

**MINUTES OF  
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 2014**

PRESENT: Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District  
Jay P. Donahue, Dranesville District  
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District  
Janet R. Hall, Mason District  
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large  
Janyce Hedetniemi, At-Large  
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District  
John L. Litzenberger, Jr., Sully District  
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District  
Peter F. Murphy, Springfield District  
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District

The meeting was called to order at 8:16 p.m. by Chairman Peter F. Murphy in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

Commissioner Hart announced that the Commission's Environment Committee had met earlier this evening with county staff regarding the draft for the White Paper regarding Electric Vehicle Charging Station Infrastructure, the upcoming Policy Plan amendment, and issues with the Mitre Part II report on Building Energy Technology. He added that the Committee would meet again on the following dates at 7:00 p.m. and that everyone was welcome to attend.

- Thursday, March 20 – 7:00 p.m., Board Conference Room
- Thursday, April 3 – 7:00 p.m., Board Conference Room
- Thursday, May 8 – 7:00 p.m., Conference Rooms 9/10 (Workshop on the White Paper for Electric Vehicle Charging Station Infrastructure)
- Wednesday, June 18 – 7:00 p.m., Board Conference Room
- Thursday, July 10 – 7:00 p.m., Board Conference Room

//

Chairman Murphy announced that the Workshop on the Advertised Fairfax County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Years (FY) 2015 through 2019 would take place on Wednesday, March 12, 2014.

//

456A-V96-17-3– AT&T, 8210 Terminal Road

Chairman Murphy: WITHOUT OBJECTION I MOVE THE CONSENT AGENDA ITEM.

The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Hurley was absent from the meeting.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Commissioner Hall established the following order of the agenda:

1. SE 2013-MV-015 – ALBERT GAGLIARDI
2. S13-II-M1 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (6862 ELM STREET)
3. RZ/FDP 2012-MV-008 – THE ALEXANDER COMPANY, INC.

This agenda was accepted without objection.

//

SE 2013-MV-015 – ALBERT GAGLIARDI – Appl. under Sect. 2-904 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit uses in a floodplain. Located at 10820 Anita Dr., Lorton, on approx. 22,412 sq. ft. of land zoned R-E. Tax Map 117-2 ((2)) 59. MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Roy R. Shannon, Jr., Applicant’s Agent, reaffirmed the affidavit dated September 13, 2013. There were no disclosures by the Commission.

Nicholas Rogers, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended approval of application SE 2013-MV-015.

Commissioner Flanagan asked what initiated the Notice of Violation. Melissa Smarr, Land Development Services, Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES) explained that a complaint had been received by her office that the landowner was disturbing the Resource Protection Area (RPA) and exceeding the minimum land disturbance area.

Referencing Figure 6 on page 8 in the staff report, Commissioner Hart noticed a narrow piece of property outside of the subject property and said that the development conditions were vague as to whether the work was to be done only on the Parcel 59 or the entire disturbed area, which included two parcels. He also asked if the County Attorney’s Office had been consulted about advertising this application as just one parcel. Mr. Rogers said that the County Attorney’s Office had not reviewed the case, but said that staff had understood the entirety of the disturbance to be solely on Parcel 59. Commissioner Hart referenced Sheet 2 of 4 and noted a lot line depiction

similar to that shown in Figure 6 and asked who owned the property adjacent to the site. Mary Ann Welton, Planning Division, DPZ, stated that it belonged to the Commonwealth of Virginia.

When Commissioner Hart asked if it would be easier to repair the existing site rather than return it to its original condition, Mr. Rogers confirmed that it would.

With regard to the offsite fill, Commissioner Flanagan referenced Figure 2 on page 4 and asked who owned the adjacent land. Ms. Welton reiterated that it belonged to the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Mr. Shannon addressed Commissioner Hart's earlier remarks and said that the property adjacent to the subject site was Old Colchester Park and Preserve and stated that the entire disturbed site belonged to Mr. Gagliardi. He further explained to Commissioner Flanagan that Figure 2 on page 4 was not meant to reference the offsite fill, but rather compare one black willow tree to another, both of which were on the applicant's property. He noted that he was working with the language in Development Condition 15, to recommend that a Certified Arborist manage the implementation of the referenced landscape plan. Additionally, the applicant is requesting that the number of visits by the landscape consultant be reduced to every other month instead of once a month. Mr. Shannon further stated that discussions were ongoing regarding language that required replacement of all of the landscaping in the event a natural disaster or similar event destroyed everything.

Commissioner Hart reiterated that Sheet 2 of 4 showed that the land disturbance crossed the property line by a few feet. Mr. Shannon said that he would work with staff to confirm the location of the property line. He noted, however, that the property would likely have been cited for disturbing state property in addition for the infill. He added that the applicant could not submit a Special Exception application for property owned by the state. Commissioner Hart again suggested that the county attorney's office review the application to determine its appropriateness with regard to the property boundaries.

Mr. Rogers noted that while there might be procedural issues regarding the application, he pointed out that the development conditions could be modified to include suggested actions that would only be incurred should the adjacent parcel owner be agreeable to it. Commissioner Hart expressed concern about the possibility of complaints associated with work being done on public land and reiterated that the application should be vetted by the County Attorney's Office. Mr. Shannon added that both the Mason Neck Citizens Association and the South County Federation were aware of the application and understood what was involved. He added that he had received no opposition from either group.

Commissioner Hedetniemi suggested that the applicant continue to work with staff on an agreement to define the language regarding restoration of the site if it were further destroyed by natural disaster. Mr. Shannon explained that an agreement was imminent and had wanted to mention it to the Planning Commission.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers, but received no response; therefore, he noted that a rebuttal statement was not necessary. He then called for concluding remarks from staff.

With regard to the applicant's request to reduce the number of visits by a certified arborist, Mr. Rogers stated that the prescribed number of visits was appropriate given the amount of change foreseen on this site. Jay Banks, Forest Conservation Branch, DPWES, added that cutting the number in half, as requested by Mr. Shannon, might prevent the consultant/arborist from noticing anything that might impede the establishment of the landscaping.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Flanagan for action on this case.

//

Chairman Murphy: The public hearing is now closed; recognize Mr. Flanagan, please.

Commissioner Flanagan: Mr. Chairman, I had a communication just late today about the suggestion on how to monitor catastrophic events and I indicated that -- I thought that this could be best handled by the staff between the Commission hearing and the Board of Supervisors, and so I'm going to go ahead and act on this tonight in that way and that manner. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF SE 2013-MV-015, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED FEBRUARY 27, 2014.

Commissioners Litzenberger and Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Litzenberger and Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: I don't have a problem with the motion other than I would hope staff would still review the question about the two parcels with the County Attorney's Office before it goes to the Board. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Hurley was absent from the meeting.

//

ac) to permit mixed use development with an overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.17 on PDC portion and 5.9 du/ac on PDH-8 portion and approval of final development plan and a waiver #1183-WPFM-010-1 to permit the location of underground storm water management facilities in a residential area. Located on the W. side of Silverbrook Road S. of its intersection with White Spruce Way on approx. 78.89 ac. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Alternate Uses. Tax Map 107-1 ((1)) 9 and White Spruce Way public right-of-way to be vacated and/or abandoned. Also under the Board's consideration will be the applicant's Water Quality Impact Assessment Request #1183-WQ-010-1 and a Resource Protection Area (RPA) Encroachment Exception Request #1183-WRPA-007-1 under Section 118-6-9 (Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance) of Chapter 118 of the Code of the County of Fairfax to permit the encroachment within a Resource Protection Area for the purpose of Storm Water Management and Road Improvements. (Approval of this application may enable the vacation and/or abandonment of portions of the public rights-of-way for White Spruce Way to proceed under Section 15.2-2272 (2) of the *Code of Virginia*.) MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Scott Adams, Applicant's Agent, McGuireWoods, LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated February 6, 2014. There were no disclosures by the Commissioners.

William Mayland, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended approval of applications RZ/FDP 2012-MV-008.

Commissioner Flanagan asked if staff would object to removing the proposed curb cut from Giles Run Road into the new private street. Mr. Mayland said that while county staff did not object, there were concerns from the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) regarding the connection and the application would need to address the curb cut during the site plan review process.

Commissioner Hedetniemi asked what the applicant proposed to do with the existing wall. Mr. Mayland explained that the applicant was working with the state of Virginia for historic tax credits. He added that the Architectural Review Board (ARB), the Virginia Department of Heritage Resources (VDHR), and the National Parks Service (NPS) have also provided comments on the application. He stated that the discussions regarding the wall concerned lowering the height in order to provide visibility for the proposed retail. When Commissioner Hedetniemi asked if the landscaping near the wall might be provided, Mr. Mayland explained that there were significant restrictions regarding what might be done on the site as it was on the National Historic Registry of Historic Sites and therefore required additional review by state and federal agencies. Commissioner Hedetniemi asked how the surrounding communities would access the retail establishments. Mr. Mayland said that the site would have two access points off Silverbrook Road, one that currently exists, and an additional one proposed by the applicant.

Christopher Caperton, Planning Division (PD), DPZ, provided a brief history of the Laurel Hill Adaptive Reuse project from its inception to the current application. He explained that the site had provided no revenue to the county for approximately 100 years and would now create jobs and provide a residential and commercial tax base for the county. He also noted that this would be historic preservation site with a unique community that would not only fit in with the surrounding communities and has the support the residents, but could serve as a model for other areas.

Mr. Adams said that the proposed use was a partnership between developers and the county to bring the 2010 Master Plan and community input to fruition, in accordance with the vision for this area. He noted the importance of recognizing that this project was financed by tax credits and, therefore, all decisions made by the applicant required approval by the VDHR and NPS to ensure conformance to their review standards. He also noted that the 2002 Memorandum of Agreement required that the project go through an ARB review process and added that the applicant had received their input. Addressing the questions regarding the landscaping and treatment of the existing wall, he said that the ARB had recommended approval of the proposal; however, it had deferred its final decision on the wall treatment to the VDHR and NPS and said that discussions were still ongoing. He added that the staff report reflected the plans for the wall and said that he believed the VDHR and NPS would ultimately approve it. With regard to the retail, Mr. Adams said that plans to enable its success included providing signage on the wall as well as at the corner of Silverbrook and White Spruce Way. With respect to the tennis courts, he said that neither the VDHR nor NPS were receptive to certain active recreation uses, but said that he would suggest it for further review. He said that the applicant had worked closely with the community and received support from the South County Federation, the Mount Vernon Council, and neighboring residents.

Commissioner Sargeant noted two different figures for the total number of residential units and asked Mr. Adams to explain the difference. Mr. Adams explained that the power plant and reformatory building would be used as residential units if the applicant could not find non-residential uses after having actively marketed for them for a certain length of time and after review by the county. He added that the higher number of units was in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Further discussion followed regarding contemporary design which would be incorporated into this use, which Mr. Adams noted was a result of feedback from the VDHR, NPS; smart design wherein some of the buildings might not be immediately occupied but would be ready for tenant occupancy; and completion of the project ahead of schedule to alleviate the current county tax burden on an unused site.

Commissioner Lawrence noted the proposed site's proximity to the Lorton Workhouse Arts Center and asked if the applicant had considered using any of the art produced at the Center. Mr. Adams confirmed that he had and noted that Proffer Number 24, Public Art, in the application addressed this and added that prospective artists would be required to present their work for approval. When Mr. Lawrence asked if staff concurred with this arrangement, Leanna O'Donnell, PD, DPZ, said yes.

Commissioner Flanagan asked about earlier remarks regarding height of the wall being reduced. Mr. Adams explained that the applicant proposed to reduce the height between the two access points from 15 feet to 7 feet. He noted, however, that neither the VDHR nor NPS wanted to see a reduction in the wall height with the concurrent retention of the existing buttresses on each end. Commissioner Sargeant pointed out that the wall was 25 feet at one point.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker and recited the rules for testimony.

Lawrence Clark, 8889 White Orchid Place, Lorton, representing Spring Hill Community Association, spoke in support of the application but noted that residents had expressed concern about the safety and efficiency of the intersection at White Spruce Way and Mountain Larkspur Drive, suggesting a four-way stop instead of the three-way stop proposed in the staff report. He added that a request was made for the proposed second access to be eliminated. In addition, he noted that an assisted living facility would be built in the area soon and requested that a traffic study be performed after completion of the development. He also pointed out that there was a bus stop/shelter located a short distance from the site on White Spruce Way.

Commissioner Flanagan asked for clarification regarding safety concerns regarding the intersection at White Spruce Way and Mountain Larkspur Drive. Mr. Clark explained that residents were concerned about cars stacking behind the gates within his community due to the retail traffic on the subject site. When Commissioner Flanagan asked about the elimination of the proposed second access, Mr. Clark noted that one resident had made that suggestion, further adding that both suggestions had been made after the South County Federation's vote to support the application.

Andy Casper, 9091 Furey Road, Lorton, Director, South County Cares, spoke in support of the proposal, noting that it would not only provide retail but the development would transform the site in a way that would benefit the entire area.

Mr. Adams agreed about safety concerns at the intersection at White Spruce Way and the entrance to the site, but pointed out that the proposed design was developed with the recommendations of the Fairfax County Department of Transportation and VDOT. He added that a four-way stop had been taken into consideration; however, VDOT did not support it because of the concern that while cars were attempting to get onto Silverbrook Road, stacking would occur. He added that the proposed second entrance was necessary for circulation purposes. He also noted that the existing proffers required the applicant to perform a warrant study prior to the first residential use permit (RUP)/ non-RUP during the second phase of the project. He stated that by that time, the assisted living facility would likely be completed and thus this feature was incorporated into the existing proffer commitment.

Commissioner Flanagan noted that Mr. Casper had requested a traffic study after completion of this development and asked Mr. Adams if he would do so. Mr. Adams reiterated his remarks regarding the existing proffer. Mr. Mayland pointed out that the facility would only be built with the Springhill community's consent and added that the traffic study could be requested as a condition of that application.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Flanagan for action on this case.

//

Chairman Murphy: The public hearing is closed; recognize Mr. Flanagan.

Commissioner Flanagan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE APPROVAL OF RZ 2012-MV-008 AND THE ASSOCIATED CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 1 OF THE STAFF REPORT AND THE APPROVAL OF THE MODIFICATIONS AND WAIVERS, AS PROVIDED IN MY HANDOUT, DATED MARCH 6<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, which each of you received a copy tonight.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, I would just like, in that second, to provide a couple of comments if you wouldn't mind. As mentioned, I've had the privilege of being involved in the land use planning process for the Laurel Hill area since the mid-1990s – yes, my kids have truly grown up during this process – first, as one of the co-Chairs for the planning process for the entire D.C. Department of Corrections site, next as Chair of the County task force that developed the reuse recommendations for the former prison buildings, and most recently as Chair of the Board-appointed Project Advisory Committee, all reviewing and relating to the land aspects of the application we are reviewing tonight. I'm pleased to second Commissioner Flanagan's motion to recommend approval of this application, and I'd like to acknowledge some of the staff members and others who have made it possible to achieve this milestone. At the top of the list are Chris Caperton and Leanna O'Donnell. Their professionalism and their diligence in both planning and communication, especially to the surrounding communities, have contributed to the completion of this application process, as well as the next phase of actually achieving the adaptive reuse of these historic structures. Over the course of the many, many years we've all been involved, they have attended so many community meetings that they are considered honorary citizens of the Mount Vernon District. Also – that's a good thing – also noted for considerable contributions to the process is Linda Haskins. She has been our guidepost regarding historic preservation throughout this process. I'd also like to acknowledge Dave Voss with the Alexander Company, Jim Perry with Elm Street Developers, and the rest of the team. They are key players in this development process who demonstrate saintly patience during the historic review process for adaptive reuse design and the application for historic tax credits. Also demonstrated is creativity. Not too many developers have to incorporate guard towers and penitentiary cells in their design. They're quite clever and creative with this, and you'll see the finished product in that fashion. Greg Riegle and Scott Adams with McGuire Woods, very much appreciated for their navigation through the review process with multiple stakeholders, bringing it to this point. Let me also say thank you to the numerous South County citizens who have contributed so much of their time and input regarding this application. That includes our very

own Larry Clarke, who is here tonight; and very much thanks to Andy as well for being here tonight. Appreciate the comments and the input that you have all provided. So it's with that acknowledgement and appreciation for the team that got us to this point this evening, that I very happily second Commissioner Flanagan's motion. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you. Further discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve RZ 2012-MV-008, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Mr. Flanagan.

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes, I have two more motions, and I would like to, before making the motion, say how I appreciate the work that Commissioner Sargeant did on the task force that developed the improvements and also to Chris Caperton who has practically lived in Mount Vernon District, I think, for the last three or four years. It's been truly remarkable, the work that the staff has done on this occasion. Mr. - Commissioner Sargeant's task force is one of the few task forces that I managed to escape being a member of and so it was wonderful just to sit on the side and watch them develop this magnificent reuse plan. Mr. Chairman I MOVE APPROVAL OF FDP 2012-MV-008, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN CONDITIONS DATED FEBRUARY 19, 2014, CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 2 OF THE STAFF REPORT, AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' APPROVAL OF RZ 2012-MV-008, AND THE ASSOCIATED CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of the motion to approve FDP 2012-MV-008, subject to the Board's approval of the rezoning and Conceptual Development Plan, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Mr. Flanagan.

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes, Mr. Chairman, following on the conversation that I had with staff after their opening presentation, the development plan we just approved depicts a roundabout in the southwestern portion of the site for possible future extension of Giles Run Road to Laurel Crest Drive. There is an existing right-of-way dedicated to connect Giles Run Road from Lorton Road to Laurel Crest Drive. This connection north of the roundabout is not needed for the development and is not proposed to be constructed by the applicant. The connection of Lorton Road and Laurel Crest Drive is not desired by the community but is still shown on the Comprehensive Plan. Supervisor Hyland has indicated that he is considering the removal of the proposed connection from the Comprehensive Plan. It is therefore my recommendation that the applicant construct the roundabout with a stub connection to the potential -- without a stub connection to the potential extension of Giles Run Road. It is -- if it is determined the road extension is necessary, the connection could still happen. If it determined the road connection is not necessary, it avoids constructing a stub connection to nowhere at this time. Therefore, Mr.

Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION GO ON THE RECORD THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION ENCOURAGE THE APPLICANT, THE FAIRFAX COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, AND THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK TOGETHER AS PART OF THE SITE PLAN PROCESS TO APPROVE A DESIGN OF THE ROUNDABOUT FOR GILES RUN ROAD THAT WOULD NOT REQUIRE THE ROAD TO BE STUBBED TO THE NORTH FOR A FUTURE CONNECTION.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of that motion which, you'll forgive me if I don't repeat? All those in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Each motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Hurley was absent from the meeting.

//

S13-II-M1 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (6862 ELM STREET) – To consider proposed revisions to the Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County, VA, in accordance with the *Code of Virginia*, Title 15.2, Chapter 22. Plan Amendment #S13-II-M1 concerns property located at 6862 Elm Street, McLean, VA, (Tax Map Parcel 30-2((1))61, formerly Parcels 30-2((1))61, ((10))(6)C, 2,3,4,5; ((4))(E)39-43) and 6870 Elm Street, McLean, VA (Tax Map Parcel 30-2((10))(6)1) in the McLean Community Business Center. The subject area is planned within an Area of Minimum Change for office and ground floor retail uses at an intensity up to .50 floor area ratio (FAR). There is an option for Tax Map Parcel 30-2((1)) 61 for mixed-use development to include elderly housing up to 1.0 FAR with conditions. If elderly housing is not developed, residential use should be limited to 50 dwelling units. The Plan Amendment proposes to re-plan the subject area as a Redevelopment Area for mixed-use development to include office, multifamily residential, and ground floor retail uses with up to 400,000 square feet and an overall intensity up to 1.94 FAR and other conditions. Recommendations to the transportation network may also be modified. DRANESVILLE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Aaron Klibaner, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended approval of application S13-II-M1.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker and recited the rules for testimony.

Alan Goldberg, 6800 Fleetwood Road, McLean, representing the Council of Co-Owners, McLean House, North, Phase 1 Condominium, spoke in support of the Amendment, but expressed the following concerns:

- Traffic: There are currently three intersections surrounding the subject parcel, each of which exist with dangerous conditions including poor signage, lighting, and regulation of existing traffic, the last of which has increased substantially in recent years;
- Safety: There is a large volume of traffic traveling often at high speeds, as well as poor lighting and poor or no street lines markings; and
- Parking: McLean House has an open parking lot which, until recently, had few problems with unauthorized parking. Residents expressed concern that the residents from the new development will park in the McLean House lot.

Commissioner Ulfelder asked Mr. Goldberg if he had expressed his concerns with the McLean Citizens Association. Mr. Goldberg stated that as a member of one of its subcommittees he had submitted a proposal referencing the traffic concerns and how it might be presented to the Planning Commission. He added that he had seen the revised staff report language which included a traffic study; however, he noted his concern that it would be an initial study and any issues arising thereafter would not be addressed. When Commissioner Ulfelder noted that the new development would replace a large area of surface parking, Mr. Goldberg concurred that the development would have a beneficial impact, but reiterated his concern regarding the consequences of the removal of the surface parking.

Chairman Murphy pointed out that some of the issues brought up by Mr. Goldberg would be appropriately addressed during the rezoning phase, which would more specifically speak to those items.

Mark Zetts, 6640 Kirby Court, Falls Church, representing McLean Citizens Association, stated that the MCA supported the Amendment, adding that of the five changes the Association proposed, four of them had been accepted by staff. He noted that the traffic study was one of the changes since it would tie in with the improvements in the Tysons Corner area. In addition, he commended the applicant and staff for their coordination with MCA and work on the Amendment.

Commissioner Ulfelder asked if a new bus stop was part of this amendment. Mr. Klibaner said that proposed Bus Route 721 would include a stop along Fleetwood Road at its intersection with Elm Street.

Bailey Hopple, 4445 Willard Avenue, Chevy Chase, MD, JBG Project Manager, said that she had met with the MCA and other McLean community groups and received feedback which was incorporated into the Amendment. She pointed out that the Amendment offered several benefits including high-quality classical architecture; easier pedestrian connections and a new internal street through the site; a mix of uses that would encourage fewer car trips; a new bus stop for the

Fairfax County Connector route that will service the new McLean Metro stop; and enhancements for bike accessibility to provide bike racks onsite.

Commissioner Ulfelder asked what efforts were made to consolidate the subject parcel with the adjacent parcel. Ms. Hopple said that she had met with the owners of the adjacent parcel but could not reach an agreement for consolidation. Consequently, she said JBG would provide interparcel access between the sites and the proposed public park would be located next to the adjacent lot to provide space between them. When Commissioner Ulfelder asked how the parking would be accommodated, Ms. Hopple said that 60 spaces would be provided along the new internal streets, adding that the parking for the existing office building and the new residential building would be underground.

Georges Tawil, 1420 Beverly Road, McLean, President, General Assets, Inc., representing McLean Square Associates, supported the Amendment. He noted that his office tenants had expressed a desire for more residential units nearby from which they could either walk or ride a bike to work, and the retail tenants had said that they would like to see more activity in their stores. He added that the Amendment would provide a more vibrant community that would benefit from both of the uses in the Amendment and the existing surrounding uses.

Paris So, P.O. Box 753, McLean, Greater Mclean Chamber Of Commerce Young Professionals Committee, spoke in support of the Amendment and said that the Amendment would benefit the community at large as well as small business owners and young professionals. She added that it would also help to create new business in this area and draw new professionals to the area.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Ulfelder for action on this case.

//

Chairman Murphy: The public hearing is closed; recognize Mr. Ulfelder.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This - the subject area of this proposed plan amendment represents the first redevelopment opportunity in the McLean CBC in many years. A number of the recommendations in the proposed plan amendment are based on suggestions from members of the McLean Planning Committee and the McLean Citizens Association who, as you heard this evening, worked closely with staff. Therefore, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR PLAN AMENDMENT S13-II-M1 WITH MODIFICATIONS RELATED TO THE PROVISION OF A TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS, ACCOMMODATIONS OF PUBLIC TRANSIT FACILITIES, THE USE OF NON-INVASIVE PLANTINGS, AND MINOR EDITORIAL CHANGES, AS SHOWN ON PAGES 2 THROUGH 4 OF THIS EVENING'S HANDOUT, DATED MARCH 6<sup>TH</sup>, 2014.

Commissioner Litzenberger and Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Litzenberger and Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it adopt Plan Amendment S13-II-M1, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Hurley was absent from the meeting.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 10:16 p.m.

Peter F. Murphy, Chairman

Janet R. Hall, Secretary

Audio and video recordings of this meeting are available at the Planning Commission Office, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Jeanette Nord

Approved on: October 22, 2014



John W. Cooper, Clerk to the  
Fairfax County Planning Commission