Prince George’s County
Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations Rewrite
County Council Retreat
*Notification and Community Involvement*
*Process and Administration*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone Structure</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses</td>
<td>February 7, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>February 14, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification and Community Involvement</td>
<td>March 2, 2017 (retreat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process and Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision Regulation</td>
<td>March 13, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Map Amendment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worksession Goals

1. Identify the key “Big Picture” Issues on Notification and Community Involvement and Process and Administration

2. Answer questions and address concerns

3. Provide Planning staff direction on key issues
Agenda

Part 1: Notification and Community Involvement

Part 2: Development Application Procedures

Part 3: Development Review Authority
Current Process

More Discretionary Review

Increased Costs

Uncertain Outcomes

Mistakes and Mistrust

Late-Stage Community Input

Overly Detailed Regulations

Disincentive to Investment in Prince George’s County

Current Process

Uncertain Outcomes

Disincentive to Investment in Prince George’s County

Overly Detailed Regulations

Lates-Stage Community Input

More Discretionary Review

Increased Costs

Uncertain Outcomes

Mistakes and Mistrust
Proposed Process

More Administrative Review

- More Modern, Appropriate Level of Regulation
- More Certainty of Outcomes
- More Streamlined Process
- More Effective Collaboration
- Successful Communities and Increased Investment

Upfront Community Input
Topics of Discussion

- Public Notice and Participation
- Pre-Application Neighborhood Meeting
Notification and Community Involvement

- Located in Module 3 on Pages 27-2-11 through 27-2-24
- Assure stakeholders are provided opportunities to voice their opinion
- Create development that reflects the values and priorities of stakeholders
- Provide more meaningful public engagement upfront
Early and meaningful public involvement:

- New Ordinance is logically organized and more understandable
- New neighborhood meeting requirement to allow citizen input on major projects before applications are submitted
- Civic organizations register to receive notice of neighborhood meetings, application submission, and public hearings on applications
- Consolidating and clarifying all public notification requirements in a table
Notification and Community Involvement

Required Public Notice Table

- Public notification requirements in one subsection
- Timing and duration of notices:
  - Mailed
  - Published
  - Posted
- Content of notices addressed in text
Required Public Notice

**Current** (Detailed Site Plan) vs. **Proposed** (Major Site Plan)

**Current Ordinance** (Detailed Site Plan)

**Proposed** (Major Site Plan)
Required Public Notice

Current (Detailed Site Plan) vs. Proposed (Major Site Plan)

Current Ordinance (Detailed Site Plan)

Proposed (Major Site Plan)
Pre-Application Neighborhood meeting

- **Encouraged** for many applications
- **Required** before application submitted for:
  - Parcel-specific map amendments
  - Planned development (PD) map amendments
  - Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Overlay Zone map amendments
  - Special exceptions
  - Major site plans
  - Major adjustments

- **Notice posted** and **mailed** 10 days in advance to adjacent landowners and civic organizations
Required Public Notice

**Current (Detailed Site Plan) vs. Proposed (Major Site Plan)**

**Current Ordinance (Detailed Site Plan)**

1. Development Idea
2. Applicant Engineers Proposal
3. Pre-Application Neighborhood Meeting Mailing
4. Pre-Application Neighborhood Meeting Posting of Sign
5. Notice of Hearing Mailing
6. Posting of Sign
7. Technical Staff Report
8. Planning Board Webpage
9. Public Hearing

**Proposed (Major Site Plan)**

1. Development Idea
2. Pre-Application Neighborhood Meeting Mailing
3. Pre-Application Neighborhood Meeting Posting of Sign
4. Notice of Hearing Mailing
5. Posting of Sign
6. Technical Staff Report
7. Planning Board Webpage
8. Public Hearing

**Applicant Engineers Proposal**

**Required Public Notice**

**Current (Detailed Site Plan) vs. Proposed (Major Site Plan)**

**Current Ordinance (Detailed Site Plan)**

1. Development Idea
2. Applicant Engineers Proposal
3. Pre-Application Neighborhood Meeting Mailing
4. Pre-Application Neighborhood Meeting Posting of Sign
5. Notice of Hearing Mailing
6. Posting of Sign
7. Technical Staff Report
8. Planning Board Webpage
9. Public Hearing

**Proposed (Major Site Plan)**

1. Development Idea
2. Pre-Application Neighborhood Meeting Mailing
3. Pre-Application Neighborhood Meeting Posting of Sign
4. Notice of Hearing Mailing
5. Posting of Sign
6. Technical Staff Report
7. Planning Board Webpage
8. Public Hearing

**Applicant Engineers Proposal**
Strengthens opportunities for public involvement:

- Requiring posting of notice on land
- Retaining public hearings
- Civic organizations register to receive notice on applications
- Public notification requirements in a table
- Recommending a new Applications Manual to incorporate administrative aspects of the application process that will:
  - Improve online information on applications
  - Require Technical Staff Reports to include a summary of citizen comments
  - Improve information included in public notices
Notification and Community Involvement

- Do you agree with the Pre-Application Neighborhood Meetings?
- Are there other public participation or notice measures you would like to include?
This concludes the staff presentation on notification and community involvement input.

Questions?
Prince George’s County
Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations Rewrite

County Council Retreat—Part 2
Development Application Procedures
Topics of Discussion

- Overview
- Master Plans
- Rezoning
- Text Amendments
- Site Plan
- Planned Development
- Special Exceptions
- Variances
- Adjustments
The current ordinance outlines approximately 67 procedures. Key procedures include:

- **Master Plans**
- **Amendments**
  - Sectional map amendment
  - Zoning map amendments
  - Text amendments
- **Special Exceptions**
- **Site Plans**
  - Conceptual Site Plan
  - Detailed Site Plan
  - Comprehensive Design Plans
- **Relief Procedures**
  - Variances
  - Departures
  - Alternative Compliance
The **proposed** ordinance outlines **20** procedures. Key procedures include:

- Master Plans
- Amendments and Planned Developments
- Special Exceptions
- Site Plans
- Permits and Certificates
- Relief Procedures
All proposed development application procedures follow a standard review procedure.
Master Plan Procedures
Master Plans

What happens now:

18 Months

Council Initiates → Master Plans → Planning Staff Prepares Plan → Council Approves/ Denies Plan

- Functional Plans
- Sector Plans
- Area Master Plans

- Community Outreach
- Joint Public Hearings
- Planning Board Work Sessions
- Council Work Sessions
Master Plans

What is proposed:

- **No Changes**, except
- Replacing the 18-month time frame with a flexible schedule to be determined by the District Council.
Questions?
Rezoning Procedures
Rezoning

Current Ordinance:

Rezoning Procedures

- Zoning Map Amendment
  - Euclidian/Conventional
    - RPC
    - CDZ
  - MIOZ
  - ACOZ
  - CBCA
  - Mixed-Use
    - M-U-TC

- Sectional Map Amendment
  - DDOZ
  - Text Amendment
  - Site Plan in a DDOZ or TDOZ

Current Ordinance: DDOZ
Rezoning

Proposed:

Re-Zoning Procedures

Zoning Map Amendment

Euclidian/Conventional

RPC
ACOZ
CDZ
MIOZ
TDO
Mixed-Use
M-U-TC
CBCA

Sectional Map Amendment

Text Amendment

DDO

Site Plan in a DDOZ or TDOZ
Rezoning

Proposed:

Rezoning Procedures

Zoning Map Amendment

Sectional Map Amendment

Parcel Specific

RPC
ACOZ
CDZ
CBCA
MIOZ
TDO
Mixed-Use
M-U-TC

Text Amendment

Site Plan in a DDOZ or TDOZ

DDO
Rezoning

Proposed:

Rezoning Procedures

- Zoning Map Amendment
- Sectional Map Amendment

Parcel Specific

- RPC
- ACOZ
- CDZ
- MIOZ
- TDO
- MIX
- M-U-TC

Planned Development

- CBCA
- Text Amendment
- Site Plan in a DDOZ or TDOZ
- DDO
Rezoning

What is proposed:

- Consolidating 13 procedures into 4
- **No changes** to SMA and CBCA Map Amendments
- Euclidian zoning amendments become Parcel-Specific Map Amendment; still require “Change or Mistake” finding.
- Planned Development zones are new, but are very similar to CDZs.
Questions?
Text Amendment Procedures
Text Amendments

What happens now:

Council Initiates

Can be requested by:
- County Executive
- Planning Board
- Public

Text Amendment

Public Hearing/Referrals

Amend zones

Amend uses

Council Approves or Denies Amendment
Text Amendments

What is proposed:

Council Initiates

Can be requested by:
- County Executive
- Planning Board
- Public

Text Amendment

Amend zones
Amend uses

Council Hearing/Referrals

Planning Board Hearing and Recommendation

Council Approves/ Denies Amendment
Text Amendments

- Per Council guidance -

No changes. Text Amendments will continue to be determined solely by the District Council.
Questions?
Site Plan Procedures
Site Plan review **currently** includes the following:

- Conceptual Site Plan
- Comprehensive Design Plan
- Detailed Site Plan
- Specific Design Plan
Proposed site plan review include the following:

- Minor Site Plan
- Major Site Plan

The Major and Minor Site Plans are similar to the Detailed Site Plan (DSP). The proposed procedures no longer include the Conceptual Site Plan (CSP).

Additionally, deletion of the Comprehensive Design Zones results in deletion of the Comprehensive and Specific Design Plans.
Removal of the Conceptual Site Plan:

- The CSP implies that there is a logical sequence and direct relationship between the CSP and the DSP. However, this is not necessarily true, particularly in the event of market changes.
- Clarion suggests that removal of the CSP would result in:
  - Consolidation
  - Cost and time savings for the applicant and County
  - Streamlining
  - Simplification of the site plan review process
Site Plan review is currently required by either:

- The zoning district e.g. R-T, R-10, and M-X-T
- The use tables e.g. day care center, churches and consolidated storage, or recreational community developments
- Through other regulatory tools as a condition of approval of a Zoning Map Amendment, Special Exception, or a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision.
Site Plans

Site Plan review is **proposed** to be required by the size of the project - number of dwelling units and/or the amount of square footage proposed for the development, as follows:

- For attached housing and multifamily – over a certain number of dwelling units
- For nonresidential – over a certain amount of square footage
- For mixed-use development – over a certain size (sq. ft. of nonresidential) and number of dwelling units
Exemptions from Site Plan Review (permit review process):

Development that is exempt from site plan review (per Sec. 27-2.508.C.1.b) will be required to file for appropriate permits and demonstrate compliance with the regulations of the proposed Zoning Ordinance.
Examples of exemptions from Minor and Major site plan review (per 27-2.508.C.1.b) include:

- Alteration of a building with no increase in GFA
- Changes in use and occupancy
- Single-family detached dwellings
- Townhouses or multifamily development of less than 10 dwelling units
- Nonresidential development less than 100,000 square feet of GFA
- Mixed-use development less than 50,000 square feet of GFA and less than 50 dwellings
- Grading that include installation of infrastructure including streets, utilities, or storm water management
Minor Site Plan review is proposed to be required with the construction, expansion, or alteration of:

- Townhouse or multifamily development between 10-75 dwellings,
- Nonresidential development between 100,000 and 150,000 square feet of GFA, and
- Mixed-use development between 50,000 and 250,000 square feet of GFA and less than 90 dwellings.
**Site Plans**

**Major Site Plan** review is proposed to be required with the construction, expansion, or alteration of:

- All development that is not exempted per Sec. 27-2.508.C.1.b and which exceeds the thresholds for minor site plan review.
## Site Plans

### Project size thresholds for each level of Site Plan review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residential (Multi-Family and Townhouse Dwelling Units)</th>
<th>Nonresidential (Gross Floor Area)</th>
<th>Mixed (Gross Floor Area &amp; Multi-Family and Townhouse Dwelling Units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit Review Only</td>
<td>0 - 9</td>
<td>0 - 99,999</td>
<td>0 - 49,999 GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 – 49 DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Site Plan</td>
<td>10 - 75</td>
<td>100,000 - 149,999</td>
<td>50,000 - 249,999 GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 89 DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Site Plan</td>
<td>76 +</td>
<td>150,000 +</td>
<td>250,000 + GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90 + DU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decision Standards

Current decision standards for site plans are being carried over except for one substantial change.

- Today’s code requires conformance to the design guidelines, which are not binding.
- The proposed decision standards require conformance to the development standards, which are mandatory.
Site Plans

- Does the Council agree with eliminating the Conceptual Site Plan procedure?

- Does the Council agree with linking the requirement of site plan review with the size (and potential impact) of the proposed development?
Planned Development Procedures
**Planned Developments**

**Currently** – CDZs include Basic Plan/CDP/SDP

**Proposed** – **Planned Development** zones are similar to today’s CDZs. A Planned Development first requires a rezoning and concurrent approval of a PD Basic Plan.

The second step for development within a Planned Development zone follows the procedures for any other development, depending on the size:

- Permit review,
- Minor Site Plan, or
- Major Site Plan
Questions?
Special Exceptions

Procedures
Special Exceptions

Current - Planning Board review is optional.

Proposed - Planning Board review is mandatory.

- Staff does not agree with this proposal and recommends codifying current procedure.
- ZHE review creates the record of hearing.
Special Exceptions

Current revision process to an approved SE (ROSP):

- Major changes are processed per the original approval of the SE
- Minor changes are processed by either the Planning Board or the Planning Director, depending on the extent of the changes
Proposed revision process to an approved SE:

Major changes to SE –
- The text as proposed is silent, but staff assumes that these would be processed according to the original application procedure.

Minor changes to SE –
- ZHE – Up to 15% increase in GFA or land area covered
- Planning Director –
  - Up to 10% increase in GFA or land area covered,
  - Compliance with Subtitle 32,
  - Redesign of parking and loading area, or
  - Redesign of landscaping.
Special Exceptions

Questions?
Variance Procedures
Variances

What happens now:

Review of a variance by the Board of Zoning Appeals, unless the application is in conjunction with an application with final decision-making authority lying with the Planning Board, ZHE or District Council, in which case that authority also makes the final decision relating to the variance.
Variances

What is proposed:

All variance requests would be heard and decided by the BZA.

What staff has directed:

Restore the current Variance procedures, which grant the body reviewing and deciding the parent application the authority to approve a requested variance.
Variances

Decision Standards
Variance decision standards are slightly different than the current code language:

Current language:

- (1) A specific parcel of land has exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape, exceptional topographic conditions, or other extraordinary situations or conditions;

- (2) The strict application of this Subtitle will result in peculiar and unusual practical difficulties to, or exceptional or undue hardship upon, the owner of the property; and

- (3) The variance will not substantially impair the intent, purpose, or integrity of the General Plan or Master Plan.
Decision Standards

Proposed language:

1. Strict application of the ordinance would result in exceptional practical difficulty for, or exceptional or undue hardship on, the owner of the land because of the exceptional shape of the land at the time of the enactment of this Ordinance or any amendment, thereto, or because of the exceptional situation of topographical conditions of the land; and

2. Authorization of the variance will not cause a substantial impairment of the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone where the proposed variance is located.
Questions?
Adjustment Procedures
Adjustments

What happens now:

Applicant cannot meet design standard

Exceptional site features
Market challenges
Building Design

Applicant requests relief from standard

Planning Board approves or denies relief request

Departures
Alternative Compliance
Waiver of Design Guideline

Planning Board has authority to alter requirement 100%
What is proposed:

- Applicant cannot meet design standard
  - Exceptional site features
  - Market challenges
  - Building Design

Design element can be adjusted

Applicant requests an adjustment from specific element

Planning Board or Planning Director approves or denies relief request

Authority to alter requirement is limited to certain percentages
Adjustments

What is proposed:

- **Adjustments** will allow for limited deviations from design standards
  - Adjustments are limited in regards to how much a standard can be deviated
  - Only certain design elements can be adjusted
- Adjustments are requested by the applicant
- These are similar to the current departures process; the term “departure” is **not** required by state land use law.
- Adjustments are **NOT** variances
The amount that a design standard can be adjusted is dependent on a few factors:

- The location of the application in the County
  - Projects inside the Beltway (more urban)
  - Projects in Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones
  - Projects outside the Beltway (more suburban)

- Major vs. Minor Adjustments approvals
  - Major adjustments are approved by the Planning Board
  - Minor adjustments are approved by the Planning Director
Major and Minor Adjustments Thresholds

- Major adjustments are 15-35% *(generally)*
- Minor adjustments are 0-15% *(generally)*
- All major adjustments are also minor adjustments, but not all minor adjustments are major adjustments
Adjustments

MINOR ADJUSTMENTS*
- Base zone dimensional standards
- Block design standards
- Vehicle stacking space
- Off-street parking spaces
- Location of off street parking
- Transparency/Fenestration
- Buffer width

MAJOR ADJUSTMENTS*
- Base zone dimensional standards
- Vehicle stacking space
- Off-street parking spaces
- Location of off street parking

*Each element has its own adjustment percentage
Adjustments

- If reviewed in conjunction with another application, are to be approved *prior to* the other application.

- Are valid for the period of the development approval or permit with which it was considered and approved.
Adjustments

Does the Council agree with the procedures to provide limited relief to the design standards as proposed in the Adjustment procedures?
This concludes the staff presentation on Development Application procedures.

Questions?
Prince George’s County
Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations Rewrite

Council Retreat – Part 3
Development Review Authority
Development Review Authority

Topics of Discussion

- Council Appeals and Election to Review
- Master Plans
- Text and Map Amendments
- Site Plan
- Relief Procedures
- Permits
Council Appeals and Election to Review
Council Appeals and Election to Review

What we have heard:
- Many community members who provided comments support Council election to review
- Members of the development community who provided comment do not support Council election to review
What happens now:

- The District Council hears a development case as an appeal requested by the applicant or an aggrieved party.

- The District Council may vote to review the Planning Board's decision, on its own motion, within thirty (30) days after the date of the notice.
Council Appeals and Election to Review

What is proposed:

- District Council can hear appeals for:
  - Major site plans
  - Appeals of minor site plans, following a Planning Board appeal of the Planning Director’s decision
- Appeals are requested by the applicant or by an aggrieved party.
- Election to review is not carried forward.
Review Authority
### Review Authority

#### Summary Comparison Chart of Clarion Associates' Proposed Changes to Development Review Responsibilities (9/30/2016)

**Key:** A - Appeal; C - Comment; D - Decision; I - Initiation; R - Recommendation; < > - Public Meeting Required; ( ) - Call Up; Blank  
Space - No action; **Red text** refers to actions in the current code **

Staff recognizes this chart is difficult to use; this is largely due to the numerous procedures that exist in the current Zoning Ordinance and how they contribute to the overall complexity of comparisons. Two follow-up products are planned to address the concern of user-friendliness. The first will be a set of graphical comparisons of the procedures of each individual review body. The second will be a summary of the biggest changes Clarion proposes to procedures and review authorities.

A number of current procedures are proposed to be removed by Clarion because either the zone (such as Comprehensive Design Zones) or procedures have been replaced by streamlined zones or procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Application / Procedure</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Proposed Application/Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master Plans or Sector Plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Amendment</td>
<td>Consolidated</td>
<td>}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Amendment</td>
<td>Maintained</td>
<td>Text Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amendments and Planned Developments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Map Amendment - Conventional</td>
<td>Maintained</td>
<td>Parcel Specific Map Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Planned Community</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Planned Development Map Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Design Zones</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-X-T and M-X-G Zones</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Conservation Overlay</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review Authority

SYMBOLS IN TABLE

- A – Appeal
- C – Comment
- D – Decision
- I – Initiation
- R – Recommendation
- <> – Public Meeting
- () – Council Election to Review (current code)
- Blank Space – No Role
Master Plan Review Authority
### Master Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>County Executive</th>
<th>District Council</th>
<th>Planning Board</th>
<th>Board of Zoning Appeals</th>
<th>Zoning Hearing Examiner</th>
<th>Planning Director</th>
<th>DPIE Director</th>
<th>Historic Preservation Commission</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I &lt;D&gt;</td>
<td>I* &lt;R&gt;</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Planning Board can initiate with the written authorization or concurrence by resolution of the District Council

No Change.
Text and Map Amendments
Review Authority
### Text Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Executive</td>
<td>I &lt;D&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>I &lt;D&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Zoning Appeals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Hearing Examiner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPIE Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Planning Board can initiate with the written authorization or concurrence by resolution of the District Council.
## Sectional Map Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>County Executive</th>
<th>District Council</th>
<th>Planning Board</th>
<th>Board of Zoning Appeals</th>
<th>Zoning Hearing Examiner</th>
<th>Planning Director</th>
<th>DPIE Director</th>
<th>Historic Preservation Commission</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td>I &lt;D&gt;</td>
<td>I* &lt;R&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td>I &lt;D&gt;</td>
<td>I* &lt;R&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Planning Board can initiate with the written authorization or concurrence by resolution of the District Council
Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Map Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>County Executive</th>
<th>District Council</th>
<th>Planning Board</th>
<th>Board of Zoning Appeals</th>
<th>Zoning Hearing Examiner</th>
<th>Planning Director</th>
<th>DPIE Director</th>
<th>Historic Preservation Commission</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td>&lt;D&gt;</td>
<td>I* &lt;R&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;R&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td>I &lt;D&gt;</td>
<td>I* &lt;R&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;R&gt;</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Planning Board can initiate with the written authorization or concurrence by resolution of the District Council
# Parcel-Specific Map Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>County Executive</th>
<th>District Council</th>
<th>Planning Board</th>
<th>Board of Zoning Appeals</th>
<th>Zoning Hearing Examiner</th>
<th>Planning Director</th>
<th>DPIE Director</th>
<th>Historic Preservation Commission</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Current       | <D>              | <R>              | <R>            | R                       | C                       |                  |               |                                   |              |
| Proposed      | <D>              | <R>              | <R>            | R                       | C                       |                  |               |                                   |              |
## Planned Development Map Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Executive</th>
<th>District Council</th>
<th>Planning Board</th>
<th>Board of Zoning Appeals</th>
<th>Zoning Hearing Examiner</th>
<th>Planning Director</th>
<th>DPIE Director</th>
<th>Historic Preservation Commission</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong>*</td>
<td>&lt;D&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;R&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td>&lt;D&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;R&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is no “current” Planned Development Zone. The authority for “Comprehensive Design Zones” is shown.

No Change.
Special Exceptions
Review Authority
## Special Exceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Executive</td>
<td>(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board</td>
<td>&lt;D&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Zoning Appeals</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Hearing Examiner</td>
<td>R*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Director</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPIE Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The DPIE Director may revoke or modify an approved special exception (Sec. 27-328).** The DPIE Director may petition the ZHE to revoke, modify, suspend, or impose additional conditions on an approved special exception.
Special Exceptions

What happens now:
- Special Exception applications may be considered by the Planning Board. This is an uncodified practice.
- The Zoning Hearing Examiner conducts the official hearing and establishes the official record in the case, and decides the case based on the evidence.
- The District Council may:
  - Elect to review the case; or
  - Hear and decide an appeal.
  - There is a mandatory review in some cases.
Special Exceptions

What is proposed:

- The Planning Board makes a recommendation to the ZHE.
- The ZHE makes the final decision on the case.
- The District Council hears and decides:
  - An appeal of an aggrieved person; or
  - A case in which the ZHE decision conflicts with the recommendation of a municipality in which the application is located.
- The District Council would not retain mandatory review on any SE.
Site Plans
Review Authority
## Major Site Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>County Executive</th>
<th>District Council</th>
<th>Planning Board</th>
<th>Board of Zoning Appeals</th>
<th>Zoning Hearing Examiner</th>
<th>Planning Director</th>
<th>DPIE Director</th>
<th>Historic Preservation Commission</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>(&lt;A&gt;)</td>
<td>&lt;D&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;D&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Major Site Plan does not exist in today’s code, but this comparison uses the process for a Detailed Site Plan.
## Minor Site Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Executive</th>
<th>District Council</th>
<th>Planning Board</th>
<th>Board of Zoning Appeals</th>
<th>Zoning Hearing Examiner</th>
<th>Planning Director</th>
<th>PIE Director</th>
<th>Historic Preservation Commission</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Minor Site Plan does not exist in today’s code, but this comparison uses the process for a Detailed Site Plan reviewed at Planning Director level.
Site Plans

What happens now:
Site plans are reviewed at both Planning Board level and at Planning Director level.

- The Planning Board reviews the original case (most often, some cases are reviewed by the Planning Board’s designee).

- The Planning Director reviews amendment requests to approved Detailed Site Plan if the amendment meets certain criteria; otherwise the case must be reviewed by the Planning Board.

- The cases reviewed by the Planning Board are appealable to the District Council, or the District Council can elect to review the case.
Site Plans

What is proposed:

- **Major Site Plans** - The Planning Board would review and decide Major Site Plans, with an appeal to the District Council.

- **Minor Site Plans** - The Planning Director would review and decide Minor Site Plans, with an initial appeal to the Planning Board and further appeal to the District Council.

- Amendments to both Major and Minor Site Plans are recommended to follow the procedures of an initial application.
Questions

- How do you feel about the overall approach for authority?

- What are you specific thoughts about recommendations for Master Plans, Amendments, Site Plans, and Special Exceptions?

- What are your thoughts regarding Election to Review?
Relief Procedures

Review Authority
Adjustments Review Authority
### Major Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Executive</th>
<th>District Council</th>
<th>Planning Board</th>
<th>Board of Zoning Appeals</th>
<th>Zoning Hearing Examiner</th>
<th>Planning Director</th>
<th>DPIE Director</th>
<th>Historic Preservation Commission</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong>*</td>
<td>(&lt;A&gt;)</td>
<td>&lt;D&gt;</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td>&lt;D&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Major Adjustment does not exist in today’s code, but this comparison uses the process for a Departure.

** Municipalities have the authority to decide adjustments when that authority has been duly delegated to the municipality by the District Council pursuant to the Regional District Act.
## Minor Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current*</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>District Council</th>
<th>Planning Board</th>
<th>Board of Zoning Appeals</th>
<th>Zoning Hearing Examiner</th>
<th>Planning Director</th>
<th>DPIE Director</th>
<th>Historic Preservation Commission</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Minor Adjustment does not exist in today’s code, but this comparison uses the process for a Departure reviewed at Planning Director level.

** Municipalities have the authority to decide adjustments when that authority has been duly delegated to the municipality by the District Council pursuant to the Regional District Act.
Adjustments

Municipal Authority

Adjustments may be determined by the Municipality if a local ordinance is enacted setting forth the procedures, and if adopted by the District Council (per resolution). Adjustments may not be more strict than the maximum thresholds of the Zoning Ordinance.
Variances Review Authority
# Permit Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>&lt;D&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Zoning Appeals</td>
<td>&lt;D&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Hearing Examiner</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Entitlement Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Executive</th>
<th>District Council</th>
<th>Planning Board</th>
<th>Board of Zoning Appeals</th>
<th>Zoning Hearing Examiner</th>
<th>Planning Director</th>
<th>DPIE Director</th>
<th>Historic Preservation Commission</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td>(&lt;A&gt;)</td>
<td>&lt;D&gt;</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;D&gt;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Permits Review Authority
## Permit Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Executive</td>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Zoning Appeals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Hearing Examiner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPIE Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Change.
# Zoning Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>&lt;A&gt;</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>&lt;A&gt;</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Change.
# Use and Occupancy Permit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Executive</td>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Zoning Appeals</td>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Hearing Examiner</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Director</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPIE Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current code states the Planning Board (or authorized representative) makes a recommendation to DPIE. The Planning Director/Staff is the authorized representative. This chart assumes the same in the proposed code.
## Temporary Use and Occupancy Permit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Executive</th>
<th>District Council</th>
<th>Planning Board</th>
<th>Board of Zoning Appeals</th>
<th>Zoning Hearing Examiner</th>
<th>Planning Director</th>
<th>DPIE Director</th>
<th>Historic Preservation Commission</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Grading Permit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>County Executive</th>
<th>District Council</th>
<th>Planning Board</th>
<th>Board of Zoning Appeals</th>
<th>Zoning Hearing Examiner</th>
<th>Planning Director</th>
<th>DPIE Director</th>
<th>Historic Preservation Commission</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current code states the Planning Board (or authorized representative) makes a recommendation to DPIE. The Planning Director/Staff is the authorized representative. This chart assumes the same in the proposed code.
## Building Permit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Executive</td>
<td>District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current code states the Planning Board (or authorized representative) makes a recommendation to DPIE. The Planning Director/Staff is the authorized representative. This chart assumes the same in the proposed code.
# Sign Permit

Sign permits in the current Zoning Ordinance are a specific form of a building permit. The proposed Zoning Ordinance makes them a distinct type of permit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>County Executive</th>
<th>District Council</th>
<th>Planning Board</th>
<th>Board of Zoning Appeals</th>
<th>Zoning Hearing Examiner</th>
<th>Planning Director</th>
<th>DPIE Director</th>
<th>Historic Preservation Commission</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;A&gt;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table above represents the current and proposed roles and responsibilities for various boards and commissions in the Zoning Ordinance.*
This concludes the staff presentation on Development Review Authority.

Questions?
## Worksessions Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone Structure</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses</td>
<td>February 7, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>February 14, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification and Community Involvement</td>
<td>March 2, 2017 (retreat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process and Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision Regulation</td>
<td>March 13, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Map Amendment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WINTER / SPRING 2017

- Council Retreat
- PZED/COW Pre-Legislative Work Sessions
  - How can we help you?
- Comprehensive review draft published

SUMMER 2017

- Review public comments of the Comprehensive Review Draft
- PZED/COW Pre-Legislative Work Sessions
  - Response to the Comprehensive Review Draft
Schedule

FALL 2017

- Legislative draft presented to Council
  - Legislative package
- Legislative hearings and approval
- Initiate Countywide Map Amendment

WINTER / SPRING 2018

- Council Retreat – Update
- Drafting Applications Manual / Re-zone County
- Approve Countywide Map Amendment
SUMMER 2018

- New Zoning Ordinance takes effect
- Public outreach and education