Planning Commission Meeting
July 28, 2010
Verbatim Excerpt

APR Item #09-IV-6LP and Plan Amendment S10-IV-LP1 – Mount Vernon District

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

Chairman Murphy: APR 09-IV-6LP and Plan Amendment S10-IV-LP1.

Commissioner Flanagan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. APR Item 09-IV-6LP/Plan Amendment S10-IV-LP1 is generally located at the intersection of Lorton Road and Richmond Highway. APR Item 09-IV-6LP proposes to amend the Plan by removing the optional uses for a drive-in bank and a drive-through pharmacy. The nomination also proposes adding text noting uses that generate high levels of vehicular traffic are not appropriate; removing the recommendation to dedicate land for widening Route 1 and Lorton Road since this has been accomplished; and removing language that recommends primary access to the site be limited to Lorton Road. Staff recommends an alternative to the nomination. The alternative supports removing the text that addresses the road widening, but recommends retaining the Plan guidance that primary access to the site would be via Lorton Road and not Route 1. According to Virginia Department of Transportation standards, there is insufficient frontage for full access on Route 1. Additionally, the portion of Route 1 that fronts the subject property is divided by a median. The adopted Plan text and approved site plan limits access to Route 1 to right-in and right-out. The staff alternative also proposes retaining the drive-through use option. A Special Exception has been approved, permitting the construction of a drive-in bank and drive-through pharmacy. It is anticipated that construction of the bank and pharmacy will begin prior to the date the SE approval expires. In fact, it's already underway. Retaining the text is important to properly review - - properly review future requests to modify the existing Special Exception. The Task Force concurred with the staff alternative. Testimony by the nominator requests - - let's see - - I support additional text to make clear that the option is intended to apply only to the existing SE. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, from South County - - FOR SOUTH COUNTY APR ITEM 09-IV-6LP, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE STAFF ALTERNATIVE, FOUND ON PAGE 145 OF THE STAFF REPORT BOOK DATED JULY 14, 2010, AND WITH THE NEW TEXT PROVIDED AS ATTACHMENT 1 DATED JULY 28, 2010, which has been distributed to you this evening.

Chairman Murphy: Without objection.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: I just have a question for staff. On the - - on the next text on the one-paged, two-sided handout tonight. The - - two sentences beginning - - the second sentence, "However, as an option, drive-through uses approved before 2011," etcetera. Does - -?

Jennifer Lai, Planning Divisions, Department of Planning and Zoning: Yes.

Commissioner Hart: Does staff support that language and specifically does that prevent any SEA application or conceptually, if somebody gets an SEA - -or excuse me - - if somebody gets an SEA - - a special exception approved in the next five months, which I guess could happen, can they apply for a SEA afterwards, or this locks it in forever?

Ms. Lai: My name is Jennifer Lai. An SEA would be tied to the approved special exception application that was done prior to 2011.

Commissioner Hart: So, an SEA is not necessarily inconsistent with the new text tonight?

Ms. Lai: Correct.

Commissioner Hart: Staff is okay with this second sentence?

Ms. Lai: Yes.

Commissioner Hart: Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. Without objection.

//

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

KAD