

## Coates, Jennifer (City Council)

---

**From:** AB Associates <ababalt@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 25, 2022 11:16 AM  
**To:** Middleton, Sharon (City Council); Conway, Mark (City Council); Dorsey, Ryan (City Council); Bullock, John (City Council); Ramos, Odette (City Council); Stokes, Robert (City Council); Glover, Antonio (City Council)  
**Cc:** Ruley, Hilary B. (Law Dept); Woods, Tamara (DOP); Coates, Jennifer (City Council)  
**Subject:** Transform Baltimore #21-0113

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of Baltimore City IT Network Systems.  
**Reminder:** DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know that the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities using the Report Phishing Email Button, or by emailing to [Phishing@baltimorecity.gov](mailto:Phishing@baltimorecity.gov)

On behalf of the Baltimore Development Work Group, I am offering our comments on Councilman Conway's proposed amendment to Section 2-203 Transition Rules.

The intent of the City's original language was to return the long-standing practice in the 1971 Zoning Code of referring changes to existing conditional uses approved by either the Zoning Board or City Council, to the Zoning Board for approval. This practice was inadvertently changed in the original Transform adoption and created sufficient ambiguity as to the actual intent.

Councilman Conway's amendment is in response to a local issue in his district that should not be the basis of a change that affects properties throughout the City. A letter to the Committee from a neighborhood resident in support of the Councilman's amendment suggests that the Council should be granted authority over "grand expansion" plans of a specific business which misrepresents the actual facts and should not be the basis for a City wide change for "any" change to a reclassified conditional use. At a minimum, "any" change should be better defined and the Board retain authority over minor expansions, eg those less than 25%.

The Councilman's amendment does, however properly address those City Council approved conditional uses where language in the approval ordinance might conflict with the change being requested.

We look forward to having a discussion with the Committee before any votes are taken.

Al Barry

## Coates, Jennifer (City Council)

---

**From:** AB Associates <ababalt@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 25, 2022 11:14 AM  
**To:** Middleton, Sharon (City Council); Dorsey, Ryan (City Council); Ramos, Odette (City Council); Bullock, John (City Council); Stokes, Robert (City Council); Glover, Antonio (City Council); Conway, Mark (City Council)  
**Cc:** Woods, Tamara (DOP); Matt Stegman; Coates, Jennifer (City Council)  
**Subject:** 21-0113 - Transform Baltimore Height issues

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of Baltimore City IT Network Systems.

**Reminder:** DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know that the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities using the Report Phishing Email Button, or by emailing to [Phishing@baltimorecity.gov](mailto:Phishing@baltimorecity.gov)

On behalf of the Baltimore Development Work Group, I am writing in support of two issues pertaining to heights being considered by the Committee.

Topic 14 - The first supports the Planning Department's language that concerns how the height of a new building is measured. The 2017 Transform definition dramatically changed how the City (and most Zoning Codes) measure the actual height of a building. Planning's proposal returns to the prior Zoning Code definition where height is measured from the immediate surrounding grade and removes the confusing references to street frontages. A letter in opposition to Planning's proposal is from an attorney who references his clients' attempts to oppose a proposed residential care facility located hundreds of feet away from their property and supported by the four surrounding community associations. This singular opposition should be ignored on this important City wide clarification.

Councilman Dorsey's Modification of heights - BDW supports his amendment that slightly increase the permitted heights of new buildings in certain districts from 60' to 68'. The current 60' limit in the existing Transform Code was never based on the actual building code and industry construction standards for new buildings particularly for mixed use buildings with a higher minimum ground floor height. We are available to provide more detailed justification if the Committee desires.

Thank you for your consideration