

Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Prince George's County Planning Department
Development Review Division
301-952-3530



Comment [COMMENT1]: WHEN INSERTING
INFORMATION AT THE @ SIGN
REMEMBER TO USE INDENT FOR SECOND
LINE - NOT TAB. ALSO, IT WILL LOOK
LIKE THE TEXT IS GOING WACKO, BUT
DON'T WORRY - IT IS FINE.

BASIC PLAN AMENDMENT

A-9550

Application	General Data
Project Name Horizon House Location North side of MD 202 approximately 2,500 feet west of Watkins Park Drive. Applicant Dee Corporation 2200 Defense Highway #101 Crofton, Maryland 21114	Date Accepted7/26/01
	Planning Board Action LimitN/A
	Tax Map & Grid075 F-3
	Plan Acreage25.3 Acres
	ZoneR-M
	Dwelling Units261
	Square FootageN/A
	Planning Area73
	Council District06
	MunicipalityNone
	200-Scale Base Map202SE11

Purpose of Application			Notice Dates	
Amendment of Basic Plan to add mid-rise residential condominiums as an approved land use type.			Adjoining Property Owners (CB-15-1998)	9-25-01
			Previous Parties of Record (CB-13-1997)	10-01-01
			Sign(s) Posted on Site	N/A
			Variance(s): Adjoining Property Owners	N/A
Staff Recommendation			Staff Reviewer	
			Jimi Jones	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION	
		X		

October 3, 2001

TECHNICAL STAFF REPORT:

TO: The Prince George's County Planning Board
The Prince George's County District Council

VIA: Arie Stouten, Zoning Supervisor

FROM: Jimi Jones, Planning Coordinator

SUBJECT: **Zoning Application No. A-9550**

REQUEST: Amendment of Basic Plan to add mid-rise residential condominiums to the approved use list

RECOMMENDATION: **DENIAL**

NOTE:

This application is on the agenda for the Planning Board to decide whether or not to schedule a public hearing. If the Planning Board decides to hear the application, it will be placed on a future agenda.

Any person may request the Planning Board to schedule a public hearing. The request may be made in writing prior to the agenda date or in person on the agenda date. All requests must specify the reasons for the public hearing. All parties will be notified of the Planning Board's decision.

You are encouraged to become a person of record in this application. The request must be made in writing and sent to the Office of the Zoning Hearing Examiner at the address indicated above. Questions about becoming a person of record should be directed to the Hearing Examiner at 301-952-3644. All other questions should be directed to the Development Review Division at 301-952-3530.

FINDINGS:

- A. 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.

- B. 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 (see attached District Council's Zoning Ordinance approving A-9550).

1987 Basic Plan Amendment

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

Preliminary Plat 4-88020

PGCPB No. 88-237 (attached) 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 (attached). This CDP was amended in March 1997 by PGCPB No. 97-43(c) (attached).

Specific Design Plan 9005/01

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

- C. 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 recommended.

D. 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.

E. 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.

F. Zoning Requirements:

Section 27-197(c):

If an amendment of an approved Basic Plan does not involve a change in land area or an increase in land use density or intensity, the Plan may be amended by the Council in accordance with the following procedures:

- (1) **The applicant shall file the request (in triplicate) with the Clerk of the Council. The petition shall be accompanied by a new reproducible copy of the proposed new Basic Plan (graphic only) or three (3) copies of the proposed new Basic Plan Text (as necessary depending on the amendment proposed). The Clerk's office shall advise the applicant (in writing) that the Technical Staff has found that the request is complete.**
- (2) **The Clerk of the Council shall refer copies of the request and accompanying documents to the Planning Board and to the People's Zoning Counsel. The Planning Board and the People's Zoning Counsel shall submit any comments which they have on the request to the Council, the Zoning Hearing Examiner, the petitioner, and all persons of record in the original Zoning Map Amendment application. The comments shall be submitted not later than sixty (60) days after the date the Clerk refers the petition to them, unless such deadline is waived in writing by the applicant.**
- (3) **Within one hundred twenty (120) days after referral of the petition to the Planning Board and People's Zoning Counsel, the Zoning Hearing Examiner shall conduct a public hearing on the petition. The hearing shall be held in accordance with Section 27-129. The hearing shall not be held until after the sixty (60) day review period has expired, unless both the Planning Board and People's Zoning Counsel have submitted their comments.**

- (4) The Office of the Zoning Hearing Examiner shall notify all persons of record (including those of the original application) of the hearing by regular mail. The notice shall be mailed not less than fifteen (15), nor more than twenty-one (21), days prior to the scheduled public hearing. Further advance notice of the public hearing shall be given by the Office of the Zoning Hearing Examiner, in accordance with the provisions of Section 27-186(a)(3).
- (5) Within thirty (30) days from the close of the hearing record, the Zoning Hearing Examiner shall file a written recommendation with the District Council, unless such deadline is waived in writing by the applicant.
- (6) All persons of record shall be given at least ten (10) days written notice by the Clerk of the Council of the date and time of the District Council's consideration of the matter.
- (7) Any person of record may appeal the recommendation of the Zoning Hearing Examiner within fifteen (15) days of the filing of the Zoning Hearing Examiner's recommendation with the District Council. If appealed, all persons of record may testify before the District Council.
- (8) Persons arguing shall adhere to the District Council's Rules of Procedure, and argument shall be limited to thirty (30) minutes for each side, and to the record of the hearing.
- (9) In approving the petition, the District Council shall find that the requirements of Section 27-195(b) have been met. If the Council does not act within forty-five (45) days of the filing of the written recommendation, the petition shall be considered to have been denied.

Section 27-195(b):

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 Community Planning Division, in a memo dated September 17, 2001, points out that:

■The master plan is very specific in its recommendation that senior citizen housing be constructed on this property. There is no indication that multifamily housing for the general public is envisioned or recommended.

■Living Areas Guideline 6 stipulates that "High density housing should be located only . . . where designated in the plan." While the plan does recommend high-density housing at this location, such housing is to be for senior citizens. High-density housing for the general public is recommended at other locations within PA 73.

The applicant, in a memo dated October 1, 2001, submits that the Master Plan merely mimicked the District Council's 1986 approval of the Basic Plan which requested senior housing.

Zoning Ordinance 45-1986 was enacted by District Council to approve the Basic Plan for A-9550 (attached). In June 1987, Council amended its decision by adopting the following conditions and considerations:

■**Land Use Type and Quantities:**

Gross Area: 34.8 acres
Flood Plain: 3.6 acres
Net Area: 33.0 acres

■Base Density: 5.8 du/ac-191 dwelling units
Increment: 70 dwelling units
Maximum Density 7.9 du/ac- 261 dwelling units*

■**Proposed Uses:**

■Mid-rise multifamily housing for the elderly and physically handicapped.

■*The actual number of dwelling units will be determined at the time of Comprehensive Design Plan approval after an analysis of the public benefit features set forth in Section 27-529(b) of the Zoning Ordinance.

■**Conditions:**

■1. The Comprehensive Design Plan and Specific Design Plan shall conform with the Patuxent River Policy Plan as set forth by Prince George's County.

■2. Noise attenuation barriers shall be installed between any residential structure within 350 feet of the pavement the proposed northbound lane of

Route 202 to ensure and maintain a reduction of noise from traffic on those proposed roads to 65 dBA, Ldn.

■3. No living area of a residential structure may be placed 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. The Comprehensive Design Plan shall include an analysis of the nature and scope of the housing for the elderly and physically handicapped.

■5. No septic system may be permitted.

■6. An amended Basic Plan shall be filed that is in conformance with this decision for approval by the District Council.

■7. There shall be a minimum of a 100-foot wide buffer, as measured from the street line, along Route 202. The buffer shall be either in homeowners association ownership, or, if part of a house lot, shall be otherwise covenanted to prohibit any building or structures or removal of vegetation required as part of the buffer. The buffer shall include berms and plantings, including preservation of existing vegetation where appropriate, sufficient to filter the view of houses from the road. The buffer shall vary in height and width and setback from the road right-of-way to provide visual variety and a more natural appearance.

■8. There shall be no grading or cutting of trees prior to the approval of the Comprehensive Design Plan, except upon written permission from the Prince Georges County Planning Board, when necessary for forestry management or for water and sewer lines approved by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission.

■9. All multifamily and three-family dwellings as defined by Section 27-107.1(a)(77) and (78) shall be fully sprinklered in accordance with National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard 13 and all applicable county laws unless or until a determination is made by the Prince Georges County Planning Board that additional fire and rescue facilities are available that will eliminate the existing deficiency in ladder truck service.

■Considerations:

■1. In subsequent consideration of development plans in this case, the Planning Board shall be guided by those exhibits, and testimony presented for approval of the original and Amended Basic Plans as modified herein.

■2. In considering density increases, the Planning Board shall be guided by the discussion in the Zoning Hearing Examiner's decision dated February 24, 1986, relative to public benefit features and increment factors.●

The Urban Design Section reviewed the Council's decision and submits the following comments:

- 1. The original Basic Plan (A-9550) was approved by the District Council on June 23, 1986, along with two other Basic Plans for the development of the overall Perrywood lands, then known as Tuck Farm. The District Council's decision on A-9550 is embodied in Zoning Ordinance No. 45 -1986 and includes the following condition No. 1:

■The Basic Plan, Exh. J-21, shall be amended by adding •FOR SENIOR CITIZEN HOUSING• TO •DWELLINGS,•under •PROPOSED USE•and under •RESIDENTIAL R-M 5.8 ZONE.▲

■This condition seems to indicate that the language on the original Basic plan allowed for housing other than Senior Citizen Housing and that the District Council may have intended to restrict the use of the property. This issue should be investigated so that there is a clear understanding of the history and the intent of the District Council at the time of their decision.
- 2. An Amended Basic Plan was reviewed and approved by the District Council on June 8, 1987, which revised previous conditions of approval. Condition No. 1 above was no longer included as a condition; however, the only proposed use in the Amended Basic Plan was listed as:

■Mid-rise multifamily housing for the elderly and the physically handicapped.

■Therefore, it is possible that the District Council intended to limited the use of the property to a special category of housing.
- 3. If the Planning Board and/or the District Council determines that the change in use of the property from elderly/handicap housing to general multifamily use is appropriate, Condition No. 7 of the Amended Basic Plan should continue to apply to the development of the property. The Considerations of the Amended Basic Plan should be eliminated as the exhibits and testimony presented at the original and Amended Basic plans are no longer relevant. The first consideration should not apply because of the technological advances in architectural design and style since 1987. The second consideration should no longer apply because the discussion within the Zoning Hearing Examiner's decision is out-dated. The techniques for determining increases in density increments through the use of public benefit features and increment factors is much more complex today than in 1987.
- 4. The Urban Design Section recommends a minimum buffer be provided along the east side of the subject property adjacent to the M-NCPPC lands. The Park property was acquired for the purpose of providing another entrance to Watkins Regional Park located to the north and west of the subject property. A minimum buffer width of 50 feet is appropriate to screen the future development of the subject property from the future entrance road into the park.●

- (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:

■The 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.

■In 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.

■The 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

■The 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> .		

■Using 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

■The 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
<p>* 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>.</p>		

■ On 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.

■ Based 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:

■ Fire Service

■ The 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.

■ The 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.

■The 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.

■The 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.

■These 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*.

■In 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.

■Police Services

■The 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.

■Public Schools

■The 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%

Source: Prince George's County Planning Department, M-NCPPC, January 2001

■ Since 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.

■ The 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):

■ Background

■ The 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.

■ Site Description

■ The 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.

■ 1. 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.

■*Discussion: No further action is required at this time.*

■2. The site contains floodplain, streams, wetlands, extensive stream buffer, and is known 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.

■*Discussion: No further action is required at this time.*

■3. 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.

■**Recommendations**

■The 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.

G. 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;**

In approving the Basic Plan, the District Council specified that the subject property was to be developed with ■housing for the elderly and physically handicapped.● The applicant●s request to amend the list of permitted uses to include mid-rise residential condominium units is not consistent with the Master Plan or Council●s findings in Zoning Ordinance 45-1986.

- (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 District Council previously determined that restricting the dwelling units to ■housing for the elderly and physically handicapped● was necessary to ensure compatibility with surrounding uses and public facilities/services to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the Regional District.

- (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**

Staff 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 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.**

While staff does not doubt that the proposed mid-rise condominium development could improve the overall quality and variety of residential environments, both the Master Plan and District Council clearly chose senior housing as the preferred type of residential environment.

CONCLUSION:

The applicant has failed to demonstrate conformance with the requirements for amending the Basic Plan as contained in Sections 27-197(c) and 27-195(b) of the Zoning Ordinance. Foremost, this request does not conform with the 1990 *Master Plan for Largo-Lottsford* which recommends senior citizen housing for the property. The Master Plan goes as far as placing an ■SC● symbol on the property to designate its intent for senior housing. District Council, in approving the Basic Plan for A-9550 in July 1986 (Zoning Ordinance 45-1986) was equally as specific by approving the application ■ . . for Senior Citizen Housing

only. . . .• In addition, the applicant has failed to demonstrate why these recommendations and decisions are no longer valid. Staff therefore, recommends DENIAL of A-9550 Amended Basic Plan.