
A G E N D A I T E M S U M M A R Y**Reference No:** CB-15-1991**Draft No:** 1**P r i n c e G e o r g e ' s****Meeting Date:** 3/19/91**C o u n t y C o u n c i l****Requester:** C CA

Item Title: An Ordinance for the purpose of deleting
 revisory petitions for a Sectional Map
 Amendment.

Sponsors C CA

Date Presented	2/12/91		Executive Action	___/___/___	---
Committee Referral	(1) 2/12/91	P&Z	Effective Date	___/___/___	---
Committee Action	(1) 3/4/91	FAV			
Date Introduced	3/19/91				
Pub. Hearing Date	(1) 4/16/91	1:30 PM			
Council Action	(1) 4/16/91	Failed			
Council Votes	CA: A_, B_: N_, C_: A_, D_: A_, F_: A_, MC: N_, M_: N_, P_: N_, WI: N_, __: __, __: __, __: __				
Pass/Fail	F				

Remarks _____

 Joyce Birkel, Prin. Cnsl. **Resource**
Drafter: to the District Council **Personnel:** Mary Lane

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY**PLANNING AND ZONING REPORT**

DATE: 3/4/91

Committee Vote: Favorable, 5-1-0 (In favor: Council Members Castaldi,
Casula, Fletcher, Del Giudice and Wineland; in
opposition: Council Member Mills).

This legislation deletes all provisions for revisory petitions from the Zoning Ordinance. The legislation is supported by the Prince George's Municipal Association and the Association of Realtors, and opposed by the M-NCPPC, the Chamber of Commerce and the SMBIA. Tom Haller and Larry Taub, representing the Chamber and SMBIA, respectively, stated that revisories are often a useful and necessary mechanism for property owners that enter the SMA process too late. Joyce Birkel, Counsel to the District Council, noted that this process

does not exist in other jurisdictions, and the property owners may still appeal to the Courts. Gail Wheat, representing the Municipal Association, stated the Association's belief that judicial appeal is more appropriate than the revisory procedure.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION/FISCAL IMPACT

(Includes reason for proposal, as well as any unique statutory requirements)

The Sectional Map Amendment revisory process developed as an equitable remedy to correct alleged errors in the zoning process. Since legal redress is available by appeal to the courts, and administrative remedy is available for drafting errors, and since this equitable remedy is not available for any other type of process, it has been determined that this process is unnecessary, duplicative, and relief is available through other established means.