

# APPENDICES



## New Town Recommendations Report June 15, 2026

## Appendix G: Comment Log

## The New Town Task Force Comment Log

#	Date	Event	Comment
1	October 20-21, 2025	New Town Task Force Public Meeting No. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Can Columbia be designated a “Special Zone” (i.e. like Historical Areas) to preserve original design!</li> <li>- Where is “Covenant enforcement”? At village level?</li> </ul> <p>To Columbia Association</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is future of Brick and Mortar stores, re: problems w/mixed use developments</li> <li>- What will zoning be for medical zoning (i.e. new hospital/rehab facilities)(senior population increases)</li> <li>-Affordability and Sustainability of housing, going out 10-20 years?</li> </ul>
2	October 20-21, 2025	New Town Task Force Public Meeting No. 1	<p>Market these opportunities better. There should be a wider net cast, if you depend upon the current audience to share with their networks there will more than likely lack diversity in community commentary. Everyone does receive and know about the DPZ Ball Bulletin newsletters. I’ll share with my networks but how do I convince them that this is important?</p>
3	October 20-21, 2025	New Town Task Force Public Meeting No. 1	<p>The presentative was quite informative about the task force, and I am interested in seeing how the group (task force) moves forward with the zoning aspect of the plan.</p>
4	October 20-21, 2025	New Town Task Force Public Meeting No. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There should be design guidelines (like the Downtown Columbia Plan) which allow people and orgs. (DPZ, Planning Board, etc.) to evaluate proposals (to FDP/SDP) for changes</li> <li>- Should remove Original Petitioner role</li> <li>- Since Columbia is developed, no need for CDPS</li> <li>- The current zoning regs allow for up to a certain % of other zoning uses; so something like MX (mixed use) can be accommodated under the regs.</li> <li>- Should separate credited &amp; non-credited open space</li> <li>- Since Columbia was developed with a wide range of housing types, MIHU targets aren’t needed, instead should preserve the current mixture.</li> </ul>

5	October 20-21, 2025	<b>New Town Task Force Public Meeting No. 1</b>	The location of new development is so far very non-specific. How will new development affect existing Columbia housing, retail, education, etc.? Will the new development plan sufficiently for expanding school populations? Many expanded housing sites will put pressure on infrastructure and schools. Trailer classrooms cannot handle the expanding school populations. How was membership in Task Force decided?
6	December 9, 2025	<b>Task Force Meeting #6</b>	Downtown MOU: “Deed Covenant Modernization and Improvement Initiative The Developer shall make a good faith effort to work over the next 6 to 12 months after the enactment of the legislation, with the county, the Columbia Association, the Columbia Village Associations and commercial property owners throughout Columbia to improve and modernize the real property covenant structure throughout Columbia.” “Ultimately, the transfer of obligations to [CA] did not occur because not occur because they wanted the Developer to continue paying the 3 <sup>rd</sup> parts costs of these architectural reviews and enforcements.”
7	December 9, 2025	<b>Task Force Meeting #6</b>	Comment by member – “nothing to do with the covenants” EO says to make recommendations including but not limited to “development processes”. This includes covenants – see comments on Downtown MOU.
8	December 9, 2025	<b>Task Force Meeting #6</b>	City of Greenbelt has authority to grant “variances from the strict application of the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance with respect to lot size, setback, lot coverage, lot width frontage, green area, height and any other requirements of the Prince George’s County zoning.” Sec. 20-3(a) City of Greenbelt
9	December 9, 2025	<b>Task Force Meeting #6</b>	A member asked about the County Council being the Zoning Board. For a history and explanation please see Turf Valley Assoc. v. Zoning Board of Howard County 262 Md 632, 278 A2d 574 (1971)
10	April 8, 2026	<b>New Town Task Force Public Meeting No. 2</b>	The term “New Town” is confusing to the public. As I understand it, legally it is accurate and probably necessary. However, the general public could easily

			interpret this to refer to a “New Town” related to Columbia, which I thought until this meeting. Please develop an alternative name for this vis-a-vis public involvement. It is basically proposed revisions to Columbia zoning.
<b>11</b>	<b>April 8, 2026</b>	<b>New Town Task Force Public Meeting No. 2</b>	Please send an email for the comment form survey.
<b>12</b>	<b>April 8, 2026</b>	<b>New Town Task Force Public Meeting No. 2</b>	<p>In the spirit of new ideas, I’d like to see a sequential “ratcheting” automated time-based upzoning system.</p> <p>Define a sequence of density categories SFD -&gt; SFA -&gt; MF (example) and then define a time window (20-40 years) and the property owner can request an upzoning as a simple administrative process.</p> <p>This manages growth, but preserves us from being “locked in” to current built neighborhoods.</p>
<b>13</b>	<b>April 8, 2026</b>	<b>New Town Task Force Public Meeting No. 2</b>	How is NT connected to rest of HoCo – even out parcels integrated into/surrounded by “CA” Columbia. What plans are made to not “break” things at boundaries.

Updated: April 21, 2026