

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

FINDINGS OF FACT

City Council Bill No: 24-0574

MOTION OF THE CHAIR OF THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, AFTER A PUBLIC HEARING AT WHICH AGENCY REPORTS AND PUBLIC TESTIMONY WERE CONSIDERED, AND PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 10-304 AND 10-305 OF THE MARYLAND LAND USE ARTICLE AND SECTION 5-508 OF THE BALTIMORE CITY CODE, THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPTS THESE FINDINGS OF FACT CONCERNING:

Rezoning – 1921 Light Street

Upon finding as follows with regard to:

- (1) Population changes;
 - a. Between the 2010 and 2020 census, the population of the Riverside Neighborhood increased from 5,671 and 6,523 people.
- (2) The availability of public facilities;
 - a. The majority of the neighborhood is well developed, and is well served by public facilities.
- (3) Present and future transportation patterns;
 - a. The proposed rezoning and redevelopment of this site will not have any significant impact to transportation patterns in the area.
- (4) Compatibility with existing and proposed development for the area;
 - a. The rezoning will enable additional redevelopment of the kind within a two-block radius of this site, which are therefore compatible.
- (5) The recommendations of the City agencies and officials, including the Baltimore City Planning Commission and the Board of Municipal and Zoning Appeals:

City Solicitor	Approve for form and sufficiency
Dept of Housing & Community Development	Favorable
Baltimore Development Corporation	Favorable
Parking Authority	Favorable
Dept of Transportation	No Objection
BMZA	Defers to Planning
Planning Commission	Favorable

- (6) The proposed amendment's relationship to and consistency with the City's Comprehensive Master Plan.
 - a. This rezoning action is compatible with the initial plan of the PUD, and furthers the Citywide goal of increasing our population.
- (7) Existing uses of property within the general area of the property in question;
 - a. The redevelopment that will be enable by this rezoning is similar to what has been done in the immediate area as it transitions from underutilized industrial properties into a mix of residential and commercial uses.
- (8) The zoning classification of other property within the general area of the property in question;
 - a. The surrounding neighborhood is predominantly R-8 residential, with the exception of a few redeveloped or mixed-use sites that are OR-2, C-1, or C-2 zoned. This property's proposed C-1 classification will follow the model used by 2 East Wells Street, two blocks to the west.
- (9) The suitability of the property in question for the uses permitted under its existing zoning classification;
 - a. The underlying R-8 residential zone is neither dense enough nor does it have the ability to provide for supporting commercial uses that will enliven the street level. Rezoning to C-1 is the appropriate tool to provide that mix of uses at the density needed, while not requiring a large among of parking.
- (10) The trend of development, if any, in the general area of the property in question, including changes, if any, that have taken place since the property in question was placed in its present classification;
 - a. The proposed rezoning, and its companion repeal of the PUD is following the pattern of a few other properties in the immediate area.
- (11) For a rezoning based on a SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE IN THE CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD, the following facts establish the substantial change since the time of the last comprehensive rezoning:
 - a. This PUD was created for a reasonable purpose twenty years ago, but the challenges with zoning tools of that time have been solved by a more modern zoning code. The continued redevelopment of the final property will support the overall neighborhood by attracting new residents. The properties will be able to continue operations under the requirements of the underlying zoning districts, without the burden of a PUD that has outlived its usefulness. No additional staff time or resources will be devoted following the rezoning.
- (12) For a rezoning based on a MISTAKE in the existing zoning classification, the following facts establish that at the time of the last comprehensive zoning the Council failed to

consider then existing facts, or projects or trends which were reasonably foreseeable and/or that events occurring subsequent to the comprehensive zoning have proven that the Council's initial premises were incorrect:

SOURCE OF FINDINGS (Check all that apply):

[X] Planning Report – Planning Commission’s report, dated August 23, 2024

[X] Testimony presented at the Committee hearing.

Oral – Witness:

- Elena DiPietro, Law Department
- Eric Tiso, Planning Commission
- Luciano Diaz, Department of Transportation
- Jason Wright, Department of Housing and Community Development
- Tom Whelley Baltimore Development Corporation
- Kris Misage, Parking Authority
- Ty’lor Schnella, Mayor’s Office

Written:

- Baltimore Development Corporation Report – Dated August 26, 2024
- Department of Transportation, Agency Report – Dated August 19, 2024
- Board of Municipal and Zoning Appeals, Agency Report – Dated July 22, 2024
- Law Department, Agency Report – Date August 28, 2024
- Department of Housing and Community Development, Agency Report – Dated September 10, 2024
- Parking Authority, Agency Report – Dated August 29, 2024

COMMITTEE MEMBERS VOTING IN FAVOR

Eric Costello, Chair
Sharon Middleton
Ryan Dorsey
Kristerfer Burnett
Isaac Schleifer