



Redevelopment Authority of Prince George's County

To: Charlotte Aheart, Committee Assistant
Planning, Housing & Economic Development Committee

From: Perry Paylor, Esq. *Perry Paylor*
Executive Director

Re: Comments regarding: CB-047-2026

Date: June 9, 2026

CC: Tracy M. Benjamin, Esq., DCAO for Economic Development.
Angela M. Angel, County Liaison

CB-047-2026 Parking Requirement Amendment

CB-047-2026 seeks to amend Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance § 27-6305 to increase the minimum off-street parking requirement for apartment housing for elderly or physically disabled families from 1 parking space per 4 beds to 1 parking space per 2 beds. The legislation therefore proposes a 100% increase in the required parking ratio. In practical terms, the County agenda summary explains that a 200-bed facility would need 100 parking spaces instead of 50.

Redevelopment Authority's Recommendation

The Redevelopment Authority recommends amending CB-047-2026 to replace the proposed blanket 100% parking increase with a tiered approach: a 25% default increase, a 50% increase where supported by parking-demand evidence, and up to 100% only for auto-dependent projects with documented need, while adding waiver provisions for transit-served, affordable, and low-parking-demand senior or disability-accessible housing projects. See attached spreadsheet for the analysis supporting the final recommendation.

Option	Parking Ratio	Benefits	Risks / Drawbacks	RDA Mission Impact	Recommendation
Current law	1 per 4 beds / 0.25 spaces per bed	Lowest development cost; preserves land for housing, open space, stormwater, and supportive services; strongest for affordability and redevelopment feasibility.	May not address caregiver, visitor, employee, paratransit, emergency-access, or spillover parking concerns if existing projects are under parked.	Supports housing production and feasibility but may not adequately address neighborhood compatibility concerns.	Retain only if the legislative record does not show recurring under parking.
10% increase	Approx. 1 per 3.64 beds / 0.275 spaces per bed	Minimal cost and land-use impact; modestly acknowledges parking concerns; useful as an interim measure while collecting utilization data.	Adds only five spaces in the 200-bed example; may be too small to solve actual parking shortages.	Least disruptive to RDA redevelopment objectives but limited practical parking benefit.	Consider only as a temporary compromise or data-gathering step.
25% increase	Approx. 1 per 3.2 beds / 0.3125 spaces per bed	Balanced approach; adds meaningful parking while limiting cost; better protects affordable, senior, disability-accessible, and infill redevelopment projects.	May be insufficient if the County record shows severe or consistent under parking.	Best default balance between neighborhood compatibility and redevelopment feasibility.	Preferred default amendment if current evidence is limited or mixed.
50% increase	Approx. 1 per 2.67 beds / 0.375 spaces per bed	Substantial parking increase; addresses parking concerns more forcefully than 10% or 25%; avoids full doubling.	Still materially increases cost and land consumption; may reduce density; or may overpark transit-served or low-car-ownership projects.	Appropriate for auto-dependent or higher-service projects where parking demand is documented.	Recommend only with waiver, transit-reduction, shared-parking, and affordability protections.

CB-047 as drafted — 100% increase	1 per 2 beds / 0.50 spaces per bed	Strongest response to spillover parking, caregiver/visitor demand, medical-provider access, paratransit, emergency staging, and neighborhood concerns; easy to administer.	Doubles required parking; highest cost and land-consumption impact; may reduce density, increase subsidy needs, impair affordable housing feasibility, and conflict with transit-oriented redevelopment.	Inconsistent with RDA objectives unless supported by strong utilization data and paired with exceptions.	Do not recommend as a blanket countywide standard without strong evidence and project-specific flexibility. Alternatively, recommend only with waiver, transit-reduction, shared-parking, and affordability protections.
Tiered alternative	25% default	Matches parking requirements to actual project context; allows stronger standards where justified; protects transit-served, affordable, and low-parking-demand projects.	Requires administrative standards and staff review; less simple than a single fixed ratio.	Best aligns parking policy with redevelopment feasibility, accessible housing, affordability, and neighborhood compatibility.	Optimal approach. If a need exists to increase parking beyond 25%, then document support and/or the waiver process should be required.