

Planning Commission Meeting
October 5, 2016
Verbatim Excerpt

RZ 2015-HM-005 – PULTE HOME CORPORATION

Decision Only During Commission Matters
(Public Hearing held on September 29, 2016)

Secretary Hart: I recognize Commissioner de la Fe.

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you, it's RZ 2015-HM-005, Pulte Home Corporation. We held a public hearing on this last week, 9-29, and then there – the staff continues to recommend denial on – on this application. If I understand it correctly, they base it on the overall design and their primary – the - their preference that one set of two-over-two's be removed so that there would be greater open space and that there would be a – in effect a better layout. In any case like this, which is for a relatively small property, in an area which is going to be subject of substantial redevelopment, I – it is difficult for the first item to come up to be the probably the smallest piece of this. As was discussed during the public hearing, the applicant made a rather substantial effort to meet the transportation requirements of the staff - that the staff had requested on, you know, as far as the street layout and, you know, contributions and so forth. The, to me, I – I – I really don't like to go against staff on this but to me in all cases are when – when they're not perfect, and I don't think many of them are, represent compromises. In this case, to me, the compromise of centers around the design for – the – those two units at the end and if we did not keep them the applicant has made it clear that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for them to meet the commitment that they have made to provide WD – three WDU's with three bedrooms each, which is something that WDU's particularly with three bedrooms are very necessary. There have been questions as to the loading spaces and access for trash trucks and that, I believe that any area that is as small as this or in almost any urban area which this is, or will become, those are things that can be handled if the – the road are wide enough. And I believe that the alley where the trash trucks will come in is wide enough to not impede the access of residents and that the trash can be loaded and unloaded without overdue inconvenience. So, as I said, this is – it is very difficult when I have a staff recommendation for denial and a – a advisory committee, Reston Planning and Zoning, for approval. That – that sort of leaves that up to me. It's easy when they both agree, either for denial or for approval, but when they're split it makes it difficult. To me, the reason I will recommend approval is revolves primarily about the need for the WDU's in this, in - not only in this area but throughout Reston and throughout the county. And the fact that the applicant has made a concerted effort to work with other developers in the area and that's what is stated by staff – the Transportation Department staff last week. There is nothing in this development that will impede the development of other developers in the area. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, given that, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF RZ 2015-HM-005, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED RELY (sic) – AND DATED REVISED SEPTEMBER 13, 2016.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Second.

Secretary Hart: Seconded by Commissioner Migliaccio. Discussion? Ms. Keys-Gamarra.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: Yes, Mr. Chair, I am not going to be able to support this today. I – and part of the reason is because this is one of the first developments and I'm very concerned about access in terms of emergency vehicles as well as trash trucks and things of that nature. I'm also concerned about the reduced open space and I did review the letter from the other potential developer and I noted that he did not make any commitment for shared open space, although he mentioned it. And I'm – the biggest concern is just the precedential value. I think that if we make significant adjustments here and allowances the – the following developers will expect the same thing. And that's of significant concern for me because I think it can produce quality of life concerns.

Secretary Hart: Further discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we'll move to a vote. All those in favor of the motion as articulated by Commissioner de la Fe, please say aye.

Commissioners de la Fe, Hurley, Migliaccio and Ulfelder: Aye.

Secretary Hart: Those opposed?

Commissioners Keys-Gamarra and Strandlie: Nay.

Secretary Hart: The motion carries. The Chair abstains. I think it's one, two, three, four, five to one, with one abstention.

Commissioner Strandlie: I actually voted nay.

Secretary Hart: Oh, I'm sorry, 4-2, with one abstention. Thank you. Mr. de la Fe?

Commissioner de la Fe: Okay, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE MODIFICATIONS AND WAIVERS THAT WERE HANDED OUT TONIGHT DATED OCTOBER 5TH, 2016, WHICH SHALL BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD FOR THIS CASE.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Second.

Secretary Hart: Seconded by Commissioner Migliaccio. Discussion on that motion?
Commissioner Keys-Gamarra?

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: Oh, I'm sorry. Could he repeat the motion?, I'm sorry, I didn't hear what he said.

Commissioner de la Fe: The – THE MOTION IS TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE MODIFICATIONS AND WAIVERS DATED OCTOBER 5TH, 2016, WHICH SHALL BE MADE A PART OF THIS RECORD.

Secretary Hart: Further discussion on that motion? Seeing none, we'll move to a vote. All in favor of the motion as articulated by Commissioner de la Fe, please say aye.

Commissioners de la Fe, Hurley, Migliaccio and Ulfelder: Aye.

Secretary Hart: Those opposed?

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra and Strandlie: Opposed.

Secretary Hart: Then, Chair abstains again. The same - same division, 4-2 with one.

//

(The motions carried by a vote of 4-2-1. Commissioners Keys-Gamarra and Strandlie opposed. Commissioner Hart abstained. Commissioners Flanagan, Hedetniemi, Lawrence, Murphy and Sargeant were absent from the meeting.)

TMW