

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George=s County Planning Board has reviewed Basic Plan Amendment Application A-9550 requesting to add mid-rise residential condominiums as an approved land use type in accordance with Subtitle 27 of the Prince George=s County Code; and

WHEREAS, after consideration of the evidence presented at the public hearing on October 18, 2001, the Prince George's County Planning Board finds:

- A. The Planning Board does not agree with the recommendation of the Technical Staff that this application be denied.
- B. Location and Field Inspection: The property is a rectangular-shaped parcel located on the north side of MD 202, approximately 2,500 feet west of Watkins Park Drive. There are floodplains, streams, and wetlands on this undeveloped, wooded site.
- C. History:

Original Basic Plan

The Original Basic Plan contained three separate Zoning Map Amendments including A-9550, which is the subject of this Basic Plan Amendment request.

Application A-9550 was originally filed May 1, 1985, for the R-M, 5.8 Zone and contained a site area of 34.8 acres with a base density of 5.8 dwelling units per acre and a maximum density of 7.9 dwelling units per acre. This translates to a base of 191 units and a maximum of 261 units. The proposed use for the property was specifically housing for elderly and physically handicapped persons.

The District Council, on July 21, 1986, approved A-9550 subject to nine conditions and two considerations.

1987 Basic Plan Amendment

In 1987, the Basic Plan for A-9550 was amended primarily to revise the original conditions of approval. The sole land use permitted remained as mid-rise housing for the elderly and physically handicapped.

Preliminary Plat 4-88020

PGCPB No. 88-237 is the approved preliminary plat that includes the R-M-zoned portion of Perrywood.
Comprehensive Design Plan 8708/02

PGCPB No. 88-157, April 1998, was the first approved CDP which included the R-M-zoned portion of Perrywood. This CDP was amended in March 1997 by PGCPB No, 97-43(c).

Specific Design Plan 9005/01

PGCPB No. 90-220 was the first SDP approval for AHorizon House, @ 261 mid-rise units for the elderly and physically handicapped. SDP 9005/01 was approved in April 1998 by PGCPB No. 98-78; 181 units of elderly housing were proposed.

- D. Master Plan Recommendation: The 1990 *Master Plan for Largo-Lottsford* recommends senior citizen housing for the subject property. Significant buffers of private open space are also recommendedd
- E. Request: The Basic Plan currently permits the construction of 261 housing units for elderly and physically handicapped persons. The proposed amendment requests the flexibility to market the units as mid-rise condominiums to the general population.
- F. Neighborhood and Surrounding Uses:

The property is surrounded by the following uses:

- North - M-NCPPC park land (Watkins Park) in the R-O-S Zone.
- East - Single-family detached homes in the R-S Zone.
- South - Across MD 202 (Largo Road) is Largo Landing Senior Citizen Apartments in the R-10A Zone and Riverdale Baptist Church and School in the R-E Zone.
- West - PEPCO right-of-way and undeveloped land in the R-O-S Zone.

- G. The subject application is being reviewed in accordance with Section 27-197(c) which permits the amendment of an approved Basic Plan, provided that it does

not involve a change in land area or an increase in land use density or intensity. Such an amendment must be approved by the District Council.

H. Section 27-195(b) provides that:

Prior to the approval of the application and the Basic Plan, the applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the District Council, that the entire development meets the following criteria:

(A) The proposed Basic Plan shall either conform to:

- (i) The specific recommendation of a General Plan map, Area Master Plan map; or urban renewal plan map; or the principles and guidelines of the plan text which address the design and physical development of the property, the public facilities necessary to serve the proposed development, and the impact which the development may have on the environment and surrounding properties; or**
- (ii) The principles and guidelines described in the Plan (including the text) with respect to land use, the number of dwelling units, intensity of nonresidential buildings, and the location of land uses.**

The applicant is requesting that a second use, mid-rise residential condominiums, be added to the list of approved uses for the basic plan. Currently, only housing for senior citizens is permitted on the subject property. The 1990 *Master Plan for Largo-Lottsford* recommends senior citizen housing for the subject property. The Master Plan map indicates that multi-family housing is recommended but has an ASC@ symbol over the multi-family zone to suggest senior citizen housing is preferred. The applicant's proposal does not eliminate senior housing from the use list, it merely adds general multi-family condominiums. Such an amendment is consistent with the recommendations of the Master Plan.

(B) The economic analysis submitted for a proposed retail commercial area adequately justifies an area of the size and scope shown on the Basic Plan;

The proposal is for residential development. This finding does not apply.

(C) Transportation facilities (including streets and public transit) (i) which are existing, (ii) which are under construction, or (iii) for which one hundred percent (100%) of the construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or will be provided by the applicant,

will be adequate to carry the anticipated traffic generated by the development based on the maximum proposed density. The uses proposed will not generate traffic which would lower the level of service anticipated by the land use and circulation systems shown on the approved General or Area Master Plans, or urban renewal plans;

The Transportation Planning and Public Facilities Division, in a memo dated September 20, 2001, submits the following analysis:

AThe current application is proposing the construction of 261 mid-rise residential condominium units instead of dwelling units for the elderly. According to the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*, a condominium unit will generate more traffic than dwelling units for the elderly. While the overall number of units will be consistent with previous approvals, the change in unit type will result in more traffic on the nearby transportation network. To that end, staff has required the applicant to furnish a new traffic study to reflect these changes.

AIn August 2000, staff received a traffic study in support of the subject application. Because the study area included county and state transportation facilities, copies of the study were sent to the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) and the State Highway Administration (SHA) for their review and comments.

AThe study identified the following intersections as the ones on which the proposed development would have the most impact:

EXISTING CONDITIONS		
Intersection	AM (LOS/CLV)	PM (LOS/CLV)
MD 202/MD 193	B/1,012	A/944
MD 202/White House Road	B/1,139	B/1,010

AThe study cited eight (8) approved background developments which collectively will impact the above intersections during the morning and evening peak hours. An analysis of the background developments was done, and the following results were determined:

BACKGROUND CONDITIONS		
Intersection	AM (LOS/CLV)	PM (LOS/CLV)
MD 202/MD 193	C/1,244	C/1,221

MD 202/White House Road	D/1,325	C/1,186
MD 202/Site Access *	D/26.9 secs. delay	C/17.1 secs. delay
* Unsignalized intersections are analyzed using the Highway Capacity Software. The results show the level of service and the intersection delay measured in seconds/vehicle. A Level-of-Service E, which is deemed acceptable, corresponds to a maximum delay of 50 seconds/car. For signalized intersections, a CLV of 1,450 or less is deemed acceptable as per the <i>Guidelines</i> .		

AUsing the *Guidelines For The Analysis Of The Traffic Impact Of Development Proposals*, the study has the following trip generation for the approved use as well as the proposed use:

Land Use	Morning Peak			Evening Peak		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Trip Generation Rates/unit - Garden Apartments	0.10	0.42	0.52	0.39	0.21	0.60
Trip Generation - 261 Condominium Units	26	110	136	102	55	157
Trip Generation - 261 Elderly Housing Units	34	71	105	71	34	105
Trip Generation (Net)	-8	39	31	31	21	52

AThe traffic study assumed a two percent growth in through traffic, hence the existing traffic data were adjusted commensurately. With the inclusion of the existing, background and site-generated projections, the intersections were re-analyzed, and the following results were determined:

TOTAL (FUTURE) CONDITIONS		
Intersection	AM (LOS/CLV)	PM (LOS/CLV)
MD 202/MD 193	C/1,249	C/1,227
MD 202/White House Road	D/1,338	C/1,197
MD 202/Site Access *	D/31.8 secs. delay	C/17.9 secs. delay
* Unsignalized intersections are analyzed using the Highway Capacity Software. The results show the level of service and the intersection delay measured in seconds/vehicle. A Level-of-Service E, which is deemed acceptable, corresponds to a maximum delay of 50 seconds/car. For signalized intersections, a CLV of 1,450 or less is deemed acceptable as per the <i>Guidelines</i> .		

AOOn the basis of these tabulated results, the traffic study concluded that all of the intersections within the study area are projected to operate at an acceptable level of service (D or better) with the development of up to 261 mid-rise condominium units on the subject property. A September 7, 2001, letter from the SHA to staff (*McDonald to Foster*) indicates SHA=s concurrence with this finding. An August 31, 2001, memorandum from DPW&T (*Issayans to Burton*) also concurred with the study=s conclusions.

ABased on staff=s analyses of the traffic data and with input from the local agencies, staff concludes that approval of the subject application will have no adverse impact on the surrounding traffic network.@

- (D) **Other existing or planned private and public facilities which are existing, under construction, or for which construction funds are contained in the first six (6) years of the adopted County Capital Improvement Program (such as schools, recreation areas, water and sewerage systems, libraries, and fire stations) will be adequate for the uses proposed;**

The Growth Policy and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed this application for adequacy of public facilities and in a memo dated October 1, 2001, submits the following findings:

AFire Service

AThe existing fire engine service at Kentland, Company 46, located at 10400 Campus Way South, has a service response time of 5.12 minutes, which is beyond the 3.25-minute response time guideline.

AThe existing ambulance service at Kentland, Company 46, located at 10400 Campus Way South, has a service response time of 5.12 minutes, which is beyond the 4.25-minute response time guideline.

AThe existing paramedic service at Kentland, Company 46, located at 10400 Campus Way South, has a service response time of 5.12 minutes, which is within the 7.25-minute response time guideline.

AThe existing ladder truck service at Kentland, Company 33, located at 7701 Landover Road, has a service response time of 11.07 minutes, which is beyond the 4.25-minute response time guideline.

AThese findings are in conformance with the *Adopted and Approved Public Safety Master Plan 1990* and the *Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities*.

AIn order to alleviate the negative impact on fire and rescue services due to the inadequate service discussed, the Fire Department recommends that all residential structures be fully sprinklered in accordance with National Fire Protection Association Standard 13D and all applicable Prince George=s County laws.

APolice Services

AThe proposed development is within the service area of District II-Bowie. The staff of the Growth Policy and Public Facilities Planning Section conclude that the existing police facilities will be adequate to serve the proposed development.

APublic Schools

AThe Growth Policy and Public Facilities Planning Section reviewed the Amendment of the Basic Plan for adequacy of public facilities in accordance with the *Regulations to Analyze the Development Impact on Public School Facilities* (revised January 2001) (CR-4-1998).

Projected Impact on Approved Public Schools

Affected School Name	D.U. by Type	Pupil Yield Factor	Development Pupil Yield	5- Year Enrollment	Adjusted Enrollment	Total Projected Enrollment	State Rated Capacity	Percentage of Capacity
Perrywood Elementary School	261 MFD	0.24	62.64	841	0	903.64	750	120.49%
Kettering Middle School	261 MFD	0.06	15.66	854	858.02	873.68	977	89.42%
Largo High School	261 MFD	0.12	31.32	1930	1938.04	1969.36	1958	100.58%

ASince the affected Perrywood Elementary School projected percentage of capacity is greater than 105 percent, the Adequate Public Facilities fee is \$2,160 per dwelling unit. The amount of the Adequate Public Facilities fee for schools shall be offset by the School Facilities Surcharge.

AThe subject project will be tested again at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision and a finding of adequate public facilities will be made at that time. If any of the affected schools are operating at a capacity that exceeds 130 percent, a 4-year waiting period will be applied.@

- (E) **Environmental relationships reflect compatibility between the proposed general land use types, or if identified, the specific land use types, and surrounding land uses, so as to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the Regional District.**

The proposal is generally compatible with surrounding land uses which include park land, single-family detached dwellings, and a mid-rise senior citizen housing (across Largo Road).

The Environmental Planning Section submits the following analysis of environmental relationships (memo dated Sept. 10, 2001):

ABackground

AThe Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed applications for this

property numbered A-9550, CDP-8708, CDP-8811, CDP-8908, CDP-8908/01, CDP-8908/02 4-88020, SDP-9005, and SDP-9005/01. This Zoning Map Amendment is for an amendment to the Basic Plan of the subject property to permit mid-rise condominium units. A Tree Conservation Plan, TCP II/121/97, was approved with SDP-8908/02.

ASite Description

AThe 25.23 acre parcel is located on the north side of Route 202 about 2020 feet west of Watkins Park Road. There are floodplains, streams, and wetlands on the site. Current air photos indicate that most of the site is wooded. No Historic or Scenic roads are affected by this proposal. Adjacent Route 202 is a significant nearby noise source. No rare/threatened/endangered species are known to occur on the project site, but are known to occur in the project vicinity. According to the Sewer Service and Water Service maps produced by DER the property is in categories W-3 and S-3. The principal soils on the site are in the Collington series and pose no problems for development. Marlboro Clay does not occur in the area.

A1. This site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it is more than 40,000 square feet in size and contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodland. A Tree Conservation Plan is required to satisfy the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. A Tree Conservation Plan, TCP II/121/97, was approved with SDP-8908/02.

ADiscussion: No further action is required at this time.

A2. The site contains floodplain, streams, wetlands, extensive stream buffer, and is know to have plant species listed by the State of Maryland as rare, threatened, or endangered. All of the sensitive areas are within the woodland conservation areas.

ADiscussion: No further action is required at this time.

A3. Maryland Route 202 is a known noise generator. Noise impacts will be reviewed and evaluated with the new or revised Specific Design Plan.

Discussion: No further action is required at this time.

ARecommendations

AThe Environmental Planning Section has no conditions for approval of the amendment of A-9550. @

- (2) **Notwithstanding subparagraphs (C) and (D), above, where the application anticipates a construction schedule of more than six (6) years (Section 27-179), public facilities (existing or scheduled for construction within the first six (6) years) will be adequate to serve the development proposed to occur within the first six (6) years. The Council shall also find that public facilities probably will be adequately supplied for the remainder of the project. In considering the probability of future public facilities construction, the Council may consider such things as existing plans**

for construction, budgetary constraints on providing public facilities, the public interest and public need for the particular development, the relationship of the development to public transportation, or any other matter that indicates that public or private funds will likely be expended for the necessary facilities.

A construction schedule of less than six years is anticipated.

I. Conformance with the Purposes of the Zone Requested:

The purposes of the R-M Zone are to:

- (1) Establish (in the public interest) a plan implementation zone, in which (among other things):**
 - (A) Permissible residential density is dependent upon providing public benefit features and related density increment factors; and**
 - (B) The location of the zone must be in accordance with the adopted and approved General Plans, Master Plan, or public urban renewal plans;**

In approving the original Basic Plan for the property, the District Council determined that a minimal amount of public benefit features may permit development of greater than the base density of 191 units, but not more than 261 units in the R-M Zone. The subject application does not seek to change the number of units or density.

- (2) Establish regulations through which adopted and approved public plans and policies (such as the General Plan, Master Plans, and public urban renewal plans) can serve as the criteria for judging individual physical development proposals;**

The applicant=s request to amend the list of permitted uses to include mid-rise residential condominium units is consistent with the Master Plan. Multi-family development was anticipated on the subject property.

- (3) Assure the compatibility of proposed land uses with existing and proposed surrounding land uses, and existing and proposed public facilities and services, so as to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the Regional District;**

The property is surrounded by parkland and single-family detached housing. The proposed uses are compatible with existing and proposed land uses.

- (4) Encourage amenities and public facilities to be provided in conjunction with residential development;**

The applicant has not provided information regarding amenities associated with the proposed development.

- (5) Encourage and stimulate balanced land development; and**

The Planning Board believes the Master Plan serves as the guide to the types of uses that will encourage and stimulate balanced land development. In the case of the subject

property, housing for senior citizens and multi-family development was determined to be the type of development that is most appropriate.

(6) Improve the overall quality and variety of residential environments in the Regional District.

The proposal provides a variety of residential environments by adding another type of multi-family use. The conditions of approval are included to insure the quality of the development.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George=s County Code, the Prince George=s County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and recommends to the District Council for Prince George=s County, Maryland that the above-noted application, A-9550 be APPROVED , subject to the following conditions:

1. The list of proposed uses for the Basic Plan shall be amended to permit senior citizen housing and/or mid-rise (3 to 4 story) residential condominiums in the R-M Zone at 5.8 to 7.9 dwelling units per acre. The number of dwelling units shall not exceed 261 units.
2. An acoustical analysis shall be performed as part of the Specific Design Plan to determine whether any noise mitigation is needed for residential units near Route 202.
3. No living area of a residential structure may be place to a depth below grade to where it would be reasonable to believe the natural water table rises during occasional or seasonal extreme wet weather.
4. No incremental factor shall be permitted for any lands or facilities which are located in floodplains, which are part or all of a storm water management system or which are areas required in accordance with the legislative actions implementing the Patuxent River Policy Plan.
5. No septic system may be permitted.
6. In considering density increments, the Planning Board shall be guided by prior Comprehensive Design Plan and Specific Design Plan decisions.

PGCPB No. 01-218
File No. -A-9550
Page

* * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Lowe, seconded by Commissioner Eley, with Commissioners Lowe, Eley, Scott, Brown and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, October 18, 2001, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 15th day of November 2001.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:JJ:rmk