

readvertising the legislation.

- The size of the main "Village Commons" should be amended from 30,000 sq. ft. in the V-L Zone and 40,000 sq. ft. in the V-M Zone to 10,000 sq. ft., plus 200 sq. ft. per dwelling unit in both zones.
- The required 3-dimensional model may include only the "Village Proper".
- The building design requirements regarding front porches and entrances should allow for designs that are "as good or better".
- The minimum width of the "Village Buffer" should be increased from 150 feet to 400 feet.
- Amend requirement for minimum size of the "Civic Use Area" from 3% of gross land area to 400 square feet of land area per dwelling unit.
- Amend measurement of block size from "perimeter" to "between intersections", reduce the block size in the "Village Proper" from a range of 500 to 800 feet, to 100 to 300 feet.

Amendments regarding calculation of the required "Storefront Area", reduction of the size of the "Village Fringe", a limitation on the number of multifamily units per building, a reduction in the lot size of the large-lot units, and the deletion of a minimum size of the Village Proper were rejected by the Committee.

A number of other issues, including density, the requirement for MPDUs, and the review process were deemed to be substantive, and were therefore not addressed by the Committee.

A number of speakers testified regarding this legislation, including Russ Warfel, George Brugger, Perry Cowgill, Mollie Giesman, Tina Badaczewski, Gail Wheat and Arthur Rosenberg. These speakers generally requested that the Committee study the legislation further, and that if this bill is enacted, a commitment be made to refining it at a later date.

The Committee voted, 4-3, to assign the legislation to a Task Force to be appointed by the Chairman for future study.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE REPORT

DATE: 6/5/91

Held in Committee.

Following the staff presentation of the legislation and proposed amendments on June 4, the Committee considered comments from the following parties. Nancy Slepicka, of Fossett and Brugger; John McDonough, of O'Malley and Miles; Bob Manzi, of Knight, Manzi, Brennan, Ostrom and Ham; Lynda Ryan, of Greenhorne and O'Mara; Jim Cronk, the City of Bowie; Arthur Rosenberg, Associated Companies; Jay Addison, Addison-Herring Inc; Russ Warfel, Meyers, Billingsley, Shipley; Jerry Brock, Rouse Company; and Perry Cowgill. In general speakers requested more time to review the legislation and resolve issues such as the density, approval process, restrictive nature of the legislation, Moderately Priced Dwelling Units, allowable dwelling units, design

guidelines, open space requirement, and viability of this type of Zone.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE REPORT

DATE: 6/4/91

Held in Committee.

Staff presented a proposed Draft 2 to the Committee, which incorporated a number of minor and technical amendments, and amendments proposed by the Planning Department Staff. Most notably, the amendments were:

- 1.) Prohibit the Board of Appeals from granting variances in the Village Zones (amended Section 27-229(b), page 8).
- 2.) Clarified that a development must fulfill its use requirements (minimum percentages) independently, although the areas may overlap. (amendment made to Section 27-514.3(d))
- 3.) Provided for more of a variety of residential lots, and specify that density shall decrease from the center to the periphery of the village. Lot sizes and frontages shall vary according to the random pattern of a traditional village, and street frontages shall vary such that there is no discernible pattern of lot width. (amended Section 27-514.3(d))
- 4.) Provided both minimum and maximum percentage requirements for residential use types to ensure that the village will consist of an actual mix of unit types. (amended Section 27-514.3(d))
- 5.) Refined definition of Village Proper to clarify that it must contain a mixture of residential and nonresidential uses generally within one-quarter mile of the village center, and it must contain enough dwelling units to support the pedestrian orientation. (Amended Section 27-514.3)
- 6.) Increased the area requirements for the Village Commons area, (Section 27-514.3(d)), and added a requirement that some sort of village common or green should be within walking distance of all residential lots.
- 7.) Deleted Section 27-514.7, "Landscape Standards", from the legislation. Much of the language is duplicative of the Landscape Manual, and some standards are less restrictive. The Planning Department is currently preparing amendments to the Landscape Manual that must be approved by the District Council. Any amendments that should be made to the Village Zones should be made through the Landscape Manual.
- 8.) Any parking requirements (Section 27-514.7) that are duplicative or conflict with the Landscape Manual, Part 11 of the Zoning Ordinance or the Road Code were eliminated. Also, any requirements that would be more appropriate in the Road Code were eliminated.

9. Deleted requirement for 5 acre lots; replaced with requirement for 25,000 square foot lots, and required that they comprise no more than 60% of all dwelling units in the village.

Staff also proposed a number of other amendments to the legislation. These amendments are:

- 1.) If the zone remains a Comprehensive Design Zone,
 - a.) Allow the District Council to call up a Specific Design Plan for review in the Village Zones. (amend Section 27-528, add new Section 27-528.1), and
 - b.) Eliminate the requirement for a Basic Plan when the property is placed in a Village Zone through the Sectional Map Amendment process. (amend Section 27-179) Amend the Sections regarding Comprehensive Design Plans (CDP) to account for crucial aspects of the Basic Plan that will now be addressed at the CDP phase. The alternative, which was endorsed by the Principal Counsel and the Committee, is to require a Basic Plan to be submitted, but allow it to be concurrent with the CDP.
- 2.) Add a phasing requirement to ensure that storefront and civic areas will be built prior to the construction of all residential units.
- 3.) Amend Section 27-514.6 (pages 35-44) per Planning Department's comments. Farroll Hamer of the Planning Department, explained the differences between the two drafts.
- 4.) Section 27-527 requires that a three-dimensional model be submitted with the Specific Design Plan. This requirement should be amended to allow the model to be submitted "prior to Planning Board review". The Committee requested that it also be specified that the model be submitted prior to District Council review.
- 5.) Specific amendments to sign requirements may be addressed in conjunction with the Committee's review of CB-61-1991.
- 6.) Amend Regulations in Section 27-514.6(c), per the Planning Department's recommendations.

Staff reiterated that if this legislation is adopted, amendments to the Road Code and the Subdivision Ordinance will follow.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting, and stated that comments regarding CB-53-1991 would be considered on June 5.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION/FISCAL IMPACT**(Includes reason for proposal, as well as any unique statutory requirements)**

This legislation establishes two new Comprehensive Design Zones, intended to be "neo-traditional village zones". These zones differ from the current CDZs, as there are no density increment provisions, and land may be placed in these zones through the Sectional Map Amendment. The village zones require a mixture of uses, including residential, retail and other limited commercial, civic, and recreational, surrounded by a permanent open space buffer area. Building and street design, landscaping, and other regulations are set forth to ensure a development with a strong sense of community identity based on a shared, coherent, functionally efficient physical environment.

Amendments to Subtitle 23 (The Road Code) and Subtitle 24 (Subdivisions) will also be necessary.