

Planning Commission Meeting
July 15, 2009
Verbatim Excerpt

BRAC APR 08-IV-1MV – Mount Vernon District

Markup Session (Public Hearing held on June 17, 2009)

Commissioner Flanagan: APR Item 08-IV-1MV proposes to add Plan text that would retain the current uses on the site of 443 multifamily units in a high-rise, and add 310 new multifamily units; 202,000 square feet of office space; 110,000 square feet of hotel space; and 21,800 square feet of retail space in a mixed-use development at an intensity up to 2.7 FAR. The Task Force recommended an alternative without the proposed new residential component and at an intensity of up to 2.0 FAR, with conditions relating to parks and recreation, telecommunications equipment, environmental protection, and maintaining a transportation level of service of "D" at the intersection of Huntington Avenue and Richmond Highway. The Task Force voted - - vote was 13 in favor, 4 opposed, and 1 abstention. Staff recommended denial of the proposed nomination after the 527 transportation analysis, which noted the subject area is more than a 1/2 mile distance from the Metro Center, potential land taking for the planned grade separated interchange at the intersection of Huntington Avenue and Richmond Highway, that higher intensities such as that proposed should be near the Transit Station, and that proposed - - and that the proposed nomination contains sufficient development beyond that which is needed to serve BRAC demand. I think you all got a copy of that estimate on the part of the staff where we had, you know, greatly exceeded the - - the needs of BRAC, with most of the other nominations that we already considered. Staff originally proposed an alternative also for an intensity up to 1.5 FAR, but the nominator chose not to pursue this option. Based on public hearing testimony from Transportation staff that recommended denial of the proposed nomination without the maintenance of LOS at the level of service at "D" or better at the intersection of Huntington Avenue and Richmond Highway and the construction of the planned interchange, the Mount Vernon Council Land Use Committee voted that approval should only be granted on the condition of maintaining the Huntington Avenue/Route 1 intersection at Level of Service "D," and the need to support County policy that intensity of this sort should be concentrated at transit centers and evidence late in the Task Force process that disclosed an excess of planned space for the needs of the BRAC-related functions. I'd also like to note that I had spoken to the engineer for the Woodrow Wilson Bridge that has redesigned the two intersections at Huntington - - Route 1 intersections at Huntington and Fort Hunt. They will not have a realistic level of service prediction for those two intersections until October of this year. I think that that's going to better guide some of the nominations that will be coming in through the South County APR process. So, Mr. Chairman, although I hope the nominator will take the staff recommendation and submit another nomination during the current South County APR process, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION SUPPORT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS [sic] THAT THEY DENY BRAC APR ITEM 08-IV-1MV.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Wait, we're not recommending - - you got to move the staff position. We're not going to recommend to the Board because the Board - - if this is denial - - recommend the staff position, which is to deny - -

Commissioner Harsel: Retain the Plan.

Chairman Murphy: - - deny it. You're going to retain the Plan. It's dead here. It doesn't go to the Board, so we don't have to recommend to the Board.

Commissioner Flanagan: Oh, okay. All right.

Chairman Murphy: So, the motion should be, I MOVE THE STAFF POSITION. Is that correct?

Commissioner Harsel: You have to retain the Plan.

Chairman Murphy: RETAIN THE PLAN. Okay? Is that the motion?

Commissioner Flanagan: That's the motion.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. All right. Without objection. Just for the record, I received a letter from Jay Spiegel, who was the Vice Chairman of the Task Force, and he believes that the Task Force recommendation should be adopted, and I will just leave that with the - - with the clerk. Also, I understand there was a little bit discrepancy. I'm not quite clear how this came about between how the analysis was done between the two levels of density. So, I don't want to get into that now and the big staff analysis, but I do think that this will be further evaluated if the applicant decided - - decides to re-nominate this particular nomination during the South County process.

Commissioner Alcorn: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Alcorn.

Commissioner Alcorn: Just quickly to follow up. I just want to clarify with staff. Would the - - would this nomination be nominatable in South County APR? Could it come back?

Marianne Gardner: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Alcorn: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Harsel: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: All right. Yes.

Commissioner Harsel: I want to follow up on that. I - - under what grounds or do we have different things since this is BRAC because I thought once a Plan amendment was denied, they couldn't come back for a year or so?

Commissioner de la Fe: No.

Ms. Gardner: It's only if the Comprehensive Plan is amended that it cannot be re-nominated in the following cycle. Or, if it's been deferred to a special study so it's still under consideration.

Commissioner Flanagan: Right.

Ms. Gardner: But if the Plan is not amended, it - - the site may be re-nominated in the following cycle.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. Without objection.

Commissioner Harsel: The following cycle.

Chairman Murphy: South County.

Ms. Gardner: Which is in this case is the South County cycle.

Commissioner Harsel: The South County cycle. Okay. So, that - - oh that will be really strange.

Chairman Murphy: Without objection.

//

(The motion carried unanimously with Commissioner Hall absent from the meeting.)

KAD

Planning Commission Meeting
July 15, 2009
Verbatim Excerpt

BRAC APR 08-IV-3MV – Mount Vernon District

Markup Session (Public Hearing held on June 17, 2009)

Commissioner Flanagan: For BRAC nomination 08-IV-3MV, staff and the Task Force recommended approval of similar alternatives to the original nomination, which proposed residential, office, and restaurant/retail mixed use up to 3.0 FAR to a height of 165 feet. This site is right next to the Metro tracks at the Huntington Station. The staff alternative includes an intensity range of 2.0 to 3.0 FAR, limits the residential component to approximately 50 percent of the development, and adds conditions related to site design, affordable housing, restoration of the RPA - - the Cameron Run runs right on one side of this property, and parks, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, green building features, and Transit Oriented Development guidelines, since it is in the transit - - right next to the transit. Staff also recommends expanding the existing Transit Development Area boundary to include this site. Oddly enough, the boundary didn't include a small portion of this site, but they're recommending that the map be changed. The Task Force alternative supports an intensity range of 1.0 to 3.0 FAR, imposes a height limit of 150 feet, and limits the residential component to 40 percent of the development. The alternative also adds conditions that address parks and recreation, telecommunications equipment screening, restoration of the RPA, and adherence to the Transit Oriented Development guidelines. I support the staff alternative, with the inclusion of the telecommunications screening condition proposed by the Task Force. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, FOR ITEM 08-IV-3MV, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION ALTERNATIVE [sic], FOUND BELOW.

Chairman Murphy: Without objection. Is that the staff alternative?

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. STAFF ALTERNATIVE, AS AMENDED. Without objection.

//

(The motion carried unanimously with Commissioner Hall absent from the meeting.)

KAD

Planning Commission Meeting
July 15, 2009
Verbatim Excerpt

BRAC APR 08-IV-4MV – Mount Vernon District

Markup Session (Public Hearing held on June 17, 2009)

Commissioner Flanagan: All right. We're ripping right along here. The APR Item 08-IV-4MV proposes to add Plan text that would retain the current uses on the site and add 602 new multi-family units and approximately 35,000 square feet of first floor retail/restaurant uses and structured parking up to 1.65 FAR. The - - this is a high-rise project of three high-rise buildings. The Task Force recommended approval of the nomination as submitted and added four conditions that addressed parks and recreation, telecommunications equipment screening, interparcel vehicle access, and restoration of the RPA. Staff recommended denial of the proposed nomination after a VDOT 527 transportation analysis. Preliminary staff approval was considered by the Task Force, subject to four conditions that addressed shuttle service, RPA/EQC restoration, internal circulation, and dedication of recreational parkland. And based on the public hearing testimony, including that of the Transportation staff approval of 4MV, the Huntington Community Association testified here in favor of this proposal, and the Mount Vernon District Land Use Committee which also testified - - presented testimony in favor of this proposal, I support the Task Force recommendation with the inclusion of a condition relating to the transportation level of service for the intersection of Huntington Avenue and Richmond Highway and the condition for the telecommunications equipment. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, FOR APR ITEM 08-IV-4MV, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE NOMINATION WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATION.

Chairman Murphy: All right. TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATION, AS AMENDED.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Commissioner Hart: Can I ask staff on this one?

Chairman Murphy: Sure.

Commissioner Hart: Is staff supporting what's in this handout or - - or not?

Marianne Gardner: We do not. We stand by our original recommendation that the Comprehensive Plan should be retained. And I would just like to clarify that Transportation staff indicated that if all the nominations that the Planning Commission is considering tonight on Huntington Avenue are approved, then that would trigger the need for an interchange at Richmond Highway and Huntington Avenue, as well as the widening of Huntington. And - - and so I - - am - - concerned that perhaps, inadvertently, the - - based on public hearing testimony, including that of Transportation staff approving 4MV that that may be a bit misleading.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Could we vote on this one separately? Is that permissible?

Commissioner de la Fe: Sure.

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Commissioner Hart: Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Are you recommending - - your motion is the staff alternative, as amended?

Commissioner Harsel: No, no.

Chairman Murphy: It's not?

Commissioner Hart: Staff wants denial, I think.

Chairman Murphy: I mean, the Task Force - -

Commissioner Flanagan: No, THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATION.

Chairman Murphy: - - recommendation, as amended.

Commissioner Flanagan: AS AMENDED.

Chairman Murphy: All right.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. de la Fe.

Commissioner de la Fe: I just have a question and - - and it's just a - - a technical question that we are - - the current Plan - - you know, we usually say, x number of units per acre, and so on and so forth. This one specifies a specific number of multi-family high-rise or low-rise units. Does that mean that anything that has less than 1,824 would not conform to the Plan? Because, you know, it normally would say, up to or no more than or approximately. But to say, 1,824 period. You know, if - - if they came in with 1,823 and a half, you would have to deny it because it doesn't conform to the Plan. So, I - - that's just a technical question. I mean, I - - I won't get into the - - the transportation issues and that. I'm just talking about that specific.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Lawrence.

Commissioner Lawrence: I have a question for staff.

Commissioner Lusk: Mic.

Commissioner Lawrence: I have a question for staff. At a committee meeting the other night, we were discussing a situation in which the Plan allows intensities that are out of balance with the supporting infrastructure, in this case, transportation. And it was pointed out that - - that inadequate transportation facilities are not grounds for denial of a rezoning application under such a Plan. Is that your understanding?

Ms. Gardner: I would prefer not to speak to a rezoning, but in terms of the Comprehensive Plan, it's totally within the purview of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors not to support a suggested Comprehensive Plan change if it is not going to be supported by the appropriate infrastructure.

Commissioner Lawrence: So, the Plan, in your view, should depict a balance between growth and infrastructure. Is that - - is that correct?

Ms. Gardner: That's correct.

Commissioner Lawrence: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Alcorn.

Commissioner Alcorn: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a quick question for Mr. Flanagan. I - - there was some discussion at the public hearing about whether this was transit-oriented development. And to me, it looks like it probably is outside of a reasonable walking distance from the Huntington Metro Station, so I would assume by your motion that this stands alone apart from any proximity to transit that this stands alone, not as transit-oriented development but as just a - - a change to the Plan that's worthy of itself. Is that - - is that your thinking?

Commissioner Flanagan: I think so.

Commissioner Alcorn: Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: All right. So, the staff is recommending retain the Plan. Is that correct? Just to make sure we got the - - .

Ms. Gardner: That's correct.

Chairman Murphy: And Mr. Flanagan is recommending the Task Force recommendation, as amended with the telecommunications and whatnot.

Commissioner Harsel: No, that was the last one.

Chairman Murphy: All right. You want to vote on this? I guess a vote was called for. So, all those in favor of the motion made by Mr. Flanagan to accept the Task Force recommendation, as amended, say aye.

Commissioners Flanagan and Litzenberger: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed?

Commissioners Donahue, Hart, and Lawrence: Nay.

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, abstain.

Chairman Murphy: All right. Division. Mr. Donahue?

Commissioner Donahue: Nay.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Sargeant?

Commissioner Sargeant: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Lawrence?

Commissioner Lawrence: Nay.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Lusk?

Commissioner Lusk: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Alcorn?

Commissioner Alcorn: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Ms. Harsel?

Commissioner Harsel: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. de la Fe?

Commissioner de la Fe: I will abstain because of that 1,824 number.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Hart?

Commissioner Hart: No.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Flanagan?

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Litzenberger?

Commissioner Litzenberger: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: And the Chair abstains and the motion fails 3-2 and the rest abstain. Okay?
Anyone want to make an alternative motion?

Commissioner Alcorn: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Alcorn.

Commissioner Alcorn: Yes, I move that - - that the Planning Commission reconsider and table the motion for further consideration.

Commissioner Litzenberger: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Or, do you want to just vote the staff alternative and move to the Board?

Commissioner Harsel: There's no staff alternative.

Commissioner Flanagan: There is no staff alternative.

Chairman Murphy: I mean, the staff recommendation is to retain the Plan and not - - you want to consider it? You want to have it reconsidered?

Commissioner Alcorn: And defer it for future time.

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, let's consider deferral.

Chairman Murphy: Okay.

Commissioner Alcorn: Yes. So, I'd MOVE THAT WE RECONSIDER, table the motion, AND DEFER IT INDEFINITELY.

Commissioner Harsel: We would not table it.

Chairman Murphy: Well, we don't table it. All those in favor of the motion to defer indefinitely APR - - BRAC APR 08-IV-4MV, and the MOTION IS TO DEFER IT INDEFINITELY FOR FURTHER STUDY, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

//

(The first motion failed by a vote of 2-3-6 with Commissioners Flanagan and Litzenberger in favor; Commissioners Donahue, Hart, and Lawrence opposed; Commissioners Alcorn, de la Fe, Harsel, Lusk, Murphy, and Sargeant abstaining; Commissioner Hall absent from the meeting.)

(The second motion carried unanimously with Commissioner Hall absent from the meeting.)

KAD

Planning Commission Meeting
July 15, 2009
Verbatim Excerpt

BRAC APR 08-IV-9S – Mount Vernon District

Markup Session (Public Hearing held on June 17, 2009)

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to say before I move the motion that the nomination 9S, APR Task Force recommended approval of the nomination for office and industrial use at an intensity up to .33 FAR. And that's on 56 acres, with additional conditions such as protecting EQC and limiting building heights, if necessary, to accommodate activities on the Davison Army Airfield, which is nearby. Staff recommendation at - - on - - recommends an alternative for office and industrial use at a lesser intensity of up to .20 FAR on the 56 acres, as a means to better achieve these conditions. Development at the lesser intensity would be consistent with the current Plan guidance to provide an appropriate transition to the industrial area to the north and the less intense industrial, office, and residential uses to the southwest. Furthermore, at a development intensity that is significantly lower than the original nomination, transportation impacts can be more readily mitigated. This nomination offers a benefit to Fairfax County by affording the opportunity to preserve an environmentally sensitive area. That's a 62-acre EQC that runs along Accotink Creek that basically surrounds this property. I support the staff alternative but recommend additional conditions be included to address heavy industrial uses, outdoor storage, construction of a new publicly available lighted athletic field or improvement of an existing field, screening and buffering, access to Cinder Bed Road, and phasing of development. The Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations and the South County Federation Citizens' Association support the staff recommendations and the new conditions. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, FOR ITEM 08-IV-9S, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION ALTERNATIVE, INCLUDED BELOW.

Chairman Murphy: Without objection.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Commissioner Hart: On this one, can I ask staff a question - -

Chairman Murphy: Sure.

Commissioner Hart: - - on tonight's handout? Maybe, Ms. Gardner. On page 8, the fourth paragraph. Does staff support the language about giving the Newington Community Association a veto over this?

Marianne Gardner: It is a bit more specific than we would normally support and could be a concern.

Commissioner Hart: So, is that a "no"?

Ms. Gardner: Well, we view the Plan as a guide and so, I would say that we would be very willing to work with the Newington Community Association in the review of the rezoning application to try to make sure that their concerns are met.

Commissioner Hart: Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: I think the danger here is that the Newington Association, with all due respect to all those great citizens down there, might not consider this statement as a guide. That's the problem I have with it.

Commissioner Flanagan: But this was a recommendation, Mr. Chairman, that the - - kind of a quid pro quo with the applicant. The applicant gains something here by including this language in here, so it isn't just the Newington Civic Association [sic], but the applicant gains something as well.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes. Mr. Hart, yes.

Commissioner Hart: Thank you. I don't know that there's an applicant on a Plan amendment. This text goes in. It's permanent. It could apply to anybody later. This - - this kind of gets into some of the same "should, shall" expectation problems that we had before. And if we start putting in, in one part of the County that a certain community association has a veto over this or that, everybody's going to want it and then that raises everyone's expectations. And I don't - - I mean that paragraph jumped out at me. I don't think that necessarily belongs in the Plan. I think we could say something about outdoor storage being screened, but giving a specific group a specific veto over something is - - is going somewhere I think we don't want to.

Commissioner Harsel: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Ms. Harsel, then Mr. Alcorn.

Commissioner Harsel: Two comments. I'm trying to read here, all I see is "to the satisfaction of the surrounding community including but not limited to the Newington...." Is that the one that's Mr. Hart's concern?

Commissioner Hart: Yes. I mean, we're saying it's not permitted unless it's to the satisfaction of this community including this specific association and that seemed very unusual.

Commissioner Harsel: I think as my second comment. I just want to make sure I have the right thing because I don't read it as a veto of power. My second comment is this. As the County becomes more developed and more built out, it's nice to have a guide, but I think also, more and

more communities are going to come forth and, you know, they have been stung. And that's not the word I want to use, but I'm not going to use the other word because I don't want a phone call from that School Board member again. But - - I think they're becoming more protective. I don't read this as a veto of power. I mean, we've done a lot of things where associations have - - they rule things like this and they've come forth. This is on - - when we've gone to rezoning and the association has an agreement or something. This is up to whoever brings the rezoning to make sure everyone's comfortable, but as I said, we've been stung a couple of times and I don't see that this says they have veto power - - but then.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Alcorn.

Commissioner Alcorn: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I - - the - - the piece that bothers me a little bit is the specific reference of a specific community association.

Chairman Murphy: Yes, me too.

Commissioner Alcorn: I would - - I would be more comfortable with, frankly, if there were A PERIOD AFTER "TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITY." I think that is more consistent with guidance that we're looking for in the Plan. But, just a thought.

Commissioner Lawrence: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Hold on. Let me see. Mr. Flanagan, you want to accept that?

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes, I want to ACCEPT THAT AS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT.

Chairman Murphy: All right.

Commissioner Lawrence: Second to the friendly amendment.

Chairman Murphy: All right. Without objection, this will be to RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD WITH THE PROVISION stated by Mr. Alcorn THAT WE PUT A PERIOD AFTER "COMMUNITY." Okay? We're ready? Marianne? Okay.

//

(The motions carried unanimously with Commissioner Hall absent from the meeting.)

KAD

MOTIONS
PLANNING COMMISSION BRAC APR MARKUP
JULY 15, 2009

Planning Commissioner Earl Flanagan
Mount Vernon District

Provided is a handout that contains my motions for consideration this evening. If a Plan change is recommended, the draft Plan text follows the motion. I am requesting that the Clerk to the Planning Commission include the motions with draft Plan text in their entirety as part of the minutes and verbatim that is sent to the Board of Supervisors

APR Item 08-IV-1MV: (Southwest Corner of Richmond Highway (Rt. 1) and Huntington Avenue)

APR Item 08-IV-1MV proposes to add Plan text that would retain the current uses on the site of 443 multifamily units, and add 310 new multifamily units, 202,000 square feet of office space, 110,000 square feet of hotel space and 21,800 square feet of retail space in a mixed-use development at an intensity up to 2.7 FAR.

The Task Force recommended an alternative without the proposed new residential component at an intensity up to 2.0 FAR, with conditions relating to parks and recreation, telecommunications equipment, environmental protection and maintaining a transportation level of service of "D" at the intersection of Huntington Avenue and Richmond Highway. The Task Force vote was 13 in favor, 4 opposed and 1 abstention.

Staff recommended denial of the proposed nomination after 527 transportation analysis, noting the subject area is more than a ½ mile distance from Huntington Metro Center, potential land taking for the planned grade separated interchange at the intersection of Huntington Avenue and Richmond Highway, that higher intensities such as that proposed should be nearer the Transit Station, and that proposed nomination contains sufficient development beyond that which is needed to serve BRAC demand. Staff originally proposed an alternative for and intensity up to 1.5 FAR, but the nominator chose not to pursue this option.

Based on public hearing testimony from transportation staff that recommended denial of the proposed nomination without the maintenance of LOS at D or better at the intersection of Huntington Avenue and Richmond Highway and the construction of the planned interchange, the Mount Vernon Council land use committee voted that approval should only be granted on the condition of maintaining the Huntington Avenue/Route 1 intersection at a Level of Service D, and the need to support County policy that intensity of this sort should be concentrated at Transit Centers and evidence late in the Task Force process that disclosed an excess of planned space for the needs of BRAC related functions.

Mr. Chairman, although I hope the nominator will take the staff recommendation and submit another nomination during the current South County APR process, I move that the Planning Commission support the staff recommendation and recommend to the Board of Supervisors that they deny BRAC APR item 08-IV-1MV.

BRAC APR Item 08-IV-3MV (Northwest corner of Huntington Avenue and Metroview Drive)

For BRAC 08-IV-3MV, Staff and the Task Force recommended approval of similar alternatives to the original nomination, which proposed residential, office and restaurant/retail mixed use up to 3.0 FAR to a height of 165 feet.

The Staff alternative includes an intensity range of 2.0 – 3.0 FAR, limits the residential component to approximately 50% of the development, and adds conditions related to site design, affordable housing, restoration of the RPA, parks, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, green building features, and Transit Oriented Development guidelines. Staff also recommends expanding the existing Transit Development Area boundary to include this site.

The Task Force alternative supports an intensity range of 1.0 – 3.0 FAR, imposes a height limit of 150 feet and limits the residential component to 40% of the development. The alternative also adds conditions that address parks and recreation, telecommunications equipment screening, restoration of the RPA, and adherence to Transit Oriented Development guidelines.

I support the Staff alternative with the inclusion of the telecommunications screening condition proposed by the Task Force.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, for Item 08-IV-3MV, I move that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Planning Commission alternative, found below.

BRAC APR Nomination 08-IV-3MV

MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2007 Edition, Area IV, Mount Vernon Planning District as amended through 1-26-09; MV-1 Huntington Community Planning Sector, Land Units G, H, I, J, and K, page 100:

(Additions are shown underlined; deletions are shown with ~~striketrough~~.)

“Land Unit G is a triangle of land that is bounded by Huntington Avenue, Cameron Run and the Metrorail guideway. It is developed with office and industrial uses and, except as noted below, is planned for redevelopment to office use with an FAR up to .30 and a maximum height of 40 feet. This reflects the majority of current development in this land unit. The uses on Parcel 45 are currently industrial uses. A significant portion of this lot may be acquired for right-of-way for planned roadway and interchange improvements to the Telegraph Road/North Kings Highway/Huntington Avenue intersections. If any publicly owned land remains after the interchange is built, it should be retained as public open space.

Parcel 83-1 ((1)) 34C falls within the Transit Development Area. This parcel is planned for a mixture of residential, office and restaurant/retail uses at 2.0 to 3.0 FAR, and a maximum

height of 165 feet. The residential component should be limited to approximately one-half of the total development. Redevelopment of the site should include, at a minimum, the following elements:

- Provision of high-quality architecture and pedestrian focused site design, which should include street oriented building forms and mitigation of visual impacts of structured parking;
- Provision of on-site affordable and workforce housing;
- Restoration and revegetation of the Resource Protection Area;
- Integration of an urban park as a wayside area along the planned Cameron Run Trail;
- Provision of integrated pedestrian and bicycle systems with features such as covered and secure bicycle storage facilities, walkways, trails and sidewalks, amenities such as street trees, benches, bus shelters, and adequate lighting;
- Provision of environmental elements into the design, including buildings designed to meet the criteria for LEED Silver green building certification;
- Buildings should be designed to accommodate telecommunications antennas and equipment cabinets in a way that is compatible with the building's architecture and conceals the antennas and equipment from surrounding properties and roadways by flush mounting or screening antennas and concealing related equipment behind screen walls or building features;
- The impact on parks and recreation should be mitigated per policies contained in Objective 6 of the Parks and Recreation section of the Policy Plan; and
- Adherence to the adopted Transit Oriented Development Guidelines contained in Appendix 11 of the Land Use section of the Policy Plan."

MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2007 Edition, Area IV, Mount Vernon Planning District as amended through 1-26-09; MV-1 Huntington Community Planning Sector, Transit Development Area Conditions and Recommendations, page 90, 94:

(Additions are shown underlined; deletions are shown with ~~striketrough~~.)

"The maximum level of development for the Transit Development Area is the following:

- 1,050,000~~650,000~~ gross square feet of office space;
- 142,000 ~~117,000~~ gross square feet of retail space;
- 1,214 ~~845~~ dwelling units; and
- 200-room hotel with conference facilities or an additional 250 dwelling units."

PLAN MAP: The Comprehensive Plan Map for parcel 83-1 ((1)) 34C will change from **OFFICE** to **MIXED USE**.

PLAN FIGURES: Plan Figures 21-25 will be modified to reflect the expanded Transit Development Area. A new Figure 21 will be inserted to include a General Locator Map of the entire Planning Sector. Figures will be renumbered as necessary.

APR Item 08-IV-4MV: (North of Richmond Highway, East of Huntington Avenue, West of Old Richmond Highway)

APR Item 08-IV-4MV proposes to add Plan text that would retain the current uses on the site and add 602 new multifamily units and approximately 35,000 square feet of first floor retail/restaurant uses and structured parking up to 1.65 FAR.

The Task Force recommended approval of the nomination as submitted and added 4 conditions that address parks and recreation, telecommunications equipment screening, inter-parcel vehicle access, and restoration of the RPA.

Staff recommended denial of the proposed nomination after a VDOT 527 transportation analysis. Preliminary staff approval was considered by the Task Force subject to 4 conditions that addressed shuttle service, RPA/EQC restoration, internal circulation, and dedication of recreational parkland.

Based on public hearing testimony including that of transportation staff approval of 4MV, the Huntington Community Association, and the Mount Vernon District land use committee, I support the Task Force recommendation with the inclusion of a condition relating to the transportation level of service for the intersection of Huntington Avenue and Richmond Highway and the condition for telecommunications equipment. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, for APR Item 08-IV-4MV, I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the nomination with the following modifications:

Additions are shown underlined and deletions are shown with a ~~strikethrough~~.

MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2007 Edition, Area IV, Mount Vernon Planning District, Amended Through January, 26 2009, Richmond Highway Corridor Area, North Gateway Community Business Center, Sub-unit A-3:

Sub-unit A-3

“The Riverside Apartments complex, located on the north side of Huntington Avenue between Cameron Run Terrace and Hunting Creek Road, is planned for ~~high-rise residential use with first floor retail or office use at a density up to 35 dwelling units per acre. This recommendation reflects the existing use which should be retained. a total of 1,824 low-rise and high-rise multifamily units and approximately 35,000 square feet of first floor retail, office and restaurant uses and structured parking at an intensity up to 1.65 FAR, subject to the following conditions:~~

1) Provision of high quality architecture;

- 2) Provision of at least 12% of new dwelling units as affordable and workforce housing;
- 3) Provision of structured parking;
- 4) Provision of pedestrian focused site design, which should include street oriented building forms, appropriate street widths and block sizes, and mitigation of visual impacts of structured parking;
- 5) Provision of integrated pedestrian and bicycle systems with features such as covered and secure bicycle storage facilities, walkways, trails and sidewalks, amenities such as street trees, benches, bus shelters and adequate lighting;
- 6) Provision of environmental elements in the design including techniques such as Low Impact Design;
- 7) Construction of the Huntington Trail along Cameron Run;
- 8) Restoration of a portion of the resource protection area (RPA) along Cameron Run, by removal of existing parking spaces that are located immediately adjacent to and abutting the proposed Huntington Trail west of the existing apartment building, and providing a continuous and uniform width landscaped strip along the proposed Huntington Trail;
- 9) Creation of a coordinated internal circulation system that will accommodate vehicular and pedestrian access among Land Sub-units A-1, A-2 and A-3;
- 10) Occupancy is phased so that a level of service "D" is maintained at the intersection of Huntington Avenue and Richmond Highway;
- 11) Provision of shuttle bus service to the Huntington Metro Station as part of a transportation demand management (TDM) program that contains a specific target to further reduce the number of vehicle trips going into and out of the site;
- 12) Mitigation of the impacts on parks and recreation per policies contained in Objective 6 of the Parks and Recreation section of the Policy Plan;
- 13) Building design that accommodates telecommunications antennas and equipment cabinets in a way that is compatible with the building's architecture and conceals the antennas and equipment from surrounding properties and roadways by flush mounting or screening antennas and concealing related equipment behind screen walls or building features.

NOTE: The Comprehensive Plan Map would not change.

BRAC APR item 08-IV-9S (West of Backlick Road and the Fairfax County Parkway, between Telegraph Road, and south of Cinder Bed Road)

For nomination 08-IV-9S, the BRAC APR Task Force recommended approval of the nomination for office and industrial use at an intensity up to .33 FAR on 56 acres, with additional conditions such as protecting the EQC and limiting building heights if necessary to accommodate activities on Davison Army Airfield. Staff recommends an alternative for office and industrial use at a lesser intensity of up to .20 FAR on 56 acres as means to better achieve these conditions. Development at the lesser intensity would be consistent with the current Plan guidance to provide an appropriate transition to the industrial area to the north and the less intense industrial, office, and residential uses to the southwest. Furthermore, at a development intensity that is significantly lower than the original nomination, transportation impacts can be more readily mitigated. This nomination offers a benefit to Fairfax County by affording the opportunity to preserve an environmentally sensitive area.

I support the Staff alternative but recommend additional conditions be included to address heavy industrial uses, outdoor storage, construction of a new publicly available lighted athletic field or improvement of an existing field, screening and buffering, access to Cinder Bed Road, and phasing of development

The Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations (MVCCA) supports the staff recommendation and new conditions.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, for Item 08-IV-9S, I move that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Planning Commission alternative, found below.

**BRAC APR Nomination 08-IV-9S
Planning Commission Alternative**

REPLACE: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2007 Edition, Area IV Volume, Springfield Planning District as amended through 1-26-2009; I-95 Corridor Industrial Area, Land Unit G, pages 23-24.

(Additions are shown in underlined; deletions are shown with ~~strikethrough~~.)

~~“Land Unit G~~

~~This land unit is located south of Backlick Road, west of Telegraph Road, and east of Cinder Bed Road. A portion is currently used as a top soil processing site while another portion was formerly used as a landfill. The land unit also contains extensive EQC land. The area formerly used as a landfill is planned for future use as private recreation use. Development of industrial uses up to .35 FAR on the top soil processing site may be appropriate. However, sufficient documentation will need to be provided to verify that the top soil processing site is suitable and safe for building and an environmental study must be performed. If found not to be suitable and safe for building, or if environmental issues cannot be resolved, this site should be planned for private recreation use. Land should be dedicated for public park use~~

adjacent to existing parkland along Accotink Creek.”

“Land Unit G

This approximately 118-acre land unit is located south of Backlick Road and the Fairfax County Parkway, between Telegraph Road and Cinder Bed Road. Approximately 56 acres is a former debris landfill that was closed in 1981.

The land unit also contains approximately 62 acres of Environmental Quality Corridor (EQC) and Resource Protection Area (RPA) acreage. This land is adjacent to existing parkland along Accotink Creek and should be dedicated for public park use.

As shown on the Comprehensive Plan map, a portion of the 56-acre area is planned for industrial use up to an intensity of .35 FAR. This is a former top soil processing site. Sufficient documentation will need to be provided to verify that the top soil processing site is suitable and safe for building and an environmental study must be performed. If found not to be suitable and safe for building, or if environmental issues cannot be resolved, this site should be planned for private recreation use.

As an option, all of the 56-acre former landfill site may develop as office and light industrial uses at an intensity up to .20 FAR. Heavy industrial uses are not permitted. Outdoor storage is not permitted unless as an accessory use, and is screened and located to the satisfaction of the surrounding community, including but not limited to the Newington Community Association. Development over the entire land unit should not exceed an intensity of .10 FAR.

Documentation including but not limited to a geotechnical report, landfill gas investigation report, and other studies should be provided to appropriate County agencies for review to verify that the former landfill site is suitable and safe for development prior to final site plan approval. If any area is found not to be suitable and safe, or if environmental issues cannot be resolved, this portion of the land unit should be preserved as open space.

The option should satisfactorily address the following conditions:

- Provision of a unified site design, with low-rise buildings in a campus setting. The buildings and hardscape elements should share similar architectural features;
- Approval of the proposed buildings by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to assure no interference with operations at Davison Airfield;
- Mitigation of the impact on parks and recreation as per policies contained in Objective 6 of the Parks & Recreation section of the Policy Plan and Springfield Planning District deficiencies, including the construction of a publicly available lighted athletic field that meets Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA) standards, or comparable improvements within the same Planning District;
- Dedication of Environmental Quality Corridor (EQC) and Resource Protection Area (RPA) acreage to Fairfax County;

- Visual screening of all development from the Fairfax County Parkway and Telegraph Road;
- Accommodation of telecommunications antennas and equipment cabinets as appropriate;
- Provision of principal vehicular access to Telegraph Road with access via Cinder Bed Road limited to emergency access only;
- Implementation of intersection improvements such as signal timing and modification and additional lanes if they are required to adequately serve the subject property;
- Provision of Transportation Demand Management Plan and other strategies to mitigate traffic impacts;
- Phasing of development in such a way that road improvements and effective traffic mitigation measures will be in place prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for completed phases prior to proceeding with future development phases.

NOTE: The Comprehensive Plan Map will not change.

