Planning Commission Meeting
April 30, 2008
Verbatim Excerpt

SCREENING OF BRAC APR NOMINATIONS

During Commission Matters

Chairman Murphy: Moving into the last item of our Commission business will be the screening of the BRAC APR nominations. As you know, we have assembled a task force of 18 citizens; 5 from the Lee District; 5 from Mount Vernon; 5 from Springfield; and 3 at-large members appointed by the Chairman, to review nominations in designated areas in and around Fort Belvoir that would, in effect, spin-off from the elevation in building and residences and people who will be assigned to Fort Belvoir as a result of BRAC. Tonight we have – what is it, 38?

Marianne Gardner, Department of Planning and Zoning: Thirty-nine.

Chairman Murphy: Thirty-nine Plan amendments. The amendments are divided almost equally between the Lee District and the Mount Vernon District. We are simply screening them tonight which will push these applications into the Task Force for review prior to going to the District homeowners associations, civic associations, umbrella groups, to review them before they come to public hearing before the Planning Commission. To do that, I will call on a committee member of the BRAC Planning Commission Committee, Mr. Sargeant, please.

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To begin the screening process, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLVE ITSELF INTO A COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING SCREENING DECISIONS ON PENDING BRAC APR NOMINATIONS IN THE LEE AND MOUNT VERNON DISTRICTS.

Commissioners Alcorn and de la Fe: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Commissioners de la Fe and Alcorn. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion –

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman? I would like to ask for some staff comments prior to that. They have some additional comments.

Commissioner Hart: We need to vote first.

Chairman Murphy: All those in favor of the motion to resolve us into a committee of the whole, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Mr. Sargeant.

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At this point I would like to ask for some staff comments regarding this.

BRAC APR NOMINATIONS

Ms. Gardner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. I am Marianne Gardner with the Department of Planning and Zoning and I am accompanied by Lindsay Mason, also with the Department of Planning and Zoning. Last week the Commission received information about the 39 nominations that were submitted as part of the BRAC Area Plan Review Process. Under guidelines adopted by the Commission, these nominations are to be screened by the Commission to determine whether the nomination would go forward to the BRAC Area Plans Task Force, be deferred to a special study, or eliminated from further review. Tonight staff has provided you with an updated description of the nominations. As stated in our memo dated April 23rd, of the 39 received, one has been withdrawn, one was rejected as it was outside the area established for the nominations, and of the remaining 37, staff recommends that 36 be forwarded to the Task Force for review and that one, which is number 08-IV-6FS be deferred for consideration as part of the ongoing Plan Amendment which is focused on the Springfield Mall, as the nominated site is located in proximity to the mall. These recommendations are contained in tonight's handout dated April 30th. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you very much. Mr. Sargeant.

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I WOULD MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH THE RECOMMENDATION SET FORTH IN THE STAFF SUMMARY OF THE 2008 BRAC APR NOMINATIONS DATED APRIL 30TH, 2008, EXCEPT AS MAY BE NOTED.

Commissioner Lusk: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Lusk. Is there a discussion of the motion? Mr. Lusk.

Commissioner Lusk: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to counter any of the recommendations that have been made by the staff. I will bring the Commission's attention to page 6 of the handout that actually lists each of the nominations. And on page 6, you will see one that is highlighted in blue and this is the nomination that was actually rejected by the staff because it did not meet the boundary and parameter guidelines as set by the Planning Commission and ultimately the Board of Supervisors. But I would note that the location of this particular Plan Amendment is adjacent to a development called Metro Park. And Metro Park is one of the largest office developments in our District. It has approximately 700,000 square feet of office uses. Once it is fully built-out, we will have close to 1.2 million square feet. That park is immediately adjacent to this 11.55 acres and I think when we think about BRAC, the decision that is yet to be made on the GSA Warehouse site will be very specific with regard to the site. You can actually walk from the site to the Metro. It's roughly a little less than a mile and I think it is uniquely situated. It will be the intent of Supervisor Jeff McKay to have this item come back as an Out-of-Turn Plan Amendment. I will certainly be looking forward to it being included in the review that will be undertaken by this BRAC Committee. So just wanted to give the Planning Commission a "heads-up." Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: Is that all you have? No amendments or anything?

Commissioner Lusk: No amendments. I'm okay with the other recommendations. Okay, without objection.

Commissioner Harsel: Now wait a minute. What are we doing?

Chairman Murphy: We are just moving – he's accepting all of the recommendations.

Commissioner Harsel: Now wait a minute.

Commissioner de la Fe: I have a question.

Chairman Murphy: Hold on a second. Mr. de la Fe.

Commissioner de la Fe: My question of Commissioner Lusk.

Commissioner Lusk: Sure.

Commissioner de la Fe: If the intention of the Supervisor is to propose this as an Out-of-Turn Plan Amendment, I understand the rationale, you know, because of the boundary –

Commissioner Lusk: Correct.

Commissioner de la Fe: -- dispute – not dispute but because of the limits that were set. But would it also be appropriate – I don't know, and I would ask staff. I don't know what kind of damage it does to the process to include it in this process since the intention of the Supervisor is to have it considered as part of it – since it's already – I don't know.

Commissioner Lusk: Well –

Commissioner de la Fe: I defer to you and to staff on that but it's here. Why go through the extra process?

Commissioner Lusk: We've had a protracted conversation about this item. Obviously, the intent, if it were feasible, is that we would be able to just push this nomination, literally push it into the BRAC Study. The issue is that there are some legal implications in doing that.

Commissioner de la Fe: Okay.

Commissioner Lusk: And therefore, we can't push it into the study. But we will be able to have the Board review it and make that recommendation at a later date. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion on the Lee District items? Mrs. Harsel.

Commissioner Harsel: Okay. A couple of questions. Number one, who set the guidelines for the areas that would be included in the BRAC Study? I want this on the record.

Ms. Gardner: The Planning Commission.

Commissioner Harsel: The Planning Commission did. And when will the BRAC Plan Amendments come for public hearing before the Planning Commission?

Ms. Gardner: They are scheduld for two times. The first batch will come to you before the end of the year. There may be a second batch that comes to you later because of the need for them to go through the VDOT 527 review which takes some extra time.

Commissioner Harsel: Okay. But this area is also, it just dawned on me, is considered South County, correct?

Ms. Gardner: Yes.

Commissioner Harsel: Yes. So the Plan review for South County isn't for two more years.

Ms. Gardner: Yes, that's correct. At least. Yes, we'll go through North County first and then take up the South County again.

Commissioner Harsel: Okay. All right. Now my question, where I was confused, with the elegant speech, was are you recommending it be included in the BRAC Study or are you just making editorial comments for us to be prepared?

Commissioner Lusk: I think my desire is that it would be included in the BRAC Study. I recognize that we can't as a Planning Commission actually push it into that study. So I'm giving you, I guess, the advance warning notice that it will be a part, hopefully once the Board takes its action, a part of this study. And it should be. I think reasonably, if we had known that there was interest with this particular property, prior to setting the boundaries and parameters for this process, we would have certainly included this area in the Study boundaries. The difficulty is that we couldn't figure out where the nominations were going to be coming from in advance of this process.

Commissioner Harsel: I think that is reasonable. And I think everyone else has followed the guidelines and stayed within and if this one wants to be part of BRAC, then they can come in as an Out-of-Turn. But just as long as we are not breaking our rules and the guidelines and the parameters that we have set, then I'm comfortable with that. I have no problem. My other question is, what is this one that we have attached that Ms. Strobel has amended from 16 to 8 parcels? What number? I don't find that number. I don't find that listed or I'm not tracking it. It didn't have a number.

Ms. Gardner: It's still listed with its Planning Commission number. I'll just find the page for you.

Commissioner Harsel: I know it's 36, but I can't find it.

Ms. Gardner: The concern was, while we are looking for the page, was that this nomination included some parcels that are outside the approved sewer service area and we were working with the nominator to make that correction. As a result, the nomination wasn't put in your book. The description of that is shown on page 6 of your handout. It's the first one on that page. It's at the top. It says "No APR number assigned." That's it.

Commissioner Harsel: Okay. So that has to be – and where do we insert that one in the book?

Chairman Murphy: Hold on. Let me finish.. This one you are talking about is in the Mount Vernon District.

Commissioner Harsel: Oh, is it? I'm sorry. Okay.

Chairman Murphy: I want to get any more comments on the Lee District.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: I had a question. I'm assuming that one of the yellow ones is in Lee District.

Ms. Gardner: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Hart: Whatever it is we are doing tonight, the fact that it's yellow and needs clarification, doesn't matter?

Ms. Gardner: That's right.

Commissioner Hart: You can fix it later, whatever it is?

Ms. Gardner: Yes. There are two that still need a little clarification. But it's not substantive.

Commissioner Hart: Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Anything else on Lee District?

Commissioner Alcorn: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Alcorn.

Commissioner Alcorn: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: We're on verbatim, everyone.

Commissioner Alcorn: This is Lee. It's also Mount Vernon. I am supportive of this whole process but I would just note in reviewing the amount of density that has been proposed throughout, I would caution everybody's expectations about how much of this would actually ultimately ever find its way into the Comprehensive Plan. So just a note. Thank you.

Commissioner Harsel: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: All right. Lee District.

Commissioner Harsel: No, Mount Vernon.

Chairman Murphy: Let me finish. Without objection on the Lee District. Mount Vernon District. Mr. Flanagan.

Commissioner Flanagan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have only four items. The first one is a clarification which I would like the staff to provide the Commission. There is one nomination on the east side of Route 1, on the east side of Hassett Street, the south end of Route 1, that was not included in the published book. The staff neither rejected it or accepted it as I understand it. So could you clarify that nomination on the east side of Route 1?

Commissioner Lusk: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Lusk.

Commissioner Lusk: For my own personal edification, which nomination are we referring to? What page is it on and what number is it?

Commissioner Flanagan: As I said, it's not in the book.

Commissioner Lusk: Oh. But is it on this sheet – the four pages?

Commissioner Flanagan: No, I don't think so.

Chairman Murphy: Marianne.

Commissioner Hart: Is it on the map?

Ms. Gardner: Everything that we received, except for the one that was withdrawn because it was editorial and the one that Commissioner Lusk has –

Commissioner Flanagan: This is the one that slightly has a – some of the nomination was outside the sewer service area.

Ms. Gardner: Oh, yes. That's the one that we were just talking about. I'm sorry. It has been corrected and is recommended to go forward into the process.

Commissioner Flanagan: So we will have one nomination added to –

Ms. Gardner: No, no. It's already included.

Commissioner Flanagan: It's already included.

Ms. Gardner: Yes, and that was the nomination that was handed to you tonight.

Commissioner Flanagan: It isn't in the published blue book.

Ms. Gardner: That's right, because we were working to amend it. But it is in your package tonight.

Commissioner de la Fe: That's the one we just got.

Commissioner Flanagan: Oh, all right. I have a copy of that.

Chairman Murphy: WITHOUT OBJECTION.

Commissioner Flanagan: The other comments I have are – I had no serious problems with any of the nominations, but there were some clarifications which I discussed with staff. I sent you an email that would help anyone reading the nominations be oriented to where the site is of the nomination. There is a – so I've requested that each nomination of the Southeast Fairfax Development Corporation include a map of the Northern Gateway or the Woodlawn Community Business Center. Each of these centers has the same subunit nomenclature. That is there is an A1 in both of them. So when it just talks about unit A1 you don't know which community business center it is in so having a map of the Northern Gateway and the Woodlawn Community Business Center added to those nominations would be of great assistance to anyone picking up the nominations for the first time. In each of them at the top of the page it mentions a subunit, like A2, A1, B1, B2, and it would be helpful if the CBC that it is in was published ahead of each of those units or "A1 in the Northern Gateway" or "A1 in the Woodlawn Community Business Center." Then they have provided – the applicant, or the nominator, has included aerial pictures that included representations of their nominations that are outside the nomination. So it is confusing as to what is in the nomination and what is outside the nomination and I have asked

the nominator to provide staff with shading of those buildings that are not in the nomination so that only the nominated portion of the representation, the three-dimensional representations, and what they are proposing will be under consideration by the casual reader. So with those three things which I think staff and the SFDC have agreed to do, those are the only changes I would have for the nominations.

Chairman Murphy: Marianne, are you okay with that?

Ms. Gardner: Yes, we can easily do the first two and I have been in contact with SFDC to see if we can get the shading on the map corrected. We are under a bit of a deadline to get the new nominations books to the printing house. So if we can get that soon enough, we will. If not, we will still place it on the web when we have the clarified map and we will also include it with our preliminary staff report.

Commissioner Flanagan: Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: WITHOUT OBJECTION. Mr. Sargeant.

Commissioner Sargeant: We have the last motion?

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Commissioner Sargeant: I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RATIFY ALL MOTIONS MADE THIS EVENING CONCERNING THE SCREENING OF PENDING BRAC APR NOMINATIONS IN THE LEE AND MOUNT VERNON DISTRICTS.

Commissioners Lusk and Flanagan: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Lusk. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to ratify the considerations this evening, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Harsel: Mr. Flanagan.

Commissioner Flanagan: Both of us.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Lusk did too and Mr. Flanagan. This in essence, I think, means that the next meeting of the Task Force is May 13 at the John Marshall Library on Rose Hill Drive and it

will be the first evening that the Task Force will receive the nominations and be presented with the nominations as a result of the screening process this evening.

//

(The motions carried unanimously.)

LBR