

LAND USE & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

FINDINGS OF FACT

City Council Bill No. 25-0082

MOTION OF THE CHAIR OF THE LAND USE & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AFTER A PUBLIC HEARING AT WHICH AGENCY REPORTS AND PUBLIC TESTIMONY WERE CONSIDERED, AND PURSUANT TO THE APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF ARTICLE 32 OF THE BALTIMORE CITY CODE, THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPTS THESE FINDINGS OF FACT CONCERNING:

Planned Unit Development – Amendment – Under Armour Headquarters

IN GENERAL:

To approve this PUD, the City Council has considered:

(check to evidence consideration)

- ☒ whether the planned unit development is in general conformance with all elements of the Comprehensive Master Plan, and the character and nature of existing and contemplated development in the vicinity of the proposed planned unit development;

Staff finds that Bill 25-0082 – does not conflict with the general land use plan of the area and does not conflict with the master plan enacted in 2024. The PUD includes Mixed Use: Predominantly Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial, Mixes Use: Predominantly Industrial, and Residential: Higher Density uses and the alterations proposed do not conflict with these uses.

- ☒ whether the planned unit development will preserve unusual topographic or natural features of the land, and the design of the planned unit development will best utilize and be compatible with the topography of the land;

Bill 25-0082 would not change any natural features currently existing in the PUD.

- ☒ whether the physical characteristics of the planned unit development will not adversely affect future development or the value of undeveloped neighboring areas, or the use, maintenance, or value of neighboring areas already developed;

Bill 25-0082 will amend the PUD to allow additional uses to permit a school in the PUD boundaries. Staff finds that this will not have an adverse effect on the PUD area.

- ☒ whether the planned unit development will provide the same protection as the basic district regulations in regard to fire, health hazards, and other dangers;

Bill 25-0082 will not change the compliance with fire, health, and other regulations currently required by all structures in the PUD.

- ☒ whether the planned unit development will encourage innovative design features or adaptive reuse of structures that would not be possible by application of the basic district regulations;

Bill 25-0082 will allow for schools to be a permissible use in the PUD. Staff finds that the conversion of property to a school in the PUD would meet this standard.

- ☒ whether the planned unit development is compatible with any nearby industrial district.

Bill 25-0082 would modify the UnderArmor Headquarters PUD to correct a mistake and allow for continued mixed use development in the area meeting the standard.

and finds that:

- (1) the use **IS** compatible with the surrounding neighborhood for the following reasons:

Bill 25-0082 is only amending a currently existing PUD. The PUD exist and the amendment does have the support of one of the local community organizations.

- (2) the use **FURTHERS** the proposed classification for the following reasons:

25-0082 is amending an existing PUD to clarify its residential use and to permit schools in the PUD boundaries. The current classification of uses in the PUD is mixed and this amendment supports those uses.

- (3) the PUD master plan developed under Section 13-304 of the Zoning Code **ENSURES** there will be no discordance with existing uses by:

Continuing the current mixed use status of the PUD currently in place. The amendment only serves to clarify and to allow for an additional use.

- (4) the establishment, location, construction, maintenance, or operation of the PUD **WOULD NOT** be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, or welfare because:

The PUD is currently operational and the amendment would not be a detriment to the public.

- (5) the use **WOULD NOT** be precluded by any other law, including an Urban Renewal Plan

Staff finds that this amendment would not conflict with or be precluded by any other law.

- (6) the authorization **WOULD NOT** be contrary to the public interest because:

Because PUD already exist and this bill would serve only to amend the PUD by including additional uses and clarifying those uses. Thereby adding additional flexablity which is in the public's interest.

- (7) the authorization **WOULD** be in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Code because:

The bill does not change the authorization of the PUD itself – but does clarify the PUD and that clarification is in harmony with the Zoning Code.

In addition, the City Council has considered the following -

- 1. The nature of the proposed site, including its size and shape and the proposed size, shape, and arrangement of structures;**
 - a. The amendment will not affect the structure, shape or size of the PUD. It is limited to the uses and vehicular access**
- 2. The resulting traffic patterns and adequacy of proposed off-street parking and loading;**
 - a. The proposed school will need fewer parking spaces than presently permitted use**
- 3. The nature of the surrounding area and the extent to which the proposed use might impair its present or future development;**
 - a. The proposed use of a school will not impair the current residential neighborhood and may help with future development more so than the current office use of the property.**
- 4. The proximity of dwellings, churches, schools, public structures, and other places of public gathering;**
 - a. This is a residential community and had significant density which a school could help to support.**
- 5. Accessibility of the premises for emergency vehicles;**
 - a. Emergency vehicles would have sufficient access**
- 6. Accessibility of light and air to the premises and to the property in the vicinity;**
 - a. The premises would have sufficient access to light and air.**
- 7. The type and location of adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, and other necessary facilities that have been or will be provided;**
 - a. The current use of the property as an office means that it is adequately served by the city's utilities.**
- 8. The preservation of cultural and historic landmarks and structures;**
 - a. No cultural or historic properties are located on the premises**
- 9. The character of the neighborhood;**
 - a. A school is compatible with the residential nature of the community**
- 10. The provisions of the City's Comprehensive Master Plan;**
 - a. The amendment is compatible with the Master Plan**
- 11. The provisions of any applicable Urban Renewal Plan;**
 - a. The PUD is not located in an Urban Renewal Plan area**
- 12. All applicable standards and requirements of this Code;**
 - a. The PUD and amendment complies with the Code**
- 13. The intent and purpose of this Code;**
 - a. The PUD and amendment is consistent with the Code**
- 14. Any other matters considered to be in the interest of the general welfare.**

- a. *The PUD will continue to operate and the proposed amendment will have the effect of supporting the general welfare*

SOURCE OF FINDINGS:

[x] Planning Commission's report, September 11, 2025

[x] Testimony presented at the Committee hearing

Oral – Witness:

Caroline Hecker – Attorney representing the applicant.

Written:

- Board of Municipal and Zoning Appeals, Agency Report – July 17 2023
- Law Department, Agency Report – September 25, 2025
- Department of Transportation, Agency Report – October 23rd, 2023
- Department of Housing and Community Development, Agency Report – September 19 2025

COMMITTEE MEMBERS VOTING IN FAVOR

Dorsey – Chair

Bullock

Middleton

Gray

Blanchard

Parker