

**INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM**  
**PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND**  
ZONING HEARING EXAMINER OFFICE  
WAYNE K. CURRY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING  
1301 McCormick Drive  
3<sup>RD</sup> FLOOR  
LARGO, MARYLAND 20774  
(301) 952-3644

**TO:** Jackie Brown, Committee Director  
Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee

**FROM:** Maurene Epps McNeil  
Chief Zoning Hearing Examiner

**DATE:** September 9, 2022

**RE:** CB-67-2022

Thank you for the opportunity to review the above referenced legislation. I would suggest the following revisions:

1. On page 1, line 21, delete "Safety " since the bill addresses additional items (i.e., aesthetics, use of funds collected, etc. ).
2. On page 2, lines 4-5, delete everything after "Subdivision" as surplusage.
3. On page 2, lines 16-17 require further thought. A private garage may or may not have additional uses "on the premises". If the sponsor agrees it might be better to add "associated with the private garage" at the end of line 17.
4. On page 2, line 22 should be revised to delete "the charging is for daytime purposes only" and insert "use of the station occurs solely during the daytime."
5. The language on page 2, line 31, to page 3, line 2, only requires that one reviews the feasibility of installing solar panels. As a law the bill should either mandate such use or allow an exemption for such installation under prescribed circumstances. A non-codified section could be used to urge consideration of solar panels wherever possible. Similar language is used on page 3, lines 25-27 and I would also suggest that it be removed since the language doesn't actually require an owner to do anything.
6. On page 3, line 13 should be revised to insert "non-residential" before "sites" and delete "except residential properties, ".
7. On page 3, line 18, delete "for the purposes of this subsection" since the word "charging" alone isn't utilized in the subsection. If a definition of charging is required it should be added to page 2 in the definitions subsection.
8. Aesthetics of the use could only be approved via a Site Plan or other zoning approval. Accordingly, I'm not sure who would decide whether screening should be provided via

landscaping or erection of walls, as required on page 3, lines 30-31. This language should be inserted in the Zoning Ordinance. If the Council chooses to allow it to remain I would suggest the language be revised since it is not clear how aesthetics supports a positive environmental impact with a positive business experience. If the intent of the language is to ensure that the electric vehicle charging station not detract from the aesthetics of the surrounding uses that language should be utilized instead.

9. The language concerning vandalism on page 4, lines 1-3, again requires assessment of the risk by someone, and the bill should address how that might be done.
10. Finally, monies paid to the County may have to go into the General Fund under most circumstances, so I am not sure that the language on page 4, lines 5-7 is permissible. I also am unsure what is meant "by lock box" and would need further information in order to comment.