MINUTES OF
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
JUNE 17, 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
Henry E. Strickland, Mason District
Alvin L. Thomas, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: Carl L. Sell, Jr., Lee District

//

The meeting was convened at 8:30 p.m. by Chairman Peter F. Murphy, Jr.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

Chairman Murphy thanked the Planning Commission members, staff, and their families and friends who worked at the Fairfax County Fair last weekend. He said the money raised would go toward George Mason University scholarships.

//

Commissioner Koch called attention to SE-92-Y-006, York Limited Partnership, scheduled for public hearing this evening. At the applicant's request, Commissioner Koch MOVED THAT WE DEFER SE-92-Y-006, YORK LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, UNTIL JULY 16, 1992.

Commissioner Huber seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioner Sell absent from the meeting.

//

Commissioner Bobzien referred to a Zoning Ordinance Amendment regarding zoological parks, scheduled for public hearing tomorrow evening, June 18, 1992. He added that, while the amendment had a potential effect on the Pet-A-Pet Farm which was the subject of a rezoning application to be heard by the Commission on July 8, 1992, only the merits of the Zoning Ordinance Amendment would be considered tomorrow evening.

//

Commissioner Strickland announced his intent to defer SEA-81-P-021-2, Gesher School & Jewish Community Center of Northern Virginia, from June 18, 1992 to July 22, 1992.

//

Commissioner Huber announced that the Environment Committee would meet on Thursday, June 25, 1992, in the new Board conference room at 7:00 p.m. to discuss the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance, Phase II Amendments.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

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

1. Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance, Phase II
2. SE-92-M-004 – Exxon Corporation
3. FDPA-85-S-064-2 – Christ United Methodist Church
4. SE-92-S-021 – Mobil Oil Corporation
   PCA-88-S-085 – Mobil Oil Corporation

This order was accepted without objection.

//

CHESAPEAKE BAY PRESERVATION ORDINANCE, PHASE II – On the matter of amendments to the Code of the County of Fairfax, VA, Chapter 101, Subdivision Provisions, Chapter 104, Erosion & Sedimentation Control Ord., & Chapt. 112, Zoning Ord.; & to the Fairfax County Public Facilities Manual. The proposed amendments align existing ordinances and provisions with proposed Chapter 118, Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance; the State Erosion Control law; & the State Erosion & Sediment Control Regulations. The amendments are proposed to incorporate measures to protect the quality of State waters in Chesapeake Bay Preservation Areas pursuant to *Va. Code* 510.1-2109. The amendments also propose to change fees which are charged under Chapters 101, 104, & 112 of the County Code for review of plats & plans, for site inspections of improvements, and for erosion and sedimentation control during land disturbing activities, pursuant to the authority granted by the *Code of VA*. The proposed amendments to Chapters 101, 104, & 112 would impose the following fees:

CHAPTER 101 – Subdivision Provisions

FEE TYPE	PROPOSED FEE
Water Quality Impact Assessment Filing Fee	$ 576.
Resource Protection Area Boundary Delineation & Resource Management Area Boundary Delineation Filing Fee	$ 2.20 per linear ft. of baseline
Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance Exception Request Fee	$ 500.
CHAPTER 104 – Erosion & Sedimentation Control Ordinance	
Water Quality Impact Assessment Filing Fee	$ 150.
Resource Protection Area Boundary Delineation & Resource Management Area Boundary Delineation Filing Fee	$ 150.
Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance Exception Request Fee	$ 100. per lot, not to exceed $500
CHAPTER 112 – Zoning Ordinance	
Water Quality Impact Assessment Filing Fee	$ 576.
Resource Protection Area Boundary Delineation & Resource Management Area Boundary Delineation Filing Fee	$ 2.20 per linear ft. of baseline
Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance Exception Request Fee	$ 500.

Mr. John Friedman, Department of Environmental Management (DEM), presented the staff report, a copy of which is contained in the date file. He said that the proposed amendment would align the affected local ordinances with the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance; include appropriate design information into the Public Facilities Manual to ensure construction plan compliance with the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance; and align Chapter 104 in the Public Facilities Manual with State erosion and sediment control laws and regulations. Mr. Friedman said that the proposed amendments had been coordinated with the Offices of the County Attorney, Comprehensive Planning, Management and Budget, and the Department of Environmental Management. The proposed amendments had also been reviewed by the Engineering Standards Review Committee (ESRC). Mr. Friedman said that on April 2, 1992 the

ESRC recommended approval of the proposed amendments with the provision that they be returned to the committee following adoption of Chapter 118 so that they could make sure that the proposed amendments to Phase II were in conjunction with Phase I. He added that staff would be requesting of the Board of Supervisors an additional eight staff positions to handle the workload generated by the proposed amendments.

Commissioner Huber asked how the changes would affect smaller lots which did not have to meet subdivision requirements. Mr. Freedman said that one of the changes was that the general phosphorus removal requirement for the resource management areas was increased from 40% to 45% which was done in conjunction with eliminating the requirement for infill subdivisions less than 18% impervious cover, and large lot subdivisions would be exempted from having to provide BMP's on their lots. He added that the original State guidance calculation procedure had a sliding scale of what the phosphorus removal requirements were, which was based directly on the percent imperviousness of the lot, starting at 18%.

//

Chairman Murphy announced that there was a technical problem with the recording machine and a short recess was needed in order to check the audio tapes.

The Commission recessed at 8:40 p.m. and reconvened at 8:50 p.m. Chairman Murphy announced that the audio tapes would be re-recorded from the video tapes due to the malfunctioning recorder.

//

Mr. Friedman continued that in addition to responding to comments from the previous public hearing, staff would also profile who would have to comply with providing BMP's if staff had gone with the State Guidance Calculation procedure.

In response to Commissioner Huber's request to address the difference in fees, Mr. Freedman said that Phase II Ordinances prepared a two tier fee structure. He explained that there was one fee structure for development plans which were processed under the Subdivision Ordinance or the Zoning Ordinance provisions, primarily site plan provisions that were in line with the normal fees charged for doing all development plan reviews. He added that the second fee structure was basically used for infill lot development and home additions, which were processed under the Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance and would have a second set of fees which were lower than the fees charged for the major site and subdivision plans. Mr. Friedman then reviewed the proposed fees.

With regard to Commissioner Huber's question on filter strips, Mr. Friedman said that staff had included them in their initial submission to the Engineering Standards Review Committee (ESRC). He said that the committee felt that filter strips would not be a workable idea and chose not to include them in the final version of the Public Facilities Manual amendments for available BMP's that they forwarded to the Planning Commission.

In response to Commissioner Strickland's questions regarding fees to homeowners, Mr. Friedman said he would provide a cost associated with a number of scenarios for a small infill development.

Commissioner Hanlon suggested that Mr. Friedman also prepare a chart of what the potential fees were so the Commission could see what it was at a glance. Commissioner Hanlon then referred to page 22, 5D (Water Quality Fees) and questioned whether the language had been made more explicit anywhere else in the document. Mr. Friedman pointed out that staff was not referring to the Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance, but to the section on fees in Article 17 which contained the site plan provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. He added that staff anticipated that most developers would have engineers perform their own boundary assessments. Commissioner Hanlon then asked if it was staff's intention to ask for an RPA delineation or whether staff would establish a delineation. Mr. Friedman said that the submission requirements for the site and subdivision plans required that a RPA delineation be supplied with the plans. He added that when staff does a delineation they refer to the definition contained in the Ordinance and prepare a boundary delineation based on more detailed topographic information from their 500 scale topography, County soils maps, and the United States Geological Survey (USGS) maps in order to locate the perennial blue line streams. Mr. Friedman said that when an individual homeowner came in for a delineation, staff would verify and refine the line that was previously developed on the maps distributed to the Board and Planning Commission, unless the homeowner was able to provide staff with a more detailed topography. In order to do a complete delineation, which staff would expect large developments to do, it would require field work to take soil samples and identify wetland areas. He added that staff would not be doing any field work in order to perform delineations.

Mr. Friedman, for point of clarification, noted that the hourly fee was $144.00, not $1.44, which was the Board approved hourly fee rate for reviewing plans.

Regarding Commissioner Byers' question on landfills, Mr. Friedman said that the sanitary landfills were regulated by the State and debris landfills were regulated under the County's Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance.

There being no further questions of staff, Chairman Murphy explained the Planning Commission's rules for speakers and called the first listed speaker.

Mr. Michael Rolband, represented National Association of Industrial and Office Parks (NAIOP). He said that the biggest conceptual problem with the proposed Ordinance was the failure to include the three most significant performance criteria concepts in the resource management area: concepts of minimizing land disturbance activity, maximizing the preservation of open space, and minimizing land disturbance activities. Mr. Rolband addressed the issues of lots platted prior to 1988 that should not be exempt, removal rate for Countywide BMPs, coverage ratios, credit for open space, BMPs, fee structure, and the RPA delineation. (A copy of his statement is contained in the date file.)

Commissioner Byers requested a copy of Mr. Rolband's testimony and he agreed to transmit them to the Commission Office.

In response to Commissioner Huber's question, Mr. Rolband said that the BMP was specified in the definition of the Resource Protection Area.

Commissioner Baldwin asked for information on the limitation of phosphorous removal and Mr. Rolband said that he would request the information from the Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Board (CBLAD).

There being no further listed speakers, Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience.

Mrs. Mary Nightlinger, 9424 Hermitage Drive, Fairfax, was concerned about the clearing and grading prior to site plan approval and suggested that it should read that the permits must be obtained before clearing and grading begins. She then referred to page 38, Water Quality Impact Assessment, and suggested that a phrase: "The director has the discretion to ask for expanded water quality impact assessment in covering some of the elements formerly in the major water quality assessment when it existed."

John Farrell, Esquire, with Oden, Feldman & Pittleman, represented the Northern Virginia Building Industry Association (NVBIA). He called the Commission's attention to page 1, which indicated that there would be no grandfathering proposed for the changes. He added that there was extensive grandfathering language in Chapter 118-6-10, which effectively causes those provisions to be allusive. With regard to credit for landscaped open space, Mr. Farrell said that no credit for landscaped open space was a true disincentive to providing open space landscaping. Mr. Farrel referred to page 16, and questioned the basis for the increase on siltation basins in the RPA. He also referred to page 36 on the prohibition of any use of open space.

There being no further speakers, Vice Chairman Hanlon, during Chairman Murphy's temporary absence, called on staff for further comments.

Mr. Friedman asked whether the Commission would like his response to the speakers' questions in writing. Commissioner Huber noted that she would defer the decision to Thursday, June 26, 1992, and would like staff to respond in writing. She then questioned whether an Environmental Committee meeting would be necessary before a decision was made on this matter.

Commissioner Baldwin said that he had distributed a memorandum with proposed modifications to the PFM, Section 6-1703, on page 38 of the staff report which he would raise when the motion was made.

Mr. Friedman said that Phase I, Chesapeake Bay would be endorsed by the Board on July 13, 1992 and would then have to go to Richmond for review and approval. He added that if the first version is substantively different than the one CBLAD had reviewed and approved last year, then it would have to go through another round of public hearings before it could be formally adopted. Mr. Friedman said that since the County is a couple years behind the State mandated

date for adopting the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance, it was the Board's intention to get it approved before the summer recess occurred.

Commissioner Hanlon noted that there were two reasons suggested in the public hearing as to why the Commission should not be proceeding so fast. One was that the Board of Supervisors had not adopted Phase I yet and therefore the Commission doesn't know what kind of Ordinance they were trying to implement. Further, there were pending State Guidance documents that were intended for use in order to figure out implementation procedures in Phase II. He added that the Commission had not seen the documents yet and that the documents may be relevant to what happens to this case tonight. Commissioner Hanlon indicated his belief that a deferral of this item might be the most prudent action.

Vice Chairman Hanlon returned the Chair to Chairman Murphy. Chairman Murphy called on Mr. Friedman for closing comments, who declined. There being no questions or comments from the Commission, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Huber for action on the case. (Verbatim excerpts are contained in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Huber MOVED TO TABLE THE MOTION.

Commissioner Hubbard seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioners Bobzien, Hanlon, Koch not present for the vote; Commissioner Sell absent from the meeting.

Later in the meeting, Commissioner Huber MOVED TO TAKE FROM THE TABLE THE MOTION REGARDING THE CHESAPEAKE BAY ORDINANCE.

Commissioner Hubbard seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioners Bobzien, Hanlon, Koch not present for the vote; Commissioner Sell absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Huber MOVED THAT THE DECISION ONLY BE SCHEDULED FOR JULY 8, 1992, AT 7:30 P.M., WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN TESTIMONY.

Commissioner Hubbard seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioners Bobzien, Hanlon, Koch not present for the vote; Commissioner Sell absent from the meeting.

//

SE-92-M-004 – EXXON CORPORATION – Appl. under Sects. 4-504 & 7-607 of the Zoning Ord. to permit renovation of an existing service station in a Highway Corridor Overlay District & the addition of a quick service food store on property located at 6661 Arlington Blvd. on approx. 0.50 ac. zoned C-5 & HC. Tax Map 50-4((1))8. MASON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Jay du Von, Esquire, Compton & Duling, reaffirmed the affidavit. There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Ms. Lorrie Kirst, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Office of Comprehensive Planning (OCP) presented the staff report, a copy of which is contained in the date file. Ms. Kirst said that she had distributed this evening revised development conditions with four additions which included: lighting, outside storage, hours of operation, and the requirement of posting the development conditions on site. She added that the additional development conditions were consistent with the previous Board approvals. Ms. Kirst noted that there were no outstanding issues and recommended that the application be approved.

Mr. du Von said that the renovations would provide a dramatic improvement to the existing site. He noted that the bay facility would be replaced by a snack shop and a gas and go facility. He added that with one exception the development conditions were acceptable. Mr. du Von said that condition #11 was not acceptable as Exxon Corporation would like to retain the right to operate twenty-four (24) hours a day. Mr. du Von said that he had met with the Mason District Land Use Committee and had their support for the twenty-four (24) hour operation. Mr. du Von submitted for the record an enlarged tax map which highlighted some of the surrounding uses. He then requested approval of the application with the deletion of condition #11.

In response to Commissioner Harsel's questions, Mr. du Von said that the Shell and Amoco stations were selling food items over the counter but were not full fledged convenience stores. However, he noted that the sites on Graham Road were full fledged convenience stores.

Mr. du Von, in responding to Commissioner Hanlon's questions, said that Exxon would have all the upgraded environmental controls, double wall fiberglass tanks, vapor recovery, double wall piping to all pumps, and automatic shut-offs. He added that it would have all the piping to permit stage two nozzles to be attached at the end of the line. As soon as the County adopts an ordinance that applies to all new stations, he noted that the nozzles would be added to the hoses, which would have stage two vapor recovery.

Chairman Murphy opened the public hearing and called the first listed speaker.

Mr. David Foerter, 3000 Cedarwood Lane, Falls Church, President of Sleepy Hollow Citizens Association, said that they supported the proposal to improve the station but, strongly opposed a twenty-four (24) hour service station. He said that there was no benefit to the community from a twenty-four hour station or quick food store at the Exxon station and would result in more hazardous conditions and traffic congestion. Mr. Foerter urged the Commission to restrict the hours of operation from 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. in order to preserve their community's nature.

Mr. Frederick Webb, 6436 Sleepy Ridge Road, Falls Church, also spoke in opposition to a twenty-four (24) hour operation. (See position statement contained in the date file.)

Mr. Robert Cassidy, 6455 Spring Terrace, Falls Church, said he was not opposed to commercial development but was opposed to a twenty-four (24) hour operation.

There being no further speakers from the audience, Chairman Murphy called on Mr. du Von for rebuttal.

During rebuttal remarks, Mr. du Von said that none of the speakers had indicated that anything that would take place on the site would bother anyone. He added that the other sites were already zoned commercial. Mr. du Von noted that what was proposed for the site was compatible with the area and that the conditions reflect that, with the exception of the condition on restricting the hours of operation.

Chairman Murphy pointed out that the Planning Commission had started a process to address the relationship between quick service food stores and gas stations with staff. He then explained development condition 6 and said that food preparation was not part of it. Mr. du Von said he understood the development condition.

Chairman Murphy called for closing staff remarks from Ms. Kirst, who declined.

Commissioner Byers referred to page 7, Section 7-608, Standard 3A and said that there was a major contradiction in that issue.

Commissioner Thomas referred to Appendix 1, paragraph 5, and asked whether there was a standard square footage for quick service food areas. Ms. Kirst said that the square footage was what the applicant had requested on their special exception plat, which was why the number varies from application to application.

In response to Commissioner Hubbard's question on the hours of operation, Ms. Kirst said that the previous staff position was that there should be no limitation in the hours of operation. However, the Board imposed the development condition in the previous application and in order to be consistent with the Board action, she had included the restriction on hours of operation.

There being no further comments or questions from the Commission, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Strickland for action on the case. (See verbatim excerpts contained in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Strickland MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT APPROVE SE-92-M-004, SUBJECT TO THE REVISED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JUNE 17, 1992, RECEIVED TONIGHT.

Commissioners Hubbard and Huber seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-1 with Commissioner Byers opposed; Commissioners Bobzien, Hanlon and Koch not present for the vote; Commissioner Sell absent from the meeting.

//

The Commission recessed at 10:55 p.m. and reconvened at 11:08 p.m.

//

The next two cases being in the Springfield District, Chairman Murphy asked Vice Chairman Hanlon to take the Chair.

//

FDP-85-S-064-2 – CHRIST UNITED METHODIST CHURCH – Appl. to approve the second final development plan for RZ-85-S-064 to permit a church & related facilities on property located S. of Silverbrook Rd. & E. of the terminus of Glen Eagles Lane on approx. 5.0 ac. zoned PDH-1. Tax Map 97-4((8))C. SPRINGFIELD DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Francis A. McDermott, Esquire, Hunton & Williams, reaffirmed the affidavit. There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Ms. Denise James, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Office of Comprehensive Planning (OCP), presented the staff report, a copy of which is contained in the date file. She said the applicant was requesting approval of a final development plan which depicted the development of a church, temporary classroom trailers, and a nursery school, and would be a phased development. Ms. James noted that the applicant had agreed to a five year limitation on the classroom trailers with one five-year administrative extension, if necessary. Ms. James said that there were no proposed changes to the proffers accepted with the rezoning or to any other portion of the proffered conceptual or final development plan. She said that there were no outstanding land use, environmental, or transportation issues with the proposed final development plan and staff found that the application was in conformance with the proffers and Comprehensive Plan and met all applicable Zoning Ordinance requirements. Staff therefore recommended approval of the application subject to the development conditions dated June 11, 1992. Ms. James said that there was one additional modification to development condition 9, and that Commissioner Murphy had one additional condition to read into the record.

Mr. McDermott said that the additional condition that was alluded to by staff was one that was worked out with two of the three adjacent property owners earlier this evening and that the applicant was agreeable to the conditions. He then requested approval by the Commission.

Vice Chairman Hanlon called the first listed speaker.

Mr. Karl Smith, 8431 Lee Alan Drive, Fairfax Station, was concerned about the ingress/egress access to Silverbrook Road over the private right-of-way on Lee Alan Drive. He noted that he was confident that the condition worked out this evening would take care of that concern. Mr. Smith was also concerned about the stormwater management and noted that if improvements were made to divert the stormwater runoff under Lee Alan Drive, it would address that concern. (See position statement contained in the date file.)

Mr. John A. Cutler, 5360 Thayer Avenue, Alexandria, said that the lot marked "under construction" at 8439 Lee Alan Drive was where he would be moving to. He agreed with the remarks of Mr. Smith and that their two principal concerns were the transitional screening and the screening in front of the parking lot or the containment pond.

Vice Chairman Hanlon called for speakers from the audience but received no response. He then called on Mr. McDermott for a rebuttal remarks.

Mr. McDermott said that the pipe coming out of the stormwater management pond would be underground. He added that where the existing tree line tapers off to a clearance area was the subject for the additional language for the provision of evergreens in addition to what was reflected on the landscaping plan and the FDP.

In responding to questions from Commissioners Byers and Hanlon, Mr. McDermott said that the undisturbed buffer would be fenced off with the orange construction fencing prior to beginning the clearing.

Commissioner Murphy asked whether a note could be added to the site plan regarding the orange construction fencing. Mr. McDermott had no objection to that addition. He also suggested that it be added to one of the conditions.

In responding to Commissioner Strickland's question on the FAR, Mr. McDermott said that a nursery school would be provided which would be limited to ninety-nine students daily; the church would be limited to eight hundred seats; and that it had to meet parking requirements of the Ordinance. He added that the FAR was not a realistic issue on this site.

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

//

Commissioner Murphy MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDP-85-S-064-2, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JUNE 11, 1992, AS AMENDED.

> AMEND DEVELOPMENT CONDITION 9, TO READ: "THE TEMPORARY CLASSROOM TRAILERS SHALL BE LIMITED TO A TERM OF FIVE YEARS FROM THE DATE OF ISSUANCE OF NON-RESIDENTIAL USE PERMIT (NON-RUP) FOR THE TRAILERS. ONE FIVE-YEAR ADMINISTRATIVE EXTENSION MAY BE REQUESTED FROM, AND APPROVED BY THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR, BASED ON SATISFACTORY COMPLIANCE WITH THE PROFFERS AND DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS. SUCH A REQUEST SHALL BE IN WRITING, PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION OF THE FIVE-YEAR

TERM. THE TRAILERS SHALL BE SKIRTED AND SHALL BE LIMITED TO SUNDAY SCHOOL OR OTHER CHURCH RELATED ACTIVITIES."

ADD DEVELOPMENT CONDITION 14, WHICH WOULD READ: "ALONG THE EASTERN PROPERTY BOUNDARY ADJOINING LEE ALAN DRIVE, SOUTH OF THE REQUIRED TRANSITIONAL SCREENING AREA, APPLICANT SHALL PLANT AND MAINTAIN ADDITIONAL EVERGREEN TREES WHICH ARE A MINIMUM OF SIX FEET IN HEIGHT AT THE TIME OF PLANTING, TO THE EXTENT PRACTICAL FROM A ENGINEERING CONSTRAINT STANDPOINT, AS DETERMINED BY DEM AND THE URBAN FORESTRY BRANCH AT THE TIME OF FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL."

AND, NUMBER 15, WHICH WOULD READ: "ORANGE CONSTRUCTION FENCING WILL BE PLACED ON THE SITE TO ENSURE NO DISTURBANCE OF UNDISTURBED AREAS DURING CONSTRUCTION."

Commissioners Byers and Hubbard seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioners Bobzien and Koch not present for the vote; Commissioner Sell absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Murphy MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE A WAIVER OF THE BARRIER REQUIREMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE BUFFERS AND SCREENING DEPICTED ON THE FDP PURSUANT TO SECTION 13-303 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE.

Commissioner Byers seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioners Bobzien and Koch not present for the vote; Commissioner Sell absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Murphy MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE A MODIFICATION OF THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING IN FAVOR OF THAT DEPICTED ON THE FDP, PURSUANT TO SECTION 13-304 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE.

Commissioner Byers seconded the motion which passed unanimously with Commissioners Bobzien and Koch not present for the vote; Commissioner Sell absent from the meeting.

//

SE-92-S-021 – MOBIL OIL CORPORATION – Appl. under Sect. 4-604 of the Zoning Ord. to permit a service station with a quick service food store & a car wash on property located at 8317 Hooes Rd. on approx. 1.41 ac. zoned C-6. Tax Map 89-3((1))48A. (Concurrent with PCA-88-S-085.) SPRINGFIELD DISTRICT.

PCA-88-S-085 – MOBIL OIL CORPORATION – Appl. to amend the proffers for RZ-88-S-085 to permit a service station with a quick service food store & a car wash with an overall FAR of 0.04 on property located in the S.W. quadrant of the intersection of Hooes Rd. & Gambrill Rd. on approx. 1.41 ac. zoned C-6. Comp. Plan Rec: Retail & other uses. Tax Map 89-3((1))48A. (Concurrent with SE-92-S-021.) SPRINGFIELD DISTRICT. JOINT PUBLIC HEARING.

Ms. Marie Travesky, Travesky & Associates, Ltd., representative of the applicant, reaffirmed the affidavit. There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Mr. Greg Chase, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Office of Comprehensive Planning (0CP), presented the staff report, a copy of which is contained in the date file. He said that the applicant was seeking approval of the proffered condition amendment to amend the proffers accepted pursuant to the approval of the rezoning to reflect the revised date of the generalized development plan/special exception plat. He added that the fuel sales and quick service food store portion of the use would operate from 6:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.; that the car wash and service bays would operate from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., seven days a week; and that there would be five employees on site per each eight hour shift. He noted that the application was in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance and in harmony with the Comprehensive Plan. Staff therefore recommended approval of the application, subject to the development conditions dated July 15, 1992.

Ms. Travesky, agent for the applicant, requested approval of the application from the Planning Commission.

Vice Chairman Hanlon called for speakers from the audience for these cases, but received no response. Vice Chairman Hanlon noted that a rebuttal statement was not necessary.

Mr. Chase had no closing staff comments.

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

//

Commissioner Murphy MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT APPROVE PCA-88-S-085, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF THE PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED JUNE 12, 1992.

Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0-1 with Commissioner Byers abstaining; Commissioners Bobzien and Koch not present for the vote; Commissioner Sell absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Murphy also MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT APPROVE SE-92-S-021, SUBJECT TO THE REVISED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JUNE 15, 1992.

Commissioners Thomas and Hubbard seconded the motion which passed by a vote of 7-0-1 with Commissioner Byers abstaining; Commissioners Bobzien and Koch not present for the vote; Commissioner Sell absent from the meeting.

At the conclusion of this case, Vice Chairman Hanlon returned the Chair to Chairman Murphy, who adjourned the meeting.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 11:46 p.m.
Peter F. Murphy, Jr., Chairman
Suzanne F. Harsel, Secretary

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

Minutes by: Sandra L. Stever

Approved on: October 14, 1992

Mary A. Pascoe

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