MINUTES OF
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
FEBRUARY 20, 1992

PRESENT: Lawrence C. Baldwin, Commissioner At-Large
David P. Bobzien, Centreville District
John R. Byers, Mount Vernon District
Patrick M. Hanlon, Providence District
Suzanne F. Harsel, Braddock District
Stephen J. Hubbard, Dranesville District
Maya A. Huber, Commissioner At-Large
Ronald W. Koch, Sully District
Peter F. Murphy, Jr., Springfield 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 8:16 p.m. by Chairman Peter F. Murphy, Jr.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

Commissioner Byers MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DELETE SP-91-V-065, GEORGE M. NEALL, II, TRUSTEE, FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION SCHEDULE. (Note: this application had been previously scheduled on Wednesday, March 25, 1992.)

Commissioner Hubbard seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

//

At the request of the applicant, Commissioner Hubbard MOVED THAT SE-91-D-016, ROTONISU INVESTMENT CORPORATION, BE DEFERRED TO MARCH 19, 1992.

Commissioner Koch seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

//

Because the application was not quite ready, Commissioner Hubbard MOVED TO (FURTHER) DEFER THE DECISION ONLY ON PCA-85-D-081, GKG LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MARCH 5, 1992.

Commissioner Huber seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

//

At the applicant's request, Commissioner Strickland MOVED TO DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING ON SEA-86-M-086, OPEN ARMS, INCORPORATED, TO FEBRUARY 27, 1992.

Commissioner Hubbard seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

//

To allow ample time to review the latest addenda in the Commissioners' packets, Commissioner Murphy MOVED TO (FURTHER) DEFER THE DECISIONS ONLY ON SE-91-S-031, VIRGINIA ELECTRIC & POWER COMPANY, AND SE-91-S-046, NORTHERN VIRGINIA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF FEBRUARY 27, 1992.

Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

//

Because there were outstanding issues to be addressed by the Lee District Land Use Advisory Committee, Commissioner Sell MOVED TO (FURTHER) DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING ON RZ-9I-L-016, FDP-91-L-016, AND 456-L19-18, FAIRFAX COUNTY REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING AUTHORITY, TO FEBRUARY 27, 1992.

Commissioners Huber and Thomas seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

//

Due to unresolved issues, Commissioner Sell MOVED TO (FURTHER) DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING ON RZ-91-L-025, WOOLHISER, INCORPORATED, TO APRIL 2, 1992.

Commissioner Byers seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

//

Because the applicant was continuing negotiations with adjacent property owners and neighbors to resolve outstanding issues, Commissioner Sell MOVED TO DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING ON RZ-86-L-088, SKY AIM, TO MARCH 19, 1992.

Commissioner Byers seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

//

Chairman Murphy announced that he had made a request of the Board of Supervisors to extend the Planning Commission's time-frame for reporting its recommendations on the Zoning Ordinance Amendment dealing with Commercial and Industrial Districts. He also noted his request that the Board of Supervisors change their public hearing date for the Chesapeake Bay Ordinance hearing to accommodate the Commission schedule.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA ITEMS

Secretary Harsel established the following order for tonight's agenda items:

1. SE-91-P-044 – West*Park Associates Limited Partnership
2. RZ-91-V-03 – Pohick Station Limited Partnership
3. SP-91-C-070 – Golf Park, Inc.
   VC-91-C-138 – Golf Park, Inc.

This order was accepted without objection.

//

SE-91-P-044 – WEST*PARK ASSOCIATES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP – Appl. under Sect. 4-304 of the Zoning Ord. to permit an establishment for scientific research & development on property located at 7913 Westpark Dr. on approx. 2.01 ac. zoned C-3 & SC. Tax Map 29-4((7))2. PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Ms. Kathryn MacLane, representing the applicant, reaffirmed the affidavit. There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Mr. Otis Robinson, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Office of Comprehensive Planning (OCP), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He stated that staff recommended approval.

Mr. Thomas Fleury, 1600 Anderson Road, Mclean, Vice President of Development Services with West*Group, Inc., also representing the applicant, gave a brief chronological overview of the application. He noted the applicant's proposed development conditions dated February 20, 1992 which were distributed tonight. He pointed out that Condition #3 differed from staff's in that the applicant had requested that: (1) the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it direct the Director of the Department of Environmental Management to expedite a site plan waiver; (2) that a non-residential use permit be issued immediately after the issuance of the special exception; and (3) that a site plan waiver not be a prerequisite to the issuance of the special exception permit. Paragraph 4, he cited, showed the applicant’s

donation of a 5 percent interior parking lot landscaping and Paragraph 6 acknowledged the placement of two handicapped parking spaces. Mr. Fleury pointed out that Development Condition #7, pursuant to Paragraph 3, Section 9-509 of the Zoning Ordinance, obligated the designation of specific square footage to use for product testing. In conclusion, Mr. Fleury asked that the Planning Commission consider the applicant's proposed development conditions and move for approval.

Commissioner Hanlon clarified that the applicant was requesting two points: (1) a waiver of the site plan so that the awaiting tenant could immediately move in without going through the delay a site plan required; and (2) a consideration and allowance of some flexibility when applying the Public Facilities Manual (PFM) regulations on their interior parking lot landscaping, otherwise strict adherence would require major landscape changes if the Zoning Ordinance's PFM requirements were mandated. Commissioner Hanlon pointed out that a site plan waiver normally would be handled through a motion rather than a development condition.

Mr. Fleury requested that, if it did not conflict with Zoning Ordinance provisions, that the non-residential use permit be granted concurrently with approval of the special exception and the site plan.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience. Receiving no response, he noted that no rebuttal was necessary. Mr. Robinson had no closing staff comments; therefore Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Hanlon for a motion on this application. (Verbatim excerpts are in the date file.)

//

After making final remarks, Commissioner Hanlon MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF SE-91-P-044, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED FEBRUARY 20, 1992, WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES:

> THE FIRST TWO AND THE LAST SENTENCE OF DEVELOPMENT CONDITION #3 WOULD BE DELETED. AND THE REMAINING SENTENCE WOULD BE AMENDED TO READ: "THE DEVELOPMENT PURSUANT TO THIS SPECIAL EXCEPTION SHALL BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE APPROVED SPECIAL EXCEPTION PLAT ENTITLED 7913 WESTPARK DRIVE BUILDING' AND PREPARED BY HUNTLEY, NYCE & ASSOCIATES, WHICH IS DATED NOVEMBER 4, 1991 AND REVISED FEBRUARY 18, 1992, AND THESE CONDITIONS."
>
> DELETE THE LAST SENTENCE, REFERRING TO BONDING, OF DEVELOPMENT CONDITION #4.

DELETE THE LAST SENTENCE OF DEVELOPMENT CONDITION #5.

Commissioners Hubbard and Sell seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Commissioner Hanlon next MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS A WAIVER OF THE SITE PLAN PURSUANT TO SECTION 17-103-1A OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE; MODIFICATION OF THE INTERIOR LANDSCAPE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 13-201 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITION #4; AND MODIFICATION OF THE BARRIER REQUIREMENT TO ALLOW THE EXISTING VEGETATION TO SERVE AS A BARRIER, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED FEBRUARY 20, 1992, AS AMENDED THIS EVENING.

Commissioner Hubbard seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Commissioner Hanlon also MOVED THAT, PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 3, SECTION 9-509 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT FIND THAT THE PROPOSED USE IS COMPATIBLE WITH THE ADJACENT AREA IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE C-3 ZONING DISTRICT REGULATIONS IN THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

Commissioner Hubbard seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

//

<u>RZ-91-V-003 – POHICK STATION LIMITED PARTNERSHIP</u> – Appl. to rezone approx. 6.17 ac. located on the W. side of Telegraph Rd. approx. 600 ft. N. of its intersection with Richmond Hwy. from R-1 & HD to R-8 & HD to permit residential development at a density of 7.94 du/ac. Comp. Plan Rec: 5-8 du/ac. Tax Map 108-1((1))19, 20, 21, 29. MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Lynne Strobel, Esquire, with Walsh, Colucci, Stackhouse, Emrich and Lubeley, P.C., representing the applicant, reaffirmed the affidavit. There were no disclosures from Commission members.

Ms. Mary Ann Godfrey, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Office of Comprehensive Planning (0CP), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that, in response to issues raised that day regarding stormwater best management practices (BMPs) and recreation facilities, the applicant had distributed revised proffers that night with changes underlined in red (a copy is in the file). Ms. Godfrey stated that staff recommended approval.

Ms. Strobel informed the Commission members that the applicant had proposed proffers to satisfy all staff's concerns with regard to transportation, the environment, archaeological preservation, dedication of trails, dedication of right-of-way for Route 1 and Telegraph Road, a contribution for the affordable dwelling unit (ADU) program, and a contribution to the Park Authority. She noted that the applicant had a recommendation for approval from the South Gate homeowners who lived adjacent to the proposed development. Ms. Strobel requested a rezoning approval from the R-1 to R-8 District which was consistent with staff's recommendation for approval.

In response to Commissioner Byers' question on the absence of tot lots or some sort of recreational facility on-site, Ms. Strobel explained that a passive recreation site had originally been proposed for the site but the Architectural Review Board had disapproved of that amenity and at their request, it was removed from the plan. Ms. Strobel stated that those funds were then expended into additional landscaping.

Commissioner Byers questioned the future of those lots which faced Route 1 and how they would be affected when Route 1 was widened.

Ms. Strobel conceded that there would be a very substantial impact on the lots fronting on Route 1.

Ms. Godfrey was unable to answer Commissioner Byers' question on whether or not the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) was obliged to acquire the entire lots which were to be severely impacted from Route l's improvements.

At Commissioner Hubbard's request, Ms. Strobel explained the applicant's $24,500 proffer versus the Park Authority's pro rata contribution request of $62,000 stating that the applicant felt that a $500 per unit contribution was more appropriate than the $1,200 per unit requested by the Park Authority. A reason for that determination was the substantial landscaping which the applicant had proffered, she pointed out, and added that only a $300 per unit contribution was required in a P-District. To answer Commissioner Harsel's question on consolidation with regard to parcel 28 zoned R-1 and only one-half acre in size, Ms. Strobel conceded that they had approached the property owner to consolidate but the owner refused to sell.

Commissioner Huber made the observation that the project proposed 49 units and if there were 50 units, then the ADU Ordinance would be applicable.

Ms. Strobel responded that the applicant's only consideration was of size constraint; that it would be impossible to fit one more unit on the parcel. She added that they were contributing to the ADU Ordinance program through proffers.

Chairman Murphy called for the first listed speaker and outlined the Planning Commission's rules for speakers.

Mr. Robert Lundy, representing the Lorton Task Force, said that they viewed the area as the "northern gateway to the Lorton area." The Lorton group was very firm in their consideration that the consolidation be complete, not "substantially" complete, he affirmed. The proposed use was a good one, he clarified, if consolidation were accomplished because otherwise, the property might be reduced to strip commercial development which would be an eye sore in the task force's opinion. Also, he added, the owners may be left with something they can do nothing with when the widening of Route 1 takes place. Mr. Lundy pointed out that consolidation would help relieve the transportation problem because of the additional access onto Telegraph Road.

Ms. Linda Seaton, 7452 Pohick Road, Lorton, said that her Southgate Woods Townhouse community approved the applicant's generalized development plan (GDP) but recommended the inclusion of more evergreen screening between the applicant's property, the commercial uses, and Worthington Woods residential development, to which the applicant agreed. She pointed out that the Worthington Woods development had a park area, belonging to the Park Authority, and its fields were used by her HOA for soccer and softball. There were no organized play areas, she added. With the addition of the 500 units proposed for development in the area, Ms. Seaton believed that their one park area should be developed for the use of all.

There being no further speakers, Chairman Murphy called upon Ms. Strobel for a rebuttal statement.

Ms. Strobel addressed the issues of consolidation explaining that the applicant was unable to afford the price for consolidation. She pointed out that the property was zoned R-1 and it was her belief that strip commercial development would not be permitted. Ms. Strobel noted that the applicant had worked very closely with VDOT and the Office of Transportation (OT) with the determination that the applicant was not permitted to access Route 1. The only allowable access, she continued, was onto Telegraph Road and the applicant had provided the road improvements that OT had requested. The applicant was in agreement with Ms. Seaton's suggestion for additional evergreen screening, she reported. Ms. Strobel stated that the applicant would be happy to have some of the proffered recreation money be allotted to a park in the area and pointed out that the drafted proffers proposed that the money be sent to Pohick Estates Park, the closest park in the vicinity. She said that they would be happy to have some of the money go to the South Gate Park when it was dedicated.

Commissioner Harsel voiced her concern over the issue of the applicant's development plan's design remaining unified and harmonious after the road improvements to Route 1 took away much of the land of those front facing lots.

At Commissioner Byers' request, Ms. Kristen Abrahamson, Zoning Evaluation Division, OCP, said that staff would provide him with the Park Authority's formula for its contribution request for $61,823. At Chairman Murphy's request, she said that she would also find out when that formula had been developed.

There being no further questions or comments, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Byers for action on the case. (Verbatim excerpts may be found in the date file.)

//

Following comments, Commissioner Byers RECOMMENDED (THAT) WE DEFER THE DECISION ON THIS CASE FOR ONE WEEK TO February 27, 1992.

Commissioner Sell seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

//

SP-91-C-070 – GOLF PARK INC. – Appl. under Sects. 3-E03 & 8-915 of the Zoning Ord. to permit an outdoor recreational use (baseball batting cage, golf course, golf driving range) & to permit a waiver of the dustless surface requirement on property located in the S.E. quadrant of the intersection of Hunter Mill Rd. & Crowell Rd. on approx. 48.66 ac. zoned R-E. Tax Maps 18-4((1)) 22, 23, 26; 18-4((8))A, 1A, 2, 3, 4, & 5. (Concurrent with VC-91-C-138.) CENTREVILLE DISTRICT.

VC-91-C-138 – GOLF PARK, INC. – Appl. under Sect. 18-401 of the Zoning Ord. to permit an existing structure and proposed light standards inside 100 ft. of the property lines, 100 ft. minimum distance from any lot line required by Sect. 8-607, on property located in the S.E. quadrant of the intersection of Hunter Mill Rd. & Crowell Rd. on approx. 48.66 ac. zoned R-E. Tax Maps 18-4 ((1))22, 23, 26; 18-4((8))A, 1A, 2, 3, 4, & 5. (Concurrent with SP-91-C-070.) CENTREVILLE DISTRICT. JOINT PUBLIC HEARING.

Charles Shumate, Esquire, with Walsh, Colucci, Stackhouse, Emrich & Lubeley, representing the applicant, reaffirmed the affidavit. The Commission members had no disclosures.

Mr. Gregory Riegle, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Office of Comprehensive Planning (OCP), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He stated that staff recommended approval.

In response to Commissioner Hanlon's question referencing the Comprehensive Plan language restricting commercial facilities within certain areas.

Mr. Riegle explained that it was staff's opinion that the intent of the language was aimed at retail type commercial uses and was not applicable to the proposed application. He noted that the

screening and buffering caused the development to be in harmony with its surroundings as any commercial impact was greatly mitigated.

To answer Commissioner Bobzien's question and as a point of clarification, Mr. Riegle reported that the applicant had withdrawn his request for variances (light poles and an existing structure which was to remain in a location which was not in conformance with the minimum yard requirement of the RE District).

With regard to the hours of operation, he confirmed that 7:00 a.m. to 9:30 p.m. in the summer and 8:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m., the hours referenced in the development conditions, were the hours that staff proposed.

Questions and comments followed between Mr. Riegle and the Commissioners regarding the intent of the Plan's language and its applicability to the application.

Mr. Shumate gave his presentation pointing out that their latest addenda was far different from the original application and had, in effect, satisfied all previously identified and outstanding issues raised by staff, environmental, transportation, developmental or land use. He informed the Planning Commission that, at the onset of the application, a development team had been put together which would deal with the sensitive issues raised by the case and introduced each member: Phil Yates, with Dewberry & Davis, who headed the engineering and planning; Thomas Clark, with Ault Clark, the architect; Tom McClurg, with Golftrust, the lighting expert; John Callow, with Callow Associates, Inc., the transportation consultant. Mr. Shumate conceded that they were unable to establish a meaningful dialogue with the citizens but that they had worked diligently with the County staff. He described the differences between the first application and the one before the Commission that night listing the amount of lighting and in which areas; the deletion of the Par 3, nine-hole golf course; the deletion of the batting cages; the inclusion of 100 unlit tees; the withdrawal of a variance request for the caretaker's lot; the removal of the light standards which would have required 100-foot setbacks; the removal of the maintenance building; the reduction, redesign and relocation of the parking lot; and the deletion of the originally proposed entrance onto Crowell Road. Mr. Shumate condensed the issues of concern into the four categories of land use, traffic impact, lighting and environmental pollution and then described how and in what manner each had been identified and then addressed. He quoted the issues raised in Ms. Lynda Stanley's (Planning Division, OCP) February 12th memorandum, a copy of which is in the date file, and noted how the number of uses were limited, the hours of operation were limited, the scaleback of nighttime use and lighting, the adequate screening and buffering of the site.

Commissioner Hanlon interjected that some people might believe the application was inappropriate because it tended to establish a precedent for commercial use in the area which undermined the future development of low density redevelopment.

Mr. Shumate cited language which said nothing of the preclusion of special permits and special exceptions in an RE zoning sector.

Commissioner Huber pointed out that the Plan language could not exclude special permit uses in any area because there were certain facilities, such as churches, which were allowed by state law and deemed to be compatible with residential uses. However, she stated, those special uses must be rigorously reviewed when considered.

Commissioner Hubbard asked Mr. Shumate if he believed that the proposed use was not a precedent for arguments for expansion beyond its particular site nor was the use a precedent for anything beyond that use at that parcel.

In response Mr. Shumate conceded that every case before the Board could be a precedent. He affirmed that the Planning Commission would make the decision as to whether or not a precedent for some other commercial use was set; and that they protected that process.

Commissioner Sell clarified that the case was a land use case and the issue would be decided upon the ramifications of the Comprehensive Plan as far as land use was concerned. He added that they were not changing the zoning to commercial and it was his concern how that particular land use implicated its surroundings.

Mr. Shumate brought the Commission's attention to Mr. Callow's report, "Traffic Impact Study for the Family Golf Park at the Dulles Toll Road/Hunter Mill Road Interchange" which was submitted for the record and may be viewed in the date file. It was Mr. Callow's determination, stated Mr. Shumate, that there were no adverse impacts on the level of service to the road work, to the roadway network nor to any of the nearby intersections. He noted that staff concluded that, with the applicant's road improvement proffers and the reduction in the hours of operation, it would serve to resolve the outstanding transportation issues. With regard to the environmental impact, Mr. Shumate said that the applicant's Condition #15 addressed the issue of nutrient runoff through a turf management and pesticide control program which would be monitored by the County. The applicant's lighting consultant, Mr. Tom McClurg of Golftrust, Inc., was retained out of Florida to address all concerns of lighting, Mr. Shumate reported. Mr. McClurg's analyses, contained in Appendix 4, concluded that there was no off-site glare impact, stated Mr. Shumate. Having determined that there were no outstanding issues regarding lighting, the environment, land use or transportation, Mr. Shumate noted that staff had recommended that the PC forward a recommendation of approval to the BZA and he asked the same.

Commissioner Bobzien voiced his concern over the issue of sky glow and requested that that be addressed.

Questions followed between the Commissioners and Mr. Shumate regarding the size of the clubhouse and the operation of the childcare facility.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience and outlined the Planning Commission's rules for speakers.

Dr. John Mansfield, 1503 Brookmeade Place, Vienna, representing the Hunter Mill Defense League, submitted written testimony, a copy of which is in the date file. He presented a petition of hundreds of people from neighboring developments who were strongly opposed to the proposed use, which is in the date file. He cited Plan language which specified residential use and pointed out that when exceptional development were permitted in an RE District by special permit, that that should not prevent surrounding land from being developed as outlined by the Plan. It was their opinion, he maintained, that the proposed development was intrusive and nonresidential and was incompatible with its residential surroundings. Mr. Mansfield was greatly concerned over the nighttime illumination, sky glow.

Mr. Ronald Stanton, 10309 Browns Mill Road, Vienna, submitted written testimony, a copy of which is in the date file. The issue of transportation and its impact was his concern.

Mr. A. L. Willson, 1538 Crowell Road, Vienna, spoke in opposition of the application. He was concerned about the lighting pollution.

Mr. Ho Chung, 1624 Crowell Road, Vienna, identified himself as a toxicologist and submitted written testimony, a copy of which is in the date file. He cited the adverse impacts upon the land surrounding the site pointing out the environmentally sensitive area of the Difficult Run Watershed and the polluting effects to both the air and the water from the chemicals and pesticides used for the lawn maintenance.

//

The Commission recessed at 11:10 p.m. and reconvened at 11:30 p.m.

//

Ms. Jeannette Twomey, representing the Steering Committee for the Hunter Mill Defense League, submitted written testimony, a copy of which is in the date file. She stated that it was her committee which had requested that the application be pulled from the BZA to be brought before the Planning Commission for a recommendation because they had helped in the development of the Plan for that area and they wanted to see it implemented; they did not want to see future development undermined by the establishment of a use which did not belong there. Ms. Twomey suggested that the only real issue before the Commission that night was whether or not the proposed commercial land use was in harmony with the Plan.

Mr. George Loud, 1628 Crowell Road, Vienna, submitted written testimony, copies of his letters are in the date file. He stated that he had solicited the professional opinion of the Illumination Society of North America. He noted that the expert with whom he had conversed described the proposal as "obnoxious" and said that there was nothing that could be done to mitigate a problem of that type and scope of lighting. Mr. Loud reported that he had called the applicant's representative, Mr. Shumate, but his calls had not been returned.

Mr. Robert W. Ruedisueli, 1537 Crowell Road, Vienna, submitted written testimony, a copy of which is in the date file. The impact on the environment in general was his concern, he stated.

As a matter of disclosure and before the next listed speaker approached the podium, Commissioner Hubbard advised the Planning Commission that he and Mr. Busch shared a common employer.

Mr. Richard Busch, 1432 Crowell Road, Vienna, spoke of two concerns, traffic and compatibility. He said he and his family were against the project.

Dr. John Hyde, representing the Chase Hill Civic Association, noted the issues of traffic, the terrible lighting glow, trash from the snack bar, and voiced his concern over the fact that the "temporary" clubhouse would be a unsightly trailer. He affirmed that the project was incompatible with the Comprehensive Plan and strongly opposed it.

Mr. Thomas Barrett, 1501 Blackeyed Susan Lane, Vienna, voiced his approval of the application saying that, in his opinion, the proposal was quite aesthetically pleasing and the best use of the land.

The next listed speaker, Terry Jennings, 1836 Post Oak Trail, Reston, was not present to speak.

Mr. Jack Gwynn, President of the Reston Citizens Association, submitted written testimony, a copy of which is in the date file. He spoke against the application listing two principal concerns: (1) that nothing be done which would endanger the commitment in the Comprehensive Plan to low density residential development for the area east of Reston and equestrian Park; and (2) that if an exception were made for a project of that type, then that project would be used as a legitimate precedent.

Ms. Jody Bennett, 1451 Hunter Mill Road, Vienna, spoke of the intensity of the development noting that the revised application cited a reduction of 50 percent usage. Her question was why the square footage of the clubhouse and the parking lot was not reduced. She pointed out that there were actually two commercial uses in operation, the driving range and the clubhouse. Because the specifications were unclear, Ms. Bennett voiced concern over the grill/snack bar's size and operation.

Mr. Donald Skidmore, representing the Equestrian Park Homeowners Association, said that the opposition was enormous. He pointed out that it was not a golf course but a high intensity driving range and the issue of lighting was of major concern to him and his neighbors. He said that he was suspicious over the use of "temporary buildings" and questioned whether permanent buildings would ever be built. Mr. Skidmore stated that the hours of operation were not compatible with a residential neighborhood when the golf park remained open as late as 9:30 p.m.

Mr. Mike Roman, President of the Sunnybrook Community Association, articulated the opposition of the majority of the people who spoke against the development. He spoke of his community's concern over the adverse precedent the golf park project represented suggesting that it looked like an attempt at commercial zoning. He cited three points: (1) the subject property was zoned for residential development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; (2) the residents adjacent to the project had bought their properties with the understanding that the subject property would be developed residential consistent with the zoning; and (3) the golf park project represented an inconsistent development which could adversely affect the property values of its neighbors.

Mr. Joseph Mignogna, 1715 Fox Run Court, Vienna, said that he was speaking on behalf of the Wayside Community. He stated that his community was strongly and overwhelmingly opposed to the special permit. Traffic was the issue which he was most concerned about.

Mr. Douglas White, 735 Old Hunt Way, Herndon (formerly resided in Reston), spoke in favor of the application saying that he played golf and this golf park facility was greatly needed in the area. He said that if the County were going to oversee the use of chemicals and pesticides for the lawn maintenance, then he had less concern than if there were 50 property owners using Chemlawn.

Mr. Jay Livingood, 11308 Harborside Cluster, Reston, said that a golf driving range required far less herbicides and pesticides than a golf course because there was no foot traffic. He maintained that one could not hear the golf action, hitting of balls with the clubs, and the only discernible sound would be the landing of the balls. Mr. Livingood said that it would be impossible to irrigate the golf park facility with a well. He said that the demand for such a facility in this area was great. Mr. Livingood said that it was his opinion that Mr. Thoburn's application was the most attractive project he had seen.

Mr. Bruce Bennett, 1459 Hunter Mill Road, Vienna, pointed out that the proposed facility was a commercial use in a residential area. He stated that Hunter Mill Road was the boundary separating commercial from residential, nothing should be allowed to cross it and the residents were willing to fight for that stand.

Ms. Marianne Bell, address unknown, spoke in favor of the application stating that, in her opinion, the plan was very attractive and Fairfax County needed a lot of facilities such as those.

Mr. Douglas Roberts, address unknown, spoke in favor of the application stating that it was an excellent place for recreation.

Mr. Reuben Cook, 10106 Tamarack Drive, Vienna, pointed out that the zoning for the area was single family residential. He believed that once commercial development was allowed to cross the Hunter Mill Road boundary, it would be very difficult to see that it not be used as a precedent. Mr. Cook encouraged the Planning Commission's continued support of the Master

Plan and the continued support of Hunter Mill Road as a barrier to further commercial development and encroachment into residential areas.

Mr. Brian Schuster, 1620 Crowell Road, Vienna, pointed out that the hours of operation included weekends and it was his opinion that the golf park would be a real intrusion into the quiet, country-like setting of their home life.

Ms. Ruth Ritchie, a resident in Reston, said that the golf park was a wonderful idea, that it preserved the 46 acres of land, and it was something that everyone could enjoy. She stated that she supported the application.

There being no further speakers, Chairman Murphy called upon Mr. Shumate for a rebuttal statement.

Mr. Shumate submitted a revised special permit plat, a copy of which is in the date file. He conceded that public opinion of the neighboring property owners was that anything other than residential was unacceptable; yet he maintained that the Comprehensive Plan, and staff, recommended special permit uses in an R District. As long as the project had the appropriate size and scale, he pointed out, it should be considered. Mr. Shumate believed that the golf park's extensive berming, screening and landscaping would greatly mitigate the toll road's noise and lighting.

Mr. John Callow, the applicant's traffic consultant, commented that the trip generation rates were the same as was produced from applications for houses and commercial establishments such as 7-11's because the rates were determined from statistical analyses of facilities of similar kinds. An interesting point, he conceded, was that the golf park would produce more traffic than a by-right development but the golf park had its entrance on Hunter Mill Road instead of Crowell Road. This regional facility would attract 90 percent of its traffic from south of the entrance, he said, which left only 10 percent to traverse along Hunter Mill and Crowell Roads. Mr. Callow affirmed that the numbers proved that their application would produce less traffic north of their entrance than a by-right development. Mr. Callow concluded his remarks by reminding the Commission that there was a consensus document currently under review by the Commonwealth Transportation Board to utilize excess revenue for a two-stage improvement to the interchange at Hunter Mill Road in that area.

Mr. Tom McClurg, Golftrust Inc., the applicant's lighting expert, 1351 Marcum Woods Road, Longwood, Florida, explained the lighting design concept pointing out that pole mounted equipment lit the tees and ground lighting lit the down range area. Any light source glare which may have spilled out onto adjacent properties, he said, was cut out by attaching a special conical shaped glare control piece on the equipment which forced a vertical aim angle down and the light beam was also controlled producing a narrow beam spread. Adequate landscaping with berms and all types of shrubbery, trees and vegetation would cut off ground light glare from adjoining properties, he maintained.

Commissioner Hubbard raised the issue of ambient light, indirect light or light pollution questioning whether or not the lighting would create a sky-glow effect like a bubble over the site.

Mr. McClurg agreed with Commissioner Hubbard's deduction that basically there was no glare but a definite glow.

Commissioner Hubbard cited language in the Comprehensive Plan which specified that commercial encroachment into residential neighborhoods must be limited and there must be an establishment of a clearly defined "edge" between commercial and residential areas.

In response to Commissioner Hubbard's referred language and query, Mr. Riegle said that the language actually supported larger language which spoke to the buffer between Reston and Tysons Corner. He was unable to draw a definitive line separating commercial use from residential use, he said, but there would always be certain types of uses which were a buffer use or a transition use. Mr. Riegle said that when considering the characteristics of the proposed development, with its significant amount of open space and significant commitments to screening and buffering, it was staff's opinion that the proposed site could serve as a type of buffer or transitional use.

Commissioner Hubbard clarified his question saying to Mr. Riegle he had asked for a "delineation of an edge" and specified that he had quoted from the Number 3 Objective in the Section of Upper Potomac. Commissioner Hubbard pointed out that his reference was far more specific than Mr. Riegle's response and that the section he had quoted defined the land use for the entire area and was one of the major objectives which defined the land use for the entire section. Commissioner Hubbard was dissatisfied with Mr. Riegle's response stating that he had not been given an answer that clearly defined "edge" between commercial and residential areas.

There being no further questions or comments, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Bobzien for action on the case. (Verbatim excerpts are in the date file.)

//

Following summary remarks, Commissioner Bobzien MOVED THAT WE DEFER THE DECISION ONLY IN THIS CASE, WITH THE RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN FOR WRITTEN COMMENT, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1992.

Commissioners Huber and Thomas seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioner Hanlon not present for the vote.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 a.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: Paula A. McFarland

Approved on: July 30, 1992

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