



THE PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY GOVERNMENT

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

BOARD OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS

WAYNE K. CURRY COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, LARGO, MARYLAND 20774
TELEPHONE (301) 952-3220

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jackie Brown, Director
PHED Committee

FROM: Barbara J. Stone, Administrator
Board of Appeals

RE: Legislative Referral – CB-73-23 (DR-1)

DATE: September 15, 2023

The Board of Appeals has reviewed Legislative Referral CB-73-23 DR-1 and have the following comments:

1. The Board finds that Section 27-8301 should include the following fee's which failed to carry over to the current Zoning Ordinance as noted in the prior Zoning Ordinance Section 2-122. Filing appeal or variance application: Fees.

Sec. 2-122. Filing appeal or variance application; fees.

* * * * *

(2) Extension of Time to Cease or Correct Zoning Violation:

(A) Residential Property Involved\$100.00

(B) All Other Requests for Time\$200.00

(3) Other Zoning Appeals\$200.00

(c) The following schedule of filing fees shall apply to appeals filed with the Board of Appeals, relative to provisions of other than Subtitle 27 of this Code:

(1) Administrative Appeals:

(A) Residential Property Involved\$200.00

(B) Commercial or Industrial Property Involved\$300.00

* * * * *

2. Due to the additional information required on the posting signs, per Section 3407 (b)(1)(2) (A-G), the size of the sign must be enlarged to accommodate the additional information, which causes an increase in printing and material cost. Currently, the fee schedule charge is \$30.00 for two signs. This increase would cost the County an approximate \$38.00 for two signs. This does not include delivery cost. Should the overall cost be increased?
3. As each agency (M-NCPPC / Zoning Hearing Examiner and Board of Appeals) necessitates varied information for each "process" that would require a public hearing; is it possible to revise the sign content requirements to gear the regulation toward the required process? This would alleviate superfluous information and possibly allow the signs to be more legible and comprehensible for travelling motorist. The supplementary regulations of sign content do provide the community with more information, although, at the same time makes the sign less decipherable to moving traffic on busy roads. To the point that a motorist would have to stop their vehicle to obtain the sign content, which may be a hazard to other motorists.

For example, within the Board of Appeals, the majority of appeals apply for variance(s) to a single-family dwelling. Inquiries are only concerned with "what is proposed"? Which in the majority of cases would be the construction of a fence, deck, addition to an existing dwelling or construction of a shed or driveway, etc... The inquirer would not be concerned with the zone or the description of the property. They are more concerned with what the request is pertaining to and will it affect their property. In regard to the Board of Appeals, I believe removing the un-needed information would allow more room on the sign for information which pertains to the proposed work.