

**PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY COUNCIL
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY**

Meeting Date: 6/27/2000

Reference No.: CB-29-2000

Proposer: Scott

Draft No.: 3

Sponsors: Scott, Maloney

Item Title: An Ordinance prohibiting consolidated storage in the C-M Zone, where this is currently permitted by special exception, and imposing a height limitation on consolidated storage structures in all zones

Drafter: Jackie Brown
PZ&ED Committee Director

Resource James F. Burton
Personnel: Legislative Aide

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

Date Presented: 4/11/2000

Executive Action: __/__/____ __

Committee Referral: 4/11/2000 PZED

Effective Date: 8/14/2000

Committee Action: 5/10/2000 FAV(A)

Date Introduced: 5/16/2000

Public Hearing: 6/27/2000 1:30 P.M.

Council Action: 6/27/2000 ENACTED

Council Votes: DB:A, JE:A, IG:A, TH:A, WM:A, RVR:A, AS:A, PS:A, MW:A

Pass/Fail: P

Remarks: _____

6/27/2000 – Amended on the floor

PLANNING, ZONING & ECONOMIC DEV. COM. REPORT

DATE: 5/11/2000

Committee Vote: Favorable with amendments, 4-0 (In favor: Council Members Russell, Maloney, Scott and Wilson)

Staff presented a Proposed Draft-2 to the Committee explaining that the revision to the legislation clarifies its effect on pending special exception applications for consolidated storage in the C-M Zone. Page 2 is amended in Proposed Draft-2 to make this clarification and to incorporate suggested amendments recommended by the Planning Board. The new draft modifies the use table to indicate

that the use is prohibited by replacing “SE” with an “X” in the column for the C-M Zone. Footnote 35 is redrafted as follows: “Special exceptions approved by June 1, 2000 may continue in effect, may be revised or amended under procedures in Part 4 and shall not be considered nonconforming uses.”

Council Member Scott, the bill’s sponsor, explained that she proposed this legislation due to concerns with the proliferation of consolidated storage in her district. Mrs. Scott indicated that there have been consolidated storage buildings constructed and new applications submitted at a rapid pace. Mrs. Scott also expressed concern regarding the architecture and height of these buildings. Council Member Maloney expressed similar concerns regarding this use in his district and suggested a height limitation of two stories for consolidated storage structures.

Joe Meinert, Assistant Director of Planning, City of Bowie, spoke in support of the legislation and provided a letter detailing the City’s position as follows. “The City is very concerned about the proliferation of commercial self-storage facilities, mini-warehouses and consolidated storage units throughout the County. The City Council believes these facilities represent an inefficient usage of commercially zoned land along highways and on the edges of our community. Left unchecked, these unsightly, low-cost structures will continue to degrade the visual attractiveness of Prince George’s County and erode the supply of high profile commercial real estate which should be reserved for retail or employment uses.” Mr. Meinert commented on the City’s concerns with scale and height of the buildings as well as lighting associated with consolidated storage sites.

Thomas Haller, representing Storage Management, spoke regarding his concerns of prohibiting the use in the C-M Zone and commented that the special exception process gives the District Council the ability to review the structure for compatibility. Bill Knight, representing Public Storage, addressed the Committee requesting that they consider a grandfather provision especially for those applications that have been before the District Council and are still in the process so that they may be processed to a conclusion. Mr. Knight also suggested retaining consolidated storage as a use in the C-M Zone as an adaptive reuse of a structure.

Russell Shipley, representing Siena Corporation (EZ Storage), also requested an amendment to grandfather applications that have been filed but have not completed the review and hearing process. Mr. Shipley explained that he has submitted applications for which the process has been underway for a year and a half and that analysis concerning need and design may be considered as part of the ongoing review of these cases. Clark Thomas, Choptank Real Estate, spoke in opposition to the legislation and suggested that the Committee consider tightening the architecture requirements for the structures instead of prohibiting the use in the C-M Zone.

The Planning Board supports CB-29-2000 with the amendments discussed above and incorporated in Proposed Draft-2. The Office of Law determined that the bill is in proper legislative form. Footnote 35 was also amended in the new draft to address other concerns raised by the Office of Law relating to pending applications, reconsideration of a special exception final decision and the approval deadline for applications/effective date of the legislation. The Office of Audits and Investigations determined there should be no negative fiscal impact on the County as a result of enacting CB-29-2000.

Council Member Scott made a motion for a favorable report on the bill with amendments to grandfather special exception applications filed prior to January 1, 2000 and to limit the height of the

structures to thirty (30) feet.

Council Member Russell suggested that the staff and industry continue looking at issues discussed during the meeting such as height, architecture and need as well as the possibility for a provision for adaptive reuse in order to address concerns associated with consolidated storage sites in the County.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION/FISCAL IMPACT

(Includes reason for proposal, as well as any unique statutory requirements)

Consolidated storage is permitted by special exception in the C-M Zone. This legislation amends the Commercial Use Tables to prohibit this use in the C-M Zone.

CODE INDEX TOPICS: