Planning Commission Meeting
July 28, 2010
Verbatim Excerpt

APR Items #09-IV-23MV, 09-IV-25MV, and 09-IV-26MV – Mount Vernon District

Markup Session (Public Hearing held on July 14, 2010)

Chairman Murphy: Okay. APR 09-IV-23MV, 25MV, and 26MV.

Commissioner Flanagan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. South County APR Items 09-IV-23MV and 09-IV-25MV and 09-IV-26MV are in the Mount Vernon Planning District, generally located north and east of the intersection of Richmond Highway and North Kings Highway. Mr. Chairman, the Mount Vernon Council submitted APR Items 09-IV-23MV and 09-IV-25MV in an effort to re-envision the Penn Daw Community Business Center as a new focal point for the Richmond Highway Corridor. APR 09-IV-25MV proposes a mixed-use, transit-friendly town center, more intense than the current Plan, on Sub-units E-l, E-2, E-3, and a portion of Land Unit G of the CBC; while APR 09-IV-23MV proposes to support this redevelopment by replanning Sub-unit F-2 of the CBC to include a rapid transit bus station. APR 09-IV-26MV on pages 533 and 534 of the Staff Report Book dated July 14, 2010, which is also primarily within the CBC, proposes to work towards a similar goal with more intense mixed-use development and expansion of the CBC. Staff and the Mount Vernon APR Task Force generally support the overarching goals of these nominations and have recommended an alternative, which combines the recommendations for the three nominations in order to provide a cohesive vision for the redevelopment. The vision would encourage development in the CBC as an urban, walkable, attractive, and transit-friendly place, while addressing concerns about intensity, transitions to adjacent neighborhoods - - and that's basically residential neighborhoods-- and impacts to transportation and environmentally sensitive areas. There is a RPA just behind this property. In the alternative, Sub-units E-l, E-2, and E-3 would dissolve into a unified Land Unit E and the current Plan's option for mixed-use development in the CBC would be shifted onto a portion of this land unit, with an increased intensity. The option would be based on a number of conditions, including the mixture of land uses and their location, buffering, orientation, design, parking, and environmental preservation, and transportation mitigation. This redevelopment also would be predicated on the provision of mass transit and a defined pedestrian circulation system. The mass transit, in the form of a transit center or enhanced transit stop, would be located within this redevelopment option or on the adjacent Land Unit, Sub-unit F-2. I believe that the alternative staff and Task Force recommendation would achieve the original goals of the nominations and create a more viable redevelopment scenario for this portion of the CBC; however, I would like to modify the alternative slightly to remove the directional guidance for the transit service in Land Bays - - Land Units E and F-2. Specifying the northbound and southbound transit service, as recommended, may be premature at this time and should occur during the rezoning development review. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have three motions for these nominations. First, FOR SOUTH COUNTY APR ITEM 09-IV-23MV, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE STAFF AND TASK FORCE ALTERNATIVE FOR LAND UNIT F-2 OF THE PENN DAW CBC, AS MODIFIED IN ITALICS AND SHOWN IN MY HANDOUT DATED JULY 28, 2010.

Chairman Murphy: Without objection.

Commissioner Flanagan: Second, FOR SOUTH COUNTY APR ITEM 09-IV-25MV, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE STAFF AND THE TASK FORCE ALTERNATIVE FOR SUB-UNITS E-1, E-2, E-3, AND LAND UNIT G on the Penn - - ON THE PENN DAW CBC, AS MODIFIED IN ITALICS AND SHOWN IN MY HANDOUT DATED JULY 28, 2010.

Chairman Murphy: Without objection.

Commissioner Flanagan: Third, FOR SOUTH COUNTY APR ITEM 09-IV-26MV, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE STAFF AND TASK FORCE ALTERNATIVE FOR LAND UNIT G OF THE PENN DAW CBC, AS SHOWN IN MY HANDOUT DATED JULY 28, 2010.

Chairman Murphy: Without objection.

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Mr. Sargeant.

Commissioner Sargeant: I'm sorry. Mr. Flanagan, were you finished? Were you finished reading your motions?

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes.

Commissioner Sargeant: Okay. Just one note that came up during the Task Force process and discussions with staff. A transit study was involved in these - - in these three - - these three proposals -- the 23MV, 25MV, and 26MV. And it was noted that the transit study - - during our Task Force process that the transit study was not completed. Just to get staff to comment on where we are at this point and what - - how that transit study may or may not influence the language, especially with regard to the transit centers in this - - in this proposal.

Thomas Burke, Fairfax County Department of Transportation: The Department of Transportation working with OCRR has identified sites through this study that are farther to the south around the Fordson/Boswell intersections with Richmond Highway. So, that study would not have an effect on this area although we did not select a site as far north primarily because of the distance to Huntington Metrorail because we were looking more for a transfer center where we would have structured parking and more of - - more of transfers. I think here we're looking more at enhanced bus stop or transfer bus stop.

Commissioner Sargeant: Just to clarify. If you are - - if you are providing transit facilities of some sort or a transit center - - okay - - if you are providing transit facilities then you do have to prioritize given - - given any budget constraints. If your study suggests transit stops, centers,

whatever farther to the south of this - - of these nominations, what does that do to what's recommended in these - - in these proposals?

Mr. Burke: I don't necessarily think that they're attached. I think they're on separate tracks. We're looking farther to the south because we want to catch more of the commuters who are going to Huntington. And if you put the station farther north at this location, you're not going to catch them. They're going to continue on to Huntington, but if you put it down towards Fordson, we're hoping that it will catch more of the - - maybe regional commuters, but we don't see any reason why there couldn't be an enhanced transit center at this location because there are six routes that do traverse the area.

Commissioner Sargeant: So, you would envision that any transit center/transit station within these nominated proposals would probably be developed privately in conjunction with other development. Is that the - - is that the thought?

Mr. Burke: On this site I would think so.

Commissioner Sargeant: Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: All right.

Commissioner Flanagan: And Mr. Chairman, I just would like to add to that. We only have really two transit locations on Richmond Highway. One is at the Kings Crossing where we do have the - - several routes that travelers cross at that point, and we do have a lot of transfers too. And we also have a lot of transfers down at - - at the Sherwood Hall in the Hybla Valley area.

Commissioner Sargeant: Yes.

Commissioner Flanagan: There's a lot of buses that interact at that particular location. So --

Commissioner Sargeant: I just wanted to make sure that the transit study would not influence location of a transit center/transit stop within this proposal.

Commissioner Flanagan: Right. I think the major decision there is to whether it's - - will have the transit on one side of the road rather than having pedestrians running back and forth across Richmond Highway.

Commissioner Sargeant: Right. Thank you.

//

(The motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Donahue and Harsel not present for the votes.)

KAD