Consolidated Comments on Module 2
Prince George's County

This document constitutes a major milestone of community stakeholder engagement in Prince George's County's effort to replace our outdated Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations. In May 2016, the County's consultant team, led by Clarion Associates, released the second of three modules containing their recommendations – based on national best practices – for creating a set of modern 21st Century zoning and subdivision laws and provide us with the necessary toolkit to successfully compete with our peer jurisdictions within the region, foster economic development opportunities, implement community-based planning, and incorporate simplified language and streamlined procedures.

Over the last eight months, the County Council (which sits as the District Council for planning and zoning matters in the County), Planning Board, County Executive's Office, residents, municipalities, civic groups, project focus groups, property and business owners, land use attorneys, the development community, Planning Department staff, and local, state, and regional agencies have engaged the project staff team and offered their thoughts on Module 2 (Development Regulations and Adequacy of Public Facilities).

The result of this on-going, essential, and extraordinarily productive conversation is contained in this analysis. In response to community desire and to better document the overall process of the difficult task of comprehensively replacing the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations, staff has adopted an approach like that taken when evaluating comprehensive plan testimony. All comments on the module received during numerous meetings and online via e-mail and our Open Comment website (http://pgplanning.opencomment.us) following the release of Module 2 have been listed below, associated with the page number from Module 2 (the "with notes" version of Module 2) whenever possible.

This analysis contains community stakeholder comments received by staff as of the date of its compilation (January 2017). Many of these comments were analyzed by staff, which then offered a recommendation for how the Clarion Associates team should address the comment. It should be noted that the national zoning and subdivision expertise offered by the Clarion Associates team is necessary to fully analyze and address some of the comments; in other words, the project staff team was sometimes reluctant to address the comments that were received since they a) pertain to a recommendation offered by Clarion Associates that is a new concept to the County, and we cannot speak for Clarion's rationale, or b) were outside our direct areas of expertise. For other comments, staff has deferred analysis in anticipation of future decision points and/or additional testimony. Finally, staff has also identified, in very general terms, the source of the comment.

Comments are generally organized into four major categories:

1. Requests from the County Council and other parties for additional supportive information.

2. Changes that need to be incorporated in Module 2 pursuant to staff analysis of comments received. Until this document was compiled, Planning Department staff, the Planning Board, and the County Council had not endorsed any of Clarion Associates' recommendations.

   Changes contained in this section of this analysis constitute staff's initial buy-in to some of the proposals (as they will be modified based on staff direction) offered for the consideration of Prince George's County by the Clarion Associates consultant team. Staff's further recommendations / endorsement of Clarion's proposals will occur with the Comprehensive Review Draft expected in Spring 2017.

   The County Council, sitting as the District Council, is not expected to take any action on any recommendations until the Comprehensive Review Draft is amended as may be necessary and appropriate, and converted into a legislative draft in late Summer 2017.

3. Comments and questions received from the community at large which should be evaluated by Clarion Associates, who should then respond appropriately. These may result in additional changes to Module 2, be incorporated in the Comprehensive Review Draft, result in no change, or merit a discussion or response as to why something was or was not incorporated. Staff may recommend an action for these comments and questions below but has not yet reached a final decision/direction. Final action by Staff for these comments and questions is in large part dependent on Clarion Associates' recommendations based on national best practices; the Clarion Associates team will have the opportunity to further explain or defend the rationale as may be necessary.

4. Typographical, grammatical, and other technical corrections that should be made prior to the release of the Comprehensive Review Draft.

Comments pertaining to the Subdivision Regulations will be addressed in a separate analysis document.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
24-3—13 Schools Adequacy	Who has the "best" school adequacy test in the state?	Planning staff	The notion of "best school adequacy test" is very subjective in nature, but staff will research the practices of other large jurisdictions within Maryland to see how they address school adequacy.	Make no change.

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Global	There may need to be additional clarity as to what is meant by "new development."	Planning staff	While the term "development" is defined in Module 3 (Process and Administration and Subdivision Regulations), it has a broad definition that extends to changes in use. This definition poses some potential difficulties of interpretation with some of the proposed development regulations, most directly, the proposed form and design standards contained in Sections 27-5.800, 27-5.900, and 27-5.1000. As currently worded, each of these sections would trigger if an existing building has a simple change in use. This is not the intent. Additional clarity in the applicability sections of the development standards – perhaps not just limited to the form and design standards – is necessary. An additional point of clarity that is required concerns new development pertaining to existing buildings. For example, if a building with multiple ground-floor retail tenants sees one of the tenants make an exterior alteration, which would trigger compliance to the form and design standards, it must be clear if only that portion of the building is impacted or if the **entire** building must then be brought into compliance.	Revise the applicability statements of the form and design standards sections – and review and revise as necessary the other applicability clauses in the rest of Module 2 (Development Regulations) – to clarify when applicants would need to comply with the standards. One way to accomplish this goal is to clearly exempt changes in use. Clarify the applicability statements throughout Module 2 (Development Regulations) or identify an alternative approach to clearly convey the extent of the development that would be subject to the standards.
Global	The proposed regulations that relate to property inside vs. outside the Capital Beltway, which is intended to classify the entirety of municipalities that span the Beltway into the "inside the Beltway" designation to keep the municipalities whole and subject to the same standards, is missing the City of College Park.	Planning staff	The references to property inside the Capital Beltway need to be revised to ensure the City of College Park is on the list of municipalities that cross the Beltway.	Revise all references to property inside the Capital Beltway to ensure each includes the corporate boundaries of the City of College Park, City of Greenbelt, City of Glenarden, and Town of Forest Heights.
Subdivision Regulations General	Always refer to "Preliminary Plan **of** Subdivision" instead of "Preliminary Plan **for** Subdivision."	Planning staff	Staff concurs.	Revise all references in the Subdivision Regulations to read: "Preliminary Plan of Subdivision."
Module 1 (Zones and Uses)	During review of Module 2 (Development Regulations), staff identified some inconsistencies regarding the use "Adult Day Care Facility."	Planning staff	The use dealing with adult care is listed two different ways within Module 1 (Zones and Uses), and seems to be inadvertently prohibited in the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center base zones.	Revise the use table listings on pages 27-4—6 and 27-4—12 to change "adult care facility" to read: "adult day care facility." Revise page 27-4—12 to permit the use "adult day care facility" by-right ("P") in all of the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center base zones, including both the core and edge areas of applicable zones.
Module 1 (Zones and Uses)	The term "front street line" is not defined.	Planning staff	This term is used in multiple locations in all three modules, and is contained in one of the other definitions in the convention that indicates it should be a defined term itself. Staff agrees this term should be defined.	Provide a definition of "front street line."
Module 3 (Process, Administration, and Subdivision Regulations)	During review of Modules 2 (Development Regulations) and 3 (Process and Administration and Subdivision Regulations), staff determined key language exempting certain entities from the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance is missing.	Planning staff	Sec. 24-1.402 of the proposed Subdivision Regulations include an essential applicability section that is missing from the Zoning Ordinance: application of the code to governments. This language must be included in the Zoning Ordinance.	Add the language of Sec. 24-1.402 Application to Governments to the Applicability section of the Zoning Ordinance.

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Off-Street Parking and Loading	The City of College Park seeks additional clarity regarding "the required use of the shared parking calculation and the applicability of parking maximums in the RTO and LTO zones."	City of College Park	Staff agrees that the shared parking calculation language found on page 27-5—49 is confusing and could benefit from rewording for clarity. This section is intended to cross-reference to Sec. 27-3.203.C.1.d. in Module 1 (Zones and Uses), which contains off-street parking guidance within the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones. This reference should stand alone to be clearer; by wrapping it within a large paragraph containing several triggers, it gets "lost in the mix" and becomes extremely confusing for the reader to decipher. It is simpler by far to state the shared parking method proposed on page 27-5—50 does not apply to these zones, which appears to be the conclusion of the wording. In this Section and 27-3.203.C.1.d (and in the broader context of 27-3.203), it is not clear whether the standards applicable to Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones are applicable ONLY to the base zones or should also serve as guidelines for the more flexible Planned Development zones. Staff understands most regulations in the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center Planned Development zones are to be negotiated and approved by the District Council in the approval of the PD Basic Plan (the rezoning to these zones), but the references in these sections are not specific to the base zones. Parking maximums in the Regional Transit-Oriented (RTO) and Local Transit-Oriented) zones are governed by Sec. 27-3.203.C.1.d.ii. on page 27-3—60 in Module 1 (Zones and Uses). In the core of these zones, the maximum parking is set at 125 percent of the minimum number of required parking spaces, while in the edge of these zones the maximum parking is at 150 percent of the minimum. Parking provided wholly within structured parking facilities do not count toward these maximums, in order to incentivize the use of structured parking.	Clarify the shared parking language on pages 27-5—49 and 27-5—50 to more clearly reflect the intent regarding the relationship of the shared parking calculation/requirement to the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones. Clarify the extent of the applicability of the standards that apply to the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones in Sec. 27-3.203 and other locations as may be necessary. Do these standards apply only to the base zones or do they also provide guidance for the Planned Development zones?
Landscape Manual and Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	There is a proposed bufferyard for incompatible uses in the Landscape Manual, which acts as a setback. What regulations control, the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards or the bufferyard requirement?	Planning staff	Staff agrees that there should be additional clarity as to which regulation controls.	Review and revise as necessary the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards and Section 4.7 Buffering Incompatible Uses of the Landscape Manual to clearly indicate the larger setback or bufferyard will apply in the event of potential overlap.
Transportation Terminology	The proposed code uses the term "limited-access expressway," which is not used by Prince George's County. The County simply uses "expressway," and it can be presumed that access is limited.	Planning staff	Staff concurs.	Change the phrase "limited-access expressway" to "expressway" in the proposed Zoning Ordinance.
Development Regulations	The beginning of Division 5 should include a general introduction to the development standards and help set the stage of the 15 Sections included in the Division.	Planning staff	Each of the 15 Sections included in Division 5 have sub-sections that contain the purpose and intent of that Section. Additionally, the general purpose and intent statements for the Zoning Ordinance as a whole, contained in Module 3 (Process and Administration and Subdivision Regulations) cover the purposes of development regulations – supporting the County's goals, implementing County policy direction and comprehensive plans, protecting residential neighborhoods and rural character, supporting green building practices, ensuring high levels of development quality, etc. There is no need for an additional purpose and intent section.	Revise the table of contents and the title of affected sub-sections to ensure each purpose sub-section of Division 5 is consistently named "Purpose and Intent." Make no other change.
Street Connectivity Index	Most street and lotting patterns will be decided at subdivision. There is no street connectivity index contained in the proposed Subdivision Regulations.	Planning staff	Section 24-3.202, Vehicular Access and Circulation, in the proposed Subdivision Regulations contain a provision that requires preliminary plans of subdivision to comply with the regulations of Sec. 27-5.108, Vehicular Access and Circulation, of the proposed Zoning Ordinance. This includes the street connectivity index.	Revise Sec. 24-3.202.A for clarity and consistency purposes to read: "~~A~~ <u>All</u> preliminary plan<u>s of subdivision and final plats</u> shall comply with….."

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			This cross-reference, and by incorporation, the extension of the regulatory guidance for street design and vehicle access/circulation, in effect requires all preliminary plans of subdivision to be designed in accordance with the street connectivity index standards. This approach will effectively implement the regulations for connectivity while avoiding duplication of regulatory text within two Subtitles of the County Code, which would lead to problems over time given the natural difficulties associated with ensuring any change to the language of one Subtitle is fully reflected in the other.	Revise Sec. 24-3.202.B for consistency purposes to read: "All ~~P~~preliminary plans ~~for~~ of subdivision and final plats…."
Signage	The Indian Head Highway Area Action Council (IHHAAC) submitted a copy of a letter regarding Council Bill CB-84-2016, which addressed outdoor advertising signs. Many of the comments were specific to that bill, but in general terms IHHAAC's comments pertain to billboard signage and whether existing billboards would be removed or made nonconforming, and illumination and animation of digital signage.	The Indian Head Highway Area Action Council, Inc.	CB-084-2016 (DR-3) was approved by the County Council on November 15, 2016. The bill deals with digital billboard signage. While Clarion Associates have recommended new sign regulation for digital signage in Module 2 (Development Regulations), there are no specific regulations pertaining to digital billboards. CB-84-2016 should be reviewed and pertinent regulations adapted into the Comprehensive Review Draft as appropriate.	Revise the signage regulations to account for digital billboard signage regulation as may be appropriate.
27-5—1 through 27-5—21 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation	Define principal and secondary access streets.	Planning staff	This comment pertains to the use of the phrases "primary vehicular access" and "secondary vehicular access" regarding the design standards governing roadway access, mobility, and circulation. Staff believe these phrases are intended to be interpreted by their common usage but seeks clarity from Clarion Associates as to whether there is a quantifiable aspect to these terms that could shed light on this question.	Clarify what is meant by "primary vehicular access" and "secondary vehicular access," including adding definitions if necessary.
27-5—2 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Developer Responsible for On-Site Street Improvements	Sec. 27-5.107 does not consider standards for municipal streets	City of Greenbelt	Staff agrees a reference to municipal streets is appropriate, and notes the current Subdivision Regulations contain a similar reference in the general requirements section of the transportation and circulation requirements. The reference at the end of Sec. 27-5.107 that reads: "as required by the Subtitle" is somewhat misleading since dedication of streets is a function of subdivision, not a part of Subtitle 23.	Revise Sec. 27-5.107 to read: "…improvements in accordance with the standards for design and construction defined in Subtitle 23, or to those of the applicable municipalities having jurisdiction, and shall dedicate any required rights-of-way or easements, as required by the Subdivision Regulations ~~Subtitle~~."
27-5—2 27-5—3 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	How will vehicular accessway classifications be coordinated between County and municipal roads? The "other streets" clause "does not take into account classification based on municipal street standards."	City of Greenbelt	The vehicular accessway classifications are intended to reflect accessway functions regarding access to and from origin and destination points and to accommodate mobility. They are not intended to be substitutes for County or municipal streets. Subsequent to the release of Module 2 (Development Regulations), the Department of Public Works and Transportation has developed urban street standards and specifications that now include alleys. Given this, the sub-section dealing with alleys on page 27-5—3 should be re-thought. There is some merit to carrying forward language regarding alleys for parts of the County not eligible for the new urban street standards, but the presence of new urban alley specifications must now be recognized and an appropriate cross-reference to the County's specifications manual provided. A minor clarification should be added to sub-section 27-5.108.B.3. that speaks to municipal jurisdiction of other streets. Additionally, since functional classification is already covered by Sec. 27-5.108.A., this clause can be deleted as duplicative.	Revise Sec. 27-5.108.B.2. to recognize the new urban street specifications and standards for alleys and clarify the applicability of the proposed alleys guidance of this sub-section is limited to parts of the County not eligible for the urban street standards. Include appropriate language to the Prince George's County Specifications and Standards for Roadways and Bridges. Revise Sec. 27-5.108.B.3. to read: "…which will follow standards of design~~,~~ and construction~~, and functional classification~~ as defined in the Prince George's County

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
				Specifications and Standards for Roadways and Bridges and in Subtitle 23, or those of the applicable municipalities having jurisdiction."
27-5—5 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	In Sec. 27-5.108.E.1., vehicle connectivity should reference municipal as well as County arterial streets and services provided to both municipal and County residents.	City of Greenbelt	This section does not speak to authority, as it is simply a purpose statement for the vehicular connectivity standards. In the context of the text, there is no need to call separate attention to municipal roadways or municipal residents because all municipalities are located within the County. The term "arterial" is unnecessary in this purpose statement.	Delete the term "arterial" on the 7th line. Make no other change.
27-5—10 27-5—11 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	Traffic calming should not be part of the zoning process. This is especially relevant when requirements would be placed on municipal streets. This overlaps with existing authority and jurisdiction held by another County agency or government entity.	City of Greenbelt	Traffic calming approaches often involve both physical design criteria as a typical part of a development entitlement application and operational considerations. Clarion Associates have proposed a menu of potential traffic-calming approaches that outline typical/common approaches but are not limited to such approaches. Staff believes it is appropriate to retain a section regarding traffic calming requirements in order to advance the County's goals to improve pedestrian connectivity and safety. The details of ownership and operational considerations will need to be negotiated with the pertinent operating agency, including municipalities with authority over streets.	Add a new number 4 to Sec. 27-5.108.J. to read: "All traffic calming measures shall be coordinated with the applicable operating agency or municipality."
27-5—10 27-5—11 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	Stop signs are recommended at all intersections as a traffic calming device, which seems to extend authority over another County agency or government entity. This could also conflict with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices.	City of Greenbelt	It is not the intent of the regulations to require stop signs at all intersections; instead, a stop sign is intended to be one of many possible options. A slight wording clarification will help address this concern.	Revise Sec. 27-5.108.J.2. to read: "…Such measures ~~shall~~ may include, but shall not be limited to:…."
27-5—13 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	What are the standards from the development types exempted from the standards of Sec. 27-5.108.N.1? The language for driveway width exemptions speaks to "lands with unique topographical features," which raises several questions. For example, who has the authority to make the determination to exempt an application from this requirement for "unique topographical features," and is this not a variance criterion? Additionally, the exception clause currently proposed as Sec. 27-5.108.N.1. seems overly confusing; would it not be simpler to just indicate the driveway width requirements apply to multifamily and nonresidential development?	City of Greenbelt, Planning staff	Should an applicant have "unique topographical features" on their property to such an extent they cannot comply with the driveway width regulations of the proposed Zoning Ordinance, they should seek a variance from these regulations. It does not make sense to incorporate a situation that would be subject to a variance process within the applicability of any regulation. Since the listed exemptions of the sub-section speak to agricultural, single-family, two-family, and three-family development, it does seem clearer to have a proactive applicability statement than an overly complex exemption clause. Staff defers to Clarion Associates to address the question posed by the City of Greenbelt.	Replace the language of Sec. 27-5.108.N.1. with the following: "All driveways serving multifamily, nonresidential, and mixed-use development shall comply with the following minimum width standards:" Retain sub-clauses a. and b. Provide the project team with additional information as to whether driveway standards should be provided for agricultural and lower-intensity residential types, and what such standards may be appropriate.
27-5—13	Some of the driveway widths listed in Sec. 27-5.108 are inconsistent with what is proposed in Module 3 (Process and Administration and Subdivision Regulations).	Planning staff	Page 24-3—8 of the proposed Subdivision Regulations indicates creation of private streets and easements pursuant to Sec. 24-3.204 "shall be deemed the creation of a driveway, in accordance with Sec. 27-5.108.B, Vehicular Accessway Classifications, in Subtitle 27: Zoning Ordinance."	Revise the proposed Subdivision Regulations, specifically Sec. 24-3.204, to sever the direct linkage of

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation			There are two significant issues with this relationship. First, and most importantly, Sec. 27-5.108.B clearly indicates a "driveway" is not generally considered a street, whereas Sec. 24-3.204 is entitled "Private Streets and Easements." This is a major discrepancy. The second issue is that linking driveways in the Zoning Ordinance to private streets and easements in the manner currently proposed indeed creates an inconsistency between driveway widths. The proposed Subdivision Regulations require a minimum right-of-way or easement of 22 feet for nonresidential development, and 20 feet under other circumstances. The standards for driveway widths on page 27-5—13 require one-way driveways to be at least 12 feet wide and two-way driveways to be at least 24 feet wide. The minimum widths/rights-of-way do not align. Private streets and easements should not be directly linked to "driveways" because they are not one and the same. Revisions to the Subdivision Regulations are required.	private streets and easements to driveways as defined and regulated by Division 5 of the proposed Zoning Ordinance. Provide additional clarity – most likely through a new sub-section under the Subdivision Transportation, Pedestrian, Bikeway, and Circulation Standards section – regarding driveways, and ensure driveway rights-of-way or easements are reconciled with the minimum widths required by the proposed Zoning Ordinance.
27-5—14 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	The figure on page 27-5—14 should show that the angled intersection would be one-way in. The diagram should also be revised to show the geometrics of a one-way out intersection.	City of Greenbelt	Upon review of this comment, staff have determined that the two regulations that propose restrictions on driveway intersection angles are best left to the specifications and requirements of the pertinent operating agency or municipality with jurisdiction over street design.	Delete both Sec. 27-5.108.N.3.a.ii. and iii. Delete Figure 27-5.108.N.3: Driveway Intersection Angles.
27-5—15 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	Regarding the minimum stacking spaces for drive-through facilities and related uses, would these requirements apply to changes in use or occupancy?	Planning staff	Staff agrees the applicability of the stacking space regulations is unclear with regard to simple changes in use or occupancy permits. The definition of "development" in Module 3 (Process and Administration and Subdivision Regulations) indicates a change in a use of a structure of land is a form of development; therefore, it does seem that changes in use or occupancy will trigger the stacking spaces requirements. However, this will have a deleterious impact on existing drive-through facilities and uses. Additional clarity regarding the applicability of these regulations is necessary – staff recommends the new stacking space requirements do not apply when a change in the use or a change of the occupancy of an existing use/facility is involved.	Revise the vehicle stacking space sub-section Sec. 27-5.108.O. to clearly exempt changes in use or changes in occupancy from the requirement to provide the minimum stacking spaces otherwise required by Table 27-5.108.O.1.a.
27-5—17 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Pedestrian Access and Circulation	Should a minimum width be specified for required sidewalks?	City of Greenbelt	No; this requirement is a global requirement that will apply to all development countywide, and the context matters – areas next to Metro stations and along busy pedestrian routes require larger sidewalks than rural areas. Speaking of rural areas, staff note this requirement does not exempt rural development along streets that lack curb and gutter construction, where sidewalks are typically not desired or appropriate.	Revise the sidewalk requirement to exempt development along streets that lack curb and gutter construction.
27-5—17 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Pedestrian Access and Circulation	Clarify if the exemption for sidewalks for one and two family developments does relates to new development or to infill units.	City of Greenbelt	Staff believes this comment pertains to Sec. 27-5.109.A.1. dealing with general pedestrian access in the form of an internal pedestrian circulation system. The intent is if a (single) new single-family detached or two-family dwelling is proposed on a single lot, there is no need to provide an "internal pedestrian circulation system" because such a system is not appropriate for single-lot development. It is, instead, intended for larger developments and subdivisions. Minor language changes will clarify this issue.	Revise Sec. 27-5.109.A.1. to read: "All new development, except the development of an individual single-family detached dwellings or two-family dwelling on an individual lot, shall be served by an internal pedestrian circulation system…."
27-5—19 through 27-5—21	This section should reference the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) roadways standards	Planning staff	Staff concurs, but prefers to generalize the reference to the Department of Public Works and Transportation since they will be revising their Specifications and Standards for Roadways and	Clarion Associates should revise Sec. 27-5.110.A.1. as follows: "…shall allow for internal bicycle circulation

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Bicycle Access and Circulation			Bridges in 2017, which may result in a name change that would require a legislative correction down the road.	(that may include bike routes, bike lanes, and/or bike paths, and shall be coordinated with the Department of Public Works and Transportation) that allows…"
27-5—18 and 27-5—19 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Pedestrian Walkways Through Large Vehicular Parking Areas and Parking Garages	These regulations require pedestrian walkways through parking lots. However, the regulations do not indicate that these walkways need to be paved or meet ADA requirements. Have ADA requirements been taken into consideration? What prevents an adjacent property owner from putting up a fence to prevent pedestrian connectivity? Is the waiver or modification provision sufficiently flexible to account for other circumstances besides topographical features or other natural features?	WMATA, Planning Staff	Staff concurs that the regulations should address the material of the walkways. Referencing ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) requirements is not essential because Federal law requires compliance with ADA. There are no prohibitions on preventing a fence on adjacent property, and it seems infeasible to include such a requirement given property rights and other considerations (including the extreme difficulty of enforcing such a prohibition at the time a fence permit may be sought). Staff defers to Clarion Associates regarding other circumstances that may be appropriate to grant a waiver or modification from the cross-access requirement.	Clarion Associates should provide regulatory guidance as to the required or potential materials that should be used for pedestrian pathways through large surface parking lots. Should Clarion wish to directly reference ADA regulations, this change should also be incorporated as a more global change since ADA regulations impact far more than parking lot pathways (such as sidewalks). Clarion Associates should provide information regarding potential approaches that may help address closure of cross-access connections by adjacent property owners. Clarion Associates should offer their thoughts on other circumstances that may be appropriate to consider for granting a waiver or modification of the cross-access requirement.
27-5—19 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Bicycle Circulation and Access	The title of Sec. 27-5.110.A.1., "General Bicycle Access," needs to be more specific. The title of Sec. 27-5.110.A.2. also needs to be more specific.	Planning staff	The first referenced section refers to bicycle circulation internal to a single site as well as to the adjoining properties. The second section refers to applicants constructing (or dedicating the necessary easement for) bicycle facilities that have been approved in County plans, not necessarily general bicycle facilities.	Revise the section title of 27-5.110.A.1. to "Internal and Adjoining Bicycle Access" and revise the section title of 27-5.110.A.2. to "Required Bikeway Network Improvements."
27-5—19 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Bicycle Circulation and Access	Section 27-5.110.A.2.a requires improvements to be made "within the development site." What does this mean?	Planning staff	This section should be clarified to refer to specific facilities that would be located on streets that front the property while providing flexibility to accommodate internal bicycle networks and facilities that may be appropriate or necessary on larger development sites. Most bicycle facility recommendations from Master Plans or Sector Plans are along the right-of-way, so there would be few projects within any given development site identified in a comprehensive plan. It will often be up to negotiation with the developer to identify appropriate "infill" facility locations to connect larger sites with recommended bicycle facilities along rights-of-way.	Revise Sec. 27-5.110.A.2.a. to read: "…shall be required to install bike lanes, bike paths, or other bicycle improvements where such facilities are identified in the applicable Comprehensive Plan. Additional bikeway network improvements are encouraged where appropriate, such as within large development sites and to provide additional connections to

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
				nearby bicycle routes. ~~within the development site if that site intersects with or is along a designated bicycle route in any County or municipal bicycle system plans.~~"
27-5—19 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Bicycle Access and Circulation	As currently drafted, Sec. 27-5.110.A.1. is not as clear as it should be, and almost seems to combine separate thoughts in the same regulation. This Section speaks to origin and destination points, internal bicycle circulation and connections to external routes, and specified amenities or land uses which should be connected.	Planning staff	This regulation should be clarified. Bicycle and pedestrian regulations are fairly new to the County, so they need to be as clear as possible for both the development community to easily implement and for the public to understand. More clearly distinguishing between goals or intended outcomes of this regulation would do much to improve it.	Revise Sec. 27-5.110.A. to more clearly distinguish between the individual elements it seems to cover – origin and destination points, linkages to amenities and land uses, connectivity between internal networks and adjoining external systems, etc. Instead of the phrase "an existing or planned external, community-wide bicycle circulation system," clearer language that provides a more direct link to facilities identified in the applicable Comprehensive Plan should be used to reduce vagueness.
27-5—20 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Bicycle Access and Circulation	Sec. 27-5.110.B.3 requires that a maintenance agreement for cross-access be recorded with the Land Records of Prince George's County. Who is this agreement between?	Planning staff	Additional clarification is needed as to who the parties to this agreement would be.	Revise the section to clarify who the cross-access agreement is between.
27-5—20 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Bicycle Access and Circulation	Re-title Sec. 27-5.110.C.2. as "Bike Facilities" instead of "Bike Lanes." Provide additional clarity as to the difference between bike paths and bike lanes/bike facilities.	Planning staff	Bike lanes are only one type of a bicycle facility along roadways. On-road bike lanes, separated bike lanes, buffered bike lanes, etc. are all considered types of bike facilities but are used in different circumstances. Staff concurs that additional clarity is necessary as to a) what a "bike path" is compared to a bike lane or other bike facility, and b) why bike paths should be treated separately.	Revise Sec. 27-5.110.C.2. to re-title it as "Bike Facilities," and to reword the standard to read: "Required bike facilities ~~lanes~~ shall be designed and provided in accordance with the cross-section, paving, and other standards applicable to the roadways of which they are a part." Provide additional clarity regarding bike paths.
27-5—20 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Bicycle Access and Circulation	Sec. 27-5.110.D. describes a provision for the Planning Director to waive all or part of the standards for bicycle access and circulation. Are there decision standards that the Planning Director must follow before waiving all or part of the standards?	Planning Staff	The waiver is in place so that applicants will not be obligated to build bicycle facilities in locations where facilities already exist or in areas that would result in a sub-par facility. The proposed regulation clearly states that bicycle access and circulation is not needed if there is "an established bicycle facility already within or abutting the development." This is clear; however, the regulation also states that facilities will not be necessary if "compliance with the required bicycle improvements is infeasible."	Provide general decision standards for the Planning Director to approve a waiver from bicycle access and circulation standards in situations where "compliance with the required bicycle improvements is infeasible.".

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			Since the term "infeasible" is too broad and can allow multiple interpretations, decision standards would help clarify what is meant by "infeasible," and how compliance with bicycle improvements may be demonstrated as "infeasible."	
27-5—22 Off-Street Parking and Loading Applicability	Sec. 27-5.202.B.2. references an increase in the number of employees creating a trigger to require an increase in parking. How will this be monitored?	City of Greenbelt	This would be monitored through the permit process by the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement, either through a building permit or use and occupancy permit. Similar requirements apply today, in that many parking requirements in the current Zoning Ordinance are based on the number of employees for a given use. Staff notes Clarion Associates have revised the parking requirements so none of the requirements are based on the number of employees; with this understanding, the reference to number of employees in this sub-section may now be moot (since the other conditions will cover increases to the building size that may be necessary to accommodate additional employees) and should be deleted.	Delete the reference to the number of employees in Sec. 27-5.202.B.2.
27-5—23 Parking Plan Required	The parking plan that Clarion had shared with staff as an example seemed to be little more than a site plan, if not identical to a site plan. When would a parking plan be required and not the circulation plan or the site plan? Should a parking plan still remain as a requirement, language should be added that clarifies the relationship between parking facilities and pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and vehicular circulation systems.	Planning staff	As proposed by Clarion, Section 27-5.204 allows parking plans to be combined with the circulation plan required by Section 27-5.106. The purpose of the parking plan, which is only required when more than 100 parking spaces are proposed, is to demonstrate the relationship of off-street parking facilities to the development they are intended to serve and to pedestrian, bicyclist, and transit-user circulation patterns. Parking plans may, in many circumstances, be depicted on a site plan drawing but there may also be circumstances where a parking lot is proposed to be expanded but not an associated building or structure; in these circumstances, a site plan per se may not be required. The requirement for a parking plan serves as a "backstop" for any such unpredictable or uncommon circumstances, and does not contradict any other site plan requirement.	Clarify the intent of the parking plan and its relationship to other submittal requirements, and, if staff is correct as to the intent, clearly indicate a separate parking plan may not be necessary if the site plan drawings include all the required information of the parking plan. Revise Sec. 27-5.204 on page 27-5—23 to more clearly require the accurate designation of sidewalks, bike paths, pedestrian or bicycle pavement striping, or other pathways so the pedestrian and bicyclist aspects of the plan will be more easily understood (and clearly required to be depicted/included). Include language that also speaks to relationships with transit facilities and/or circulation systems.
27-5--23 Off-Street Parking and Loading General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading Area	Section 27-5.205.A identifies farmer's markets as an exception to the "display of goods for sale." How does this apply to other temporary uses such as food trucks, a Peapod type temporary retail operation, etc.?	WMATA	In 2015 the District Council passed legislation pertaining to food truck hubs. The location of food truck hubs is controlled by Subtitle 5 of the County Code, rather than the Zoning Ordinance, but would be possible within parking lots under certain circumstances. The proposed Zoning Ordinance language should be amended to reference food truck hubs pursuant to Subtitle 5 of the County Code.	Revise Sec. 27-5.205.A.1 to read: "…Required parking spaces and loading berths may not be used for the display of goods for sale (except <u>for food truck hubs operating pursuant to Subtitle 5 of the County Code, and</u> that farmers' markets may be permitted to operate within parking areas)…."
27-5—23 Off-Street Parking and Loading	Sub-section 27-5.205.B.1.a. is difficult to read due to the double exception phrasing.	Planning staff	Staff concurs.	Revise the general surfacing regulations to read: "B. Surfacing

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading Areas				"1. General "a. Except as provided for in Secs. 27-5.205.B.1.b and B.2 below, all off-street parking and loading areas ~~except those serving all uses in the Rural and Agricultural base zones except for agricultural research facilities, farm supply sales or farm machinery/implement sales, rental, or repair, rural corporate retreats, and cemeteries,~~ shall be surfaced with asphalt, concrete, brick, stone, pavers, or an equivalent hard, dustless, and bonded surface material. Use of surfacing that includes recycled materials (e.g., glass, rubber, used asphalt, brick, block, and concrete) is encouraged. These surfaces shall be maintained in a smooth, well-graded, clean, orderly, and dust-free condition. "b. Parking for most ~~all of the~~ uses in the Rural and Agricultural base zones ~~exempted from the requirements of Sec. 27-5.205.B.1.a above shall~~ may be allowed on non-engineered surfaces of grass, gravel, dirt, or similar materials. The following uses shall comply with Sec. 27-5.205.B.1.a above: agricultural research facilities; farm supply sales or farm machinery/implement sales, rental, or repair; rural corporate retreats; and cemeteries. "
27-5—24 Off-Street Parking and Loading	Pervious and semi-pervious surfacing should be review by DPIE in association with storm water management regulations, not by zoning/DRD. Further the regulation requires "an on-going maintenance program;" however, it is	Planning staff	Ongoing maintenance of semi-pervious and pervious materials are required to ensure that these surfaces do not become impervious surfaces. Evidence of ongoing maintenance is essential to the viability of pervious surfacing. However, Planning Department staff do not have the expertise to evaluate and enforce pervious surfacing maintenance programs.	Revise the regulation to read: "…provided such surfacing is subject to an on-going maintenance program (e.g., sweeping, annual vacuuming)

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading Areas	not clear how this would be enforced.		Many neighboring jurisdictions require ongoing maintenance as a part of their stormwater management practices in their zoning regulations. The Prince George's County stormwater management regulations are contained in other Subtitles of the County Code and are under the purview of the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement (DPIE). Staff recommends additional language to clarify that DPIE must be involved in the implementation of pervious paving surfaces.	submitted to and approved by the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement…."
27-5—25 Off-Street Parking and Loading General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading Areas	Revise the first standard under the Markings subheading. It is unclear put the regulation first, then list any exceptions.	Planning staff	Staff concurs.	Replace Sec. 27-5-205.D.1. with the following language: "1. Each required off-street parking area and space, and each off-street loading area and berth, shall be identified by surface markings that are arranged to provide for orderly and safe loading, unloading, parking, and storage of vehicles. Such markings—including striping, directional arrows, letting on signs and in handicapped-designated areas, and labeling of the pavement—shall be maintained so as to be readily visible at all times. The following uses are exempt from the requirement to mark parking and loading areas: a. Single-family detached dwellings b. Two-family dwellings c. Three-family dwellings d. Uses in the Rural and Agricultural base zones, except that agricultural research facilities; farm supply sales or farm machinery/implement sales, rental, or repair; rural corporate retreats; and cemeteries shall be subject to the markings requirement."
27-5—25 Off-Street Parking and Loading General Standards for Off-Street	Regarding Sections 27-5.205.E and 27-5.205.F: Slope is reviewed by the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement (DPIE) under the County's grading ordinance. Drainage is reviewed by DPIE under the stormwater management ordinance. These sections should	Planning staff	Staff concurs	Either delete both Sections or revise to include cross-references to the appropriate Subtitles of the County Code. If the second alternative is selected, ensure there is no conflict between the proposed slope

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Parking and Loading Areas	refer to those respective. Subtitles of the County code or be eliminated from the proposed Zoning Ordinance.			requirement and the current County regulation on parking and loading area slopes.
27-5—25 Off-Street Parking and Loading General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading Areas	The removal of the requirement of mandatory wheel stops for all parking spaces, except tandem parking spaces, is requested. It is viewed as economically burdensome to their client given the size of the existing parking lot, and will negatively affect the functionality of large parking lots by deterring open-air markets, fairs, or temporary locations for seasonal goods. Sec. 27-5.205.H.1. requires wheel stops for most parking stalls. Wheel stops can be a maintenance issue, particularly for snow removal, and this requirement may create push-back from developers, property owners, and other stakeholders.	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman, Planning staff	While wheel stops may be helpful to protect landscaping and pedestrian areas from vehicles, the proposed regulation may be too detailed or overly regulatory for zoning purposes. This regulation should be reevaluated to see if it should be more targeted in nature.	Clarion Associates should re-evaluate the need for this standard and let the project team know their thoughts on this question. Should it be retained: revise this standard to require wheel stops for gravel parking lots that have no markings, and for any space (any surface types) where the motor vehicle may hang over or intrude too far into landscaped or pedestrian areas. Revise the exemptions to this standard to ensure they are easier to understand, by relocating them to the end of the standard and wording as follows: “The following uses are exempt from the requirement to provide permanently anchored wheel stops: a. Single-family detached dwellings b. Two-family dwellings c. Three-family dwellings d. Uses in the Rural and Agricultural base zones, except that agricultural research facilities; farm supply sales or farm machinery/implement sales, rental, or repair; rural corporate retreats; and cemeteries shall be subject to the wheel stops requirement.”
27-5—26 Off-Street Parking and Loading General Standards for Off-Street	The Landscape Manual defines large parking lots at 150 spaces. The two should be consistent. The Landscape Manual should be revised to conform to the proposed Zoning Ordinance. What if someone provides 250 parking spaces now (which	Planning staff	Staff concurs with the underlying premise of the comments. The proposed Landscape Manual tends to use square footage as a measurement point while the proposed Zoning Ordinance uses the number of parking spaces. Direct reconciliation of these different points of measurement for parking lot design may not be advisable due to other impacts on the Landscape Manual, but there are some amendments to the Landscape Manual that should be incorporated to bring these regulations into closer alignment.	Revise Section 4.3, Parking Lot Interior Planting Requirements, Standard I on page 78 of the proposed Landscape Manual to read:

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Parking and Loading Areas	would not trigger the large vehicular use areas requirements), then adds 250 spaces later? It is not clear if this section is cumulative.		Staff agrees additional clarity is necessary regarding cumulative parking spaces and if multiple additions that ultimately add to more than 300 spaces for a given vehicular use area requires conformance with these standards.	"The following requirements apply to all zones, and shall only apply to parking lots more than ~~fifty thousand (50,000)~~ one hundred thousand (100,000) square feet in area…." Revise Figure 4.3-13 on page 79 to add a third "parking bay" and a "fully-separated, improved pedestrian pathway" enhanced with planted landscaping strips as required by page 27-5—27 of the proposed Zoning Ordinance. Add language on page 27-5—26 (Sec. 27-5.205.K of the proposed Zoning Ordinance) that speaks to cumulative additions of vehicular use areas that would pass the 300 space threshold and then require conformance to the regulations of this sub-section. Include a section reference to the reference of the Landscape Manual referenced above in Standard 2 (perhaps specifically Standard 2.b) on page 27-5—27.
27-5—26 Off-Street Parking and Loading General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading Areas	The "Primary Drive Aisle" required by Sec. 27-5.200.K.1. needs to be defined. Is the primary driveway the access an integrated shopping center or the drive aisle that is in front of the shopping center? Not all shopping centers are shaped as large rectangles, so the primary drive aisle may not be as clearly established in these situations. The image on page 27-5-27 should be larger. It shows an example of the "Primary Drive Aisle" as being in front of the shopping center. The pedestrian pathways regulations may conflict in some ways with the proposed Landscape Manual.	Planning staff	Staff believes the primary drive aisle is intended to refer to the vehicular circulation pathway that fronts the main portion of an integrated shopping center immediately adjacent to the entrances to the retail uses. However, Clarion Associates should clarify the intent by providing a definition, particularly since Figure 4.3-11 on page 77 of the Landscape Manual seems to depict the primary drive aisle as simply the major connection between the street and the shopping center. Staff notes the description of the primary drive aisle on page 27-5—26 and figure 27-5.205.K.1. suggest the primary drive aisle directly connects to a public right-of-way. This is not always possible, and the definition of the primary drive aisle likely should not refer to or imply a direct connection to a public right-of-way. In many situations, the primary drive aisle is connected to the public right-of-way by a separate, perpendicular drive aisle.	Clarion Associates should clarify the intent of the primary drive aisle, and provide a definition for the primary drive aisle in Division 8 of the Zoning Ordinance. Additionally, Clarion Associates should revise Figure 27-5.205.K.1. on page 27-5—27 to enlarge the overall image and better highlight the primary drive aisle. Finally, Clarion Associates should review the pedestrian pathways requirements side-by-side with the applicable section(s) of the proposed Landscape Manual and reconcile any potential conflicts.

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—26 and 27-5—27 Off-Street Parking and Loading General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading Areas	Sec. 27-5.205.K.1.d discusses street trees, and should align with and reference the Landscape Manual.	Planning staff	Staff concurs.	Reconcile Sec. 27-5.205.K.1.d with the interior parking planting requirements of Section 4.3 of the Landscape Manual. This may necessitate moving this specific standard to the Landscape Manual
27-5—26 Off-Street Parking and Loading General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading Areas	Clarification is requested that drive aisles within a shopping center will not be constructed as either public or private streets.	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman	Staff concurs with this comment. The definition for "parking lot drive aisle" on page 27-8-67 or the regulations concerning these drive aisles, whichever is most appropriate, should explicitly note that they are not public or private streets or required to be built to public/private street standards. Sec. 27-5.205.K.1 requires "primary drive aisles within vehicular use areas shall be designed to **appear** as an extension of the public street network…" (emphasis added). This is not the same as requiring them to **be** part of the public street network.	Clarion Associates should clarify, in the appropriate location (the definition or the regulation) that drive aisles are not required to be constructed as public or private streets.
27-5—31 Off-Street Parking and Loading Minimum Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces	The City of College Park is opposed to reducing the minimum parking requirement for single-family detached dwellings to 1.0 space per dwelling unit inside the Capital Beltway, citing concerns with single-family rentals.	City of College Park	Staff agrees that the proposed reduction from two parking spaces to one space for each single-family dwelling unit inside the Capital Beltway is too aggressive a change in the current development situation within Prince George's County. While staff believes Clarion Associates' intent is to take advantage of transit service and increased connectivity in general inside the Beltway, and that these figures are minimum parking requirements, reduction to just one space per dwelling unit may not be a feasible solution. A compromise is recommended.	Revise the minimum number of off-street parking spaces required for single-family dwellings inside the Capital Beltway from 1.0 to 1.5 spaces per unit.
27-5—28 Off-Street Parking and Loading Completion	Concern was expressed about the requirement that all off-street parking and loading areas shall be complete prior to the issuance of a use and occupancy permit under Sec 27-5.202.L. It should be clarified that only parking to support the use or use in each building should be provided to the issuance of use and occupancy permits for the user or uses in each constructed building. This comment is particularly concerned with phased development projects and the difficulty, if not impossibility, of providing all of the parking for a project or even a phase of a project before the first part may be complete and ready for use and occupancy permits.	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman	Staff concurs.	Revise Sec. 27-5.205.L to allow use and occupancy permits to be issued once the parking necessary to support the use or building subject to the permit application is provided.
27-5—49 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Space Standards	The proposed code suggests that applicants refer to the Institute for Transportation Engineers, the Urban Land Institute, the National Parking Association, or the American Planning Association for establishing the minimum number of parking spaces for uses not listed in the table. Given the professional divergence between these groups, this gives Planning Staff very broad discretion.	WMATA	Comment noted. These groups will likely have different suggested parking minimums for each use type, and not all uses or parking generation rates may appear for all groups. The referenced parking minimum can substantially change the design and space requirements of an application, so it is important to have additional clarity to provide guidance for situations that may come into question.	Clarion Associates should clarify this section by either making a singular recommendation on the standard parking resource to use for review of development applications or provide an ordered list of the professional groups that should be referenced.

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—50 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Space Standards	Why are there no caps or maximum parking calculations for the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones and areas inside the Capital Beltway?	Communities, Planning staff	The maximum parking requirements for the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones are contained in the general regulations that apply to all of these zones in Module 1 (Zones and Uses). However, in investigating this comment, staff determined there appears to be no way to request an adjustment or other relief from the maximum parking caps in these zones. This inability, short of a true variance, will be detrimental to the County's economic development goals by potentially overly-constraining redevelopment opportunities of existing built lands in these zones. Regarding areas inside the Capital Beltway, it appears that there are no maximum parking ratios established anywhere in the proposed Zoning Ordinance. This appears to be an oversight that must be corrected. Staff notes the maximum number of off-street parking spaces suggested for commercial and mixed-use development outside the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones and outside the Capital Beltway may be overly restrictive at 125 percent and 110 percent of the minimum otherwise required for these uses. These percentages only seem achievable with multiple transit options in proximity, which is unlikely in these locations. These thresholds may need to be increased for areas outside the Capital Beltway, but may be appropriate for areas inside the Capital Beltway, which has greater overall transit service.	Provide a cross-reference in Sec. 27-5.206.D. back to the maximum number of off-street parking spaces in the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center base zones in Sec. 27-3.203.C.1.d. in Module 1 (Zones and Uses). Add regulatory guidance establishing maximum parking ratios for development inside the Capital Beltway. Increase the maximum parking ratios for development located outside the Capital Beltway to an appropriate level for locations that will have either no transit accessibility or low frequency bus service. Provide for a way to adjust the maximum parking caps – not just for the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones but also for the base zones – in the adjustments section of Module 3 (Process and Administration and Subdivision Regulations).
27-5—54 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Alternatives	It seems that Sec. 27-5.208.A is referring to the proposed Adjustment Process (Sec. 27-2.517). It should explicitly reference that Section. If an adjustment is requested, the alternative plan is needed for justification for the adjustment. Can an applicant apply for an adjustment, an alternative parking plan, and a parking demand reduction (pursuant to Sec. 27-5.209)?	Planning staff	Sec. 27-5.208 deals with off-street parking alternatives and establishes several potential pathways for developers in the event they may not be able to provide the minimum number of off-street parking spaces otherwise required for their proposed developments. These pathways and regulations are adapted from regulations in the current Zoning Ordinance and national best practices. Staff believes the interpretation of relief from parking space requirements would progress as follows: 1) If an applicant cannot provide the minimum number of parking spaces, they should propose off-street parking alternatives in accordance with Sec. 27-5.208. 2) Should an applicant be unable to meet the requirements of Sec. 27-5.208, only then should they seek an adjustment pursuant to Sec. 27-2.517. 3) The reduced parking standards regulations of Sec. 27-5.209 will allow up to a 10 percent reduction in the minimum number of required off-street parking spaces for development proximate to a high-service transit stop. This reduction can "stack" with Sec. 27-5.208, meaning that both Sections can potentially apply to the same development. Any **additional** reductions pursuant to this Section will require the establishment of a transportation demand management plan.	Clarify the relationship between off-street parking alternatives proposed in Secs. 27-5.208 and 27-5.209 and parking adjustments as outlined in Sec. 27-2.517, with particular emphasis as to the intended progression or relationships between potential reductions. Refer to forthcoming staff comments on Module 3 (process and administration), which will speak to the need to more clearly compile/identify all potential relief mechanisms from the development regulations of the proposed Zoning Ordinance.

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			Allowing an adjustment without first seeking parking alternative approaches would weaken the parking standards of the proposed Zoning Ordinance. Staff feels this progression should be made clearer in the new Zoning Ordinance.	
27-5—54 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Alternatives	Footnote 117 on page 27-5—54 seems to eliminate the Departure from Parking and Loading Spaces process. "What will this do to the municipal authority in this area?"	City of Greenbelt	"Departures" are proposed to be replaced by "adjustments" in the new Zoning Ordinance. The proposed adjustments are contained in Module 3 (Process and Administration and Subdivision Regulations), and still include changes to off-street parking space standards. Changes to loading spaces and standards are currently missing from that module, but need to be added. Where a municipality has been delegated authority over certain zoning regulations by the District Council, the new Zoning Ordinance is intended to retain all such existing authority. This will be clarified within the staff analysis of comments pertaining to Module 3 (Process and Administration and Subdivision Regulations). It must be noted that Clarion Associates propose to limit the authority of the Planning Director and the Planning Board with regard to the scale of the adjustment either body can grant. This is very different from today's current Zoning Ordinance, where Departures are not typically restricted in the amount or percentage of change. Staff is working with the Planning Department's legal team to determine what, if any, impact such limitation may have on municipal delegation.	Revise the minor and major adjustments tables in Sec. 27-2.517 of Module 3 (Process and Administration and Subdivision Regulations) to provide for adjustments from the loading area standards contained in Sec. 27-5.211.
27-5—54 through 27-5—60 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Alternatives	Likes the off-street parking alternatives but perhaps they should only be allowed when there is a minor or major site plan review. If a building permit is the trigger for this section, it could conflict with the Planning Director's authorization since the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement is the issuing agency for permits. The information in footnote 117 is valuable information for what would be reviewed in this Section. It should be adapted into the Zoning Ordinance and not just be an explanatory footnote.	Planning staff	Regarding permit-level applications, staff believes it logically flows that such decisions should fall within the purview of the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement director to approve an alternative parking plan in accordance with the framework of the overall proposed Zoning Ordinance and the goals for streamlining process. It is less clear why the Planning Board should not be the body that would approve the alternative parking plan in a concurrent submittal with a major site plan, which would be decided by the Planning Board. An alternative parking plan may be viewed as an administrative practice, but engaging multiple decision-makers for aspects of the same entitlement case seems potentially confusing and time-consuming. The information in footnote 117 would be appropriate as part of the "General; Alternative Parking Plan" sub-section to help provide additional, clear guidance as to the purpose of off-street parking alternatives.	Revise Sec. 27-5.208.A. to indicate the director of the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement (DPIE) is also authorized to approve an alternative parking plan, with appropriate language clarifying which decision-maker would be involved under what circumstances (e.g a permit-only review would be approved by the DPIE Director, while the Planning Director would approve alternative parking plans submitted in connection to a major or minor site plan). Incorporate the intent language currently contained in footnote 117 into Sec. 27-5.208.A. Clarion Associates should provide the project team with additional information as to why the Planning Board should not decide an alternative parking plan submitted in conjunction with a major site plan application.

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—55 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Alternatives	Do the allowed distances for shared and off-site parking regulations "measure to the nearest point of the shared parking area? Does this consider the size and depth of the shared parking area?"	City of Greenbelt	The measurements are indicated by note 1 in Table 27-5.208.C.2., and are taken "by the actual distance of the pedestrian walkway from the shared parking area to the primary pedestrian entrance(s), not a straight-line, point-to-point distance." This distance does not consider the size of the shared parking area. Staff notes it would be more accurate to indicate the pedestrian path rather than the more specific term "walkway."	Revise Note [1] in Table 27-5.208.C.2. to read: "…actual distance of the pedestrian <u>path</u> ~~wallkway~~ from the …."
27-5—58 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Alternatives	In Sec. 27-5.208.E.2.a, "on-street parking should not be approved as part of required parking unless it is specifically approved, in advance, by the appropriate municipality."	City of Greenbelt	Sec. 27-5.208.E.2.a. reads in part: "If an alternative parking plan is approved for on-street parking, the applicant shall enter into an on-street parking agreement or series of agreements, depending on ownership of the streets where on-street parking is proposed…or any municipality with jurisdiction of the street." Thus, the appropriate municipality must approve the on-street parking. However, staff notes the term "approved" in the sentence above, may lead to confusion.	Revise Sec. 27-5.208.E.2.a. to read: "If an alternative parking plan is ~~approved~~ <u>proposed</u> for on-street parking…."
27-5—60 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Alternatives	The proposed valet parking agreement is stated to bind heirs, successors and assigns, but does not include the property owner.	City of Greenbelt	This is a very good observation. There are four types of agreements found in Module 2 (Development Regulations), each of which contain the same language. None of them speak directly to the "party hereto," e.g. the initial landowner or signatory to the agreement. While all of the agreements would include a minimum timeframe which would bind the signatory, the language may be insufficiently robust to lock in the initial landowner should these timeframes expire or under other circumstances. For clarity, it may be best to be more specific regarding the initial signatory.	Revise the four agreements contained in the module to clearly cover the initial signatory/landowner and not just their heirs, successors, and assigns.
27-5—60 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Alternatives	Regarding the provisions for valet and tandem parking, other jurisdictions require renewal provisions for valet parking to keep track to ensure it is working properly and remains in valet use. Why is the valet parking agreement for ten years? This seems overly long in that restaurants (which may be the most likely to take advantage of valet agreements) go out of business all the time. With shared parking does it make sense to have an annual re-up of pertinent agreements? Should this also apply to the valet parking? Valet and shared parking offer more options to the developer but maybe need a better approach to how they are handled.	Planning staff	Staff concurs with the comments on valet parking. The language proposed for shared parking would seem to address the concerns, in that the land to be used in a shared parking agreement is required to be set aside except in the case of land transfer, and that uses served by shared parking may not continue if the shared parking location becomes unavailable, unless alternatives are provided. However, there may be some enforcement difficulties without some kind of annual or bi-annual survey or more stringent documentation requirement.	Re-evaluate the ten-year valet parking agreement requirement and offer suggestions that may address the primary concerns of ten years being too long and whether an annual or bi-annual re-submittal of the agreement to demonstrate it is still in effect is appropriate. Provide recommendations as to how reviewers and decision makers can best ensure areas set aside for use as shared parking remain available for that purpose.
27-5—61 through 27-5—64 Off-Street Parking and Loading Reduced Parking Standards for Parking Demand Reduction Strategies	Transportation Demand Management is proposed in this Zoning Ordinance primarily to reduce the number of parking spaces that may be required. However, the two most intense transit-oriented/activity center base zones have no parking minimums. There appears to be absolutely no incentive to use TDM measures in these situations, which is contrary to many goals associated with TDM. Removing the adequacy of transportation determination in certain transit-oriented/activity center zones also removes	Communities, Developers, Planning staff	Staff believes the proposed TDM approaches will simply not be used in many circumstances since there is little to no incentive for developers to coordinate and voluntarily establish TDM plans or pursue alternative parking strategies, particularly in the highest-intensity transit-oriented/activity center zones where such TDM approaches are the most necessary and appropriate. There must be trade-offs between parking requirements/demand and TDM approaches to make TDM an attractive alternative.	Revisit and comprehensively address these issues in the off-street parking and loading regulations to ensure there is true incentive for developers to participate in and/or create TDM plans and alternative parking strategies.

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
	pressure from developers to build improvements. The developers are not willing to make public improvements if there are no requirements in place. Community members are concerned that developer costs to meet adequacy of public facilities will be passed on and contribute to residential financial burdens if there are no adequacy requirements.		Clarion Associates responded that the compromise regarding transportation adequacy is imperfect – eventually people will need to pay for public services, at some point or another. Adequacy findings may prevent development in existing communities where services already exist, and contribute to sprawl by pushing development into suburban or rural areas.	
27-5—61 Off-Street Parking and Loading Reduced Parking Standards for Parking Demand Reduction Strategies	When it comes to transit accessibility requirements, a 10 percent reduction is not enough of a reduction for properties within ¼ mile of a major transit facility. A ten percent reduction might be reasonable for ½ mile. A higher reduction should be allowed for development within ¼ miles of transit, especially if it is rail transit.	WMATA	Staff concurs; the closer a property is located to a transit facility, particularly one classified as "high-service," the more it is possible and appropriate to reduce the minimum amount of required parking. Staff also notes that there are no minimum parking requirements within the "core" area of the proposed Regional Transit-Oriented (RTO) and Local Transit-Oriented (LTO) Zones, so this reduction is meaningless for these situations.	Increase the allowable percentage reduction from the minimum number of parking spaces required for developments within ¼ miles from high-service transit stations. Extend the 10 percent reduction to include properties located within ½ miles of the transit station.
27-5—65 Off-Street Parking and Loading Bicycle Parking Standards	The description of the parking requirement calculation in Sec. 27-5.210.A should clarify that the mandatory bicycle parking space is also the first bicycle parking space for the first ten automobile spaces. Simplify the language for standard A.1.a. to apply to multifamily development. Revise standards A.1.b. and A.1.c. to clarify these standards only apply to private schools and universities.	Planning staff	Staff agrees that some revisions are necessary to clarify the language of these regulations. Regarding provision of bicycle parking for residential development, it seems that the use category "Group Housing" should also provide bicycle parking, in addition to just multifamily dwellings. Staff notes that public schools, colleges, and universities are exempt from the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance; therefore, it makes sense to clarify the bicycle parking regulations are required for private educational facilities.	Revise Sec. 27-5.210.A to read: "A. Bicycle Racks or Lockers Required 1. In all zones except the RTO, LTO, TAC, and NAC base and PD zones, all parking areas shall provide bicycle racks or lockers sufficient to accommodate the parking of at least one bicycle, regardless of the number of vehicle spaces provided (up to ten spaces)., ~~and at~~ At least one additional bicycle space shall be provided for each additional ten parking spaces or major fraction thereof~~, above ten spaces~~…. a. For multifamily dwellings and uses in the Group Living Uses principal use category, ~~any residential uses other than single-family dwellings, two-family dwellings, three-family dwellings and mobile home dwellings,~~ one space shall be required per four dwelling units, with no fewer than two

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
				bicycle parking spaces provided. b. For <u>private</u> elementary, middle, and high schools, one space per ten employees plus one space for each 20 students (in grades four and higher) of planned capacity <u>shall</u> ~~will~~ be required. c. For <u>private</u> colleges and universities, one space per ten employees plus one space for each five students of planned capacity shall be required…."
27-5—66 Off-Street Parking and Loading Bicycle Parking Standards	Standard 27-5.210.B.2. should allow existing bicycle parking to count toward the required bicycle parking facilities for the transit-oriented/activity center base zones and the Planned Development (PD) zones.	Planning staff	Staff concurs.	Revise the last sentence of Sec. 27-5.210.B.2. on page 27-5—66 to read: "Developments may ~~not~~ count existing bicycle parking <u>along frontage streets and</u> in the street right-of-way toward these requirements."
27-5—66 Off-Street Parking and Loading Loading Area Standards	Bicycle parking in the public right-of-way should require the approval of the appropriate public agency.	City of Greenbelt	Staff concurs.	Revise Sec. 27-5.210.B.2. to read: "…may place up to 20 percent of required bicycle parking in the public right-of-way as street furnishings <u>(subject to the approval of the operating agency or municipality with jurisdiction)</u>, provided that they…."
27-5—67 Off-Street Parking and Loading: Loading Area Standards	The final sentence of Sec. 27-5.211.A does not provide certainty for applicants or other stakeholders because it appears to allow the Planning Director to require more or fewer loading berths but does not provide detail about a process or speak to any requirements by the applicant to seek more or fewer loading berths.	Planning staff	Staff concurs the current sentence provides too much ambiguity and needs to be revised to establish a baseline level of certainty (as is intended by the rest of the proposed regulations on loading berths). This additional measure of flexibility should be more clearly worded and linked to the proposed adjustments contained in Sec. 27-2.517 in Module 3 (process and administration).	Delete or revise the last sentence of Sec. 27-5.211.A to link to the adjustments contained in Sec. 27-2—517 and to provide clarity as to how decisions regarding the number of loading berths are to be made. For example, this provision could include language similar to that found in Sec. 27-5.211.B which speaks to larger or smaller loading berths.
27-5—67 Minimum Number of Off-Street Loading Berths	Can the trigger for a required loading space for retail sales and service uses be increased from 2,000 to 5,000 square feet?	Developers	Current loading space regulations require 1 loading space per 2,000 square feet of retail. This regulation, however, has led to many departure requests. Staff agrees that 5,000 square feet is an appropriate threshold.	Increase the threshold for requiring a minimum number of loading berths from 2,000 square feet for retail sales and service uses to 5,000 square feet in Table 27-5.211.A on page 27-5—67.

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—68 Off-Street Parking and Loading: Loading Area Standards	The location of the loading space as required by Sec. 27-5.211.C is dictated to be "to the rear" of the building, but this is not always the best location for such areas. There should be a more direct link to the Landscape Manual with this requirement. Additionally, there should be reference made to avoiding conflicts with pedestrian paths.	Planning staff	Staff concurs.	Revise Sec. 27-5.211.C.1. to read: "To the maximum extent practicable, loading areas shall be placed away from a public street and screened from view in accordance with the Landscape Manual ~~located to the rear of the use they serve~~ (see Figure 27-5.211.C: Loading Area Configuration)." Revise Sec. 27-5.211.C.3. to read: "…obstructing or interfering with any public right-of-way, ~~, or any~~ parking spaces, ~~, or~~ parking lot aisles, or pedestrian pathways."
27-5—68 Open Space Set-Asides	"Is this open space is separate from mandatory dedication? Shouldn't this be explicitly stated?"	City of Greenbelt	The open space set-asides are different than the mandatory dedication procedures contained in the Subdivision Regulations and are required in addition to mandatory dedication (though lands set aside for parks and recreation through the subdivision process may count toward the open space set-aside as these regulations are currently drafted). The relationship between open space set-asides and the parks and recreation requirements of the Subdivision Regulations should be referenced and clarified.	Provide language in the purpose statement for the open space set-asides on page 27-5—68 that clarifies the relationship to the requirements of the Subdivision Regulations for parks and recreation facilities, and clearly indicate if "double-counting" is permitted, as seems to be the intent.
27-5—68 through 27-5—75 Open Space Set-Asides	How would the open space set-aside requirements be treated in multi-phase developments?	Planning staff	There appear to be no regulations that speak to the timing of open space set-aside provision for larger, phased projects. Will the developer have to provide all the set-asides up-front? Will a percentage of the total set-aside need to accompany each phase of development? Additional clarity on this common development approach in Prince George's County is necessary.	Provide additional clarity on how phased projects should address open space set-aside requirements.
27-5—69 Open Space Set-Asides Purpose	Clarify the exemptions for open space set-asides for single-family and two-family dwellings. "This seems to assume that open space is not a necessary element of single-family development."	City of Greenbelt	The exemption referencing single-family detached dwellings and two-family dwellings is intended to apply to individual dwellings on individual lots (e.g. infill lots). Residential subdivisions containing single-family dwellings and two-family dwellings will be subject to the requirements of the open space set-asides. A minor clarification should help with this question.	Revise Sec. 27-5.302.B.2. to read: "An individual ~~S~~single-family detached dwelling~~s~~ or two family dwelling~~s~~ on a single lot."
27-5—70 through 27-5—72 Open Space Set-Asides Areas Counted as Open Space Set-Asides	Community gardens or urban farms should count toward open space set-asides.	Communities	Per Clarion Associates, urban farms and community gardens are not considered open-space set asides. Staff have no strong opinion regarding this question and defer to Clarion Associates for additional information.	Clarion Associates should determine if community gardens and/or urban farms are appropriate features to count toward the open space set-asides requirement and revise Table 27-5.305: Open Space Set-Aside Features as may be necessary.
27-5—71 Open Space Set-Asides	Squares, forecourts, and plazas are not preferred unless there is a requirement for benches, fountains, varied paving treatments, plantings, etc. Squares and plazas without any amenities (such as benches) will be empty of activity and will damage the pedestrian street, walls, and retail.	WMATA	The images shown in the code includes benches and fountains. These features may be assumed, but unless it is explicitly indicated, it is possible that builders will forgo any plaza amenities.	Clarion Associates should revise the open space set-asides requirements as may be appropriate to ensure a minimum of pedestrian amenities – benches, tables, trash cans, fountains, etc. – are provided.

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
	There need to be some level of design standard for plazas and squares.			
27-5—72 Open Space Set-Asides Areas Counted as Open Space Set-Asides	Regarding the inclusion of stormwater management areas treated as site amenities as countable toward the open space set-aside requirements, "there should be a routine maintenance associated with the facility."	City of Greenbelt	Staff notes this comment is in apparent contradiction with other comments offered by the city that indicate maintenance/property standards should not be part of the Zoning Ordinance; as staff disagreed with those comments, we agree that maintenance should be referenced with regard to stormwater management facilities.	Add language to the "Design and Maintenance Requirements" column for stormwater management areas counted as site amenities to indicate maintenance agreements should be established in accordance with the requirements of the pertinent operating authority or agency.
27-5—74 Open Space Set-Asides Design Standards for Open Space Set-Asides	The example of open space set-asides shown on page 27-5—74 is for a for single-family detached community; would like to see a similar diagram for townhouses, and it would be helpful to have a sample of the credits or computations that would be involved..	Planning staff	Staff concurs, and notes an example of how the open space set-asides could be calculated would be helpful and appropriate (such an example is provided with the shared parking calculation, so there is precedent already in the proposed Zoning Ordinance). A diagram of a commercial shopping center's open space set-asides would also be particularly illustrative for this section.	Add an open space set-asides diagram for a townhouse development and another diagram for a traditional commercial shopping center. Provide an example of the calculations of how the open space set-asides would be determined for a sample development.
27-5—74 Open Space Set-Asides Design Standards for Open Space Set-Asides	In Sec. 27-5.307.D.1.d., use of the term "parks and trails" could be misconstrued to mean M-NCPPC property.	Planning staff	Staff concurs additional clarity would be appropriate. Open space set-asides may be in private ownership or may be conveyed to M-NCPPC or other organizations that are able to maintain the land as open space for perpetuity, but it should not be implied that park spaces would automatically mean M-NCPPC property.	Revise Sec. 27-5.307.D.1.d. to read: "Parks and trails <u>(regardless of public or private ownership)</u>;"
27-5—75 Open Space Set-Asides Design Standards for Open Space Set-Asides	Ownership, management, and maintenance of lands are controlled by Subtitle 24, so there needs to be coordination with the Subdivision Regulations.	Planning staff	Staff concurs, as Maryland State Law provides enabling provisions that govern dedication of property for public purposes. There needs to be additional clarity and/or cross-referencing reflecting the relationship to the Subdivision Regulations.	Provide appropriate language, including any necessary cross-references, that more clearly establish the relationship of the ownership, management, and maintenance of open space set-asides to the Subdivision Regulations.
27-5—75 Open Space Set-Asides Design Standards for Open Space Set-Asides	Regarding Sec. 27-5.309.A.2. and conveyance of open space set-asides, instead of M-NCPPC say "or government agency, " as such property could be owned and maintained by a municipality.	City of Greenbelt, Planning staff	Staff agrees that it is appropriate to reference the potential role of municipalities, particularly for those who may be outside the Metropolitan District where conveyance to M-NCPPC is not possible.	Revise Sec. 27-5.309.A.2. to read: "Conveyance of open space set-aside areas to a third-party beneficiary such as an environmental or civic organization, <u>a municipality,</u> or the M-NCPPC, that is organized for…."
27-5—75 through 27-5—82 Fences and Walls	Need to globally exempt Rural and Agricultural uses from the fences and walls section. Farm fencing is not compatible with the regulations for other fences and walls for other uses.	Planning staff	Staff concurs; many of the principal use types in the Agriculture/Forestry Uses and Agriculture/Forestry Related Uses principal use categories require specialized fencing for protecting livestock which would be incompatible with the fencing and walls regulations proposed in Sec. 27-5.500. There needs to be a general exemption for appropriate uses such as agricultural production or equestrian center.	Add language to Sec. 27-5.500 Fences and Walls to exclude fencing for appropriate uses in the Agriculture/Forestry Uses and Agriculture/Forestry Related Uses categories.

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—75 through 27-5—82 Fences and Walls	WMATA asked several questions pertaining to materials: • Is concrete a prohibited material for walls? • Are chain link and concrete prohibited for fences and walls in the transit-oriented/activity center zones? • Can concrete walls or chain link fences be built within 15' of rights-of-way? • Do the fence and wall landscaping regulations affect WMATA? • Does the Security Exemption apply to WMATA?	WMATA	WMATA is exempt from the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance. There would be no need for WMATA to apply for a security exemption for development on WMATA's property when built and maintained by WMATA. Concrete is not listed as a prohibited material, nor is it listed under the general materials; therefore, concrete must be addressed one way or the other Chain link fences are prohibited in a number of the proposed zones, including within the transit-oriented/activity center zones. Fences and walls located within 15 feet of a street right-of-way are permitted but shall be supplemented with landscape screening. The materials for such fences and walls are the same as any other fence and wall covered by this Section. Additional flexibility is necessary regarding "similar or equal materials" to those that are listed here to accommodate future proposals.	Revise Sec. 27-5.506.A to add a provision that addresses similar or equal materials as demonstrated by the applicant to the list of permitted fence and wall materials. Revise the fence and wall materials regulations to account for concrete construction.
27-5—76 Fences and Walls Applicability	The exemptions from the fences and walls standards pertaining to parks and schools need to be tweaked because schools include charter schools that are privately owned but subject to the Mandatory Referral process.	Planning staff	Staff concurs.	Revise Sec. 27-5.502.B.6. to read: "Fences at parks and schools, where such uses are owned by public agencies or are subject to the County's Mandatory Referral process."
27-5—78 Fences and Walls Height Standards	Are noise attenuation walls considered walls and subject to these regulations?	City of Greenbelt	No, noise attenuation walls should not be subject to these regulations. In many cases these walls are placed in the right-of-way and would not be subject to zoning, but it would be helpful to clarify this point.	Add noise attenuation walls to the exemptions to the fences and walls standards on page 27-5—76.
27-5—78 Fences and Walls Materials	The Landscape Manual lists fencing for purposes of screening (in terms of materials). We need to make sure these sections do not conflict.	Planning staff	There is no conflict between the materials included in Sec. 27-5.506 for fences and walls in general and the materials referenced in the Landscape Manual for fences and walls used specifically for screening purposes because the Zoning Ordinance sets a baseline standard that is applicable across the County. The Landscape Manual is more restrictive (for example, it prohibits chain link fencing as a screening material) because the intent of its regulations regarding fences and walls is for a more specific purpose.	Make no change.
27-5—79 Fences and Walls Prohibited Materials	Page 27-5—79 prohibits chicken wire as a fence or wall material. The regulations need to be clear that coops for poultry may allow the use of chicken wire.	Planning staff	On October 18, 2016, the County Council was briefed by Clarion Associates on Module 3. During this briefing, the Council expressed desire to tighten the focus of the rewrite project and raised topics that could be deferred. "Home housing for poultry" was one of these topics.	Make no change.
27-5—79 Fences and Walls Prohibited Materials	The prohibition on chain link fences in the transit-oriented/activity center base zones (in particular) and in other base zones pose a problem when it comes to fencing for community gardens and urban farms. These uses often need fencing to prevent deer and other wildlife from consuming the produce.	Planning staff	Staff concurs.	Provide an exemption to the prohibition of chain link fences for urban agriculture and community garden uses. Revise Table 27-5.505.A: Fence and Wall Height on pages 27-4—77 and 78 to provide for an exemption to the front yard, side yard, or build-to zone fence height to permit fences up to six feet in

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
				height for urban agriculture and community garden uses.
27-5—81 Fences and Walls	Suggested revising Sec. 27-5.508.B to provide flexibility for situations when the applicable historic preservation authority requires an alternative appearance at the end of the section.	WMATA	Staff concurs.	Revise section 27-5.508.B to read: "All fencing or wall segments located along a single lot side shall be composed of a uniform style and colors, except when the Historic Preservation Commission may require an alternative appearance."
27-5—81 Fences and Walls Appearance	The appearance of fences and walls requires compatibility in styles and colors along a single lot line. What about materials? Does this also mean that fences on adjoining properties need to be of similar style and color?	City of Greenbelt	The sub-section references materials in the title but is not contained in the text. There is no requirement that fences on adjoining properties be of a similar style or color – this regulation pertains only to fencing or wall segments located along a single lot side.	Revise Sec. 27-5.508.B. to read: "All fencing or wall segments located along a single lot side shall be composed of a uniform style, materials, and colors."
27-5—83 Exterior Lighting Applicability	"What about exterior alterations that impact existing lighting?"	City of Greenbelt	Because the exterior lighting section involves numerous aspects of lighting – including building lighting, street lighting, and site lighting – it may not be appropriate to subject a property to the entire lighting section if they make changes to a portion of their exterior lighting fixtures. It would, however, be appropriate to subject the changed portion to the new regulations.	Revise the applicability section to require exterior alterations that impact existing lighting fixtures to comply with the new exterior lighting regulations for the portion or type of the lighting impacted by the change.
27-5—83 27-5—91 27-5—97 27-5—105 27-5—108 27-5—141 Applicability for Various Standards	As currently worded, many development standards would apply to redevelopment that is limited to interior renovations and not just expansion. It is important that the Council and Planning Department look at this language, which may discourage reinvestment by improving existing buildings.	Matthew M. Gordon	Staff concurs. As currently drafted, these applicability statements do subject interior renovation to compliance with the development standards contained in Module 2 (Development Regulations). This is a potentially significant disincentive to reinvestment and could lead to blight.	Revise the applicability statements throughout Module 2 (Development Regulations) to ensure that interior-only renovations are exempt from the development standards.
27-5—83 Exterior Lighting Purpose and Intent	Regarding purpose statement C: "this requirement should come with more specifics. Reducing light pollution is important for the health of nocturnal animals."	Communities	Instead of listing all specifics, it may be more effective to broaden the purpose statement, so that all specific issues apply.	Revise 27-5.601.C on page 27-5—83 to read: "Curtail light pollution, reduce skyglow, and preserve the nighttime environment;"
27-5—85 Exterior Lighting Hours of Illumination	Several specific changes to Sec. 27-5.607.A, Hours of Illumination, are recommended to ensure the public health, safety, and welfare: 1. Require the extinguishment of exterior light by 11:00 P.M. or within one hour of closing, whichever occurs later (rather than first). 2. That this requirement apply to the establishment open the latest on any property 3. That exterior lighting be directional so as not to directly illuminate adjacent properties.	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman	Staff concurs the lighting regulations, as currently proposed, do not properly provide for the protection of the health, safety, and welfare of the community. Entertainment outlets, theaters, restaurants, bars, and similar uses will often close later than 11:00 P.M. and lighting is necessary to provide for the safety of patrons and employees. While lighting near existing residential development is an important aspect of compatibility, it is more appropriate to address specific regulations in the neighborhood compatibility standards rather than with the general exterior lighting standards. Sec. 27-5.607.B. requires the use of full cut-off lighting fixtures, addressing potential spill-over of light onto adjoining properties.	Revise Sec. 27-5.607 to read: "Public, civic, and institutional uses, commercial uses, mixed-uses, and industrial uses that are adjacent to existing residential development shall extinguish all exterior lighting – except lighting necessary for recreation, security, or emergency purposes – by 11:00 P.M. or within one hour of the closing of the establishment open latest, whichever occurs last ~~first~~."

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
	The comments also observe there are no exceptions noted for parking lots, where exterior lighting is perhaps most necessary following closure of a business.			Clarion Associates should clarify how a determination would be made as to what "lighting necessary for recreation, security, or emergency purposes" means. Applicants will attempt to make a case that lighting meets one of these circumstances and there is insufficient guidance to make a determination, particularly at a permit-only level, as currently drafted. Clarion Associates should re-evaluate the provision "minimum amount of exterior lighting necessary to illuminate…" to provide additional clarity as to what, exactly, this minimum amount of lighting would be so this clause is not subjective in nature and, therefore, more difficult to enforce. Clarion Associates should re-evaluate the lighting regulations for the neighborhood compatibility standards to determine if they are sufficiently robust or should include some of the intended outcomes of this hours of illumination regulation.
27-5—85 Exterior Lighting Street Lighting	"Please add a section requiring new and replacement systems to follow the guidelines of the American Medical Association in regards to the color output."	Communities	Staff concurs.	Clarion Associates should add a new standard to Sec. 27-5.606 that provides clear street lighting guidance in accordance with the recommendations from the American Medical Association.
27-5—89 27-5—90 Environmental Protection and Noise Controls	Sec. 27-5.707, Noise Control, should be revised and expanded to strengthen the County's noise protections. There are few noise regulations that apply to development in the current Zoning Ordinance, and this has caused challenges over the last several years as noise impacts on quality of life have become better understood.	Planning staff	Staff concurs. While there are proposed noise standards in Sec. 27-5.707, they are based on octave bands when they should be linked more closely to the maximum allowable noise levels in a-weighted decibels (dBA), which is the accepted industry practice for noise regulation. The State of Maryland has incorporated noise precepts and standards for environmental noise in COMAR 26.02.03.02 which should be adapted for the local context and incorporated in the Zoning Ordinance. Staff offer additional guidance on appropriate noise regulation for the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance as a starting point for the discussion with Clarion Associates as follows: 1. Provide an applicability element for noise regulation that, at minimum, would apply to all residential development (including adult care facilities) that is proposed on a lot within	Revise the noise control regulations proposed in Module 2 (Development Regulations) in accordance with the guidance offered by staff. Clarion Associates should speak directly to staff environmental planning experts should they have any questions or wish to discuss the guidance in further detail.

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			the impacted area of the noise standards. The principal use types "Assisted Living Facility," "Continuing Care Retirement Community," and "Nursing Home Facility" should always be subject to the noise regulations. Exemptions would include any residential development that occurs within a Transit-Oriented/Activity Center base of Planned Development zone or in the Mixed-Use Planned Development (MU-PD) Zone; visitor accommodation uses, "Adult Care Facility," and "Child Care Facility." 2. Provide definitions of the following terms: "Traffic-Generated Noise (e.g. aircraft, railroad, roadways)," "Outdoor Activity Area (e.g. playgrounds, sitting areas with benches and/or tables, and the back yard of single-family dwellings that lack rear-loaded garages, but not including front yards/fronts of multifamily buildings, sidewalks, or trails)," "Phase I Noise Study," and "Phase II Noise Study." 3. Provide a table of noise standards/thresholds and time periods to focus on the "day" as 7 a.m. through 10 p.m. and "night" as 10 p.m. through 7 a.m." The maximum allowable noise area for receiving lands should be established as 65/55 dBA for residential uses day/night, 67/62 dBA for commercial and mixed-use uses day/night, and 75/75 dBA for industrial uses day/night in accordance with State guidance. 4. Provide noise study language in the appropriate location (which may consist of the Procedures Manual rather than the Comprehensive Review Draft) that would prevent proposed buildings from being used as noise mitigation unless the project is phased, require calculation of day and night averages separately, and require that lots and outdoor activity areas within the noise impact area be relocated outside the noise impact area unless mitigation is provided.	
27-5—90 through 27-5—107 Form and Design Standards	How do we control the location of utility boxes on new developments?	Planning staff	Utility box location is, in part, subject to the approval of the utility provider and cannot always be mandated by zoning regulations. There are no proposed standards that address utility boxes, and utility box locations are often determined by the utility provider only after the site plan is approved, but requiring the locations to be shown on plan submittals (at least at an illustrative level) is appropriate to allow for review and comment. We recommend avoiding situations where the utility boxes may be required to be shown on the site plan, the utility provider moves the boxes, and the applicant must seek a site plan revision to reflect relocated boxes.	Include an *illustrative* utilities plan depicting the potential location of utility boxes and other utility lines/equipment as part of the submittal requirements for pertinent applications in the upcoming Procedures Manual.
27-5—93 Multifamily, Townhouse, and Three-Family Form and Design Standards	Clarion Associates have proposed a fixed length of 150 linear feet for any multifamily, townhouse, or three-family building, regardless of the number of units. Is this too restrictive? How does this limit correspond to the block size criteria Clarion has established?	WMATA, Planning staff	These are key questions that must be addressed to ensure functional, high-quality multifamily, townhouse, and three-family development. A maximum length of 150 feet would seem to preclude common development approaches for modern multifamily development, such as the "Texas donut" where apartments flank all sides of an interior parking structure. Regarding townhouse development, 150 feet may only yield "sticks" as small as 6 units if each unit is 22 to 24 feet in width. This limits the provision of townhouses and results in a less urban approach where one may be desired. Staff notes the block size criteria may generally result in 200 by 400 or 800 foot blocks, and it seems particularly awkward to have multiple buildings along the block, particularly in an urban and/or transit-oriented condition, because of a maximum building length requirement that is too short to permit desired development patterns. The maximum building length must be revisited.	Re-evaluate and revise the maximum building length limitation of 150 feet to a more appropriate figure.
27-5—102 through	Mr. Nelson and Mr. Lynch present several comments regarding the potential impacts of so-called "big box retail"	G. Macy Nelson and	Staff does not concur with the underlying premise that a "large retail building" become a defined use. A retail building – regardless of size – is not a use. It is, instead, merely a form of	Add a definition for "combination retail" to include, at minimum, a

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—107 Nonresidential and Mixed-Use Form and Design Standards Large Retail Establishment Form and Design Standards	and concerns over how Clarion Associates' recommendations do not seem to fully address the impact of large retailers. Supporting information from Professor Jennifer Cowley and Professor Emeritus Ralph D. Bennett, Jr. are included. The major requests Mr. Nelson and Mr. Lynch would like to see considered include: 1. "Define 'large retail building' and allow it only as a Special Exception in the County's high-intensity commercial zoning districts," 2. "Prohibit 'retail sales and service uses' with 75,000 square feet or greater in the MFR-20, MFR-48, NC, and NAC zones," and 3. "Adopt design standards for large retail buildings that are consistent with the intent of limiting automobile-oriented development and created [sic] a sense of place." The supportive information included as two attachments provide additional detail regarding the outside professor's review of Clarion's proposals, their critiques, and recommendations for changes.	David S. Lynch	development. Clarion Associates recognize particularly large retail uses, in this case those of 75,000 or more square feet in size, require a more sensitive approach regarding the form and design of the buildings. However, from the pure zoning perspective, there is no particular reason why the size of a retail establishment should force it to be treated as a separate and distinct use. Having said that, and in general agreement with observations offered by Professor Cowley regarding the Montgomery County example of defining "combination retail" to account for the trend of some large commercial/retail establishments including both consumer goods and full-size grocery stores and/or pharmacies, staff agrees that a new definition of "combination retail" is appropriate for Prince George's County. In addition, and given some of the unique aspects of "combination retail," staff concurs this use should be limited to more high-intensity zones and restricted from the proposed multifamily zones and the lower-intensity nonresidential and transit-oriented/activity center base zones. There is no additional need to define "large retail building," because the "definition" is self-evident with the regulations – only buildings exceeding 75,000 square feet would trigger the additional large retail establishment form and design standards. Most, if not all, "combination retail" development would be subject to these regulations, in addition to new use restrictions. Since there would be development regulations oriented to any retail establishment that exceeds 75,000 square feet, and not all such retailers would be "combination retail," staff does not concur with the suggestion that these uses be permitted only upon the approval of a Special Exception. There is some misunderstanding in both Professor Cowley and Professor Emeritus Bennett's analyses that should be kept in mind in any additional discussion of this topic; for example, Professor Cowley incorrectly states the proposed MFR-20 (Multifamily Residential – 20) Zone would not permit grocery stores; Professor Emeritus Bennett offers some suggestions on the general nonresidential form and design standards that, if applied across the board and not limited to large retailers, would have a deleterious impact on commercial and industrial development throughout the County. Staff points this out not to criticize either professor but instead to reinforce that this issue is more complicated than it may seem at first blush, and that debate on this topic may have something of a domino effect in terms of other standards or areas of regulation that may be involved. Staff concurs with some of the suggestions pertaining to strengthened design regulations for large retail establishments. These include: • Establish a maximum footprint for large retail establishments located in the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center base and Planned Development zones, which would force vertical development in at least some situations and result in building forms more appropriate for walkability. Note – the suggestion was to consider a maximum footprint regardless of zone. This will not be feasible in some situations, such as large home improvement retailers located in the GCO (General Commercial Office) Zone. • Clarifying the requirement for "main streets" for multiple building developments to eliminate vagueness. • Clarifying that false building entrances shall not be permitted.	reference to consumer goods retail sales space at a minimum square footage and incorporates grocery sales. Best practice definitions, including the 2014 definition used by Montgomery County, should serve as inspiration for this use definition. This use should fall within the "Retail Sales and Service Uses" Principal Use Category. List "combination retail" as a permitted use in the TAC (Town Activity Center), LTO (Local Transit-Oriented), RTO-L (Regional Transit-Oriented – Low), RTO-H (Regional Transit-Oriented – High), and GCO (General Commercial Office) base zones. List "combination retail" as an allowable use in the TAC-PD (Town Activity Center – Planned Development), LTO-PD (Local Transit-Oriented – Planned Development), RTO-PD (Regional Transit-Oriented – Planned Development), and MU-PD (Mixed-Use – Planned Development) zones. Revise Sec. 27-5.904.A.3.b.iii. (Multi-Building Development) on page 27-5—98 to read: "Frame and enclose a '~~Main Street'~~ pedestrian or vehicle access corridor within the development site~~, if appropriate~~; and." Incorporate language in Sec. 27-5.905 B. (Building Entrances) on page 27-5—102 that clearly indicates false or faux entrances shall not be permitted. All entrances for large retail establishments must be functional entrances. Revise Sec. 27-5.905.C. (Facades and Massing) to create a new number 1 to establish an appropriate maximum

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			Staff does not support other specific suggestions. For example, a suggestion to break up parking lots of 100 spaces in size into smaller bays (rather than lots in excess of 300 spaces, as recommended by Clarion Associates) would end up consuming more land for surface parking and landscaping. Another suggestion, to require structured parking for lots with 500 or more parking spaces, is not feasible in the Prince George's County market in the near- to mid-term for retailers not located in proximity to major transit lines. Staff believes judicious revisions can better express the stated intent regarding large retail establishments and mitigate the potential impacts of "combination retail" development.	building footprint size for large retail establishments located in any of the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center base or Planned Development zones. Renumber the remaining standards in this sub-section accordingly. Clarion Associates should advise the project team as to the suitability of increased design regulation – potentially including mandating additional ground-level retail spaces within the larger building footprint (with separate exterior entrances), consideration for requiring structured parking, and increased fenestration and articulation – for large retail establishments within walkable distance of a heavy rail transit station.
27-5—107 through 27-5—115 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	One thing about the neighborhood compatibility standards that seems problematic is the prohibition on outdoor dining within 200 feet of any single-family homes. This does not work for all of US 1, and would be difficult to apply new zoning to historic contexts. The Town of Berwyn Heights specifically asked what may happen if the town wishes to encourage outdoor dining and outdoor activities within proximity to existing residential development.	Council, Municipalities, Town of Berwyn Heights Planning staff	Staff concurs the neighborhood compatibility standards as currently proposed by Clarion Associates will be extremely difficult to effectively implement in the rapidly redeveloping US 1 Corridor, and would create numerous conflicts regarding, in particular, the potential height and density of new development along US 1 and in permitting vibrant outdoor activities such as sidewalk cafes. While the proposed regulations would seem quite appropriate for development in much of Prince George's County, they simply will not be effective in balancing development and market potential with being "good neighbors" to the existing single-family communities that are just off US 1. These standards need to be reworked to more appropriately and effectively deal with development along narrow commercial and mixed-use frontages along this key corridor in northern Prince George's County. Members of the County Council requested additional investigation of how the proposed neighborhood compatibility standards may impact other corridors in Prince George's County. This exercise is underway and will be used to further inform potential revisions to these proposed standards.	Clarion Associates shall, in coordination with the project team, revise the neighborhood compatibility standards to better address the development and redevelopment potential along the commercial and mixed-use frontage properties of US 1, particularly south of the Capital Beltway. Consider a more nuanced approach to regulations such as building height step-downs and global restrictions on café seating areas and other outdoor activities. The project team will continue the investigation of how neighborhood compatibility standards may impact other commercial corridors in the County and suggest additional revisions as may be appropriate for review in the Comprehensive Review Draft.
27-5—107 27-5—108	The Neighborhood Compatibility Standards apply to adjoining development. The distance between an industrial area and a residential area may be more of an issue than whether or not there is a stream or road that separates properties	Communities	Comment noted. Staff defers to Clarion Associates to address this question.	Clarion Associates should determine if additional proximity or other thresholds should trigger the requirement for Neighborhood Compatibility Standards when new

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Neighborhood Compatibility Standards				industrial development is proposed in proximity to single-family residential areas, or if the currently-proposed standards would be sufficient to mitigate any negative impacts of industrial uses.
27-5—107 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	It is not clear if townhouses are exempt from the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards. Recommend adding them, two-family houses, and "two-over-two" (two-family attached) to the exemption clauses.	Municipalities, Planning staff	Clarion Associates needs to resolve the central question of how townhouses and multifamily development is treated throughout the new Zoning Ordinance. Townhouses have been generally grouped with multifamily development because of their form and mass – a "stick" of townhomes has a very similar form to a traditional walk-up multifamily building. However, because this treatment is not universal (for example, multifamily dwellings and single-family attached dwellings are considered two different uses by Clarion Associates), staff concurs that the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards should be revised to explicitly address single-family attached dwellings.	Revise the applicability language in Sec. 27-5.1102 to clearly mention whether or not development of single-family attached dwellings require compliance with the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards.
27-5—109 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	The Town of Berwyn Heights seeks clarity as to the measurement of transitional distances for maximum building height.	Town of Berwyn Heights	The requirement to reduce the height of new development to 3 stories within 150 feet of a single-family or two-family dwelling, and to 4 stories within 200 feet, is based on a measurement from the closest portion of that dwelling. Staff agrees that additional language may provide necessary clarity.	Revise Sec. 27-5.1103.A. to clearly indicate the measurement/distance from a single-family dwelling, two-family dwelling, or vacant land in a single-family zone is to be determined from the closest portion of the dwelling (in the case of single-family and two-family dwellings) and from the property line (in the case of vacant land).
27-5—110 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	A severely pitched roof within 100 feet of vacant lands in a single-family residential zone may be inappropriate for new development residential area.	Planning staff	Staff concurs, but notes the nature of "severely" in this context may be in the eye of the beholder.	Provide additional guidance as to appropriate roof slopes for Sec. 27-1103.C.1.b. on page 27-5—110.
27-5—112 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	A 12-foot setback for parking from existing single-family or two-family dwellings seems inadequate.	City of Greenbelt	While the subsequent clause also requires a landscaped perimeter buffer (this term needs to be corrected for consistency) between the off-street surface parking areas and existing development, 12 feet may indeed be a bit on the short side.	Revise Sec. 27-5.110.F.4. to read: "…shall be screened by a perimeter ~~buffer~~ landscape strip in accordance…."
27-5—113 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	Regarding Sec. 27-5.1103.F.5., "shouldn't the façade of a parking structure be required to comply with architectural compatibility standards?"	City of Greenbelt	Staff concurs it would be helpful to add language that parking structures should be designed in accordance to the exterior materials standards on page 27-5—112.	Revise Sec. 27-5—1103.F.5. to read: "The façade of any parking structure…shall be designed in accordance with the exterior materials standards of this Section and ~~shall~~ be landscaped to soften its visual impact."
27-5—113 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	Please add recycling to refuse collection areas. In some of the older townhouse areas, they didn't really think about how residents would handle trash and recycling, so it has exasperated problems.	Council	Staff concurs	Add recycling collection to the loading, service, and refuse collection areas standards in Sec. 27-5.1103.G.1.

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—115 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	What is meant by "outdoor activities" on this page?	Planning staff	Staff concurs the phrase “outdoor activities” may be too broad in the context of the proposed regulation.	Clarify or provide additional examples as to what would be considered “outdoor activities” for purposes of the standard.
27-5—115 through 27-5—119 Agricultural Compatibility Standards	These standards work well for farms in rural areas of the County. However, they do not take urban farms into account.	Planning staff	Staff concurs.	Clarion Associates should determine if there are any additional (or current) Agricultural Compatibility Standards that should apply to new development adjacent to urban farms and revise Sec. 27-5.1200 as appropriate.
27-5—117 Agricultural Compatibility Standards	Figure 27-5.1204 on this page does not seem to incorporate the regulatory guidance of the street connectivity index proposed on page 27-5—8.	Planning staff	The graphics of the new Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations should match the text.	Revise the diagram to ensure the illustrated residential subdivision complies with the street connectivity index.
27-5—119 through 27-5—140 Signage	Are the consultants aware that we have been in litigation regarding signage, and have been providing more exemptions? Many will be looking closely at the County’s signage regulations in light of the Supreme Court’s decision of Reed v. Gilbert. The International Municipal Lawyers Association (IMLA) is working on a model signage code.	Communities	The seminal Supreme Court decision made in *Reed v. Town of Gilbert, AZ* will have significant impact on the nation’s signage regulations. Essentially, all signage regulation must be content neutral and is subject to “strict scrutiny.” This emerging challenge impacts thousands of communities, including Prince George’s County. Staff does not believe the proposed signage regulations contained in Module 2 are fully compliant with the guidance of Reed v. Gilbert. Numerous references to different types of signs (e.g. real estate signs, club signs, other “special purpose” signs) remain and may be problematic. Additional changes will be necessary and this discussion will likely continue through the life of the project.	The signage regulations contained in Sec. 27-5.1300 should be re-evaluated with content neutrality in mind and revised as necessary and appropriate.
27-5—120 Signage Exemptions	Regarding Sec. 27-5.1302.B.9., “is this stating that other governmental entities wishing to post crime prevention, public safety and health related signage must receive District Council approval?”	City of Greenbelt	No. However, staff can see why this may be confusing, and recommends a simplification.	Revise Exemption B.1. to read: “County, municipal, State, and Federal <u>traffic, crime prevention, public safety and health,</u> or directional signs;” <u>Delete</u> Exemption B.9. Renumber remaining exemptions accordingly.
27-5—120 Signage Exemptions	Sec. 27-5.1302.B.10 exempts temporary signs advertising County-sponsored events; this should be expanded to include municipal events.	City of Greenbelt	Staff concurs.	Revise Exemption B.10 to read: “Temporary signs advertising County <u>or municipal</u> sponsored events.”
27-5—121 Signage Signs Not Requiring a Sign Permit	Sec. 27-5.1303.A. should be expanded to include municipal and state signage.	City of Greenbelt	There is no reason why municipalities should not be added to this clause for additional clarity. State agencies are exempt from local jurisdiction (as are municipalities for municipal property), and do not need to be referenced.	Revise Sec. 27-5.1303.A. to read: “…a County <u>or municipal</u> public official in the performance of official duty, or by a County governmental agency <u>or municipality,</u> such as….”

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—123 and –124 Prohibited Signs	Vinyl banners mounted on the facades of buildings are permitted as permanent signs today. This material is not well-suited for permanent signage.	Planning staff	There are no specific standards pertaining to materials for general signage in Section 27-5.1300. It may be helpful to have general regulatory guidance that speaks to durable materials for permanent signage, for example.	Revise the signage standards as may be necessary and appropriate to ensure durable, low-maintenance, high-quality materials are used for permanent signage.
27-5—125 Signage General Standards	Signs in the right-of-way "should be subject to municipal approval if the proposed right-of-way is intended to be dedicated to the municipality."	City of Greenbelt	Staff has determined Sec. 27-5.1305.C. Signs Within Proposed Right-of-Way constitutes something of a misunderstanding of the current Zoning Ordinance provisions, and conflates current Sections 27-614(a)(4), which deals with signage in the area located between a current right-of-way and a built street. The situation described in 27-614(a)(4) should be exceedingly rare in occurrence, and this provision does not need to carry forward into the new Zoning Ordinance. In order to carry forward the intent of current regulations for signs within proposed rights-of-way, several changes to this section are necessary. First, and most importantly, the current regulations require compliance with the procedures and findings for issuing building permits in a proposed right-of-way. This process is extremely cumbersome and burdensome for signage, is seldom used, and staff recommend this process (which involves a Zoning Hearing Examiner public hearing and District Council approval) be eliminated. Second, a sub-clause that allows permits to be issued without Council authorization under very limited circumstances seems to be more in keeping with the intent of allowing signs within proposed rights-of-way, and staff understands sign permits are issued under these regulations from time to time. It is this set of circumstances that staff recommend be brought forward to the new Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, staff recommend Sec. 27-259(a)(2) of the current Zoning Ordinance be adapted to new Sec. 27-5.1305.C. This section has nothing to do with municipal authority, and it is not necessary to address municipalities within this language.	Delete 27-5.1305.C.1. Reorder and revise 27-5.1305.C.2. to read: "~~When a sign is not allowed based on the building setback requirement for freestanding signs in Table 27-5.1306: Standards for Specific Sign Types, the District Council may authorize the issuance of a sign permit for any~~ 1. Sign permits may be issued for signs on land located within the right-of-way, property, or acquisition lines of a proposed street, rapid transit route, or rapid transit facility, or proposed relocation or widening of an existing street, rapid transit route, or rapid transit facility as shown on the General Plan or other County plan only if such signs are placed on: "a. Land which: i. Was in reservation but is now not in reservation; and ii. Has not been acquired and is not being acquired. "b. Land which was subdivided after the adoption of the General Plan or other County plan, but was not reserved or required to be dedicated for a street or rapid transit route or facility shown on the Plan." ~~The requirements for this authorization are the same as those for authorizing the issuance of a building permit for a structure on land located within a proposed right-of-way (see Sec. 27-259, Permits within proposed rights-of-way).~~"

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—126 through 27-5—133 Signage Standards for Specific Sign Types	In Table 27-5.1306: Standards for Specific Sign Types, the maximum wall coverage of 25 percent of a street facing building seems very high. What is the basis for this standard? Do these signage standards increase, decrease or maintain current area standards?	City of Greenbelt	Staff defers to Clarion Associates regarding the percentage of street-facing buildings. Most, if not all, of the signage standards in the table carry forward the County's current sign area regulations, but in a simplified and modified form necessary to accommodate the new zone structure proposed by Clarion Associates.	Clarion Associates should provide the project team the rationale behind allowing up to 25 percent of the street-facing building's wall to be covered by signage area. Delete the "a." that is misplaced in the "Other Standards" rows on pages 27-5—128 and 27-5—130.
27-5—129 Signage	The maximum sign area of 400 square feet for canopy signage seems large. Is this for a whole building or for a specific canopy sign?	Planning staff	This standard is carried forward from the current Zoning Ordinance, but the distinction of whether the sign area is a sum or applies to each canopy was lost in translation. The current Zoning Ordinance indicates the sum of all the canopy signage would be 400 square feet.	Revise the sign area regulations for canopies to clearly indicate the sign area is the maximum sign area for the sum of all canopy signage for the development, and not the maximum for any individual canopy sign.
27-5—130 Signage	Need to look at the prohibition on projecting signs for the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center base and Planned Development zones, and the Mixed-Use Planned Development (MU-PD) Zone. This prohibition seems unnecessary, as it would prevent common signage types such as blade and bracket signs.	Planning staff	Staff feels that blade signs and other traditional forms of signage are quite appropriate for the street level activity and uses within transit-oriented areas and activity centers. There would seem to be no compelling reason to prohibit such signage.	Revise the signage table to allow for projecting signs in these zones.
27-5—135 Signage Standards for Special Purpose Signs	In Sec. 27-5.1307.D.2., 19 feet is too high for directional signs.	City of Greenbelt	Staff concurs.	Clarion Associates should provide a revised maximum height for directional signage for public, civic, and institutional uses, or golf courses or country clubs.
27-5—140 Signage Alternative Sign Plan	The City of College Park generally supports the new signage regulations proposed by Clarion Associates "but has concerns about allowing alternative sign plans to be approved without municipal review and support. The City currently has the authority to hear and decide sign departures and it is important for the City to retain this authority." The City of Greenbelt indicates the alternative sign plan seems to preempt the Departure from Sign Design Standards authority. What happens to this process?	City of College Park, City of Greenbelt	Staff concurs. The Maryland State Legislature has authorized the delegation of certain powers of the District Council to municipalities in Prince George's County subject to the approval of the District Council; among these expressly-authorized powers are sign design standards. Since the entirety of Sec. 27-5.1300, Signage, deals with sign design standards, alternative sign plans would seem to be nothing more than a mechanism by which departures (today's terminology), or adjustments (Clarion's proposed terminology) are proposed and approved. The decision-making body for alternative sign plans should be expanded beyond the director of the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement to include municipalities where such authority has been duly delegated.	Revise Sec. 27-5.1309 on page 27-5—140 to account for alternative sign plan approval by municipalities which have been delegated authority over sign departures. In accordance with footnote 343, be sure to provide for municipal review and approval of alternative sign plans (when a municipality has been delegated signage authority) in the forthcoming Applications/Procedures Manual.
27-5—141 through 27-5—149	Some concern was expressed that over time, developers may "skip over" the incentives that are more difficult to achieve, and we will get the same incentives over time. This pertains to a broader question as to whether the proposed standards and incentives are sufficiently robust for the County.	Planning staff, Department of Permitting, Inspections, and	Staff is coordinating with the County Department of the Environment and Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement (DPIE) to re-evaluate the green building standards and incentives proposed by Clarion Associates to determine their suitability for Prince George's County. DPIE's sustainability experts have indicated the proposed elements seem in line with best practices and would encourage County developers and residents to comply, but feel many of the potential points could be earned from measures developers would do anyway.	Re-evaluate the green building points/elements that have been proposed and add additional elements that will help the County push the envelope for sustainability.

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Green Building Standards and Incentives		Enforcement (DPIE) staff	Clarion Associates should also re-evaluate the proposed green building elements and strengthen them as may be appropriate/suitable for Prince George's County, current market and developer green building trends, and cutting-edge approaches such as blue roofs, operable street level window systems, and biomimicry, and other former/current LEED® pilot credits.	
27-5—142 27-5—147 Green Building Standards and Green Building Incentives	The green building standards should be expanded; for example, the " cool roof" provision should be expanded to other development types, not just residential subdivisions.	Planning staff	Staff concurs.	Revise the green building standards and incentives pertaining to "cool roofs" to ensure these features will grant points when applied to any type of development, not just residential development. Such "cool roof" features for non-residential development should only grant points when the entire roof of the development is built as a "cool roof."
27-5—142 27-5—148 Green Building Standards and Incentives	Module 2 (Development Regulations) should "specifically recognize the ICC/ASHRAE-700 National Green Building Standard™ (NGBS) certification, NGBS Green, issued by Home Innovation Research Labs, as on-par with LEED and actively promote NGBS Green as an option for local residential (single-family and multifamily) development." The Home Innovation Research Labs issue this certification for residential development, are based in Prince George's County, and have a vested interest in promoting and ensuring green building practices and sustainable development. In addition, the International Code Council's (ICC) *International Green Construction Code* was also cited as an appropriate green building rating system. General support for sustainable building programs and practices was expressed.	Michael Luzier, President & CEO, Home Innovation Research Labs; Evan Auld; Mark Garner; L. Neal Fiorelli, President, Lorax Partnerships, LLC; Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement (DPIE) staff	Staff concurs; it would be very appropriate to expand the references to LEED® within Module 2 (Development Regulations) to include both the National Green Building Standard and the *International Green Construction Code* as alternatives.	Revise Sec. 27-5.1402.B.3. on page 27-5—142 to read: "New buildings that have achieved ~~LEED~~ requirements necessary to receive certification from the U.S. Green Building Council at the LEED® gold level or above or an equivalent level of sustainable development performance under an alternative rating system such as the National Green Building Standard™/NGBS Green or the International Code Council's *International Green Construction Code*, as determined by the Planning Director." Revise the LEED® Certification section of Table 27-5.1506: Green Building Features on page 27-5—148 to expressly incorporate the National Green Building Standard™/NGBS Green and the International Code Council's *International Green Construction Code* as equivalent systems for certification and feature crediting purposes.
27-5—145 Green Building Incentives	One of the proposed green building incentives is to allow a developer to decrease or increase the number of parking spaces provided by 15 percent without the need of an alternative parking plan.	Planning staff	Increased available parking generally induces more private automobile transportation, which will undercut efforts to improve the environment through green building provisions. While allowing further reductions to parking would contribute to sustainability goals, staff believe this incentive and its relationship to the parking requirements proposed in Module 2 (Development Standards)	Rethink the proposed incentive regarding parking on page 27-5—145, considering the proposed parking regulations in Sec. 27-5.200. Revise or delete the parking incentive as may be

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			needs to be reconsidered. These two sections in combination may be duplicative in some respects, or not appropriate.	necessary and appropriate to avoid duplication or undermining the alternative parking plan provisions.
27-5—147 Green Building Incentives Timing of Review	The Green Building Incentives section is missing the sub-section entitled "Timing of Review" that exists with the other Sections of Division 5.	Planning staff	It appears the language currently contained in Sec. 27-5.1505.B. is the language that should be relocated to become the language of the Timing to Review sub-section.	Create a new Sec. 27-5.1503. Timing of Review. Revise the numbering of other sub-sections in this Section and the tables of contents accordingly.
27-5—147 Green Building Incentives Procedure	Since the second and third incentives in Table 27-5.1505.D. allow for increases in gross floor area, staff recommend increasing the minimum number of building practices from Schedule A to 3 points, and from Schedule B to 4 points for both of these incentives. Suggest an applicant who wishes to take advantage of two or more incentives achieve silver or gold rating (or equivalent) from a building rating system such as LEED®.	Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement (DPIE) staff	While in concept increases to gross floor area should perhaps require further commitment to green building incentives by a developer, the proposed incentive thresholds seem relatively modest. Staff have no strong feelings regarding this recommendation, and defer to Clarion Associates. Staff concurs that it would be appropriate to seek formal certification of a minimum silver or equivalent rating from a recognized green building rating system, but notes there are practical difficulties of enforcing zoning regulation based on prospective certification that only occurs following building occupancy that preclude such a requirement. Clarion Associates do recommend that if principal buildings are constructed in order to meet the certification standards of LEED®, they may gain additional points. In lieu of requiring certification, staff believe the approach recommended by Clarion Associates, which would require providing more minimum green building practices, is an effective approach to ensuring sustainable design elements are incorporated in the project.	Evaluate the comment and, if deemed appropriate, increase the minimum number of building practices as proposed.
27-5—142 27-5—143 27-5—147 27-5—148 Green Building Standards and Green Building Incentives	"All references to ASHRAE [American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers] should be adopted by reference so that as ASHRAE updates their standards the zoning code is automatically updated without need for rule making." The edition of ASHRAE 90.1 cited on page 27-5—142 is out of date; should use the 2013 edition instead of the 2004 edition.	Communities, Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement (DPIE) staff	Staff concurs; ASHRAE is the recognized industry standard for various elements dealing with heating, ventilation, and air conditioning, but they do update and change standards from time to time. General references to ASHRAE are appropriate, but specific reference citations may not be for zoning regulatory purposes. The current ASHRAE 90.1 standard is dated 2016, not 2004 or 2013. This speaks to the heart of the comment.	Clarion Associates should re-evaluate the green building menu items that refer to ASHRAE to determine how best to reword those items to be more general in nature.
27-5—145 through 27-5—149 Green Building Incentives	Regarding the green building point system, is there a best practice or opportunity to provide an incentive for a developer to redevelop a vacant property?	Planning staff	This question was asked of Clarion Associates during their trip to the County to present their recommendations on Module 2 (development standards). Clarion replied that the redevelopment and/or adaptive reuse of an existing building could be considered for the incentive program. This potential addition seems beneficial for Prince George's County.	Add language that provides for redevelopment or adaptive reuse as part of the green building incentives.
27-8—54 Interpretations and Definitions Terms and Uses Defined	What is the definition of abutting or adjacency?	Communities	"Abutting or adjoining" are defined as "Touching and sharing a common point or line." The term "adjacent" will be defined in the Comprehensive Review Draft pursuant to staff direction from the Module 1 (Zones and Uses) analysis of comments. Further, Clarion Associates indicated that adjacent or abutting properties would also include those with connected property lines and across streets of four lanes or less. It would not include properties across rail lines, streams, or rivers.	Revise the definition of "abutting or adjoining" and add to the pending definition of "adjacent" to include reference to streams, rivers, rail lines, and streets four lanes or less if this is part of the intent of these terms.

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-8—54 Interpretations and Definitions Terms and Uses Defined	The definition of "Agriculture, home-based" should be deleted based on direction issued for Module 1 (Zones and Uses).	Planning staff	Staff concurs.	Delete the definition of "Agriculture, home-based."
27-8—74 Interpretations and Definitions Terms and Uses Defined	"The definition for traffic sign should be amended to include municipal signs."	City of Greenbelt	Staff concurs.	Revise the definition of "Sign, traffic" to read: "A sign indicating Federal, State, ~~or~~ County, or Municipal regulations for automobile, truck, bicycle, and pedestrian movement."
27-8—75 Interpretations and Definitions Terms and Uses Defined	"The terms right-of-way and street line seem to be used interchangeably throughout the document. Are these intended to define the same term?"	City of Greenbelt	No. A "street line" is more specific and refers exclusively to the edge of the broader "right-of-way" which provides the separation from abutting property. The term "property line" would essentially be the same thing as "street line." Staff has two observations based on review of this comment: first, the term "right-of-way" should be defined both in the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations. Second, a reference in the "street line" definition needs to be updated.	Provide a definition of "right-of-way" in both the new Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations. Revise clause (B) in the definition of "street line" on page 27-8—76 to read: "…Capital Improvement Program, or Maryland State Consolidated Transportation Program ~~Five Year Highway Construction Program~~…."
27-8—75 Interpretations and Definitions Terms and Uses Defined	There is no definition for the term "street."	Planning staff	There should be a definition for this common term.	Provide a definition for "street."
27-8—76 Interpretations and Definitions Terms and Uses Defined	There are two different definitions for "street stub."	WMATA, Planning staff	There should only be one definition for each term.	Combine the definitions of "street stub" and revise as necessary to eliminate conflict or confusion.
Landscape Manual General	"Please consider adding information about SHA [State Highway Administration] landscape guidance documents to various sections of the Prince George's [sic] Landscape Manual where such reference might be helpful to users." SHA suggested Section 4.2 or Appendix 4 as particularly appropriate locations.	State Highway Administration	SHA produces and annually updates four landscaping documents dealing with landscape design and construction along State highways. Staff concurs that referencing these documents is appropriate to provide additional clarity to applicants.	Revise the "Additional Requirements" section on pages VIII and IX to add a section on SHA as follows: "The Maryland State Highway Administration administers annually-updated landscape guidance documents, which provide guidance to applicants to help ensure landscaping plans will be granted SHA construction permits. These documents are published online and should be

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
				consulted in addition to the regulations of this Landscape Manual if the property under development is adjacent to SHA property."
Landscape Manual General	The Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) requests additional guidance in the proposed Landscape Manual to clarify landscape plans developed for County entitlement approvals "should not calculate or include trees and other plantings in SHA property or rights of ways in any tallies, or towards any type of zoning credit for plantings, as all plantings on SHA property or within SHA rights of way are subject to removal by SHA at any time. Prince George's County zoning approvals should not be dependent upon the species, quantity, or location of trees or other planting proposed on SHA property or rights of way.:" SHA also seeks clarification the Landscape Manual requirements do not apply to SHA property and SHA rights of way.	State Highway Administration	Staff concurs, with one caveat: the Planning Department has occasionally encountered applications where there was no room for any trees along the frontage of a state roadway to fulfill the requirements of Section 4.2 (Requirements for Landscape Strips Along Streets) of the current Landscape Manual. This situation would typically force an applicant into a departure process. An internal procedure was established that would allow the applicant to seek permission from the State Highway Administration to plant street trees within the SHA right-of-way subject to a signed agreement with SHA that those trees could be removed at any time. While this is not the normal or most desirable situation, it will still occur in the future and guidance should be provided to deal with it. The new Zoning Ordinance will be amended in the Comprehensive Review Draft to clearly indicate state property is not subject to the regulations, pursuant to other discussions in this analysis of comments. This clarification extends to the Landscape Manual, which is part of the Zoning Ordinance by incorporation and extension.	Add text either as a new applicability statement on page 15 or a new Subsection in Section 1 on page 20 that clearly establishes plantings in SHA rights-of-way or on SHA property shall not count toward any credits or requirements of the Landscape Manual unless there is no room for plantings along the frontage of a state roadway and the applicant has obtained permission from SHA to plant trees subject to signed agreements such trees may be removed by SHA as may be necessary for maintenance or operational purposes. Add language that references the above to Sections 4.2, 4.6, and 4.8 of the Landscape Manual, as appropriate.
Landscape Manual Approval Processes, Landscape Elements and Design Criteria, and Other Landscape Design Considerations	The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) offered several suggestions regarding coordination: "Landscaping within a WSSC easement is not allowed. Other special treatments in a WSSC easement may need a Hold Harmless Agreement with WSSC." "The landscape architect must coordinate the location of street trees with water and sewer service connections. Root intrusion is a major cause of sewer blockage. Sewer backups are a health hazard to the owner and a long-term maintenance expense that proper planning can minimize." "Root zones are why underground utilities must be considered. Blockage of the sewer line as noted above. But also, if WSSC needs to replace the sewer, they will cut through the root zone and damage the tree root system." "Existing trees in a proposed WSSC easement cannot be counted toward the tree conservation requirements for the property."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	Staff concurs that approval for landscaping and structures within a WSSC right-of-way should require approval from WSSC, and that coordination of plantings with water and sewer utilities provision is important. Tree conservation requirement pertain to the Woodland Conservation Ordinance and is not directly related to the requirements of the Landscape Manual. However, staff agrees that additional clarity is warranted to indicate WSSC easement plantings should not count toward landscaping requirements for a property. Regarding masonry walls, plans are reviewed so that footers within easement areas are avoided. A clear statement speaking to this concern should be added to the Landscape Manual.	Include a new sub-section in Section 3.5 (Other Landscape Design Considerations) that clearly indicates that landscaping within WSSC easements is not permitted, and that the approval for structures or other special treatments shall require coordination with and approval of WSSC. This new sub-section should also speak to the coordination of street trees and other plantings with water and sewer connections. Incorporate language that clearly establishes plantings in WSSC rights-of-way or easements shall not count toward any credits or requirements of the Landscape Manual. Incorporate language that the construction of masonry walls should be avoided within public utility easements and other easements unless

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
	"Masonry walls cannot be placed in a WSSC easement or a Meter Vault easement. If a water or sewer line crosses under and perpendicular to a masonry wall, a sleeve protecting the pipe is required."			the operating agency has provided prior approval.
Landscape Manual Section 1.1 Applicability	The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) suggested revising the applicability to clearly indicate all development shall also comply with pertinent standards of the other design review agencies such as the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC), County Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement (DPIE), Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), etc.	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	The regulations of other agencies is a design consideration for overall site design but do not necessarily supersede or determine the applicability and requirements on the Landscape Manual. Staff agrees that a reference to other applicable standards is appropriate.	Add a new sentence at the end of standard 1.1.a. on page 12 that reads: "Development must also comply with pertinent standards of other County, state, and regional agencies."
Landscape Manual Section 1.3 Alternative Compliance	The alternative compliance section of the Landscape Manual needs additional clarity regarding its relationship to the adjustments procedures contained in Module 3 (Process and Administration and Subdivision Regulations).	Planning staff	It is unclear if the alternative compliance procedure is intended to be a type of adjustment as proposed by Module 3 (Process and Administration and Subdivision Regulations). There are two cross-references on pages 16 and 17 of the proposed Landscape Manual that are placeholders back to the adjustment section, but they appear to be contradictory. The first reference suggests alternative compliance is, in fact, intended to be a type of adjustment. The second reference indicates that if alternative compliance cannot be granted, the applicant can seek relief by applying for an adjustment. These are contradictory concepts. At minimum, this inconsistency needs to be reconciled. If the intent is that alternative compliance is a form of adjustment (contained in the Landscape Manual, which is a by-reference extension of the Zoning Ordinance), this relationship must be clarified – at minimum, the adjustments section of the proposed Zoning Ordinance should contain specific language regarding alternative compliance, by listing it as an adjustment and providing appropriate references back to the Landscape Manual. If the intent is that alternative compliance is a wholly separate process from adjustments, this should also be made clearer, both in the Landscape Manual and in the adjustments section of the proposed Zoning Ordinance.	Revise the language of Section 1.3 Alternative Compliance to reconcile the inconsistency between the two references to adjustments. Clarify the relationship of alternative compliance to adjustments and revise the Landscape Manual and Module 3 (Process and Administration and Subdivision Regulations) as appropriate.
Landscape Manual Section 4.5 Stormwater Management Facilities	Add the following to the second goa of Section 4.5, Stormwater Management Facilities: "And be properly coordinated with the utility designs such as water, sewer, electric, telephone, etc."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	Staff concurs with the recommended addition.	Revise Goal 2 on page 87 to read: "Stormwater management facilities should be designed as an integral part of the overall landscape design approach and be properly coordinate with utility designs including, but not limited to, water, sewer, electric, and telephone service."
Landscape Manual Section 4.5 Stormwater Management Facilities	"WSSC Pipeline Design Manual also has design restrictions for ESD [environmental site design] relative to location of water and sewer lines."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	Referencing both WSSC and public roadway operating agencies, which also provide design guidance for stormwater management facilities, would provide additional clarity to designers and applicants.	Add a new sentence at the end of the first full paragraph on page 87 to read: "The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) and agencies or municipalities with operational responsibilities for public streets should also be consulted during the design of stormwater management facilities."

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Landscape Manual Section 4.6 Buffering Development from Streets	The proposed regulations of Section 4.6 do not contain any provisions which would allow for the substation of two ornamental trees for one shade tree where overhead utility wires may exist, as is found in proposed Section 4.2, Requirements for Landscape Strips Along Streets.	Planning staff	Staff concurs that language speaking to substitution where overhead utilities exist is appropriate for Section 4.6 and would be consistent with Section 4.2.	Add language similar to that found on page 65 regarding overhead utilities to Section 4.6 where it may be most appropriate.
Landscape Manual Section 4.6 Buffering Development from Streets	"Enough room must be allowed in the design to provide the utilities such as water, sewer, storm drain, esd [environmental site design], electric, telephone, gas, CATV [cable television], etc. Remember transformer, junction boxes, vaults and other large underground structures must be considered during design."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	Buffers and buffer landscaping are required to be provided outside of public utility easements pursuant to the Section 4.6(c) requirements of this draft Landscape Manual; this said, staff noticed a typo on page 91. Other existing or proposed easement areas typically avoided in the in the design of Landscape Plans.	Revise the second sentence of standard c.2.A on page 91 to read: "All plant material required for this buffer ~~should~~ shall be provided between the development and the street…."
Landscape Manual Section 4.6 Buffering Development from Streets	Regarding Buffering Special Roadways, here is a thought for Rural and Agricultural zones, where the bufferyard is proposed as 75 feet wide: a. If the existing context and character of the Special Roadway where the development is proposed is a wooded area with mostly mature trees and/or understory plantings that block and diffuse views, the bufferyard shall be planted as required to mimic this character within the entirety of the bufferyard; b. If the existing context and character of the Special Roadway where the development is proposed is mostly open, with low plantings, grasses, and/or agricultural land and farmland, allowing for long extended views: i. The portion of the bufferyard closest to the Special Roadway, at least 55 feet in width, shall be planted to mimic this existing character; ii. The portion of the bufferyard farthest from the Special Roadway and closest to the development, not more than 20 feet in width, shall be planted more densely to buffer the development as specified by the landscape requirements; In fact, where there are existing extended views and we do not want to fill that in with densely planted trees, perhaps we should require something more than 75 feet? This could be applied to non-residential and residential development also, maybe the bufferyard is increased by 50 percent or something?	Planning staff	The suggestion pertains to Section 4.6.c.3, Buffering Development from Special Roadways, which includes landscape buffer requirements for special roadways (historic roads and scenic roads) based on the classification of zones abutting these roadways. The proposed regulations for Rural and Agricultural zones as currently drafted seem perhaps overly restrictive in the sense that they seem to require a planted buffer that may one day mimic a wooded vista when many of these special roadways flanking these zones pass through farmland and non-wooded natural landscapes. Staff believes there should be a context-sensitive approach to landscape buffers that meet this circumstance, but the exact proposal offered here may not be fully effective to achieve the goal of context-sensitive landscaping for farmland and other non-wooded areas. Clarion Associates should continue to refine this regulation.	Clarion Associates should look to the comment as being closer to the desired context-sensitive solution and continue to explore and refine approaches to situations where the land is mostly open with low plantings, grasses, and/or agricultural land and farmland.
Landscape Manual	Section 4.8 of the proposed Landscape Manual should apply to all zones except those in the Rural and Agricultural zones.	Planning staff	Proposed Section 4.8, Building Frontage Landscape Requirements, is one of two new sections proposed by Clarion Associates to provide additional landscaping requirements primarily oriented to more urban and built-out portions of Prince George's County.	Revise the first paragraph of page 113 to read: "This section applies to buildings in the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center,

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Section 4.8 Building Frontage Landscape Requirements			Staff believes the purpose of Section 4.8 is beneficial, and supports the addition of this section. However, minor amendments are necessary to better clarify the purpose and streamline its use. In particularly, it would be helpful to clearly address the Planned Development zones so that the Landscape Manual establishes a set of baseline regulations that may not necessitate negotiation for each application.	Nonresidential, and Residential base zones and to buildings in the Planned Development zones where a building's primary front façade…." Revise other references to the zone classes in this Section to include the Planned Development zones. Revise c.1. on page 117 as follows: "Nonresidential and Mixed-uses ~~in Transit-Oriented/Activity Center, Nonresidential, and Residential~~ Except Within the Rural and Agricultural Zones:" Revise c.2. on page 120 to read: "Residential ~~uses~~ Uses ~~in Transit-Oriented/Activity Center, Nonresidential, and Residential~~ Except Within the Rural and Agricultural Zones:" Revise the rest of the Landscape Manual and revise as may be necessary to incorporate these comments.
Landscape Manual Section 4.8 Building Frontage Landscape Requirements	It is unclear what is meant by "for other conditions" in the second paragraph of Section 4.8 on page 113. It is not clear how the Building Frontage Zone is actually to be measured based on the proposed language in the third paragraph on page 113.	Planning staff	Additional clarity would help narrow what is meant by "for other conditions" so all prospective parties will know when Section 4.8 applies. Does this mean when a building is more than 40 feet away (and only this)? Are there other circumstances where other conditions may exist? The description for how the Building Frontage Zone would be measured is not precise enough to provide clear guidance to plan reviewers, applicants, or decision makers. By using the phrase "building, lot, or block frontage width," one could conceivably base a measurement by one frontage width whereas another person working on the same project could disagree because they used another frontage width.	Revise the second paragraph on page 113 to provide additional clarity as to what is meant by "for other conditions where a building is along a street." Provide additional clarity as to which frontage width dimension must be measured to help determine the Building Frontage Zone.
Landscape Manual Section 4.8 Building Frontage Landscape Requirements	"Specifically include WSSC" in the text of footnote 1 on page 113.	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	Staff concurs it would be appropriate to reference WSSC.	Revise footnote 1 on page 113 to add WSSC to the parenthetical clause in third line (e.g. SHA, DPW&T, WSSC…).
Landscape Manual	The figures on pages 114 and 115 are helpful but need consistent titles.	Planning staff	Staff concurs, and notes a diagram that begins to explain the relationship of Sections 4.2 and 4.8 appears on page 57 of the proposed Landscape Manual. However, this diagram focuses more on the requirements/applicability of Section 4.2. Additional diagrams will help illustrate these important inter-relationships.	Rewrite the labels for the three figures on page 115 to be consistent with those for the two figures on page 114, with "Building Frontage Zone" coming first

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Section 4.8 Building Frontage Landscape Requirements	Additional diagrams that show the interactions of different sections of the Landscape Manual are requested to provide clarity in interpretation.			and the additional qualifier (e.g. "Parking Lot" or "Drive Aisle" coming in parentheses after. Provide two new diagrams: 1. One that shows a site that would be subject to both Section 4.2 and 4.8 2. One that shows a site subject to Sections 4.2, 4.8, and 4.10.
Landscape Manual Section 4.8 Building Frontage Landscape Requirements	The first paragraph on page 116 reads like an intent statement.	Planning staff	Staff concurs; the language in this paragraph seems more like a restatement of the intent of Section 4.8 and should be relocated/combined. Additionally, this paragraph does not speak to ornamental trees, which should be a valid option for building frontage landscaping.	The first sentence of the first paragraph on page 116 should be combined with the first paragraph of Section 4.8 on page 113; the reference to the building types should be reworded – this Section speaks more broadly to uses and zones. The second sentence on page 116 should be combined with the second paragraph, and the term "ornamental trees" should be inserted between "street trees" and "shade trees."
Landscape Manual Section 4.8 Building Frontage Landscape Requirements	There appear to be no minimum depth requirements for the Building Frontage Zone, which may leave no space for planting ground layers of vegetation or canopy vegetation. The order of standards on pages 117 through 123 should be set such that the area requirement comes first, then the quantity requirement, and then the details of the planting location.	Planning staff	Staff concurs.	If there is a valid reason why a minimum depth requirement for the Building Frontage Zone should not be specified, Clarion Associates should provide this information to the project team. Otherwise, a minimum Building Frontage Zone of 10 feet should be set adjacent to a parking lot and 14 feet adjacent to a street. Reorder Section 4.8.c.1. and 4.8.c.2. to provide regulations dealing with planting area first, plant quantity standards second, and planting location standards third.
Landscape Manual Section 4.8 Building Frontage Landscape Requirements	Several standards that are recommended need to be reworded to ensure more effective landscaping in the Building Frontage Zones.	Planning staff	Staff concurs. Some of these changes include elimination of duplicative and possibly conflicting language, removal of lawn plantings in these areas (which would be difficult to maintain), and clarity regarding ornamental trees.	Reword Standard D on page 119 and Standard E on page 122 to read: "A minimum of one half (1/2) of the surface area of each provided tree planter shall be planted with shrubs and/or perennials. The remainder of the surface area ~~must~~ shall be planted with groundcover. Tree grates and pervious

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
				materials (such as hand-laid granite cobbles) ~~are only~~ may only be permitted within the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones ~~and within the Building Frontage Zones in Transit-Oriented/Activity Center, Nonresidential, and residential zones~~." Reword Standard E on page 119 and Standard F on page 122 to read: "Continuous tree planters at least fifty (50) feet in length may be planted with ~~grass,~~ shrubs, perennials, and/or groundcover." Delete the last sentence on groundcover or lawn from both Standard F on page 119 and Standard G on page 122. Replace the first sentence of Standard G on page 119 with the following: "When the Building Frontage Zone (from the edge of right-of-way to the building face) is greater than thirty (30) feet in depth, ornamental trees shall be provided. Such ornamental tree plantings are in addition to any required shade trees." Relocate Standard D on page 121 to follow Standard G on page 122, and replace the first sentence with the following: "When the Building Frontage Zone (from the edge of right-of-way to the building face) is greater than thirty (30) feet in depth, ornamental trees shall be provided. Such ornamental tree plantings are in addition to any required shade trees."
Landscape Manual Section 4.8 Building Frontage	Minor changes are needed to the sample planting schedules on pages 124 and 125.	Planning staff	Staff concurs that minor changes are needed to ensure consistency with the proposed standards.	Add "mixed-use" to the title of the sample schedule 4.8-1 on page 124. Add the phrase "if applicable" after "Number of Shade Trees Provided per

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Landscape Requirements				Section 4.10: Street Trees" in both schedules on pages 124 and 125.
Landscape Manual Section 4.10 Street Trees (For Private Streets)	"Also WSSC; see article 27-1-1 for Powers and Duties of Commission for regulating all above ground and buried utilities in the public street ROW."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	WSSC should be mentioned in the second paragraph on page 130. Staff notes the Powers and Duties of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission are now codified as part of Division II of the Public Utilities Article of the state code.	Add the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission to the list of agencies that govern public rights-of-way in the County in the second paragraph on page 130.
Landscape Manual Section 4.10 Street Trees (For Private Streets)	"Street trees (and lights) should be planted a minimum of 10' from water and sewer connections."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	Staff agrees that the location of trees near existing and/or proposed water and sewer lines should be a design consideration and added language is needed. Street lighting fixtures are not regulated by the Landscape Manual.	Revise Standard c.14 on page 134 to read: "Street trees shall be located a minimum of ten (10) feet from storm drain inlets, <u>water and sewer service connections,</u> or manholes.
Landscape Manual Section 4.11 Requirements for Nonresidential and Mixed-Use Development	Regarding the proposed new Section 4.11 (Requirements for Nonresidential and Mixed-Use Development), staff has numerous reservations. The purposes seem helpful, but the overall regulations seem flawed and unnecessary. Among other key issues, the basis for requirements in this section deal with the ratio of green area required by the zones, but several key nonresidential or "mixed-use" zones do not contain minimum green area requirements, imperiling the underlying premise of these planting requirements. Even if, for example, a ten percent requirement for green area is provided to these zones, there are questions as to whether there will be enough green area on-site to make a difference. Additional refinement and explanation is necessary before staff can support the addition of this section to the Landscape Manual.	Planning staff	Staff concurs that the intent of Section 4.11 seems appropriate but that there are fundamental implementation challenges with this section as currently drafted. Staff notes the proposed General Commercial Office (GCO), Local Transit-Oriented (LTO) and other Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones, Neighborhood Commercial (NC), and Service Commercial (SC) zones in Module 1 (Zones and Uses) do not require a minimum green area. It appears the minimum green area, and thus Section 4.11, would only apply to the proposed Industrial/Employment (IE) and Heavy Industrial (HI) zones. There is also a County Tree Canopy Coverage requirement for a minimum of 10 percent coverage that applies to all zones. It is unclear how Section 4.11 meshes with this requirement.	Re-evaluate if Section 4.11 is necessary. If so, take the following actions: Revise Section 4.11 to clarify and improve the proposed regulations. This could be done by using a different metric than green area provided, ensuring the zones of Module 1 that currently lack green area minimums include such requirements, or through other means. Revise Section 4.11 to clarify the relationship with the County's Tree Canopy Coverage requirements. Provide the project team with additional justification for the purpose and benefits of this new section over the regulations of the current Landscape Manual. Why is this section recommended? What improved conditions are to be expected in nonresidential and mixed-use areas?
Landscape Manual Section 4.11 Requirements for Nonresidential	It is unclear if the shade trees that would be planted to fulfill the requirements of Sections 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, and 4.10 can be counted toward the requirements of Section 4.11. If so, these combined sections will result in many more plantings than Section 4.11 alone would yield.	Planning staff	Staff concurs that additional clarity is warranted as to whether Section 4.11 is in addition to the other sections, and/or all these shade tree requirements can be counted together.	Clarion Associates should clarify the intent of Section 4.11. Is it intended to "stand-alone" or can the shade tree requirements of other sections be counted toward the Section 4.11 requirements?

DIRECTED CHANGES				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
and Mixed-Use Development				
Landscape Manual Section 4.11 Requirements for Nonresidential and Mixed-Use Development	Standard D on page 137 should clarify that the required plantings are in addition to the required major shade tree in this Section, and that said shade tree cannot be "double-counted." Staff reviewers may find it challenging to compute the percentage of green areas. Is it intended the proposed canopy coverage is counted? Do we want plants within the tree canopy area, where they may ultimately compete with the tree's root system and cause stress on the tree?	Planning staff	Staff concurs.	Clarify that Standard D's requirements are in addition to the major shade tree required by Standard A and that said shade tree may not be counted toward meeting D. Evaluate staff's questions on calculating the green area percentage and questioning plantings in the tree canopy area and provide additional clarity as may be necessary.
Landscape Manual Section 4.11 Requirements for Nonresidential and Mixed-Use Development	Standard F on page 138 is confusingly worded.	Planning staff	Staff concurs.	Revise Standard F on page 138 to read: "~~The number of required shade trees that exceed the~~ Shade trees provided in excess of the minimum tree canopy requirement may be substituted with ~~Ornamental~~ ornamental trees, ~~Evergreen~~ evergreen trees, shrubs, and/or perennials in accordance with the Plant Equivalences (See Glossary)."
Landscape Manual Section 4.11 Requirements for Nonresidential and Mixed-Use Development	Standard G on page 138 should be consistent with Standard F on page 48.	Planning staff	Staff concurs.	Replace Standard G on page 138 with the following language: "An existing shade tree, except for an invasive species, exceeding two and one-half (2-1/2) inches diameter at breast height (dbh) located on an individual lot may be counted toward fulfillment of the requirement, provided that the size (dbh), genus, condition, and location of each tree to be counted toward the fulfillment of this requirement is shown on the landscape plan. The site and landscape plan must also demonstrate that a minimum of seventy percent (70%) of the critical root zone of such tree will remain undisturbed."

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Global	"The current Zoning Ordinance has not always provided our community with the types of development and amenities our residents would like to see; therefore, the Town supports the effort to transform the current zoning code into a more modern and user-friendly ordinance."	Town of Berwyn Heights	Comment noted.	Make no change.
Global	"Overall we find Module 2 to represent a vast improvement over the voluminous and complicated existing zoning ordinance. The liberal use of tables to summarize requirements greatly simplifies and clarifies the proposed zoning ordinance. The proposed zoning ordinance's language and organization also contributes to a user-friendly document." "While we were generally impressed with the proposed document, we do have several questions and comments on Module 2 and the proposed Adequate Public Facilities regulations."	City of Greenbelt	Comment noted.	Make no change.
Global	Municipal standards, interests, authority, and responsibility have been omitted throughout Module 2 (Development Regulations).	City of Greenbelt	Comment noted. Staff continues to identify appropriate locations – often in coordination with municipal partners – where references to municipalities are appropriate to incorporate in the new Zoning Ordinance.	Make no change except as may be noted elsewhere for specific references.
Global	Hope to see in Module 2 (development regulations) an opportunity for all new development to be "stormwater neutral" (issues in some communities, such as Riverdale Park, were cited as examples) through offsets, energy efficient codes that go beyond established minimums to reduce carbon pollution, and more transit-oriented development to reduce impervious surfaces and address air pollution. Encourage grey- and brownfield redevelopment, hope to see safer streets for our kids, pedestrians, elderly, and bicycling.	Community	While stormwater management is addressed in Subtitle 32, Division 3 of the County Code, the green building standards proposed in Module 2 (development regulations) provide additional opportunities to incorporate innovative and sustainable stormwater management practices, and speak to some extent to brownfield redevelopment. Air pollution is a regional issue and can be difficult to address in any zoning ordinance. This module also provides street connectivity and infrastructure requirements to facilitate more opportunities and connections for pedestrians and bicyclists.	Make no change.
Global	Would like to understand how to ensure that quality of development is captured in the rewrite, and ensure that high-quality development moves the County forward.	Communities	The proposed development standards in Division 27-5 are intended to ensure a higher level of development quality throughout Prince George's County, and focuses on key elements such as improved connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles; new parking, lighting, and signage regulations; building façade articulation and massing; green building requirements; and compatibility standards to ease potential impacts on neighborhoods and existing farms.	Make no change.
Global	Developers indicate that currently they are meeting the requirements and that's all they need to do. We need to look to change the threshold across the board. How do we say something in zoning about the quality of public gathering spaces?	Communities	Public space regulations are included in several places within Module 2 (development standards), such as with the Landscape Manual and in the open space set-aside requirements.	Make no change.
Global	Should not focus on amenities in the temporal sense but focus on the money. Creativity based on increasing density should be based on pricing or taxation per square foot.	Communities	While staff is sympathetic to the intent of the comment, it would be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to base zoning and subdivision regulation and the provision of required amenities on a pricing or taxation approach. The targets or thresholds involved with such a proposal would require constant adjustment and evaluation to determine if they are fair and reasonable. It is not typical for zoning or subdivision to control amenities based on financial calculations.	Make no change.
Global	This whole discussion deals with the issue of 'what is quality?' It is very subjective. Some of the better projects in	Communities	The more the ordinance ties down specifics, the more the outcome will be known to all parties earlier in the development process. What happens today is that negotiations are not always	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
	the County have been negotiated, where the site plan establishes the parameters. The tighter the issue of quality is tied down the more difficult it is to negotiate		transparent, and the public often feels their concerns have not been heard at all, or worse – that they were completely and purposely ignored.	
Global	The Planning Board often hears requests to adjust of phasing for provisions of parks and recreation facilities. In terms of the proposed exemptions, some of the other aspects of the draft Zoning Ordinance may factor in to the transportation exemptions (parking, interior connectivity) may offer another way to look at the overall transportation picture.	Planning Board	Comment noted	Make no change.
Global	Is there a way to balance the office side of the equation, particularly near transit-oriented places?	Planning Board	While the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones Clarion Associates have proposed may help with the balance of mixed-use development, zoning cannot control or guarantee specific growth. Market conditions have a more direct impact on what gets built, where, and when, than anything else. Zoning provides the tools that can help set the stage.	Make no change.
Global	Are you pulling out or identifying elements for follow-up efforts, including in other parts of the County Code, as they come to your attention?	Planning Board	As the project progresses, these additional elements will crop up and will be documented over time.	Make no change.
Global	Regarding the street connectivity index and "green streets,", are there opportunities to help provide compatibility through traffic-calming measures for impacted communities?	Planning Board	Other parts of the County Code contain road design and pedestrian safety regulations; this project is trying to avoid any inconsistencies between various Subtitles of the County Code Clarion Associates propose some level of regulatory guidance for street connectivity and traffic-calming, and we will need to continue coordination with County agencies to ensure the proper balance is achieved.	Make no change.
Global	There appears to be a bit of co-mingling of fees, surcharges, and adequacy of public facilities (APF) mitigation. You get hit with a surcharge, then you get hit with an impact fee. We do not have impact fees per se today. Using this process to attempt to introduce an impact fee is going to pose some challenges.	Planning staff	The County needs to be very careful looking at this issue It is unconstitutional to over-charge a developer for the mitigation of their potential development impacts. If a developer can prove that their property tax or other payments are going to pay for something, they are entitled to a credit against their "fair share". There are really three different concepts at play with this line of questioning: impact fees commensurate with the amount of the development, a mitigation fee of the development, and a flat surcharge that every development pays. While some of this may be addressed through the revision of the Subdivision Regulations, much of it deals with Countywide fiscal policy and is outside the scope of this project.	Make no change.
Global	If there is a Transit-Oriented/Activity Center base zone next to a neighborhood, will the green building incentives, such as increased density and height, apply?	Planning staff	As currently proposed, the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards would supersede all other regulations, so no incentives for providing green building elements would apply in this situation.	Make no change.
Global	Regarding the placement of utilities: the Planning Board approves utility boxes to the rear of the building but at the time of building permit the utilities locate them on the front between the building and sidewalk. What can keep utilities from overruling the entitlement process?	Planning staff	In the end the utility companies put the utilities equipment where they are needed. Developers hire utility planners that submit plans to the utility companies, and providing direction or guidance helps with location decisions. It is important to sit down with the utility companies during plan development.	Make no change.
Global	Concern was expressed that the new Zoning Ordinance seems like a form-based zoning approach that "can be prohibitively restrictive for existing properties undergoing redevelopment."	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman	While there are certainly some form-based design approaches included in the proposed new Zoning Ordinance (build-to lines for some zones, standards that regulate the form of buildings in terms of height and massing, emphasis on streetscapes, etc.), it is not a true form-based code. It is more of a hybrid approach that combines elements intended to ensure buildings are designed and oriented to create a better sense of place and relationship to the street (e.g. the form-based	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			aspects) with elements of traditional zoning ordinances, emphasizing open spaces, recognizing the importance of uses, etc. The proposed transit-oriented/activity center base zones and Planned Development zones are intended to be applied to the more urban and transit-served locations of the County, where it is most important to ensure the highest quality of placemaking and building design. These are the zones where the most form-based design elements appear. To the extent that these regulations may be potentially restrictive regarding redevelopment of existing buildings and uses that may not lend themselves to the desired character and vision of these key locations in the County (such as the Plan 2035-designated Centers and the Innovation Corridor), it is because they are intended to achieve the County's goals in the long run for these areas. Staff notes the property represented by Mr. Taub and Mr. Forman is located in the County's Innovation Corridor, but is not able to speculate on the potential impact of the new regulations on individual sites at this time. Other locations in the County, including many existing shopping centers, will not be subject to the same level of form-based standards because they may not be located in these targeted growth locations.	
Global	The Zoning Rewrite should include clear distinctions between, and definitions of "development" and "redevelopment" and provide greater flexibility for redevelopment. The number of development standards subject to modifications or waiver by the Planning Director should be expanded to provide a greater need of flexibility from the development standards.	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman	Staff notes that Clarion Associates have defined "development" in Module 3 (process and administration). There are numerous potential modifications from the development standards as recommended by Clarion Associates. These include the adjustments defined in Module 3 in Sec. 27-2.517 and a number of different modification paths throughout Module 2 (development regulations). Staff believes the number of potential modifications and their "scattering" throughout Module 2 actually detracts from the clarity and certainty of the proposed Zoning Ordinance and, in combination with the upcoming staff analysis of Module 3 comments, will be recommending consolidation of these potential modifications under the umbrella of "adjustments." Flexibility in the Zoning Ordinance must be properly balanced with certainty and surety of outcomes. If we do not achieve the proper balance, we will miss a tremendous opportunity to ensure the new Zoning Ordinance will be more effective – for all users – than the current Zoning Ordinance. With this in mind, staff generally believes the type of standards that can be varied are appropriate, along with the proposed thresholds or percentages from the standard that can be varied. Clarion Associates recommend a range for variations, what they term "adjustments," to ensure there is flexibility but also provide a balance with certainty.	Make no change at this time.
Global	When did we start this effort? How long have we been working on this project?	Council	Clarion Associates have been working on the project since January 2015, with technical staff working on it for at least a full year prior.	Make no change.
Global	Regionalism is a reality, and the reality of regionalism is creating tax base. To compete in real time, we have to operate in real time. One of the things left out in the other efforts have been the transitions. Inherent to this project, can we articulate how the new Zoning Ordinance deals with those types of transitions?	Council	We have traditionally done a better job at addressing the transitions between suburban and agricultural development, and from the Rural and Agricultural Area to the waterways (such as through the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area zones, which will carry forward). Where we need to improve is with the urban to suburban range and transitions within and between these areas. The new approaches recommended by Clarion Associates should help us do better with urban and suburban development, and provide stronger economic development tools.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Global	Will the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations address the issue of aging in place?	Communities	No. However, the Plan Prince George's 2035 General Plan includes countywide policies and strategies to address affordable housing and opportunities for aging in place. These concepts require additional policy guidance and Council decision-making before they may be suitable for incorporating in the Zoning Ordinance. For example, should the Council one day decide to implement a moderately priced dwelling unit requirement, the Zoning Ordinance and County Code could be amended to incorporate that decision.	Make no change.
Global	Will the new Zoning Ordinance apply to the municipalities?	Communities	Yes, the new Zoning Ordinance will apply to all of Prince George's County, with the exception of properties located within the municipal boundaries of the City of Laurel (which is subject to its own planning and zoning authority).	Make no change.
Global	Will the rezoning of land cause an increase in the tax rate on my property?	Communities	While staff cannot guarantee any potential tax or property value outcomes, we believe there will be very little change in this situation because the re-zoning of residential properties will be to the most similar new zone as the one the property is currently zoned.	Make no change.
Global	If 90 percent of the County will remain as single-family zoning as is currently, what will become of the remaining 10 percent of properties?	Communities	The 90 percent figure refers to the portion of the County that is currently in what is called a "Euclidean" zone, or a base zone that is applied to land and generally falls within the "residential," "commercial," and "industrial" categories. The remaining 10 percent of the properties in the County consist of mixed-use or comprehensive design zones. These properties will be subjected to a proposed rezoning matrix that will be developed for the Countywide Map Amendment and approved by the District Council before the rezoning begins. The rezoning matrix will determine the zone these properties should be reclassified.	Make no change.
Global	A particular development application was questioned as to whether it would be appealable under the new proposals.	Communities	For many cases, yes. Under the proposed code, major site plans would be approved by the Planning Board and appealable to the District Council. Minor site plans would be approved by the Planning Director and appealable to the Planning Board, and can be further appealed to the Council. Projects that would come in below the development threshold proposed for a minor site plan would proceed to the Permits Office in Largo, and would not be appealable to the District Council, but the issuance of a permit is appealable to the Board of Appeals, and then to court.	Make no change.
Global	Additional flow charts should be added to the Zoning Ordinance.	Planning staff	Staff notes this comment was made during review of Module 2 (Development Standards). More flow charts on the proposed procedures are contained in Module 3 (Process, Administration, and Subdivision Regulations).	Make no change.
Global	Is there a way to avoid the design and density of "Texas Doughnut" multifamily development in the design standards?	Communities	The "Texas Doughnut" design refers to the use of above-ground parking structures wrapped with apartments around the exterior of the garage. This concept is developed across the country, not just in our County. It would be difficult to avoid this type of design of multifamily developments for a number of reasons, not least of which is that underground parking is very expensive and cannot be accommodated everywhere, due to hydro-soils or other constraints. Attempting to prohibit a common development approach may also have numerous unintended consequences that will lead to other problems.	Make no change.
Global	How can we prevent urban sprawl, specifically as it relates to the locational criteria for the proposed Planned Development zones? The proposed criteria are problematic and will allow too much sprawl. Add more limitations on locations where these zones cannot be applied.	Communities	Staff assumes this comment does not pertain to the transit-oriented/activity center planned development zones, which would only be applicable to designated Centers per Plan 2035. This comment also does not pertain to the Mobile Home Planned Development Zone, which would only be used for existing mobile home parks. The other two proposed residential planned development zones may only be located in an existing residential base zone. The proposed Mixed-Use Planned Development (MU-PD) Zone is restricted to property outside the rural and agricultural zones, residential base zones, or certain	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			centers as designated by Plan 2035. Finally, the proposed Industrial/Employment Planned Development (IE-PD) Zone may only be applied on land within a designated employment area per Plan 2035, or in an industrial base zone. To the extent that these locational criteria may seem broad, this is because there is a need for these proposed planned development zones to allow for nimble responses by the County to emerging market opportunities. These zones are deliberately intended to allow the County to capitalize on such opportunities. Staff notes these zones will require applicant-driven rezoning pursuant to procedures specified in Module 3 (process and administration), and such rezoning requires the approval of the District Council. The Council will have the authority to decide the scale of development that can occur within these zones and may act as a "check" on sprawl development.	
Global	Who are Clarion Associates?	Communities	Clarion Associates are the consultants for the Prince George's County Zoning Rewrite. The firm has experience rewriting and updating the zoning codes for more than 100 jurisdictions across the County. Don Elliot and Craig Richardson are the project managers working directly in Prince George's County. Clarion was selected through a formal Request for Qualifications bid. The Planning Department wanted someone with experience, but also directed them not to bring us an off-the-shelf product. Additional information on the firm can be found on their website, http://www.clarionassociates.com/.	Make no change
Global	The current development situation is very complicated, and small businesses cannot afford to do anything because of the costs. Could a small business liaison position be created to serve as a go-between to assist the small business owner with understanding the new Zoning Ordinance?	Communities	This issue would have to be decided by the County Council and would involve some budgetary considerations. Such a position cannot be created through the Zoning Ordinance itself.	Make no change.
Global	Does the new Zoning Ordinance stop land speculators from keeping properties vacant for long periods of time? Washington, D.C. imposes a higher tax rate on vacant buildings to discourage such speculation.	Communities	No. As long as buildings are kept up to code, there is very little the County can do in this situation. Maryland state law prohibits property tax increases on vacant properties (the Washington, D.C. example).	Make no change.
Global	Will the predictability set forth in the development standards allow for developers to estimate costs in advance?	Communities	Yes, this is one of the goals of the new Zoning Ordinance: to set forth design standards and procedures that are predictable and quantifiable for the development community, to increase certainty for all.	Make no change.
Global	How can homeowners be assured that: a.) the communities in which they buy into will not be rezoned for commercial uses, b.) a text amendment is not approved to allow a commercial use, and c.) illegal uses do not come into the neighborhood, if it is already a commercially-zoned property?	Communities	Rezoning of property in the future (under the new Zoning Ordinance) would typically follow a comprehensive planning process or be subject to an individual rezoning process that requires public hearings and notification. Text amendments are a legislative procedure subject to decisions of the District Council. Should a use actually be "illegal," it would not be permitted to come to a neighborhood or a property. However, if the question pertains to a commercial property in a residential neighborhood, than any commercial use permitted in that commercial zone will be allowed. New development on such a property would likely trigger conformance to the proposed neighborhood compatibility standards.	Make no change.
Global	Do the definitions contained in Module 1 get adjusted as the new Modules 2 and 3 are produced?	Communities	Yes, some of the definitions may be adjusted if deemed necessary. Other definitions will be modified in response to community input on the three modules.	Make no change at this time.
Global	Do the consultants understand the difference between Subtitles 23, 24 and 27? There are some things that seem to appear in parts of the proposals that seem to belong in other Subtitles of the County Code.	Communities	Yes. Clarion Associates understand the premise and purpose of each Subtitle in the County code. One of the struggles for a project of this complexity is ensuring appropriate cross-referencing is made but duplication or contradiction is avoided. This work will continue throughout the life of the project.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Global	Concern was expressed regarding the loss of a “nice department or grocery store” in a community and it being replaced by a less desirable tenant.	Communities	This is not an issue that zoning can address. If the zone permits a general retail use, any particular retailer can come into that zone. Specific retail trade brands cannot be regulated through zoning.	Make no change.
Global	How will the Zoning Ordinance deal with the concentration of motels and discount retailers?	Communities	Generally, Zoning Ordinances do not deal with concentrations of one type of use or another. Zoning Ordinances establish the framework by which uses are permitted and let the market decide the locations of specific uses.	Make no change.
Global	A concern was expressed that the County’s Metro stations are often looked upon as belonging to individual Councilmanic districts. The Metro stations belong to the County as a whole.	Communities	Comment noted.	Make no change.
Global	Does the proposed code provide a bonus for “great architecture” in some zones, like Montgomery County? How does the Montgomery County system work?	Council	In mixed-use areas, Montgomery County uses three CR zones - the Commercial Residential (CR), Commercial Residential Town (CRT), and Commercial Residential Neighborhood (CRN). These zones are geared toward mixed uses, interactive streets, and usable public spaces. As such, the buildings in these zones are highly visible and tend to define the character of the neighborhood and public space. In order to encourage better aesthetics, developments in the CR and the CRT zones are allowed to follow an "Optional Method of Development." This method allows developers to build more than 10,000 SF or more than 1.0 FAR in exchange for a variety of "public benefit improvements," including: • Major Public Facilities • Transit Proximity • Connectivity and Mobility • Diversity of Uses and Activities • Quality of Building and Site Design • Protection and Enhancement of the Natural Environment • Building Reuse Each public benefit is scored a certain point value and if a developer earns at 25 points within two of the above categories in the CRT zone, or 50 points within three of the categories in the CR zone, they can build more than would be allowed under the traditional building method. The Optional Method requires the applicant to submit a Sketch Plan as well. All public benefits are defined in the County Code, Chapter 59, Section 4.5.4, Optional Method Development. Quality of Building and Site Design specifically aim to achieve “great architecture.” There are seven elements within this category: 1. **Architectural Elevations –** The applicant provides elevations of architectural facades and agrees to be bound by particular elements of design, such as minimum amount of transparency, maximum separation between doors, awning provisions, sign restrictions, or lighting parameters that affect the perception of mass, pedestrian comfort, or enhance neighborhood compatibility. 2. **Exceptional Design –** The building’s design and functional impact exceptionally enhances the character of the setting, by creating a landmark; enhancing public realm; using compact infill development; etc.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			3. **Historic Resource Protection –** The applicant preserves or enhances a historic resource, a contributing element within a historic district, or the applicant makes a payment towards preserving a historic resource. 4. **Public Open Space –** The applicant provides open space in excess of the minimum requirement or makes a payment for public open space. 5. **Public Art –** The development includes public art that is reviewed by the Art Review Panel and meets the Public Art Guidelines or the applicant pays a fee, which is accepted by the Public Arts Trust Steering Committee. 6. **Structured Parking –** The development includes parking in an above- or below-grade parking structure. 7. **Tower Step-Back –** The building's upper floors are six feet behind the lower floors. The *CR Zones Incentive Density Implementation Guidelines* (October 2015), further detail each element of Quality Building and Site Design. The guidelines do not mandate that any specific building material is used or any specific architectural style is followed. Staff briefly spoke with Mike Bello from Montgomery County Planning. He told us that the optional method is a successful approach to getting better quality designs from developers. Adding that developers recognize that if they are required to do the Optional Development Method, they really make an effort to submit plans that are high-quality, because the guidelines empower planners to leverage the qualitative design criteria into the zoning regulations during development review. We note that the "optional method" adds additional discretionary review to the process, and that none of the features that are part of this approach are standards that would apply to all development throughout Montgomery County or even within the same CR, CRN, and CRT zones. The Montgomery County approach is intriguing, but staff does not see how it can be implemented in Prince George's County. Montgomery County sets the maximum "standard method" density level in the CR Zones unrealistically low, and then requires amenities to obtain a more realistic density via the "optional method." We do not see support for reducing the base density in Prince George's County's urban centers.	
Global	The design standards in the proposed code may not be aggressive enough. What would higher form and design standards look like?	Council	*Clarion responds:* "Most form and design standards address some – but few address all – of the following topics (grouped based on their frequency of use): A. Frequent Design Controls (more than 50 percent of newer codes) • Building placement on the site (in walkable areas, buildings need to be near at least one fronting street, and often need to be near all fronting streets); • Entry requirement and orientation (at least one pedestrian entrance needs to face the primary fronting street – even if another faces the parking lots); • Parking location (usually requiring parking to the rear, and in some instances a portion to the side, or in a parking structure); • Ground floor window requirement and orientation (at least a stated percentage of the wall area needs to be occupied by windows or other transparent materials); and	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			• Street façade articulation requirements (there needs to be a change in wall plane alignment, projection, inset, or change of materials or texture – more than a change in color – every X feet of horizontal wall plane). B. Occasional Design Controls (roughly 25-50 percent of newer codes) • Upper floor window requirement and orientation (at least a stated percentage of the wall area needs to be occupied by windows or other transparent materials); • Side and rear façade articulation requirements (same as for street frontage articulation – although sometimes the requirement is simplified into "four-sided design" – i.e. a requirement that all facades of the building have a similar level of detailing, articulation, and material change as the street facing facades); • Required façade elements (for example, a requirement for arcades, storefronts, galleries, awnings, porches, stoops, or entry courtyards), where each of the required elements needs to be designed and illustrated; • Base-middle-cap requirements (buildings over a certain number of stories need to have ground floor designs differ from middle stories, and the top floor or parapet/roof needs to create a "cap" for the building distinct from the design of the middle stories); and • Roof shape or variation (there needs to be a distinctive roof shape, or a change in roof parapet height or materials or alignment, every X feet of horizontal roof length along the street). C. Rare Design Controls (probably less than 10-25 percent of new codes) • Façade material controls (either a list of required façade materials – which usually applies to 60-80 percent of the non-window-and-door wall area, allowing the remainder to be of different "accent" materials to provide variety, or sometimes the list of permitted accent materials excludes some disfavored materials (e.g. reprocessed waste materials, or unfinished corrugated iron); • Façade color controls (either a list of required colors or a list of prohibited colors – which is fairly rarely used outside of historic districts and special defined character areas); and • Specific architectural style controls (generally limited to designated historic districts). "In an objective system of land use controls – as we are drafting for Prince George's County – 'higher design standards' generally means requiring more of the tools listed above, and many of these tools are included in the Activity Center/TOD zones. "Although it is tempting to think that requiring a larger number of design elements result in better design, that is not necessarily true, for two reasons. First, as more requirements are added, the chance that two or more required design elements cannot be accommodated on the same building due to the functional requirements of the building increases. The end result is more requests for waivers and variances from some of the requirements (which take time to review and decide) rather than better design. Second, as the number of requirements increases, complaints about unnecessary restrictions on architectural creativity and innovation increases (i.e. 'if we have to meet all these requirements, all of the new buildings will look alike').	

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			"To address those issues, as more design requirements are added, communities often move towards a 'menu approach' that lists more of the elements described above, and requires that the applicant meet some (but not all) of those requirements. For example, a community might adopt a table listing basic façade articulation, upper floor window standards, façade material standards, roof shape and variation controls, but then require that the applicant satisfy any three of those four requirements (at the builder's option)." "Some communities offer applicants an optional design review process, so that if the architect cannot or will not meet the objective building design standards (or menu of alternative building design standards), the applicant can 'opt into' a design review process conducted by a Planning Board or Design Review Board to provide alternative designs that the architect feels are of equal or higher design merit. Where this approach is used, it is important that the choice be left to the applicant – i.e. the applicant is not required to complete a design review process (which is generally more subjective than the Ordinance standards), and only goes through that process by choice. The ability of an applicant to complete a project based on compliance with objective standards is essential to the success of the Ordinance." "Clarion Associates generally recommends that mandatory design review by a Planning Board or a Design Review Board (as opposed to staff reviewing for compliance with objective standards) be limited to areas with very distinct and well defined architectural or historic character or areas that will have a very dramatic impact on the image of the entire community. We do not generally recommend that mandatory design review be applied in an entire category of zoning districts (e.g. in all TODs), for two reasons. First, design review processes take time. Although some cities such as Philadelphia have adopted a 'one-time only' advisory meeting with a design review body for very tall buildings in the downtown area, that is the exception. Often, design review bodies want to review the design at least twice (as in Denver, where the code only requires one meeting but the Planning Board requests a second meeting and applicants almost always comply). In many cases, design review processes result in three or more meetings as details of the design are finalized in greater detail. The result can be a three to six month process that substantially increases development time and costs and discourages investment." "Second, mandatory design review inserts uncertainty into the development process, because it is very difficult to draft design guidelines that allow for architectural creativity without making the process a subjective 'beauty contest' that depends on the personalities appointed to the design review body. Because of the subjective character of the design guidelines, it is not uncommon for members of the design review body to differ amongst themselves about how to meet the guidelines, which results in confused feedback to the project architect and can result in additional rounds of review as those inconsistent directions are reconciled." "Because the current length and unpredictability of the Prince George's County development review and approval process is a significant barrier to high quality development and job creation, we do not recommend the use of a mandatory design review body or requirement."	
Global	Development standards should not be too flexible. Many of the most recent developments in the Largo Town Center	Largo Civic Association	The proposed code does provide some flexibility in regards to the design standards through an adjustments process. However, the adjustments are limited to no more than a 15 percent change	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
	Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ) have received numerous amendments to the DDOZ standards.		for minor adjustments and a 35 percent change for major adjustments, which is less flexible than the current code.	
Global	There is no confidence or trust in the Planning Board or in the Planning Department staff. There is no transparency in the process.	Largo Civic Association	Comment noted. The proposed code will introduce clear design guidelines, which will help provide a sense of what new development will look like. Additionally, the proposed code will require applicants building large/more impactful developments to hold a public community meeting before the design review process begins (prior to the acceptance of the application) to help introduce public engagement and consideration into the process at an earlier phase where it has a much higher chance to positively influence the proposed development. Should an applicant need to amend their site plan following approval, the current proposal in the new Zoning Ordinance would require the request to proceed through the site plan process again; this may encourage builders to finalize their plans before any amendments may be necessary.	Make no change.
Global	There is distrust among the public, developers, Council, and Planning Board and staff. Will people use the countywide rezoning as an opportunity to change their zoning?	Communities	The project team is developing a proposed methodology for the upcoming Countywide Map Amendment necessary to implement the new Zoning Ordinance. This methodology will include a decision tree that will guide the rezoning decisions. It is not the intent of the Countywide Map Amendment to encourage zoning changes. Instead, changes to the zoning category or intensity should be the result of either a Sectional Map Amendment (comprehensive rezoning concurrent with or following a master plan for a community) or a Zoning Map Amendment (an applicant-driven request to change the zoning of their property). The success of the Countywide Map Amendment is essential in implementing the new Zoning Ordinance, and the Planning Department is committed to doing everything we can to stay to the core purpose of the Countywide Map Amendment and will not use it as an opportunity to up-zone properties.	Make no change.
Global	There is much citizen distrust in the development process, and this project is taking a very long time, is very complex, and is not yet set in stone.	Municipalities	The process does take a long time. Jurisdictions that attempt comprehensive updates of their zoning or subdivision codes need to spend the time to get the new codes right, even those jurisdictions which have less to do because their original codes are newer or shorter. Prince George's County has a particularly complex, large, and outdated Zoning Ordinance and it will take time to replace it.	Make no change.
Global	One participant indicated in their view, the Plan Prince George's 2035 General Plan is not a great document and only emphasizes multifamily homes and moves a lot of development into rural areas	Communities	The new code, and Plan 2035 aim to build high density in specific transit or activity centers in the County. The new code does not only encourage high density building, but it encourages density in focused areas, which the current code does not do. One challenge of the existing code is that it hasn't been able to streamline a process for building high densities near transit stations. If it is easier to build in focused areas, it may encourage development in those transit-oriented areas and may discourage development in non-transit/activity centers. The code does not discourage development in non-activity/transit centers, but it does not reward or encourage density in those areas.	Comment noted.
Global	What is the relationship between the Zoning Ordinance and the Subdivision Regulations? In particular, it is difficult to require entitlement comments when the engineering hasn't been completed. How is Clarion addressing the relationship	Developers	Clarion Associates has been endeavoring to align entitlement and engineering to make sure they are not "double-dipping" in the draft codes. Some stakeholders have raised a concern that there may be some inconsistencies, and we do not want to be inconsistent.	Clarion Associates should continue to prevent inconsistencies between the proposed Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Regulations, and other parts of the County Code.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
	between the agencies and the entitlement process from the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations?		Specific inconsistencies, when identified, are corrected. Should others remain, they should be brought to the attention of the project team. Additionally, staff and Clarion Associates are coordinating with agencies involved in the development review/entitlement, permitting, and engineering review processes. This work will continue through the life of the project to minimize confusion and conflicts, and ensure buy-in from all parties.	
Global	Parking requirements may be too stringent for banks or for tenants. Standards in general may be too stringent, and could lead to a disconnect that would prohibit the kind of development the County wants to see. Hope there will be enough flexibility in the proposal to address this	Developers	Clarion Associates responded to this question in part: "The amount of totally unpredictable waivers and adjustments are a big problem in this County. People are very distrustful as a result. The best practice is to circumscribe the ability of staff to X, the Planning Board to Y, and beyond that you will have to get a zoning change." There are adjustments for parking that would allow more/fewer parking spaces than listed in Table 27-5.206. Most parking is listed as a minimum, so developers could build more parking than what the proposed Zoning Ordinance would require. Furthermore, a parking management plan can be submitted to build beyond the maximum parking.	Make no change.
Global	What is the timing of the review?	Planning staff	The timelines for development review are not listed in Module 2 (Development Regulations) Some key timeframes, including those mandated by the State of Maryland, are included in Module 3 (Process, Administration, and Subdivision Regulations) Discussion of the issue by Clarion Associates indicated that many timelines are best not included in a jurisdiction's ordinances because the length of time needed to get to the end result will often change. Clarion also noted that specific timelines often lead to a "gaming" of the system where staff will request applicants to submit development applications at certain times or request applicants to apply for extensions.	Make no change.
Global	Information related to Module 2 (Development Regulations) should be posted on the project website at least one week prior to the first community meeting on that module.	Largo Civic Association	All information subject to major community meetings (such as the waves of meetings held in north, central, and south County at the time a major project deliverable is released), including each of the three complete modules, are available on the project website and are posted to the project website prior to the meetings.	Make no change.
Global	There is concern that the Planning staff and the Planning Board will not enforce the new development standards as proposed and will waive requirements for developers simply because the developer does not want to comply. The District Council is viewed as the more "trustworthy" defender of the community's interests.	Largo Civic Association	The proposed standards and the regulations proposed in Module 3 (Process and Administration) provide the Planning Director and Planning Board limited and clearly constrained/defined leeway regarding adjustments to the development standards. These constraints will make any alteration to the design standards more predictable for the public and for the applicant. Members of the public can appeal the Planning Director's decisions to the Planning Board, and Planning Board decisions to the District Council, if they have legal standing to do so.	Make no change.
Global	There is concern that the current members of the District Council will no longer hold elected office once the new Zoning Ordinance takes effect. A transition to a newly elected council that does not have experience with the zoning rewrite project may be challenging.	Largo Civic Association	Comment noted. There will be extensive outreach and education with the community once the new Zoning Ordinance is approved – both before and after it takes effect. Similar education efforts will be made with new elected officials, as is the current practice following an election.	Make no change.
Global	Consideration should be given to adding public art requirements for new development.	City of Greenbelt	Comment noted. Staff has no strong viewpoints on this issue as a zoning matter and defers to Clarion Associates' experience with other jurisdictions.	Clarion Associates should advise the project team on the suitability of public art as a zoning entitlement requirement, and provide an idea of

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
				how common such requirements may be in other jurisdictions, as well as what criterion is typically used (e.g. art as a percentage of project cost or based on other factors).
Global	Provision for automatic dimming lights should be included in the sections dealing with lighting.	City of Greenbelt	Automatic dimming is required with regard to digital signage displays but is not included in the rest of the proposed Zoning Ordinance. Since exterior lighting is intended in part to ensure public safety, it may not be appropriate to mandate automatic dimming fixtures. Instead, nothing about the proposed regulations prohibit automatic dimming; so long as a property owner ensures the overall lighting level is within the required thresholds for safety, illumination, and other purposes, they are free to use such fixtures. The requirements for full cut-off lighting fixtures serves the public good more effectively than automatic dimming fixtures, and there would appear to be little compelling reason to require automatic dimming as a function of zoning regulation.	Make no change.
Global	"There should be some provision to ensure that the requirements of home owner associations, cooperatives and condominiums are taken into account during development review."	City of Greenbelt	The requirements of home owners associations, cooperatives, or condominium regimes have no bearing on zoning and subdivision decision-making, and it is inappropriate to conflate the two. Staff notes members of such associations will have ample opportunities for public engagement as proposed in Module 3 (Process and Administration and Subdivision Regulations).	Make no change.
Global	During the testing phase, one of the locations should be in a municipality.	City of Greenbelt	Several of the eight selected test cases, which are properties the Clarion Associates team is evaluating to identify site design standards that may not work as initially proposed, are located within municipalities. One site is in Greenbelt. Another is in the City of College Park. A third is in the Town of Capitol Heights.	Make no change.
Global	Development of techniques to encourage affordable housing should be part of the rewrite.	City of Greenbelt	Affordable housing entails a broader discussion than what is possible through the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations rewrite, and should involve County, state, and regional agencies, non-profits, municipalities, property owners, residents, and many other stakeholders. Should such a discussion take place and lead to County policy direction, the new Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations can be amended as may be necessary to incorporate such direction.	Make no change.
Community Involvement	What will be the community involvement not just in the process to date but overall and moving forward? The expectations of our constituents is mighty high. How have you encountered our constituents, what have you found, what are we doing? The proposed code should not reduce the public's role in the decision-making process.	Council	Clarion Associates responded to this question on June 7, 2016: "Clarion visits north, central, and south County in each trip, and County staff have been all over the County in numerous meetings. We cannot do zoning by a "group hug," and have to put a draft in place. We do the best we can to put it in writing, bring it forward, and let people respond to the exact language. No matter how good a job we do, some people will tune in only at the end. "We have to keep the momentum going." We are on schedule, and it normally takes at least two years for the consultant project. This is an aggressive schedule. "As we draft each part, we have to go back and rethink the last part we drafted. We collect all the comments; some comments can be rolled in and some have to wait. In closing, our experience nationally (160 communities—this is one of *the* most complicated we have encountered), what we try to do is get residents engaged in what the rules should be so they do not feel as much need to get involved in every application. Early, open communication is key."	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			In addition, the proposed code increases the public's role and public engagement. Notably, the proposed code requires a neighborhood pre-application meeting to give the public an opportunity to get a better sense of a proposed development and share their concerns. Further, the proposed notice procedures have been expanded.	
Development Notification	What will the zoning rewrite do to improve the sign content that advertises public hearings?	Communities	Clarion Associates recommends the addition of a description of the proposed development on the signs themselves, which is not the current practice in Prince George's County but is extremely common across the country. Staff notes this revision is not something that should be codified in the new Zoning Ordinance. Instead, this recommendation will be incorporated in the proposed Procedures Manual that will be prepared after the new Zoning Ordinance is approved and before it goes into effect.	Make no change at this time.
Module 1 Zones	Developed properties currently in the R-30, R-30C, R-18, and R-18C zones will be placed in the Multifamily Residential – 12 (MFR-12) and Multifamily Residential – 20 (MFR-20) zones. Many of these properties currently exceed the maximum dwelling units per acre and will lack the ability to expand under the zoning rewrite's recommendations. This will result in little incentive for these properties to redevelop. "Many of these multifamily apartments may exceed the maximum permitted density allowed by the R-30 or R-18 zones for example, and may be certified as non-conforming uses." Should consider increasing the maximum permitted density for multifamily development in the proposed MFR-12 and MFR-20 zones.	Matthew M. Gordon	While the new Zoning Ordinance is intended in part to facilitate redevelopment, it is not intended to do so by incentivizing investment through the increase of allowable density on properties that have long been zoned for a more modest density. Any potential density increases should come as a result of a comprehensive planning effort and associated comprehensive rezoning to an appropriate zone, not due to a change to the Zoning Ordinance.	Make no change.
Module 1 Zones	Is the Neighborhood Conservation Overlay (NCO) Zone an "anti-McMansion" zone?	Communities	In a sense, is the proposed Neighborhood Conservation Overlay (NCO) Zone could act as an anti-McMansion zone as we understand it in the region. It is intended to make sure new development fits within the character of established neighborhoods. Each potential NCO will have its own unique attributes. Should a community wish to implement additional regulations meant to prevent infill homes from being out of scale with the existing development, they could pursue an NCO through a Planning Department workprogram item in the future.	Make no change.
Module 1 Zones	Is the town center development plan for the Mixed-Use Town Center (M-U-TC) Zone for Riverdale Park able to be adapted into the new Zoning Ordinance?	Town of Riverdale Park Mixed-Use Town Center Development Committee	In general, Clarion Associates recommends that the County avoid creating unique zoning codes for each jurisdiction. The urban parts of the County and our Metro-served areas have more in common with each other than they have differences. Clarion Associates believes that most of the time you can create zoning categories that are similar and can work in multiple areas. We end up with very complicated, staff-intensive, anti-development ramifications with different, unique codes for every place if we continue the current practices. Should the District Council ultimately agree with Clarion Associates' recommendation to delete the M-U-TC Zone, the M-U-TC development plans will not carry forward. One alternative that has been discussed is the potential for "converting" or adapting a specific M-U-TC development plan into a new Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Zone, which would be established in the Zoning Ordinance rather than in a separate document such as a development plan. However, there are no plans at this time to create a Neighborhood	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			Conservation Overlay Zone for any of the four existing M-U-TC areas in Prince George's County. Should any of these communities desire the conversion of their M-U-TC into a Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Zone, this would likely entail a future Planning Department work-program item to develop the new plan recommended by Clarion as the initial step, and the new development regulations that would need to be added to the Zoning Ordinance at a future point in time. Of particular importance to this discussion is that the M-U-TC communities should fully evaluate the recommendations and regulations of the new Zoning Ordinance to first determine if the new design regulations will meet the needs of the community. Clarion Associates' experience has been that many communities come to agree that the new zoning regulations will meet their goals and no longer feel they need to have unique zoning or regulatory approaches.	
Module 1 Zones	How are the proposed Planned Development (PD) zones different than today's comprehensive design zones? Are there examples of PD zones in the region?	Largo Civic Association	The proposed Planned Development zones are very similar to the comprehensive design zones. In the region, the Navy Yard in Washington, D.C. and Kentlands in Maryland are planned developments that would be similar to the proposed Planned Development zones.	Make no change.
Module 1 Zones and Uses	There is concern that permitting multifamily in the proposed General Commercial and Office (GCO) and Service Commercial (SC) zones may create too much residential and not enough commercial use. The Development District Overlay Zone standards and land use recommendations are allowing for more residential development without any mixing or commercial uses.	Largo Civic Association	The proposed code does not include a percentage of how much land area within these zones can be turned into residential development; this is intentional, to allow for greater flexibility. Many factors will influence what types of uses will be built on these zones in Prince George's County. There is a lot of commercial space in the County that may not always support commercial development. Unless there is additional flexibility allowed, these properties may become vacant or blighted.	Make no change.
Module 1 Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Zone	The Town of Berwyn Heights asked how the proposed Neighborhood Conservation Overlay (NCO) Zone could be applied to the town, and if the neighborhood compatibility standards for the NCO Zone would be the same or different from other nonresidential base zones.	Town of Berwyn Heights	The proposed Neighborhood Conservation Overlay (NCO) Zone is not a base zone. Unless an NCO Zone specifically waives requirements of the neighborhood compatibility standards, those standards will still apply. Should the Town of Berwyn Heights identify specific elements or characteristics of their community they would wish to protect – and which would not already be protected through the rest of the proposed regulations of the new Zoning Ordinance – they may seek to develop an NCO Zone. This would be done through the Planning Department's annual workprogram.	Make no change.
Greenbelt Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Zone	How can Greenbelt Homes, Inc. (GHI) put regulations into the proposed Neighborhood Conservation Overlay (NCO) Zone?	Greenbelt Homes, Inc.	GHI would work with the City of Greenbelt and the Planning Department to draft legislation for the District Council's vote. Through this process, the stakeholders would determine which elements would be necessary to include in the NCO zone.	Make no change.
Greenbelt Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Zone	Will the new Zoning Ordinance have a limit to the number of exceptions a development can attain?	Greenbelt Homes, Inc.	Although staff initially answered this question at the community meeting thinking it pertained to Special Exceptions, we now believe it seeks to ask if the number of potential adjustments from the standards that an applicant can request would be limited. The answer to this question is no. An applicant can request as many adjustments as they feel they need for their project to be successful. However, adjustments are limited in topic and in the percentage of change to the standard in the proposed Zoning Ordinance – adjustments are not unlimited or unrestricted changes from the regulations.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Greenbelt Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Zone	A participant mentioned the current zoning map for Historic Greenbelt contains many errors.	Greenbelt Homes, Inc.	Historic Greenbelt was last comprehensively rezoned in 1990, and essentially carried forward the zoning from the prior comprehensive rezoning to that point in time. Should someone feel there are specific errors in the zoning, these errors should be identified.	Make no change.
Greenbelt Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Zone	It was suggested that the proposed Neighborhood Conservation Overlay may not help protect the superblocks. Is this true?	Greenbelt Homes, Inc.	The "superblocks" are the original blocks between the street network established when Greenbelt was built in the 1930s. Staff notes two things in response to this specific question. The first is that GHI owns the land contained in the superblocks. These areas will only redevelop should GHI wish to do so. Second is that zoning cannot protect the block layout. This is a function of subdivision, not zoning. From this perspective, no, the NCO would not preserve the superblocks.	Make no change.
Greenbelt Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Zone	Module 2 identifies Greenbelt as "inside the Beltway." What does this mean?	Greenbelt Homes, Inc.	Module2 discusses development standards, including parking, connectivity, etc. The County is not homogenous and standards for rural and suburban sections of the County would not benefit the more urban sections of the County. Generally, communities inside the Capital Beltway tend to be more urban that those outside of it. However, Greenbelt spans both sides. It was decided that because of Greenbelt's more urban (than suburban/rural) character and the general reluctance to arbitrarily "break up" a municipality by applying different regulations to different portions, it would be considered as "inside the Beltway" for the purposes of these development standards.	Make no change.
Greenbelt Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Zone	If the federal government sells some of the open space that surrounds Greenbelt, can the new zoning code do anything to keep the purchasers from developing?	Greenbelt Homes, Inc.	The federal government is not subject to the Zoning Ordinance and can choose to sell their land. However, the open space land is zoned for very sparse development. Should a developer purchase the federal land, they may have to get it re-zoned, which would need to be approved by the District Council. Additionally, staff notes that the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center is subject to state law that mandates the District Council to retain it in an agricultural open space zone in perpetuity in the event it may be sold to the private sector.	Make no change.
Greenbelt Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Zone	If GHI sells some of their land, is it possible to stop the purchaser from developing?	Greenbelt Homes, Inc.	Not through the new Zoning Ordinance – any purchaser can develop the property in accordance to the regulations for the zone. However, private covenants can be placed on the property that would be binding.	Make no change.
Greenbelt Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Zone	The proposed Neighborhood Conservation Overlay zone may help preserve GHI, and a historic designation may also help. GHI, in the past, has voted against historic designation. Which is better?	Greenbelt Homes, Inc.	It depends on what the community decides should be protected. If there are only a few 3-8 elements, a NCO zone may likely be the best approach. If there are 25+ elements, it may be beneficial to use the historic designation. This depends on what elements the community wants to preserve.	Make no change.
Module 1 Building Height	Concern was expressed about "pop-up" development, where a homeowner may add extra floors to their home.	Planning Board	Development must comply with the height regulations ultimately approved with the new Zoning Ordinance. If a residential property is 30 feet in height and the zone permits 40 feet, then 10 additional feet could be added. This is no different than what would be possible under the current Zoning Ordinance.	Make no change.
Module 1 Uses	Need commercial development in industrial areas, so workers can conveniently get to lunch and other convenience services.	Planning staff	Limited commercial uses are allowed within the proposed Industrial/Employment (IE) and Heavy Industrial (HI) zones.	Make no change.
Module 1 Uses	What about today's footnotes in the use tables? What do we do with these?	Communities	Staff expects that the footnotes in today's code will not be included in the new code. They were not incorporated in Module 1. The desire is that the initial use tables with the new Zoning Ordinance are footnote-free because the new use structure and definitions will be sufficiently flexible to address the unique or unusual circumstances covered by most of the current use table footnotes.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Module 1 Home Gardens	Some stakeholders do not support any ban on front-yard gardening.	Communities	The proposed definition of "home garden" in Module 1 (Zones and Uses) contains a clause that would prevent front-yard gardens. Staff concurs this is probably too regulatory for zoning purposes and should be deleted.	Revise the definition of "home garden" op page 27-8—60 of Module 1 (Zones and Uses) to delete the second sentence, which restricts the location of home gardens on residential properties.
Module 1 Definitions	Does the definition of "agriculture" include tree banks? Are private forest conservation banks included?	Maryland Building Industry Association	The definitions section of Module 1 (Zones and Uses) defines "Agriculture/Forestry Uses" as activities related to "the production of field crops, fruits, vegetables, ornamental and flowering plants, and the breeding, rising, or keeping of livestock, poultry, swine, or other animals for food or other marketable products. The Agricultural/Forestry Uses category also includes forestry or sylvicultural activities related to the planting, management, protection, and harvesting of trees for timber or other forest products. Use types include: agricultural production and forestry; the keeping of horses or ponies; other agricultural uses; private noncommercial gardening and community gardens; and similar uses. This use category does not include the processing of animal or plant products for wholesale or retail purposes, which is generally considered an industrial manufacturing use type." Tree banks or private forest conservation banks are not included in the definition of "Agriculture."	Make no change.
Industrial Zones and Uses	Many uses that were formerly allowed in the Light Industrial (I-1) Zone will only be allowed in the Heavy Industrial (HI) Zone under the proposed code. Many light industrial building owners will want to re-zone so that they can avoid being a non-conforming use.	Communities, Developers	Staff is in the process of creating a use "cross-walk" that would show how the current uses "nest" into the proposed uses. This should allow staff to identify industrial uses that are currently allowed in the I-1 Zone that may become non-conforming in the proposed HI Zone. Additional changes may be necessary to address at least some of these uses before the new Zoning Ordinances moves to a legislative draft.	Make no change at this time.
Use and Code Enforcement	There are discrepancies between the Planning Department's database of indexed uses and the database from Department of Permitting Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE). Additionally, the process for DPIE's violation notices and enforcement is not clear.	Largo Civic Association	The proposed enforcement procedures are specified in Module 3 (Process, Administration, and Subdivision Regulations). The new use structure proposed in Module 1 (Zones and Uses) should greatly streamline the use databases in use in the County and allow for reconciliation of the databases.	Make no change.
Development Standards	There was a concern that we will set our standards too high and get no development since the market challenges facing Prince George's County are high. Are the proposed design standards reasonable in terms of costs to the developer so they will not be economically prohibitive?	Communities	The draft Zoning Ordinance responds to this concern and proposes design standards that Clarion Associates believe are in the "sweet spot" of being high enough to get quality development without being too high, making it economically infeasible to accomplish. Clarion Associates have also responded that many complicated communities such as Prince George's County adopt the Clarion codes because the process is designed so that the developer is given more flexibility to invest in a community in Module 1 through the zones and uses, Module 2 gives more predictability to all parties, and Mod 3 gives certainty of process so the development doesn't mind spending more money on quality. If the developer can quantify the requirements, they can adjust their budget accordingly.	Make no change.
Development Standards	The need for neighborhood compatibility standards seems straight-forward, but why have any form and design standards? Why not let the architect design the building?	Planning staff	A baseline level of development regulation is necessary to ensure development in Prince George's County is high-quality. The current Zoning Ordinance generally lacks standards other than for landscaping, parking, signage, Special Exception uses, and certain development types in certain zones (e.g. townhouse development in the R-T and M-X-T zones). The standards	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
	Applying design standards to even by-right development (development only subject to permit-level review) cannot involve discretionary review.		proposed by Clarion Associates are written in a way as to minimize discretion, allowing them to be applicable by administrative staff at a permit level.	
Development Standards	Some of the proposed standards, including those that touch on roadways, landscape buffers, and open space set-asides are somewhere else in the County Code.	Planning staff	Open space set-asides are a new concept for Prince George's County. Other standards, such as roadway access, mobility, and connectivity standards, have a close relationship with other parts of the County Code and with other County agencies but provide clearer guidance to developers, decision makers, and residents as to what the County hopes to achieve through its development patterns. Coordination with the rest of the County Code is an integral part of the current Zoning Ordinance, as it will need to be with the new version. Additional points of clarification and appropriate cross-referencing is necessary, as may be some judicious deletion of duplicative regulations found in Clarion Associates' draft. This will be an on-going process in collaboration with County, state, and regional agencies.	Make no change as a direct result of this comment. Refer to other directed changes and requests for additional information for specific changes that are recommended by staff to clarify these relationships.
Transit-Oriented Densities	The four- to five-story walkup buildings near the Largo Town Center Metrorail station is a missed opportunity and these buildings do not provide the density that the Plan Prince George's 2035 General Plan envisioned. This seems to be a broad pattern within the County in many locations. There is concern that by allowing personal service commercial uses in the Multifamily zones, there will be free-standing commercial buildings, which would preclude future residential development. Commercial uses should be integrated into multifamily buildings.	Largo Civic Association	Many issues impact the density at which a builder chooses to develop a property. The transit-oriented/Activity Center zones proposed by Clarion Associates allows for taller buildings as well as a mix of uses, which should make developing properties as envisioned by Plan 2035 easier. Additionally, the County recently adopted the new International Building Code which could encourage and allow taller "stick-built" buildings on top of concrete and steel podiums within the County, leading to increased densities at reduced development costs. However, there are still many factors that will contribute to the final built density. The same rationale applies to multifamily zones.	Make no change.
Design Quality	Regarding the base level of design standards, may these be different, staggered, or progress depending on the scale of the development? Thinking that large subdivisions far from transit should provide more by way of quality to offset the transportation impacts.	Planning Board	It may be possible for Clarion Associates to develop finer gradations of building quality if there is desire, but achieving an appropriate balance between the level of design quality that is regulated by the Zoning Ordinance and the market feasibility of achieving those standards is a very difficult task. Clarion Associates have indicated they believe the level of design quality they propose strikes that appropriate balance for Prince George's County.	Make no change.
Building Materials	The Planning Board asked if Clarion Associates were making recommendations on building materials.	Planning Board	Generally, building materials are not addressed in the proposals for the new Zoning Ordinance, with the exception of some areas in Module 2 (Development Regulations) that provide guidance as to prohibited materials for non-residential or mixed-use development, for example. Clarion Associates urge caution should the County wish to regulate building material standards through the Zoning Ordinance, since architectural quality is a very subjective topic and it may not be appropriate to use zoning regulation to control design.	Make no change.
Building Frontages on Alleys	Alleys need to be adjusted to require fronting of units on streets as opposed to alleys. If units do not front on a public street (for example, if a mews-type development is proposed), there would need to be a minimum width of the mews: adjustments to these widths should not be the normal situation. It would be helpful to speak to frontage in Subtitle 27, not just Subtitle 24.	Planning staff	The Subdivision Regulations – both existing and proposed – contain the regulatory guidance on buildings fronting streets vs. those that may front alleys. Essentially, buildings fronting an alley are permitted only under very limited circumstances where fronting public or private streets may be difficult or unsafe. Most typically, an alley can provide vehicular access to a dwelling unit but the frontage of the unit would be on a public or private street. Mews-type developments or the ability to build dwelling units that front open spaces (rather than just public or private streets) do not seem to be addressed in the proposed Subdivision Regulations. It is most appropriate to retain frontage regulations of this nature in the Subdivision Regulations; staff notes the definition for alleys included on page 27-5—3 of the proposed Zoning Ordinance	Make no change to the proposed Zoning Ordinance. Clarion Associates should review the proposed Subdivision Regulations and recommend if additional language is necessary to permit dwelling units to front mews or other open spaces.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			is specifically identified by Clarion Associates as desirable to include to clarify that "alleys are recognized as an acceptable means of allowing the sort of internal circulation that is envisioned in more urban, walkable developments." Staff concurs with this rationale and approach.	
Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Connectivity	The City of College Park welcomes and supports "the emphasis on multimodal circulation, connectivity and bicycle and pedestrian circulation."	City of College Park	Comment noted.	Make no change.
Off-Street Parking and Loading	The City of College Park "generally supports the revisions that modify the parking standards based on the new table of uses within zones, updates the parking dimensional standards and provides for bike parking standards."	City of College Park	Comment noted.	Make no change.
Off-Street Parking and Loading	The City of College Park suggests that "private-sector student housing (essentially an off-campus dormitory) should be acknowledged as a separate use or included in the category of fraternity or sorority house." The City believes this type of housing is different than typical multifamily dwelling units and should have an increased parking requirement to reflect the likely presence of additional residents of driving age.	City of College Park	Staff believes this comment may pertain to specific multifamily and mixed-use buildings in College Park that are rented by the bed rather than by the bedroom/unit. For example, a four-bedroom unit may be rented as eight beds, with two beds per bedroom, resulting in eight residents in each unit. Staff has no strong feelings regarding this comment and defers to Clarion Associates' expertise.	Clarion Associates should let the project team know their experience with this type of rental arrangement and if it typically results in additional parking demand due to the presence of more potential drivers. Is this type of development sufficiently different from other types to warrant a new, defined use and separate parking and other requirements? Would it be appropriate to clarify the definition of fraternity or sorority to include this type of development?
Off-Street Parking and Loading	The City of College Park commented that it was difficult to comment on the proposed parking requirements since the minimum parking requirements table does not include the parking requirements of the County's design overlay zones.	City of College Park	Comment noted. Many of the recent Development District Overlay Zones (DDOZs) and Transit District Overlay Zones (TDOZs) take a similar approach to that suggested by Clarion Associates, in that they reduce the minimum number of required parking spaces and establish maximum parking spaces at a percentage of the number that would otherwise have been required as the minimum number per the current Zoning Ordinance. Staff believes the key point to evaluate is the overall reduction of parking and whether the suggested ratios make sense for the County, not the specific numbers recommended by individual overlay zones. The intent is identical.	Make no change.
Off-Street Parking and Loading	The suggested approach that links off-site improvements with reducing automobile trips is desirable. Linking it to trip reduction as well should make the nexus much stronger	Planning staff	Comment noted.	Make no change.
Off-Street Parking and Loading	Have parking adjustments been deleted?	Communities	No. The proposed adjustments to the design standards are included in the Adjustments section of Module 3 (Process and Administration and Subdivision Regulations).	Make no change.
Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Alternatives	The City of College Park "supports the flexibility to consider the types of alternatives listed" by the off-street parking alternatives regulations contained in Sec. 27-5.208, but indicates alternative parking plans within municipalities "should require the approval of the municipality."	City of College Park	As proposed by Clarion Associates, Sec. 27-5.208, Off-Street Parking Alternatives, contain several regulatory approaches to allowing alternatives to providing the minimum number of off-street parking spaces that would otherwise be required, subject to the approval of the Planning Director. These approaches are most akin to today's shared parking approaches in the Zoning Ordinance and design overlay zones, and the transportation demand management strategies contained in Subtitle 20A of the County Code.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			The Maryland State Legislature has not authorized municipalities in Prince George's County to have decision-making authority over shared parking or transportation demand management strategies as part of the entitlement process. Municipalities have – and will continue to have – the authority to decide requests for Departures from Parking and Loading Standards (which Clarion Associates include as a type of "Adjustment"), where such authority has been duly delegated by the District Council, but the Zoning Ordinance cannot delegate the decision-making of shared parking and transportation demand management to municipalities lacking State enabling legislation. Staff recognizes the City of College Park has established a municipal parking district. Additionally, staff expects there to be coordination between the Planning Director and municipalities when off-street parking alternatives are proposed for development within municipal corporate boundaries as part of the referral process.	
Open Space Set-Asides	Are mandatory open space set-asides separate from mandatory dedication? Does Module 2 eliminate or incorporate the fee-in-lieu provision? Concern was expressed that providing both an open space set-aside and mandatory dedication would create unreasonable burdens on any property. A suggestion was made that, in the case of a redevelopment of property, a fee-in lieu provision should be allowed, as it is successfully done under the current Subdivision Regulations.	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman	Yes, the open space set-aside requirements are a separate element from the mandatory dedication or fee-in-lieu procedures established in the current Subdivision Regulations. The open space set-aside is intended to provide for usable, active or passive recreation amenities for residents, workers, and visitors of development, much of which may not be subject to subdivision review and therefore, not subject to mandatory dedication. However, it is essential to understand that open space set-asides **work together with** mandatory dedication. The purpose statement on page 27-5—68 clearly indicates coordination with the Parklands and Recreation Facilities requirements of the Subdivision Regulations is needed. This section contains the mandatory dedication standards. Additionally, the open space set-asides are designed so that the required percentage of land to be retained as open space **can count** both mandatory dedication land requirements (refer to Table 27-5.305 and Sec. 27-5.309) and any required landscape areas pursuant to the Landscape Manual. It is not the intent for the open space set-asides to add undue burden or costs for developers. Allowing elements such as mandatory dedication or landscaping that may otherwise be required to count toward these set-asides minimizes this potential while still ensuring a high level of open space and amenity space for Prince George's County.	Make no change.
Open-Space Set Asides	"Maybe I missed something, but there should be a requirement of bike/ped access to the open spaces, though perhaps that is covered by the earlier statements on accessibility for bike/peds."	Communities	Pedestrian and bicycle access to adjacent development and to other facilities is discussed in Section 27-5.100 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation.	Make no change
Nonresidential and Mixed-Use Form and Design Standards	Are pad sites (developable areas typically located at the edges of shopping centers along streets) subject to the nonresidential and mixed-use form and design standards?	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman	Yes, pad sites – called "outparcels" in the proposed Zoning Ordinance, will be subject to the nonresidential and mixed-use form and design standards for new development or expansion/alteration of existing buildings outside of the transit-oriented/activity center base and Planned Development zones if the expansion increases the building's gross floor area by 50 percent or more. Refer to Sec. 27-5.902 on page 27-5—97.	Make no change.
Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	The City of College Park "supports this new section that establishes standards for higher density development in proximity to existing single-family homes."	City of College Park	Comment noted.	Make no change resulting from this comment, but refer to other directed changes and discussion of the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards in general.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Agricultural Compatibility Standards	How do we prevent incursions into the Rural and Agricultural areas of the County?	Communities	The new Zoning Ordinance proposes protection of the Rural and Agricultural Area (which was established by the Plan 2035 General Plan) through several means. Most importantly, by establishing a new class of zones called Rural and Agricultural zones that will provide stronger tools for preservation by allowing and encouraging more active agricultural uses. Additionally, Clarion Associates propose design regulations in the agricultural compatibility standards that, among other measures, require a substantial landscaped buffer between new development and existing farmland/agricultural uses.	Make no change.
Scenic and Historic Road Design Standards	With regard to scenic and historic roads, the Zoning Ordinance needs to include design standards.	Planning staff	In general terms, staff agrees that the regulatory guidance provided in Module 2 (Development Standards) seems light regarding Rural and Agricultural Area. To some degree, this comment extends to the County's Scenic and Historic roads. Members of the project team continue to evaluate this aspect of Clarion Associates' proposals and will work with Clarion to strengthen Rural and Agricultural standards as may be appropriate.	Continue work with Clarion Associates to refine and strengthen design standards pertaining to the Rural and Agricultural portions of the County, including pertinent guidance for Scenic and/or Historic roads.
Telecommunications Infrastructure	Is there any support for infrastructure on telecommunications, such as antennas and other equipment located on roof tops?	Hyattsville Planning Committee	There are some provisions for roof top wireless telecommunications towers, monopoles, antennas, and similar equipment in Module 2 (development standards), primarily dealing with masking these features from public view.	Make no change.
Developer Incentives and Accountability	From the environmental incentives and green building standards, developers would get certain points for providing green building features and credits/incentives for going beyond the minimum. Would the points be tied to them getting additional funds? Developers say it may be too cost-prohibitive for redevelopment. How will you hold individuals accountable? This same question applies to transportation and parking. What do we want to do to say that if we limit parking for providing bus service, the developer is held accountable?	Council	Clarion Associates replied to this question on June 7, 2016: "The first key is offering flexibility. Give the applicant a menu to let them evaluate the economics for green building in redevelopment. The second part, with the focus groups and subcontractors who are economic development experts, is making sure what we are proposing will get built. The third is making sure the incentives are coordinated with tax incentives. How do we hold developers accountable?" One example given was that Transportation Demand Management Districts require Memoranda of Understanding and other measures. The proposals in Module 3 (Process, Administration, and Subdivision Regulations) contain a Division on enforcement, which sets the stage for increased accountability by holding property owners in violation of the Zoning Ordinance or Subdivision Regulations and establishing a framework to assist in enforcement.	Make no change.
Inside the Beltway	A Councilmember expressed particular interest in revitalization inside the Capital Beltway and asked about the best way to move forward with redevelopment in this area and how the zoning laws work in the community's favor.	Council	The proposed Zoning Ordinance recommendations from Clarion Associates would provide increased flexibility and streamlined procedures that should encourage infill development and redevelopment, particularly within the Capital Beltway.	Make no change.
Mixed-Income Housing	The proposed Zoning Ordinance seems to be eliminating "Euclidean" zones and shifting to mixed-use zones. Has there been consideration about proposing mixed-income housing?	Hyattsville Planning Committee	It would not be accurate to indicate the proposed Zoning Ordinance is "eliminating Euclidean zones." The new Zoning Ordinance would carry forward a number of traditional "Euclidean" zones (base zones that typically focus on residential, commercial, or industrial development) in addition to providing more effective mixed-use zones. Mixed-income housing is not actively under consideration for the new Zoning Ordinance but may be added as appropriate in the future following policy guidance by the Council.	Make no change.
Affordable Housing	I think allowing for micro-units at our Metro stations that are close to Washington, D.C. (e.g. at West Hyattsville, Capitol Heights, or Suitland) would allow us to have the density desired in transit-oriented regions while increasing housing supply in a manner that maintains some affordability.	Communities	There are no proposed requirements that would prevent "micro" or "tiny" homes from being built at the principal dwelling on a lot, although this may not be the best principal use of land proximate to Metro stations. While these units could fall into the umbrella of accessory dwelling units as initially proposed by Clarion Associates in Module 1 (Zones and Uses), On October 18, 2016, the County Council was briefed by Clarion Associates on Module 3. During this briefing, the Council expressed	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			desire to tighten the focus of the rewrite project and raised topics that could be deferred. Accessory dwelling units was one of these topics.	
Module 3 (Process, Administration, and Subdivision Regulations)	Should consider including some exemptions for lawfully existing development that predate the adoption of the new Zoning Ordinance. Property owners should be allowed to make alteration that increase the gross floor area of their building(s) to a moderate degree.	Communities	This question deals with grandfathering, transition, and nonconformities issues that are addressed in Module 3 (Process, Administration, and Subdivision Regulations).	Make no change.
Module 3 (Process, Administration, and Subdivision Regulations)	A Councilmember stated they would look to see, and their constituents would look to see, a product that enhances trust and confidence that when a plan is in front of the Planning Board, this thing we have agreed to will not just be waived in full.	Council	Clarion Associates answered: "You have read our minds. We have noticed that the more a code is broken, the more desire or need there is for waivers."	Make no change.
Council Election to Review Cases	A community organization noted Prince George's County is one of the only counties in the area with this ability delegated to the Council, and indicated their belief that Prince George's County still does not get quality development.	Communities	Comment noted.	Make no change.
Municipal Role	How are municipalities being brought into the dialogue regarding standards and processes?	Municipalities	The consultant team has reached out to municipalities throughout the drafting and information gathering process to ensure that the recommendations and desires municipalities are being considered.	Make no change
Municipal Role	Will municipal authority still exist? Is there opportunity to expand municipal authority?	Municipalities	In the proposed Zoning Ordinance, municipalities will still have the authority to review specific elements of site plans – e.g. adjustments (known as Departures today) and variances. No authority is being removed from municipalities in the draft. This process cannot grant additional review authority to municipalities. This authority is granted to municipalities by the state legislature. Any change that conveys authority to municipalities that was initially granted to the District Council is decided at the state level.	Make no change.
Application Requirements	All major case types should include Tree Conservation Plans (or exemption letters) and approved Natural Resource Inventories (as appropriate).	Planning staff	The specific requirements for different case/application types will be part of the Procedures Manual that will be drafted following the approval of the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations. Such requirements are typically not codified as law.	Make no change.
Grandfathering Existing Development	Existing land use approvals that apply to existing developments should be grandfathered. As proposed, Module 2 does not address if, and how, the proposed development standards will affect existing Planning Board resolutions or District Council decisions. The Town of Berwyn Heights seeks confirmation on whether proposed grandfathering provisions will allow existing businesses to be "phased in or exempt altogether under the new regulations."	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman, Town of Berwyn Heights	Module 3 (process and administration) speaks to grandfathering provisions, transitions from the current Zoning Ordinance to the new Zoning Ordinance, and nonconformities. The general rule of thumb is that all development that is legal on the date the new Zoning Ordinance goes into effect is grandfathered and still subject to any pertinent findings and conditions of approval that may impact that development until and unless a change is proposed to the property/use/structure that would require conformance to the new regulations.	Make no change.
Use and Occupancy Permits	Does the new Zoning Ordinance eliminate the need for a new Use and Occupancy permit due to a change in business ownership without a change in use?	Communities	Yes, the proposed Zoning Ordinance eliminates the need to secure a new Use and Occupancy (U&O) Permit for a simple change in ownership. Clarion Associates have indicated it is exceedingly unusual to require a new U&O if the use remains the same but the ownership changes.	Clarion Associates should provide the project team with their thoughts on the concern expressed by the County Office of Law and, if necessary, revise the proposed Zoning Ordinance to address the situation.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			However, staff notes the County Office of Law have expressed some reservation about this recommendation because requiring a new U&O permit in this situation ensures the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement has up-to-date contact information in case they need to pursue code enforcement measures. Clarion Associates heard this comment in their trip to the County to present Module 3 (process and administration) in September 2016, and indicated they would re-evaluate their recommendation in light of this concern.	
Use and Occupancy Permits	Will the new Zoning Ordinance also require a new owner to file for a new Use and Occupancy (U&O) permit? This has been the source of many problems for landlords because a change in the ownership for a property in the R-18 (Multifamily Medium Density Residential) Zone has to secure a new U&O permit, and this often identifies the property as a non-conforming use. The result is a potentially large negative factor on resale value.	Communities	Although Clarion Associates recommend in Module 3 (Process, Administration, and Subdivision Regulations) there be no requirement for a new U&O permit for a chance in the ownership of a use, both property owners and the County Office of Law have raised valid concerns about forgoing a U&O in these circumstances. This topic will be revisited in the upcoming Module 3 analysis.	Make no change at this time.
Special Exceptions	It is troubling to the community to require Special Exceptions for particular stores or uses, and then the business just ends up being poorly run and looking poor on the exterior.	Communities	What happens to a use after it is approved and in operation is a function of code enforcement. So long as the use is meeting the rules that are established (such as in the Zoning Ordinance) they comply. This is one reason why it is important to ensure the new Zoning Ordinance gets the development regulations, approval procedures, and code enforcement measures right.	Make no change.
Sustainable Growth Act	Did not see a reference to the Sustainable Growth Act tiers other than in the form of a map after the Sewer Envelope Map. Perhaps we should ensure language is inserted that would be applicable to the Sustainable Growth Act Tiers?	Agencies	Recommendations pertaining to the state-mandated Sustainable Growth Act tiers are contained in Module 3 (Process, Administration, and Subdivision Regulations) and are not addressed at this time.	Make no change at this time.
Historic Properties	Does the new Zoning Ordinance protect historic sites and landmarks?	Communities	No, Such protection is the purpose of Subtitle 29 of the County Code, which is dedicated to historic sites, resources, and districts. Subtitle 29 will be appropriately referenced in the new Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations as necessary.	Make no change.
Countywide Map Amendment	When will the rezoning of the land take place?	Communities	This project has been developed and is on-track to begin the Countywide rezoning of all properties to the new zones on the same day the new Zoning Ordinance is approved. We are building in a six-month transition window before the rezoning is approved and the Zoning Ordinance goes into effect.	Make no change.
Countywide Map Amendment	How would the proposed “one to one” replacement of current zones be done in the upcoming Countywide Map Amendment? How will people find out about the proposed zoning changes? The Town of Berwyn Heights asked for a map of proposed zoning districts for the town.	Communities, Town of Berwyn Heights, Planning staff	The proposed residential and nonresidential base zones are very similar to the County’s current “Euclidean” zones – base residential, commercial, and industrial zones. Staff proposes that these zones transition from the current zone to the closest proposed zone in the Countywide Map Amendment. Approximately 92 percent of Prince George’s County is placed in one of these zones today. The methodology for the Countywide Map Amendment is in development, but will certainly include notification and public participation opportunities such as potential Countywide information meetings. It is premature to provide mapping of potential rezoning.	Make no change.
Countywide Map Amendment	Will R-18(Multifamily Medium Density Residential)-zoned properties be rezoned to the Multifamily Residential – 12 (MFR-12) or to the Multifamily Residential – 20 (MFR-20) zone? It would be considered a taking if the properties were down-zoned to a lower density.	Communities	Although the specific approach of the forthcoming Countywide Map Amendment is still being developed, one of the key tenets is to bring as much of the current zoning as possible into the new zoning structure on a “one-to-one” basis, matching the closest new zone. Thus, the R-18 Zone would become the MFR-20 Zone. Downzoning properties is not a taking. A taking is an action that would deny the use of a property.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
WMATA Facilities, Operations, and Property	The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) asked numerous specific questions regarding parking, lighting, environmental, form and design, and other regulations and if they apply to WMATA's operations.	WMATA	Development by WMATA on WMATA property is exempt from the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance but would be subject to the Mandatory Referral process. Public/private partnerships, which may include development projects fronting public streets adjacent to Metro stations, may be subject to the Zoning Ordinance. This decision is typically made at the time a potential development is ready to proceed. Should a development be determined to be subject to the Zoning Ordinance (and not the Mandatory Referral process), it will be subject to the requirements for vehicular access and circulation contained in Sec. 27-5.108.C.	Make no change.
Property Maintenance	There is no need for the Zoning Ordinance to include property maintenance requirements; the proposed regulations include language requiring the proper maintenance of paved areas. This may conflict between governmental agencies and raises questions regarding "Tillie Frank" issues and municipal police power with respect to code enforcement.	City of Greenbelt	The only references to "maintenance" in combination with paved areas occur with regard to recordation of maintenance agreements with the County's land records, a "maintained in good repair" clause for the off-street parking and loading requirements that is general in nature, and in conjunction with pervious and semi-pervious surfaces. Staff is unclear to which specific provision(s) Greenbelt may be referencing in this comment. In general terms, staff believes the maintenance language, where it exists, is general in nature and does not supersede or conflict in any way with County of municipal police powers. The County Office of Law is involved in one of the rewrite's advisory committees and is reviewing Clarion Associates' proposals for potential conflicts with other parts of the County Code and the roles and responsibilities of other County agencies. Should specific issues be brought to light by the Office of Law regarding conflict of maintenance provisions, we will work to revise the language as appropriate.	Make no change.
Online Access	Will this ordinance hyperlink to other things outside our control, such as state regulations, the regulations of the Americans with Disabilities Act, etc.?	Planning staff	The intent is to host the new Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations on a dedicated code-hosting online platform. All of these platforms support hyperlinks, both internal to the code and to external sites.	Make no change.
27-5—1 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Consistency with Plans	Should mention be made of coordinating with local plans?	City of Greenbelt	As proposed by Clarion Associates, access and circulation systems associated with development shall be consistent with various County-adopted plans addressing transportation. These plans include the Countywide Master Plan of Transportation, General Plan, and other Comprehensive Master Plans. Between them, these documents constitute the local transportation plans; while municipalities may own and operate streets through their own public works departments, and establish their own street design criteria, the planning for those streets – such as their alignment – is conducted through countywide plans to ensure consistency and coordination of planning and implementation.	Make no change.
27-5—2 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	Sec. 27-5.108.A, entitled "Definition of Street Functional Classification," does not take into account municipal street standards.	City of Greenbelt	Sec. 27-5.108.A. also does not take into account County street standards. This is not the point of this sub-section. The sub-section is intended solely to reinforce that public streets will be classified according to the roadway classification system used by the Department of Public Works and Transportation – Freeways, Expressways, Collectors, Arterials, Primary Residential Streets, etc. Streets are classified according to the County system; the street standards are then applied afterward, either by the County or by municipalities having jurisdiction over their streets. The change recommended for the prior comment by the City of Greenbelt clarifies that the design and construction of streets would be to the standards of the municipalities having jurisdiction, e.g. Greenbelt.	Make no change.
27-5—4	Regarding the proposed limitation on direct driveway access along other streets other than arterials, "shouldn't there be	City of Greenbelt	No. This proposed regulation is intended to provide for a single point of access from a non-arterial (staff notes given the prior sub-section, this limitation also needs to extend to access	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access Management	access for more than one dwelling unit, if off-street spaces are required?"		from collectors) to single-family, two-family, or three-family dwellings and is intended in part to minimize access points along the street, thus minimizing points of conflict. Driveway access for two- and three-family dwellings could accommodate off-street parking spaces for these dwellings in the same driveway; there is no need to provide two driveways for every two-family dwelling unit or three driveways for every three-family dwelling unit, as the off-street parking spaces can simply be consolidated. This also has the side-benefit of reducing impervious surface area.	
27-5—4 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access Management	Is a permit reviewer going to look at the vehicular access management regulations?	Planning staff	The term "development" is defined in Module 3 (Process and Administration and Subdivision Regulations). If an application involves a permit and is not otherwise subject to a discretionary review procedure such as a major site plan, yes, permit review staff will review the application for compliance with the development regulations, including vehicular access management.	Make no change.
27-5—5 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	Does Sec. 27-5.108.D.2.c. conflict with Sec. 27-5.103.D.2?	City of Greenbelt	There is no Sec. 27-5.103.D.2. Staff is unsure what this comment refers to.	Make no change.
27-5—5 27-5—6 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Connectivity	There residential street connectivity is fine., but is there a similar connectivity requirement for commercial development, something beyond interconnected parking lots? This could help take traffic off the main roads.	Communities	Yes, there are connectivity requirements for nonresidential development, including internal vehicular circulation and cross-access to adjoining parcels contains a nonresidential or mixed-use development or vacant land.	Make no change.
27-5—6 Cross Access Between Adjoining Developments	Cross-access between adjoining developments does not seem to address cross-access with townhouse development. Nor does the street connectivity index for single-family development. Do the cross- access between adjoining developments regulations include or extend to townhouses or multifamily development?	Planning staff	As currently drafted, the cross-access regulations of this Section apply only to development within the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center and Nonresidential zones, and connections to adjoining parcels containing a nonresidential or mixed-use development, or adjoining vacant land. The regulations do not include single-use townhouse of multifamily development but would extend to townhouses or multifamily buildings that are part of mixed-use developments. Page 27-5—9 contains external street connectivity regulations that will apply to future single-family residential subdivisions to ensure greater connectivity to future development. There are no recommendations or proposals to require existing communities to provide additional connections.	Clarion should provide the project team additional information on cross-access between residential developments of varying densities and abutting nonresidential or mixed-use development. Is such access for townhouse and multifamily development desirable or appropriate?
27-5—6 Cross Access Between Adjoining Developments	Page 6 mentions "new development," we should clarify it's also applies to redevelopment of the site. Need to know what triggers the new standards. "What does 'new' mean?"	Planning staff	Staff agrees the term "development" would benefit from additional clarity rather than just relying on the common-law interpretation of the term. This term is defined in the current Zoning Ordinance, and has been included by Clarion Associates in Module 3.	Make no change.
27-5—6	Does the code address situation with two existing strip commercial centers next to each other on collector roadways	Planning staff	No. The regulations proposed for the new Zoning Ordinance are prospective, meaning they will apply to future development applications. They will not force or require existing development to	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Cross Access Between Adjoining Developments	or higher, which have no provision for connectivity between the centers?		comply with the new standards. Should an existing shopping center redevelop, it will be subject to the new standards and will need to provide connectivity to abutting nonresidential or mixed-use development.	
27-5—6 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	It is not clear we will enforce cross-access between adjoining development in the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones.	Planning staff	Sec. 27-5.108.E.2.a. on page 27-5—6 requires new development in the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center and Nonresidential zones to design and build internal vehicular circulation systems in such a way as to provide vehicular cross-access to adjacent parcels that a) contain nonresidential or mixed-use development, or b) are vacant. It is, admittedly, easier to enforce the regulation to ensure connection points are provided to adjoining vacant parcels. Enforcement of cross-access to adjacent land containing nonresidential or mixed-use development will, of necessity, be a work in progress. Since that development is assumed to already exist, it may not have a potential connection point. Therefore, the new development site cannot ensure cross-access. It can, however, ensure that a connection is possible for when the adjoining parcel **redevelops**, at which time the adjoining parcel will then be subject to this same requirement. Over time, cross-access is assured. In the short-term, however, cross-access will be difficult to achieve in many situations.	Make no change.
27-5—6 and 27-5—7 Footnote 14	This section seems to give the Planning Director broad flexibility. Is this a change from current situations? Can the County Council override a Planning Board decision?	WMATA	Footnote 14 consolidates the various administrative decisions on proposed changes from the development standards that Clarion Associates recommend should be made by the Planning Director. Many of these decisions are already made by the Planning Director in the current Zoning Ordinance, having been delegated by the District Council over time. There are some proposed changes from the current regulations because these pertain to new design elements that are not listed in the current code. Should the District Council ultimately agree to delegate these decisions to the Planning Director, the Council could not overrule the Planning Director's administrative decision for these elements. This is identical to today's practice for decisions that have been delegated by the District Council. While no change is necessary based on this particular comment, there are some related comments on Module 2 (development standards) that will likely lead to recommended changes regarding the types of design elements that can be administratively varied, the proposed thresholds, and/or the location where these decisions are contained in the new Zoning Ordinance.	Make no change.
27-5—7 through 27-5—10 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	Cul-de-sacs are not uniformly bad. They can be used to end streets or to avoid environmental conditions, such as steep slopes.	Maryland Building Industry Association	The street connectivity index does not preclude culs-de-sac. However, it is unlikely that the connectivity score will meet the proposed regulations if a development has many culs-de-sac. While culs-de-sac have their place, they substantially decrease the accessibility of a neighborhood, which in turn has negative impacts including further dependence on arterial roads, reduced ability for transit to service neighborhoods, reduced walkability, etc.	Make no change.
27-5—7 27-5—8 Roadway Access, Mobility, and	The street connectivity index may result in lost density.	Maryland Building Industry Association	The street connectivity index is a tool to help increase the accessibility of subdivisions throughout the County. It is likely that new patterns and layouts for residential neighborhood will need to be developed to accommodate both density and accessibility.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation				
27-5—8 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	Regarding the proposed minimum street connectivity index, "low connectivity increases congestion, which increases pollution and leads to more aggressive and dangerous driving. It also creates more problems during traffic emergencies such as snow storms. The minimum score should be much closer to a perfect grid of 2.5 than it is being recommended now."	Communities	Staff agrees that streets in grid patterns increase connectivity and lead to the benefits suggested. However, requiring all neighborhoods to meet a full gird layout, particularly in a County the size of Prince George's County and with our clearly distinct rural, suburban, and urban areas, is not feasible because of environmental features, existing adjacent developments, and existing roadway networks/connection points.	Make no change.
27-5—8 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	Why are cul-de-sac heads and street stub-outs considered links in the proposed street connectivity index?	City of Greenbelt	Street stubs have the potential to connect to a future development on an adjoining vacant parcel of land. These connections can facilitate better traffic flows and facilitate emergency vehicles when responding to calls for service. Culs-de-sac are considered nodes, not links.	Make no change.
27-5—9 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation External Street Connectivity	Clarification is sought as to whether Sec. 27-5.108.H.1 (external street connectivity) relates to both single-family detached and single-family attached housing.	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman	Yes, this regulation pertains to both single-family detached and single-family attached housing types. The standard reads in part: "the arrangement of streets in a single-family residential subdivision shall provide for the alignment and continuation of existing or proposed streets…." By using the term "single-family residential subdivisions," the standard is broadly applied to all single-family residential uses and housing types.	Make no change.
27-5—9 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	Pedestrian connections are required for cul-de-sac street patterns that would allow pedestrians to pass-through cul-de-sacs to nearby destinations. This creates a possible situation where no one connects because no one else has this connection. It was suggested that developments build connections even if they initially lead nowhere.	WMATA	Sec. 27-5.100.G.1 would require pedestrian connections between a cul-de-sac head or street turnaround and the sidewalk system of the closest adjacent street or pedestrian pathway. Standard G.1.c. indicates a determination based on being able to reasonably achieve such a connection to an existing pedestrian pathway. It can be inferred that unless there is a pedestrian pathway in proximity to the cul-de-sac head or street turnaround, the pedestrian connection would not be required. This seems to be at the heart of the comment. Staff agrees that it would be desirable to provide for future connections even if there is no immediately available or proximate pedestrian pathway because there may be a future pedestrian connection as abutting properties development.	Clarion Associates should recommend an alternative approach for requiring pedestrian connections in cul-de-sacs that link to future potential developments; this may mean, at minimum, revising the proposed determination statements to better address situations where the abutting property may not yet be developed and there would not be a proximate pedestrian pathway.
27-5—9 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	External street connectivity should be extended to adjoining property boundaries to create a street connection or a street stub at a vacant property. The only standard of development here is "practical and feasible" even if there isn't an actual or proposed tie-in.	WMATA	"Practical and feasible" may be too flexible a standard to ensure street connectivity. The goal of increased street connectivity between developments and subdivisions is supported by staff, but the practicality of how to achieve this goal is the challenge.	Clarion Associates should recommend an alternative approach to strengthen the standards for street connections.
27-5—9 Roadway Access, Mobility, and	Pedestrian connectivity is required to off-site locations if they are deemed to be significant pedestrian generators. Does this create a legal issue regarding "nexus," or the contributions that can be required from the developer?	Planning staff	Staff concurs. The "nexus" for developer contributions/improvements in proportion to their impact is not well defined in the traffic analysis.	Clarion Associates and staff should continue to review possible "nexus" issues (as well as proportionality issues) as they relate to transportation

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	Are there projects where force majeure issues would override improvements?			and other public facility improvements and make clarifications as may be necessary.
27-5—9 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	Sec. 27-5.108.G.1. a and b seem very complicated. Terms like 'close proximity' should be defined.	City of Greenbelt	The proposed regulation includes language that explains "close proximity" is "(defined generally as within a half-mile)." Similarly, Sec. 27-5.108.G.1.b. includes interpretive guidance regarding unreasonable impediments to pedestrian circulation	Make no change.
27-5—9 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	In Sec. 27-5.108.G.2., should these pedestrian links also be considered nodes?	City of Greenbelt	No. Nodes are defined as street intersections and cul-de-sac heads within a subdivision.	Make no change.
27-5—9 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	Does Sec. 27-5.108.H.1, external street connectivity, relate to both single-family detached and attached developments?	City of Greenbelt	Yes, it relates to both housing types.	Make no change.
27-5—9 27-5—10 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation	A Councilmember indicated they were glad to see the regulations on requiring improved connectivity, and loved the suggestion to indicate future connections with signage. There have been a number of cases where a connection was anticipated but the community forgot about it, and were shocked when a connection is finally provided.	Council	Comment noted.	Make no change.
27-5—10 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	Sec. 27-5.108.J, Traffic Calming Measures, requires traffic calming measures for residential street segments over 800 feet in length, and provides examples of such measures to include, among others, curvilinear street segments; street neck-downs, chicanes, or diverter islands; and narrower lane widths. Such traffic calming measures could be problematic for bus service.	WMATA	Traffic calming is valuable for residential neighborhoods and mixed-use development because it slows motor vehicle traffic down where there is expected to be pedestrian activity. This will also help bus riders as calmer traffic is more comfortable for a transit-rider as they are walking to the bus stop. Staff notes the traffic calming measures proposed by Clarion Associates with this standard are examples of effective approaches, not requirements for each development. The details of specific traffic calming measures must be determined on project-by-project basis in collaboration with the Planning Department and operating agencies including WMATA and the Department of Public Works and Transportation.	Make no change.
27-5—10 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation	Traffic-calming measures for residential development should be provided every 300 to 400 feet instead of every 600 feet.	Communities	As with many other things, there is a cost-benefit analysis that plays a role in the provision of traffic-calming measures. There are also operational considerations that must be considered. Standard J.1. on page 27-5—10 recommends traffic-calming approaches that connect any two nodes, or points, in the street connectivity index system. The requirement for traffic-calming measures for linear street segments in excess of 800 feet is a "backstop" to ensure traffic-	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Vehicular Access and Circulation			calming is provided within neighborhoods. This is an appropriate approach to balance safety with costs and operational considerations.	
27-5—10 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	Will required turn-arounds associated with lengthy stub streets require additional right-of-way.	City of Greenbelt	It would depend on the size of the right-of-way. In most situations, a vehicle turn-around can be accommodated within the existing right-of-way, particularly since this requirement would be known when new rights-of-way and stub streets are planned.	Make no change.
27-5—11 Block Length	The requirement for maximum block length range feels too great for the "urban areas" within the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones and the Mixed-Use Planned Development (MU-PD) Zone. Eight hundred feet is too large a block length for urban areas, so reduce it, perhaps to six hundred feet.	Planning staff	Clarion proposes that block lengths in the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones and the MU-PD Zone shall be at least 200 feet but no more than 800 feet. Eight hundred feet is a long block for an urban area, but is not "too long." Urban development typically incorporates a mix of block lengths, which may have resulted from geography, the point in time in which the city was laid out and built, planning approaches, and other factors. A typical rule of thumb for an "ideal" urban block is between 400 and 600 feet on the long end. However, allowing an increase to 800 feet for Prince George's County is warranted in light of the reality of where our most urban places are sited. Many of the County's Metro station sites and other transit hub facilities are located where geographic and infrastructure challenges often constrain the developable area. Additionally, the County faces economic challenges regarding infrastructure implementation and maintenance which may make shorter blocks – and therefore, more roadway surface to build and maintain – less feasible. Providing for a range of block lengths between 200 and 800 feet strikes a good balance between walkability, urbanity, and flexibility that allows the County and developers to respond more nimbly to urban, transit-oriented, mixed-use development and infill development while not being so long a distance as to preclude or discourage walking and bicycling.	Make no change.
27-5—11 Mid-Block Access	Could mid-block access be applied to nonresidential zones?	Planning staff	Yes. There is nothing about the provision requiring mid-block access in three named single-family residential zones that precludes such access in other zones. The mid-block access regulation is intended to require additional pedestrian and bicyclist connectivity in single-family neighborhoods.	Make no change.
27-5—11 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	Regarding the proposed requirement for mid-block access in certain residential zones, "this is important for connectivity and these should be set up to allow bicycle traffic."	Communities	Comment noted. Staff notes that sidewalks and mid-block paths would allow for bicycle access, but is hesitant to require all such connections to be designed to accommodate both bicycles and pedestrians because such a requirement would necessitate a minimum paved width of eight feet, detracting from environmental and stormwater management goals and contributing maintenance costs.	Make no change.
27-5—12 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation	"The requirement of a minimum number of access points for any non-residential property based on acreage, as set forth in Table 27-5.108.K.4, makes no sense." Concern is expressed that the burden is on the property owner to demonstrate why the standard cannot be met, when it may be more appropriate to determine access to commercial properties based on numerous other factors.	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman	Staff notes this table provides a minimum number of access points based on the level of development proposed on a given property, and does not limit access points if more are deemed necessary. The purpose of such a requirement is to ensure sufficient connectivity exists to the developing property.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—12 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation	Providing traffic calming measures in a development's vehicular circulation system "should be a requirement, not 'as necessary.' Nearly every street is unsafe for pedestrian usage without traffic-calming measures."	Communities	Traffic-calming measures should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for determination of need and regarding the specific features or designs to be incorporated. It would not be appropriate to require traffic-calming measures in all circumstances.	Make no change.
27-5—12 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Street Layout and Design	The Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) prefers nearly highway-type conditions even in transit-oriented locations, whereas WMATA prefers narrower, more streetscape-oriented environments.	WMATA	Comment noted. The proposed standards, particularly within the transit-oriented/activity center base and Planned Development zones, encourage walkability and more comprehensive streetscapes. However, it must be recognized that the agencies that own and operate public streets, such as SHA, are not subject to the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance	Make no change.
27-5—12 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	"There also needs to be a much higher required minimum number of entry points for bikes/peds if such a low number of automobile entry points is maintained."	Communities	The required pedestrian connectivity requirements that Clarion Associates have proposed may act as the mechanism to increase the number of pedestrian and bicycle entry points. This would make an additional requirement for pedestrian and bicycle access points unnecessary.	Make no change.
27-5—12 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	The required development entry point minimums should be higher, "since such a low number of required entrances increase congestion, and therefore increase pollution and aggressive driving. The County should really look at the inner ring suburbs for examples of a good number of access points".	Communities	Staff does not agree that additional entry points to developments should be provided. Increases to the number of entry points along major roadways to development such as shopping centers **increases** congestion on the main road by creating additional points of conflict and adding to driver confusion. This also has negative impacts on safety. The goal is to balance connectivity with these other considerations. Additional connections just for the sake of connection are not always desirable. That said, it may be appropriate to revisit the threshold for residential use types to determine if 81 units is the appropriate point at which a minimum of two access points should be provided.	Clarion Associates should re-evaluate the threshold for the number of units that require a minimum of two access points and revise that threshold if appropriate.
27-5—12 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Circulation	"Is it appropriate for the Planning Director to determine if adequate transit facilities exist? Shouldn't this be a decision coordinated with the appropriate transit authority?"	City of Greenbelt	The Planning Director would not be making determinations or decisions in a vacuum – they are all informed by technical staff and, where appropriate, coordination with applicable operating agencies.	Make no change.
27-5—17 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Pedestrian Access and Circulation	Add transit stations and bus stops to the list of areas that should have general pedestrian access.	WMATA	Staff concurs	Revise the first paragraph of section 27-5.109.A.1 to read: "…community-wide pedestrian circulation system and any adjoining <u>transit stops, bus stops,</u> public parks, greenways, schools, community centers, and shopping areas:…"
27-5—17 Roadway Access, Mobility, and	The Planning Director is proposed to have the ability to waive or modify sidewalk requirements. Should the Planning Director have the authority to waive sidewalks within a development?	Planning staff	This authority is proposed in Sec. 27-5.109.2.c. on page 27-5—17. In general terms, sidewalks are important to provide connectivity and accessibility within developments, and are essential components of place-making and neighborhoods. However, as this standard notes, on occasion there are going to be situations where providing a sidewalk is impossible or, at best, impractical	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Circulation Pedestrian Access and Circulation			due to topography such as steep grades. A sub-par sidewalk for the sake of having a sidewalk probably does more harm than good. The Planning Director should have the authority to modify the sidewalk requirement, and, in extreme cases only, to waive the sidewalk requirement such to the presence of such natural features.	
27-5—19 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation	The Zoning Ordinance should require off-street bikeways instead of relying on bike lanes that operating agencies may refuse to maintain.	Planning staff	This recommendation is too prescriptive and does not allow for instances where rights-of-way are not available to accommodate off-street bikeways. There are no "one size fits all" standards that would apply for every road in the County.	Make no change.
27-5—19 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Bicycle Circulation and Access	Section 27-5.110.A.2.b. seems to be a sub-part to Section 27-5.110.A.2.a.	Planning staff	Sec. 27-5.110.A.2.b describes what should happen if there is insufficient right-of-way to implement Sec. 27-5.110.A.2.a. It is appropriately placed in such a way as to reduce confusion.	Make no change.
27-5—19 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Bicycle Access and Circulation	Sec., 27-5.110.A.2.a. indicates that the applicant is responsible for installing bicycle improvements. Requiring a developer to build in the right-of-way along their site frontage has led to inconsistencies in the past. What will happen if the road agency recommends against a bicycle facility along a public right-of-way?	Planning staff	In the past, there has been discussion whether a bicycle facility should be installed if it were to only be built along a subject site frontage. Staff prefers this approach. An intermittent network of facilities that eventually creates a useable network is better than postponing construction/striping until a complete network can be built as one project – which would typically necessitate public sector investment. In past cases the Planning Board has required the applicant to dedicate right-of-way or an easement for future use, which helps facilitate future, more comprehensive action. Conditions of approval are often drafted so that should the appropriate road agency opt against an improvement, the applicant is not accountable for its construction.	Make no change.
27-5—19 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Pedestrian Access and Circulation	Language should be added to the parking area walkway standards "to recognize municipal standards, which may differ from those in the zoning ordinance."	City of Greenbelt	Parking area design, including the proposed pedestrian walkways, is governed by the County's Zoning Ordinance. Municipalities may have jurisdiction over streets and roadways, but this jurisdiction does not extend to parking area design (excepting situations where a Departure from Parking and Loading or Design Standards is involved and the municipality has been delegated authority over these departures, or municipal-owned parking lots). Since municipalities are exempt from the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance for municipal land, municipal-owned parking lots and pedestrian walkways through these parking lots may be designed to the standards the municipality decides. Otherwise, the Zoning Ordinance controls.	Make no change.
27-5—19 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Pedestrian Access and Circulation	Lighting standards along required pedestrian walkways refer to standards in the County's Specifications and Standards for Roadways and Bridges or other standards in Subtitle 23. Need a photometric plan with footcandles to evaluate this. Public rights-of-way are over lit, but we don't want inadequate lighting.	Planning staff	Staff expects photometric plans to be required for many types of development cases; however, the submittal requirements for applications are most appropriately located in the proposed Applications Manual, and should not be codified.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—20 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Bicycle Access and Circulation	Sec. 27-5.110.C.1.d. requires lighting standards that are established in the County's Specifications and Standards for Roadways and Bridges (or other standards in Subtitle 23). For Prince George's County, the approved lighting standards may be for motor vehicles and may not take bicycles into consideration.	Planning staff	County lighting standards are not specific to pedestrian and bicycle users. Providing lighting that is appropriate for pedestrian and bicyclist use would better serve the needs of the user. Staff notes the recent urban street specifications include more appropriate pedestrian- and bicyclist-scale lighting fixtures.	Make no immediate change; however, staff should continue work with DPW&T and utility agencies to determine the best provision of trail lighting over time.
27-5—20 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Bicycle Access and Circulation	"It should be encouraged that bike lanes are separated from vehicle traffic with zebra structures or pylons." "It should be required that if on street parking is available that the parked cars be placed in between the vehicular traffic and the bikes."	Communities	The style and location of bicycle lanes is often dependent upon other roadway factors including available width, intersection design, and overall traffic. Furthermore, such considerations are beyond the ability of the Zoning Ordinance to regulate since they fall within the purview of the operating agency of the roadway. The County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) is in the process of developing urban street standards, which include bicycle lanes. These standards will recommend the best bicycle lane style for the specific roadways that are incorporated in these standards.	Make no change
27-5—21 through 27-5—68 Off-Street Parking and Loading	Concern was expressed with the lack of parking in the College Park community. There are conflicts between parking availability for high-density multifamily development and adjoining civic associations/neighborhoods. A request was made to "not have one blanket lower percentage across the County"	Communities	Clarion Associates propose a comprehensive parking schedule of minimum requirement parking spaces that includes varying amounts of parking for development inside the Capital Beltway, within a transit-oriented/activity center zone, and in communities outside of the Capital Beltway. This approach provides for more nuance to address the unique characteristics of different physical locations that exist and are planned within the County, and departs from the current Zoning Ordinance's approach to have "blanket" parking requirements regardless of location.	Make no change.
27-5—21 through 27-5—68 Off-Street Parking and Loading	Parking areas can also serve as active areas and gathering spaces. Are there design considerations to provide for this potential and/or use of parking areas by pedestrians?	Planning staff	Alternative usage of parking areas is a functional challenge rather than a zoning challenge. From a broad, umbrella perspective, multipurpose parking lots are typically used in instances when there is an abundant supply of parking that regularly exceeds the demand for parking or when the parking area is partially or fully closed to automobiles to hold special events. A common approach is to reduce the number of parking spaces (as Clarion has proposed) and design the parking and development site to incorporate natural areas, green space, non-vehicular paths for connectivity, and pervious surfaces that can be used for active/passive recreation or social gatherings. However, the key design consideration for parking areas must be to design for stormwater management, shade/landscaping/micro-climate mitigation, durability, low maintenance, and functionality for the primary use – parking of automobiles. This is the intent of the proposed zoning regulations regarding parking area design.	Make no change.
27-5—22 Parking for Expansion of Existing Development	This section recommends that if an existing structure/use is expanded, then the parking must also expand. One of the definitions of expansion is the increase in number of employees. How is this reasonably enforced? Moreover, if a business needs more employees to serve customers, requiring more parking without actually increasing the building size could be to the detriment of the business. Suggest removing the number of employees as a definition of expansion.	Planning staff	Clarion's recommendation is that additional parking may be required when a business increases employees, if the current parking does not meet the off-street parking standards provided in Table 27-5.206.A Minimum Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces. The County's current standards generally require parking spaces in excess of the actual demand, resulting in surplus parking that is not used. Because Section 27–5.202.2 applies to existing development, staff believes is likely that in many instances, an existing site will have excess parking and would be able to meet the requirements in the new Zoning Ordinance without providing additional parking spaces – particularly since Clarion Associates have proposed new parking requirements that, in general, reduce the minimum amount of parking spaces required. However, this assumption would also lead us to believe that there are instances where a business	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			would be unable to meet the minimum requirements for employee parking. In these scenarios, the Planning Director may, through approval of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan, authorize up to a 30 percent reduction in the minimum number of off-street parking spaces required by Table 27-5.206.A: Minimum Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces, for nonresidential or mixed-use developments having a floor area of at least 25,000 square feet, in accordance with defined standards. The burden is on the applicant to demonstrate an increased number of employees at the time they apply for permits for the proposed expansion. They will also need to calculate the new parking need, which would be verified by staff. Since some of the minimum parking requirements proposed by Clarion Associates are based on spaces per number of employees in accordance with best practices for those particular uses, staff recommends retaining number of employees as one of the factors that may determine parking space increases for expansion of existing development.	
27-5—23 Off-Street Parking and Loading General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading Areas	There is some concern regarding Sec. 27-5.204, which requires a parking plan for any proposal with more than 100 off-street parking spaces. How would proposed parking be evaluated without a parking plan for simple projects such as a business permit that only needs a handful of spaces? It seems a parking plan should always be a requirement.	Planning staff	Staff defers to Clarion Associates.	Clarion Associates should a) explain the rationale of the parking plan threshold of 100 spaces, and b) indicate how proposed parking locations of 100 or fewer spaces would be evaluated in the development or permit review processes.
27-5—24 Off-Street Parking and Loading General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading Areas	Should the requirements regarding certification of load capacity for pervious parking areas be (or are they already in) Subtitle 32 of the County Code?	Planning staff	While there should be no duplication of the Zoning Ordinance and Subtitle 32 of the County Code, it may be appropriate to speak to the ability of pervious or semi-pervious surfacing handling the weight of proposed parking without impairing the pervious nature of the surfacing. The primary concern is that such certification may require a geotechnical survey, which would best be addressed through Subtitle 32 and other County agencies.	Clarion Associates should review Subtitle 32 to see if pervious and semi-pervious surfaces are addressed and include certification requirements. If so, it may be best to retain the first sentence of Sec. 27-5.205.B.2. and delete the rest of the text from the Zoning Ordinance.
27-5—24 Off-Street Parking and Loading General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading Areas	Sec. 27-5.205.C.1.b. “states that ‘no parking incidental to parking’. Parking should never be allowed on sidewalks. The statement is confusing. How can parking be incidental to parking?”	City of Greenbelt	The sentence reads: “…so no parking or **maneuvering** incidental to parking shall occur on a public street or sidewalk.” [Emphasis added]. There is no need to revise the statement.	Make no change.
27-5—25 Parking and Loading Area Markings	The second requirement for markings seems to suggest that a centerline stripe should be installed on any road with angled parking, but it also says "this requirement does not apply to parking lot drive aisles." Since this is within the off- street parking and loading section, where on site would this section be applicable?	Planning staff	Section 27-5.205.D.2 reads “One-way and two-way accesses into required parking facilities shall be identified by directional arrows. Any two-way access located at any angle other than 90 degrees to a street shall be marked with a traffic separation stripe running the length of the access. This requirement does not apply to parking lot drive aisles.” This statement refers to the angles of the access into the parking lot from the street, not of the parking spaces themselves.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—28 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Space Standards	Regarding Sec. 27-5.206.A., "is it appropriate to consider garage spaces as parking spaces? Many garage spaces are used for storage. When this happens parking demand is offset to streets or other available parking. Also, should there be a minimum width for a garage door opening to be considered a parking space?"	City of Greenbelt	Yes, garage spaces should be considered parking spaces. There would seem to be no compelling reason to require a minimum garage door width to count the garage space(s) as parking spaces.	Make no change.
27-5—28 through 27-5—49 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Space Standards	"Parking minimums should be lowered. They encourage excess vehicle use and pollution. They decrease walkability since they often lead to buildings that are further apart. Frankly the market should be left decide how many spaces should be built, but if that is not acceptable parking minimums should be decreased considerably." "All of the parking minimums are based on standards in very carcentric [sic] areas. If the zoning revisions are going to be forward thinking [the County] needs to look at better examples than Sacramento or Pasadena."	Communities	The parking minimums proposed by Clarion Associates are, in nearly all cases, less than required by the current code. Further, Clarion Associates propose no minimum parking requirements within the core area of the Regional Transit-Oriented (RTO) and Local Transit-Oriented (LTO) zones, which will be the parts of the County with the best transit accessibility. Many of the proposed parking minimums are based on implemented standards from other communities similar to Prince George's County, and balance parking demand with market considerations. The standards from Sacramento and Pasadena are from areas that are like Prince George's County in that they are fast urbanizing areas having to manage parking for both dense and non-dense areas. Additionally, Pasadena is served by the Los Angeles Metro Gold Line rail transit line. Other jurisdictions, including Arlington, VA, are also used as the basis for the parking minimums recommended by Clarion.	Make no change.
27-5—29 through 27-5—49 Off-Street Parking and Loading	We should drastically reduce parking requirements at our Metro stations.	Communities	Staff concurs, and notes that Clarion Associates have recommended no parking space minimums for the core area of the proposed Regional Transit-Oriented (RTO) and Local Transit-Oriented (LTO) zones. These zones would likely be applied at 14 of the County's 15 Metro stations (as a Plan Prince George's 2035-designated Neighborhood Local Center, the Southern Avenue Metro Station would not be eligible for these zones given the currently proposed locational criteria). Clarion Associates generally proposed reduced parking minimums throughout the County as compared to the current regulations.	Make no change.
27-5—29 through 27-5—49; 24-3—2 Minimum Number of Off-Street Parking Standards and Public Facility Adequacy	Following the presentation of Module 2 (development regulations) to the County Council, several Council offices expressed concern about having no parking minimums or transportation test for adequate public facilities in the proposed Regional Transit Oriented (RTO) Zone. Council staff asked if it were possible to have an easier test to incentivize investment but still have a test.	Council	It should be noted that only locations within the core areas of the proposed Regional Transit Oriented (RTO) and Local Transit-Oriented (LTO) zones are proposed to have no minimum parking space requirement. The core area of these zones is expected to occur generally within one-quarter mile of a transit station and are the areas of the County with the most transit accessibility and alternatives to the automobile. Not requiring a minimum amount of parking is not the same as banning parking. Staff expects developers will still propose parking believed to be necessary to support the proposed development program. Public facility adequacy will be addressed in the staff analysis of comments received on the proposed Subdivision Regulations.	Make no change.
27-5—29 through 27-5—49 Off-Street Parking and Loading Minimum Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces	WMATA prefers minimum parking requirements or at least the lowest possible minimum.	WMATA	The proposed parking space requirements include a zero-minimum parking space requirement for the "core" of transit-oriented/activity center base and Planned Development zones (the area generally within ¼ mile of a transit facility) and reduced parking space requirements for the "edge" areas of these zones (generally between ¼ and ½ mile of a transit facility). Clarion Associates also propose lower minimum parking requirements in general than what is mandated by the current Zoning Ordinance.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			Additionally, there are adjustments, Transportation Demand Management measures, alternative parking strategies, and shared parking policies that can help further reduce parking demands.	
27-5—29 through 27-5—49 Minimum Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces	The minimum parking is insufficient. Accessible parking is insufficient.	Communities	Reduced parking minimums do not mean that no parking will be built. It means the builder will have more discretion to build the amount of parking that is deemed appropriate for the context of the proposed development. The parking table proposed by Clarion Associates establishes reduced parking minimums for most uses and locations in the County because we have been providing too much parking, essentially planning and building for the worst case scenario (the week before Christmas) when much of the parking will remain unused for most of the year. Developers can provide more parking up to a certain maximum amount based on the use and location. Should additional parking be necessary, the development can conduct a parking demand study and use some of the other parking approaches recommended in the Zoning Ordinance. Accessible parking requirements reference and match the Americans with Disabilities Act guidelines.	Make no change.
27-5—29 Off-Street Parking and Loading Minimum Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces	In the parking schedule, does medical office count as office?	Developers	Yes.	Make no change.
27-5—29 Off-Street Parking and Loading Minimum Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces	How is parking for shopping centers calculated? Are there parking caps for entire shopping centers?	Developers	When a shopping center application is submitted, parking would be calculated based on expected uses and square footage. Additional parking is only required for new high-traffic generators.	Make no change.
27-5—35 Off-Street Parking and Loading	Is the parking requirement for educational uses based on student enrolment? What does design capacity refer to?	Planning staff	The design capacity refers to the maximum number of students that the private school facility was designed to accommodate without being considered over-capacity.	Make no change.
27-5—50 Off-Street Parking and Loading Mixed-Use Developments and Shared Parking	Would like to know the basis for determining the “Time-of-Day Demand Factors” for shared parking, as shown on Table 27-5.206.C.1, and would like to have an opportunity to evaluate the basis for determining those factors.	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman	While this table appears to be a version of shared parking tables developed by the Urban Land Institute, staff is not positive as to its source. his is a question best suited for Clarion Associates to address.	Clarion Associates should provide the project team with the source of this table.
27-5—51 Off-Street Parking and Loading Maximum Number	Include a description of how to calculate parking maximums/minimums. If two reductions can be made, are they both calculated based on the initial parking minimum, or one after the other? All parking reductions should be calculated based on the initial parking minimum. This will	Planning staff	Staff notes the standards proposed by Clarion Associates to determine the maximum number of parking spaces currently apply to separate situations: commercial development, and mixed-use development. Therefore, there are not two reductions since development would fall into just one of these categories.	Clarion Associates should provide the project team with additional information as to why maximum parking numbers are not recommended

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
of Parking Spaces	remove the discrepancy if two parking reductions are for different percentages.		However, there is a broader set of questions that arise from this comment. Most importantly, is it the intent there will be no maximum number of off-street parking spaces for development either in a transit-oriented/activity center base zone or inside the Capital Beltway? Clarion Associates indicates this section is deliberately intended to discourage commercial development from providing overly large paved parking lots. Why would this logic not necessarily apply to the more densely developed parts of the County?	except under the proposed conditions on page 27-5—51.
27-5—51 Off-Street Parking and Loading Maximum Number of Parking Spaces	Is the 125 percent parking maximum (for commercial development outside the Capital Beltway and outside the transit-oriented/activity center base zones) and the 110 percent maximum (for mixed-use development outside the Capital Beltway and outside the transit-oriented/activity center base zones) the maximum that is allowed before an adjustment is required? If that is the case, can a development increase parking to 125 percent and then ask for an adjustment in addition to the 125 percent?	Planning staff	Yes. These recommended parking maximums establish the maximum number of off-street parking spaces that can be provided by a proposed use before an adjustment may be desired. For example, if a retail sales business outside the Capital Beltway must provide a minimum of 20 parking spaces, this regulation establishes their maximum number of parking spaces at 25 spaces (125 percent of the minimum). Should this business wish to provide more parking, the applicant would need to seek approval of an alternative parking plan or seek an adjustment or a variance. Yes, a development may seek to increase parking above the maximums established by this Section by seeking an adjustment or variance.	Make no change.
27-5—51 Off-Street Parking and Loading Maximum Number of Parking Spaces	Need maximum parking standards and incentives for alternative parking arrangements (shared parking and TDM).	Planning staff	Transportation demand management standards are found in Sec. 27-5.209.B of the proposed Zoning Ordinance. Maximum parking numbers for off-street parking spaces for certain development outside Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones and outside the Capital Beltway are provided for in Sec. 27-5.206.D. This analysis of comments document seeks clarity from Clarion Associates about why maximum parking numbers are not recommended in these center zones or inside the Capital Beltway.	Make no other change
27-5—51 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Space Standards	How will the “reasonable parking fee” be determined? Leaving such subjective determinations to individual plan reviewers causes some concern. How would this be monitored over time?	City of Greenbelt	It would not be appropriate to use the Zoning Ordinance to attempt to set or define “reasonable parking fees.” There is an inherent subjective nature to any such criterion, and such decisions should result from more in-depth analysis of the circumstances involved, the specific alternative parking approaches that are proposed, etc.	Make no change.
27-5—52 Off-Street Parking and Loading	Should allow electric vehicle charging stations.	Planning staff	Electric vehicle charging stations are allowed and encouraged.	Make no change.
27-5—53 Off-Street Parking and Loading Dimensional Standards for Parking Spaces and Aisles	“Only straight and parallel space should be allowed. Angled spaces are nearly impossible to back into. It is far safer to back into parking spaces than it is to back out of them....Only spaces that can easily be backed into (straight or parallel spots) should be permitted.”	Communities	Angled spaces allow a parking lot drive aisle to be narrower, which can reduce crossing distances for pedestrians and may be the only feasible parking approach for one-way streets in some circumstances. Prohibiting angled parking spaces removes a potentially useful tool from the zoning toolbox.	Make no change.
27-5—55 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Alternatives	Section 27-5.208 contains recommendations for locating shared parking spaces within specified maximum walking distances of the primary pedestrian entrances to uses served by the parking. The recommended distances for off-site shared parking top at 1,320 feet (1/4 mile).	WMATA	Staff interprets WMATA’s comment that the “rule is the reverse” to mean that WMATA allows 1,500 feet for shared parking to serve residential uses, and shorter distances for office or mixed-use development. Staff believes the distances and ordering proposed by Clarion Associates are appropriate. A shorter maximum walking distance from the primary pedestrian entrance to a residential building to the shared parking location is desirable because it reduces weather impacts and	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
	The WMATA station planning guide recommends 1,500 feet. Further, this rule is the reverse of the proposed distances when walking distance to transit is concerned.		provides additional safety when people are walking to or from their home. Conversely, having the largest walking distance apply between shared parking areas and the entrances to office uses is desirable because there is less frequency necessary for such trips. People tend to walk to or from their car twice in a working day, perhaps more for a lunch trip, while they may need to make multiple daily trips between their car and home. Clarion Associates generally outline this philosophy in footnote 121. While additional coordination with WMATA may be necessary on a case-by-case basis to address any issues that may arise between differing regulations, there is no compelling reason to adjust the proposed zoning regulation at this time.	
27-5—56 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Alternatives	If an agreement between properties and/or uses is required to be recorded in the land records as a mutually restrictive (or beneficial) covenant, there is no need to prohibit transfers of only one of the two properties because the new owner is automatically bound by the recorded agreement. This prohibition will make it impossible for WMATA to share parking or for any two owners of adjoining land to share parking where the property with the parking is owned separately from the benefitted land. This is counterproductive. A non-violating benefitted owner should not be required to discontinue the use of its property because of a breach by the burdened property.	WMATA	While staff does not see or necessarily agree with how the proposed requirement would make it impossible for WMATA to share parking, staff does agree that this regulation seems potentially problematic and should be revised. Staff has some concern regarding Sec. 27-5.208.C.6.b. If the property containing the shared parking facility is sold and the parking no longer made available, it seems that the owner of the served use may be unfairly disadvantaged if they cannot locate alternative parking spaces. Forcing discontinuation of the use may have negative financial impacts on the County. Furthermore, this provision seems particularly difficult to track and enforce. This same comment applies to Sec. 27-5.208.E.2.b, dealing with on-street parking agreements.	Clarion Associates should remove the provision of Sec. 27-5.208.C.6.a that directly links transfers of land between the property contain the use and the property containing the shared-parking area. If this provision is somehow essential to the success of the shared parking agreement, Clarion should provide additional information to the project team. Clarion Associates should also re-evaluate the need for Secs. 27-5.208.C.6.b. and 27-5.208.E.2.b. and provide suggestions to the project team.
27-5—56 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Alternatives	How did Clarion determine 15 years for a shared/joint parking agreement?	Communities	Clarion Associates responded that there is no “right” number for the length of time for a parking agreement and is open to suggestions. The proposed 15-year timeframe is based on other jurisdictions with successful shared parking agreements.	Make no change.
27-5—57 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Alternatives	There isn’t any “same ownership” requirements for off-site parking in Sec. 27-5.208.D.4.a. as there is in the shared parking agreement section. This further suggests that the “same ownership” requirement in Sec. 27-5.208.C.6.a is unnecessary.	WMATA	Comment noted.	Make no change.
27-5—59 Off Street Parking and Loading Off-	Regarding the Parking Demand Study required to demonstrate reductions based on deferred parking agreements, it will be interesting to see how well these studies are done and the results enforced. How will violators be punished?	WMATA	Violators of any provisions of the Zoning Ordinance would be subject to the enforcement provisions recommended by Clarion Associates in Module 3 (process and administration). Details on the alternative parking plans and studies conducted to support deferred parking and other approaches should be incorporated in the Procedures Manual that will be prepared upon approval of the new Zoning Ordinance.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Street Parking Alternatives				
27-5—59 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Alternatives	Can reserve parking be required, but at less than the 25 percent set-aside?	City of Greenbelt	Yes. The proposed regulation reads: "…of up to 25 percent…," which means any figure below 25 percent may be proposed to be set aside as deferred parking.	Make no change.
27-5—60 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Alternatives	In order to determine that the drop-off and pick-up points will not be located in a fire lane would require that the fire lanes be designated during the plan review process. Fire lanes are usual designated by a fire marshal after construction. Fire lanes are not discussed in this module as part of the planning process. Additionally, drop-off and pick-up areas are not permitted in moving vehicle and bicycle travel lanes in the public right-of-way without obtaining a street closure permit. "Does this assume that a street will be permanently closed (and perhaps abandoned) as part of the development review process? Or is this anticipating something that would happen post development review? It would be cleaner to state that drop-off and pick-up areas are not allowed in travel lanes and omit any reference to street closure permits."	City of Greenbelt	Fire lanes are not addressed in the current Zoning Ordinance or Subdivision Regulations, nor should they be; they are part of the fire safety code. Fire lanes are coordinated with the fire department through referrals and discussion as part of the development review process. Drop-off and pick-up with regard to travel lanes and closure permits refers to temporary closures of rights-of-way to vehicular traffic for special events. Simply prohibiting drop-off and pick-up areas from travel lanes may have unintended negative consequences.	Make no change.
27-5—60 Off-Street Parking and Loading	Replace the term "future off-street parking" with "potential off-street parking" in the section titled "Landscaping of Reserve Areas Required."	WMATA	This proposed requirement requires future off-street parking areas that are approved as part of a deferred parking approach to be landscaped with ground cover. Staff believes this to be an appropriate regulation to prevent vacant ground and to improve stormwater management.	Make no change.
27-5—60 Off-Street Parking and Loading Off-Street Parking Alternatives	Instead of an agreement for valet parking (Sec. 27-5.208.G.3), replace it with a restrictive covenant. This agreement seems too long to be feasible. Why would a landowner give a valet company a 10-year contract that cannot be terminated (even if the valet company defaults)? A simple restrictive covenant by a landowner working unilaterally would be best.	WMATA	Staff defers to Clarion Associates.	Clarion Associates should provide the project team with additional detail as to whether a valet parking agreement is the best approach, if a covenant is possible or recommended, if the 10-year timeframe is appropriate and advisable, etc. What happens in situations where the business served by the valet parking agreement is discontinued? Most restaurants do not make it to ten years of operation, for example. Refer to comments made elsewhere in this analysis regarding Sec. 27-5.208.G.3.b and the discontinuation of the use served by valet parking if the

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
				service becomes unavailable and additional off-street parking spaces cannot be provided.
27-5—61 Off-Street Parking and Loading Reduced Parking Standards for Parking Demand Reduction Strategies	"A Parking Reduction Strategy study should be required for developments of a certain size rather than an optional approach. Perhaps if 2 acres or more are under development."	Communities	Further discussion and analysis is needed to determine how to best reduce parking and overall motor vehicle traffic for developments in specific areas of the County. The size of a development does not necessarily indicate the amount of generated vehicle traffic/parking demand. Additionally, staff is concerned that requiring parking reduction strategies for all development that exceeds a certain size could a) make enforcement and operation of parking reduction approaches infeasible due to the sheer number of potential approaches that would come into play, and b) detract from more collaborative approaches from groupings of developers/properties by preempting such opportunities.	Clarion Associates should discuss alternative approaches for parking reduction strategies and encouraging additional use of Transportation Demand Management techniques with the project team.
27-5—63 Off-Street Parking and Loading Reduced Parking Standards for Parking Demand Reduction Strategies	Regarding the recording of a transportation demand management plan, "in perpetuity" is a very long time. What happens if the building is demolished or its use materially changes" such as from office to multifamily residential?	WMATA	The requirements listed in the proposed Zoning Ordinance intended to implement a TDM plan seem potentially onerous, and the time frame (in perpetuity) presents further challenges for the developer to implement TDM.	Clarion Associates should reevaluate the TDM measures and propose alternative approaches to implementing TDM, with emphasis on the long-term viability and oversight over time. A perpetual TDM agreement may not work for many reasons. What is the best alternative?
27-5—63 Off-Street Parking and Loading Reduced Parking Strategies for Parking Demand Management Strategies	What is the penalty for failure to provide a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) report?	City of Greenbelt	Failure to provide the TDM report – and, in fact, failure to meet any of the standards and regulations of the new Zoning Ordinance – would be considered a violation of the ordinance and involve enforcement measures as proposed in Division 27-7 Enforcement in Module 3 (Process and Administration and Subdivision Regulations).	Make no change.
27-5—65 Off-Street Parking and Loading	There appear to be no minimum bicycle parking standards.	Planning staff	Bicycle parking standards can be found in Sec. 27-5.210. This section sets standards for the minimum number of bicycle racks/lockers as a ratio to vehicle parking spaces.	Make no change.
27-5—66 Off-Street Parking and Loading Bicycle Parking Standards	Do the long-term bicycle parking standards apply to Metro bike parking facilities? Only the College Park station has a covered bicycle parking area today.	WMATA	WMATA is exempt from the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed regulation suggests that long-term facilities should be provided for stays of eight hours or longer or overnight. This could be interpreted as commutes where a person rides a bicycle to their office and they bicycle is parked for eight hours during the day at the office. Although the regulation doesn't explicitly indicate transit stations, covered/secure bicycle parking would benefit a person who rides a bicycle to transit, then rides transit to their final destination and returns eight hours later.	Make no change.
27-5—68 through 27-5—75	Who will determine how open space set-asides will be used within a particular community?	Communities	Open space set-asides are intended to provide public or private open spaces that may be used by future residents or workers of new development. The proposed regulations offer guidance as to providing such set-asides adjacent to existing or planned public open spaces, but does not	Clarion Associates should clarify if the intent is to allow woodland conservation areas to be credited.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Open Space Set-Asides			require or dictate the location on individual sites or the ultimate ownership of open space set-asides. These details would be determined on a case-by-case basis. One question that occurred while reviewing this comment is what, if any, relationship the open space set-asides would have with the County's woodland conservation ordinance. The set-asides allow "double-counting" of other required environmental features such as buffers and landscaping, but it is unclear if this extends to woodland conservation requirements. A more generic reference to "woodland areas" is part of the "Natural Features" option, but should be clarified.	
27-5—68 through 27-5—75 Open Space Set-Asides	Regarding open space set-aside provisions, would suggest they be scaled. Instead of percentages across the board, treat it differently depending on the size of the site.	Hyattsville Planning Committee	Staff defers to Clarion Associates to address this comment.	Clarion Associates should advise the project team of the pros and cons of scaling open space based on the size of the site instead of using fixed percentages based on the general use classifications proposed for a given zone.
27-5—68 through 27-5—75 Open Space Set-Asides	Can open space areas can be paved as well as green space?	Planning staff	Yes. Open space areas can be active/passive recreational areas, plazas, landscaped, planted or maintained as lawn area, or stormwater management areas, among other approaches.	Make no change.
27-5—68 through 27-5—75 Open Space Set-Asides	Can set-asides be private or privately held space?	Maryland Building Industry Association	Yes, the open space set-asides can be privately-held space, but there must be deed restrictions, covenants, or other legal instruments to ensure the continued use of the land for open space purposes, in perpetuity, and to provide for management, operation, and maintenance of both the land and any facilities that may exist.	Make no change.
27-5—68 through 27-5—75 Open Space Set-Asides	Can open space set-asides be used for school properties?	Planning staff	The recommended regulations do not suggest use of open space set-asides as public school space. In most situations, land used as set-asides may not be conveniently located or large enough to permit use as a school. Furthermore, the purposes of the open space set-asides focus on preserving natural resources, ensuring resident access to open areas and active recreation, providing meeting spaces, enhancing stormwater management, and providing other health benefits. School buildings themselves would achieve few of these purposes. That said, staff recognizes there are many benefits offered by public schools and that school locations are hard to come by in the County, and this potential should be investigated. This may not be feasible in that the set-asides are not land dedications to an agency, they are owned	Clarion Associates should provide the project team with a recommendation as to whether it would be valuable to use open space set-asides as school properties.
27-5—68 Open Space Set-Asides	Many open spaces are built as large stormwater management ponds. These have become mosquito breeding areas. It is better to collect and hold stormwater on smaller sites.	Communities	While stormwater management facilities may be counted toward both the open space set-asides requirement and green building standards/incentives, stormwater management is regulated by other parts of the County Code. The design and engineering of stormwater management approaches is not part of this project.	Make no change.
27-5—69 Open Space Set-Asides	There is some confusion resulting from the applicability statement that reads: "Single-family detached dwellings or two-family dwellings on a single-lot."	Planning staff	The intent of this applicability statement is to exempt infill development of a single dwelling from the requirement to provide an open space set-aside. Subdivisions of multiple dwellings on separate lots would handle overall open space design as part of the subdivision to establish the lots. Additional clarity in the wording of the exemption statement would probably help reduce confusion.	Clarion Associates should revise the applicability statement(s) to clarify their intent.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—69 Open Space Set-Asides Amount of Open Space Set Asides Required	The proposed set-asides for development in the Nonresidential and Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones seem low.	City of Greenbelt	Comment noted. There are no open space set-aside requirements in the current Zoning Ordinance, so all of the requirements in this section are higher than the status quo. Regarding the Nonresidential zones and especially the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones, density and intensity of development is a key component so the balance becomes one between developed space and open space. Staff recommends evaluating the open space set-aside requirements over time and adjusting in the future as may be necessary.	Make no change.
27-5—70 Open Space Set-Asides	Is green space countable toward the open space set-asides?	Maryland Building Industry Association	Natural features are counted as open space set-asides. Natural features are described as including lakes, ponds, rivers, streams, bays shorelines, wetlands, drainageways, and other riparian areas, riparian buffers, flood hazard areas, steep slopes (15 percent or greater), wildlife habitat and woodland areas. Required landscape areas and agricultural buffers can also be counted toward the open space set-asides, as can stormwater management areas which are treated as site amenities.	Make no change.
27-5—70 Open Space Set-Asides Areas Counted as Open Space Set-Asides	Table 27-5.305: Open Space Set-Aside Features speaks to "land dedicated for parks." Is this public or private land?	City of Greenbelt	Both public and privately-owned lands – including park space – would count toward the open space set-asides. The specific reference in question states: "…and land dedicated for parks in accordance with Subtitle 24…." This refers to the parks and recreation provisions in the Subdivision Regulations, which deal more typically with public parklands.	Make no change.
27-5—70 through 27-5—72 Open Space Set-Asides	Regarding open space set-asides, can natural features be included as stormwater facilities?	Planning staff	Not natural features per se. To the extent a natural feature acts as natural stormwater management, it would certainly count toward the open space set-aside requirements should the developer choose to pursue the natural features option. However, it is much more likely stormwater management facilities will need to be constructed in the development process, and Clarion Associates provides for this scenario. Under the open space set-asides proposal, up to 75 percent of the land area occupied by stormwater management facilities can count toward the required open space set-aside for a development when these stormwater management facilities are designed and treated as amenities. Stormwater management facilities that are not designed as site amenities will not be able to count toward the set-asides requirement.	Make no change.
27-5—74 Open Space Set-Asides	There does not seem to be a requirement for plazas or forecourts.	WMATA	Plazas, forecourts, and other types of open space set-asides are left to the discretion of the developer. The requirement for open space set-asides in terms of the percentage of a property that must be set-aside is the key. Flexibility is permitted regarding how these set-asides may be designed or located.	Make no change.
27-5—75 Open Space Set-Asides	The three options for management of open space set-asides are kept in perpetuity, which is a very long time. Some flexibility is needed.	WMATA	WMATA is exempt from the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance. In general terms, staff agrees with Clarion Associates' rationale that open space set-aside areas under private ownership include permanent easements, covenants, or other legal instruments because this provides the necessary surety that the set-asides will remain as open space and not be developed in the future.	Make no change.
27-5—75 Fences and Walls	Are the fencing and walls standards only for single-family residential uses or for all uses?	Hyattsville Planning Committee	The fence and wall standards would apply to a variety of uses, not just single-family residential development.	Make no change.
27-5—76 Fences and Walls General Standards	Regarding allowing fences and walls on the property line between two or more parcels of land in private ownership, how does this address shared ownership and maintenance responsibility?	City of Greenbelt	All this provision does is indicate a property owner can put a fence on their property line, which is the common approach to fencing property for privacy or security. The person who builds the fence is responsible for the ownership and maintenance.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—83 through 27-5—89 Exterior Lighting	Concern was expressed regarding the proposed exterior lighting standards. Are there situations where we may not want fully shielded lighting fixtures, which may be a safety issue?	Planning staff	The exterior lighting regulations focus on full cut-off lighting fixtures, which would allow better aiming of light to where it is needed and prevent light spill-over into the sky. Safe lighting at night depends on uniformity in lighting, which prevents the creation of shadows and dark areas between lit and unlit areas. This is a more important consideration for safety and crime prevention than any other factor pertaining to light.	Make no change.
27-5—84 Exterior Lighting Applicability	"High quality full and nearly full cut off lighting exists for sporting venues. As good as this section is, it could be better if new sporting venues in the county [sic] have to use or are at least encouraged to use full cut off fixtures." Should also encourage the use of timing devices to ensure outdoor recreational lighting does not continue after the curfew time.	Communities	It is not just full cut-off fixtures that are regulated by proposed Sec. 27-5.600 Exterior Lighting, but also aspects of lighting design such as the maximum height of lighting fixtures, hours of illumination, and light calibration requirements. It is not practicable to remove sporting venue lighting from the list of generally exempted fixtures. However, staff notes page 27-5—88 specifically requires glare control packages for sports and performance venues that will help achieve the requested outcome. Automatic lighting cut-off based on timing devices would not allow events that have been in progress prior to the curfew time to continue past that time; therefore, they are too limiting and are not advisable to require in this circumstance.	Make no change.
27-5—85 Exterior Lighting Street Lighting	"Please add a section that requires replacement systems to comply with these new standards."	Communities	While a good suggestion, this may not be feasible in practice because replacement of street lighting fixtures is often considered ordinary maintenance and is exempt from any permitting requirements; this means it would be impossible to enforce such a requirement. Additionally, requiring updated street lighting to meet the new standards may preclude the updated street lights from being consistent with existing development.	Make no change.
27-5—85 Exterior Lighting Street Lighting	Add a new standard "C" to require that all new street lights have LED bulbs.	Communities	While staff agrees with the general intent to encourage energy efficiency, requiring any particular type of lighting is too proscriptive. Further, requiring a single lighting type could preclude future lighting technologies that would be more efficient that LED lighting. Staff notes Sec. 27-5.605.E requires color-correct lighting types such as Halogen, LED, or metal halide, which speaks, in part, to the comment. It must be noted that most street lights will likely be provided within the right-of-way, and therefore would be subject to the regulations of the operating agency rather than the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed standards are included primarily for private streets and situations where street light fixtures may be installed on private property.	Make no change.
27-5—87 Exterior Lighting Lighting Design Standards for Specific Uses and Site Features	Why are internally-illuminated awnings prohibited? "How does this impact signage in awnings?"	City of Greenbelt	Internally-lit awnings are only prohibited if the awnings are transparent, semi-transparent, or translucent to prevent additional light pollution and spill-over. Awnings may be internally illuminated if the awning material is entirely opaque. Awning signage is addressed in the signage regulations.	Make no change.
27-5—88 Exterior Lighting Lighting Design Standards for Specific Uses and Site Features	Why are wall pack light sources visible from locations off the site prohibited?	City of Greenbelt	Staff defers to Clarion Associates for this question.	Clarion Associates should provide the project team with the rationale as to why wall pack light sources visible off-site are prohibited.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—89 Exterior Lighting Lighting Design Standards for Specific Uses and Site Features	The measurement of exterior lighting requirements only focus on light levels at the lot lines and do not speak to lighting levels within the interior of the property.	Planning staff	Staff wonders as to the best practices for zoning regulation of lighting levels interior to development sites and lots.	Clarion Associates should let the project team know if it is common to regulate interior site lighting levels and, if so, offer recommendations on appropriate regulations to include in the new Zoning Ordinance.
27-5—89 Environmental Protection and Noise Controls Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation	Community members spoke on their desire to preserve remaining woodland within Prince George's County.	Community	There are three sections of the proposed development standards that speak directly to woodland preservation. Section 27-5.700, Environmental Protection and Noise Controls Woodland, would require that new development comply with the County's requirements for woodland conservation, tree preservation, and tree canopy coverage in accordance with Subtitle 25 of the Prince George's County Code. Woodland conservation and preservation is not a direct function of the Zoning Ordinance. Sections 27-5.1400 and 27-5.1500 address green building standards and incentives. These standards offer options to encourage development to retain at least 20 percent of the existing pre-development natural vegetation. This may be an avenue to help protect natural forest or green spaces in a community.	Make no change.
27-5—89 27-5—90 Environmental Protection and Noise Controls	Can the Zoning Ordinance help reduce emissions?	Planning staff	No. Emissions are a regional issue. Local efforts could be made to reduce driving, and the new regulations of the Zoning Ordinance would address increased connectivity, infill development, modern use controls, and other aspects that may contribute to solutions, but overall emissions also originate from neighboring jurisdictions.	Make no change.
27-5—89 27-5—90 Environmental Protection and Noise Controls	With regard to regulated environmental features, should mitigation be required for any impacts that are not limited to water and sewer connections, storm drainage outfalls, road crossings, and master plan trails and roads?	Planning staff	This question seems to pertain more to other parts of the County Code that regulate environmental features, and does not directly impact the Zoning Ordinance or Subdivision Regulations.	Make no change.
27-5—89 27-5—90 Environmental Protection and Noise Controls	Are we factoring in tree canopy as part of development standards? What can be done to encourage preservation of mature trees?	Planning Board	Tree canopy coverage is controlled by Subtitle 25 of the County Code, not in the Zoning Ordinance. A Natural Resources Inventory is often required as part of the development process to demonstrate conformance with the tree canopy ordinance. Alternatively, an exemption letter may be issued where a project would not need to comply, but there would need to be justification and a staff review to determine the project is truly exempt or should be subject.	Make no change.
27-5—89 27-5—90 Environmental Protection and Noise Controls	Is it necessary to require a green area ratio?	Planning staff	No; Clarion Associates believe the purposes of a green area ratio are is best implemented through a combination of tree canopy, landscaping requirements, and open space set-aside requirements.	Make no change.
27-5—90	Do the noise controls apply to noise generated by trains on joint development sites?	WMATA	While WMATA is exempt from the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance, any noise generated by WMATA operations that exceed the thresholds at the property lines will need to be mitigated by the affected property owners. WMATA should be aware that their operations are noise generators that impact private sector development – which may include joint development sites.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Environmental Protection and Noise Controls				
27-5—90 Environmental Protection and Noise Controls	How will noise control be enforced?	City of Greenbelt	Noise is controlled by Subtitle 19 of the County Code. Enforcement is up to the Director of the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement; the Police Chief, or any police officer. The proposed noise standards are recommended to be revised by staff to the state standards for decibel levels. Mitigation would need to be demonstrated in the development entitlement process.	Make no change.
27-5—90 Environmental Protection and Noise Control	There is no need for erosion and sediment control requirements, they are covered in other ordinances.	City of Greenbelt	Staff notes the proposed Zoning Ordinance does not regulate erosion and sedimentation control in any way. Instead, it simply cross-references to the appropriate provisions – in this case, Subtitle 32 of the County Code – as an indication to all readers that compliance with the County's environmental codes is required.	Make no change.
27-5—90 through 27-5—96 Multifamily, Townhouse, and Three-Family Form and Design Standards	How will the new zoning regulations manage materials such as vinyl siding?	Council, Planning staff	The proposed regulations to not dictate specific building materials. Instead, the regulations focus on the more important architectural and form standards such as the building's mass, height, placement and orientation, and transparency (e.g. windows and doors). Architecture in the form of styling and materials is extremely subjective and difficult to effectively regulate. It is literally akin to attempting to regulate art – architecture is a form of art. What one feels is "good" architecture is quite different from what another feels. It is generally not effective to attempt to regulate architecture, including required materials, and staff recommends no such regulation occur.	Make no change.
27-5—90 through 27-5—96 Multifamily, Townhouse, and Three-Family Form and Design Standards	Townhouses are considered a multifamily type in these proposals; why are they not considered a single-family type? Why are townhouses considered multifamily dwellings and not single-family?	Municipalities, City of Greenbelt	Clarion Associates' recommends the integration of the current Townhouse (R-T) Zone into the proposed Multifamily Residential-12 (MFR-12) Zone based on maximum permitted density (Clarion recommends a corresponding increase in the maximum permitted townhouse density from 6 dwellings per acre to 12). Additionally, for purposes of massing and form regulations in Module 2 (Development Regulations) and in other parts of the proposed Zoning Ordinance, townhouses are grouped with multifamily development because a "stick" or "row" of townhouses have a very similar built form, or size, as a traditional multifamily walk-up building. Rather than create a separate section of form and massing standards that would apply only to single-family attached buildings, Clarion Associates, based on the approach taken by many other jurisdictions, recommend treating them similarly to multifamily buildings. This approach makes sense to the project team. Modern zoning codes place much less emphasis on separation of residential uses by the type of dwelling unit than they do on ensuring the types of residential development permitted in any one given zone are of similar density and development form. There is no compelling reason to separate townhouses from any other type of residential development – either multifamily or single-family – so long as they result in compatible densities and forms. Staff notes that a number of the current Residential zones in the Zoning Ordinance already permit a mix of residential types within the same zone; therefore, Clarion's recommendations do not significantly differ from current regulations.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—90 through 27-5—96 Multifamily, Townhouse, and Three-Family Form and Design Standards	Do we want to add two-family attached to this section to be similar to multifamily, townhouse, and three-family? Thinking about "two-over-two" designs in particular.	Planning staff	The "two-over-two" design consists of a two-story dwelling unit stacked atop another two-story dwelling unit, and would be captured by Clarion Associates' proposed definition for two-family dwellings. However, the built form of "two-over-two" buildings looks most similar to a tall townhouse. Staff is leery of subjecting all two-family dwellings to these particular form and design standards, but defers to Clarion Associates' expertise regarding the design of "two-over-two" building forms.	Clarion Associates should provide the project team with a recommendation regarding the form and design of "two-over-two" buildings.
27-5—91 Multifamily, Townhouse, and Three-Family Form and Design Standards	"So Monday thru Friday above ground floor retail is exempt?"	WMATA	The Multifamily, Townhouse, and Three-Family Form and Design Standards do not apply to any dwelling units located above a nonresidential use. It does not specify the operating hours of the nonresidential use.	Make no change.
27-5—91 Multifamily, Townhouse, and Three-Family Form and Design Standards Applicability	Why should interior renovations in a residential building trigger compliance with the exterior form and design standards?	City of Greenbelt	Staff defers to Clarion Associates for this question.	Clarion Associates should provide the project team with the rationale as to why interior alterations of residential buildings should require conformance to the form and design standards.
27-5—94 Multifamily, Townhouse, and Three-Family Form and Design Standards	The roof standards seem too specific on what types of roofs should be developed.	Planning staff	Staff believes that the proposed roof standards for multifamily, townhouse, and three-family development are intended to reflect the most common development approaches and historical patterns of the Mid-Atlantic region while also provide for and ensuring variety and freedom of expression.	Make no change.
27-5—94 27-5—101 Multifamily, Townhouse, and Three-Family Form and Design Standards Nonresidential and Mixed-Use Form and Design Standards	"A certain percentage of all roofing in multifamily units should be set aside for required solar panels or green roofing, unless the roof is being otherwise utilized (e.g., rooftop pool)."	Communities	Since this comment was also left in the nonresidential and mixed-use form and design standards section, staff assumes it applies to these building types in addition to multifamily buildings. Requiring roof space for solar panels, green roofs, or other sustainable approaches will impact the design of all multifamily, nonresidential, and mixed-use buildings in the County. The proposed code includes green building incentives to encourage these improvements (see Sec. 27-5.1400), but it is not appropriate to require such approaches for all development, particularly since intensive green roofs and certain other approaches require additional structural considerations.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—97 27-5—98 27-5—101 27-5—104 27-5—105 Nonresidential and Mixed-Use Form and Design Standards Industrial Form and Design Standards	Consider the impact that these design standards will have on WMATA facilities such as free standing chiller plants and traction power stations. Additionally the fenestration requirements in Sec. 27-5.904.E and the loading/service buildings requirements in Sec. 27-5.904.H will impact these WMATA utility buildings Will these design rules apply to buildings within rail yards?	WMATA	WMATA is exempt from the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance. Also, structures to house transportation equipment would likely be considered transportation or utilities development rather than "commercial", "industrial," or "mixed-use." Having said this, staff encourages high-quality design of buildings intended to house rail operations equipment, such as chiller plants and traction power stations. Unrelieved "boxes" to cover this equipment contribute little to the quality of the built environment.	Make no change.
27-5—98 Nonresidential and Mixed-Use Form and Design Standards	The term "outparcel" creates some confusion with regard to each of them needing their own parking and other requirements. Outparcels and their buildings are not quite the same as pad sites, so we should we not use these terms interchangeably.	Planning staff	The term "outparcel" as used today appears in the Subdivision Regulations and has a distinct meaning – it is a parcel of land that is not usable as a legal building site. This term has a different meaning as used by Clarion Associates – in accordance with national best practices – and has a different definition in the proposed Zoning Ordinance. Page 27-8—65 defines an outparcel as "a parcel that is part of a development located on the exterior of the development, generally adjacent to the street." The term "pad site" is undefined in the current Zoning Ordinance but is generally used to refer to potentially buildable area of larger developments, usually integrated shopping centers, located on the exterior of the development adjacent to the street. "Outparcel" as used by many jurisdictions and as proposed by Clarion Associates are the same thing as "pad sites," which is a term Clarion Associates does not use. The term "outparcel" should remain with the new definition in the proposed Zoning Ordinance, particularly as Clarion Associates have removed this term from their proposed Subdivision Regulations, thereby eliminating potential confusion.	Make no change.
27-5—98 Nonresidential and Mixed-Use Form and Design Standards	These rules, which require large buildings be "broken up" into multiple buildings, can present challenges to proposed joint development projects	WMATA	Staff concurs that the current wording of the multi-building development standard may be too restrictive in that it requires all four of the proposed solutions to be incorporated. It may be more effective and flexible to provide for choices in the design approach rather than requiring multiple approaches for each project.	Revise the regulations that pertain to multiple buildings to a) clarify if the 120,000 square foot threshold applies to each building or is a total of the overall development, and b) provide for more flexibility in the design approach (for example, by replacing "and" with "or."
27-5—103 Nonresidential and Mixed-Use Form and Design Standards Large Retail Establishment Form	"Why not impose stricter standards with respect to the location of parking relative to the building and the street?"	City of Greenbelt	Elsewhere in this analysis, staff recommend some changes to these design standards that may partially address this comment. In general terms, the parking location criteria are linked to the location of the large retail establishment within the County. More front parking is permitted in the more traditionally suburban areas of the County. In more urban locations where a more walkable built environment is most desired, the amount of front parking is less (not more than 25 percent). This seems to be an appropriate threshold of parking in front of a large retail building – most of the parking must be located to the side or rear, but allowing some parking in the front, particularly when the building is located outside a Transit-Oriented/Activity Center	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
and Design Standards			zone, provides convenience parking and facilitates loading of large packages or goods in vehicles.	
27-5—107 through 27-5—115 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	A Councilmember commended Clarion on the thought given to the proposed Neighborhood Compatibility Standards, and indicated that a big concern in their district was how to address the conflict between these standards and others within the proposed Zoning Ordinance – which standards control in case of overlap or conflict? With regard to neighborhood transitions, one thing that comes up a lot in communities next to townhouses are blank side-walls. Can you ensure bay windows may be allowed on end units? An example was cited that a public utility easement prevented a bay window in a recent application.	Council	Comments noted. As proposed in Module 2 (development standards), the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards always supersede in case of conflict.	Clarion Associates should recommend if there is a way to ensure public utilities easements are located so as not to prevent the inclusion of bay windows or other windows on the side walls of townhouses.
27-5—107 through 27-5—115 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	For the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards, what constitutes "next door?" Are we looking at hours of operation and how these standards impact communities next door?	Planning Board	The proposed Neighborhood Compatibility Standards section is a new element recommended by Clarion Associates to ensure new development is a "good neighbor" to existing single-family communities. These standards would apply when new multifamily, nonresidential, or mixed-use development is located adjacent to or across a street or alley from existing single-family or two-family dwellings, or vacant land in four traditional single-family zones. Operational standards, including hours for music and trash collection, are a potential component of the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards.	Make no change.
27-5—107 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	"The work that the Design Review Board in Mount Rainier developed for the ACOZ [Architectural Conservation Overlay Zone] should be reviewed and incorporated here."	Communities	The development of a potential Mount Rainier Architectural Conservation Overlay Zone is part of the Planning Department's FY 2016 and FY 2017 work program. This zone, should it proceed, will likely be adapted into a Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Zone and incorporated in the new Zoning Ordinance. It would not be placed in the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards; instead, it would be located in the zones division of the new code.	Make no change.
27-5—107 27-5—108 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards Applicability	Do the neighborhood compatibility standards apply to townhouses and multifamily, or just single-family detached and attached homes? May need tighten these up.	Communities, City of Greenbelt	The Neighborhood Compatibility Standards are intended to protect single-family detached and two-family communities, as well as vacant lands in single-family residential zones. They would be "triggered" when new nonresidential, mixed-use, or multifamily development is to be built on adjacent property. Multifamily dwelling units should not be subject to the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards because the ability to build nonresidential development in proximity to multifamily development makes both the multifamily building and the new nonresidential building more attractive from a mixed-use/density/activity generation perspective. In the County, townhouses are generally built in their own subdivision neighborhoods, and as such, function closer to single-family attached homes, which some may argue would make Neighborhood Compatibility Standards appealing for townhomes. However, townhouses are well-suited as infill development in already-dense areas and within the edge area of the County's designated centers, and applying the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards to this development type will have a detrimental impact for development.	Make no change.
27-5—108 Neighborhood Compatibility	Should there be a distinction based on the width of the street regarding whether expansion or alteration of a use across from existing dwellings requires compliance with the neighborhood compatibility standards?	City of Greenbelt	Sec. 27-1102.B.1. exempts development from compliance if it is across a street with four or more lanes. There is merit in considering additional nuance or clarity regarding the functional design/use of the street; staff defers to Clarion Associates for additional consideration of this suggestion.	Clarion Associates should make a recommendation to the project team regarding street width as an exemption

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Standards Applicability	Should exemptions based on lanes be based instead on the width of the street? A street may have the width of a four-lane cross-section but be designed (and treated) as a two-lane facility with bike lanes and on-street parking.			criterion based on lanes or width in feet.
27-5—109 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	How is height measured?	City of Greenbelt	Height measurement is defined in Division 8 in Module 1 (Zones and Uses). Generally, it is measured from the mean elevation of the finished grade at the base of the structure to various roof elements depending on the type of roof used.	Make no change.
27-5—109 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	"Is it necessary that adjacent dwellings be patterned based on adjacent homes?"	City of Greenbelt	Staff notes this regulation pertains to neighborhood compatibility standards meant to ensure compatibility of nonresidential, mixed-use, and multifamily development to existing single-family development. This regulation would not apply to new single-family residential development adjacent to existing single-family development.	Make no change.
27-5-109 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	The proposed Neighborhood Compatibility Standards include a 150-foot distance from the neighboring zone. Does this apply to the street line or property line? Under today's regulations, the developer only surveys out to 50 feet from the property line, and this standard would require surveys out to at least 150 feet.	Planning staff	According to the language and as shown in Figure 27-5.1103.A.3 on page 27-5-109, the 150-foot setback is measured from the single-family detached building itself, not the property or street line. In situations where the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards are triggered due to a vacant parcel in one of the single-family residential zones, this 150-foot distance would be measured from the property line. There are broader questions that concern the proposed setback distances for the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards that need to be addressed. Refer to the directed changes section of this analysis for more detail.	Make no change.
27-5—112 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	Sec. 27-5.1103.F.1. "describes distance to dwelling units, but doesn't specify if this is measured from the actual dwelling unit, or from the property line."	City of Greenbelt	The measurements in this Section are to the closest point of the actual dwelling unit when the phrase "dwellings" is used, and to the property line with the phrase "vacant land" is used.	Make no change.
27-5--113 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	Consider requiring walls to screen loading and service areas.	City of Greenbelt	A wall is just one approach that can be used to effectively screen loading, service, and refuse collection areas. Walls should not be required, as this may preclude other alternatives and may be more costly.	Make no change.
27-5—114 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	Does the 50-foot setback from residential uses relate to all signage?	City of Greenbelt	Yes.	Make no change.
27-5—115 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	"These regulations are more permissive than noise ordinances. Standards that are inconsistent with other applicable law should be removed or changed."	City of Greenbelt	Staff agrees that inconsistent standards, where they may exist, should be revised to be consistent with other federal, state, or County laws.	Clarion Associates should review the operational standards on page 27-5—114 and revise as may be necessary to ensure consistency with County and state noise regulations.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—116 Agricultural Compatibility Standards	Is there any reason for the proposed 100-foot buffer distance between new development and existing farms?	Hyattsville Planning Committee	Staff defers to Clarion Associates on this question	Clarion Associates should provide the project team with additional information as to why a 100-foot buffer was selected or is considered to be sufficient, in combination with landscaping.
27-5—119 through 27-5—140 Signage	Some members of the community believe the County should encourage signage advertising commercial businesses and recreational facilities along state highways or interstates.	Communities	Comment noted.	Make no change.
27-5—119 through 27-5—140 Signage	There are many issues between rural landowners and the Department of Permitting, Inspections, and Enforcement regarding signs. Urban farms also require signs, and one of the things that we're looking to change is the signage size.	Communities	Further information is needed regarding the types of issues that rural landowners have with signs. Will these issues be addressed by the new standards? Should there be specific suggestions on signage sizes appropriate for urban farms in the County, these should be provided to the project team for further analysis.	Make no change.
27-5—119 through 27-5—140 Signage	The Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) does not like their roadways to be cluttered with signs. If some uses, such as urban farms are allowed signs along SHA roadways, then all uses should have signs along these roads.	Community	The State Highway Administration (SHA) regulates signage along SHA rights-of-way/roadways. This cannot be addressed through the Zoning Ordinance rewrite.	Make no change.
27-5—119 through 27-5—140 Signage	Adjoining property owners should be able to jointly apply for a sign plan, instead of having to apply for off-site signs.	Maryland Building Industry Association	Staff has no strong opinion on this issue, and defers to Clarion Associates.	Clarion Associates should provide the project team with information regarding best practices on off-site signs (in general) and if it is common or a good idea to permit adjoining property owners to jointly file for sign permits.
27-5—120 Signage	Temporary sign advertising events sponsored by businesses (in addition to signs advertising County sponsored events exempted from the proposed signage regulations under Sec 27-5.1302.B.10) should also be exempt from the signage regulations. If this recommendation is not included, consider excluding temporary signs pertaining to such events from the permit requirements under Sec. 27-5.1303.E	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman	Staff does not agree that temporary outdoor signs advertising for-profit businesses/entities should be exempt from the sign standards. The lack of monitoring or enforcement of these types of signs could have significant impacts on neighboring communities and businesses.	Make no change.
27-5—120 Signage	Is WMATA subject to the signage regulations or is it exempt? If WMATA is required to follow signage regulations, there may be challenges to installing the "next bus" display signs. Is WMATA exempt from section 27-5.1307.D, which requires special standards for directional signs for public/civic/institutional uses?	WMATA	WMATA is exempt from the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance.	
27-5—121 Signage	Sec. 27-5.1303.B seems to require temporary real estate signs proposed to be erected in other governmental right-of-way secure a sign permit. Is this the intent?	City of Greenbelt	No; municipalities are exempt from the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance, including the signage regulations, for municipal property including rights-of-way. However, for clarity, staff agrees revisions to the signage regulations are appropriate.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Signs Not Requiring a Sign Permit				
27-5—121 Signage Signs Not Requiring a Sign Permit	Define temporary.	City of Greenbelt	The subject of the comment pertains to temporary real estate signs posted on the property; this regulation is adapted from the current Zoning Ordinance clause dealing with real estate while under the construction period. "Temporary" has a common law interpretation, typically meaning it can be up for 180 days (6 months). In other contexts, "temporary" has other meanings; therefore, staff does not recommend defining the term.	Make no change.
27-5—122 Signage Signs Not Requiring a Sign Permit	Regarding Sec. 27-5.1303.I, "does this assume sandwich board signs would be placed on private property, or is this intended to extend to public right-of-way?"	City of Greenbelt	The proposed language and sandwich board regulations are not specific as to location. These signs may be on private property or in a public right-of-way; it depends on the context. Development within a Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zone may be placed along a build-to line immediately abutting a public right-of-way, which means the sandwich board sign of necessity must be in the right-of-way. As long as such a sign does not impede movement, and is only on display during operating hours, this is a common approach in urban areas.	Make no change.
27-5—123 Signage Signs Not Requiring a Sign Permit	Regarding Sec. 27-5.1303.O., "is this allowing election signs to remain for the entire time between the primary and a general election?"	City of Greenbelt	Yes. This reflects current County law.	Make no change.
27-5—131 Signage	The table on signage contains "N/A" in the Neighborhood Commercial (NC) Zone and the Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones. Is this a problem, especially in the NC Zone?	Planning staff	The rationale for prohibiting freestanding signage in these zones needs to be more clearly expressed before staff can make a final recommendation.	Clarion Associates should provide the project team with their rationale on why they recommend prohibiting freestanding signs in these zones (especially the Neighborhood Commercial/NC Zone).
27-5—134 Signage Standards for Special Purpose Signs	What is the difference between an identification sign and a gateway sign?	City of Greenbelt	Gateway signs are monumental signs placed at the entrance of a subdivision, office park, or other larger development. An identification sign is typically a smaller form of sign used to identify an individual business or property/address.	Make no change.
27-5—134 Signage Standards for Special Purpose Signs	Are architectural embellishments included in the calculation of sign area for single-family residential gateway signs?	City of Greenbelt	While staff is unclear what architectural embellishments may be envisioned, the maximum sign area standard for single-family residential gateway signs is identical to the current regulation, and would extend to the maximum size of the entire sign.	Make no change.
27-5—141 through 27-5—144 Green Building Standards	What is the relationship to the green building and development codes that will be changing over time?	Planning Board	Typically, one would not want to codify specific regulations or procedures that will soon become out of date. Alternatively, and in the approach Clarion Associates have taken, one can tie the regulations to the elements one wishes to achieve or more broadly to rating systems while recognizing they evolve over time. Another approach would be to amend the Zoning Ordinance to reflect changes in green building and development codes.	Make no change.
27-5—141 through 27-5—144 Green Building Standards	The point system is hard to understand, what does a one or two point difference mean?	Municipalities	The recommended green building standards would be required for all new development above a certain size, while the green building incentives are optional. The standards include a weighted menu of green building elements and a minimum threshold of 3 points. The different elements have different point values. The intent is to increase the County's sustainability.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—141 through 27-5—144 Green Building Standards	In terms of green building are we looking at zero waste?	Municipalities	Zero waste would not be something one would require through zoning regulation since achieving this goal is dependent on a number of factors outside the umbrella of what zoning can address. Zero waste development is a worthy goal, but not suited for zoning regulation.	Make no change.
27-5—141 through 27-5—149 Green Building Standards and Green Building Incentives	The green building standards may not be aggressive enough. The City of College Park commented that "the addition of this new section is a move in the right direction however it falls far short of what other jurisdictions are doing in terms of adopting new building codes and requiring industry certifications such as LEED. The City anticipates forwarding more specific recommendations in this area in the near future." The City of College Park's subsequent letter did not contain specific recommendations regarding green building standards. It does indicate a belief that "the minimum requirements under the proposed green building point system are too low to be meaningful and should be increased," and recommends certification be required before granting incentives such as increased to height or density. Finally, the City believes "penalties for failure to install or maintain green building practices need to be strengthened to ensure compliance and should also include fines." The Mount Rainier Green Team submitted numerous specific comments. The project team has not had the time to incorporate these comments in this analysis but will continue to evaluate.	Council; City of College Park; Mount Rainier Green Team	It is important to first note that there are currently no standard, codified, green building requirements in the County Code. Some of the Transit District and Development District overlay zones include development standards promoting Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED®) certification and green building standards drawn from LEED® principles, but those are generally either limited to specific areas within those zones, or are discretionary requirements, using terms such as "should be" or "are encouraged." Only 1 or 2 overlay zones of the 18 currently in effect in the County require LEED® certification, and then only in limited circumstances. LEED® Accredited Professionals on staff support the guidance of the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC, the originator and operator of the LEED® program), which recommends that LEED® certification not become a legislated requirement of development. The USGBC recognizes there are many valid green building certification programs in existence. The green standards subject to this question are contained in proposed Sections 27-5.1400 Green Building Standards and 27-5.1500 Green Building Incentives of the *Module 2: Public Review Draft* by Clarion Associates. Section 27-5.1404 first establishes a minimum point requirement, 3 points for all development in excess of 10,000 square feet of nonresidential development or 10+ dwelling units, and 4 points for larger development. Very small developments (less than 10 residential units or 10,000 square feet of nonresidential space) do not have to meet a point requirement. This proposed requirement could be a major step forward simply by requiring applicants to verify they are meeting a baseline green building standard for nearly all new development in the County, regardless of location, zone, or type. Allowing small developments to continue without meeting these requirements seems reasonable, as most projects of that size would be infill projects and have limited opportunity to incorporate green building approaches. Table 27-5.1404.B Green Building Point System then lists specific ways to earn these required points, grouped into categories that reflect major green building rating system categories. Some of the categories offer point options that would be easier to obtain, depending on the type of development proposed, but generally, those options are allotted lower point values. For instance, using air conditioners that are Energy Star qualified, which probably happens frequently, earns only 0.5 points, or less than 17 percent of the total point threshold needed for new development. The two highest point earners, at 2 points each, are generating or acquiring a minimum of 50 percent of the electricity needed by the development from alternative energy sources (e.g., solar, wind, geothermal) and installing a green vegetated roof on at least 50 percent of the roof area of the primary structure. As far as staff is aware, this level of green building practice has only been done in the County for LEED®-certified buildings, and would be quite aggressive, especially if done on some of the	Make no change at this time, but continue to review the proposed green building elements to determine if future changes may be advisable prior to approval of the new Zoning Ordinance.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			larger (e.g. 1,000+ residential units or more than 250,000 square feet of nonresidential space) developments. It is possible that some of the suggested standards are not commensurate with the number of points earned; for instance, one point is earned for providing rain gardens or other appropriate storm water infiltration system(s) that accommodate a minimum of 25 percent of the runoff. An applicant may be able to argue that, since a traditional stormwater pond is an "appropriate infiltration system," it would be allowed to count toward this point. However, situations such as this may be easily adjusted with a minor language correction; the important question is: does this general requirement and point system make sense for the County? Overall, the proposed green building standards and incentives system allows for many options, which will offer the applicant flexibility to respond to market conditions based upon the specific development proposal without becoming too cost-prohibitive. In the end, requiring developers to implement any of these features will be a significant improvement over the current green building requirements within the County, which are almost non-existent.	
27-5—141 through 27-5—149 Green Building Incentives and Green Building Standards	The listed green building features and incentives do not seem to account for new or innovative practices that may exist in the future.	Maryland Building Industry Association	There are many green building features listed in Module 2 (Development Regulations), focusing on broad categories such as energy conservation; water conservation; LEED® certification; passive solar; water conservation and quality protection; vegetation; urban agriculture; and transportation efficiency. Each of these categories have several specific elements listed. As more features or practices come online in the future, the Zoning Ordinance should be amended to incorporate those practices the District Council wishes to encourage. It would be difficult to have a "catch all" category to encompass new green building approaches because it would involve significant discretion and interpretation that may be beyond what is otherwise recommended and appropriate for administrative approval. The proposed green building incentives include bonuses of density, height, and lot coverage, or a 15 percent modification of the number of parking spaces, which are the only four potential incentives in exchange for providing green building features that are currently recommended. Clarion Associates have cautioned that, while more incentives can be incorporated, the danger is that they become less meaningful.	Make no change.
27-5—141 Green Building Standards	Would the green building standards apply to current overlay zones?	Hyattsville Planning Committee	No. The current design-oriented overlay zones are proposed to be replaced by the zones, use regulations, and development standards of the new Zoning Ordinance.	Make no change.
27-5—141 Green Building Standards	Would green building standards be required for each dwelling unit or for a percentage of the entire development?	Hyattsville Planning Committee	The green building standards are proposed to be based on the overall percentage of single-family dwellings. See table 27-5.1404.B on pages 27-5—142 and 27-5—143.	Make no change.
27-5—141 Green Building Standards Applicability	The proposed green building standards should also apply to new residential development with less than 10 dwelling units and new non-residential development with less than 10,000 gross square feet.	Communities	Although there are benefits to requiring all development to meet green building standards, smaller developments could be adversely impacted in regards to cost.	Make no change.
27-5—142 Green Building Standards	If a building only achieves the "silver" ranking for LEED® certification, would they still need to comply with the proposed green building standards?	WMATA	Yes. However, the proposed standards are less strict that what would be implemented if a building were to achieve a "silver" rating for LEED® or an equivalent rating system, so any building achieving a "silver" rating would almost certainly earn the necessary green building requirements proposed in this code.	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—142 Green Building Standards	Should "just require that new construction be certified to the lowest level of LEED. That way the checklists are already developed and developers would not have to familiarize themselves with new standards. If certification is too much perhaps the county can conduct the review instead." "If this suggestion is taken, LEED standards should be adopted by reference rather than a specific standard so that as LEED standards improve the zoning code updates without a need for rulemaking."	Communities	The U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), which maintains the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED®) program, does not recommend requiring LEED®. USGBC recognizes there are numerous alternative ratings systems for green and sustainable building practices and does not believe it appropriate to require any one of those over any other approach. Staff concurs with this rationale. There are no specific LEED® standards adopted by the proposed standards. The items in the recommended green building point system, while very similar to elements contained in various rating systems, stand alone.	Make no change.
27-5—142 Green Building Standards	"The point minimums are way too low. They really should be in the 10 point range as a minimum required."	Communities	Achieving ten or more points based on the weighted point system proposed by Clarion Associates would be extremely difficult and likely unreachable as a Countywide baseline for all new construction. While staff will recommend some additional aspects of consideration for the green building standards, we generally believe the current minimum thresholds and the weighted point system are appropriate for Prince George's County at this juncture. As more projects come on-line over time, the County should continue to re-evaluate the green building standards and incentives to revise them as may be necessary.	Make no change.
27-5—143 Green Building Standards	"Points should be given for storm water neutral development."	Communities	Staff agrees stormwater neutral development may be worthy of consideration in the green building standards and incentives.	Clarion Associates should evaluate stormwater neutral development practices, and if appropriate, add points to the standards and incentives for implementing stormwater neutral approaches.
27-5—143 Green Building Standards	"Points should be given for plantings of native trees and shrubbery under conditions in which they cannot be removed for a certain number of years."	Communities	The Landscape Manual (current and proposed) require native species and removal of invasive species. Given this, staff does not believe additional points in the green building standards or incentives should be achievable for something applicants will be doing anyway (with the exception of providing points for development in targeted growth locations).	Make no change.
27-5—142 27-5—143 Green Building Standards	Is there a way to provide green building points for enhanced indoor air quality?	Planning Board	While indoor air quality is a common component of green building rating systems such as LEED®, it is not an appropriate element to regulate through zoning because indoor environmental air quality cannot be measured and confirmed until after the building is complete and is in occupancy.	Make no change.
27-5—143 and 27-5—148 Green Building Standards and Green Building Incentives	How would earning green building points for community gardens work?	Planning Board	Community gardens are allowed in most zones. If a developer brings forward a site plan or Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and provides a community garden site, they can seek points through the incentive program.	Make no change.
27-5—145 through 27-5—149 Green Building Incentives	Since density bonuses are included as part of the proposed Green Building Incentive, it will be necessary that the subdivision section review these plans if an applicant chooses to increase the number of units	Planning staff	Applicants may not know when green building improvements will be confirmed, this will likely happen after lots are subdivided, because many of the green building elements are design related. If the number of dwelling units or square footage increases as a result of these incentives, it is possible that it will trigger further adequacy of public facility improvements, dedication, or subdivision of additional lots. If the applicant chooses to increase density, it will be necessary that the timing of the review takes place during the review of preliminary plan of subdivision.	Clarion Associates should make a recommendation as to the best way that increased density/number of lots as a result of the Green Building Incentives could invoke an adequacy of public facilities review or perhaps an abbreviated minor subdivision review.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			Alternatively, if the increased density is not going to create additional lots, the application could be approved at the time of minor or major site plan review and no additional dedications/infrastructure would be required.	
27-5—145 Green Building Incentives	An increase to the allowed parking maximum seems like it would undercut the purpose of the green building standards.	WMATA	Parking flexibility is proposed as one of the potential incentive to encourage the provision of green building features. In particular, the proposed parking increase (or decrease) listed as an option is intended to allow a developer to provide more (or less) parking than would otherwise be required without having to go through a separate process, as long as they are providing additional green building features. Such flexibility, including a potential increase in parking, is often necessary to encourage economic investment and development in any jurisdiction, not just Prince George's County. Staff notes that any additional parking spaces that may be permitted through this incentive option must still comply with the parking standards proposed in Module 2 (development standards).	Make no change.
27-5—145 Green Building Incentives	Footnote 349 on page 27-5—145 refers to Sec. 27-5.1300, but it seems the correct reference should be to Sec. 27-5.1400 since it speaks to green building standards.	Communities	Comment noted. None of the footnotes from the three draft Modules will be carried forward into the Comprehensive Review Draft, so no change is necessary.	Make no change.
27-5—146 Green Building Incentives Conflict with Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	"Green building should trump neighborhood compatibility."	Communities	The proposed neighborhood compatibility standards should control in the event of conflict in most circumstances to better ensure the protection of existing residential neighborhoods, but the County's desire for sustainable development may warrant additional consideration.	Clarion Associates should re-evaluate Sec. 27-5.1504 on page 27-5—146 to determine if there are situations where green building standards or incentives should control over any conflicting neighborhood compatibility standards.
Landscape Manual General	SHA indicates the proposed Landscape Manual regulations for planting setbacks along roads with posted speeds over 30 miles per hour "differ substantially from SHA guidance for roads with higher speed limits and higher traffic volumes. The differences between SHA standards and the Manual are very great for roads with posted speeds over 50 mph" SHA indicates all construction on SHA property "and within and adjacent to SHA rights of ways under SHE District Permits must conform to SHA design standards." SHA asks that references to SHA landscape guidance documents and occasional references to these documents be provided as helpful to developers and County staff.	State Highway Administration	While staff concurs that referencing applicable SHA design documents is helpful in avoiding potential errors or omissions that may contribute to delays of approvals for SHA permits, and fully recognize that SHA is exempt from the regulations of the County's Zoning Ordinance, Landscape Manual, and Subdivision Regulations. Land **adjacent** to SHA rights-of-way is not under the control of SHA. If there are safety concerns by SHA, the applicant should review the issues cited by the agency. Furthermore, staff believes that, particularly in our more urban and transit-served locations, SHA landscaping guidance may not achieve the design and amenities sought for these key locations. Staff notes that all site plans that front an SHA right-of-way are currently sent to SHA for review. However, SHA does not comment on these plans regarding proposed landscaping for properties adjacent to their right-of-way. The details of such conversations are beyond the full scope of the Zoning Rewrite project, and staff expects the conversation to be ongoing, likely on a case-by-case basis in the short term. There are broader philosophical differences that need to be resolved before full resolution of this question is achieved.	Make no change.
Landscape Manual General	Concern was expressed regarding purpose statements that speak to using new technologies in urban settings, specifically regarding landscape planting and maintenance.	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman	Staff is unsure of the exact clause that is the heart of this concern but supports Clarion Associate's purpose statements that speak to new technologies. This project has been branded by staff from the beginning as a new Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations for the 21st Century, and a large aspect of the flexibility proposed by Clarion within these codes is to	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
			accommodate new, emerging uses, technologies, and development approaches much more nimbly than the current regulations.	
Landscape Manual Introduction	"Private streets can be problematic to providing public utility services (water, sewer, electric, telephone, CATV, etc.) to the buildings that they serve. Adequate space, PUE's and restrictions need to be in place to prevent an unmaintainable utility configuration."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	Adequate roads and public utility easements (PUEs) along public and private roads are implemented through the Subdivision process, not the Landscape Manual. Landscaping is generally provided outside of the PUE.	Make no change.
Landscape Manual Section 1.1 Applicability	"Increases in GFA [gross floor area] to existing structures and changes in use may affect adequacy of other utilities such as water and sewer. The applicant should contact the appropriate agency to determine adequacy."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	This is a site planning and permitting issue, and is not applicable to the Landscape Manual.	Make no change.
Landscape Manual Section 1.2 Approval Process	"Grading in an existing WSSC easement requires prior approval by WSSC through the DRP review process."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	WSSC reviews grading plans in the permit review process and this is independent of the Landscape Manual regulations.	Make no change.
Landscape Manual Section 3.5 Other Landscape Design Considerations	"ESD [environmental site design] must be coordinated with the water and sewer alignments and service connections and the requirements established in the WSSC pipeline design manual must be followed."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	This is an environmental review consideration and not part of the regulations of the Landscape Manual.	Make no change.
Landscape Manual Section 4.2 Requirements for Landscape Strips Along Streets	"All public and private streets should have a PUE [public utility easement] on each side to provide a utility corridor."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	Public utility easements (PUEs) along public and private roads are implemented through the Subdivision process, not the Landscape Manual. Landscaping is generally provided outside of the PUE.	Make no change.
Landscape Manual Section 4.2 Requirements for Landscape Strips Along Streets	"Edge of sidewalks should be placed at least one foot from the property line to allow space for water curb stops and sewer cleanouts for service connections to buildings within the public street right of way. Placing these structures in a sidewalk create a tripping hazard."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	This comment does not pertain to the Landscape Manual. Section 4.2 of the Landscape Manual relates to on-site landscape strips, outside of the public right-of-way.	Make no change.
Landscape Manual Section 4.2 Requirements for Landscape Strips Along Streets Section 4.6 Buffering Development from Streets	"Show PUEs [public utility easements] along public or private streets on all details." "Agree!" "Include 10 foot PUEs along all public or private roads."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	Comments noted. There are philosophical differences between agencies regarding the location and configuration of public utility easements, particularly in urbanized locations and servicing transit-oriented development. Until these differences are worked out, staff does not believe it appropriate to depict the location of potential public utilities easements on street section diagrams. The "agree!" comment pertains to a note provided by Clarion Associates on page 65 of the proposed Landscape Manual that indicates continued coordination with utility companies and public transportation agencies regarding the location and requirements for public utility easements is still necessary. Staff concurs.	Make no change at this time.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Landscape Manual Section 4.5 Stormwater Management Facilities	Add WSSC to the second full paragraph on page 87 regarding coordination of the review of landscaping design associated with stormwater management facilities.	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	WSSC should coordinate with DPIE or other agencies with stormwater management authority. The Landscape Manual does not regulate the plantings within stormwater management facilities, although planting may be dually counted toward required Landscape Manual plantings.	Make no change.
Landscape Manual Section 4.8 Building Frontage Landscape Requirements	"Private streets should comply with the design standards and widths for public streets. Turning radius [sic] for large trucks, fire trucks, etc. need to be considered to avoid clipping curbs, trees, fire hydrants, storm drain inlets, ESD [environmental site design] (and pedestrians)."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	This is an aspect of site design that should be considered at the time of Subdivision, when adequate roads and roadway ownership are determined.	Make no change.
Landscape Manual Section 4.8 Building Frontage Landscape Requirements	"Note that the buildings in the pictures to the right have good setbacks from the street allowing room for utilities in these areas outside of the street area where the water and sewer lines are generally placed."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	Comment Noted.	Make no change.
Landscape Manual Section 4.8 Building Frontage Landscape Requirements	"Additional considerations: Buildings must be set back - - 15 feet off water or sewer 12 inches and smaller - 25 feet off water or sewer for larger mains "Additional setback is recommended for large diameter PCCP water mains. This is for maintenance and also for pipe breaks to avoid damage to structures."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	Building setback requirements are applicable at the time of site plan review and are not applicable to the Landscape Manual.	Make no change.
Landscape Manual Section 4.8 Building Frontage Landscape Requirements.	Preventing commercial properties from selecting plants with thorns, or that attract bees and insects, as required by Section 4.8.b.5 of the proposed Landscape Manual is inconsistent with the requirement to also address the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman	Staff notes the referenced language is a design guideline rather than a regulatory requirement. The guideline speaks to avoiding thorns and plants that attract bees and insects as contributing to selection of plants for safety reasons. The guideline then indicates that visibility should also be a consideration for CPTED principles and enabling views. These do not need to be contradictory outcomes, as plant species selection may accommodate both goals.	Make no change.
Landscape Manual Section 4.8 Building Frontage Landscape Requirements	The concept of building frontage landscape requirements may be problematic in that it does not distinguish between new development and redevelopment; the building frontage landscape area's location between the building façade and street curb of a drive aisle or parking lot may be very burdensome to retail centers; and a minimum 8 to 20 percent of the building frontage area to be green space may negatively impact the economic viability of large retail centers.	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman	The referenced section of the Landscape Manual is a new addition proposed by Clarion Associates and intended to address a perceived gap in the current regulations – specifically, the area between the right-of-way and the front building façade. Staff has not fully evaluated the impacts or vetted the details of proposed Section 4.8, as additional information including testing of the proposed standards by the Clarion team is pending. Staff will continue to investigate the recommendations of proposed Section 4.8 and work with Clarion Associates to clarify or revise as may be appropriate prior to the preparation of the Comprehensive Review Draft.	Make no change at this time.
Landscape Manual Section 4.9 Sustainable Landscaping Requirements	"It is great news that these requirements are being included."	Communities	Comment noted.	Make no change.
Landscape Manual Section 4.9 Sustainable	The objective to provide opportunities for edible landscaping was questioned regarding how this may be done, and if it is purely symbolic.	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman	The sixth purpose and objective statement for sustainable landscaping requirements states: "provide opportunities for edible landscaping to improve access to healthy foods for all Prince Georgians." This seems to staff to be a worthy objective that will help contribute to the	Make no change.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EVALUATION AND RESPONSE				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Landscaping Requirements			Countywide goals for increased access to healthy foods and to improve health outcomes for all Prince Georgians. This is an objective, and there are no requirements to provide edible landscaping. Staff expects edible landscaping opportunities will be explored over time by applicants and communities throughout the County.	
Landscape Manual Section 4.10 Street Trees (For Private Streets)	Standard 4.10.C.17, which prohibits mulch in street tree planters, needs an explanation. Why prohibit mulch? What is "the harm that this standard is intended to prevent or alleviate?"	Lawrence N. Taub and Nathaniel Forman	This is a question best suited for Clarion Associates to address.	Clarion Associates should let the project team know why this standard is recommended and what issues may exist with mulch in street tree planters for private streets.
Landscape Manual Glossary	"Private streets should not be encouraged. It places long term maintenance costs on the homeowners or property owners. It creates a situation where the developer reduces the street/utility corridor and compromises the ability to place the utility lines in a sustainable manner to serve the development with public utility services."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	Comment noted.	Make no change.
Landscape Manual Appendix: Alternative Compliance Checklist	"WSSC recommends to add as a submittal requirement that the applicant should show proof that an HPA submittal has been made to WSSC for any site requiring public water and sewer extensions or if there is doubt that the existing water and sewer in the vicinity is sufficient to meet the demands for the development or re-development."	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)	Water and sewer adequacy is a determination made through the Subdivision process and not applicable to the Alternative Compliance process, which is for the limited review of alternative landscape designs.	Make no change.

TYPOGRAPHIC AND EDITORIAL COMMENTS				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Global	Division 8 of the proposed Zoning Ordinance document for Module 2 (development standards) has reversed the page number from the outside corner to the inside corner. This makes it very difficult to locate pages and is inconsistent with the format of the rest of the documents.	Planning staff	Correct this formatting issue.	Clarion Associates needs to ensure that all page numbers are consistently located on the outside corners.
Module 1 (Zones and Uses) Definitions	There is a typo in the definition of "Consumer goods establishment" on page 27-8—37.	Communities	The typo should be corrected.	Revise the first sentence of the definition of "Consumer goods establishment" on page 27-8—37 to read: "Establishments that sell ~~sale~~ consumer goods at retail…."
27-5—4 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access Management	Regarding Sec. 27-5.108.D.1., the first paragraph states that limitation on direct access applies to arterial streets only. Does this apply to collector streets as well?	City of Greenbelt	Yes.	Revise Sec. 27-5.108.D.1. to read: "…may be provided directly from an arterial or collector street only if:…."
27-5—6 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Connectivity	Add the word "development" after "…within new mixed-use and nonresidential…" in the first paragraph.	WMATA	Staff concurs.	Add the word "development" after "…within new mixed-use and nonresidential…" in the first paragraph under the heading "Cross Access Between Adjoining Developments."
27-5—11 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Connectivity	Add the word "feet" after "no more than 800…" in the first paragraph of Sec. 27-5.108.K.1.	WMATA	Staff concurs.	Add the word "feet" after "but no more than 800…" to 27-5.108.K.1
27-5—14 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Vehicular Access and Connectivity	Remove the "s" from "single monument signs" in standard 27-5.108.N.3.c.i.	WMATA	Staff concurs that the singular rather than the plural is appropriate for this standard.	Remove the "s" from "single monument signs" in 27-5.108.N.3.c.i.
27-5—19 Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation Bicycle Access and Circulation	The word "or" is missing from the second line of Sec. 27-5.110.A.2.a. There is also a typo in Sec. 27-5.109.B.4.b.i. at the top of the page.	Planning staff	The typos should be corrected.	Revise the first sentence of Sec. 27-5.110.A.2.a. to read "…of single-family detached dwellings or two-family dwellings…." Revise Sec. 27-5.109.B.4.b.i. to read: "…unless expressly stated otherwise in those zone regulations;…"

TYPOGRAPHIC AND EDITORIAL COMMENTS				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
27-5—25 Off-Street Parking and Loading General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading Areas	This section discusses the need for off-street parking areas to comply with the Landscape Manual. Do WMATA parking lots comply with the Landscape Manual?	WMATA	Staff is unclear whether WMATA was asking if their current parking lots comply with this regulation or if their lots will need to comply with the regulation moving forward. WMATA is exempt from the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance (and the regulations of the Landscape Manual). In reviewing this comment, staff noticed a small typo.	Revise Sec. 27-5.205.H.1. to eliminate the brackets (<>) from the standard. Make no other change.
27-5—53 Off-Street Parking and Loading Dimensional Standards for Parking Spaces and Aisles	The dimensional standards table for parking spaces and aisles may have typos.	Planning staff	Staff believe the decimal points are unnecessary in this table.	Revise Table 27-5.207A.1. on page 27-5—53 to round down the two figures incorporating decimal points.
27-5—70 Open Space Set-Asides Areas Counted as Open Space Set Asides	The word “river” is included twice in the description for natural features.	Planning staff	The typo should be corrected.	Deleted the second reference to the word “rivers” from the description of natural features.
27-5—81 Fences and Walls	The third level header on this page has a typo.	Planning staff	Ensure consistency.	Ensure the third level header is correct.
27-5—83 Exterior Lighting Applicability	There is a misplaced quotation mark in Sec. 27-5.602.A.1.	City of Greenbelt	The typo should be corrected.	Delete the quotation mark following the word County in Sec. 27-5.602.A.1.
27-5—90 Environmental Protection and Noise Controls Noise Control	Sec. 27-5.707 carries forward a legacy reference to the interim land use controls that were associated with development around Joint Base Andrews.	Planning staff	The interim land use controls are no longer active; this reference should be deleted.	Delete the reference to the interim land use controls.
27-5—107 Neighborhood Compatibility Standards	The first applicability statement for the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards should be clarified to indicate that the types of development that trigger compatibility would do so independently rather than an application requiring all three types. There is a typo in Sec. 27-5.1102.A.1.a.	Planning staff	The applicability statement should be revised, and the typo corrected.	Revise Sec. 27-5.1102.A.1.a. to read: “Any new multifamily, nonresidential, ~~and~~ or mixed-use development….” Revise Sec. 27-5.1102.A.1.a. to read: “Any new multifamily, nonresidential or ~~and~~ mixed-use development….”
27-5—144	The second level header on this page has a typo.	Planning staff	Ensure consistency.	Ensure the second level header is correct.

TYPOGRAPHIC AND EDITORIAL COMMENTS				
Page Number	**Comment**	**Source**	**Staff Analysis**	**Staff Recommendation**
Green Building Standards				
Landscape Manual Section 4.11 Requirements for Nonresidential and Mixed-Use Development	There is a comma at the end of purpose and objective a.1. on page 136 with a period.	Planning staff	The typo should be corrected.	Replace the comma at the end of standard a.1. on page 136 with a period.
Landscape Manual Section 4.11 Requirements for Nonresidential and Mixed-Use Development	Revise the outline format for subsection c. on pages 137 and 138.	Planning staff	The outline format needs to be revised since these standards only apply to nonresidential and mixed-use development.	Revise the subheading for c. on page 137 to read: "Requirements <u>for Nonresidential and Mixed-uses:</u>" Delete "Nonresidential and Mixed uses:" from 1 on page 137. Renumber requirements A through G on pages 137 to 138 (they should be numbers 1 through 7).