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1. INTRODUCTION

For nearly three centuries the land of Baltimore County was used almost exclusively for agriculture. But the twentieth century, particularly the last three decades, has been a period of great and irreversible transi­
tion. The County has burgeoned into a massive urban-industrial complex, an absolutely vital sector of the eleventh largest metropoli­
nian area in the country. As a result, Baltimore County has acquired a double identity: urban in a wide belt around the city, largely rural beyond.

And change will continue. Some 12,000 new residents each year will swell the County's population. The 70's will see still more homes and schools built, more shopping and jobs provided, and more streets and roads constructed. In addition, rapid-transit lines will be built, and new centers and recreation areas will be added, all this and more without turning the County's superb countryside into urban chaos. To avoid that chaos, plans are needed.

This is the 1980 Guideplan, the official master plan for Baltimore County. It is in two parts: the text and the maps and dia­
grams that form the background material and speci­
ifie policy guidelines. Various aspects of Baltimore County's growth through the 1970's, the 1980's, and beyond, are discussed in general terms, but these guidelines may be applied through 1980 and beyond.

This Guideplan, then, is a culmination of the County's planning efforts to date. As such, it must serve as the basic framework for other major plans and programs, such as the County's Five-Year Capital Program and the County Comprehensive Water and Sewerage Plan, and it will be a basis for advice to government agencies and citizens as development proposals are formed.

Preliminary versions of the Guideplan have been the subject of twelve public hearings over a three-year period, and have undergone numerous review and modification sessions as fresh information came to the Board's attention during and after those hearings. (The preliminary version provided the foundation for the 1971 comprehensive zoning map.) The first comprehensive revision of the Guideplan is scheduled to begin in 1974.
II. THE COUNTY NOW
and in 1980

The County's citizenry numbered 621,077 in 1970, according to the Census—128,649 more than in 1960. Estimated population as of January 1, 1972 was 642,324, indicating an additional, 20-month increase of more than 21,000 persons.

The 1970 figures show that 26.1 per cent of the people were less than 14 years old; 12.5 per cent were 14 to 20 years old; 50.2 per cent, 20 to 59 years old; and 11.2 per cent, over 60. 3.2 per cent of the population was black. Median family income in 1970 was $12,081 per year—slightly more than $3,960 per capita. Of the County's 162,375 families, only 5,610—3.5 per cent—had an income below the poverty level, as classified by the Bureau of the Census. Nine out of every ten citizens lived in the eleven town-planning areas of the urban-suburban belt surrounding Baltimore City.

The chart at right shows how the population was geographically distributed in 1970 and how that distribution is expected to change over the two-year period.

According to current predictions, about 140,000 people will live in the County in 1980—119,000 more than in 1970. Nearly 17,000 acres of land will have to be developed to house and service these new County residents.

There is more than ten times as much land already zoned than will be needed to accommodate the urban-residential and industrial portions of this development. The ratio of unzoned land to land currently zoned is over 10 to 1—shown slightly more than 10 to 1—this ratio indicates a surplus. Assuming to some degree will never be necessary, none of these unused development potentials will be in the right places at the right times. The tables and map on page 3 show (among other things) how this land is to be used and the anticipated general locations of schools and highways to be constructed through 1980. (In addition to these, many of the facilities shown on the Guideplan Map are to be constructed after 1980.)
1970-1980 LAND OCCUPANCY
and 1970 Inventory of Land Zoned for Urban Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Occupied by Private Land Uses</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>10-YEAR INCREASE</th>
<th>1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>54,700</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>58,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>4,670</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>5,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>12,840</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>14,310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Land for Public Open Space and Private (Institutional) Open-Space Uses | 30,500 | 10,800 | 41,300 |

| Vacant Land Zoned for Urban Development in 1970 | 39,700 | - | - |
| Commercial                                      | 1,305  | - | - |
| Industrial                                      | 10,000 | - | - |


NEW SCHOOLS and HIGHWAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW SCHOOLS</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE/JR. HIGH</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR HIGH</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY COLLEGE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGHWAYS</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FREEWAY &amp; EXPRESSWAY (mi)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUNK ROADS &amp; ARTERIALS (mi)</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As of May 1972, none of the facilities and services listed have been constructed, nor has funding been allocated for or approved under the Five-Year Capital Program.
III. POLICIES FOR THE COMING YEARS

The policies of this part of the Guideplan will be those of the Planning Board's General Plans, adopted in 1969 and revised 1971. These policies are the expressions of the Board's professional judgment on the urban growth problem in the County, as modified by the Board's study of proposals for the development of the rural parts of the County. They are also influenced by the Board's previous experience in guiding the development of the County's urban area, which has been characterized by the provision of public services that will allow urban development in the "new-growth" areas.

Policy No. 1: Urban growth should be accommodated by development of vacant land within the 1970 urban-rural demarcation line and by provision of water-supply facilities to the new-growth areas. This policy is designed to prevent any further use of the rural lands for urban purposes, except for certain lower density uses.

Policy No. 2: The full range of modern public works should be provided to the population in already-developed areas before, or as a concurrent requisite to, providing services that will allow urban development in the "new-growth" areas.

Policy No. 3: Essential urban facilities should be provided in the same manner as the "goals" of the planning efforts, these policies are not expressed in the same form as the "goals" contained under the County's much more recently prepared Overall Program Design, as an incipient development. In the next revision of the Guideplan, these policies will be expressed in a form parallel to that of the Overall Program Design.

Policy No. 4: Steps should be taken to prevent the expansion of existing privately owned institutions in their urban settings. This policy is designed to prevent any further use of the rural lands for urban purposes, except for certain lower density uses.

Policy No. 5: Urban growth should be accommodated by development of vacant land within the 1970 urban-rural demarcation line and by provision of water-supply facilities to the new-growth areas. This policy is designed to prevent any further use of the rural lands for urban purposes, except for certain lower density uses.

Policy No. 6: Essential urban facilities should be provided in the same manner as the "goals" of the planning efforts, these policies are not expressed in the same form as the "goals" contained under the County's much more recently prepared Overall Program Design, as an incipient development.
The efficiency and much of the quality of life in the metropolitan area can be largely determined by the pattern of urban development. A rational pattern reduces travel times and distances as well as public expenditures on utilities and other services, and it can reduce the tendency toward encroachment of incompatible uses on residential areas. It is the primary function of Policies Nos. 5, 6, and 7 to promote such a pattern, although other policies clearly can contribute toward that goal.

POLICY NO. 5. New development in outlying areas should be designed in accord with a rationally describable form, such as the Guideplan model development form described below.

POLICY NO. 6. Where public improvements are to be installed in areas already developed or partially developed, the locations and sizes of those improvements should be determined under standards formulated in accordance with the Guideplan model or determined under such alternative comprehensive sets of standards as may be established by the Planning Board after the adoption of this plan.

POLICY NO. 7. The most intensive residential and commercial development, such as high-rise apartment and office buildings and regional shopping complexes, should take place in sector and community centers as designated on the Guideplan Map, where access is or will be supplied by such facilities as ring roads and rapid-transit stations. Development of medium-high intensity—categorized by buildings six to eight stories high—should take place in designated community centers, where necessary central accessibility features are planned.
A region's transportation system is a major determinant of the urban development pattern—and, therefore, of how efficiently people's needs are accommodated. A properly organized, well-operated, balanced transportation system meets the travel needs of all residents and businesses and allows for (even encourages) new growth.

An incomplete system, such as one that lacks rapid transit, may not accommodate the travel needs of the elderly, the poor, or others unable to drive. Also, where mass transit is inadequate, highway users spend excessive time in daily travel and suffer frequent traffic jams, merchandise is subject to shipping delays, and, ultimately, urban sprawl results.

As a complete system, such as one that lacks rapid transit, may not accommodate the travel needs of the elderly, the poor, or others unable to drive. Also, where mass transit is inadequate, highway users spend excessive time in daily travel and suffer frequent traffic jams, merchandise is subject to shipping delays, and, ultimately, urban sprawl results.

But there is obviously more to a balanced transportation system than just transit—vital as that is. The vehicles in this section are also concerned with major highways, local streets, neighborhood ways, bicycle trails, and airports.

POLICY NO. 6. Radial and circumferential bus service should be improved immediately.

POLICY NO. 5. A complete rail-rapid-transit system should be constructed, and in a manner that (a) will provide access to present and future major residential areas in the vicinity, and (b) will generally provide service to North Baltimore City and the surrounding counties. Detailed planning for this system should be completed by the Mass Transit Administration, with County cooperation, as soon as possible. See feeder-bus lines should be expanded to support the rapid-transit system as it goes into operation.

POLICY NO. 10. The present highway network should be expanded and modernized to the point that it will allow stable traffic flow with minimum congestion, making maximum use of the highway funds to be generated by the recent State-gasoline-tax increase. A bridge or other crossing—"the northern Bay crossing"—should be planned so that continuous travel between the northern part of the Baltimore Region and the Eastern Shore may be assured in the future. Also, the County should establish stringent controls (a) to regulate access across cul-de-sacs, highway median, and interchanges between arterials streets and freeways or expressways, and (b) to regulate access to classes II commercial motorways and other arterial streets where an unrestricted-access policy has not yet been established.

POLICY NO. 11. The widths of future streets should be more closely related to their functions, as indicated by studies made in preparation of the "Comprehensive Manual of Development Policy." In particular, local streets should be narrower than has been required in the past.

POLICY NO. 12. A system of pedestrian ways and bicycle trails should be established throughout the County, to meet both transportation and recreation needs.

POLICY NO. 13. Encouragement should be given to the development of permanent, publicly accessible general-relief airports.

From the table on page 3 it would appear that the County has a 68-year supply of industrial land—10,000 acres, being used at the rate of 147 acres per year. However, investigation reveals that nearly 40% of the vacant land lies in the coastal plains of Eastern Baltimore County, while only slightly more than 25% is located in the parts of the County closest to the fast-growing Baltimore-Washington corridor.

Each of the vacant land is not yet ready to be utilized, since essential public facilities—of one kind or another (sewers, water, roads) are lacking. As competition for available industrial land increases, it will become critical that vital services be provided at an accelerated rate.

POLICY NO. 14. The inventory of industrial land should be reduced by about 10% in the coastal plains of the County, while the inventory in the Southwest and Western parts of the County should be increased to take advantage of those areas' location within the Baltimore-Washington corridor.

POLICY NO. 15. Planning, programming, and installation of public facilities to serve industrial land should be accelerated in order to promote increased industrial development.

ACCESS to TOWN CENTERS and INDUSTRIAL AREAS
The need for housing for families of low and moderate income has been apparent for some time, and this critical problem must be solved. More recently, the need for more and better housing within the reach of families with greater incomes has also become apparent, and so has the need to place homes nearer—or more convenient to—jobs. Action is needed on all fronts.

**POLICY NO. 16.** New housing construction should offer the widest choice of housing for both new and older residents of the County through—

a) Residential development near employment centers or at locations with good accessibility, so that the journey to work will be short; and

b) Utilisation of selected State and Federal programs to bring housing within the reach of families with incomes of $12,000 or less per year.

The Countywide zoning map adopted in 1971 may have established adequate potential housing within the most employment areas through all or most of the 70's. The policies in the section on transportation and their expression on the Guideplan Map are designed to promote adequate highway and transit facilities between employment centers and residential areas removed from them. To further balance the ideal housing study and program of a future plan are not in progress.

**education**

Until 1969, the schools in Baltimore County were mostly organized along traditional lines, with elementary schools accommodating grades one through six, and junior high schools through grades seven through nine. Since then, the Baltimore County Department of Education has altered a structure generally known as the "intramural system" in which separate high schools for grades ten through five were allocated to elementary schools, grades six through eight to middle schools, and grades nine through twelve to high schools. The following policy is a direct reflection of that change.

**POLICY NO. 17.** In areas already developed, the middle-school system should be established if and when it is practical to do so. In areas yet to be developed, new schools should conform to the middle-school system structure, the elementary schools to be established at neighborhood centers and middle and high schools at community centers, as described in the section on the urban development pattern (page 2). In many cases, the middle and high schools should be constructed on joint or adjoining sites.

Because the feasibility of expanding current high schools to accommodate the middle grades has not yet been determined, it is recommended that further study be undertaken before the middle-school system is established throughout the County.

Since the early 1950's, Baltimore County has been committed to the policy of developing schools and parks as joint facilities—school-recreation centers. This policy has yielded such extraordinarily successful results that no change is being recommended. It should be noted that school-recreation centers accommodate much more than just educational, and recreational needs, having served as places for meetings of area residents, polling places, centers for health campaigns, and locations for all kinds of neighborhood and community activities.
open space

In planning the future environment of the County, parks and other open spaces after values well beyond those just of play. They serve significantly in the physical structuring of the pattern of development. For example, the traditional concept of open space has been broadened to include not only those areas actively used, but also those areas--public and private--accommodating passive recreation or simply providing strips or islands of green. For what would life be like if streams and their valleys, if wooded areas, or if rugged land is not preserved! Clearly, those lands as well as spaces for active recreation must be secured.

POLICY NO. 18. Open spaces of all sizes should be set aside for future park development. Areas of significant potential should be purchased for future development. Such areas should be set aside and recreation facilities should be provided to accommodate the fullest range of recreational activities for Baltimore County's neighborhoods, communities, and towns. At minimum, 7,650 acres beyond what has already been secured should be set aside by 1980, allocated as follows:

- Locality parks and playgrounds: 550 acres
- Recreational-amenity portions of school-recreation centers: 1,430 acres
- Stream-valley parks: 870 acres
- waterfront parks: 930 acres
- area parks: 1,730 acres
- Other public open spaces: 2,120 acres

This policy applies to both presently developed areas and areas of new growth.

POLICY NO. 19. Corridors of open space should be maintained around the present urban area and, to the extent possible, around and between present and future towns. Where not publicly acquired, these spaces should be secured through securing eminent domain or purchasing development rights, or, in certain cases, through zoning.

POLICY NO. 20. The practice of donating desirable lands to the County for open-space use should be better publicized, so as to generate more interest among possible donors.

Many of the local parks and other open spaces contemplated under Policy No. 18 (and not reflected in the tables of this document) are being acquired through the dedication of land (usually and local open spaces required of developers when their subdivisions plans are approved. Other lands are being purchased by the Department of Recreation and Parks and by the Maryland State Department of Parks and Forests, while a few are acquired as gifts or bequests. But if the major portion of the open-space pattern is to be secured, more emphasis must be placed on the acquisition of "regional" open spaces. Techniques other than outright purchase—such as the purchase of certain development rights, in the absence of such an unwieldy way—will have to be investigated and, where feasible, utilized. In areas of permanent agricultural use or very-low-density residential development, application of a new or revised market classification could be a sufficient means.

Next of the open spaces shown on the Growth Map would be in areas that are not easily developable, in other areas that are not presently subject to heavy development pressures. This is not so, however, of the designated land in the undeveloped waterfront area of the waterfront land being used by the United States government. Acquisition priorities must be high to the extent of the former, and the County must be ready to use whatever land is vacated and declared surplus by the Federal government.

In areas of permanent agricultural use or very-low-density residential development, application of a new or revised market classification could be a sufficient means.

As indicated both in Part 17 and in the section on urban growth, there is plenty of land in Baltimore County's urban area to accommodate growth for coast to coast. The scope of this is that there is a surplus land area that any current need for urban development with the County's rural area. These lands are a legacy for the future; today's planning cannot—and should not—determine precisely how they will be used. But planning can say what the implications are. And planning can surely make recommendations on what should not happen in the rural area now, if rational decisions are to be made in the future.

The proper future possibilities are those: agriculture (for which there is a need for which may be more intensive than presently thought), public or semi-public open-space uses (which may be more intensive than presently thought), and conservation of the urban-intensity level. That is the specter of uncontrolled acre-lot development over Baltimore County's wetlands and other sensitive areas. Conservation threats to pressure the first two possibilities. And while acre-lot housing is to prevail a large amount of urban development, by no means is it to be considered any economic or rational pattern. Acre-lot development first emphasizes the land a few small and private wells usually exist, be employed efficiently and not overburden the taxpayer—because of the extremely high cost associated with the installation and operation of water lines, schools, roads, and other services and facilities. So as to provide for development of this density.
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The pollution of such impoundments has been well documented by statistician, health, and State health and public health officials. The necessity of such controls is well proven. The reservoirs' impoundments have been well fertilized. At some point in the future, development could prevent excessive runoff, further contaminating the region's major sources of drinking water. 

To be imperative that the reservoirs' impoundments be preserved. Until now, no development is taking place without sewage and water services; neither from the inevitable pollution from high-intensity development, nor from the use of sewage and water services; neither from the inevitable pollution from high-intensity development, nor from the use of sewage and water services. The reservoirs' impoundments are a danger of surface-water runoff, further contaminating the region's major sources of drinking water.

And conservation must become the rule along the bayfront. Here again, there has been development without sewage and water services; neither from the inevitable pollution from high-intensity development, nor from the use of sewage and water services. The reservoirs' impoundments are a danger of surface-water runoff, further contaminating the region's major sources of drinking water.

POLICY NO. 25. Beverage and water lines should be extended where they will contribute to orderly, staged development, or where they are necessary to correct existing health hazards. In other cases, their extension should not be allowed.

POLICY NO. 26. The Planning Board will continue to formulate and revise policies to promote efficient and environmentally adaptive land development in the urban area of the County, as envisioned under the "density" residential zoning regulations established under County Council Bill No. 299 of 1970. Further, use of the unit-development zoning regulations, adopted under the same bill, should be encouraged and the establishment of unit developments within the urban-rural demarcation line should be promoted.

POLICY NO. 27. Modernization of the County's various land-use controls, such as the zoning and subdivision regulations, should be continued. First priority should be given to revision of the subdivision regulations, but all zoning and subdivision controls and certain other land-use controls ultimately should be incorporated within a comprehensive development code.

POLICY NO. 28. The subject of taxation will be studied by the Planning Board, in order to:

a) Learn whether there are alternative tax practices that would better promote development in accordance with this plan and with comprehensive planning goals in general, so that appropriate recommendations may be made.

"This is a policy as stated for planning purposes."

The subject of taxation will be studied by the Planning Board, in order to:

b) Learn whether there are alternative tax practices that would better promote development in accordance with this plan and with comprehensive planning goals in general, so that appropriate recommendations may be made.
IV. THE GUIDEPLAN MAP

The Guideplan Map, which accompanies this text, is an equally important and an inseparable part of the Guideplan. Although the map is "generalized"—not prescriptive of specific locations—it nonetheless has force. From the time of its adoption, all public and private land-use proposals within its purview will be measured against it by the Planning Board.

Three aspects regarding the Guideplan Map need emphasis here:

First, parts of the town planning areas designated as Liberty, Reisterstown, Chestnut Ridge, Windlass, and Essex are not "new-growth" areas for the 1970-1980 period. Development of these areas should take place after 1980, and internal planning for them now would be premature.

Second, while no northern Bay crossing is shown on the map, it is still recommended—as indicated under Policy No. 16—that such a crossing eventually be built. The Planning Board will amend the Guideplan Map to show a northern Bay crossing after further studies of alternative locations.

Third, designations of possible locations for joint utility and maintenance use by various County agencies are also omitted, pending further study with respect to locations and other factors. But the principle that joint utility-maintenance centers should be developed is still endorsed by the Planning Board.

Official master-plan maps have been adopted for various parts of Baltimore County over the past years, and much of the Guideplan Map can be considered as a composite of those earlier documents. But this is the first official County-wide master plan map in the County's history.

The official Guideplan Map is on file in the Office of Planning and Housing. The copy published here, smaller in scale, omit certain items to the limits of legibility. Every effort has been made, however, to indicate the major substantive proposals reflected on the official map.

1. PLY 3 when facing growth areas both inside and outside the unincorporated areas. The names are shown on the map on page 2.
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