Reference No: CB-112-1990

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Draft No: 2

Prince George's

Meeting Date: 10/16/90

County Council

Requestor: WI

Item Title: An Ordinance for the purpose of defining

and adding Special Exception provisions

for rural retirement centers

Sponsors	WΙ
----------	----

Date Presented Committee Referral Committee Action Date Introduced Pub. Hearing Date	L(2) 10/23/90 ((1) 10/16/90 N 10/16/90	C.O.W. E NR(A)			_/_/_	
Council Action Council Votes Pass/Fail	(_)// _:,:,	,: ,:	:; :;	_: _'; _: _',	_: _' _: _'	
Remarks	Intro too late	to proc	ess			
		Resou	rce Jud	lv Johnso	n	

Drafter: Personnel: Legislative Aide

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

COMMITTEE-OF-THE-WHOLE REPORT

Committee Vote: No recommendation with amendments, 6-1-0 (In favor: Council Members Bell, Casula, MacKinnon, Pemberton,

Mills and Wineland; in opposition: Council Member

DATE: 10/16/90

Castaldi)

Staff explained that the legislation creates a new use, "rural retirement center", and permits it by Special Exception in the O-S, R-A, and R-E Zones. The use is defined in Section 107.1, and a new Section 27-404.1 is established which sets forth requirements for the use.

Staff proposed several amendments. First, language should be added to Section 27-404.1 to read as follows: "The District Council shall find that the proposed use will not adversely affect the character of the surrounding residential community." This will provide some assurance that the rural character of neighborhoods in the large-lot zones will be

preserved. As a result of the adoption of CB-30-1990, which amended the County's Human Relations Ordinance, the requirement that at least one member of each household be at least fifty-five years of age must be amended. The requirement was amended to "at least sixty- two years of age, or fifty-five if the housing satisfies the requirements of Title 24, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 100:304." The final amendment proposed was to change the requirement that the facility not house more than seventy residents to "consist of not more than sixty dwelling units". This is more enforceable, and in keeping with the original intent of the legislation.

Fern Piret, representing the Planning Board, stated the Board's opposition to the legislation based mainly on the small acreage required (5 acres) and the number of units allowed.

Committee members raised several issues regarding the legislation. The requirement that the facility be located not more than one-half mile from an existing medical facility was questioned. The sponsor explained that this would ensure lower costs for residents for on-site health facilities, since they would have access to medical facilities off-site. The issue of affordability was also raised. Paul Rodbell, speaking in support of the legislation, stated that the market would dictate affordability. Mr. Rodbell also noted that there is a great need for this type of facility in Prince George's County. Finally, the compatibility of this type of facility with a rural area was questioned. Committee members expressed concern that there are no criteria in the legislation that will ensure a "rural" character, with the possible exception of the additional finding proposed by staff.

The Committee requested that the legislation be amended prior to introduction to incorporate the amendments proposed by staff. Staff was also requested to work with the M-NCPPC and other interested parties prior to the public hearing to address the Committee's other concerns.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION/FISCAL IMPACT (Includes reason for proposal, as well as any unique statutory requirements)

This legislation establishes a new use, rural retirement center, and sets forth specific criteria for the use.