

CITY OF BALTIMORE

BERNARD C. "JACK" YOUNG, Mayor



OFFICE OF COUNCIL SERVICES

LARRY E. GREENE, Director
415 City Hall, 100 N. Holliday Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
410-396-7215 / Fax: 410-545-7596
email: larry.greene@baltimorecity.gov

HEARING NOTES

Ordinance: 19-0427

Rezoning - 1020 West Pratt Street

Committee: Land Use
Chaired by: Councilmember Edward Reisinger

Hearing Date: July 29, 2020
Time (Beginning): 1:05 PM
Time (Ending): 1:25 PM
Location: Webex Virtual Hearing
Total Attendance: Approximately 40 people

Committee Members in Attendance:
Edward Reisinger Shannon Sneed
Mary Pat Clarke Eric Costello
Ryan Dorsey Sharon Green Middleton
Robert Stokes

Bill Synopsis in the file? [X] YES [] NO [] N/A
Attendance sheet in the file? [X] YES [] NO [] N/A
Agency reports read? [X] YES [] NO [] N/A
Hearing televised or audio-digitally recorded? [X] YES [] NO [] N/A
Certification of advertising/posting notices in the file? [X] YES [] NO [] N/A
Evidence of notification to property owners? [X] YES [] NO [] N/A
Final vote taken at this hearing? [X] YES [] NO [] N/A
Motioned by: Councilmember Dorsey
Seconded by: Councilmember Clarke
Final Vote: Favorable

Major Speakers

(This is not an attendance record.)

Eric Tiso, Department of Planning
Hilary Ruley, Law Department
Alyssa Domzal, Representative for the Applicant

Major Issues Discussed

1. Chairman Reisinger called the hearing to order; read the bill number, title, and purpose; and confirmed that the public notice requirements were met.
2. Councilman Bullock explained the history of the property and the background for the bill. He noted that the developer has been working with the community to address its concerns and that the community is in support of the project.
3. Eric Tiso summarized the Planning Staff's report and the Planning Commission's recommendation. He noted that the developer appears to have resolved the concerns expressed by neighbors at the Planning Commission's hearing.
4. Representatives from the other City agencies confirmed the recommendations in their written reports.
5. Representatives for the applicant and developer explained the plans for the property and why the IMU district was most appropriate. They further explained that the property has never been used for residential purposes and that the existing building is not suitable for residential use.
6. The committee voted to approve the findings of fact.
7. The committee voted to recommend the bill favorably.

Further Study

Was further study requested?

Yes No

If yes, describe.

Committee Vote:

E. Reisinger: **Yea**
S. Sneed: **Yea**
M. Clarke: **Yea**
E. Costello: **Yea**
R. Dorsey: **Yea**
S. Middleton: **Yea**
L. Pinkett: **Absent**
R. Stokes: **Yea**



Matthew L. Peters, Committee Staff

Date: August 12, 2020

Cc: Bill File
OCS Chrono File