

**MINUTES OF
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MARCH 25, 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
Alvin L. Thomas, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: Henry E. Strickland, Mason District

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:28 p.m. by Chairman Peter F. Murphy, Jr.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

Commissioner Bobzien announced that the Reston Towne Center Conceptual Development Plans were still being worked on by the applicant, and that on April 1, 1992 staff would be providing a brief memorandum reporting on the proposed plans. He added that it was his intention to bring this matter forward as an administrative matter on Thursday, April 2, 1992.

//

Commissioner Bobzien stated that on Tuesday, March 24, 1992, a work session was held on the proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance Amendment concerning the Commercial and Industrial Districts. Because there were still a few outstanding issues to be resolved, he announced another work session for the Planning Commission on Monday, March 30, 1992 at 7:30 p.m. in the Board Room. Commissioner Bobzien stated that markup on this item was scheduled for Thursday, April 9, 1992 at 7:30 p.m.

//

Commissioner Huber announced the following workshops/meetings concerning the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance and the public was invited to both:

Wednesday, April 15, 1992 at 7:30 p.m., a workshop in the Board Room;

Wednesday, April 22, 1992, the Environment Committee, at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Conference Room;

She added that these meetings were to prepare the Planning Commission for the markup scheduled on Thursday, May 21, 1992 at 7:30 p.m. to be held in the Board Room and that the Board of Supervisors' public hearing was scheduled on June 8, 1992 at 3:30 p.m.

//

Because of confusion over public hearings, workshops, meetings, and markups concerning the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance and the Commercial and Industrial Districts Zoning Ordinance Amendments, Chairman Murphy requested that Ms. Barbara Lippa, Deputy Director, Planning Commission Office, send a memorandum to Gail Eskew of the Cable Programming Division clarifying these dates and events for periodic broadcasting over Cable Channel 16.

//

At the request of the applicant, Commissioner Byers MOVED TO DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING ON RZ-90-V-026, GEORGE M. NEALL, II, TRUSTEE, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF APRIL 2, 1992.

Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioner Strickland absent from the meeting.

//

Because the applicant was considering other alternatives and had been allowed an extension of 30 days before coming before the Planning Commission, Commissioner Hanlon MOVED THAT THE PUBLIC HEARING ON 456-P91-19, SOUTHWESTERN BELL MOBILE SYSTEMS, INC., BE DEFERRED TO A DATE CERTAIN OF APRIL 29, 1992.

Commissioner Byers seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioner Strickland absent from the meeting.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA ITEMS

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

1. SE-91-V-047 – The Most Reverend John R. Keating, Bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Arlington, et. al.
2. SE-91-P-041 – Fairfax County Redevelopment & Housing Authority

3. SE-90-L-037 – VA Office I Limited Associates Limited Partnership, et. al.
SE-90-L-038 – VA Office IV Limited Associates Limited Partnership, a
Massachusetts Limited Partnership
SE-90-L-039 – VA Office VII Limited Associates Limited Partnership, et. al.
4. SE-90-C-044 – The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Inc., an
Illinois Non-Profit Corporation
5. S92-III-UP1 – Out-of-Turn Plan Amendment – Center for Innovative
Technology (CIT)

This order was accepted without objection.

//

SE-91-V-047 – THE MOST REVEREND JOHN R. KEATING,
BISHOP OF THE CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF ARLINGTON,
VA, ET. AL. – Appl. under Sect. 3-204 of the Zoning Ord. to
permit an increase in enrollment for an existing school of general
education on property located at 2901 Popkins La. on approx.
15.72 ac. zoned R-2. Tax Map 93-1((1))6. MOUNT VERNON
DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Mr. William F. Enderle, Director of Property and Construction for the Catholic Diocese of Arlington, 200 North Glebe Road, Arlington, representing the applicant, reaffirmed the affidavit. The Commission members had no disclosures.

Chairman Murphy asked if there was anyone present who would be speaking in opposition to the application. There being none, he waived the staff report and without objection, closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Byers for action on the case. (Verbatim excerpts may be found in the date file.)

//

Following closing remarks, Commissioner Byers MOVED (THAT) THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND (THAT) THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE SE-91-V-047, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 1 OF THE STAFF REPORT.

Commissioners Bobzien and Sell seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioner Strickland absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Byers next MOVED (THAT) THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WAIVE THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING AND BARRIER REQUIREMENTS ALONG ALL BOUNDARIES TO THAT CURRENTLY EXISTING ON SITE.

Commissioners Bobzien and Sell seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioner Strickland absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Byers then MOVED (THAT) THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND (THAT) THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WAIVE THE INTERIOR PARKING LOT LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS.

Commissioners Bobzien and Sell seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioner Strickland absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Byers finally MOVED (THAT) THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND (THAT) THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WAIVE THE SERVICE DRIVE REQUIREMENT ALONG RICHMOND HIGHWAY.

Commissioners Bobzien and Sell seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioner Strickland absent from the meeting.

//

SE-91-P-041 – FAIRFAX COUNTY REDEVELOPMENT & HOUSING AUTHORITY – Appl. under Sects. 5-404 & 5--504 of the Zoning Ord. to permit hotel/motel use on property located at 3700 Pender Dr. on approx. 3.48 ac. zoned I-4 & I-5. Tax Map 47-3((1))59B. PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Mr. Michael Scheurer, with the Department of Housing, representing the Fairfax County Redevelopment and Housing Authority, reaffirmed the affidavit. There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Ms. Lorrie Kirst, Zoning Evaluation Division, Office of Comprehensive Planning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She brought the Commission's attention to the development conditions dated March 25, 1992 which she had distributed that night. The only change, she noted, was in Condition #3 in which four words had been added for clarification. Ms. Kirst said that staff recommended approval.

Commissioner Hanlon cited a letter dated December 3, 1991 from Ms. Peggy Wagner, Director of Department of the Community Development and Planning, City of Fairfax, which referenced three matters regarding the application. A copy of the letter is in the date file. He asked Ms. Kirst if the application met the requests of the City.

In response, Ms. Kirst explained that the City was making residents aware of the possibility of noise and light from several existing ballfields which would probably make an impact on them. The other two issues, she said, dealt with the screening and buffering along the eastern boundary

and the City wanted to ensure that the existing screening and buffering, as shown on the approved site plan, would be provided. Ms. Kirst stated that staff believed that the issues, as identified by the City of Fairfax, had been adequately addressed.

In response to Commissioner Hanlon's question, Ms. Kirst affirmed that the Special Exception plat and the development conditions would require the placement of at least 18 trees and more if necessary, in order to provide adequate buffering between the subject property and the Gainesville Court Apartments.

In response to Commissioner Hanlon's question of whether or not landscaping materials or decorative fencing would be provided behind Lot 27 to avoid pedestrian cut-through to the apartments, Ms. Kirst explained that staff believed that that would not be practical because that area was in a stormwater management outlet area.

Mr. Scheurer said that the Housing Authority owned the building at 3700 Pender Drive and that they had a full range of housing programs serving families and the elderly. He pointed out that the Housing Authority did not have a program for low-income singles and they wanted to introduce a prototype program, modeled after one in Montgomery County, for working singles. He added that the results of the Montgomery program and its operations had been very successful. The program would be for working singles only and would have both a minimum and maximum income ceiling, explained Mr. Scheurer. He said that they wanted to commit to the formation of an advisory committee to be made up of surrounding property owners in order to mitigate any problems. Mr. Scheurer stressed that there would only be the addition of two new entrances to the building and any other improvements, such as painting, etc., would be worked through with the Pender Architectural Advisory Board.

In response to Commissioner Harsel's question, Mr. Scheurer said that a conservative estimate for an average stay of about 40 percent of the occupants would be three months or more. He added that only with experience would time foretell the average stays but that this type of program would serve populations which were transient in their situations in that these persons may be coming out of a family situation, such as a divorce or business relocation.

Chairman Murphy called the only listed speaker and outlined the rules for giving oral testimony.

Ms. Geneva Cox, representing Catholics for Housing, affirmed the necessity for affordable housing in Fairfax County. She used the example of MCI relocating their corporate headquarters outside of the County stating the two reasons given were; (1) the cost of living; and (2) affordable housing. Ms. Cox pointed out that if the County was to continue to be an economically viable community with entry level positions of technical and professional caliber for its employees then housing was a necessity and this application was a way to provide housing for those persons already in the County. She explained to Commissioner Harsel the reasons why one to three month stays were common for people coming into the County who were employed in entry level positions. She commented on and how their circumstances could change and allow them to be in a position to move out of affordable dwelling units (ADUs).

In response to Commissioner Hanlon's straightforward question, Mr. Scheurer affirmed that, as the City of Fairfax had requested, they would honor the development condition that required them to place an additional 18 trees.

Commissioner Bobzien expressed his appreciation for the hard work performed by Mr. Scheurer and his staff in fielding and resolving concerns regarding the facility raised by adjoining property owners.

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

//

Following final remarks, Commissioner Hanlon MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF SE-91-P-041, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED MARCH 25, 1992 AND HANDED OUT TONIGHT WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENT:

THAT DEVELOPMENT CONDITION 4 SHALL READ: "THE EXISTING VEGETATION SHALL BE SUPPLEMENTED AS SHOWN ON THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION PLAT AND FURTHER SUPPLEMENTED AS NECESSARY TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF TRANSITIONAL SCREENING TYPE 1 ALONG THE EASTERN BOUNDARY AS DETERMINED BY THE URBAN FORESTRY BRANCH."

Commissioner Hubbard seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioner Strickland absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Hanlon then MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT THE BARRIER REQUIREMENT ALONG THE EASTERN BOUNDARY BE WAIVED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 14 OF SECTION 13-304 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE.

Commissioner Hubbard seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioner Strickland absent from the meeting.

//

SE-90-L-037 – VA OFFICE I LIMITED ASSOCIATES
LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET. AL. – Appl. under Sect. 5-504 of
the Zoning Ord. to permit office use in an I-5 District on property

SE-90-L-037 – VA OFFICE I LIMITED ASSOCIATES L.P., ET. AL.
SE-90-L-038 – VA OFFICE IV LIMITED ASSOCIATES L.P.,
A MASSACHUSETTS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
SE-90-L-039 – VA OFFICE VII LIMITED ASSOCIATES L.P., ET AL

March 25, 1992

located on the S. side of Boston Ave. across from its intersection with Corporate Ct. & across from its intersection with Grainger Ct. on approx. 22.85 ac. zoned I-5 & NR. Tax Map 99-1((12))15, 21A, A1, 24 (Formerly pt. of Cl.) (Concurrent with SE-90-L-038 & SE-90-L-039.) LEE DISTRICT.

SE-90-L-038 – VA OFFICE IV LIMITED ASSOCIATES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, A MASSACHUSETTS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP – Appl. under Sect. 5-504 of the Zoning Ord. to permit office use in an I-5 District on property located on the N. side of Boston Blvd., E. & W. of Corporate Ct., & on the N. & E. side of Grainger Ct. on approx. 24.72 ac. zoned I-5 & NB, Tax Maps 98-2((18))12; 99-1((12))2, 3, 9, 10. (Concurrent with SE-90-L-037 & SE-90-L-039.) LEE DISTRICT.

SE-90-L-039 – VA OFFICE VII LIMITED ASSOCIATES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET. AL. – Appl. under Sect. 5-504 of the Zoning Ord. to permit office use in an I-5 District on property located on the S. Side of Boston Blvd. across from its intersection with Research Way & W. of the terminus of Boston Blvd. on approx. 16.5 ac. zoned I-5. Tax Maps 99-1((12))19; 99-1((1))pt.1 (Proposed Lot 13.) (Concurrent with SE-90-L-037 & SE-90-L-038.) LEE DISTRICT. JOINT PUBLIC HEARING.

Melanie M. Reilly, Esquire, of McGuire, Woods, Battle & Boothe, representing the applicant, reaffirmed the affidavit. There were no disclosures from Commission members.

Ms. Lorrie Kirst, Zoning Evaluation Division, Office of Comprehensive Planning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that a set of revised development conditions dated March 25th were distributed that night. Ms. Kirst stated that staff recommended approval.

Ms. Reilly emphasized that the proposal, which had been ongoing for 10 years, was for an existing office park and that the applicant's multimillion dollar road improvements had enhanced the roadways in the area. She stated that it was the intent of Boston Park to release space within the park with the existing type of tenant mix. She explained that due to the Comprehensive Plan's C & I text amendments, the applicant was unable to release space for those spaces with expired leases if the proposed tenant mix was not identical to the original mix shown on the original approved site plans. She stated that these special exceptions were sought to allow the Park to proceed as planned and intended. Ms. Reilly explained the editing changes to three of the proposed development conditions for SE-90-L-039 which the applicant was requesting.

SE-90-L-037 – VA OFFICE I LIMITED ASSOCIATES L.P., ET. AL.
SE-90-L-038 – VA OFFICE IV LIMITED ASSOCIATES L.P.,
A MASSACHUSETTS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
SE-90-L-039 – VA OFFICE VII LIMITED ASSOCIATES L.P., ET AL

March 25, 1992

Questions followed between the Commissioners, staff, and the applicant regarding best management practices, phosphorus removal, the buffers surrounding the site, and the applicant's 48-month and 30-month construction requirement.

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

//

Following summary remarks, Commissioner Sell MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT APPROVE SE-90-L-037, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED MARCH 11, 1992 AND CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 1A.

Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioners Hanlon, Hubbard and Huber not present for the vote; Commissioner Strickland absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Sell next MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT APPROVE SE-90-L-038, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED MARCH 11, 1992 AND CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 1B.

Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioners Hanlon, Hubbard and Huber not present for the vote; Commissioner Strickland absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Sell then MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT APPROVE SE-90-L-039, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED MARCH 25, 1992, WITH THE DELETION OF CONDITION #7.

Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioners Hanlon, Hubbard and Huber not present for the vote; Commissioner Strickland absent from the meeting.

//

SE-90-C-044 – THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS
OF MATHEMATICS, INC., AN ILLINOIS NON-PROFIT
CORPORATION – Appl. under Sect. 5-304 of the Zoning Ord.
to permit expansion of existing office use in the I-3 District on
property located at 1906 Association Dr. on approx. 2.54 ac. zoned
I-3. Tax Map 17-4((12))1. CENTREVILLE DISTRICT.
PUBLIC HEARING.

Antonio J. Calabrese, Esquire, of McGuire, Woods, Battle & Boothe, representing the applicant, reaffirmed the affidavit. The Commission members had no disclosures, with the exception of Commissioner Bobzien, who announced that his wife was a dues-paying member of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Ms. Mary Ann Godfrey, Zoning Evaluation Division, Office of Comprehensive Planning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She stated that staff recommended approval.

//

During Chairman Murphy's temporary absence from the room, Secretary Harsel chaired the proceedings.

//

Mr. Calabrese reviewed the applicant's proposal, its history, purpose, function, and pointed out its unanimous support by Reston's businesses, government, and community. He noted that the requested expansion of the building was needed to accommodate the association's growing needs. Because the expansion was small, explained Mr. Calabrese, there would be relatively few new employees and there should be no significant change to or impact on the existing traffic. Mr. Calabrese reported that the applicant had secured a parking determination which reduced the required number of parking spaces to permit an approximate 20 more feet of tree save area.

//

Chairman Murphy resumed the Chair.

//

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

//

After making final remarks, Commissioner Bobzien MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT SE-90-C-044 BE APPROVED, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 1 OF THE STAFF REPORT.

Commissioners Huber and Thomas seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioner Strickland absent from the meeting.

//

The Commission recessed at 9:24 p.m. and reconvened at 9:43 p.m.

//

S92-III-UP1 – OUT-OF-TURN PLAN AMENDMENT –
CENTER FOR INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY (CIT) – Appl. to consider proposed revisions to the Adopted Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County, VA, in accordance with the Code of Virginia, Title 15.1, Chapter 11, which concerns several properties located N. of the Dulles Airport Access Rd. in the vicinity of Rock Hill Rd. referred to as Tax Maps 15-2((1))1, 2, 3, 4, 5, BA, 15, 16, 17; 16-1((1))parcels 1, 2, 3, 4, 4A, 5, 5A, and 7. The CIT is located within this area which is currently planned for residential use at 2-3 du/ac. (du/ac.) with an option for office/light industrial use for the area located W. of Rock Hill Rd. & an option for office/research & development use E. of Rock Hill Rd. The CIT is planned for institutional use. The proposed Out-of Turn Plan Amendment item will consider residential & non-residential land uses, public facilities & transportation amendments related to the recommendations of the Dranesville Task Force. Some of the transportation amendments include recommendations for off-site improvements related to the realignment of Rock Hill Rd. The area is approx. 90 ac. in size & generally bounded by the Dulles Airport Access Rd. on the S.; the Town of Herndon boundary line on the N.; Reflection Lake subdivision on the E.; and, the Fairfax/Loudoun County boundary line on the W.
DRANESVILLE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Before the public hearing commenced, Commissioner Hubbard announced his intention to defer the decision on the case.

Mr. Fred Selden, Branch Chief, Policy Development Branch, Planning Division, Office of Comprehensive Planning (OCP), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file.

After his presentation, in which he addressed several issues concerning the different options for the proposed land use development, he introduced Mr. Jaak Pedak, with the Office of Transportation (OT).

Mr. Jaak Pedak, Transportation Planner, OT, listed the following major transportation issues associated with the development of the subject property: (1) the provision of sufficient road capacity to accommodate traffic generated by the development; (2) avoidance of long, single-ended accesses and poor circulation for both the residential and non-residential developments; and (3) the potential development of a western region park-and-ride facility, its feasibility, accessibility, and the impact on its surroundings.

Chairman Murphy announced that the application was a Plan Amendment with no applicant, as such. He called the first listed speaker and reminded the audience that the rules for giving testimony, as articulated earlier in the meeting, were still in effect.

John DeNoyer, Vice Mayor of the Town of Herndon, submitted a written resolution from the Town of Herndon, a copy of which is in the date file, which registered his town's endorsement of the Kay/CIT site as a location for the park and ride facility. He stated that the town took no formal position on the overall land use for the area but would hope that any changes made by the Comprehensive Plan would remain sensitive to all adjacent residential neighborhoods. Vice Mayor DeNoyer said that he understood that the area must become a transitional area because of the high intensity land use proposed by Loudoun County, their contiguous neighbor, which would surely have an effect.

Mr. Lynn Caraway, 2147 Maleady Drive, Herndon, submitted written testimony, a copy of which is in the date file. He viewed Worldgate's latest proposal to substitute multifamily housing for much of the planned office space as even less desirable to his community than the proposal which had come before the Planning Commission a year before. It was his opinion, he said, that the proposal indicated that additional high-density housing in the neighborhood was inappropriate. Mr. Caraway listed "noise" as one of his concerns not adequately addressed in the staff report. His other concerns were the traffic connection through Reflection Lake; the infrastructure of Reflection Lake streets and the fact that those streets were not adequate to support through traffic.

Mr. Len Bull, 2001 Blue Ridge Court, Herndon, emphasized two points; the fact that until the transportation studies were completed, any consideration of any type of proposal was pointless and; the subject property had never been considered appropriate for the high intensity now proposed. Mr. Bull recommended that the proposal be denied at least until all aspects of the transportation studies had been completed.

Ms. Rea Mueller, Chairman of the Land Use Committee of Reflection Homes Association, submitted written testimony, a copy of which is in the date file. On behalf of her association, she requested that the decision on this Out-of-Turn Plan Amendment be deferred until the Virginia

Department of Transportation (VDOT) had completed its western regional park and ride study. She maintained that VDOT would determine the most appropriate site for the facility and Fairfax County should wait for the information the study would provide before changing the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Mueller said that they supported the current Plan's recommendation for the area, that of a base line development of two to three dwelling units per acre with a preferred option of low-density office, light industrial, or research and development use.

Randolph A. Sutliff, Esquire, with Miles & Stockbride, represented Mr. Alan I. Kay, the owner of the largest parcel, Land Unit C, in the study area and stated their support of the Dranesville Task Force's recommendation. He submitted a bound report which presented a summary analysis of the task force's recommendation for the Greater Herndon Planning District which may be found in the date file. He pointed out the site's uniqueness because of its proximity to five different land use jurisdictions, Fairfax County, the Town of Herndon, Loudoun County, the CIT, which was state owned and subject to its own land use controls, and the federal facility of Dulles Airport. Mr. Sutliff pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan had planned that land for a future transit and rail facility. He emphasized the super priorities made by the Planning Commission which were to facilitate the effectiveness of the Comprehensive Plan noting that those same priorities were also recommended by the Dranesville Task Force.

Commissioner Huber corrected Mr. Sutliff's quotes reporting that he had not mentioned the words "in centers" and she said that, to her knowledge, the subject proposal was not a mixed use center. She wanted it clarified that the Commission had specified "in centers" so as to allow higher density residential to be integrated into those existing communities which provided such amenities as post offices and shopping centers.

Mr. William Vitale, 4802 North Hill Drive, Fairfax, stated his opposition to the proposed amendment citing the aircraft noise which already impacted the area and he believed that more residential development would only increase the complaints. He informed the Commission that military aircraft used Dulles Airport and that they were not under any noise restrictions as were commercial airlines. Mr. Vitale said that in his opinion, staff's suggestion to noise proof the structures would not be effective.

Ms. Doreen Gumas, 2100 Sugarloaf Court, Herndon, submitted her written statement, a copy of which is in the date file. Her suggestion, concurred by the Reflection Homes community, was that the most appropriate land use for the Kay property was low density, non-residential. She pointed out that the natural conditions of the land itself limited the extent of development and she listed her association's concerns of damage to their homes due to blasting, radon gas, shallow bedrock, potential for pollution to their watershed, the presence of sensitive environmental quality corridor areas with wetlands, and poor drainage. In conclusion, Ms. Gumas voiced support for the current Plan's preferred option for low density, commercial use.

//

At this time, Secretary Harsel assumed the Chair due to Chairman Murphy's absence from the room.

//

In place of the next listed speaker who was unable to be present for the public hearing, Ms. Gumas read the prepared statement of Ms. Patricia E. Sakowski, 2102 Sugarloaf Court, Herndon, who had expressed her concerns with respect to the negative impact on the quality of life to the Reflection Lake subdivision due to increased traffic. A copy of her statement is in the date file. Her statement shared the difficulty her family had in trying to sell their home because of the uncertainty over the proposed rezoning to a high density development.

Mr. Richard Hobson, Esquire, with the law firm of McGuire, Woods, Battle and Boothe, represented LIS Partnership, an owner of one of the adjacent parcels to the proposed development. He noted that the owner, Mr. Kavar, as part of his rezoning application, had agreed to do extensive road improvements to the area. Mr. Hobson stated that his client, along with Mr. Kay, supported the Dranesville Task Force's (DTF) recommendation, Option A. They requested that the language which stipulated "all" be replaced with "most" so that future land bay buyers would not have to buy all the land but only some of it in order to obtain the preferred option. Mr. Hobson stated their opposition to the proposed 12,000 space parking lot on Land Unit C noting serious environmental issues as well as traffic related transportation problems due to insufficient roadways which would be unable to accommodate the increase.

//

Chairman Murphy resumed the Chair.

//

Commissioner Hubbard clarified that the use suggested by Mr. Hobson had no residential component nor an intention of ever having any.

The next listed speaker, Ms. Cindy Vasko, 2101 Sugarloaf Court, Herndon, was unable to appear. Her neighbor, Mr. Charles Gumas, read Ms. Vasko's statement, a copy of which is in the date file, in which she evaluated the two land use options, "A" being the DTF's proposal, and "B" the existing plan, as proposed in the OCP (staff) report, which called for low density commercial use. She used three evaluation criteria to judge each proposal: (1) the integrity and stability of adjacent areas; (2) the development of an appealing transition while avoiding the creation of isolated patchworks of parcels; and (3) the "integrity and stability" of the proposed development itself. In Ms. Vasko's opinion, Option B was the best choice for all concerned with the added requirement to maintain a service level D for the roads on site.

Mr. John Callow, 2112 Maleady Drive, Herndon, as a member of the Dranesville Task Force, spoke in favor of Option A. His concern was over the intersection of Parcher Road and Centreville Road stating that no roads should tap into Parcher Avenue because the delicate balance at that intersection would change to a level C, which was a very high and dangerous increase in traffic volume. In response to Commissioner Huber's question, he affirmed that there should be no road connection through his community of Reflection Homes. He added that, from his perspective, mixed-use development was the best way to reduce overall traffic on the road systems.

Ms. Stacia Davis Le Blanc, 1314 Summerfield Drive, Herndon, submitted written testimony, a copy of which is in the date file. She spoke in opposition of the proposal to permit high density development on the property presently zoned R-1. Ms. Le Blanc listed diminished property values in their community and a severe negative impact on their quality of life as the reasons for her and her community of Autumn Glen's reasons for concern.

Ms. Sheila Olem, 1501 Snowflake Court, Herndon, submitted a form letter signed by nine of her neighbors in the Autumn Glen community, a copy of which is in the date file. She said her community was in favor of supporting the current County Plan because they believed that neither their neighborhood nor its school could absorb the increase in residents. Ms. Olem pointed out that the County needed the tax dollars generated by large businesses.

Ms. Susan Parker, 2002 Blue Ridge Court, Herndon, read the statement, of one of her neighbors, Mr. Ray Ocel, who was unable to be present for the public hearing. A copy may be found in the date file. Mr. Ocel pointed out the importance of the Comprehensive Plan with its long range planning for future growth of the County and he expressed dismay that the staff report seemed to judge the merits of the Plan amendment solely on transportation issues without considering the key elements of land use and economics. He listed some of the economic benefits of commercial land uses surrounding the Dulles International Airport.

Mr. Howell Simmons, 11001 Raccoon Ridge Court, Reston, said that he represented five landowners of property within the Dulles Transitional Area (DTA). He stated that they favored Option A, the Dranesville Task Force (DTF) recommendation, because more multifamily housing was needed in the County. To address the issues of stormwater management, the environmental quality corridor (EQC), and problem soils, Mr. Simmons suggested that the County's stringent criteria be maintained.

Mr. Robert Spunar, 13347 Feldman Place, Herndon, President of the Reflection Homes Association, said that his association consisted of 586 homes and the following concerns were those unanimously presented by the Reflection Homes development; (1) any land use plan for the DTA should preclude vehicular interconnection between the DTA and Parcher Avenue or any street which had primary access from Centreville Road via Parcher Avenue; (2) any land use for the DTA should minimize visual impacts on the Reflection Homes development and; (3) any land use plan for the DTA should incorporate provisions to relieve the stormwater drainage

problem which should back up to the Reflection Homes neighborhood. Mr. Spunar stated that his association agreed with the DTF Plan A, as presented by former Supervisor Lilla Richards with some modifications, as the best plan for their community.

Mr. John Shepard, 2027 Tamani Drive, Herndon, a Reflection Homes resident, strongly advocated the State of Virginia's historical support of property rights as long as the welfare of juxtaposed areas were protected. He stated that any owner who sought to change a zoning in order to enrich himself must demonstrate incontestably that the public interest was served. Mr. Shepard maintained that the proposed site was not suitable for housing.

Mr. John Malone, 802 Winterhaven Place, Herndon, said that in his opinion, Option A was not a good choice because of the following reasons: (1) it appeared at this time that the input from the community had been basically ignored by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors; (2) the County staff had reversed their earlier opinion; (3) the airplane noise had not been adequately addressed; (4) the airport would not be able to expand if housing was placed close to it; and (5) the DTF had shirked its responsibility to protect the character and stability of the existing residential communities. Mr. Malone believed that a low density office park, without the proposed apartments, would not significantly burden the existing roadways or school system and would preserve the integrity of the neighborhoods and schools. Mr. Malone concluded by stating that Option A was not a viable plan, that it did not make good sense for the County or its residents, and that he was in favor of Option B.

//

Secretary Harsel assumed the Chair in the temporary absence of Chairman Murphy.

//

Mr. Mark Wallenstein, a legislative aid to Supervisor Berger, Dranesville District, said that he had been appointed to the Dranesville Task Force by the previous Supervisor, Lilla Richards. A verbatim of his comments are in the date file. He clarified that Option A was not the same plan known as the "Kay" plan but was quite different. He wanted to assure the citizenry that Supervisor Berger would agree to close Parcher Avenue under Option A.

//

Chairman Murphy resumed the Chair.

//

Mr. Charles Gumas, 2100 Sugarloaf Court, Herndon, said that Mr. Spunar, the current president of the Reflection HOA, had contradicted the unanimous resolution passed by their board stating that their community did not support Option A but Option B.

In staff's closing comments, Mr. Selden said that staff had not changed its position since last year although there had been a question of isolation and staff believed that that should not preclude consideration of residential use. He noted that the Public Facilities Branch had determined that the area could be served by the essential services of police, fire, and school. To address the issue of noise it was staff's opinion, he said, that that issue must be dealt with through the policies which currently existed regarding residential developments as they were impacted by airport noise. He reported that a new set of noise contours were being considered by the Washington Metropolitan Airport Authority and that the Route 28 Task Force was considering residential use as an option for Dulles Corner. Mr. Selden said that he anticipated a need for future policy guidance on whether or not the County would adopt the new noise contours or elect to revise the existing County policy. He also said that it was staff's view that wherever there was a Plan recommendation for residential use, that it be conditioned on noise attenuation measures.

Mr. Selden answered questions posed by Commissioner Hubbard regarding density ranges in various designated transit facility areas and the possible siting of a transportation facility somewhere on the proposed site. He explained that the transportation issue played no part in the analysis of the residential option versus the commercial option but instead the analysis looked at it as a transitional function.

In response to Commissioner Hubbard's earlier question regarding the possible parking designation in conjunction with the transit site, Mr. Pedak said that it was OT's recommendation to defer a determination until VDOT completed its study. He said that if the Planning Commission were to proceed and designate that area as a commuter parking site, OT would promote staff's language to phase development across Land Unit C so that the 16 acres allotted for parking would be developed last and that would allow OT more time to make the determination on the adequacy of that location.

There being no further questions or comments, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Hubbard for a motion on this application. (Verbatim excerpts are in the date file.)

//

Following remarks, Commissioner Hubbard MOVED THAT WE DEFER S92-III-UP1, FOR A DECISION ONLY, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF APRIL 23, 1992.

Commissioner Byers seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioner Hanlon not present for the vote; Commissioner Strickland absent from the meeting.

//

ADJOURNMENT

March 25, 1992

The meeting was adjourned at 12:02 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: September 23, 1992


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