



**Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations Rewrite
Glenn Dale Citizens' Association
February 16, 2016**

The purpose of this discussion was to present Clarion Associates' recommendations contained in Module 1 for zones, zone regulations, and uses, and to discuss the concerns and questions of the civic association. Responses to questions and additional presenter comments are identified by *italicized text*.

- The first question was: “to what extent has the County Council been involved?” *Staff noted that there have been multiple briefing and opportunities for comments for the entire council.*
- Once the explanation of the changes in zoning categories was underway a request for a cross reference table was made and it was acknowledged that one will be made available. *Staff notes that Clarion has provided a cross-reference table of the initial recommendations contained in Module 1, which may be found at the back of the Executive Summary:*
http://zoningpgc.pgplanning.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/ExecSum_FINAL_10-23-15.pdf
- A questions was raised as to why there are no density requirements noted in the current R-35 and R-20 residential zones. *Staff believes this comment dealt with one of the slides shown to the community. These two zones are recommended by Clarion for consolidation to the new Single-Family Residential Attached (SFR-A) Zone; the maximum densities of this zone are contained in Module 1.*
- Nearing the end of the review of proposed residential zoning changes, an observation was made that it appears to be simply collapsing categories and changing names; this was followed by an inquiry into whether or not there are any policy changes proposed. *Staff explained that most of the residential zones are strictly Euclidian (single use) and for compatibility sake do not represent a significant change in policy. Policy changes will become more apparent in the commercial zones and in the newly proposed transit-oriented/activity center base zones.*
- It was noted that the Neighborhood Commercial (NC) Zone sounded like a strip retail center. *Staff explained that through development regulations, one could alleviate the “strip center” appearance through such methods as requiring parking behind the building and for the building to front the street.* There was concern that the NC Zone could be misused and encourage commercial development in existing residential neighborhoods through future rezoning.



- Seabrook MARC and its designation as a Local Center (Neighborhood) by the Plan Prince George's 2035 General Plan was brought up, along with questions as to how such a vision will happen. *There was acknowledgement that a market was needed first but the consultant's proposed Neighborhood Activity Center (NAC) Zone would encourage and facilitate the implementation of the community vision when and if the market arrives.*
- A question was raised if the Neighborhood Conservation Overlay (NCO) was an anti-McMansion zone. *The NCO was described as a way to preserve the character of the existing neighborhood.*
- While some members present during the discussion indicated that the County Council's ability to elect to review cases (often referred to as "call-up") was beneficial to the community, one member made the observation that Prince George's County is one of the only counties in the area with this ability delegated to the Council, and indicated their belief that Prince George's County "is still at the bottom of the heap." *Staff explained that community input is essential in setting the standards and ensuring that they are high enough to result in development the community can embrace.*
- There was a concern that we will set our standards too high and get no development since the market challenges facing Prince George's County are high. Or we may set intermediate standards and then we get development we do not want. One view was that the alternative is to have review and that the community needs a safety net. The counter-point was made that we do not get what we want today when a path for this review already exists.
- The final comment involved aging in place and whether or not the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations Rewrite would address this issue. The policy change of allowing accessory dwelling units was noted as a significant policy change, and appeared to be supported overall by the meeting participants.