

Planning Commission Meeting  
July 28, 2011  
Verbatim Excerpt

APR 09-IV-12LP – SOUTH COUNTY ANNUAL PLAN REVIEW ITEM

Decision Only During Commission Matters  
(Public Hearing held on June 16, 2011)

Commissioner Flanagan: I have a decision only. It's the first item on the agenda and at the June 16 – I'd just like to go back a little bit if you humor me for a little bit here. At the June 16, 2011 meeting of the Planning Commission, the decision on APR item 09-IV-12LP was deferred to allow time for additional community comment. The site is part of Land Unit D in the Lorton Route 1 Community Planning Sector and is planned for industrial use at an intensity up to 0.35 FAR, but it's zoned I-4 with a by-right FAR of 0.50. The BRAC at – in fact the BRAC Task Force dealt with this issue previously. As you'll recall, this South County APR item proposes to re-plan the 69-acre portion of the industrial area surrounding Lockport Place west of Telegraph Road to support office redevelopment with limited hotel, limited retail, and light industrial uses. The nominator originally proposed an intensity of 1.0 as a BRAC APR. The BRAC Task Force recommended an APR instead of 0.80, but the applicant withdrew the application and resubmitted as a standard APR nomination. This nomination, as a part of the APR, proposed an intensity of 0.80, which basically was the one that the Task Force – the BRAC Task Force had recommended, but following discussion with the community, reduced the proposed intensity to 0.65 FAR. The nomination was reviewed by the South County Federation and the Mount Vernon APR Task Force in 2010. The Federation voted not to oppose and the APR Task Force supported the nomination. Both groups individually added conditions limiting intensity as well as addressing access from Telegraph Road, other transportation improvements, and tapering and buffering to protect residential areas nearby. All of these conditions are included in the draft text I am providing tonight. The nomination was last reviewed on July 19, 2011 by the South County Federation's Land Use Committee, which voted to support the nomination, once again with additional conditions. These conditions, which are also included in the proposed text, recommend reducing trip generation to 20 percent below that which would be generated by office use at 0.5 FAR. Phasing development to ensure needed transportation improvements are concurrently in place by limiting retail and hotel use to no more than five percent of the development. Other conditions supported by the Committee will provide amenities designed to enhance the development through open space and urban design amenities as recommended by Commissioner Lawrence at the public hearing and protecting the view shed of the Historic Pohick Church. I concur with the findings of the Mount Vernon APR Task Force, the South County Federation, and the Federation's Land Use Committee and believe that the intensity of 0.65 FAR will provide incentive to avoid office development at 0.50, which could occur under the present Zoning District, thereby benefiting the community, by assuring its involvement in the rezoning process and through the ultimate development design. Lastly, I believe that the redevelopment will provide a significant development to Fairfax County as a whole by providing office space near Fort Belvoir that will be convenient to those in support of its mission – changing mission. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEXT FOR APR ITEM 09-IV-12LP, AS SHOWN IN MY HANDOUT DATED JULY 28, 2011.

Commissioner Litzenberger: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Litzenberger. Is there a discussion of the motion?

Commissioners Hart and Sargeant: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Mr. Hart, then Mr. Sargeant.

Commissioner Hart: I'm going to be abstaining; not present for the public hearing.

Chairman Murphy: All right. Mr. Sargeant?

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Question – clarification for staff on the Comprehensive Plan language dated July 28 for this evening. I'm looking at the bullet point starting with the quote: "The TDM program should reduce peak hours." This references: "Reduction target should be achieved with each phase of development." Just to refresh my memory, have we identified phase – phasing in this – in this application?

Marianne Gardner, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: No sir, Mr. Sargeant. That would be determined at the rezoning.

Commissioner Sargeant: Okay, so the rezoning will determine each phase of development. Is it helpful or beneficial to identify rezoning as part of that description? Just so everybody's clear as to what we're doing and when?

Chairman Murphy: Anybody?

Ms. Gardner: I don't-

Chairman Murphy: It's a jump ball, we call it.

Ms. Gardner: Excuse me. Yes or no. I don't really think it's necessary. I believe that it's understood that it would be determined at rezoning. However, if you would feel more comfortable adding that, I don't think it would take away from the text.

Commissioner Sargeant: Okay. How does staff's reaction to these updates – does staff concur with this, in terms of the TDM plan?

Tom Burke, Fairfax County Department of Transportation: The TDM plan – at a 0.65 FAR, it would – to meet the traffic levels of the 0.5 office minus 20 percent, they would have to achieve approximately 27 percent TDM, which we don't think for this area is realistic.

Commissioner Sargeant: Is that for the total development? Or is that for incremental development phasing?

Mr. Burke: I mean - that is based on the total build-out, based on the trip generation from the 527, but if we're looking at each phase, I suppose we could monitor and make sure they're achieving it. We just – we're not sure that's an achievable goal.

Commissioner Sargeant: Okay. What is – just for clarification – in terms of monitoring each phase? How do we do that, based on this language?

Ms. Gardner: I'm sorry, I forgot to introduce myself. I'm Marianne Gardner with the Department of Planning and Zoning and with me is Tom Burke with the Department of Transportation. What would need to happen is at the time of rezoning, a plan would be set up that would establish how the targets would be met. Would it shuttle buses or some other opportunities to encourage people not to drive alone? And then there would need to be an effort that would track the achievement of those goals, whether it's by having cars counted on a daily basis or some other feature. I would expect that there would be provisions to determine what would happen if these goals were not met. The basis of it, though, if the project were phased and we had the 20 percent reduction based on the 0.5 in each phase, the developer would be unable to go to the next phase. But we would also need to have text or proffers that would describe how remediation or improvement would occur to reach that, even within that phase if it's not being met.

Commissioner Sargeant: We are to add the reference under that TDM plan following each phase of development at the time of rezoning? Would that be helpful to ensure some additional review as this application moves forward?

Ms. Gardner: Yes, we could ADD: "TO BE DETERMINED AT THE TIME OF REZONING."

Commissioner Sargeant: Acceptable?

Commissioner Flanagan: THAT'S ACCEPTABLE TO ME, yes.

Commissioner Sargeant: All right. All right, if you ACCEPT THAT AS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT?

Commissioner Flanagan: YES.

Commissioner Sargeant: All right. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Litzenberger? Do you concur?

Commissioner Litzenberger: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: All right. Further discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to adopt APR 09-IV-12LP with the language that's been amended this evening, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Hart: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Mr. Hart abstains. Not present for the public hearing.

//

(The motion carried by a vote of 9-0-1 with Commissioner Hart abstaining; Commissioners Alcorn and Donahue absent from the meeting.)

JLC