Planning Commission Meeting
July 28, 2010
Verbatim Excerpt

APR Item #09-IV-9LP – Mount Vernon District

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

Chairman Murphy: All right. APR 09-IV-9LP. And I may say parenthetically if some of these items come to us in the rezoning it's going to be very interesting. And I might take a long vacation. All right. 9LP.

Commissioner Flanagan: 9LP. This is the fastest growing part of Fairfax County, by the way.

Chairman Murphy: You'd never know it by some of these nominations.

Commissioner Flanagan: That's - - I think that's what prompted them actually. APR Item 09-IV-9LP is generally located at the southeast corner of the intersection at Lorton Road and Lorton Market Street. APR Item 09-IV-9LP proposes to amend the Plan by adding text stating access to parcel 109 [sic] - - 107-4 ((23)) B is constrained because it does not have sufficient frontage on Lorton Road for an exit, and auto-oriented uses and uses that generate high amounts of traffic should be discouraged. The staff supports adding language that auto-oriented uses and uses that generate high amounts o f vehicular traffic should be discouraged. In order to fully address access issues; however, staff recommends that the nominator's text regarding access on Lorton Road be modified to note that both ingress and egress are prohibited from Lorton Road. According to the Virginia Department of Transportation standards, there is insufficient frontage along Lorton Road for any access. Due to these constraints, the - - the best access for the site is through interparcel connection with parcel 107-4 ((23)) Land Unit C, adjoining the subject property to the south. This access is not ideal, and amending the Plan to discourage auto-oriented uses could help minimize the volume of traffic generated by the site. The Mount Vernon APR Task Force voted to approve the nomination as submitted. Testimony by the nominator noted that VDOT has recently widened Lorton Road at this site to six lanes with a deceleration lane for eastbound traffic south onto Lorton Market Street and with a right-in only curb cut onto the nominated site, which is contrary to the staff statement earlier that there was both ingress and egress. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, FOR APR ITEM 09-IV-9LP, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE NOMINATION AS SUBMITTED, AS SHOWN ON PAGE 203 OF THE STAFF REPORT BOOK DATED JULY 14, 2010 AND ON PAGE 5 OF THE STAFF REPORT.

Chairman Murphy: Without objection.

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, may I ask just one question for clarification?

Chairman Murphy: Please. Mr. Sargeant.

Commissioner Sargeant: In the - - in the summary chart regarding this nomination, page 2 of 5, the nominated plan simply says, discourage auto-oriented uses on Parcel 107-4 ((23)) B. The staff alternative lists mixed use up to .25 FAR with conditions, and then it goes on to say, auto uses should be - - auto-oriented uses should be discouraged. Direct access from Lorton Road should be avoided, access provided via Lorton Market Street. Why - - just clarification, why the difference if - - if both staff and the Task Force nominations say discourage access from Lorton Road?

Marianne Gardner, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ): Do you mean why is the - - Marianne Gardner.

Commissioner Sargeant: Why the two point - - why the .25 FAR?

Ms. Gardner: The - - one is just, if I understand your question, they're the same. It's just that the nominated Plan text only shows the beginning part of the recommendation and the way the staff did the recommended text, we showed all of it for that Land Unit.

Commissioner Sargeant: So, you're comfortable with the motion Commissioner Flanagan just - - just read?

Ms. Gardner: I'd like to ask Tom Burke of the Department of Transportation to respond to that because it is related to access.

Thomas Burke, Fairfax County Department of Transportation: Thomas Burke, Department of Transportation. We just raised the point that Virginia Department of Transportation access management standards requires for partial access, 305 feet between centerline to centerline. In this case, Lorton Market Street, and I believe we only have 250 feet. So, you have a situation where cars slowing down to turn right at Lorton Market Street may be surprised that someone is entering the site in the turn lane. That was our safety concern that we raised, so we would prefer that the avoiding access be as in the staff report.

Commissioner Sargeant: I don't disagree with the issue regarding ingress and egress from Lorton Road. It is not an easy turn unless you're using that stop light at the corner. The - - I just wanted to make sure that when the staff alternative listed here, it says, mixed use up to .25 FAR with conditions. Is - - is that included in this - - is that incorporated into the motion that Commissioner Flanagan just read?

Jennifer Lai, PD, DPZ: Yes.

Commissioner Sargeant: Okay. All right. Thank you.

Commissioner Flanagan: Mr. Chairman, I'd like - -?

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Mr. Flanagan.

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes, and I'd also like to clarify the - - the curb cut on Lorton Road that the staff thought would provide ingress and egress was approved by VDOT when they widened Lorton Road from two lanes to six lanes. In other words, that curb cut is there at the approval of VDOT and - - however they do restrict it to right-in only. And we have a - - if you'll remember, we had an application of an Exxon station that wanted to go there some months ago, and we denied that on the basis that there was - - but we did - - we didn't deny it on the basis that it had that right-in only access on Lorton Road, but it was a part of the application that we didn't object - - at that time, we didn't object to the right-in only from Lorton Road. So, it all depends upon whether we want to put something in the Plan now to do away with that curb cut that was previously approved by VDOT, or not. I think it's better if we just defer that until there's another application that comes in, frankly. That issue - - if that okay with you, Tim?

Commissioner Sargeant: That's fine. That's fine.

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes. Okay.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. Without objection.

//

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

KAD