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Outreach and Comments in Total
Outreach & Comments

343 MEETINGS
held with Civic Associations, State & County Agencies, Non-Profit Organizations, Municipalities, and other stakeholders

37635 EMAILS
sent about the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations Rewrite and meetings since January 2015

30 MENTIONS
about the Prince George’s Zoning Rewrite in local and regional newspapers, blogs, and media stations.

1186 FOLLOWERS
who connected with the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations Rewrite on Facebook, Twitter, and CiviComment

1688 SUBSCRIBERS
who registered to receive email updates about the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations Rewrite

10709 VISITORS
to the project’s website since its re-launch in December 2014.
Outreach & Comments
Outreach & Comments

30 Meetings between September 26 and December 15, 2017.

145 Individuals stakeholders commented by letter, email, or CiviComment.

687 Total pages of individual stakeholder comments
Comment
Categories
Comment Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Provisions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions and Measurement</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Standards</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonconformities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Boundaries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comment Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Topic</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensional / Intensity Standards</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Parking</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority to Continue</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Publishing Use Permission</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Map Amendment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Roof</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Police</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Energy Conversion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Themes

current, composting, parking, review, zoning, city, town, zones, food, area, public, site, proposed, farm, table, definition, permitted, planning, plan, permit
Outreach & Comments

- Comment Digest
  - Comment
  - General Topic
  - Source
  - Staff Analysis & Recommendation
  - 178 pages (and growing!)
- Resource for Council and Public
Comment Categories

- General Support
- Healthy Communities
- Municipal Inclusion
- Neighborhood Protection
- Public Engagement
- Standards
- Uses
What We’ve Heard
What We’ve Heard

General Support
- Transit-oriented development
- Mixed-use zones
- Strong design Standards
- Definitions
What We’ve Heard

Healthy Communities
- Allow beekeeping in more areas and remove standards
- Create a food truck hub use
- Reincorporate Health Impact Assessments

Response
- We fixed it
- Use added
- Health Impact Assessments will be restored for Major Detailed Site Plans and Comprehensive Master Plans
Healthy Communities
- Permit urban agricultural and related uses in more zones
- Increase composting opportunities, update composting definition

Response
- Urban farms allowed in non-residential zones; Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones still under consideration
- Updated definition, consideration for neighborhood-scale composting
What We’ve Heard

Neighborhood Protection

- Keep M-U-TC

Response

- Retain Legacy MUTC in legislative draft

- Neighborhood Conservation Overlay (NCO) Zone desired

- NCO process included in proposed ordinance, implementation of new NCOs up to Council
What We’ve Heard

**Neighborhood Protection**
- Higher density for single-family zones in small lot communities
- Lower density for single-family zones
- Increase density for RMF-20 to RMF-28
What We’ve Heard

Municipal Inclusion
- Incorporate municipalities in review chart for referral roles
- Invite Municipalities to Pre-Application meetings

Response
- The review chart contains statutory authority; referrals will still be sent to municipalities
- Municipalities are certainly welcome in pre-app neighborhood meetings; pre-app conferences are an administrative, staff-level function
What We’ve Heard

**Municipal Inclusion**
- Mailing and posting deadlines less than 30 days are difficult to obtain municipal response

**Response**
- Many administrative-level decisions require shorter notification times to streamline the process; these are small, constrained decisions per the County Council’s level of comfort with delegation to Director
### Procedures
- Major and Minor Detailed Site Plan thresholds too high; and too low
- Require detailed site plans for all projects in the nonresidential and Transit-Oriented / Activity Center zones

### Response
- Thresholds reduced from earlier draft and designed to balance economic investment and review process
- DSP requirement is based on project size
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reincorporate civic associations into the notification table</td>
<td>Civic associations inadvertently left out and will be added to the table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of Countywide Map Amendment</td>
<td>The map amendment will be a public process directed by County Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What We’ve Heard

Public Engagement
- Some wanted to reduce appellate period, others wanted to extend
- Improve sign postings

Response
- Appellate period retained at 30 days for major decisions
- Intend to increase information contained on signage – not a legislative function
What We’ve Heard

Public Engagement
- Like pre-application neighborhood meetings
- Seek concrete details and consequences for neighborhood meetings
What We’ve Heard

**Standards**

- Some support no minimum parking in RTO/LTO zones; some oppose
  - Reasonable in high transit areas ONLY (e.g. not US 1)
  - Increase parking maximum percentage
  - Parking districts
### Standards – Landscape Manual

- Improve shade tree distances for better coverage
- Revise recommended tree types
- Fire/EMS Department recommend separation from landscaping

### Response

- Shade tree distance reflects distance from building
- Remove Sugar Maples and Silver Maples
- Require a six-inch separation between landscaping and building walls
What We’ve Heard

Standards – Green Building
- Supportive of Green Building Standards
- Desire even stronger standards
- Better suited for Subtitle 4 (Building Code)

Response
- Council staff and Executive Office staff recommend placing green building standards in future Subtitle 4 legislation rather than Zoning Ordinance
What We’ve Heard

Uses

- Support mixed-use development
- 18% requirement is problematic and arbitrary
What We’ve Heard

Fast Food Uses & Drive-Through Service

- Distinction between “Fast food” and “Fast Food (without drive-through service)”
- “Quick Service” is preferred term

Response

- Fast Food drive-through service prohibited in denser zones; “fast-casual” restaurants permitted in many areas
- “Fast Food” will be replaced with “Quick Service”
What We’ve Heard

**Combination Retail**
- Detrimental to economic health
- Should be special exception
- Prohibit on-site usage of shipping containers for storage
- Much stronger design standards desired
**What We’ve Heard**

**Newspaper/Periodical Publication**
- Newspaper / periodical publishing should not be prohibited in most zones

**Response**
- The use permissions are from the current ordinance and are outdated; will be permitted in more zones
Questions ?