

**MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2016**

PRESENT: Peter F. Murphy, Springfield District
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commission At-Large
Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District
John C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District
Julie M. Strandlie, Mason District
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District
Karen Keys-Gamarra, Jr., Sully District

ABSENT: Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District
Janyce N. Hedetniemi, Commissioner At-Large

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:17 p.m., by Vice Chairman de la Fe, in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

SE 2016-PR-014 – STEVEN F. TEETS/CABOOSE BREWING COMPANY, LLC (Decision Only) (The public hearing on this application was held on October 19, 2016.)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Hart: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On the Caboose case, I have a decision only. If I could ask a representative of the applicant to come down to the podium...

Matt Greer, Applicant's Agent, Caboose Brewing Company, LLC: My name is Matt Greer. I'm living at 2111 Twin Mill Lane in Oakton.

Commissioner Hart: And you're representing the – the applicant in this case?

Mr. Greer: Yes. I'm representing Caboose Brewing Company.

Commissioner Hart: Can you please confirm, for the record, that you understand and agree to the proposed development conditions now dated October 27, 2016?

Mr. Greer: Yes. We comprehend and agree with these conditions.

Commissioner Hart: Thank you. You can sit down. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, on October 19, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the Caboose Brewing Company special exception to permit an eating establishment within an existing metal building that will be adaptively reused as a brewery in an industrial district across the street from the Mosaic District in Merrifield. We deferred decision until tonight. I wanted to thank Billy O'Donnell for his fine work on this interesting case. I also want to thank the adjoining neighbor, Mr. Coakley, for his correspondence and photographs, which we've placed in the record, and also thank the applicant for its willingness to provide additional information and make changes to the original proposal. Since the public hearing, you should've received revised development conditions from staff dated October 27, both by email and hardcopy, which further address architectural elements on the exterior of the building and include additional renderings now showing all four sides of the building and require repair of any damaged exterior siding. In my judgment, these revised conditions adequately address the visual impacts from the use, which I believe will be a significant upgrade from the current dilapidated appearance of the building. I believe, also, with the limited width of the property, the applicant has done about as much as reasonably be done on the screening and landscaping issues. With the grade separation between this and the adjoining property, the existing retaining wall, and the staggered setback between the existing buildings, I believe any visual impacts are sufficiently mitigated. And, as conditioned, this will be a vast improvement over the current situation. Based on the applicant's other locations, I also believe this combination restaurant and brewery will turn out to be an upscale use and will enhance the diversity of high-quality entertainment options in the Mosaic District. The application has staff's favorable recommendation, with which I concur. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I FIRST MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT APPROVE SE 2016-PR-014, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS NOW DATED OCTOBER 27, 2016.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Second.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Seconded by Mr. Ulfelder. Any discussion? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, abstain. I was not present for the public hearing.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay. With one abstention, the motion passes.

Commissioner Hart: Secondly, Mr. Chairman – thank you – I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE THE LIST OF MODIFICATIONS AND WAIVERS DATED OCTOBER 27, 2016, which was provided to you yesterday, the rationale for which was further discussed in the staff report. That list will be made a part of the record of this case.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Second.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Seconded by Mr. Ulfelder. Any discussion?

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, abstain.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor please signify by saying aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: And the same abstention. Motion carries.

Commissioner Hart: Thank you.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Thank you.

(Each motion carried by a vote of 8-0-1. Commissioner Sargeant abstained. Commissioner Murphy was not present for the vote. Commissioners Hedetniemi and Lawrence were absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hart established the following order of the agenda:

1. SE 2016-MV-010 – MARC ANTHONY MUSSOLINE
2. PA 2016-IV-MV1 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (NORTH HILL SITE)
(Mount Vernon District)

This order was accepted without objection.

//

SE 2016-MV-010 – MARC ANTHONY MUSSOLINE – Appl.
under Sect. 2-904 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit provisions for
uses in a flood plain. Located at 1212 Olde Towne Rd.,
Alexandria, 22307, on approx. 7,150 sq. ft. of land zoned R-3. Tax
Map 83-4 ((2)) (40) 501. MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT.
PUBLIC HEARING.

Marc Mussoline, Applicant/Title Owner, reaffirmed the affidavit dated June 1, 2016.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Angelica Gonzalez, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that staff recommended approval of application SE 2016-MV-010.

When Commissioner Flanagan asked whether the existing dwelling unit on the subject property had sustained damage after the most recent flood event in the area, Ms. Gonzalez stated that staff was not aware of such damage and deferred to the applicant for additional information. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Flanagan and Ms. Gonzalez regarding the location of the subject property within the existing floodplain in the area and the overall size of the floodplain wherein Ms. Gonzalez stated that the site was located entirely within a floodplain and a Resource Protection Area.

Mr. Mussoline addressed Commissioner Flanagan's concern regarding whether the existing dwelling unit on the site had incurred damage during the most recent flood event, explaining that only the crawlspace within the dwelling unit had flooded and the finished surfaces within the unit remained undamaged. He added that the grade on the site incurred further protection from such flooding. Mr. Mussoline also indicated that the public hearing for the subject application had been originally scheduled for Wednesday, October 5, 2016, but this public hearing had been subsequently deferred. He then stated that since that date, the applicant had met with the Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, which voted in support of the subject application.

Commissioner Ulfelder pointed out that the proposal would permit the construction of a dwelling unit on the site that was approximately double the height of the existing dwelling unit. However, he noted that there were numerous dwelling units in the surrounding neighborhood that had a similar height. When he asked whether the proposed dwelling unit on the site would be consistent with the character of this neighborhood, Mr. Mussoline indicated that this unit would be consistent, adding that two to three-story dwelling units were common in the area.

When Commissioner Ulfelder asked where vehicles on the subject property would be parked, Mr. Mussoline said that vehicles would be parked on the driveway. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Mussoline regarding the slope of the driveway, the issues that had occurred at other sites that utilized driveways with significant slopes, and the potential for flooding on the site.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Flanagan and Mr. Mussoline regarding the features of the dwelling unit to the west of the subject property, the number of stories in this unit, and the architecture of the units throughout the surrounding neighborhood.

Vice Chairman de la Fe called for speakers from the audience, but received no response; therefore, he noted that a rebuttal statement was not necessary. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Vice Chairman de la Fe closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Flanagan for action on this case.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Close the public hearing and...Mr. Flanagan.

Commissioner Flanagan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I'd like to thank Mr. Mussoline for allowing me to defer the public hearing on this until such time as you could get it through the Land Use Committee of the Mount Vernon – and where they supported it unanimously – so I just want to be sure the Commission is aware that - that you did follow the procedures on that. Individual applicants quite often don't know the procedures that the developers, who do this with great regularity, so I can understand why you were not aware of that. And – so that – with that, Mr. Chairman, I request that the applicant confirm for the record their agreement to the proposed development conditions dated September 28, 2016. So if you could come forward...And you do confirm that – you're agreement with the conditions for this application approval?

Marc Mussoline, Applicant/Title Owner: I do agree with those conditions.

Commissioner Flanagan: Thank you.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Mr. Flanagan, could I ask a question of staff? Development Condition Number 4, the third line, should – it says “a copy of the recoded conditions,” should it be “recorded?” I – I didn't know...

Angelica Gonzalez, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: That's correct. It should be “recorded.”

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Recorded. Okay, thank you. Just a typo.

Commissioner Flanagan: I need a second.

Commissioners Sargeant and Ulfelder: Second.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Seconded by Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: No. It was somebody down here.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Oh, Mr. Sargeant and Mr. Ulfelder.

Commissioner Sargeant: Am I on?

Vice Chairman de la Fe: I don't know. Okay. We have – you have a second.

Commissioner Hart: Jacob says no one made a motion.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Nobody has made a motion yet.

Commissioner Flanagan: Oh that's...

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay?

Commissioner Hart: I got to do it again?

Commissioner Flanagan: I just requested a – okay.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: We usually – we usually – we usually don't second for non-motions. Mr. Flanagan, this is in the Mount Vernon District.

Commissioner Flanagan: I plead – I plead guilty.

Commissioner Hart: Well he needs a second. He just needs an actual motion.

Commissioner Flanagan: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF SE 2016-MV-010, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED SEPTEMBER 28, 2016.

Commissioner Sargeant: Now?

Commissioner Ulfelder: Third.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: It has been moved and seconded by Mr. Sargeant and Mr. Ulfelder. Any discussion? Yes.

Commissioner Hurley: I – I just can't vote in support of building, this nice house in a known floodplain that close to the river with the only disclosure – not much more than the disclosure to protect future homebuyers from knowing how our lovely river does kind of take over the neighborhood on – more than every 100 years. However, I certainly don't want to stand in the way of this homeowner to improve upon his property and, therefore, I will abstain in my vote.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay. Have we vote – no, we have not voted. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Opposed? And, with one abstention for Ms. Hurley, motion passes. And that's it. Thank you very much.

(The motion carried by a vote of 8-0-1. Commissioner Hurley abstained. Commissioner Murphy was not present for the vote. Commissioners Hedetniemi and Lawrence were absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

PA 2016-IV-MV1 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT
(NORTH HILL SITE) – To consider proposed revisions to the

Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County, VA, in accordance with the *Code of Virginia*, Title 15.2, Chapter 22. This Amendment concerns approx. 35 ac. generally located along the east side of Richmond Highway, north of Dart Drive (Tax Map Parcel 92-4 ((1)) 82A (pt.)). The area is planned for public park or passive recreational use. The amendment considers a mix of approximately 278 multifamily units and 195 townhouses inclusive of affordable housing, public park, as well as limited community serving uses. Recommendations relating to the transportation network may also be modified. PA 2016-IV-MV1 is concurrently under review with Rezoning application RZ/FDP 2016-MV-014. MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Kenneth Sorenson, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended adoption of PA 2016-IV-MV1.

When Commissioner Migliaccio asked whether the connection between Dart Drive and Arlington Drive would be included in a future rezoning for the subject property, Mr. Sorenson indicated that such a connection would be included in a rezoning.

Commissioner Migliaccio expressed concern regarding the Level of Service for the intersection of Richmond Highway and Lockheed Boulevard, noting that this was one of two intersections that would not be improved under the recommended development articulated in the proposed Amendment. He then asked whether this development would further reduce the Level of Service at this intersection. Tom Burke, Transportation Planner, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT), explained that the intersection of Richmond Highway and Lockheed Boulevard was currently operating at Level of Service E, but indicated that the inclusion of traffic mitigation measures would be included with a rezoning of the site. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Migliaccio and Mr. Burke regarding the feasibility of such provisions, the existing condition of this intersection, and the need for improvements at this intersection wherein Mr. Burke stated that staff would coordinate with prospective applicants on implementing appropriate traffic mitigation provisions at this intersection.

Answering questions from Commissioner Flanagan, Mr. Burke explained the following:

- The existing width of Richmond Highway was six lanes and a portion of these lanes were reserved for bus traffic;
- The Embark Richmond Highway initiative, which was under review by an advisory group for the Lee and Mount Vernon Districts, would improve Richmond Highway by installing two additional lanes that would be utilized exclusively by bus rapid transit;

- The two additional lanes that would be installed on Richmond Highway under the Embark Richmond Highway effort could potentially accommodate routes utilized by the Fairfax Connector bus service;
- The Embark Richmond Highway effort would install additional right-turn lanes where necessary; and
- The overall efforts of Embark Richmond Highway would mitigate the existing traffic conditions at intersections, such as Richmond Highway and Lockheed Boulevard.

Commissioner Migliaccio asked whether the provisions included in the Embark Richmond Highway effort had been considered by staff when evaluating the transportation impact around the subject property. Mr. Burke indicated this site would be among those considered when evaluating the overall impact of Embark Richmond Highway. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Migliaccio and Mr. Burke, with input from Marianne Gardner, PD, DPZ, regarding the impact that the potential improvements being considered in Embark Richmond Highway, the extent to which these impacts were considered within traffic studies of the existing road network, and the inclusion of such impacts during staff's evaluation of the traffic impact of the recommended development articulated in the proposed Amendment wherein Ms. Gardner indicated that the Embark Richmond Highway improvements were not included in staff's evaluation of the traffic impact for the this recommended development.

Commissioner Hurley pointed out that the subject property had previously been recommended for a development that included mobile homes. She also noted the limited availability for mobile home developments in the County, adding that mobile homes were a mechanism for providing affordable housing. She then asked whether staff evaluated alternative sites that could accommodate a mobile home development. Mr. Sorenson stated that such an evaluation was beyond the scope of the proposed Amendment.

When Commissioner Hurley asked for additional information about the existing zoning on the site and whether the site could accommodate a mobile home development under this zoning, Mr. Sorenson explained that there were portions of the site that were zoned to accommodate mobile homes. However, he noted that the provisions for mobile homes had been removed from the site due to concerns regarding the slope and soil composition of the site. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hurley and Mr. Sorenson, with input from Ms. Gardner, regarding the possibility of reserving other areas of the County for mobile home developments, the existing zoning of the site compared to the recommendations articulated in the Comprehensive Plan, and the provisions for affordable housing that would be included in a development of the site wherein Ms. Gardner said the following:

- The recommendations articulated in the proposed Amendment would accommodate approximately 279 affordable multifamily units, pedestrian-friendly amenities, and community-serving park facilities;

- The Comprehensive Plan identified other areas of the County, including sites along the Richmond Highway corridor, for mobile home developments and included recommendations that favored the preservation of existing mobile home developments; and
- The installation of a mobile home development was determined to be unfeasible due to the condition of the slope and soils on the site.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sargeant, Ms. Gardner and Mr. Burke stated the following:

- The subject property was located in a suburban neighborhood area, as articulated in the Comprehensive Plan;
- The subject property was owned by the Fairfax County Redevelopment and Housing Authority;
- The residents of the neighboring mobile home community were contacted by staff and a prospective applicant for redeveloping the site had conducted meetings with this community as well;
- The opportunities for additional bus services for the site had been evaluated by FCDOT, but no additional bus services were recommended;
- The existing bus services that served the subject property would continue to serve the site if the recommended development articulated in the proposed Amendment were implemented; and
- The southwest corner of the subject property contained an existing bus stop at the intersection of Dart Drive and Richmond Highway and this bus stop would continue to serve the site after redevelopment.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Sargeant and Mr. Burke regarding the possibility of installing additional bus stops around the subject property and the sufficiency of the existing bus stop wherein Commissioner Sargeant suggested that staff conduct additional analysis on methods for improving access to bus services from the site.

Referring to the last sentence in the second bullet on page 13 of the staff report, Commissioner Hart pointed out that this sentence contained a typographical error and recommended that it be revised to read, "If parking structures are planned on the ground floor of buildings, appropriate screening of parking should be achieved in order to avoid adverse impacts to the public realm." In addition, he also expressed concern regarding the language of the second sentence at the top of Page 13 and suggested that it be revised to clarify that the retention of a significant portion of the site for a publicly- accessible park should be applied to both the townhomes and the multifamily units. Mr. Sorenson did not object to these proposed revisions.

In reply to questions from Commissioner Migliaccio, Mr. Burke and Ms. Gardner said the following:

- The recommended development articulated in the proposed Amendment contained sufficient land to accommodate the improvements included in the Embark Richmond Highway for Bus Rapid Transit Lanes and multi-modal transportation;
- The feasibility of a community park facility located in close proximity to Richmond Highway would be subject to further evaluation during the rezoning process for the site;
- The Policy Plan would be referenced for provisions to mitigate the noise impact on the community park facility on the site, which would be located in close proximity to Richmond Highway;
- The language of the proposed Amendment was sufficiently flexible to permit modifying the location of the community park facility to ensure its feasibility;
- The proposed Amendment cited the southwest corner of the subject property as a possible location for a community park facility, but the configuration of this facility and the noise mitigation measures that would be utilized would be evaluated during the rezoning process; and
- The language of the proposed Amendment was sufficient to ensure that a community park facility would be installed in a redevelopment of the site.

Commissioner Flanagan explained that the Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations (MVCCA) had recommended alternative language that modified the first sentence of the final bullet on Page 13 of the Staff Report so that the term "urban plaza" would read "well-designed, publicly accessible community gathering areas." He then echoed remarks from Mr. Burke and Ms. Gardner regarding the flexibility of the language in the proposed Amendment, stating that this language was sufficient to ensure that these recreational areas were feasible. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Flanagan and Commissioner Migliaccio regarding the challenges of installing such a recreational area in close proximity to Richmond Highway and the noise levels generated by Richmond Highway wherein Commissioner Flanagan noted that this issue had been taken into consideration by the MVCCA.

Referring to the language at the top of Page 10 of the Staff Report, which articulated the guidelines for contributions to schools and after-school programs for a development on the site, Commissioner Strandlie explained that this language had been submitted by Fairfax County Public Schools and was not included in the Comprehensive Plan. She then indicated that some of these guidelines were not supported by the community, but issues relating to school contributions from the site would be evaluated during the rezoning process.

Commissioner Flanagan addressed Commissioner Hurley's concerns regarding the removal of an option to develop the site with a mobile home development and the limited availability for mobile home developments throughout the County, stating that the economics for redeveloping the site had changed in a manner that made a mobile home development unfeasible. He added that since the subject property was owned by the County, the modifications required to make a mobile home development feasible would require public funds. Commissioner Flanagan noted that the elimination of an option for a mobile home development on the site would not modify the County's existing policies on such developments, as articulated in the Comprehensive Plan, which favored the preservation of these developments. He said he supported additional efforts to implement mobile home developments on other sites, acknowledging the benefits of mobile home units compared to rental units.

Commissioner Flanagan addressed Commissioner Migliaccio's concerns regarding transportation and recreation facilities, stating that provisions for these issues would be finalized during the rezoning process.

Commissioner Sargeant suggested that staff evaluate additional opportunities for providing on-site program services for residents of the affordable dwelling units that would be included in the development of the site recommended by the proposed Amendment.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Migliaccio and Mr. Sorenson, with input from Ms. Gardner, regarding the impact the recommended development would incur on the local school system, the existing capacity of the school system in the area, the provisions a development on the site would utilize to mitigate this impact on the schools, and the impact of the Embark Richmond Highway effort on public facilities such as schools wherein Ms. Gardner stated that such a development would be expected to offset the impact on the local school system, adding that there were existing Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) in the surrounding area to increase school capacity and further mitigation efforts would be finalized during the rezoning process.

Commissioner Sargeant recommended that additional analysis on the school system in the area, such as the expansion of school facilities such as West Potomac High School, be conducted during the Commission's annual CIP review in March 2017.

Addressing Commissioner Sargeant's concerns regarding the recommended development's impact on the local school system, Commissioner Flanagan said that this issue had been discussed by the MVCCA when reviewing the proposed Amendment. He indicated that it was concluded that the planned increases in school capacity that would be included in the CIP could sufficiently accommodate the increases generated by the recommended development. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Flanagan and Commissioner Migliaccio regarding the specific schools in the surrounding neighborhood that would be impacted by the development and the schools that the children living at this development would attend.

Commissioner Hurley also addressed Commissioner Sargeant's concerns regarding the recommended development's impact on the local school system, stating that this impact could be mitigated by reorganizing the school districts in the area, but noted that the authority for reorganizing the districts was under the purview of the Fairfax County School Board (FCSB).

She added that the FCSB exercised the authority to approve expansions of school facilities. Commissioner Flanagan reiterated that this issue had been discussed by the MVCCA when reviewing the proposed Amendment and had concluded that the provisions for addressing this issue were sufficient.

There being no listed speakers, Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience.

Matt Bell, 2451 Midtown Avenue, Alexandria, representing Fairfax County Housing & Community Development (FCHCD), stated that he was a Commissioner for the FCHCD. He then expressed support for the proposed Amendment, explaining that the recommended development would facilitate a public/private partnership that would install a residential community that included affordable dwelling units, townhouses, and a community-serving park. In addition, Mr. Bell said that approximately 10 acres of the site would be reserved for the community-serving park and this park could be utilized by neighboring communities. He also indicated that the proposed Amendment was supported by the residents of the surrounding community and the MVCCA.

Lynne Strobel, 2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1300, Arlington, representing Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, PC, said she was speaking on behalf of the private developer that would coordinate with the FCHCD on redeveloping the subject property. She spoke in support of the proposed Amendment, echoing remarks from Mr. Bell regarding the features of the residential community that would be included under the recommended development. Ms. Strobel indicated that her client and the FCHCD had coordinated with the MVCCA and the residents of the surrounding community to address their concerns, echoing Mr. Bell's remarks regarding the MVCCA's support of this Amendment. She also stated that a rezoning application for the site had been submitted and was scheduled for public hearing by the Planning Commission in early 2017. Ms. Strobel said that her client and the FCHCD intended to utilize the services of a transportation consultant to determine appropriate traffic mitigation provisions, adding that this effort would be done in coordination with FCDOT and the Virginia Department of Transportation. She added that the proposed development would provide adequate dedication to accommodate the widening of Richmond Highway and the improvements prescribed by the Embark Richmond Highway effort. Ms. Strobel also addressed Commissioner Migliaccio's concerns regarding the noise impact on the community-serving park within the development, stating that a noise study had been conducted and this study was being reviewed to determine the appropriate mitigation provisions.

Commissioner Migliaccio reiterated his concerns regarding the recommended development's impact on the Level of Service at the intersection of Richmond Highway and Lockheed Boulevard, stating that he favored additional coordination between neighboring communities and prospective applicants to address this issue. Ms. Strobel did not object to such coordination, stating that additional review would be conducted with the traffic consultant to determine the appropriate transportation provisions for the development. Commissioner Migliaccio then noted the importance of addressing the level of service at the intersection of Richmond Highway and Lockheed Boulevard prior to the completion of the Embark Richmond Highway effort.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for closing remarks from Mr. Sorenson, who declined.

Commissioner Flanagan commended Commissioner Migliaccio's for raising his concerns regarding the traffic impact the recommended development would incur on the surrounding road networks. He added that additional coordination would be conducted between the Mount Vernon District and the Lee District to address this issue.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Flanagan for action on this item.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Chairman Murphy: Public hearing is closed. Mr. Flanagan.

Commissioner Flanagan: Thank you. As staff indicated, the Plan Amendment would modify the Plan language for the northern portion of the Tax Map Parcel 92-4 ((1)) 82A to support affordable and market-rate housing options and the creation of a large public park accessible to all members of the community. The Amendment would further revitalization goals of Richmond Highway and may increase future transit ridership along Richmond Highway corridor as well. Staff worked closely with the community and the property owner to identify issues and opportunities and the result of this effort is a project that both retains a portion of the site for a future public park and provides housing options at multiple points along the income spectrum. Subsequently, the planning, zoning, recreation, environment, and transportation committees of the Mount Vernon Council reviewed and unanimously supports the staff recommendations with the minor modifications that are now also acceptable to County staff, pertaining to community gathering spaces and access - and the scale of the public park. I agree with these minor modifications. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF A PLANNING COMMISSION ALTERNATIVE FOR PLAN AMENDMENT 2015-IV-MV1, AS FOUND ON MY HANDOUT DATED OCTOBER 27, 2016.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion? Ms. Hurley and then Mr. Migliaccio.

Commissioner Hurley: This Plan Amendment has many good elements, as was just encapsulated – revitalization, affordable senior housing – all to the good. However, I'm still looking – especially when it comes to the rezoning part – that that MP – MHP, Mobile Home Park, has some public/private partnership considerations of somewhere in this County to have that option still available so, although I won't vote against this option, I will abstain. I won't vote for it.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Migliaccio.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this Plan Amendment and what we're doing on this site. I will be supporting this Amendment this evening but, as I expressed during the public hearing, I do have great concern about the intersection of Lockheed Boulevard and Richmond Highway and general transportation issues – but that specific intersection. And when we get to the rezoning, that is what I'm going to be keying in on as we move forward. But tonight I am supporting this because this does need to move forward to the next phase. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion?

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Yes, thank you. I understand that there is some time pressure to voting on tonight's handout tonight. I wish we had time to edit the first new sentence in paragraph four and the second bullet following that along the lines of what I had suggested on the other one. And I hope that, between now and the Board, some of the clarity could be improved in those two sentences. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Flanagan.

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes. I'd be happy to take that up with Supervisor Storck when this comes before the Board of Supervisors – before it comes before the Board of Supervisors – because I think your observations are valid.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion? All those in favor of the motion on PA 2016-IV-MV1, to adopt the alternative as submitted and articulated by Mr. Flanagan, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? The motion carries.

Commissioner Hurley: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: One abstention, Ms. Hurley.

(The motion carried by a vote of 9-0-1. Commissioner Hurley abstained. Commissioners Hedetniemi and Lawrence were absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

The meeting was adjourned at 9:29 p.m.
Peter F. Murphy, Chairman
James R. Hart, Secretary

Audio and video recordings of this meeting are available at the Planning Commission Office,
12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Jacob Caporaletti

Approved on: March 29, 2017



John W. Cooper, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission