

# COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

## FINDINGS OF FACT

### City Council Bill No. 21-0111

MOTION OF THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, AFTER A PUBLIC HEARING AT WHICH AGENCY REPORTS AND PUBLIC TESTIMONY WERE CONSIDERED, AND PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 32, SECTION 5-406 OF THE BALTIMORE CITY CODE, THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPTS THESE FINDINGS OF FACT CONCERNING A CONDITIONAL USE FOR:

#### **Zoning - Conditional Use Conversion of a Single-Family Dwelling Unit to 3 Dwelling Units in the R-7 Zoning District - Variance - 2312 Eutaw Place**

- (1) the establishment, location, construction, maintenance, or operation of the conditional use **will not** be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, or welfare **for the following reasons:**

Establishment, location, construction, maintenance or operation of a multi-family dwelling, containing three dwelling units at 2312 Eutaw Place (Block 3424, Lot 027), would not be detrimental to or endanger public health, safety, or welfare (its previous use from before 1950 to 2010 having not proven a danger to public health, safety, or welfare).

- (2) the use **would not** be precluded by any other law, including an applicable Urban Renewal Plan;

The proposed use is not precluded by any other law, including an Urban Renewal Plan (URP), as there is no URP for this area.

- (3) the authorization **would not** be contrary to the public interest **for the following reasons:**

Use of this property for a multi-family dwelling is not otherwise in any way contrary to the public interest. The authorization could advance the public interest by creating housing affordable to moderate-income families.

- (4) the authorization **would** be in harmony with the purpose and intent of this Code **for the following reasons:**

The authorization would be in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Code.

After consideration of the following, **where applicable (fill out all that are *only* relevant)**:

- (1) the nature of the proposed site, including its size and shape and the proposed size, shape, and arrangement of structures;

Department of Planning staff finds that the site, including its size and shape, is appropriate for the proposed use.

- (2) the resulting traffic patterns and adequacy of proposed off-street parking and loading;

There would be no change to traffic patterns if this use would be authorized.

- (3) the nature of the surrounding area and the extent to which the proposed use might impair its present and future development;

The surrounding area is one in which the predominant residential type was originally single-family owner-occupancy row-housing, but in which some conversions of single-family to multi-family dwellings occurred during the 20th Century. For this reason, it is unlikely that the proposed multi-family use would impair present or future development.

- (4) the proximity of dwellings, churches, schools, public structures, and other places of public gathering;

There is reasonable proximity of other dwellings, churches and other places of worship, schools, public structures, and places of public gathering.

- (5) accessibility of the premises for emergency vehicles;

There is adequate accessibility for emergency vehicles

- (6) accessibility of light and air to the premises and to the property in the vicinity;

There is adequate light and air to the premises and to other properties in the vicinity.

- (7) the type and location of adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, and other necessary facilities that have been or will be provided;

There are adequate utilities, roads, drainage, and other necessary facilities.

- (8) the preservation of cultural and historic landmarks and structures;

The proposed use of a portion of the existing structure would not affect preservation of

cultural and historic landmarks and structures, including this structure.

- (9) the character of the neighborhood;

Approval of the proposed use as a multi-family dwelling would not affect the existing character of the neighborhood, as noted above.

- (10) the provisions of the City's Comprehensive Master Plan;

The proposed use is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Master Plan.

- (11) the provisions of any applicable Urban Renewal Plan;

The proposed use is not prevented or limited by any Urban Renewal Plan.

- (12) all applicable standards and requirements of this Code;

The proposed use meets all applicable standards and requirements of the Zoning Code.

- (13) the intent and purpose of this Code; and

Multi-family use would meet all applicable standards and requirements of the Zoning Code and would be consistent with the intent and purpose of the Zoning Code.

- (14) any other matters considered to be in the interest of the general welfare.

The proposed use is consistent with any other matters that may be considered to be in the interest of the general welfare.

SOURCE OF FINDINGS (Check all that apply):

[X] Planning Commission's report, dated August 6, 2021, which included the Department of Planning Staff Report, dated August 5, 2021.

[X] Testimony presented at the Committee hearing

Oral – Witness:

- Matt DeSantis, Planning Department
- Hilary Ruley, Law Department
- Liam Davis, Department of Transportation

Written:

- Planning Commission, Agency Report – Dated August 6, 2021 which included the Department of Planning Staff Report – Dated August 5, 2021
- Department of Transportation, Agency Report – Dated October 18, 2021
- Board of Municipal and Zoning Appeals, Agency Report – July 22, 2021
- Law Department, Agency Report – Dated September 2, 2021
- Department of Housing and Community Development, Agency Report – Dated October 7, 2021
- Baltimore Development Corporation, Agency Report – Dated August 30, 2021
- Parking Authority, Agency Report – Dated October 12, 2021
- Fire Department, Agency Report – Dated October 19, 2021

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS VOTING IN FAVOR**

Sharon Green Middleton, Chair  
John Bullock  
Mark Conway  
Ryan Dorsey  
Odette Ramos  
Antonio Glover  
Robert Stokes