Planning Commission Meeting
May 26, 2011
Verbatim Excerpt

ST11-IV-LP1 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (Village of Accotink Special Study) (Mount Vernon District)

Decision Only During Commission Matters
(Public Hearing held on May 11, 2011)

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On the 11th of this month we had a public hearing on an Out-of-Turn Plan Amendment that was requested by Supervisor Hyland. Just as a way of background a little bit on this, the widening of Richmond Highway at the entrance to - - one of the main entrances to Fort Belvoir, Tulley Gate, is going to demolish basically all of the commercial buildings on the other - - at the Village of Accotink that are on Richmond Highway, and so consequence, this seems to be timely - - a good time for the entire community to be replanned. So, that has - - that's what the Out-of-Turn Plan Amendment is going to address this evening. As a result of the public hearing, we had testimony from the residents of the community that they hadn't been consulted and there were a couple of requests on the part of the Land Use Committee of the South County Federation and the Mount Vernon Council that also needed to be addressed so I ask that the decision on that be deferred to this evening in order to get any time to consult and work out those concerns. And I'm happy to report that that has now occurred. And so consequently, I MOVE this evening THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATION, AS FOUND IN AN HANDOUT DATED MAY 26, 2011 [sic]. The handout contains proposed Plan text that was revised since the May 11 public hearing, and the following changes are recommended. Number One, the building heights limited to a maximum of 60 feet along Richmond Highway with height tapering toward the north to foster a transition to the adjoining single-family residences, which area - - some of which are historic. Two, move Lots 28 and 29 from Land Bay C to Land Bay D by changing to a land bay not recommended for redevelopment. The houses - - house on Lot 29, which is recommended for further evaluation for possible inclusion in the Fairfax Inventory of Historic Sites will be afforded protection. That's the reason why I'm doing that. Item Three, add text to allow for the evaluation and analysis of a cul-de-sac. If the cul-de-sac is found to be feasible after studying its impact to traffic operations, it would be located somewhere between Richmond Highway and the Beulah Road split. The cul-de-sac concept has been - - has received strong community support as a way to prevent cut-through traffic. In fact the meeting that I had with the community of the last Friday; they were unanimous in signing a petition requesting that the cul-de-sac be provided in - - at the end of what is now called Backlick Road. They've even requested that the road revert to its original name, Accotink Road, but I'm not including that in the motion tonight because I think that's probably a better part of the eventual rezoning application that will follow on this change in the Comprehensive Plan. And Item Number Four, for Land Bay G change the optional use from office to residential at five to eight dwelling units per acre. The residential use ensures better compatibility with the Accotink United Methodist Church and the surrounding residences. The one landowner who has - - the largest landowners in the area has agreed to this. I mean he likes this new approach and so consequently, I don't have any opposition to that from any of the Land Use Committees or from the community. And

for Land Bay - - for Item Number Five, move the office potential recommended for Land Bay G to Land Bay B. In other words, the 16,000 square feet of office could take the place of an equal amount of residential square footage within that Land Bay, and the office use should be located above ground-floor retail. That's basically within the development up - - the new development that will be built up on Richmond Highway. Item Number Six, the change that I'm recommending is to include specific text that addresses archeological resources. We heard at the public hearing form Sallie Lyons, who recommended this very strongly, and since then there's been a detailed study recommending the same thing so the community - - and the community is in favor of this as well. The proposed text notes that the scope of work should be developed for on-site archeological surveys and proposes additional guidance to steps that should be taken if architectural - - archeological resources are found. Once again, this is one of the two oldest settlements in Fairfax County. The other being Old Colchester down on the Occoquan, and it's a - - it was a previous Indian community of sometime back so this - - one of the things I think they're going to bump into as they start doing the archeological search. Number Seven Item that I'm recommending is, include the safe bicycle connectivity and movement under Circulation and Access, adding that language in there about bicycle as a - - that should be addressed in any rezoning. And then lastly, Item Number Eight, to delete EarthCraft from the Green Buildings recommendation to be consistent with current Policy Plan and revisions under consideration. And that was raised by Commissioner Hart at the last - - at the public hearing, and I recommend that we do as he recommended. So with that now, Mr. Chairman, I - -

Vice Chairman Alcorn: Yes. Let's - - let's - - why don't you restate the motion you - -

Commissioner Flanagan: Okay.

Vice Chairman Alcorn: Yes.

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION, AS FOUND IN THE HANDOUT DATED MAY 26, 2011 [sic].

Commissioner Litzenberger: Second.

Vice Chairman Alcorn: For - - and this is for which case - - for which?

Commissioner Flanagan: That's for ST11-IV-LP1.

Vice Chairman Alcorn: Thank you. The motion's been made.

Commissioner Litzenberger: Second.

Vice Chairman Alcorn: Seconded by Commissioner Litzenberger. Any discussion?

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman Alcorn: Mr. Sargeant.

Commissioner Sargeant: Okay. I'm assuming it's this document, which is dated MAY 24TH. I just want to make sure we're all on the same page.

Commissioner Flanagan: That one. The - - everything that's highlighted in yellow are the changes that I just discussed.

Commissioner Sargeant: Okay. I second.

Vice Chairman Alcorn: Okay. Seconded also by Commissioner Sargeant. Any - - any additional discussion?

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman Alcorn: Commissioner Hall and then Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hall: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was not - - Mr. Chairman, I was not present for the public hearing. I will be abstaining.

Vice Chairman Alcorn: As will I. Commissioner Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to ask a question before we were on the verbatim, but I guess we're on the verbatim.

Vice Chairman Alcorn: We're on the verbatim.

Commissioner Hart: In the - - the - - the last yellow paragraph on page 7, in the first sentence, is the word "architectural" intentional? I mean the rest of that paragraph was about archaeological, I mean maybe it is architectural, I just want to - -

Commissioner Sargeant: I think - - I believe it is archaeological.

Commissioner Hart: Well, that's why I asked. Because I thought you said "archaeological" but then that one place it says "architectural."

Commissioner Flanagan: No, it is definitely "archeological."

Commissioner Hart: It's - -

Marianne Gardner, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: Mr. Chairman? If I may - -

Commissioner Flanagan: Staff.

Ms. Gardner: clarify.

Commissioner Hart: Ms. Gardner is saying something.

Vice Chairman Alcorn: Yes, please.

Ms. Gardner: Thank you. I'm Marianne Gardner with DPZ.

Vice Chairman Alcorn: Oh, there you are.

Ms. Gardner: Hi. The - - we did mean it to be "architectural" because it's talking about which department would get consulted for the different actions. We'd like to be consulted in there are architectural surveys, but the staff from Cultural Resource Management and Protection Services would be consulted on archeological work.

Vice Chairman Alcorn: Okay.

Commissioner Hart: Yes. That's - - that's fine. I just - - I want to make sure that was the right word.

Vice Chairman Alcorn: Okay. Any additional discussion? All those in favor of the motion as articulated by Commissioner Flanagan, please say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Vice Chairman Alcorn: All opposed? That motion carries.

//

(The motion carried by a vote of 8-0-2 with Commissioners Alcorn and Hall abstaining; Commissioners de la Fe and Murphy absent from the meeting.)

KAD