Planning Commission Meeting
July 28, 2010
Verbatim Excerpt

APR Item #09-IV-2LP – Mount Vernon District

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

Chairman Murphy: Item APR 09-IV-2LP.

Commissioner Flanagan: APR Item 09-IV-2LP, generally located north of Interstate 95 on the west side of Furnace Road. The nominated area for APR Item 09-IV-2LP is split between two triangular pieces of land that are located approximately 600 feet apart on Furnace Road. The nomination proposes to modify the current Plan text by replacing the recommendation for industrial use with a recommendation for "light industrial use," and deleting the recommendation for recycling facilities. The nomination would also plan the nominated area for open space in the long term. The subject property is surrounded by other industrial and/or public facility uses and is not located near a residential area. In addition, the conditions in the surrounding area have not changed since the subject area was originally planned for industrial use in 1995; therefore, replanning the subject property is not warranted at this time. For these reasons, staff recommended that the Plan be retained - - the adopted Plan be retained. The Task Force recommended that the nomination be approved for the northern portion of the subject property and that the adopted Plan be retained for the southern portion of the property. In other words, there's a split between the nominator and the staff. Public hearing testimony supported the Task Force recommendation. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, FOR APR ITEM 09-IV-2LP, I support the Task Force recommendation and MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT THE NOMINATION BE ADOPTED AS AMENDED AND SHOWN ON PAGE 4 [sic] OF MY HANDOUT DATED JULY 28, 2010.

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Are we on page 4?

Commissioner Sargeant: We're on page - -

Chairman Murphy: We're on page 6.

Commissioner Sargeant: Six.

Commissioner Flanagan: We're on page 6.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. Without objection.

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: I'm sorry. Mr. Sargeant.

Commissioner Sargeant: Given that both sites were planned in the original language, long range for public - - with an option for public open space, I'm wondering if we are by specifically identifying a site for a recycling center and other uses, if we are not limiting our opportunities and options for the future. But the northern site may be an opportunity if and when something else comes adjacent to it for public use, especially recreation use. But do we not limit our options by saying one will be more dedicated for a specific use than another?

Commissioner Flanagan: I believe that question came up in the Task Force and was resolved - - you know - - before they made their recommendation.

Commissioner Sargeant: And how was that resolved?

Commissioner Flanagan: Staff, can you give me the background on that?

Aaron Klibaner, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ): Well, the nomination is proposing - - so, right now both - - both pieces of the property have the option for public open space in the long term once the adjacent landfills are closed. That's the adopted Plan. The nomination was proposing that for the northern triangular piece that that be mandatory, so it's not an option when the adjacent landfills are closed. And that - - and that currently it should be planned for the light industrial classification that they identified. So.

Commissioner Sargeant: Does that limit the site's use in the future for such specific language for something of such along the lines of recreational use?

Marianne Gardner, PD, DPZ: The - - within the scope of the nomination - - I'm Marianne Gardner. Within the scope of the nomination, we could only consider light industrial use, so private recreation wasn't a part of the nomination, so we didn't specifically analyze it. And it's unusual to see property planned specifically for open space, and I would say that if someone came in for private recreation use in the future or once those adjacent landfills are covered and perhaps become public park, then that was the intent. But the language has been in the Plan for 15 years or so, and that's why it has this term that we don't designate as a - - as a land use category, which is open space.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes. Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Thank you. I - - without - - without getting into whether staff is right or the Task Force is right, the motion itself I think - - I think there's a mistake somewhere because the - - it's referring to page 4 of the handout dated tonight, but page 4 of the handout deals with the shopping center with no free-standing uses, it's a different - - it's a totally different case.

Mr. Klibaner: Aaron Klibaner.

Commissioner Hart: It should be pages 6 and 7, I think. Is that right?

Mr. Klibaner: Yes, that is a mistake. You're correct.

Commissioner Hart: PAGES 6 AND 7 are the right pages?

Mr. Klibaner: Six and seven.

Commissioner Hart: All right. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: All right. Further discussion? All right.

//

(The motion carried unanimously with Commissioner Harsel not present for the vote.)

KAD