

Staff has also recommended a floating zone of CRT 1, H55, with a residential/commercial mix to be determined at time of rezoning. This creates the possibility of about 450,000 square feet of commercial or 450,000 square feet of residential or some mix. This is huge. No more commercial is needed in the Westbard area. It is a particularly inappropriate site for commercial, located adjacent to single family detached homes of Kenwood and Somerset. The floating zone should permit no commercial and the FAR for residential should be 0.50 – 1.0 which would permit hundreds of dwelling units.

Further, the staff recommended use and amount of development would be an incentive to WES to sell with the community losing the open space of the athletic fields and other desirable features associated with the school.

#### Site 15

This is a one acre location of 121 dwelling unit facility for senior housing approved by the Council as part of the PD-28 rezoning. The Planning Board approved a CRT 4.75, C-O – 0.75, H-97 purportedly to accommodate the approved PD-28 senior housing. However, the PD-28 has no commercial and the FAR is 3.25 not 4.75. Staff recommends that this zoning be approved if senior housing is built. We request the FAR be lowered to 3.25 which more accurately reflects what is required, as well as to delete the commercial.

Staff recommends that if it is not used for senior housing, the zoning should be “CRT 2.5, C 0.75, C [sic – should be R] 1.75 and H 97.” The 97 feet height was solely to accommodate senior housing. It is too high and totally inconsistent with the height called for generally along River Road. If there is no senior housing, the zoning should be as we requested on the remainder of the WES site. CRT 0.50 – 1.0, all residential with a height of 55 feet.

### **SOUTH RIVER DISTRICT**

We agree with the staff’s recommendation.

### **SOUTHWESTBARD DISTRICT**

We agree with the staff’s recommendation that the floating zone on the library site be deleted but we disagree that the site continues to be listed as an appropriate one for affordable housing.

### **COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND PARKS**

We continue to endorse the need for a senior community facility. We continue to question the adequacy of open space/civic green consisting of less than 1/2 acre re – such as only 1/3 acre proposed on the Westwood Shopping Center. (Staff Rep. p. 5).

In view of the large number of residential units that are likely to be added and the absence of parks and playgrounds for children, particularly those living in multifamily buildings,