

# PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY COUNCIL

## COMMITTEE REPORT

2018 Legislative Session

---

**Reference No.:** CB-092-2018

**Draft No.:** 2

**Committee:** PLANNING, ZONING, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**Date:** 09/19/2018

**Action:** FAV (A)

---

### REPORT:

Committee Vote: Favorable as amended, 5–0 (In favor: Council Members Harrison, Franklin, Glaros, Patterson, and Toles)

The Council's Zoning and Legislative Counsel summarized the purpose of the legislation and informed the committee that, since the bill had been recently presented by the Council at its September 18, 2018, legislative session-day, no formal comments had been received regarding the subject legislation prior to the committee's final work session. This legislation amends the Zoning Ordinance Commercial Table of Uses to provide for certain mixed use and residential development, as set forth in an applicable area master or sector plan, in furtherance of realizing the plan vision calling for revitalization and redevelopment of aging commercial shopping centers in the County. Council Member Toles, the bill's sponsor, indicated that this bill is intended to facilitate opportunities for redevelopment and reinvestment of struggling, aged integrated shopping centers, to promote community investment opportunities, multifamily and commercial development responsive to market demand, to include seniors desirous of aging in place, and opportunities to incentivize owner-occupied multifamily housing for veterans.

Council Member Glaros inquired as to the purpose and significance of the language of subsection (C) to proposed Footnote 66, in the bill, which provides, "(C) In addition, a preliminary plan of subdivision application may be required in order to appropriately address adequacy of public facilities, absent sufficient demonstration by applicant that the existing record plat is adequate to support the proposed development contemplated herein." The Zoning and Legislative Counsel, as the bill's drafter, responded that the inclusion of this requirement in the proposed footnote does not create or supplant any otherwise applicable provision of the County Subdivision Regulations for proposed development pursuant to this Ordinance. As such, Counsel recommended that subsection (C) to proposed Footnote 66 be stricken as surplusage.

The Zoning Hearing Examiner commented that a title change is needed in Lines 2 and 4 on Page 1 to reflect the bill's proposed application to certain property within the C-O Zone. In addition, the Zoning Hearing Examiner offered a clerical correction in the first line of subsection (A) to proposed footnote 66 to substitute "an" for "a" therein.

The bill's sponsor made a motion for favorable recommendation on the legislation as amended, seconded by Council Member Glaros.

The committee unanimously voted for a favorable recommendation as to CB-092-2018, as amended.