

*WORK SESSION OF THE GREENBELT CITY COUNCIL held Wednesday, October 5, 2016, to receive a briefing on Module 3 of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance Rewrite and Subdivision Regulations.*

*Mayor Jordan started the meeting at 8:10 p.m. The meeting was held in Room 201 of the Greenbelt Community Center.*

*PRESENT WERE: Councilmembers Judith F. Davis, Konrad E. Herling, Leta M. Mach, Silke I. Pope, Edward V. J. Putens, Rodney M. Roberts and Mayor Emmett V. Jordan.*

*STAFF PRESENT WERE: Michael McLaughlin, City Manager; Celia Craze, Director of Planning and Community Development; and Cindy Murray, City Clerk.*

*ALSO PRESENT WERE: Chad Williams and Brian Barnett-Woods, Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission; Kathleen Gallagher, News Review; Kap Kapastin, Quantum Corporation; Nathaniel Foreman, O'Malley, Miles, Nylan & Gilmore; Brian Almquist, Molly Lester, Bill Orleans, and others.*

*Chad Williams presented a PowerPoint presentation on the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission's (M-NCPPC) Zoning Rewrite process. He noted the key themes of the Zoning Rewrite were to: 1) make the regulations more user-friendly and streamlined; 2) modernize, simplify, and consolidate zones and zone regulations; 3) implement key goals, policies, and strategies of Plan Prince George's 2035; and 4) modernize the regulations and incorporate best practices.*

*He summarized the highlights of Module 3 which consolidates and clarifies development review procedures to: 1) make it easier to achieve high quality development/jobs; 2) makes process more efficient and certain; and 3) provides more flexibility to support desired redevelopment. He noted that Module 3 strengthens opportunities for early and meaningful public involvement and provides for consolidated/standardized review procedures.*

*Mr. Williams described the specific procedural review requirements and decision standards that are unique to each type of development application. He said the current conceptual and detailed site plans would be consolidated into one site plan procedure with two tiers: 1) Minor – which is decided by the Planning Director, appealable to the Planning Board and then to the District Council; and 2) Major – which are decided by the Planning Board, appealable to the District Council. Mr. Williams reviewed the major and minor adjustments procedure (currently called "departures"), with the Planning Director deciding minor adjustments (appealable to the Planning Board) and the Planning Board deciding major adjustments (appealable to the Circuit Court). He also reported on nonconformities, including uses, structures, lots of record, signs and sign features.*

*Mr. Williams said following the review of Module 3, the new code will be tested to ensure that the proposed process makes it easy to approve the kind of development supported by Plan 2035 and difficult to approve development not supported by Plan 2035. He noted that Beltway Plaza had been chosen as one of the test sites.*

*Ms. Craze said Planning staff has completed its review of Module 3 and was very pleased overall with the content and organization. She advised that procedures for the administration of*

*the zoning ordinance are described for every type of zoning and subdivision application in a flow chart, which is very easy to understand. In addition, procedures have been standardized so the same basic procedure applies to equivalent zoning application. She noted that this is a significant improvement over the existing zoning ordinance. Ms. Craze added that the subdivision regulations are simplified, easily described, and are standardized.*

*Ms. Craze said some of the same concerns staff has expressed with Modules 1 and 2 are repeated for Module 3, including municipal authority missing at critical points. She advised that staff was very pleased that the municipal authority over variances and departures (now called adjustments) is continued.*

*She reviewed the following major concerns/questions/issues identified during Planning staff's review of Module 3 and the Subdivision Regulations:*

- 1. The city's authority over variances and departures (now adjustments) continues. Clarification is needed on whether the city's enabling legislation will need revision as a result of new limitations on variances and adjustments.*
- 2. There should be an appeal process with all zoning applications. This is not reflected in the document.*
- 3. The threshold between a Major and Minor site plan is too great. Minor site plans as proposed would be considered major projects in most communities. The review and decision of such projects should not be relegated to an administrative process which is invisible to the public and cities. Minor reviews would also be reviewed by M-NCPPC plan reviewers, if current staffing organization continues. This would mean that community planners would have no opportunity to review such projects, which is not desirable.*
- 4. In streamlining many types of review by making them administrative, the public's ability to be aware of proposed development, to comment and to have appeal opportunity are not available. Streamlining the development review process has value, but such streamlining should not be at the expense of the public's right to know what is going on in the development world.*
- 5. There is inadequate time for municipalities to review, consider and comment on development applications. Module 3 is silent in many areas where time frames were previously set forth. The review process needs to be more explicitly addressed and provided for in the administrative procedures.*
- 6. Appropriate references to municipalities should be made.*
- 7. Fee-in-lieu payments for recreation facilities need to be paid directly to the cities not within the Metropolitan District.*
- 8. As was described in the comments for Module 2, traffic calming should not be a function of the development review process, since it relates to right-of-way management under the authority of another department or governmental entity.*

*Mr. Williams said comments on Module 3 are being requested by November 1<sup>st</sup> but any comments received after that date will still be accepted. Ms. Craze advised that the City letter with comments is tentatively scheduled to be on Council's agenda for approval at the October 24, 2016, meeting.*

*In response to a question from Mr. Putens, Ms. Craze explained that once the Zoning Rewrite goes to legislation, public hearings will be held and comments will be heard by County Council.*

*Mr. Kapastin, Quantum Management, said he was unaware that Beltway Plaza had been chosen as a test site until tonight's meeting.*

*Molly Lester, 6-M Hillside Road, asked about the protection of historic areas. Mr. Williams said he was consulting with Ms. Craze on this designation.*

*Mayor Jordan asked if the Zoning Rewrite would be presented at a Prince George's County Municipal Association (PGCMA) meeting. Mr. Williams said he has been trying to get a presentation scheduled for the past two years with PGCMA but had been unsuccessful thus far. He said he will continue reaching out to PGCMA.*

*Ms. Craze said she was meeting with Planning Department staff from the Cities of Bowie and College Park tomorrow to discuss the Zoning Rewrite.*

#### *Informational Items*

*Several informational items were discussed.*

*The meeting ended at 10:30 p.m.*

*Respectfully Submitted,*

*Cindy Murray  
City Clerk*