

**MINUTES OF  
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2004**

PRESENT: Walter L. Alcorn, Commissioner At-Large  
John R. Byers, Mount Vernon District  
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District  
Janet R. Hall, Mason District  
Suzanne F. Harsel, Braddock District  
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large  
Nancy Hopkins, Dranesville District  
Ronald W. Koch, Sully District  
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District  
Rodney L. Lusk, Lee District  
Peter F. Murphy, Jr., Springfield District  
Laurie Frost Wilson, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: None

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:15 p.m. by Chairman Peter F. Murphy, Jr., in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center at 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

**COMMISSION MATTERS**

Commissioner Byers MOVED THAT THE DECISION ONLY ON RZ 2004-MV-020, GUNSTON CENTER LLC, BE FURTHER DEFERRED TO A DATE CERTAIN OF DECEMBER 9, 2004.

Commissioner Hall seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

Commissioner Murphy MOVED THAT THE PUBLIC HEARING ON FDPA 82-P-069-13-09, NATICK VA REALTY CORPORATION, BE DEFERRED TO A DATE CERTAIN OF JANUARY 27, 2005.

Commissioners Byers and Lawrence seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

Chairman Murphy announced that the final Planning Commission meeting of this year would be on December 9th, which he could not attend due to business obligations. He noted that 2004 was the first year in the history of the Commission to welcome four new members, whom he recognized as Commissioners Hart, Hopkins, Lusk, and Lawrence and congratulated them. Chairman Murphy then thanked the Commission for working together to help resolve issues and acknowledged the Commission's own staff and its new members, Kara DeArrastia and Susan Donovan. He further thanked Fairfax County staff and the television crews who filmed the regular Commission meetings and the Planning Commission Roundtable show. He wished everyone a happy holiday and pointed out that 2005 would be challenging since it would begin the review of the Comprehensive Plan.

//

#### ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Harsel established the following order of the agenda:

1. SE 2004-MV-029 - LINDA K. REMICK AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
2. SE 2004-SU-025 - STANFORD HOTELS CORPORATION
3. S04-IV-MV2 - OUT-OF-TURN PLAN AMENDMENT

This order was accepted without objection.

//

SE 2004-MV-029 - LINDA K. REMICK AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS - Appl. under Sect. 2-904 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit uses in a floodplain. Located at 6418 13<sup>th</sup> St. on approx. 10,500 sq. ft. of land zoned R-3. Tax Map 93-2 ((8)) (26) 21. MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Linda K. Remick, sole owner of the subject property, reaffirmed the affidavit dated November 5, 2004. There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Commissioner Byers asked that Chairman Murphy ascertain whether there were any speakers present for this application. There being none, he asked that 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 Byers for action on this case. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Byers MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF SE 2004-MV-029, LINDA K. REMICK AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, SUBJECT TO DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 1 OF THE STAFF REPORT.

Commissioner Hall seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

SE 2004-SU-025 - STANFORD HOTELS CORPORATION - Appl.  
under Sect. 9-607 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit an increase in building height. Located in the N.E. quadrant of Lee Jackson Memorial Hwy., (Rt. 50) and Sully Rd. (Rt. 28), on approx. 5.61 ac. of land zoned C-8, HC and AN. Tax Map 34-4 ((12)) 3A2, 3A3, 3A4 and 3A5. SULLY DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Gregory Riegle, Esquire, McGuire Woods LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated November 15, 2004. Commissioner Hart disclosed that his law firm, Hart and Horan PC, had a pending case with Mr. Riegle's law firm but there was no financial relationship and it would not affect his ability to participate in this case.

Kristen Crookshanks, 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 application.

Mr. Riegle stated that the request for additional height would allow the applicant to design a full-service hotel that would consist of internal elevators, eating establishments, and a series of small meeting rooms totaling less than 5,000 square feet. He added that this design was not presently available in the hotel market and this differentiation would meet the needs of the community. He explained that the proposal to adjoin the hotel with the existing restaurant would provide the opportunity to link these two sites with pedestrian connections and landscape amenities and would function better than if it was only allowed to occur under by-right development. Mr. Riegle pointed out that there were new development conditions dated December 2, 2004, dealing with lighting and that the landscaping and screening were above the minimum requirements. He also indicated that the application had the support of staff and the Sully District Council.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience.

Brian Cook, with Palmer-Gosnell Management, Inc., noted that he was representing the owners of Inns of Chantilly, LLC, doing business as Fairfield Inn. He read excerpts of a letter written by Rich Palmer, President of Palmer-Gosnell Management, Inc., addressed to Ms. Crookshanks. (A copy of the letter is in the date file.) In reference to the letter, Mr. Cook explained that the site plan was too congested in terms of facilities and parking for the existing surrounding uses particularly the Fairfield Inn and TownePlace Suites hotels.

Tom Galle, with Marriott International, noted that he was representing Palmer-Gosnell Management, Inc. and the owners of TownePlace Suites. He stated that Marriott believed that the proposal would not provide enough parking to support the rooms, meeting space, and the restaurant in the proposed Hilton Garden Inn and that the remote parking bay would present a pedestrian hazard for vehicles traveling to Fairfield Inn along Cosair Court. He explained that the subject hotel's proposed height was out of scale with the surrounding hotels and would overwhelm the existing businesses in the Dulles Business Park. Mr. Galle recommended that the proposed parking count be substantially increased to reflect all of the proposed uses and the hotel's height be reduced to no greater than five stories.

There were no further speakers. Therefore, Chairman Murphy called upon Mr. Riegle for a rebuttal statement.

Mr. Riegle stated that he had not been aware of the speakers' issues until recently. He addressed the concern about parking and noted that the typical guest would arrive directly from the airport by shuttle or cab and therefore the proposed parking would be more than adequate. He explained that this proposal would offer continuous shuttle service to and from Dulles Airport and a service to neighboring business parks and corporations. He further noted that the existing Dulles Hilton hotel had 10 times the meeting space of this proposal for which the County had approved a parking reduction of 17 percent on the basis of the shuttle service and other empirical data. Mr. Riegle said that the application had a development condition that required the applicant to adjust the intensity of the meeting space if necessary. He next addressed the concern about the proposed restaurant parking and explained that it would have access to overflow parking, which would be available on a shared basis for both the hotel and the restaurant. He believed that this was a reasonable proposal for parking and that there were extensive development conditions beyond the by-right use. He concluded that the applicant would work with their corporate neighbors to resolve concerns.

In response to questions from Commissioner Harsel, Mr. Riegle said that the meeting rooms would not be banquet-style rooms and would not be able to hold 100 people at one time. He pointed out that the applicant had made a commitment to the Sully District Council to make the meeting rooms available at no charge for community groups to hold small meetings and this proposal would be added to the development conditions.

In response to further questions from Commissioner Harsel, Mr. Riegle explained that the proposed restaurant would have 40 seats, offer three meals a day, have no outside advertising, and would mainly cater to the full-service hotel customer who typically did not have a vehicle.

Responding to questions from Commissioner Alcorn, Regina Murray, Zoning Administration Division, DPZ, said that the applicant and staff had calculated the parking requirement based on the Zoning Ordinance requirements for a hotel/motel use and did not include the additional requirement for any accessory uses.

Responding to another question from Commissioner Alcorn, Ms. Murray noted that the parking study that would be performed by the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES) would review the allocation of space and the use type to determine whether more or less parking would be required.

In response to further questions from Commissioner Alcorn, Ms. Murray said that if the number of parking spaces changed as a result of the parking study then a Special Exception Amendment (SEA) would be required. She explained that Development Condition Number 15 stated that if additional parking could not be accommodated in conformance with the Special Exception (SE) plat, then the SE would be null and void.

Replying to questions from Commissioner Wilson, Ms. Murray reported that the SE, if approved, would be contingent upon the approval of the parking study by the Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Wilson asked Ms. Murray how the applicant could reduce the intensity of uses if the parking study was not approved. Ms. Murray responded that the SE would only become null and void if the applicant could not reduce the intensity of uses or provide additional parking. She then gave examples of how the applicant could provide additional parking or reduce the intensity in the event the parking study was denied.

Commissioner Wilson referred to Mr. Riegle's offer to add a development condition regarding the use of the proposed meeting rooms for community associations and emphasized the need for this commitment to be in writing. Mr. Riegle reaffirmed his offer and pointed out that the applicant was not asking for a reduction to any Zoning Ordinance requirement on parking.

In response to a question from Commissioner Wilson, Mr. Riegle noted that the number of required parking spaces would be determined by DPWES based on the information presented by the applicant regarding the size of the uses proposed by the hotel.

Commissioner Hart suggested that staff clarify the clause in Development Condition Number 15 concerning reduction in intensity of uses if the applicant's request for a reduction in parking spaces is denied by the Board.

Commissioner Hart referred to the clause "within those areas depicted as paved or built upon and resulting in no reduction in open space" in Development Condition Number 15 and inquired where the additional parking would be allowed. Ms. Murray replied that the parking could be restriped or reconfigured.

In response to a comment made by Commissioner Hart, Ms. Murray noted that parking on a built-upon area was not the intent of staff.

Commissioner de la Fe noted that he appreciated the willingness of the applicant to donate free community meeting space but he felt uncomfortable about making it a development condition.

Chairman Murphy suggested that staff not consider cutting down the width of parking spaces if the parking lot was restriped to make more spaces.

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 Koch for action on this case. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Koch MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER DECISION ON SE 2004-SU-025, STANFORD HOTELS CORPORATION, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF DECEMBER 9, 2004.

Commissioners Byers and Lawrence seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

S04-IV-MV2 – OUT-OF-TURN PLAN AMENDMENT - To consider proposed revisions to the Adopted Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County, VA, in accordance with the *Code of Virginia*, Title 15.2, Chapter 22. The Out-of-Turn Plan Amendment concerns the area bounded by Richmond Highway, Memorial Street, Donora Drive, and Groveton Street in the Richmond Highway Corridor. The amendment proposes to add an option for high density residential with support retail and office use up to 1.8 FAR. LEE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Jayjeev Hada, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended approval of this Out-of-Turn Plan Amendment.

Responding to questions from Commissioner Byers, Marianne Gardner, PD, DPZ, explained that the applicant would need to redesign the proposed building to meet the staff recommendation of 1.8 Floor Area Ratio (FAR).

Commissioner Hall reminded the Commission that the applicant in this case was the Board of Supervisors and that it was for a Comprehensive Plan change, which would still need to go through a design process and evaluation, and that the focus now should only be on language and FAR.

Commissioner Lusk noted that concurrent rezoning applications had been filed with this Plan amendment. Commissioner Hall responded that it should not matter since the Commission should only be looking at the Plan language at this point.

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

Stewart Schwartz, Executive Director of the Coalition for Smarter Growth, expressed support of the proposed Heights of Groveton project based upon its design and the community consultation by the developer. He addressed the concern about FAR and pointed out that it should not be the only guide and that higher density and full use of the parcel would allow for greater transit usage and greater “walk-ability”. Mr. Schwartz noted that he had distributed a letter he had written to the editor of the *Voice* dated August 5, 2004. (A copy of his letter is in the date file.)

Commissioner Lusk inquired as to how to best balance the office, residential, and retail components in a mixed-use development. Mr. Schwartz responded by saying that the integration of all three uses depended on the design issues of the project. He added that there were office uses adjacent to the subject parcel and there was space for other office uses in the Route 1 corridor that might not be currently zoned for commercial use and some were located within a quarter to a half mile of this site. He disclosed that he had not seen the developer’s proposed new designs to try to accommodate the office use but he hoped that it would not substantially change the proposal he had seen to date.

Commissioner Lusk noted that the rezoning application concurrent with this Plan amendment had proposed a certain number of units and the office and retail components had each been assigned square footage.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lusk, Mr. Schwartz explained that one way to define the size of the uses would be to have ground-floor retail, one floor of office above, and/or office occupying some of the ground-floor retail spaces. He further explained that there was no specific standard or measurement particularly for one building on this type of site but that architects could define a percentage share of each use.

Responding to another question from Commissioner Lusk, Mr. Schwartz said that certain goals of mixed office, retail, and residential uses did not have to be imposed on any one parcel but it was necessary to achieve that goal over time. He noted that he had discussed with staff foreign-based design codes as the zoning overlay for the Route 1 corridor and how that could establish office percentage goals and retail percentage goals.

Replying to a question from Commissioner Hall, Mr. Schwartz indicated that he had not read the current staff report, but was referring to the proposed designs he had seen prior to that report. Commissioner Hall responded that if Mr. Schwartz had read the staff report, he would realize that development might or might not occur as illustrated and that this Plan amendment depicted the proposed language for the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Alcorn agreed with Mr. Schwartz and said that the design was crucial when dealing with higher density proposals. He pointed out that the Commission rarely looked at the design at the Comprehensive Plan phase and suggested that the Commission reviewed its process when dealing with similar Plan amendments.

John Bailey, representing the Smart Growth Alliance, 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street NW, Suite 500 West, Washington, DC, noted that the Alliance's Smart Growth Project Recognition Program's jury met on July 8, 2004 and recognized the Heights of Groveton project as a Smart Growth Project Proposal. He explained that after review, the jury concluded that this proposal incorporated infill development and pedestrian-oriented design in an area appropriate for growth with development densities consistent with smart growth principles. He noted that the historic Richmond Highway corridor was recognized by Fairfax County as a crucial growth corridor and would provide opportunities for increased redevelopment. (A copy of his remarks is in the date file.)

Al Lupenski, Vice President of the Groveton Civic Association, 3304 Arundel Avenue, Alexandria, stated that his association was opposed to an office building on the subject property but supported a residential and retail mixed-use building to revitalize the community. He noted that his association had voted to support this Plan amendment on November 1, 2004, as described in a letter dated November 9, 2004 written by the association's President, Eric Reeder. (A copy of the letter is in the date file.)

Commissioner de la Fe called attention to the letter and inquired as to why the Groveton Civic Association was opposed to an office building even though the staff report recommended that there be at least 50,000 square feet of office. Mr. Lupenski responded that his association understood that there would be office space but were opposed to a gigantic office building.

Commissioner Hall commented that many of the concerns expressed by Mr. Lupenski were issues that would be addressed during the rezoning process. He said he understood and assured her that the community would remain involved throughout the process.

Richard Neel, President of the Southeast Fairfax Development Corporation (SFDC), stated that the SFDC conditionally supported this Plan amendment and requested that the text be revised to require a minimum of 70,000 square feet of office space and 10,000 square feet of retail space to be built. He explained that the current planned 0.7 FAR density was more reasonable than the requested 1.8 FAR for this site and the additional office space would help meet the current shortage of available office space, would encourage a more diverse mix of uses along Richmond Highway, and would contribute proportionately more to the County tax coffers than residential. (A copy of his remarks is in the date file.)

In response to a question from Commissioner Hall, Ms. Gardner explained that this Plan amendment was advertised as a mixed-use, predominantly residential, development up to 1.8 FAR and Mr. Neel's proposal to increase the office space from 50,000 to 70,000 square feet would not be outside its scope.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Wilson, Ms. Gardner said that the staff recommendation was not based on the contractual commitment between the County and the owner, but was based on the proposal's benefits to the historic Richmond Highway corridor and its support of the revitalization objectives for the area.

Commissioner Wilson explained that if the applicant was held to the agreement with the County, then that would leave, according to the Plan language, only 10,000 square feet for retail use. She then inquired as to whether staff would still recommend that kind of mixed-use. Ms. Gardner replied that staff would prefer to have flexibility for additional retail space and added that if the range was heavier on office space than retail, it might be problematic.

Commissioner Wilson suggested that, since the owner of the property already had a contractual agreement with the County, staff determine a greater percentage of mixed office and retail. Ms. Gardner reiterated that the staff recommendation was not based on this agreement. She pointed out that the Plan recommendation for office at 0.7 FAR still remained and if 70,000 square feet of office space was not possible to achieve within the mixed-use development, then the developer could still carry out an all-office use. She noted that the proper balance of mixes within the development was unknown.

Jim Walton, representing the Mount Zephyr Citizens Association, 4320 Jackson Place, Alexandria, spoke in opposition to this Plan amendment and delivered a slide presentation supporting his remarks. (A copy of his presentation is in the date file.) He explained that commercial use would both support the revitalization and tax base goals of the County, noting that there was a shortage of office space along the Richmond Highway corridor. Mr. Walton noted that at a recent land use meeting, the developer's traffic consultant dismissed all the traffic issues. He added that the overflow of residents would also create parking problems. He stated that the Mount Vernon Council Civic Association voted unanimously to oppose this Plan amendment.

Responding to questions from Chairman Murphy, Mr. Walton said that the Mount Zephyr Citizens Association was located across the street from the South County Center and that he preferred to see two office buildings and no residential use on the subject property.

Annabel Baer, Treasurer of the Groveton Civic Association, 3310 Memorial Street, Alexandria, noted that she was also the Chairman of the Traffic Calming Committee for Memorial Street. She expressed support of the proposal but opposition to an office building being built on the subject property. She said that her association was willing to work with the developer to ensure that the community interests were upheld throughout the process. Ms. Baer explained that the proposed mixed-use development would blend in well with the community, be pedestrian-friendly, improve the quality of life, would not take away from community businesses, and would help achieve the goals of Fairfax County and the community.

David Dale, President of the Spring Bank Association, 2520 Fairview Drive, Alexandria, noted that he was also speaking on behalf of the Mount Vernon Council of Citizen Associations and was the Vice Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Committee. He voiced objection to this Plan Amendment and to the whole Out-of-Turn Plan process because there was no urgent need for this proposal. He explained that the proposed total density of 1.8 FAR was too high. He pointed out that the retail component of 10,000 square feet was very small and that the proposed building would be out of place with the rest of the Richmond Highway corridor.

On behalf of the Spring Bank Association, Mr. Dale recommended that the Board of Supervisors exercise the option to purchase the property for an office building or an office and retail mixed-use building to foster the revitalization of the corridor. He added that the area did not need the additional population pressures of proposed residential units nor had the potential impact on the area's schools been discussed. (A copy of his remarks is in the date file.)

Robin Antonucci, principle associate with Wells & Associates, LLC, explained that the applicant had worked with staff to review the transportation impacts associated with this Plan amendment and agreed that although there would be a slight increase in the evening trip generation, there would be a better distribution of trips as opposed to the office uses. She added that this Plan amendment would have no appreciable impacts on the delays of the light cycles at the intersections or have a detrimental affect on the Richmond Highway corridor.

Doug Jones, Chairman of the Mount Vernon-Lee Chamber of Commerce, 8729 Lukens Lane Alexandria, noted that the Chamber of Commerce supported the legal agreement between Fairfax County and Madison Development Partners as part of the South County Center "Two for One" office arrangement. Mr. Jones read the following excerpt from the Resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce, "Therefore Be It Resolved that any development to this site should provide for a minimum of 70,000 square feet of office space to satisfy the legal requirements of the property deed and further the economic revitalization of Richmond Highway." (A copy of the Resolution is in the date file.)

Chairman Murphy called Mr. Jones' attention to the second bullet on page 8 of 9 of the staff report, which stated: "The development includes 60,000 to 80,000 square feet of office and retail use. A minimum of 50,000 square feet of office is desirable."

Mr. Jones mentioned that the original plan called for an office building to be between 70,000 and 140,000 square feet.

Kathy Lupenski, 3304 Arundel Avenue, Alexandria, noted that she lived two streets away from the subject property and her neighborhood was strongly in support of the proposed mixed-use development. She pointed out that the property taxes paid by the residents of the proposed building would benefit the surrounding community.

Rick Haughey, 2206 Marthas Road, Alexandria, expressed support of the proposal because it was a good example of smart growth. He noted that he was the Director of Multi-family Development for the Urban Land Institute in Georgetown as a planner and a real estate market analyst. He explained that the current office market could be improved by the absorption of a significant amount of vacant office space prior to the construction of new development and new space. He pointed out that along Route 1, there were more than enough under-utilized, vacant, and abandoned parcels that could be redeveloped as office space when the market improved. Mr. Haughey said that he appreciated Fairfax County's effort to enlarge the commercial tax base and FSDC's improvements along the Route 1 corridor but he believed that this was the wrong time and place to be pushing for significant new office construction along the corridor.

Mr. Haughey concluded that the residents of the proposed building would have less impact on public services than low density single-family homes because they would have close access to public transportation and retail.

Commissioner Byers called attention to the real estate report published by the Fairfax County Economic Development Authority (EDA) for mid-year 2004 on page 4 of 9 in the staff report. He inquired as to why this survey stated that the office vacancy rate in the Richmond Highway commercial submarket was 12 percent while the survey performed by the SFDC found that the vacancy rate was only a little over 7 percent. Ms. Gardner replied that the discrepancy could be based on factors such as the geography and the types of office space. Commissioner Byers suggested that the discrepancy be verified but he believed that the SFDC statistics were more factual.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Harsel, Ms. Gardner explained that the Comprehensive Plan language did not specifically state the residential use but it was assumed that there would be residential apart from office and retail.

Responding to another question from Commissioner Harsel, Ms. Gardner noted that the Plan would not indicate whether the residential use should be owner occupied or rental because it had not been considered when staff had reviewed typical planning issues.

Chairman Murphy pointed out that the Plan did not usually address unit types or ownership issues. The Commission concurred.

Ms. Gardner noted that Mr. Neel had explained that the SFDC survey considered all classes of office space along Richmond Highway and the difference between the two surveys was in the geography.

Dorothee Sisk, 3305 Arundel Avenue, Alexandria, spoke in support of the residential component of this proposal.

Lynne Strobel, Esquire, with Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Emrich & Terpak, PC, noted that she was a representative of the owner of the subject property. She stated that the proposed mixed-use development would best assist in achieving the revitalization goals of the Richmond Highway corridor. She pointed out that the Lee District Land Use Committee voted on November 15, 2004, to approve this Plan amendment if the language was modified to require a minimum of 50,000 square feet of office space with 70,000 square feet desirable. She added that the committee's recommendation was not favored by the owner because if too much office space was proposed, then it would take away from the mixed-use nature of the proposal. Ms. Strobel distributed packets that contained letters of support for this Plan amendment. (A copy of the packet is in the date file.) She noted that the packet also included a memorandum from Lee District Supervisor Dana Kauffman asking County Executive Anthony H. Griffin as to whether the subject property should be purchased back by Fairfax County. She called attention to a sentence that read: "There is no advantage for the County to buy back the site."

Ms. Strobel did not believe that the Board of Supervisors would authorize this Plan amendment if there was a covenant that could not be amended to allow this to go forward. (A copy of the memorandum is in the date file.)

Darrell Butcher, representing Madison Development Partners, spoke in support of the staff recommendation and explained that his organization had attempted for several years to attract a major tenant to build an office building on the subject property. He contended that 12 percent of the office vacancy rate along the Richmond Highway corridor was a more accurate number. He noted that the existing rental rates in the area were not able to support new Class A office construction and that the developer should strive to acquire some auxiliary office use.

Jon Hass, with Madison Development Partners Groveton, LLC, noted that his agency had worked since 1998 to build an office building on the subject property. He pointed out that in 2001, Madison went to the Board of Supervisors to renegotiate the contractual agreement and the deed had been changed to include the provision that if a commendable proposal was presented, then the Board would change the agreement. He stated that the rents were well below replacement value.

Replying to a question from Commissioner Alcorn, Mr. Hass said that many properties along Richmond Highway had been acquired and marketed by the SFDC and many were under development at this time.

Commissioner Alcorn commented that it was uncommon for a Plan amendment that proposed more intense use to have a number of citizens support it. He pointed out that the recommendation made by the Commission should be based on whether the proposal was appropriate for the area and whether it could overburden the public facilities structure.

Chairman Murphy called for concluding staff remarks from Mr. Hada, who declined.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Lusk for action on this case. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Lusk MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT ADOPT OUT-OF-TURN PLAN AMENDMENT, S04-IV-MV2, WITH THE FOLLOWING PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEXT REVISIONS: THE ADDITION OF AN OPTION FOR A MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT COMPRISED OF 70,000 TO 90,000 SQUARE FEET OF OFFICE AND RETAIL USES, WITH A MINIMUM OF 50,000 SQUARE FEET OF OFFICE WITH 70,000 SQUARE FEET DESIRABLE AND ADDITIONALLY 20,000 SQUARE FEET OF RETAIL.

Commissioner Lawrence seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 11-0-1 with Commissioner Harsel abstaining.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.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: Kara A. DeArrastia

Approved on: March 14, 2007

---

Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk to the  
Fairfax County Planning Commission