MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, JULY 7, 2011

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
Suzanne F. Harsel, Braddock District
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District
John L. Litzenberger, Jr., Sully District
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District
Peter F. Murphy, Jr., Springfield District
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: Walter L. Alcorn, Commissioner At-Large

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:17 p.m. by Chairman Peter F. Murphy Jr., in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

Chairman Murphy recognized Jacob Caporaletti as the new Associate Clerk to the Planning Commission.

//

FSA-P99-28-1 – AT&T MOBILITY, 8201 Greensboro Drive

Chairman Murphy MOVED THE CONSENT AGENDA ITEM.

Without objection, the motion carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

//

FS-P11-15 – FIBERTOWER, 3111 Fairview Park Drive (Fairview Marriot Hotel)

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH THE STAFF DETERMINATION THAT THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY

PROPOSED BY FIBERTOWER, LOCATED AT 3111 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE, IS SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED A "FEATURE SHOWN" PURSUANT TO *VIRGINIA CODE* SECTION 15.2-2232, AS AMENDED.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

//

Commissioner Hart announced that the Environment Committee had met earlier this evening with staff and industry personnel to discuss proposed changes to the Green Building Policy. He noted that the Committee would meet again on Wednesday, July 27, 2011, from 7 to 9 p.m., in the Board Auditorium. He also noted that a public workshop on the proposed Policy changes would be held on Wednesday, September 14, 2011, in the Board Auditorium to brief the full Commission.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Harsel established the following order of the agenda:

1. FAIRFAX COUNTY CODE AMENDMENT (Conservation Plan for Land Disturbing Activities)
2. 2232-M11-2 – WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY
3. SE 2011-MA-001 – HOMAN SOLEMANINEJAD
4. SE 2011-PR-003 – GRANT 1651 OLD MEADOW ROAD, LLC
5. PCA/FDPA 2005-PR-041-02 – ESKRIDGE (E&A) LLC
6. SEA 82-V-012-06 – INOVA HEALTH CARE SERVICES
7. PRC A-502-02 – FAIRWAYS I & II RESIDENTIAL, LLC

This order was accepted without objection.

//

FAIRFAX COUNTY CODE AMENDMENT (Conservation Plan for Land Disturbing Activities) – Pursuant to authority granted by *Virginia Code* Sections 10.1-562(I), a $980 fee, charged under Chapter 104, Article. 1, Sect. 104-1-3 (Erosion and Sedimentation Control), included in Appendix Q (Land Development Services Fee Schedule) of the County Code, is proposed for review, processing, and inspections for a conservation plan when such plan is separate from a grading plan. The proposed amendments to Chapter 112 incorporate

provisions that allow a plat certified by a land surveyor, engineer, landscape architect, or architect that includes siltation and erosion control measures in conformance with Chapter104 of the Code to be used in lieu of a grading plan for the demolition of a single family dwelling, demolition of an accessory structure to a single family dwelling, construction of an addition to a single family dwelling, or construction of an accessory structure to a single family dwelling, that results in a disturbed area of 5,000 square feet or less and does not require the installation of water quality controls or other drainage improvements. The proposed amendment also requires that various existing easements, any mapped flood plain boundary, and distances to certain features demonstrating compliance with requirements be delineated on plats submitted in conjunction with building permit approval when no site plan is required. In addition, the proposed amendment requires the demonstration of compliance with minimum yard requirements for as-built house location survey plats for single-family detached dwellings and the display of any floodplain, any Resource Protection Area, and various easements on said plat. The proposed amendments to Chapter 104 incorporate provisions that allow the conservation plan to be incorporated into a plat certified by a land surveyor, engineer, landscape architect, or architect in lieu of a grading plan for the demolition of a single family dwelling, demolition of an accessory structure to a single family dwelling, construction of an addition to a single family dwelling, or construction of an accessory structure to a single family dwelling that results in a disturbed area of 5,000 square feet or less and does not require the installation of water quality controls or other drainage improvements. The proposed amendments also clarify the standards to be used in reviewing conservation plans and make the provisions relating to penalties, injunctions, and other legal actions applicable to all of Chapter 104 not just Sections 104-1-2 and 104-1-5. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

John Friedman, Code Analysis Division, Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended approval of the proposed County Code Amendment.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience, but received no response. There were no comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Hart for action on this item. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Hart MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT ADOPT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL ORDINANCE, ZONING ORDINANCE, AND APPENDIX Q OF THE COUNTY CODE, AS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT DATED JUNE 7, 2011.

Commissioners Lawrence and Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

//

2232-M11-2 – WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY (WMATA) – Appl. under Sect. 15.2-2232 of the *Code of Virginia* to permit vehicular parking and other outdoor storage at an existing parking area. Located 6851-6853 Industrial Road on approx. 9.45 ac. of land zoned R-2, R-3, I-2, I-6, and HC. Tax Map 80-2 ((1)) 32. MASON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Hall asked that Chairman Murphy ascertain whether there were any speakers for this application. There being none, she asked that the presentations by staff and the applicant be waived, and the public hearing closed. No objections were expressed; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Hall for action on this case. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Hall MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION FIND THAT THE FACILITY PROPOSED UNDER 2232-M11-2 DOES SATISFY THE CRITERIA OF LOCATION, CHARACTER, AND EXTENT AS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 15.2-2232 OF THE *CODE OF VIRGINIA* AND IS SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

//

SE 2011-MA-001 – HOMAN SOLEMANINEJAD – Appl. under Sect. 3-304 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a dental office. Located at 6065 and 6067 Arlington Blvd. on approx. 20,800 sq. ft. of land zoned R-3, CRD, and SC. Tax Map 51-4 ((2)) (A) 5 and 6. MASON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Robert Kearney, Architect, reaffirmed the affidavit dated May 26, 2011. There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Commissioner Hall asked that Chairman Murphy ascertain whether there were any speakers for this application. There being none, she asked that the presentations by staff and the applicant be waived, and the public hearing closed. No objections were expressed; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Hall for action on this case. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Hall MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF SE 2011-MA-001, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JUNE 22, 2011.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Hall MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE MODIFICATION OF THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING YARD AND BARRIER REQUIREMENTS IN FAVOR OF THAT DEPICTED ON THE SE PLAT.

Commissioners Lawrence and Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

//

SE 2011-PR-003 – GRANT 1651 OLD MEADOW ROAD, LLC –
Appl. under Sect. 4-403 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a college/university located at 1651 Old Meadow Road on approx. 3.35 ac. of land zoned C-3 and HC. Tax Map 29-4 ((6)) 102. PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Sara Mariska, Esquire, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Emrich, & Walsh, PC, reaffirmed the affidavit dated June 1, 2011. Commissioner Hart disclosed that his law firm Hart & Horan, PC, had a pending case with Ms. Mariska's firm, but indicated that there was no financial relationship and it would not affect his ability to participate in this public hearing.

Nick Rogers, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended approval of the proposal.

Ms. Mariska said the application proposed 6,000 square feet of college/university use within an existing building. She noted this would be interim use until a future rezoning of the property.

In response to questions from Commissioner Lawrence, Ms. Mariska assured that the proposed college/university use would be temporary. She noted that the applicant was pursuing additional parking spaces and expected the building to be fully leased before the Metro Silver Line became operational.

Replying to a question from Commissioner de la Fe, Ms. Mariska clarified that using the building for college/university purposes required Special Exception approval and upon the adoption of the Planned Tysons Corner Urban District, it would be a permitted use.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers, but received no response; therefore, he noted that a rebuttal statement was not necessary. 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 Lawrence for action on this application. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF SE 2011-PR-003, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JULY 1, 2011.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE MODIFICATION OF TRANSITIONAL SCREENING AND BARRIER REQUIREMENTS ALONG THE PROJECT'S EASTERN BOUNDARY LINE, IN FAVOR OF THE EXISTING CONDITIONS DEPICTED ON THE SE PLAT DATED JUNE 16, 2011.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE MODIFICATION OF THE LOADING SPACE REQUIREMENT, IN FAVOR OF THE LOADING SPACE DEPICTED ON THE SE PLAT DATED JUNE 16, 2011.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF A WAVIER OF THE INTERIOR

PERIPHERAL PARKING LOT LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS, IN FAVOR OF THE EXISTING LANDSCAPING DEPICTED ON THE SE PLAT DATED JUNE 16, 2011.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE MODIFICATION OF THE TREE COVER REQUIREMENTS, IN FAVOR OF THE EXISTING LANDSCAPING DEPICTED ON THE SE PLAT DATED JUNE 16, 2011.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

//

PCA/FDPA 2005-PR-041-02 – ESKRIDGE (E&A), LLC – Appls. to amend the proffers, conceptual, and final development plans for RZ 2005-PR-041 previously-approved for mixed-use development to permit single-family attached dwellings and associated modifications to site design and development conditions with an overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1.90 for the subject property and 1.39 for the entire (original) rezoning property including bonus density associated with ADUs and workforce housing. Located on the E. side of Eskridge Road approx. 350 ft. N. of its intersection with Williams Dr. on approx. 13.22 ac. of land zoned PDC and PRM. Comp. Plan Rec: Mixed Use. Tax Map 49-3 ((1)) 80E pt. and 80F pt. PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Steven Teets, Engineer, Edens & Avant, reaffirmed the affidavit dated June 16, 2011. Commissioner Hart disclosed that his law firm, Hart & Horan, PC, had an attorney-client relationship with RTKL Associations, Inc. listed on the drawings and not on the affidavit, but indicated that there was no financial relationship and it would not affect his ability to participate in this public hearing.

William O'Donnell, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended approval of the applications.

In response to questions from Commissioner Lawrence, Mr. O'Donnell stated that the exhibits depicted on Attachment A of the revised Proffer Statement dated July 7, 2011 were decided upon the day before this hearing. He affirmed that the goal of these exhibits would create a durable and attractive exterior.

Replying to questions from Commissioner Hart, Mr. O'Donnell pointed out that the building materials for the structures were listed on page 72 under Proffer Number XVII (5). He stated that not every structure depicted in the drawings would use all listed materials. He noted that the graphics in the staff report showed the buildings as intended and included statements that affirmed they were in conformance with those renderings. Mr. O'Donnell said staff supported removing the sentence, "This attachment will serve as a guideline for the colors and materials only," from Proffer Number XVII (1(B)) on page 72.

In reply to questions from Commissioner Harsel, Mr. O'Donnell clarified that the structures on Conceptual Rendering 1 in Attachment A on page 81 of the Proffer Statement were townhouses. He clarified that the elevations were provided from different perspectives. He affirmed that the townhouses would be four stories tall. Mr. O'Donnell showed an image of the rear section of the townhouses. He affirmed that there would be no movie theatre as shown on Parcel I in the staff report, but there was an option to provide a smaller theatre on Parcel D.

Responding to questions from Commissioner Flanagan, Mr. O'Donnell stated that he was not sure what sort of materials were implied by the "pre-cast" term used in the proffers. He clarified that concrete blocks would fall under the category of "masonry." He said concrete block was still a possible building material.

Chairman Murphy called on the applicant for a presentation.

Mr. Teets said that the proposal involved an amendment to a plan approved in 2007. He stated that the original plan had depicted a theatre, which was later shifted to the north end of the project. He said the plans for the theatre had been replaced by a residential area. Mr. Teets described the existing surrounding uses in the area. He said that South Park was kept in the proposal and reoriented to create a four-acre turf field at Luther Jackson Middle School. He clarified that the articulation in the staff report assured the color scheme for each unit.

In response to questions from Commissioner Hart, Mr. Teets stated that the materials intended for the structures would be brick. He clarified that the blue and green colors represented Hardi Plank and the lighter colors were brick. Mr. O'Donnell clarified that the corner units that wrapped around a street corner would consist of brick along the side while the front areas would be Hardi Plank. Mr. Teets said that cinderblocks were not intended for use in these units.

In reply to questions from Chairman Murphy, Mr. Teets clarified that the applicant was building a turf field for Luther Jackson Middle School that would be illuminated.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Sargeant, Mr. O'Donnell said cinderblocks would be used to separate each townhouse.

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

Chuck Pena, 2929 Eskridge Road, Suite S, Fairfax, Executive Director, Fairfax Cable Access Corporation, spoke in favor of the proposal. He stated that his organization and the Alliance Condominium Association had no objections to the proposed revisions.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for a rebuttal statement from Mr. Teets, who declined. Chairman Murphy then called for closing comments and questions from the Commission and staff.

Commissioner Lawrence said that the architecture and elevations were depicted on the Conceptual Development Plan. He clarified that the materials and colors were depicted in the proffers on page 72. Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Teets concurred with this statement.

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 Lawrence for action on these applications. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE PCA 2005-PR-041-02, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED JULY 7, 2011.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF CDPA 2005-PR-041-02, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JUNE 22, 2011.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDPA 2005-PR-041-02, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JUNE 22, 2011, AND TO THE BOARD'S APPROVAL OF THE CONCURRENT PCA APPLICATION.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION REAFFIRM ALL PREVIOUSLY-APPROVED WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH RZ/FDP 2005-PR-041 AND PCA/FDPA 2005-PR-041 FOR THE CURRENT APPLICATIONS.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE MODIFICATION OF THE PDC STANDARDS TO PERMIT RESIDENTIAL USES TO EXCEED 50 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL GROSS FLOOR AREA.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF A MODIFICATION OF THE 200-SQAURE-FOOT MINIMUM PRIVACY YARD REQUIREMENT FOR SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED DWELLINGS, IN FAVOR OF THAT SHOWN ON THE CDPA/FDPA.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

//

SEA 82-V-012-06 – INOVA HEALTH CARE SERVICES – Appl. under Sect. 4-304 of the Zoning Ordinance to amend SE 82-V-012 for expansion of an existing medical care facility and medical office uses and associated modifications of development conditions. Located at 2501 Parkers Lane on approx. 26.37 ac. of land zoned C-3 and PDH-5. Tax Map 102-1 ((1)) 4 pt. MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Sarah Hall, Esquire, Blankingship & Keith, PC, reaffirmed the affidavit dated June 3, 2011. There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Commissioner Flanagan pointed out that the staff report was published on July 1, 2011, and the community had not had sufficient time to review it. Therefore, he announced his intent to defer the decision on this application.

Erin Grayson, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that staff recommended approval of the proposal.

In response to questions from Commissioner Flanagan, Ms. Grayson affirmed that the only residential area surrounding the hospital was to the west along Holland Road. She stated that the Gum Springs Conservation Area covered a large section of land to the west. She affirmed that it would be possible to change the area listed as Holland Hollows in the staff report to clarify that it

was part of Gum Springs. Ms. Grayson clarified that the north and south elevations for the two parking garages would look similar to one another. She said she did not know how soon Phase 2 would be constructed after Phase 1 of the parking garage was completed. She stated that the Police might have a security issue during Phase 3 of the construction for the parking garage and a development condition requiring a site plan would help address this issue. Ms. Grayson said the current condition did not require Phase 3 to appear as depicted in the staff report. She clarified that there were some missing bullet points on page 9 of the staff report because she only included information that was specific to the hospital use and not the overall site. She stated that the recommendations of the Health Care Advisory Board (HCAB) had not been added to the staff report. Ms. Grayson stated that there had not been any changes to the complications of weekly average trip generation as shown in Table 4 on page 15 of the staff report. Alan Kessler, Fairfax County Department of Transportation, stated that the estimated total figure of approximately 15,000 trips generated by the future campus was accurate and the proposal would generate approximately 8,000 of that total figure. He confirmed that the Mount Vernon Police Station and Fire Station could expand if necessary. Ms. Grayson affirmed that the proposed use of the land would not adversely affect surrounding properties.

Responding to additional questions from Commissioner Flanagan, Mr. Kessler affirmed Sherwood Hall Lane was planned for extension from two to four lanes. He said that the Commission could approve Phase 1 in compliance with the traffic plan, but transition to a four-lane road would be included in subsequent phases.

In reply to questions from Commissioner Sargeant, Mr. Kessler said the triggers for the proposed escrow funds to deal with traffic issues would be compiled by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), such as the required number of right turns. He confirmed that the applicant was responsible for providing the necessary traffic information to VDOT, including an analysis to determine if a turn signal was warranted. Mr. Kessler said that as the phases of development progressed over the years, transportation studies would need to be revised. He said it was possible to perform a periodic review of the traffic impact, but the studies could be revised when the applicant met certain development conditions. Mr. Kessler said there had been no contact with the Fire or Police stations regarding the site. He noted that the proposal included conditions for bicycle racks, pedestrian networks, and transit-friendly campus.

In response to questions from Commissioner Hart, Ms. Grayson agreed to remove the word “substantial” from Development Condition Number 24, regarding the parking garage lighting.

Responding to questions from Commissioner Flanagan, Mr. Kessler said the left-turn lane on Sherwood Hall Lane would remain. He added that the additional lane would be constructed across the street from the Fire station.

Replying to questions from Commissioner Donahue, Ms. Grayson clarified that the Chief of the Environment and Development Review Branch, DPZ, would be able to review the project status and monitor the progress of all submitted documents, but would not be assigned responsibility

for any LEED credits or authority to modify any documentation. She stated that she would verify the LEED review and approval process.

Chairman Murphy called upon the applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant sought to expand the INOVA Mount Vernon Hospital. She described the components of the expansion. She said the first phase would be Bed Tower C and the operating room expansion. She explained that later phases would follow as needed, but now the applicant was not certain on the time or order of the process. Ms. Hall estimated that the cost of Phase 1 would be over $43 million. She recommended the following revisions to the development conditions:

1) Delete Condition Number 11A, which stated that the VDOT Chapter 527 traffic impact study could be deemed inconclusive and INOVA could be required to provide supplemental studies.
2) Amend Condition 12A to indicate that INOVA's monetary contributions for transportation improvements would be $5.45 per gross square foot of any Ambulatory Care Center (ACC) and $1.83 per gross square foot of an expansion of the hospital, excluding the ACC.
3) Specify a basis in the proposal for the surrounding community to determine how INOVA's contributions should be spent.
4) Revise Condition Number 13, regarding Transportation Demand Management to ensure that the current measures would not impose inappropriate measures on INOVA.

Ms. Hall expressed concern that staff recommended that the Board of Supervisors not approve the prior modification of the transitional yard along Holland Road. She said INOVA proposed additional landscaping surrounding the transitional yard that included a fence to block glare from vehicle headlights. Ms. Hall noted that the application had the support of the HCAB, Health and Human Services Committee of the Mount Vernon Council of Citizen's Associations, the Route 1 Task Force for Human Services, and Southeast Fairfax Health Planning Task Force.

Responding to questions from Commissioner Flanagan, Ms. Hall clarified that the parking structure would be constructed in two phases and the figure on page 7 of the staff report showed the second phase north elevation. She noted that the Police request for security assistance would not occur until Phase 2 was constructed. She stated that it would not be possible for Phase 1 of the parking garage construction to provide the screening preferred by the Police. She said the applicant had showed the Mount Vernon Police Department the elevations for Phases 1 and 2 and explained that INOVA did not know when Phase 1 would be constructed. Ms. Hall affirmed that she did not know how much time it would take for the overall construction, but estimated it could take 15 to 20 years. She also clarified that the HCAB required a certificate for public need once additional beds were installed. She affirmed that if the proposal was approved, then INOVA could build everything in one phase and would make a major contribution to Fairfax County for transportation improvements along Sherwood Hall Lane.

In response to a question from Commissioner Litzenberger, Ms. Hall stated that this proposal was only for an expansion and did not involve relocating services from another health care system.

Replying to questions from Commissioner Harsel, Ms. Hall said there would be gardens throughout the landscape for this proposal and the Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA) would be consulted for specific details on what plants would be included.

In reply to a question from Commissioner Sargeant, Ms. Hall said that she would consult with INOVA about deleting Development Condition Number 11A.

Responding to questions from Commissioner Lawrence, Mr. Kessler affirmed that the traffic impact study covered the full build-out of the proposal in one phase at 0.5 floor area ratio. He clarified that the study, which was based on existing traffic flow counts, would be built upon trip generation data compiled by the applicant. He stated that traffic impact studies that were two to three years old would no longer be relevant. Mr. Kessler said that the proposal would increase the average daily trips from 20,000 to 28,000 for a two-lane roadway. He noted that the applicant would continue investigating ways to mitigate the growing traffic around the surrounding area.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker.

Queenie Cox, 8100 Fordson Road, Alexandria, President, New Gum Springs Civic Association spoke in opposition to the proposal because of the following reasons:

1) INOVA and staff did not mention Gum Springs as a surrounding residential community even though it would be adversely affected by the increased traffic.
2) The County allowed the Gum Springs Neighborhood Improvement Program and Conservation Plan to lapse and did not inform the community of any land use actions like this project that would affect them.
3) Staff recommended and the Board of Supervisors approved the Hybla Valley/Gum Springs Community Business Center Sub-unit D-1 without consulting Gum Springs.

Ms. Cox further argued that staff's recommendation for the proposal conflicted with the Comprehensive Plan Text adopted by the Board of Supervisors on June 21, 2011 that addressed certain traffic issues. She requested that the Planning Commission recommend the following:

1) The applicant should submit a detailed phasing plan to ensure that the application was in line with the Comprehensive Plan.
2) The applicant should make a quality of life contribution of either $250,000 or $7.92 per square foot to offset the impacts to Gum Springs.
3) The applicant should designate a specific amount of money from the contribution to the Park Authority to the Martin Luther King, Jr. Park.

4) If the applicant failed to provide documentation of LEED certification within one year of the Residential Use Permit (RUP)/Non-RUP for the building, the escrow should be released and used to improve the environment in the Mount Vernon District.

(A copy of Ms. Cox's statement is in the date file.)

Responding to questions from Commissioner Flanagan, Ms. Cox affirmed that she recommended that the project be phased so that there would be time for the surrounding communities to adapt. She said that based on recent developments surrounding Gum Springs, the increase in traffic would be greater than the one-percent projections estimated by the applicant. She noted that Beacon Hill was a two-lane road that utilized parking lanes and removing those would cause hardship on the owners and members of Bethlehem Baptist Church.

Commissioner Sargeant commented that the increase in traffic was affecting all the surrounding communities including Gum Springs and that more funding was needed for the roads to mitigate traffic.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience.

Christopher Granger, 1901 Sherwood Hall Lane, Alexandria, President of the Sherwood Estates Citizens Association, opposed the proposal. He favored recommendations presented by Ms. Cox, stating that the proposal should be constructed in phases.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for a rebuttal statement from Ms. Hall.

Ms. Hall stated that INOVA would meet with the Gum Springs community as it proceeded with the proposal. She clarified that the proposal would not involve a transit facility on Route 1. She further clarified that the one-percent increase in traffic was a one-percent increase per year for 20 years. Ms. Hall emphasized that due to its tremendous investment, INOVA would not allocate the $43 million into Phase 1 if this project needed to file a Special Exception Amendment application process for each phase thereafter. She noted that the last sheet of the SE plat showed what would be constructed with each phase, but it could not tie down the order or timing of the phases because it would not productively respond to the needs of the community.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Flanagan, Ms. Grayson stated that staff preferred more detail on phasing and would not have any problem with a phasing approach.

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 application. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Flanagan MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY ON SEA 82-V-012-06 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF JULY 20, 2011 WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC COMMENTS.

Commissioner Hall seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

//

The Commission went into recess at 10:40 p.m. and reconvened in the Board Auditorium at 10:54 p.m.

//

PRC A-502-02 – FAIRWAYS I RESIDENTIAL, LLC & FAIRWAYS II RESIDENTIAL, LLC – Appl. to approve a PRC Plan associated with RZ A-502 to redevelop existing multifamily dwellings with single family attached and multifamily dwellings (including high rise) and bonus density for providing ADUs. Located at 11555 and 11627 North Shore Dr., S.W. corner of North Shore Dr. and Fairways Dr. and E. of intersection of North Shore Dr. and Wainwright Dr. on approx. 18.82 ac. of land zoned PRC. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential Planned Community. Tax Map 17-2 ((18)) 1 and 17-2 ((19)) 2A. HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

St. Clair Williams, Zoning Evaluation Division, 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 the application.

In reply to a question from Commissioner de la Fe, Mr. Williams said the maximum density allowed for the property was 50 dwellings per acre.

Commissioner Hart commented that the language in Development Condition Number 9 that required the building designs to meet the character of existing neighborhoods was vague and would be difficult to enforce.

Responding to questions from Commissioner Hart, Mr. Williams said there were no renderings of the proposed buildings at this time and the applicant had provided a list of materials. He added that the applicant could not provide renderings at this point in the process and would need to obtain building permit approval from the Reston Association's Design Review Board (DRB). He stated that if the proposal were subject to an administrative review, this would not require a public hearing.

Commissioner de la Fe commented that the DRB did not give final approval until after the site plan process and had final decision authority. He said the Planning Commission could only rule on whether or not the proposal was in conformance with established zoning rules.

Chairman Murphy called upon the applicant.

Robert Lawrence, Esquire, Reed Smith LLP, stated that the proposal had been revised six times since it was first proposed in 2010. He noted that the total number of dwelling units had been reduced and the high-rise building was replaced with mid-rise apartment buildings. He said there was also a mixed-use development that included single-family attached units. He noted that these units included two land bays, each with a Central Park theme. Mr. Lawrence added that the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services reviewed and supported the waivers and modifications for stormwater detention. He stated that he did not object to staff requirements for the revision in the staff report addendum. He said he would also not object to presenting the architectural renderings to the Commission and DPZ, noting that the plans were subject to DRB approval. In response to a question from Commissioner de la Fe, Mr. Lawrence affirmed that no construction on Fairways West would begin until Fairways East was complete and he would add development condition language to clarify this.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker.

Freya De Cola, 1626 Wainwright Drive, Reston, spoke in opposition to the proposal. She expressed the following concerns about the proposal:

1) The proposed "Texas Doughnut" style buildings would be inconsistent with the area, would have too large a footprint, and would obstruct the park-like ambience of the community.
2) The increased number of housing units would increase traffic along North Shore Drive, which was a two-lane winding street that was not designed for such heavy volume.
3) The increase in traffic would be hazardous to pedestrians approaching bus stops and children walking to and from Langston Hughes Middle School, South Lakes High School, and Lake Anne Elementary School.

Ms. De Cola stated that the current proposal should be revised to include new traffic measures such as stop signs and pedestrian-activated lights. (A copy of Ms. De Cola’s remarks is in the date file.)

Diane Blust, 12132 Quorn Lane, Reston, President, Fairfax Coalition for Smarter Growth, spoke in opposition to the proposal for the following reasons:

1) The surrounding areas were not developed as high-density neighborhoods and the construction of the proposed buildings would disrupt the stability of the surrounding residential community.

2) The proposal was not in conformance with the desired transit-oriented development because it would be over a mile from the future Reston Town Center Metro Station and would not have sufficient access to pedestrian routes and bus stops.
3) The residents of the high-density residential units would be forced to use their vehicles because they would not have sufficient access to public transit, which would increase air pollution. In addition, the loss of tree canopy because of the proposal would exacerbate the air pollution issues.
4) The price range for the new residential units would be too high, which would upset the area tradition of offering housing for all income levels.

Ms. Blust recommended that the Commission require revisions that included environmental protection provisions and traffic mitigation strategies to minimize the impact on the surrounding communities. (A copy of Ms. Blust's remarks is in the date file.)

Tammi Petrine, 2503 Foxcoft Way, Reston, Co-Chair, Reston 2020 Committee, expressed opposition to the proposal due to the following concerns:

1) The new residential units would lead to a loss of affordable housing.
2) The design of the new units would not be in harmony with the character of the surrounding community.
3) An increase in traffic would be a burden on nearby roads that could not sustain such volume.
4) An influx of new residents would burden the nearby schools, which were already overcrowded.

Ms. Petrine proposed that the new residential units accommodate elderly and handicapped residents as a means to mitigate the negative impacts. (A copy of Ms. Petrine's remarks is in the date file.)

Barbara Byron, 2386 Generation Drive, Reston, Chair, DRB, spoke in opposition to the proposed development, citing concerns about negative impact on the residential character of the community; excessive scale and height of the buildings; potential loss of affordable housing; increased traffic; inadequate stormwater management; inappropriate Texas Doughnut design; unattractive façade; lack of setbacks; proximity of building corners to paving with limited green space; and overall amount of hardscape in relation to the green space. Ms. Byron stated that the applicant should seek greater input from the community.

Replying to questions from Chairman Murphy, Ms. Byron said that she did not think the design for the parking garage was appropriate for Reston. She said she favored underground parking for the structure because it would provide more flexibility with regard to street parking. She encouraged the applicant to revise the designs to make them in conformance with DRB standards.

In response to questions from Commissioner Harsel, Ms. Byron said she did not know if other residential structures had underground parking but affirmed that some residential structures had surface parking. She said that the DRB also required a more refined layout of the units in order to facilitate parking.

Responding to questions from Commissioner Lawrence, Ms. Byron said she did not know if any hard rock layers existed in the area that would prohibit the construction of underground parking. She clarified that she was not opposed to increased density, but was opposed to the issues that such density incurred.

Answering another question from Commissioner Lawrence, Mr. Williams stated that many of the PRC standards addressed the same issues as the Residential Development Criteria; therefore, there were comparable PRC standards that achieved that same effect as the Residential Development Criteria.

Chairman Murphy commented that utilizing underground parking would make the housing units less affordable.

In reply to a question from Commissioner Donahue, Ms. Byron affirmed that the applicant was aware of the DRB's desire to use underground parking.

Alan Montgomery, 11609 Clubhouse Court, Reston, representing the Clubhouse Court Cluster Association, expressed support for redeveloping Fairways Apartments because of the following reasons:

1) The existing development was in need of renovation.
2) The redevelopment would improve the quality of the neighborhood and provide meaningful linkage to the Reston Town Center.
3) The applicant was a high-quality builder with a solid reputation.
4) The applicant was receptive to the input of the Clubhouse Court community.

While Mr. Montgomery supported the proposal, he requested that the applicant make the following modifications to address his concerns about aesthetics of the structures:

1) The height and scale of the seven-story building was inconsistent with the surrounding buildings and that such density would be more appropriate on East Fairways or the Hidden Creek Golf Course.
2) The parking garage should be relocated to the west side of the proposed building so that it was not on the side facing the Clubhouse Court Cluster, which he noted was accommodated in the most recent proposal.
3) Additional screening of trees or mature plants should be required and replaced if any were uprooted during construction.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Flanagan, Mr. Montgomery said he would consider Ms. Petrine's suggestion that the proposed residential units accommodate elderly and handicapped residents.

Marion Stillson, 11286 Spyglass Cove Lane, Reston, President, Reston Citizens Association, spoke in opposition to the proposal, citing concerns about the possibility of setting a precedent for future redevelopment in the surrounding area; adverse impact on the character of the property and area; and negative impact on the affordability of housing in the area. She suggested that higher density residential units were more appropriate in an area closer to the Reston Town Center or the future Metro station. (A copy of Ms. Stillson's statement is in the date file.)

Commissioner de la Fe commented that the Reston Planning and Zoning Committee never rejected the proposals from JBG.

Joe Stowers, 11448 Waterview Cluster, Reston, spoke in favor of the proposal, but pointed out that there were five buildings with underground parking at the Reston Town Center. He noted that none had affordable housing units. He recommended the following revisions:

1) High-density units should emphasize closer connectivity with nearby high, medium, and low-density areas.
2) High-density units should be focused around pedestrian-bicycle spines instead of along collector streets.
3) The units should encourage pedestrian-bicycle use between centers.
4) The layout should encourage a reduced dependency on cars.

Mr. Stowers stated that most of the groups located near the subject site have been involved with the proposal and have since accepted the revised plan.

Chairman Murphy called for additional speakers from the audience.

Jon Patrick, 1711 Clubhouse Road, Reston, General Manager, Hidden Creek Country Club and Golf Course, supported the proposal. He stated that the applicant had preserved the existing vegetation around the Hidden Creek Country Club. He said the applicant had increased the setback of the buildings, which would maintain the density of the area and complement the nearby golf course.

In response to a question from Chairman Murphy, Mr. Patrick said that he did not have an issue with the height of the proposed structures that would be near the golf course.

Iroll Skaar, 11611 Clubhouse Court, Reston, opposed the proposal because the high-rise structures would obstruct the view from his property. He also said that he was against increasing the density of the area.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Harsel, Mr. Skaar clarified that he objected to the five-to-seven story building in the proposal, but he did not object to the townhouses.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for a rebuttal statement from Mr. Lawrence.

Mr. Lawrence stated that a condition would be added to the proposal that would reduce the setback height of the multi-story building. He noted that the subject property was already designated as high-density and could be developed as such. Mr. Lawrence noted that the Level of Service on North Shore Drive would remain "A." He pointed out that the applicant was voluntarily providing affordable and workforce housing units. Mr. Lawrence added that requiring underground parking for the units would not be economically feasible and the cost of the units would be prohibitive. He noted that the applicant revised the proposal after staff had rejected an earlier proposal for a taller structure and that staff now accepted the current plan because it was deemed appropriate for the surrounding neighborhoods. He stated that the proposal had to remain economically feasible or redevelopment of the area would be hindered.

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 de la Fe for action on this application. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner de la Fe MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY ON PRC A-502-02 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF JULY 20, 2011, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN COMMENTS.

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with Commissioner Alcorn absent from the meeting.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 12:33 a.m.
Peter F. Murphy, Jr., Chairman
Suzanne F. Harsel, 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: Jacob Caporaletti

Approved on: June 28, 2012

_____

Kara A. DeArrastia, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission