

**Springfield District Fairfax Center Area Land Use Committee Meeting  
April 1, 2003, 7:00 p.m. Meeting Minutes  
Conf. Rm. 4 & 5, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, VA 22035**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mark Cummings, Chair, *Brentwood Civic Association*  
Fred Bailey, *Deerfield Forest Homeowners Association*  
Sherry Fisher, *Ridgetop Commons Homeowners Association*  
Gail Brugger, *Little Rocky Run Homeowners Association*  
Tom McDonald, *Buckner Forest Homeowners Association*  
Philip Poole, *Cannon Ridge Civic Association*  
Jeff Saxe, *Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce*  
Steve Wallace, *Greenbriar Civic Association*

**COUNTY STAFF PRESENT:**

Marlae Schnare, *Supervisor Elaine McConnell's Office*  
Norman Byers, *Supervisor Elaine McConnell's Office*  
Fred Selden, *Fairfax County Planning & Zoning*  
Alison Kriviskey, *Fairfax County Planning & Zoning*

**APPLICATIONS PRESENTED**

**Monument Place**

SO2-II-F1

Monument Place is a 7.4 acre property located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Monument Drive and Fair Lakes Parkway and is planned for office mixed-use. On December 9, 2002, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors authorized County staff to process an Out-Of-Turn Plan Amendment for Tax Map Parcel 46-3 (91) 36E to provide an option for multi-family residential use.

Location: N.E. quadrant of the intersection of Monument Drive and Fair Lakes Parkway  
Planning Commission Hearing Scheduled: 4/24/03  
Board of Supervisors Hearing Scheduled: 5/19/03

Applicant: Camden  
Attorney/Agent: Tony Calabrese, Cooley Godward LLP  
Presenter(s): Tony Calabrese, Cooley Godward LLP

Mr. Tony Calabrese noted some details for the residential development – predominantly 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom apartments, renting within the range of \$1100-\$1700, 372 total units with small retail (approx. 3000 sq. ft.), structured parking, courtyards are external and internal, internal spine road from north to south, community center, 1.75 parking spaces per unit which is more than what is required by ordinance. There will be no restrictions as to children and pets are allowed. Mr. Calabrese noted the staff report with regard to the ADU contribution (i.e., “provide affordable dwelling units that constitute 6.25 percent of the total number of units.”) and stated that the County should not legislate or dictate the number of ADUs in the Comprehensive Plan

because this is a decision to be made during the rezoning process. The Applicant would prefer to keep the discussion open during that time.

Ms. Alison Kriviskey of the Fairfax County Planning and Zoning staff provided a brief overview of the staff analysis. She noted the unique characteristics of the plan that make this type of proposal new to the Fairfax Center Area – high density, structured parking, mixed units, elevators. This is atypical for this area and is different than the garden apartment communities which prevail in this area. She also noted the impact on the schools will be smaller, the impact on the roads is minimal and the number of trips generated is lower than it would have been with office use. The impact on the parks is mitigated by the inclusion of a swimming pool and gym, but providing open space in and around the development is important and maintaining the continuity of the linear park. Ms. Kriviskey stated that in the context of Land Unit J’s mixed use character, either office or residential use on the property would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s objectives for the “J Core.”

Questions from the land use committee members addressed commuter impact on roads, buffering between office uses and the development, and ADU contribution. Mr. Selden stated that the County can specify the type of contribution (i.e., units vs. cash), and the number of units to be contributed in the Comprehensive Plan. He noted it is important to retain and maintain the number of ADUs in this area and he believes this is an opportunity to address the need for ADUs for singles, for efficiencies. Ms. Kriviskey noted that the 6.25 percent number equated to 24 units for this development.

Comments from the public included concern about further traffic congestion in this area by the addition of more residents. Also, someone noted that this sets a precedent for opening up office use to residential use in this area.

Jeff Saxe made a motion to approve the option as proposed by staff and rewritten by the Applicant, *with the following changes*:

- (1) The requirement for retail should be more of a requirement for exploration for a retail use. Insert the words “Retail shall be provided subject to a market for it” after the first sentence of paragraph 2.
- (2) With regard to the existing sidewalk clause (paragraph 2, bullet point 6, condition 1), restate this condition with the following, “Remove the existing sidewalk subject to VDOT approval.”
- (3) With regard to the special features noted in paragraph 2, bullet point 6, condition 6, leave the last sentence in and insert the words “or architectural treatment.”

The motion was seconded by Tom McDonald and was carried unanimously.

Chairperson Mark Cummings noted the date, time, and subject of the May land use meeting: Tuesday, May 6, 7 p.m. to review the Fairfax County Family Shelter proposal.

The meeting adjourned at 8.40 p.m.