The following improvements shall be completed before building permits are issued to development projects that are required to tie into them:
  - The White Marsh Pumping Station
  - The second Stemmers Run Pumping Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Initiated Sewer Construction Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Marsh Pumping Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stemmers Run Pumping Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Inch White Marsh Force Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Inch Stemmers Run Force Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Inch Windlass Run Interceptor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sewer Projects

Stemmers Run Pumping Station
Projected Completion 07/2007

Windlass Run Pumping Station

24’ Windless Run Interceptor
Projected Completion 1 year from
Row acquisition

42’ White Marsh Force Main
Projected Completion 07/2007

White Marsh Pumping Station
Projected Completion 10/2007

Bird River Pumping Station

54’ Stemmers Run Force Main
Projected Completion 07/2007

Stemmers Run Pumping Station
Projected Completion 07/2007

Windlass Run Pumping Station

24’ Windless Run Interceptor
Projected Completion 1 year from
Row acquisition

42’ White Marsh Force Main
Projected Completion 07/2007

White Marsh Pumping Station
Projected Completion 10/2007

Bird River Pumping Station

54’ Stemmers Run Force Main
Projected Completion 07/2007

Stemmers Run Pumping Station
Projected Completion 07/2007

Windlass Run Pumping Station

24’ Windless Run Interceptor
Projected Completion 1 year from
Row acquisition

42’ White Marsh Force Main
Projected Completion 07/2007

White Marsh Pumping Station
Projected Completion 10/2007

Bird River Pumping Station

54’ Stemmers Run Force Main
Projected Completion 07/2007

Stemmers Run Pumping Station
Projected Completion 07/2007

Windlass Run Pumping Station

24’ Windless Run Interceptor
Projected Completion 1 year from
Row acquisition

42’ White Marsh Force Main
Projected Completion 07/2007

White Marsh Pumping Station
Projected Completion 10/2007

Bird River Pumping Station

54’ Stemmers Run Force Main
Projected Completion 07/2007
The force mains between these stations and the Back River Treatment Facility

The Windlass Run Interceptor (these projects are detailed in Table 17)

The storm drain systems in the Wampler Road Catchment Area

**WATER INFRASTRUCTURE RECOMMENDED ACTIONS**

- Construct new water mains in the MRCP area to provide water service to the residential and manufacturing development projects that have been planned in conjunction with the extension of White Marsh Boulevard. These water mains will also provide added capacity for future residential and commercial development within the MRCP area, as well as increase water pressure in existing communities. The recommended projects are listed in Table 18 with costs and time frames for the water improvements. Map 27 denotes the location for the water projects.

**TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE**

Master Plan 2010 identifies three road improvement projects that are partly located within the MRCP area. The following two projects are identified as “projects in capital program” category and are in various stages of engineering and construction. These projects are shown on Map 27.

- White Marsh Boulevard from Pulaski Highway to Eastern Avenue has been constructed.
- Construct Campbell Boulevard from Philadelphia Road to White Marsh Boulevard.

Developers will build proposed Campbell Boulevard between Bird River Road and White Marsh Boulevard, as the individual parcels of land being developed require access. Completion time will be dependent on new development. These extensions are needed to improve local circulation and to provide access for future development of the vacant land lying west of Windlass Run.

The third Master Plan 2010 road improvement project is Transverse Road extended to Bird River Road. Transverse Road extended to Bird River Road is expected to be constructed as part of a residential

**Table 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Contract Award Price</th>
<th>Notice to Proceed Date</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Marsh Blvd 24&quot; Main</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelso Dr 36&quot; Main, Rossville Blvd to Martin Blvd</td>
<td>$3,700,000</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>Summer 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse Ave 30&quot; Main, Martin Blvd to Middle River Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle River Rd 24&quot; Main, Bird River Rd to Pulaski Hwy</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski Hwy 24&quot; Main, Middle River Rd to Ebenezer Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development project at the developer’s expense.

The extension of Compass Road from its terminus eastward to Wampler Road is a joint transportation project. A developer is building a portion of the connection and acquiring the necessary right-of-way and environmental permits to construct a culvert over the stream bed. When this is completed, the county will finish constructing the remaining portion. These last two transportation projects will help local circulation and reduce local traffic being directed to the arterial road network for local transportation trips.

The Ebenezer Road Bridge over Windlass Run (Bridge No. 294) has construction funding to address traffic accidents as well as flooding at this stream crossing. Traffic will be maintained during the construction period. Right-of-way acquisition and utility relocation is necessary before the bridge reconstruction can take place. Utility relocation work is expected to begin in the Spring of 2007. The construction contract for the project has been awarded, with construction to begin in the Fall of 2007. The project shall be completed before building permits are issued to development projects on the east side of new Route 43.

State Highway Administration has active projects underway to improve the level of service of the intersections at Pulaski Highway and Ebenezer Road and Pulaski Highway and Middle River Road. State Highway Administration is currently making construction improvements for the Pulaski Highway and Ebenezer Road intersection. Construction is expected to be complete by May 2007. Improvements for the Pulaski Highway and Middle River Road intersection have been designed. State Highway Administration will advertise the construction contracts in June 2007, with construction to start in September 2007.

Another road connection between Earls Road and White Marsh Boulevard as shown on Map 27 should be built in the future. While this connection is outside the MRCP area, its need is partially driven by issues within the MRCP area. High volumes of large trucks travel Ebenezer Road daily. The trucks originate from the LaFarge quarry located on Earls Road. Due to the rural nature of Ebenezer Road, conflicts result. Once the proposed Vincent Farm Elementary School opens (2008 – 2009), further conflicts will occur. Now that White Marsh Boulevard is open, some or all of the truck traffic may choose to travel south to Eastern Avenue Extended in order to access White Marsh Boulevard. This would put the trucks in direct conflict with the heavily traveled intersection of Eastern Avenue and Carroll Island Road, which handles a majority of the Bowleys Quarters peninsula traffic. The redevelopment of the GSA Depot, which is located virtually at the intersection of White Marsh Boulevard and Eastern Avenue, would also likely be adversely affected by the truck traffic. Finally, once the quarry ceases operation and is reclaimed, the subsequent use, as well as the local communities and local road network, would benefit from the direct access provided from Earls Road to White Marsh Boulevard.
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ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

- Construct Campbell Boulevard from Philadelphia Road to White Marsh Boulevard, with the county constructing the section between Philadelphia Road and Bird River Road and Developers constructing the section between Bird River Road and White Marsh Boulevard. The design of Campbell Boulevard should include bicycle lanes, sidewalks, and a landscaped median along its full length. Baltimore County will build proposed Campbell Boulevard between Bird River Road and Pulaski Highway and between Pulaski Highway and Philadelphia Road.

- Provide a road connection between Earls Road and White Marsh Boulevard to create stronger transportation network allowing enhanced circulation opportunities.

- Transverse Road should be extended to Bird River Road. The construction should occur as the development associated with the improvement proceeds.

- Compass Road should be extended to Wampler Road. The construction should occur as the development associated with the improvement proceeds.

- State Highway Administration should make improvements to the intersections of Pulaski Highway and Ebenezer Road and Pulaski Highway and Middle River Road.

- The improvements to Wampler Road between Bird River Road and Pawnee Road associated with new development should be matched by Baltimore County to enhance the entire section of Wampler Road.

- Planned improvements to Bengies Road shall be completed prior to the issuance of building permits.

- Any new residential development shall be required to access the new Route 43 or Campbell Boulevard. Access to Bird River Road from such developments should not be permitted.

Public Schools

The maintenance, modernity, and capacity of the public schools in the Middle River Community Plan area are points of concern for the residential community. The school facilities are a focal point of the community that are often used as benchmarks for the health and viability of the community. In addition to improving school performance, providing adequate school facilities helps demonstrate the commitment to providing a quality education to the current and future residents of Baltimore County.

PUBLIC SCHOOL RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

- The additional students expected to result from the pipeline development and remaining development in the MRCP area require the construction of a new elementary school. Baltimore County has purchased additional land adjacent to the Vincent Farm Elementary School site to allow for the construction of a new 700 seat elementary school. The FY 2007 Capital Budget has $23,820,000 in construction funds programmed in FY 2007. Vincent Farm is expected to be open for students for the 2008 – 2009 school year.
Based on the anticipated development in the MRCP area, Middle School enrollment is projected to remain under capacity through 2014. The normal strategies for relief of overcrowding, such as annexation plans, boundary changes, and relocatable classrooms, will be effective in addressing overcrowding at the middle and high school levels.

Given the development levels proposed by the MRCP and the existing capacity with the modifications already in progress at the area high schools, there should be enough capacity at the high school level to accommodate the anticipated high school students in the MRCP area.

Baltimore County should retain the Nottingham and Chase school sites owned by BCPS for future needs. A determination as to whether these sites could accommodate a future school facility should be made. If not, land surrounding them should be examined for possible purchase to make the sites feasible for future school facilities.

Baltimore County and BCPS should investigate the possibility of purchasing currently available acreage (210 acres) on the east side of Ebenezer Road, adjacent to the plan boundary, for the future school facilities.

Recreation and Parks

When fully developed under existing zoning, the MRCP area would require 152.6 additional acres of parkland to meet MDP’s guideline of 30 acres of parkland per 1,000 citizens. Implementing the zoning recommendations items 1 through 3 would increase the required acreage to meet MDP’s guideline by 24.5 acres. Implementing the zoning recommendations on items 1 through 3 and the developer’s proposals would increase the required acreage to meet MDP’s guideline by 29.4 acres.

No attempt has been made to calculate the potential contribution proposed developments in the plan area will make toward parkland goals. Many developers choose to pay Baltimore County a fee in lieu of dedicating open space as part of their developments. Frequently, this actually works out better for the County and its citizens because the open space that would have been dedicated would have been of an unusable size, quality, or location. The fees can be accumulated to purchase, develop or redevelop sites that will provide more local use to communities than the subdivision open space would have.

RECREATION AND PARKS RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

Joint acquisition by the Department of Recreation and Parks and Baltimore County Public Schools of the properties adjacent to Vincent Elementary School Recreation Center Site will make progress towards the parkland acreage goal (only 60% of the site
Middle River Community Plan

The playground at Glenmar Elementary School is easily accessible to community residents.

The acreage of school recreation centers are creditable towards the acreage goal).

- Designate the entire MRCP area, Map 2, as a master plan conflict evaluation area for potential recreation and park sites. This would enable any concept plan to be evaluated for its suitability as an active or passive recreation area. This evaluation could recommend that 1) the entire property be purchased by Baltimore County; 2) A portion of the property be purchased by Baltimore County; or 3) that the open space dedication be provided in a certain location on the property, which might require the redesign of the subdivision. The evaluation would take into account contiguous properties and the possibility of assembling portions of contiguous properties, the sum of which would be greater than the value of the isolated parts. Any or all of these options could be exercised in order to assemble usable recreation and parks sites.

- Concerted effort should be made by land developers, in cooperation with County agencies, to dedicate at least 29.4 acres of land for parks, open spaces or recreation sites in the MRCP area.

### Police and Fire

The Baltimore County Police Department projects that the current level of police services at the Essex precinct will be adequate to handle additional growth in the MRCP area. This assessment considered existing and projected changes in officer workload in the study area and precinct.

The Baltimore County Fire Department also projects that the current level of resources will be adequate to handle additional growth in the MRCP area.

#### POLICE AND FIRE RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

- The police precinct’s post car boundaries (see Maps 10 and 11) should be monitored to equalize or balance officer workload resulting from the new development.

- Residential communities must work with the Baltimore County Police Department to develop a program of increased vigilance and frequency for monitoring speeds along local roads, such as Compass Road and other residential streets.

- The Fire Department will monitor the impact of the MRCP area development on fire resources and will proactively address any issues that may be expected as development occurs.

### Historic Preservation

The development proposed for the MRCP area should not have any significant impact on the historic
resources present in the area. The Office of Planning will continue to monitor development as it occurs and evaluate proposed development in terms of its impact on existing historic properties. Require the coordination and consideration of road improvement projects with historic sites.

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities**

Communities where people can walk and bike are being increasingly recognized as the most “livable” communities. Walking and bicycling provide many benefits. In addition to being alternative transportation choices that can save money and reduce air pollution, walking and bicycling provide opportunities for recreation and exercise. Residents walking and biking in the neighborhood increases interaction among neighbors, thereby helping to establish a sense of community interaction among neighbors.

**PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE RECOMMENDED ACTIONS**

- The MRCP area should include a comprehensive system of walkways and bikeways linking all residential, employment, and recreation areas within the planning area, and providing appropriate links to the surrounding area.
- Public roads should include a sidewalk, separated from the roadbed with an amply sized green area containing street trees.
- Public roads should accommodate bicycles in some fashion. For low traffic roads, bicycles may share the road; roads with a moderate amount of traffic should include a widened curb lane or shoulder.
- Take advantage of opportunities to create hiker-biker trails in association with the Windlass Run stream system. These park-like “greenway” trails could wind through the natural areas of the planning area. Using a stream crossing, a trail could link the residential development to the employment area.
- Use the improvements identified in the recently adopted Eastern Baltimore County Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Plan as a foundation to add new pedestrian and bicycle improvements as the MRCP area develops.
- Bicycle improvements are not supported along Bird River Road, Ebenezer Road and Compass Road. Bicycle and pedestrian improvements should be considered with any new development. Proposed bicycle improvements within the plan area should not be made if property is taken from existing property owners.

The following bicycle related improvements are recommended by the draft Eastern Baltimore County Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Plan. See Map 28.

- #66 - Martin Boulevard from Eastern Boulevard to Pulaski Highway - Bike lane by striping
- #68 - Middle River from Pulaski Highway to Martin Boulevard - Bike lane by striping
- #102 - Pulaski Highway from Martin Boulevard to Harford County Line - Bike lane by striping
- #155 - Bengies Area Trail from Campbell Boulevard to the Marc Station - Off-road shared use trail
- #162 - Campbell Boulevard from Philadelphia Road to MD 43 - Bike lane by right of way widening
- #173 - MD 43 from Bird River Road to Eastern
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Boulevard - Off-road shared use trail

#205 - MD 43 from Pulaski Highway to Eastern Boulevard - Share the road bicycle/route signage

#223 - MD 43 from Bird River Road to Pulaski Highway - Off-road shared use trail

The following pedestrian related improvements are recommended by the draft Eastern Baltimore County Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Plan. See Map 29.

#5 - Compass Road from Martin Boulevard to Middle River Road - New sidewalk.

#9 - Ebenezer Road from Pulaski Highway to Eastern Avenue - New shared use (pedestrian and bicycle lanes)

#17 - Martin Boulevard at Middle River Road - New sidewalk, drainage, crosswalk signals, no right turn on red

#38 - Compass Road at Middle River Road - Crosswalk signals

#50 - Compass Road at Martin Boulevard - Bus Shelter

Design Issues

A community plan provides an opportunity to address site or architectural design issues. While the MRCP Advisory Team meetings primarily focused on ensuring adequate infrastructure for existing and proposed residential development, a discussion regarding design issues occurred during one of the Advisory Team meetings. The discussion explored the opportunity to map and include the MRCP area within Baltimore County Design Review Panel (DRP) purview.

The DRP was established by Section 32-4-203 of the Baltimore County Code 2004, as amended. The goal of the DRP is to encourage design excellence through the application of design guidelines contained in the Master Plan, the Comprehensive Manual of Development Policies, adopted community plans and/or Section 260 of the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations, as applicable. The DRP’s general charge is to assess the overall quality of a project. The DRP acts in a technical consulting capacity; its recommendations are binding to the Hearing Officer and County agencies.

Panhandle lots that are created through minor subdivisions often create orientation, open space and parking problems. This occurs when too many lots are squeezed on to a small a piece of land with access problems.

DESIGN RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

- Designate a Design Review Panel area for the Middle River Community Plan as shown on Map 30. Development proposals using alternative processes, such as the Renaissance Pilot Program or the Planned Unit Development, should be exempt from the Design Review Panel. Before the Design Review Panel area is implemented, guidelines should be developed so the DRP has benchmarks against which they can measure the proposed development.

- Legislation should be developed to eliminate panhandle lots through the minor subdivision development process in the MRCP area. An example of how to address this issue can be found in the South Perry Hall – White Marsh Plan. The South Perry Hall – White Marsh Plan recommended a minimum width for any single-family detached lot of 75 feet as measured along both the front wall and rear wall.
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of the dwelling unit. This did not apply to alternative site design dwellings. A more detailed examination needs to take place to determine if this solution was effective and should be applied the MRCP area.

**Impervious Surface Impact**

An increase in impervious surface is expected in the MRCP area as a result of new development. Two of the subwatersheds that are located in the MRCP study would show deteriorated stream conditions based on the increase in impervious surfaces from future development activity associated with the zoning proposals. Windlass Run subwatershed is expected to change from a sensitive watershed to an impacted watershed and Cowpens Run subwatershed is expected to change from an impacted watershed to a damaged watershed when build out is completed. See Table 19.

To possibly mitigate the potential impairment to streams, design criteria for minimizing impacts to water quality could supplement development plan requirements. Current requirements include a rigorous review of the environmental impact of a proposed development, including a review of steep slopes, erodible soils, non-tidal wetlands, streams, floodplains, forest buffers (forest buffer easements, both existing and proposed), forest (forest conservation easements, both existing and proposed), water quality and suitable outfalls, as well as a review of the location of proposed development in relation to existing agricultural operations, agricultural easements, prime and productive soils. The following additional criteria should supplement these standard requirements.

Better site design should consider: 1) residential streets and parking lots, 2) individual lot development, 3) conservation of natural areas. As much as 65% of the total impervious cover in the landscape can be classified as “habitat for cars”, which includes streets, parking lots, driveways and other surfaces designed for the car. Innovative site design can help address ways to reduce car habitat in new development.

Baltimore County in conjunction with the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, Home Builders Association of Maryland and the Center for Watershed Protection recently completed a systematic review of local codes and ordinances with a focus to promoting more environmentally sensitive and economically viable development. This process, known as Builders for the Bay, was a collaborative consensus initiative designed to pull together local government agencies, the development community, neighborhood organizations, engineering and planning firms and groups interested in environmental and conservation issues. The five categories that were reviewed through this process included: residential streets and parking lots, lot development, natural areas, stormwater management, and the review and approval process. Over 40 principles with recommendations and action items were developed through this consensus building process. Time frames for implementation were established for each principle.

**WATER QUALITY RECOMMENDED ACTIONS**

- Continue working on the principles identified in the Builders for the Bay June 2006 Report with the objective they shall be used within the plan area as growth takes place.
- Builders and developers should make every practicable effort in stormwater management and creation of impervious surfaces to avoid further deterioration in the condition of the subwatersheds. Development plans should be required to include specific site design requirements to prevent further deterioration.
Middle River Community Plan

Map 30

Legend
- Roads
- Future Road Extensions
- Plan Area Boundary
- URDL
- MRCP Proposed DR/RO Areas
- Parcels

Proposed MRCP
Design Review Area
Renaissance Opportunity Area

2,000 0 2,000 Feet
Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subwatershed</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Existing Impervious Acres</th>
<th>Build Out Impervious Acres w/Zoning</th>
<th>Percent Impervious after Build Out</th>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Condition after Build Out with Zoning Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cowpens Run</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>Impacted</td>
<td>Damaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkhead Creek</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>Impacted</td>
<td>Impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeygo Run</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>Damaged</td>
<td>Damaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle River</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>Damaged</td>
<td>Damaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Briens Run</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>130.5</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>Impacted</td>
<td>Impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Marsh Run</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>209.4</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>Impacted</td>
<td>Impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windlass Run</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>154.2</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>Impacted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Number</th>
<th>Owner, Petitioner</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning and</th>
<th>Requested Zoning and</th>
<th>Staff Recommendations</th>
<th>Planning Board Recommendations</th>
<th>County Council Decisions</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td>Office of Planning</td>
<td>RC 5</td>
<td>59.290</td>
<td>DR 1 306.560</td>
<td>DR 1 306.560</td>
<td>DR 2 306.560</td>
<td>DR 3.5 41.490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC 3</td>
<td>194.000</td>
<td>Total 306.560</td>
<td>Total 306.560</td>
<td>Total 306.560</td>
<td>RC 2 28.180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC 2</td>
<td>53.270</td>
<td>Total 306.560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC 3 194.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC 5 42.890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 306.560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-</td>
<td>Office of Planning</td>
<td>DR 2</td>
<td>272.830</td>
<td>DR 3.5 276.740</td>
<td>DR 3.5 276.740</td>
<td>DR 3.5 276.740</td>
<td>BL 15.250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DR 1</td>
<td>3.910</td>
<td>Total 276.740</td>
<td>Total 276.740</td>
<td>Total 276.740</td>
<td>DR 3.5 261.490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 276.740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-</td>
<td>Office of Planning</td>
<td>DR 2</td>
<td>62.630</td>
<td>BL 3.510</td>
<td>BL 11.730</td>
<td>BL 11.730</td>
<td>BL 11.730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DR 3.5</td>
<td>59.120</td>
<td>DR 3.5 50.900</td>
<td>DR 3.5 50.900</td>
<td>DR 3.5 50.900</td>
<td>DR 3.5 50.900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 62.630</td>
<td>Total 62.630</td>
<td>Total 62.630</td>
<td>Total 62.630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COUNTY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND
Legislative Session 2007, Legislative Day No. 15

Bill No. 59-07

Mr. Joseph Bartenfelder, Councilman

By the County Council, August 6, 2007

A BILL
ENTITLED

AN ACT concerning

The Comprehensive Zoning Map - Middle River Area

FOR the purpose of repealing a portion of the existing zoning map for the Sixth Councilmanic District and to adopt an official zoning map for the portion of the Sixth Councilmanic District of Baltimore County known as the Middle River Area, such map to be known as the Official Comprehensive Zoning Map for the Middle River area of Baltimore County and to supersede any previous zoning maps approved by the County Council of Baltimore County for that particular area, all pursuant to the provisions of the Middle River Community Plan.

WHEREAS, the County Council approved Resolution 77-07 adopting and incorporating the Middle River Community Plan into the Baltimore County Master Plan 2010 to be a guide for the development of the Middle River area of the County; and

WHEREAS, the plan includes land use and zoning recommendations and specifically recommends that new zoning be enacted outside of the County’s four year comprehensive zoning
process; and

WHEREAS, the County Council adopted Bill 51-94 which authorized a comprehensive zoning process in designated portions of the County within the URDL in conjunction with revisions or updates to the Master Plan, after receipt of recommendations from the Planning Board and in accordance with certain procedures set forth in the Bill; and

WHEREAS, the County Council approved Resolution 40-04 which authorized the Baltimore County Planning Board to review the existing zoning maps in effect in the Middle River area of Baltimore County and to recommend to the County Council such comprehensive revisions thereof as the Board deemed advisable in conjunction with the recommendations contained in the Middle River Community Plan; and

WHEREAS, under the provisions of Article 32, Title 3 of the Baltimore County Code, 2003, the County Council has received a final report of the Planning Board on the Board’s proposed Comprehensive Zoning Map for the Middle River area of Baltimore County and has held public hearings thereon after giving at least 10 working days’ notice thereof in a newspaper of general circulation throughout the County; and during the period of such notice the final report of the Planning Board, with accompanying maps and supporting exhibits, were shown and exhibited in the Office of Planning, in the Sixth Councilmanic District, and at such other public places as designated by the County Council; and after the expiration of such period of notice and hearings, the County Council made certain changes in the Comprehensive Zoning Map for the Sixth Councilmanic District of Baltimore County which the County Council deemed appropriate pursuant to the Middle River Community Plan; now, therefore

SECTION 1. BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE
COUNTY, MARYLAND, that the portion of the official zoning map of Baltimore County referred to in Section 32-1-101 of the Baltimore County Code and now in effect, including any amendments thereto and comprehensive revisions of portions thereof as it pertains only to the Middle River area of the Sixth Councilmanic District of Baltimore County, be and it is hereby repealed, and that the boundaries of zones and districts, as established by the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations as shown on the Official Comprehensive Zoning Map for the Middle River area of Baltimore County accompanying this act, are hereby established.

SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, that the accompanying Official Comprehensive Zoning Map for the Middle River area of Baltimore County is hereby adopted and declared to be a part of this act to the same extent as if it were incorporated herein. The Official Comprehensive Zoning Map for the Middle River area is the map described in Section 32-3-202(d) of the Baltimore County Code, the correctness of which is attested to by the signature of the Chairman of the Baltimore County Council. When this Act stands enacted, the Director of Permits and Development Management shall thereupon have legal custody of said map.

SECTION 3. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, that the dimensions of any zone or district boundary shall be determined by use of the map scale, shown on the zoning map, scaled to the nearest foot. The Director of Permits and Development Management and the County Board of Appeals shall conclusively determine the location and dimensions of zone and district boundaries from the official zoning map.
SECTION 4. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, that in case it be judicially determined that any word, phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph or section of this Act, or that the application thereof, or the application of any portion of the Official Comprehensive Zoning Map for the Middle River area of Baltimore County, accompanying this Act, to any person, property, or circumstance is invalid, the remaining provisions of this Act and the application of such provisions, and the application of the remaining portions of said Comprehensive Zoning Map for the Middle River area of Baltimore County to other persons, properties or circumstances shall not be affected thereby; the County Council of Baltimore County, Maryland, hereby declares that it would have ordained the remaining provisions of this Act and the remaining portions of said map without the provisions or portion or the application thereof so held invalid.

SECTION 5. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, that this Act, having been passed by the affirmative vote of five members of the County Council, shall take effect on September 19, 2007.
READ AND PASSED this 4TH day of SEPTEMBER, 2007.

BY ORDER

Thomas J. Peddicord, Jr.
Secretary

PRESENTED to the County Executive for his approval this 5TH day of SEPTEMBER, 2007.

Thomas J. Peddicord, Jr.
Secretary

APPROVED AND ENACTED:

September 13, 2007

James T. Smith, Jr.
County Executive


S. G. Samuel Moxley
Chairman, County Council
A BILL
ENTITLED

AN ACT concerning

Zoning Regulations - Middle River Area

FOR the purpose of requiring the construction of certain capital projects before building permits may be issued in the Middle River Area; specifying certain performance standards to be considered by the Design Review Panel for single-family detached lots in the Middle River area of the County; prohibiting panhandle lots in the Middle River area in certain cases; requiring a residential development plan in the Middle River Area to include certain design requirements to mitigate certain adverse effects; practices to prevent deterioration of certain subwatersheds; and generally relating to building restrictions and residential performance standards for the Middle River area of the County.

BY adding

Section 259.13
Baltimore County Zoning Regulations, as amended

By repealing and reenacting, with amendments

EXPLANATION:
CAPITALS INDICATE MATTER ADDED TO EXISTING LAW.
[Brackets] indicate matter stricken from existing law.
Strikeout indicates matter stricken from bill.
Underlining indicates amendments to bill.
Sections 260.2C. and 260.2F:
Baltimore County Zoning Regulations, as amended

BY adding

Section 260.2F
Baltimore County Zoning Regulations, as amended

BY adding

Section 32-4-224(a)(20)
Article 32 - Planning, Zoning and Subdivision Control
Title 4 - Development
Baltimore County Code 2003

SECTION 1. BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE
COUNTY, MARYLAND, that Section 259.13 be and it is hereby added to the Baltimore County
Zoning Regulations, as amended, to read as follows:

259.13 MIDDLE RIVER AREA – BUILDING PERMITS.

BUILDING PERMITS MAY NOT BE ISSUED FOR RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION
IN THE MIDDLE RIVER AREA, AS DEFINED IN COUNTY COUNCIL BILL 59-07, PRIOR
TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF ALL CONTRACTS NECESSARY TO CONSTRUCT
CONSTRUCTION ON THE FOLLOWING CAPITAL PROJECTS:

1. THE WHITE MARSH PUMPING STATION;
2. THE SECOND STEMMERS RUN PUMPING STATION;
3. THE FORCE MAINS BETWEEN THESE STATIONS AND THE BACK RIVER
TREATMENT FACILITY;
4. THE WINDLASS RUN INTERCEPTOR; AND

5. THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE EBENEZER ROAD BRIDGE OVER WINDLASS RUN (BRIDGE NO. 294).

SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, that Sections 260.2C. and 260.2F. of the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations, as amended, be and they are hereby repealed and re-enacted, with amendments, to read as follows:

Section 260
Residential Performance Standards

260.2 Site planning.

C. Panhandle lots are not permitted as a matter of right. Panhandles must conform to §32-4-409 of the Baltimore County Code and to the standards in the Comprehensive Manual of Development Policies. Panhandle lots are not permitted in the South Perry Hall-White Marsh area.

PANHANDLE LOTS ARE NOT PERMITTED IN THE MIDDLE RIVER AREA, AS DEFINED IN BILL 59-07, UNLESS EACH LOT HAS A MINIMUM SIZE OF TWO ACRES.

F. SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED LOTS IN MIDDLE RIVER AREA:

1. FOR ANY SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED LOT LOCATED IN THE MIDDLE RIVER AREA, AS DEFINED IN COUNTY COUNCIL BILL 59-07, AND ZONED D.R. 3.5:

A. THE MINIMUM WIDTH IS 70 FEET AS MEASURED ALONG BOTH THE FRONT WALL AND REAR WALL OF THE DWELLING UNIT;

B. THE MINIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACK IS 20 FEET, AND

C. THE MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACK IS 40 FEET, EXCEPT FOR:

(1) UNROOFED ADDITIONS, INCLUDING PATIOS AND DECKS; AND
(2) ROOFED ADDITIONS WHICH DO NOT EXCEED IN WIDTH 50% OF
THE DWELLING UNIT, AND WHICH DO NOT EXTEND MORE THAN 10 FEET INTO THE
REAR YARD SETBACK AREA.

2. THIS SUBSECTION DOES NOT APPLY TO ALTERNATIVE SITE DESIGN
Dwellings permitted in accordance with Section 1B01.1.A.1.B.

SECTION 3. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, that Section 260.2F be and it is hereby
added to the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations, as amended, to read as follows:

F. SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED LOTS IN MIDDLE RIVER AREA.

THE MIDDLE RIVER AREA, DESCRIBED IN THE MIDDLE RIVER COMMUNITY
PLAN ADOPTED BY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 77-07, IS DESIGNATED AS A DESIGN
REVIEW AREA. FOR ANY SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED LOT IN THE AREA THAT IS
PART OF A DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND IS ZONED D.R. 3.5, THE DESIGN REVIEW PANEL
SHALL CONSIDER THE DESIGN STANDARDS OF THIS SECTION WHEN MAKING A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE HEARING OFFICER.

SECTION 3.4. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, that Section 32-4-224(a)(20) be and it
is hereby added to Article 32-Planning, Zoning and Subdivision Control, Title 4 - Development, of
the Baltimore County Code 2003, to read as follows:

§32-4-224. Required Development Plan Information.

(a) In general. The Development Plan shall contain the following development information:

(20) FOR A RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE MIDDLE RIVER AREA, AS
DEFINED IN COUNTY COUNCIL BILL 59-07, DESIGN REQUIREMENTS TO MITIGATE
THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE CONDITION OF THE COWPENS
RUN, HONEYGO RUN AND MIDDLE RIVER SUBWATERSHEDS, AS DESCRIBED IN THE
MIDDLE RIVER COMMUNITY PLAN ADOPTED BY RESOLUTION 77-07: DEFINED IN COUNTY COUNCIL BILL 59-07, SPECIFIC PRACTICES THAT WILL BE EMPLOYED TO PREVENT DETERIORATION OF ANY SUBWATERSHED, AS DESCRIBED IN THE MIDDLE RIVER COMMUNITY PLAN ADOPTED BY RESOLUTION 77-07, THAT IS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED BY THE DEVELOPMENT.

SECTION 4 5. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, that this Act, having been passed by the affirmative vote of five members of the County Council, shall take effect on September 19, 2007.
READ AND PASSED this 4TH day of SEPTEMBER, 2007.

BY ORDER

Thomas J. Peddicord, Jr.
Secretary

PRESENTED to the County Executive for his approval this 5TH day of SEPTEMBER, 2007.

Thomas J. Peddicord, Jr.
Secretary

APPROVED AND ENACTED:

September 13, 2007

James T. Smith, Jr.
County Executive


S. G. Samuel Moxley
Chairman, County Council
COUNTY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND
Legislative Session 2007, Legislative Day No. 15

Resolution No. 77-07

Mr. Joseph Bartenfelder, Councilman

By the County Council, August 6, 2007

A RESOLUTION of the Baltimore County Council to adopt the Middle River Community Plan as part of the Baltimore County Master Plan 2010.

WHEREAS, the Baltimore County Council adopted the Baltimore County Master Plan 2010 on February 22, 2000; and

WHEREAS, the County Council asked the Planning board to prepare a Middle River Community Plan (Resolution 40-04); and

WHEREAS, the Middle River Community Plan was prepared in close cooperation with an advisory committee representing various components of the community in the plan area; and

WHEREAS, the Plan was the subject of a public hearing by the Planning Board and was adopted by the Board on June 8, 2007; and

WHEREAS, the County Council held a public hearing on the recommended Middle River Community Plan on July 2, 2007;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND, that the Middle River 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 2010 to be a guide for the development of the Middle River Community area, as amended by the County Council, copy of which amendments are attached hereto and made a part hereof, and subject to such further modifications as deemed advisable by the County Council.
AMENDMENTS TO THE MIDDLE RIVER COMMUNITY PLAN

Joseph Bartenfelder, Councilman

1. On page 52, strike the paragraph under the heading “Sewer Infrastructure Recommended Actions” that begins on page 52 and ends on page 56, and substitute the following paragraph:

“THE FOLLOWING IMPROVEMENTS SHALL BE COMPLETED BEFORE BUILDING PERMITS ARE ISSUED TO DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS THAT ARE REQUIRED TO TIE INTO THEM:

• THE WHITE MARSH PUMPING STATION
• THE SECOND STEMMERS RUN PUMPING STATION
• THE FORCE MAINS BETWEEN THESE STATIONS AND THE BACK RIVER TREATMENT FACILITY
• THE WINDLASS RUN INTERCEPTOR (THESE PROJECTS ARE DETAILED IN TABLE 17)
• THE STORM DRAIN SYSTEM IN THE WAMPLER ROAD CATCHMENT AREA”

2. On page 57, amend the first full paragraph in the left column as follows:

“The Ebenezer Road bridge over Windlass Run (Bridge No. 294) has construction funding to address traffic accidents as well as flooding at this stream crossing. Traffic will be maintained during the construction period. Right-of-way acquisition and utility relocation is necessary before
the bridge reconstruction can take place. Utility relocation work is expected to begin in the Spring of 2007. The construction contract for the project has been awarded, with construction to begin in the Fall of 2007. THE PROJECT SHALL BE COMPLETED BEFORE BUILDING PERMITS ARE ISSUED TO DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS ON THE EAST SIDE OF NEW ROUTE 43.”

3. On page 59, strike the last paragraph in the left column, and substitute the following:

“• PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS TO BENGIES ROAD SHALL BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS.
• ANY NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE REQUIRED TO ACCESS THE NEW ROUTE 43 OR CAMPBELL BOULEVARD. ACCESS TO BIRD RIVER ROAD FROM SUCH DEVELOPMENTS SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED.”

4. On page 60, insert the following in the left column as the concluding item under the heading “Public School Recommended Actions”:

“• BALTIMORE COUNTY AND BCPS SHOULD INVESTIGATE THE POSSIBILITY OF PURCHASING CURRENTLY AVAILABLE ACREAGE (210 ACRES) ON THE EAST SIDE OF EBENEZER ROAD, ADJACENT TO THE PLAN BOUNDARY, FOR FUTURE SCHOOL FACILITIES.”

5. On page 66, insert the following after “requirements.” in the second paragraph in the left column under Impervious Surface Impact:
“CURRENT REQUIREMENTS INCLUDE A RIGOROUS REVIEW OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF A PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING A REVIEW OF STEEP SLOPES, ERODIBLE SOILS, NON-TIDAL WETLANDS, STREAMS, FLOODPLAINS, FOREST BUFFERS (FOREST BUFFER EASEMENTS, BOTH EXISTING AND PROPOSED), FORESTS (FOREST CONSERVATION EASEMENTS, BOTH EXISTING AND PROPOSED), WATER QUALITY AND SUITABLE OUTFALLS, AS WELL AS A REVIEW OF THE LOCATION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IN RELATION TO EXISTING AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS, AGRICULTURAL EASEMENTS, PRIME AND PRODUCTIVE SOILS. THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL CRITERIA SHOULD SUPPLEMENT THESE STANDARD REQUIREMENTS.”

6. On page 66, insert the following as the second sentence in the second paragraph under “Water Quality Recommended Actions”: “DEVELOPMENT PLANS SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO INCLUDE SPECIFIC SITE DESIGN REQUIREMENTS TO PREVENT FURTHER DETERIORATION.”

7. Delete Map 22 on page 49, Map 24 on page 53 and Map 25 on page 54, and substitute, respectively, Map 22, 24 and 25 attached hereto.
READ AND PASSED this 4TH day of SEPTEMBER, 2007.

BY ORDER

Thomas J. Peddicord, Jr.
Secretary

ITEM: RESOLUTION 77-07