MINUTES OF
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
JANUARY 13, 1993

PRESENT: Lawrence C. Baldwin, Commissioner At-Large
John R. Byers, Mount Vernon District
Judith W. Downer, Dranesville District
Patrick M. Hanlon, Providence District
Suzanne F. Harsel, Braddock District
Robert v. L. Hartwell, Commissioner At-Large
Ronald W. Koch, Sully District
Peter F. Murphy, Jr., Springfield District
John M. Palatiello, Hunter Mill District
Carl L. Sell, Jr., Lee District
Henry E. Strickland, Mason District
Alvin L. Thomas, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: None

//

The meeting was convened at 8:20 p.m. by Chairman Peter F. Murphy, Jr.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

Mr. John Frey, Clerk of the Circuit Court of Fairfax County, performed the swearing-in ceremony for John M. Palatiello, the newly appointed Commissioner for Hunter Mill District. Commissioner Palatiello's wife Sally and sons Nicholas and Michael, as well as Robert Dix, the Hunter Mill District Supervisor, were also present for the ceremony.

//

Chairman Murphy welcomed Troop 577 from Clifton, Virginia to the meeting. He noted that the troop was attending tonight's meeting to work on their Citizenship in the Community Badge.

//

Commissioner Sell presented the following slate of officers to serve the Planning Commission for 1993:

Chairman	- Peter F. Murphy, Jr. (Springfield District)
Vice Chairman	- Patrick M. Hanlon (Providence District)
Secretary	- Suzanne F. Harsel (Braddock District)
Parliamentarian	- Alvin L. Thomas (At-Large)

He then SO MOVED.

Commissioner Byers seconded the motion and MOVED THAT THE NOMINATIONS BE CLOSED.

The motions passed unanimously with Commissioners Strickland and Thomas not present for the vote.

//

In Commissioner Strickland's temporary absence, Chairman Murphy noted that it was Commissioner Strickland's intent to further defer the decision only on SEA-81-P-021-2, Gesher School and the Jewish Community Center, scheduled for January 14, 1993 to February 18, 1993.

//

Chairman Murphy called the Commission's attention to a memorandum dated January 13, 1993, regarding the 1993 Preference Form for Planning Commission Committees. He asked that each Commissioner complete and return the attached form no later than Thursday, January 21, 1993.

Commissioner Hanlon suggested abolishment of the Major Plan Review Committee for 1993 which passed by unanimous consent.

//

AF-92-V-001 - BELMONT BAY FARMS LTD., GUDRUN K. HOOFF & CHARLES R. HOOFF, III
AR-84-V-007 – CHARLES R. HOOFF, JR., ELIZABETH D. HOOFF & HARRIET CRAMPTON (Decisions Only)

(The public hearing on these applications was held on December 16, 1992. A complete verbatim transcript of the decision made on these items is included in the date file.)

Commissioner Byers MOVED THAT APPENDIX E, OF CHAPTER 114 OF THE FAIRFAX COUNTY CODE BE AMENDED TO ESTABLISH THE BELMONT BAY STATEWIDE AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTAL DISTRICT, AF-92-V-001, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM DATED JANUARY 7, 1993, WITH THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROVISIONS DATED JANUARY 8, 1993, AND DISTRIBUTED TO THE COMMISSION LAST WEEK.

Commissioners Hanlon and Hartwell seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 6-0-3 with Commissioners Downer, Hansel, and Palatiello abstaining; Commissioners Sell, Strickland and Thomas not present for the vote.

Commissioner Byers also MOVED THAT APPENDIX F16, OF CHAPTER 115 OF THE FAIRFAX COUNTY CODE, BE AMENDED TO RENEW THE BELMONT BAY FARMS II LOCAL AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTAL DISTRICT, AR-84-V-007, SUBJECT TO THE SAME PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROVISIONS DATED JANUARY 8, 1993.

Commissioners Hanlon and Hartwell seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 6-0-3 with Commissioners Downer, Harsel and Palatiello abstaining; Commissioners Sell, Strickland and Thomas not present for the vote.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA ITEMS

Chairman Murphy noted that the only item on tonight's agenda was a Work Session on S92-CW-4CP, Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Route 28) Draft Dulles Suburban Center Plan.

//

> S92-CW-4CP - COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (Route 28) - WORK SESSION - The Planning Commission will hold a work session with staff from the Office of Comprehensive Planning on the *Draft Dulles Suburban Center Plan*, & the recommendations proposed by the Route 28 Task Force, to amend the 1991 Edition of the Area III Plan for portions of the Bull Run & Upper Potomac Planning Districts in the Board Auditorium at the Government Center.

Commissioner Koch entered into the record correspondence from the following: Claudet Ward, President of the Historic Preservation Committee, Sully District Council; Susan D. Larson; John Culvert, GTE; Bill Keach, Westfields; Julie Pastor, Director of Loudoun County Department of Planning; John Thillmann, member of Rt. 28 Task Force; John Litzenberger, Vice President of Virginia Run HOA; E. L. Tillison; and Sidney Steele, member of Rt. 28 Task Force.

Commissioner Palatiello entered into the record a letter from Mary Hennigan also a member of the Rt. 28 Task Force.

Ms. Lynda Stanley, Director, Planning Division of the Office of Comprehensive Planning (0CP), said that staff had grouped into specific areas issues which staff thought were outstanding areas where consensus had not been achieved by the Route 28 Task Force. She added that staff was prepared to give a brief overview of each issue and answer questions. She then explained the Dulles Airport Development regarding future growth of airport and supporting land uses, and noise contours. Ms. Stanley said that the key was to make sure there was enough land area and future development to allow for the continuation of non-residential uses, office, hotel and industrial space that would foster the kind of economic development that staff would like to see at the airport and throughout the County. She said that the proposed Plan would allow for 83 million square feet of non-residential development under the baseline proposal.

In response to Commissioner Baldwin's question on the passenger load that Dulles Airport may expect, Commissioner Byers exercised his prerogative and called Dr. Sidney Steele, a member of the Transportation Commission, to respond. Dr. Steele pointed out that there were now about 11 thousand passengers, and it was anticipated that the traffic, by the end of the century, would reach 20 million passengers, while employment levels, at that time, would grow to 20 thousand jobs.

In response to Commissioner Hanlon's questions, Ms. Stanley said that OCP and Fairfax County participated in the Cooperative Forecasting Effort at the Council of Governments. She added that on a regular basis, every five years, all of the jurisdictions in the region participated in an effort to forecast total number of jobs, households, and population for the region for a 20 to 30 year period at five and ten year intervals. Ms. Stanley said that in that process, Fairfax County along with other counties are allocated a particular share of what would be projected to be the overall development in the region. She said there were models to project total development in the region, then broken down by shares in each jurisdiction, and further delineated by traffic zones in each individual jurisdiction.

Commissioner Koch noted his concern with the proximity of the proposed runways to Land Bays D2 and D3 with regard to safety and noise.

Ms. Stanley then explained that the guidelines suggested that noise sensitive uses, such as housing, not be permitted in areas projected to be exposed to aircraft noise in excess of 65 Ldn dBA. She added that the adopted noise contours assumed a five runway airport configuration, operating at physical capacity, with assumed levels of noise generated by individual aircraft which produced more noise than Stage II or Stage III aircraft. Ms. Stanley said that in recent years a newer generation of quieter aircraft engines had been developed and Congress had legislated that the older, noisier engines be replaced by the year 2000. As a result, she said that the revised contours being developed for the Airport Authority in 1992 may change and encompass a smaller area than was the current situation. She also said that no new residential use should occur within the area currently shown as impacted by airport noise on the 1992 Comprehensive Plan map until the County considered, and adopted, new noise contours which defined areas impacted by aircraft noise. Ms. Stanley said that prior to consideration by the Board, it would be desirable, although not required, that any new contours be reviewed and accepted by the Federal Aviation Administration.

In response to Commissioner Koch's question on the Loudoun County Airport Noise Policy, Ms. Stanley said that Loudoun County had adopted a different policy than Fairfax, which was outlined in the letter the Commission received from Loudoun County.

Mr. Fred Selden, Branch Chief, Policy Development Branch, OCP, responded to Commissioner Baldwin's questions stating that the Airport Authority had provided staff with the 60 contour that their consultant prepared, which was used by Loudoun County.

Mr. Selden presented an overview of the residential development including implications for tax district, public facilities/school need implications, and affordable housing.

In responding to Commissioner Koch's question on affordable housing for elevator structures, Mr. Selden said that the elevator apartments, garden apartments without elevators and single family developments would all have to meet the fifteen percent standard for affordable housing.

Mr. Selden pointed out, in response to Commissioner Harsel's question on ADUs, that there were performance criteria for residential development that spelled out screening and buffering requirements for residential development to provide a degree of protection from industrial, office and other non-residential uses set forth in the baseline recommendations of the Plan.

In response to a question from Commissioner Baldwin, Mr. Glenn Stroup, Rt. 28 Task Force Chairman, said that it was his recollection that the Task Force did not vote on whether the density credits would be provided or not. He noted that the task force was solid on the fact that there should be affordable housing in the Route 28 Tax District, but the difference was how much.

//

Due to a technical problem, the Commission recessed at 10:00 p.m. and reconvened at 10:10 p.m.

//

In response to Commissioner Downer's questions, Mr. Selden said that the 15 percent requirement of affordable dwelling units would be based on the total number of housing units being developed. He added that he would check the Ordinance provisions for additional follow-up information.

Mr. Robert Moore, Chief, Transportation Planning Division, Office of Transportation (OT), discussed the transportation issues relating to level of analysis, planned vs. built capacity of the transportation network, and a fixed guideway system.

In responding to Commissioner Strickland's question on the tax district, Mr. Moore said that the tax district was never forecasted to start generating revenues in the early years, even under the assumptions which it was established. He added that when the tax district was created, there was an expectation that the early years would not generate sufficient revenues to pay off the initial bond payments. Mr. Moore did not know the extent to which revenues had fallen short of expectations, if any.

Commissioner Koch asked whether Westfields Boulevard and Route 28 would be able to handle the traffic if the Poplar Tree flyover were deleted. Mr. Moore said that OT was very concerned about it and felt strongly that the flyover needed to remain on the Plan.

There was a lengthy discussion regarding other modes of transportation, and Mr. Moore said that he was trying to emphasize that OT had looked at experience around the country. He added that there was an extensive effort directed, during the Policy Plan, at setting goals for mode splits and

came out with goals of 60 percent modal split to the Core, 20 percent to the County's urban center, and 15 percent to suburban centers. Mr. Moore said that after extensive review everyone agreed that they were optimistic. He said that on the basis of OT's experience and other suburban jurisdictions in the country, OT could not say that it would happen. Mr. Moore said that the logic of placing a fairly extravagant fixed rail system on the Master Plan in a suburban environment with the resources limited the way they were was difficult to accept. He added that if the County was to pursue it, with the recognition that it was the goal, they should then rescind the HOV action on the toll road.

Commissioner Palatiello asked about the status of the difference between the roads in Fairfax County and Loudoun County and whether that issue should be addressed before the Route 28 Plan was implemented. Mr. Moore said that the State had made an effort to develop a mechanism whereby inconsistencies in sub-regional plans could be resolved. He commented that it was ironic that the current sub-regional Plan showed Route 50 as a freeway within Fairfax County and not in Loudoun County. He indicated that he would not wait for the completion of a sub-regional Plan. Mr. Moore stated that, insofar as he was concerned, the major issues were the reservation of rights-of-way and whether or not the Planning Commission would require service drives which would allow the County the right-of-way to everything except interchanges. He said the Office of Transportation had suggested a plan for an enhanced public transportation corridor which would help to eliminate the number of incremental through trips.

Ms. Stanley discussed the implementation issues regarding performance criteria for optional uses, floor area ratios (FAR) in Land Units A and D, and design guidelines. She referred to the staff report dated October 1992, page 14, and suggested the deletion of the following language from paragraph 3: "Within the Center, there may be other uses that are not yet identified that could be developed to be compatible, to generate fewer or equivalent trips, and to maintain the high quality image of the area. Where a proposal for a use can meet the performance criteria, these uses may also be considered."

Commissioner Hanlon suggested that the language be modified, rather than deleted, to read: "Where a proposal for a use can meet the performance criteria, and are consistent with the specific recommendations of the individual areas, these uses may also be considered." Ms. Stanley said that the language should be clarified to indicate that one could not do everything everywhere simply because they met the performance criteria.

Mr. Selden explained the transfer of development rights (TDRs). He said that the desire was not to expand the capacity of the area but to move intensity around. Mr. Selden said that staff had a recommendation that would tie the ability of TDRs with the provision of land for needed public facilities.

Ms. Susan Allen, Park Authority, referred to page 38, of the staff report dated October, 1992, and clarified the district wide recommendations, which addressed the need for the acquisition and development of public parklands in the area. She said that staff had identified specific locations throughout the Dulles suburban area which had been identified as highly desirable for the development of parks of sufficient size to provide a viable mix of active recreation facilities or to provide substantial protection for significant natural and cultural resources.

Mr. Selden discussed Land Unit issues for Land Unit A regarding intensity of nodes, residential options and President's Park Plan Amendment. He noted that the principal issue dealt with the intensity of the Core. Mr. Selden said that the only place residential use was suggested outside of the transit station core would be President's Park.

Mr. Stephen Lopez, Planning Division, OCP, presented the Land Unit issues.

Commissioner Hanlon suggested that staff not go into detail on all land units. He added that if staff had comments beyond what was in the text, that they focus attention on those in order to save some time.

Ms. Stanley said staff had no other proposals to bring forward and tried to focus on issues that were discussed last week.

Chairman Murphy called for questions or comments from the Commission on any of the land units listed.

Ms. Stanley, in response to Commissioner Palatiello's comment, said that the Districtwide and implementation policies were interwoven, however, on individual land units, a lot of the recommendations stood on their own.

Mr. Stroup added that the Task Force planned the area as a whole and tried to consider how everything worked together. He urged the Commission not to make any arbitrary changes in a given land unit that would affect on the whole.

Ms. Stanley pointed out that staff had received several phone calls from owners of smaller properties in Land Unit Fl. She said their concern was that if they consolidated their properties they might not meet the minimum of five acres. Ms. Stanley said that the language on the minimum five acres was troublesome in a number of ways and asked that the Commission look at that language.

Chairman Murphy thanked staff and Mr. Stroup for their input. He announced that markup on this item was scheduled for Wednesday, January 27, 1993.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 p.m.
Peter F. Murphy, Jr., Chairman
Suzanne F. Harsel, Secretary

For a verbatim record of the meeting, reference may be made to the audio and video recordings which can be found in the Office of the Planning Commission of Fairfax County, Virginia.

Minutes by: Sandra L. Stever

Approved on: May 5, 1993

Mary A. Pascoe

Mary A. Pascoe, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission