
CITY OF BALTIMORE

BRANDON M. SCOTT
Mayor



DEPARTMENT OF LAW
EBONY M. THOMPSON, CITY SOLICITOR
100 N. HOLLIDAY STREET
SUITE 101, CITY HALL
BALTIMORE, MD 21202

June 9, 2026

The Honorable President and Members
of the Baltimore City Council
Attn: Executive Secretary
Room 409, City Hall
100 N. Holliday Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Re: City Council Bill 26-0177 – Rezoning – 901 S Caton Avenue

Dear President and City Council Members:

The Law Department has reviewed City Council Bill 26-0177, which would change the zoning for the property known as 901 S Caton Avenue (Block 2108C, Lot 001) from the OR-2 Zoning District to the C-2 Zoning District. This bill would take effect on the day of its enactment.

The OR-2 Zoning District is an Office Residential Zoning District. “Office-Residential Zoning Districts are intended for areas where there is a mix of office and residential uses. The regulations for these Districts are designed to ensure that office uses remain compatible with residential uses, thereby permitting the area to maintain a more residential character.” Baltimore City Code, Art. 32, § 12-201. “The C-2 Community Commercial Zoning District is intended for areas of small to medium-scale commercial use, typically located along urban corridors, that are designed to accommodate pedestrians and, in some instances, automobiles.” Baltimore City Code, Art. 32, § 10-204(a).

Standards for Rezoning

Even if the Mayor and City Council now believe that the selection of the OR-2 Zoning District for this parcel was wrong, second guessing is not allowed in piecemeal rezoning. While any number of zoning designations are open for properties in a comprehensive rezoning, there is not the same flexibility in piecemeal rezoning. *Mayor and City Council of Rockville v. Ryllys Enterprises, Inc.*, 372 Md. 514, 535-536 (2002).

Although “the impact of this presumption often has been felt to be unduly harsh to the landowner who finds that planned uses of a property are no longer allowed under the zoning classification into which the land has been placed,” Maryland’s highest Court has explained that the greater good to the landowner and society at large is the reason for the rigidity in zoning. *Id.* at 536. The “requirement of uniformity serves to protect the landowner from favoritism towards certain landowners within a zone by the grant of less onerous restrictions than are applied to others within the same zone elsewhere in the district, and also serves to prevent the use of zoning as a form of

leverage by the local government seeking land concession, transfers, or other consideration in return for more favorable zoning treatment.” *Id.*

The Mayor and City Council may permit a piecemeal rezoning *only if* it finds facts sufficient to show either a mistake in the existing zoning classification or a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood. Md. Code, Land Use, § 10-304(b)(2); Baltimore City Code, Art. 32, §§ 5-508(a) and (b)(1).

The “change-mistake” rule is a rule of the either/or type. The “change” half of the “change-mistake” rule requires that, in order for a piecemeal Euclidean zoning change to be approved, there must be a satisfactory showing that there has been significant and unanticipated change in a relatively well-defined area (the “neighborhood”) surrounding the property in question since its original or last comprehensive rezoning, whichever occurred most recently. The “mistake” option of the rule requires a showing that the underlying assumptions or premises relied upon by the legislative body during the immediately preceding original or comprehensive rezoning were incorrect. In other words, there must be a showing of a mistake of fact. Mistake in this context does not refer to a mistake in judgment.

Rylyns Enterprises, Inc., 372 Md. at 514..

It is critical to understand that in “Maryland, the change-mistake rule applies to all piecemeal zoning applications involving Euclidian zones, including those involving conditional zoning. The change-mistake rule does not apply, in any event, to changes in zoning made in a comprehensive rezoning, or the piecemeal grant of a floating zone.” *Id.* at 539. This is why a change or a mistake must be found for rezoning and NOT for comprehensive map changes or Planned Unit Developments, which is a type of floating zone.

Legal Standard for Change

“It is unquestioned that the City Council has the power to amend its City Zoning Ordinance whenever there has been such a change in the character and use of a district since the original enactment that the public health, safety, morals, or general welfare would be promoted by a change in the regulations.” *Cassel v. Mayor and City Council of Baltimore*, 195 Md. 348, 354 (1950) . The Mayor and City Council must find facts of a substantial change in the character and the use of the district since the last comprehensive rezoning of the property and that this rezoning will promote the “public health, safety, morals, or general welfare” and not merely advantage the property owner. *Id.*

As to the substantial change, courts in Maryland want to see facts of a “significant and unanticipated change in a relatively well-defined area.” *Rylyns Enterprises, Inc.*, 372 Md. at 538. The “‘neighborhood’ must be the immediate neighborhood of the subject property, not some area miles away; and the changes must occur in that immediate neighborhood of such a nature as to have affected its character.” *Clayman v. Prince George’s County*, 266 Md. 409, 418 (1972). The changes are required to be physical. *Anne Arundel County v. Bell*, 442 Md. 539, 555 (2015) (citations omitted). However, those physical changes cannot be infrastructure such as sewer or

water extension or road widening. *Clayman*, 266 Md. at 419. In addition, the physical changes must be shown to be unforeseen at the time of the last rezoning. *Rylyns Enterprises, Inc.*, 372 Md. at 538. Contemplated growth and density are not sufficient. *Clayman*, 266 Md. at 419. As to whether the change benefits solely the property owner, Courts look, in part, to see if a similar use is nearby such that the community could easily take advantage of the use elsewhere. *Cassel*, 195 Md. at 358 (three other similar uses only a few blocks away lead to conclusion that zoning change was only for private owner's gain).

Findings of Fact

In determining whether to rezone based on mistake or change in the character of the neighborhood, the Mayor and City Council is required to make findings of fact on the following matters:

- (i) population change;
- (ii) the availability of public facilities;
- (iii) the present and future transportation patterns;
- (iv) compatibility with existing and proposed development for the area;
- (v) the recommendations of the Baltimore City Planning Commission and the Board [of Municipal and Zoning Appeals]; and
- (vi) (vi) the relationship of the proposed amendment to Baltimore City's plan.

Md. Code, Land Use, § 10-304(b)(1); Baltimore City Code, Art. 32, § 5-508(b)(2).

The Mayor and City Council must also consider:

- (i) existing uses of property within the general area of the property in question;
- (ii) the zoning classification of other property within the general area of the property in question;
- (iii) the suitability of the property in question for the uses permitted under its existing zoning classification; and
- (iv) 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 zoning classification.

Baltimore City Code, Art. 32, § 5-508(b)(3).

The Mayor and City Council's decision regarding a piecemeal rezoning is reviewed under the substantial evidence test and should be upheld "if reasoning minds could reasonably reach the conclusion from facts in the record." *City Council of Prince George's Cty. v. Zimmer Dev. Co.*, 444 Md. 490, 510 (2015) (citation omitted); *see also White v. Spring*, 109 Md. App. 692, 699 (1996) ("the courts may not substitute their judgment for that of the legislative agency if the issue is rendered fairly debatable"); *accord Floyd v. County Council of Prince George's County*, 55 Md. App. 246, 258 (1983) ("substantial evidence" means a little more than a "scintilla of evidence.").

Spot Zoning

The City must find sufficient facts for a change or mistake because "[z]oning is permissible only as an exercise of the police power of the State. When this power is exercised by a city, it is confined

by the limitations fixed in the grant by the State and to the accomplishment of the purposes for which the State authorized the city to zone.” *Cassel*, 195 Md. at 353.

In piecemeal rezoning bills, like this one, if there is not a factual basis to support the change or the mistake, then rezoning is considered illegal spot zoning. *Id.* at 355. Spot Zoning “has appeared in many cities in America as the result of pressure put upon councilmen to pass amendments to zoning ordinances solely for the benefit of private interests.” *Id.* It is the “arbitrary and unreasonable devotion of a small area within a zoning district to a use which is inconsistent with the use to which the rest of the district is restricted.” *Id.* It is “therefore, universally held that a ‘spot zoning’ ordinance, which singles out a parcel of land within the limits of a use district and marks it off into a separate district for the benefit of the owner, thereby permitting a use of that parcel inconsistent with the use permitted in the rest of the district, is invalid if it is not in accordance with the comprehensive zoning plan and is merely for private gain.” *Id.*

However, “a use permitted in a small area, which is not inconsistent with the use to which the larger surrounding area is restricted, although it may be different from that use, is not ‘spot zoning’ when it does not conflict with the comprehensive plan but is in harmony with an orderly growth of a new use for property in the locality.” *Id.* The example given was “small districts within a residential district for use of grocery stores, drug stores and barber shops, and even gasoline filling stations, for the accommodation and convenience of the residents of the residential district.” *Id.* at 355-356. Thus, to avoid spot zoning, the Mayor and City Council must show how the contemplated use is consistent with the character of the neighborhood. *See, e.g., Tennison v. Shomette*, 38 Md. App. 1, 8 (1977) (cited with approval in *Rylyns Enterprises, Inc.*, 372 Md. at 545-46).

Planning Commission Recommendation

The Planning Department Report (“Report”) supports this rezoning, finding that there has been a change in character since the last comprehensive rezoning in 2017. The Report notes that, “[t]he area has experienced significant population growth [(approximately 34% based on Census data)], supporting more intense commercial development at the site.” Report, p.3. The report notes that there are no anticipated changes to the availability of public facilities or changes in transportation patterns and that the change is compatible with existing and proposed development for the area. Report, p.4.

Process

The City Council is required to hold a quasi-judicial public hearing with regard to the bill wherein it will hear and weigh the evidence as presented in: (1) the Planning Report and other agency reports; and (2) testimony from members of the public and interested persons. Baltimore City Code, Art. 32, § 5-601(a). After weighing the evidence presented and submitted into the record before it, the Council is required to make findings of fact about the factors in Section 10-304 of the Land Use Article of the Maryland code and Section 5-508 of Article 32 of the Baltimore City Code. If, after its investigation of the facts, the Council makes findings which support: (1) a mistake in the comprehensive zoning or a change in the neighborhood; and (2) a new zoning classification for the properties, it may adopt these findings and the legal requirements for granting the rezoning would be met.

Additionally, certain procedural requirements apply to this bill beyond those discussed above because a change in the zoning classification of a property is deemed a “legislative authorization.” Baltimore City Code, Art. 32, § 5-501(2)(iii). Specifically, notice of the City Council hearing must be given by publication in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, by posting in a conspicuous place on the property and by first-class mail, on forms provided by the Zoning Administrator, to each person who appears on the tax records of the City as an owner of the property to be rezoned. Baltimore City Code, Art. 32, § 5-601(b). The notice of the City Council hearing must include the date, time, place and purpose of the hearing, as well as the address or description of the property and the name of the applicant. Baltimore City Code, Art. 32, § 5-601(c). The posted notices must be at least 3 feet by 4 feet in size, placed at a prominent location near the sidewalk or right-of-way for pedestrians and motorists to view, and at least one sign must be visible from each of the property’s street frontages. Baltimore City Code, Art., § 5-601(d). The published and mailed notices must be given at least 15 days before the hearing; the posted notice must be at least 30 days before the public hearing. Baltimore City Code, Art. 32, § 5-601(e), (f).

The bill is the appropriate method for the City Council to review the facts and make the determination as to whether the legal standard for rezoning based on change in the character of the neighborhood has been met. Assuming the required findings are made at the hearing and that all procedural requirements are satisfied, the Law Department can approve City Council Bill 26-0177 for form and legal sufficiency.

Sincerely,



Desiree Luckey
Assistant Solicitor

cc: Ebony Thompson, City Solicitor
Hilary Ruley, Chief Solicitor, General Counsel Division
Jeff Hochstetler, Chief Solicitor
Ashlea Brown, Chief Solicitor
Michelle Toth, Assistant Solicitor