

**COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND**  
**SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**2000 Legislative Session**

Bill No. CB-80-2000  
 Chapter No. 74  
 Proposed and Presented by Council Members Bailey and Shapiro  
 Introduced by Council Members Bailey and Shapiro  
 Co-Sponsors \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date of Introduction October 24, 2000

**ZONING BILL**

1 AN ORDINANCE concerning the

2 Biennial Growth Policy Plan

3 For the purpose of approving the initial Plan proposed by Commission 2000, with amendments,  
 4 to begin Prince George's County's biennial growth policy review process.

5 WHEREAS, the County Council of Prince George's County, Maryland, sitting as the  
 6 District Council, initiated Commission 2000 in Council Resolution 62-1998, to address long-  
 7 term growth policy and related issues in Prince George's County; and

8 WHEREAS, Commission 2000 was appointed, met from November 1998 to July 2000, and  
 9 reviewed County law and policy concerning land use, land development, public facilities  
 10 planning, and growth policy generally; and

11 WHEREAS, Commission 2000 has adopted and transmitted to the District Council a  
 12 Biennial Growth Policy Plan addressing growth policy issues and related issues in Prince  
 13 George's County; and

14 WHEREAS, the District Council has reviewed the Biennial Growth Policy Plan from  
 15 Commission 2000 and has determined that it should be approved, with amendments; and

16 WHEREAS, approval of the Biennial Growth Policy Plan of 2000, attached hereto as  
 17 Attachment A and incorporated herein by reference, with amendments by the District Council,  
 18 attached hereto as Attachment B and incorporated herein by reference, constitutes the District  
 19 Council's initiation of the biennial growth policy review process, a process to be formulated,  
 20 approved, and codified as part of the processes whereby the Prince George's County Planning

1 Board and the District Council amend and implement the General Plan and Master Plans for  
2 the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Prince George's County, Maryland.

3 NOW, THEREFORE:

4 SECTION 1. BE IT ENACTED by the County Council of Prince George's County,  
5 Maryland, sitting as the District Council for that part of the Maryland-Washington Regional  
6 District in Prince George's County, Maryland, that the Biennial Growth Policy Plan of 2000,  
7 attached hereto as Attachment A and incorporated herein by reference, and its amendments,  
8 attached hereto as Attachment B and incorporated herein by reference, are hereby approved. The  
9 Plan in Attachments A and B amends the General Plan for the Maryland-Washington Regional  
10 District in Prince George's County, Maryland and amends all adopted and approved Master Plans  
11 in Prince George's County. Approval of the Plan in Attachments A and B also initiates the  
12 District Council's biennial growth policy review process, a process to be approved and codified  
13 in the future.

14 SECTION 2. BE IT FURTHER ENACTED that this Ordinance shall take effect on the  
15 date of its adoption.

Adopted this 21st day of November, 2000.

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S  
COUNTY, MARYLAND, SITTING AS THE  
DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PART OF  
THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTON REGIONAL  
DISTRICT IN PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY,  
MARYLAND

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Dorothy F. Bailey  
Chair

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joyce T. Sweeney  
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENT B**

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO**

**BIENNIAL GROWTH POLICY PLAN**

**KEY:**

Underscoring indicates new language.  
[Brackets] indicate language to be deleted.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

### I. Goals and Priorities Chapter

#### Priorities

##### A. *Page 11*

- ☐ Add a new priority after Priority No. 3, AInfill and Revitalization≡ and renumber subsequent priorities:

A4. Existing Neighborhood Integrity X new development will be compatible and will strengthen viable existing neighborhoods and communities.≡

- ☐ Add a new priority after Priority No. 6, ATransit Support:≡

A8. Socio-Economic Diversity X the County will promote and strengthen its unique character as a diverse, multi-cultural jurisdiction.≡

- ☐ Revise Priority No. 5:

AEnvironmental Protection X ... to establish a functional system of open spaces that provide energy efficient, environmental, recreational and visual amenities for current and future County residents...≡

### II. Growth Policies Chapter

#### Plan Maps

##### A. *Pages 16, 20 and 24*

- ☐ Revise Map 1 and Map 3 to show the Town of Upper Marlboro as part of the Rural Tier
- ☐ Revise Map 1 and Map 4 to indicate that the incorporated area of the Town of Upper Marlboro is not included in the Upper Marlboro Center
- ☐ Revise Map 1 and Map 4 to delete the symbol for the Bowie State University MARC area as a Possible Future Center
- ☐ Revise Map 1 and Map 4 to delete the designation of the Cheverly Metro area as a Possible Future Center and show it as a Center
- ☐ Revise Map 1 and Map 4 to delete the designation of the Greenbelt Metro

area as a Possible Future Center and show it as a Center

- ☐ Revise Map 1 and Map 4 to delete the designation of the Southern Avenue Metro area as a Possible Future Center and show it as a Center
- Revise Map 1 and Map 3 to show all of the Beltsville-Calverton area located north of the Beltway in the Developing Tier.
- Revise the depiction of Map 1 and Map 3 for those portions of the Mattawoman basin that are shown as cross-hatched so that they are depicted in the same color as the Rural Tier. This clarifies the intent of the plan to place unsubdivided parts of this basin in the Rural Tier.

#### Rural Tier Policies

##### B. *Page 22*

- ☐ Delete Policy No. 1: A[Modify zoning standards so that rural development potential is based on maximum density rather than solely on minimum lot size. For instance, instead of requiring a minimum lot size of five acres (as is now the case in the O-S Zone), regulations would be changed so that lot sizes could vary as long as the resulting density on a property does not exceed 0.2 dwellings per acre. However, it is recognized that a minimum lot size will still be needed so that rural character is protected and there is adequate land to accommodate on-site wastewater treatment and disposal requirements.]≡
- ☐ Delete Policy No. 2: A[Permit cluster development in the Rural Tier. To ensure that it is consistent with the areas=s prevailing rural character, cluster development will meet minimum criteria including minimum and maximum lot sizes, standards for open space configuration and management, buffering and a limit on the maximum number of units in a single cluster.]≡

#### Corridors and Centers Overlay Policies

##### C. *Page 26*

- ☐ Add a new Policy No. 6 for metropolitan centers: A6. Structured parking shall be facilitated, as necessary and appropriate, at Metro stations and throughout revitalization areas, through financial incentives and through State and County/private infrastructure investment. Incentives may include implementation of Special Tax Districts, the revenue growth from which would be utilized to finance structured parking infrastructure.≡
- ☐ Add a new Policy No. 6 for regional centers: A6. Structured parking shall

be facilitated, as necessary and appropriate, at Metro stations and throughout revitalization areas, through financial incentives and through State and County/private infrastructure investment. Incentives may include implementation of Special Tax Districts, the revenue growth from which would be utilized to finance structured parking infrastructure.≡

D. *Page 27*

- ⊞ Add the following to the list of community centers: ACheverly Metro≡ and ASouthern Avenue Metro area≡
- ⊞ Add the following to the discussion of community centers: A ... West Hyattsville Metro and Oxon Hill have been designated as community centers. It should be noted that the municipality of the Town of Upper Marlboro is not included in the Upper Marlboro center. It should also be noted that the Town of Upper Marlboro should be considered as a special treatment area and that the Town=s character will be protected and enhanced.≡
- ⊞ Add a new Policy No.6 for Community Centers: A6. Structured parking shall be facilitated, as necessary and appropriate, at Metro stations and throughout revitalization areas, through financial incentives and through State and County/private infrastructure investment. Incentives may include implementation of Special Tax Districts, the revenue growth from which would be utilized to finance structured parking infrastructure.≡
- ⊞ Revise the discussion concerning Center Priorities:

AAAlthough all of the centers identified in Map 4 are places where the County will encourage future development, there are some centers that should have priority over others in the competition for limited resources. All Metro station areas are high priority centers for economic development. Efforts to encourage mixed-use development (including a combination of commercial office, entertainment, residential and retail uses) should be emphasized and supported as high priority items. It should be noted that, although all Metro stations have the same priority for economic development, they are not all to be developed with the same character and intensity. It should also be noted that an educational centers category (including policies guiding future development and public investment) should be added to the Biennial Growth Policy Plan in the next biennial review cycle."

[For the term of this first Biennial Growth Policy Plan, efforts to encourage the following centers should be emphasized (in order of priority):

1. National Harbor
2. Branch Avenue Metro area
3. Bowie  
Largo Town Center  
Prince George's Plaza Metro area  
Suitland Metro area
7. Oxon Hill-Constellation Center
8. Port Towns
9. Naylor Road Metro area
10. Upper Marlboro

In addition, priority should be given to all other centers inside the Beltway that can be served by existing or future transit.]≡

*E. Page 28*

- ⊖ Delete, from the list of Possible Future Centers: A[Bowie State MARC (Community Center)]≡
- ⊖ Delete, from the list of Possible Future Centers: A[Cheverly Metro area (Community Center)]≡
- ⊖ Delete, from the list of Possible Future Centers: A[Southern Avenue Metro area (Community Center)]≡
- ⊖ Delete, from the list of Possible Future Centers: A[Greenbelt Metro area center]≡

Environmental Overlay Policies

*F. Page 29*

- ⊖ Delete Policy 2.c.: A[Cluster development to protect elements of the green infrastructure.]≡

*G. Page 30*

- ⊖ Add the following new policy: A7. Create a Countywide energy efficiency plan. See local action plan as contained in CR-10-1999.≡

- ☐ Add the following new policy: A8. Establish outdoor lighting standards for each tier.≡

## Schools

### H. *Pages 30 to 34*

- ☐ Delete discussion concerning schools including Background, Findings, School Policies and School Adequate Public Facilities Test. Add the following:

#### ASchools

The provision of high quality school facilities for current and future County students is the highest priority issue identified in this Biennial Growth Policy Plan. The relationship between new development and the provision of school facilities has been the subject of an extraordinary effort over the last six years. The County Council, Executive and the Board of Education have worked with the State in order to undertake an unprecedented amount of new school construction. A new revenue source for school construction has been established with the authorization of the school construction surcharge. And, in 1997, a Schools Adequate Public Facilities test was established to better control the rate of development in relationship to the school facilities that could be provided.

The issue of providing adequate school facilities is complex. Board of Education educational policies such as magnet schools programs can impact the number of students attending an individual school. School enrollment is further impacted by the establishment of attendance area boundaries, transfers between schools, in- and out-migration and the amount and character of new development. The impacts of any policy may be extensive and will require careful study and consideration. Because of these factors, there will have to be careful consideration of possible future APF legislation in the implementation phases of the Biennial Growth Policy Plan.≡

## Pipeline Policies

### I. *Page 35*

- ☐ Revise Policy No. 4: ASpecial exceptions shall expire [six] three years after the date of approval if, at the end of the [six] three year validity period, all necessary permits for construction or operation of the special exception have not been issued. There will be no extensions.≡



### **III. Biennial Growth Policy Plan Implementation Chapter**

#### **Guidance and Relationship to Other County Plans and Programs**

A. *Page 38*

- ☐ Revise the guidance given for the General Plan Environmental Element: AEnvironmental Element. This Biennial Growth Policy Plan makes recommendations that will require further action for the creation of a Countywide energy efficiency plan, a green infrastructure, identification of sensitive watersheds, protection of aquifers and targets for tree conservation and preservation within each tier. The environmental element should reflect the goals, objectives, policies and recommendations of this Biennial Growth Policy Plan.≡

B. *Page 41*

- ☐ Revise the task description for Task #2: ADevelop General Plan based on the policy direction provided by Commission 2000 to serve as a consistent framework for area plans, land use regulation, capital improvement decisions and other fiscal programs, including measurable objectives to gauge progress.≡

### **IV. Other Amendments**

- A. Revise text as appropriate to reflect Council adoption of Commission 2000 proposed policies.