

**MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 2018**

PRESENT: Peter F. Murphy, Chairman, Springfield District
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commission At-Large
John A. Carter, Hunter Mill District
Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District
Julie M. Strandlie, Mason District
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District
Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Providence District
Donté Tanner, Sully District
Mary D. Cortina, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: John C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District

//

The meeting was called to order at 7:42 p.m., by Chairman Peter F. Murphy, in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

RZ/FDP 2016-HM-034 – RENAISSANCE CENTRO 1801, LLC
(Decision Only) (Public Hearing was held on December 6, 2017)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Carter: Well you know, some of these cases are more difficult than others and unusually the test, a good recommendation is everybody is mad at the end. So I think we might be able to accomplish that. Yes, I'm going for deferral on 1801 Renaissance Centro. It's been a difficult case for me and I wanna thank Mary Ann Tsai for working with me. And I made all sorts of friends from all around. And getting lots of calls from everybody that I know – knew and some people I don't know. The Master Plan is – it's conflicting inside the Master Plan. It calls for a lot of density, a 3.0 and then it calls for a step down, and the two don't work very well. It calls for the project to be in scale with the adjacent – and by the way I did listen to the tapes twice, and parts of it more times than that then, I guess we gotta thank somebody for deferring this for today since we're trying December before it all started. But okay. And some of the language in the zoning is a little – it's either not there or it's a little contorted, I think and not clear to me. So, with that I'm gonna make a stab at this. And, number one, the reason for the deferral is the Comprehensive Plan is about scale and development and there is at least four areas. One it talks about the highest densities a quarter mile away to a half mile. This one is not half mile, it's a little more than half mile but it's on the edge and the plans says, well it's not a half mile but if it's on the edge it's ok, so. Interesting language. It says transition of building heights from the Metro Station. It says appropriate design features, such as reduce building height, mass, and for new development closest to these existing neighbors, should be utilized to

help define the limits of the TSAs. Well, okay. The parcel of three stories has a three-story office building and the new development should be a similar scale to the high-rise building. Well, I think the building that you see in this is not a similar scale. Undefined exactly what similar scale is, but if it means density, it's not close to the same density. If it means building height, it's twenty stories, and the adjacent development is fourteen. The building across the street is eighteen, so it's not close. And then there's some setback issues from Reston Parkway. So, I'd like the applicant to work on those things and – and I've talked to the applicant about this and I don't know where we would end up. But we ought to work on those. But in short, it's gonna have to come down a bit. And, Mary Ann helped us a little bit when they changed the workforce housing units. And if you remember at the last hearing the issue was the – the market rate units have to be within ten percent of the workforce housing units. If you do that, and what happens? It means the market rate units get smaller which means the density gets smaller. You cannot go up because it's already at the maximum. So, there's some room there to change the density. Now there is a waiver requirement. If you're gonna accept the PRM, which not everybody does, some people thinks this should be PRC and that would change the unit types. But you can't use the PRM if the lot size is less than 2.0. So, the staff had originally suggest, well why don't we just do a waiver for it. Well, I don't think you get a waiver unless you're in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, which this isn't, unless they change that density and the height. So, no waiver yet. And the next aspect is a loading docks and we've talked about that here quite a lot. There is a grand total of three on-site park – parking spaces. There's two loading dock spaces and they want a waiver from three. Well, given what's been talked about here, UPS trucks, the plumber who comes with fixtures, the kitchen re-doer - remodeler comes with his cabinet – he's gotta have a place to park. And some of these are very short-term. So, I think you can have a waiver of the large size, but something in the garage or somewhere has to have more spaces for their service vehicles. And then, finally, is this workforce housing issue. I think that Mary Ann Tsai is successfully worked with the applicant to come up with the new proffer there, so that the market rate units will be within ten percent of the workforce housing units. But there's still a lingering issue about the parking. And the Zoning Ordinance is unclear, doesn't talk about this. So, I'm going to propose something which is that every unit regardless of size would have one space. Now normally, it's a 1.6. So, I figured well it's hard to get .6 space. So, we'll go for a one space per unit. This is not in the Zoning Ordinance. And the combination of the price of the – of your unit, plus the price of the parking has to meet the workforce housing income levels. Future maintenance, all those issues that's beyond this. But the parking – you buy your house with the parking. Just like you don't buy a single-family house without the garage and the drive way. You buy it all together. So, I want all those three things worked out. Maybe other people have some suggestions and we'd like to give the applicant some time to work on that. And I then I got another suggestion. Since we're interpreting things a bit, I'm used to an interpretation booklet where we would write these things down. And I've got four of these cases and they're all very similar but they're being judged differently for different reasons. So, I think we ought to be able to record some of these things that we come up with so that we remember the next time. And to me it would be best for – I don't know if Fred's here. But Fred Selden to actually sign those and so that all the staff get them and that we could get them. So, I'm giving a developer a little of an assignment as well as perhaps the staff. I know it's a little bit off color, but I think we need this for these. And this workforce housing issue is gonna come up at least in Reston times a thousand. And so, anyway that's my reason for a deferral. And I see there are several dates, probably the 22nd might be a good date to defer this to. So, want a motion now or do you want to discuss?

Chairman Murphy: No.

Commissioner Carter: Okay.

Chairman Murphy: Please.

Commissioner Carter: Motion now?

Chairman Murphy: Yup.

Commissioner Carter: Okay. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR RZ/FDP 2016-HM-034, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN COMMENTS TO A DATE CERTAIN OF FEBRUARY 22ND.

Commissioners Strandlie and Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Strandlie [sic]. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision only RZ FDP 2016-HM-034, to a date certain of February 22nd with the record remaining open for comments, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Ulfelder was absent from the public hearing.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Commissioner Migliaccio established the following order of the agenda:

1. SEA 82-M-093-02 – 7231 ARLINGTON BOULEVARD, LLC
2. SE 2017-MA-001 – BYCJJ, LLC
3. SE 2017-BR-023 – DANIEL AND MATTHEW INVESTMENTS LP
4. PA 2015-IV-MV1 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (EMBARK RICHMOND HIGHWAY)

This order was accepted without objection.

//

Chairman Murphy called the first case on the agenda.

//

SEA 82-M-093-02 – 7231 ARLINGTON BOULEVARD, LLC – Appl. under Sects. 4-504, 9-610 and 9-612 of the Zoning Ordinance to amend SE 82-M-093 previously approved for a service station with waivers of minimum lot size requirements and open space requirements, to permit site modifications and reaffirm previous waivers of minimum lot size requirements and open space requirements and associated modifications to development conditions. Located at 7231 Arlington Blvd., Falls Church, 22042 on approx. 26,557 sq. ft. of land zoned C-5. Tax Map 50-3 ((4)) 260A. MASON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Mark M. Viani, Applicant's Agent, Bean, Kinney & Korman, P.C., reaffirmed the affidavit dated December 14, 2017.

Commissioner Strandlie asked that Chairman Murphy ascertain whether there were any speakers for this application. There being none, he asked that presentations by staff and the applicant be waived, and the public hearing closed. No objections were expressed, therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Strandlie for action on this application.

//

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This application has been before the Mason District Land Use Committee on two or three separate occasions. The Mason District Land Use Committee gave its approval for this matter and I'd like to go ahead and make a motion to approve. The applicant 7231 Arlington Boulevard, LLC request approval of an amendment to a special exception previously approved for a service station and waivers of the open space and lot size requirements to permit site modifications, and a waiver of the loading space. Specifically, the applicant proposes to construct two additional service bays, close of vehicular access point and reconfigure the onsite substandard parking spaces. A big improvement to that lot. I request that the applicant state on the record their acceptance of the development conditions dated January 12th, 2018.

Mark M. Viani, Applicant's Agent, Bean, Kinney & Korman, P.C.: Thank you, Commissioner Strandlie. On behalf of the applicant we accept the development conditions.

Commissioner Strandlie: Great. Thank you. I MOVE THAT THAT PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE SEA 82-M-093-2 FOR A SERVICE STATION – SERVICE STATION AND A WAIVER OF OPEN SPACE, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JANUARY 12TH, 2018.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve SEA 82-M-093-02, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Strandlie: I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE A WAIVER OF THE LOADING SPACE REQUIREMENT PER SECTION 11-200 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE.

Commissioner Flanagan: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Flanagan. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you very much.

The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Ulfelder was absent from the public hearing.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

SE 2017-MA-001 – BYCJJ, LLC – Appl. under Sects. 4-804, 4-806, 4-807, 4-808, 4-809, 9-301, 9-302, 9-304, 9-309 and 9-622 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit an adult daycare center and banquet hall; provisions for modifications, waivers, increases and uses in a commercial revitalization district. Located at 4311 Ravensworth Rd. and 7233 and 7243 Little River Tpke., Annandale, 22003 on approx. 3.79 ac. of land zoned C-8, CRD, SC and HC. Tax Map 71-1 ((1)) 83, 84 and 85. MASON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Ilryong Moon, Applicant's Agent, Moon, Park & Associates, reaffirmed the affidavit dated January 29, 2018.

Kelly Atkinson, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She stated that staff recommended approval of SE 2017-MA-001.

Commissioner Strandlie asked for the expectation of required shuttles in lieu of individual vehicle drop-offs and the impact to morning commute. She stated she was concerned with traffic backups at Ravensworth Road and Little River Turnpike. Ms. Atkinson stated staff analyzed the trip generation uses and with the proposed daycare center and banquet hall, there would be a significant reduction in trip generation in that area. Commissioner Strandlie stated there were no customers in the morning hours at the Kids Choice Sports Center and would be at the adult daycare center. Ms. Atkinson deferred to the applicant. Commissioner Strandlie requested additional information on the building construction. Ms. Atkinson deferred to the applicant's architect.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked for clarification on the elevation to the design quality for the area. He asked whether the design quality was at the discretion of the applicant or resolved at site plan. Ms. Atkinson stated the applicant was conditioned to elevations that were included in the special exceptions plat. The Office of Community Revitalization also reviewed the application and provided the applicant with some design suggestions. The design of the building has improved since the submission of the application. She stated the applicant was not conditioned to anything other than what was required in the special exceptions plat. The applicant was encouraged to continue working to refine the building materials, however they were not required to do so. Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked why this was not a requirement. Ms. Atkinson stated the applicant agreed to the brick and stone veneer. The applicant tried to adhere to the design guidelines.

Commissioner Hart stated in Development Condition Number 16, there should not be an inter-parcel access to the north of Little River Turnpike. He asked for the location of the inter-parcel access. Ms. Atkinson stated there was an existing inter-parcel access between the two properties. The applicant owned all three parcels. Staff requested the applicant maintain the inter-parcel access. With the two newly created lots, the applicant could sell the adult daycare and banquet hall. Commissioner Hart made reference to the second sentence of Development Condition Number 16. Ms. Atkinson stated there was not an easement in place between the two properties. Staff required one of the easements be recorded at time of site plan. Commissioner Hart asked whether the first and second sentences of the development conditions made reference to her point. Ms. Atkinson stated the first sentence of Development Condition Number 16 made reference to access to the north, and if necessary the language would be refined. There was an inter-parcel access to the north and one in the south. The applicant continued to maintain the existing southern inter-parcel access. Commissioner Hart asked if the restaurant part of the property was not part of the development conditions. Ms. Atkinson stated the restaurant parcel was subject to the development conditions. Commissioner Hart asked why there was not an east bound connection. Ms. Atkinson stated in the Public Facilities Manual (PFM), the applicant was required to have inter-parcel access in all directions. The applicant requested a waiver of the inter-parcel access requirement to the east from the proposed adult daycare center. Commissioner Hart asked what would happen if the parcel redeveloped. Ms. Atkinson stated because the applicant was proposing to reuse the building, and not a complete demolition and redesign of the property, staff did not recommend inter-parcel access to the east. Commissioner Hart stated he thought this was an either-or situation. In response, Ms. Atkinson stated the applicant could either reuse the building or build a new building and the same footprint would be reused. Discussions continued regarding the inter-parcel access.

Commissioner Flanagan made reference to Page Number 9 of the staff report. He said in the event the applicant chose to demolish the existing building, the footprint would remain and the new building would be constructed using that footprint. He stated the staff report recommended the applicant retain a structural engineer to evaluate the stability of the building. Commissioner Flanagan stated he could not locate in the proffers or development conditions language that spoke to said recommendation. He asked whether the applicant agreed to hire the structural engineer. Ms. Atkinson stated the applicant hired a structural engineer to complete an assessment of the property. A copy the report was provided to staff. Land Development Services staff and building officials also reviewed that report. There were no concerns at this point with the

applicant's report. The report noted there were no significant structural failures that would warrant discontinuance of the building. Ms. Atkinson stated this issue has been resolved.

Commissioner Sargeant made reference to Development Condition Number 8. He stated preapproval was required prior to having Non-Residential Use Permit (Non-RUP) issued. Commissioner Sargeant asked whether there were any concerns. Ms. Atkinson stated adult daycares were not required to go before the Healthcare Advisory Board. The applicant agreed to go at staff's request. Once an operator was chosen, questions regarding Non-RUP issues would be answered. Commissioner Sargeant asked whether there was an overlap with the hours of operation for the proposed adult daycare center. Ms. Atkinson stated based on a discussion at the Mason District Land Use Committee, the hours of operation have been revised. Services on weekdays would end at 4:00 p.m. versus 6:00 p.m. This would allow for a two-hour window. The proposed use would be closed on Saturdays. Commissioner Sargeant asked whether the two-hour window posed any concerns. Ms. Atkinson stated there were no overlapping concerns.

Commissioner Strandlie stated there was a discussion about changing the condition to requiring certification before construction. She asked whether this was still an option. Ms. Atkinson stated based on discussions with the State of Virginia, they would not hear the application until the applicant the project was further along in the construction of the building.

Mr. Moon gave a presentation wherein he stated the following:

- Presented the Commission with visuals of the current conditions of the buildings on each of the properties. The subject property had three lots. They consisted of Lots 85, 84 and 83. A restaurant was located on both Lots 85 and 83. The sports center also sat on two lots;
- Through the special exception process, the applicant's intent was to consolidate three lots and have them subdivided. Lots 85A and 84A would be created in order for the restaurant to be on Lot 85, and the daycare center would be on Lot 84A;
- The gas station and convenience store would be removed. All underground tanks would also be removed. A soil test would be conducted. Three years ago, the client went through a Phase I testing and no problems were detected. A Phase II would be conducted with the current proposed development. The applicant would remedy any issues that may arise during Phase II of the project;
- The roof of the sports center was in poor condition and the property required improvements. The applicant planned to demolish the building with the exception of the middle steel frame of the building and foundation wall;
- The restaurant would remain as is and the current use of the sports center would become an adult daycare center and banquet hall. Operating hours would not overlap. The use of the banquet hall for the public would be conducted during evening hours and would include Saturdays and Sundays. The adult daycare operating hours would be reduced by two hours, with an end time of 4:00 p.m. It was anticipated many individuals who utilized

the adult daycare center would leave shortly after lunch. That timeframe would vary between 1:30 p.m. and 2:30 p.m.;

- The size of the banquet hall was approximately 11,000 square feet. In order to accommodate parking requirements, the capacity for the banquet would be capped at 150 guests. The banquet hall would also be used by the adult daycare center's clients for lunch and various group activities. The area would also serve as a multi-purpose room. No walk-ins would be allowed and everyone would be transported to the facility;
- Fifty-seven spaces to include the use of 13 vans was required. The applicant would provide a total of 80 spaces. Child daycare requirements were being implemented for the adult daycare center. Those parking requirements satisfied the parking requirement needs. Should additional parking be required, the applicant would find alternate parking locations;
- The State of Virginia required one caretaker for every six participants. There were five administrative staff and five kitchen staff. Up to five visiting instructors were expected;
- Based on Fairfax County's data for the year 2015, an estimated 70% of commuters had personal vehicles, 11% utilized mass transit, 9.5% car pooled and others walked and biked. By applying this data, sixty-nine spaces would be required for the proposed facility. The Comprehensive Plan called for residents to utilize mass transit, car pools, and incentives be provided to the working class for mass transit services;
- If the special exception process were approved, potential operators would be screened and a final candidate would be selected. The applicant would also seek the guidance of the Healthcare Advisory Board. The selected operator, to include the client's architect would study state requirements of the design and other needs of the facility; and
- The applicant satisfied all County requirements and was willing to accept and comply with the terms of the development conditions.

Commissioner Hurley asked to explain the transportation system for the clients in the adult daycare. Mr. Moon stated that other than the occasional daily pickups, or someone leaving earlier than the scheduled pickup time, all individuals would be transported by 13 passenger vans. The seating capacity for those vans was 15 individuals. Commissioner Hurley inquired about the challenges elderly individuals with wheelchairs would face waiting for a shuttle at a pickup location during the winter months. Mr. Moon stated pickup locations were from the individual homes. The shuttles would be on a pick-up and drop-off schedule. Mr. Moon provided the Commission with visuals of the facility's pick-up and drop-off locations. He further stated the improvement of the facility would be an added benefit to the applicant and surrounding communities. Property values would also increase. The applicant would contribute additional taxes to the community. An eight-foot wide sidewalk would be constructed along Ravensworth Rd. The three entry points to the proposed daycare center would be removed. Keeping the multiple entry points would create a risk for drivers and pedestrians.

Commissioner Strandlie stated she read the Development Condition Number 9 as a requirement for participants to enroll and utilize the shuttle service for both drop-offs and pick-ups. She asked whether family members would pick up the elderly on a daily basis. Mr. Moon stated they would be picked up from home and transported to the facility and vice versa, unless in case of emergency. Commissioner Strandlie asked for an explanation of the applicant's business model. Mr. Moon stated the applicant, at that point, did not have a business model. Commissioner Strandlie asked what the applicant envisioned for the service area. Mr. Moon stated that due to the limitation of van transportation pick up, there would be cap on travel distance within a certain mile radius of the Annandale area. Commissioner Strandlie asked for an explanation of the brick veneer material used. Dooil Paik, Applicant's Architect, Gods Grace Enterprise, Inc., stated with the limited budget, the choice of finishing material was limited. An effort was made to match the materials with the Han Gang Korean Restaurant's stucco material. The proposed material was above the regular wall and the sloped roof would be hidden. A light finishing material would be used. The existing frame had a sloped roof and metal plates. He echoed Mr. Moon's comments regarding demolition of the building with the exception of the middle steel frame of the building and foundation wall. There would be a stone water table around the building. A granite material would put the project overbudget. Due to the applicant's limited budget, Commissioner Strandlie asked for the outcome of the project in a situation where the footprint or frame could not be used. Mr. Moon stated in such scenario, the applicant would make a decision regarding additional investments, however, was not able to predict a final outcome.

Commissioner Flanagan clarified the brick veneer material. He stated all materials proposed were masonry veneer. The backing would either be steel studs or wood. Wood studs were less expensive but more combustible. Commissioner Flanagan stated for safety reasons in a public building, steel studs should be used. Mr. Paik confirmed steel studs would be used for the proposed building. He stated based on commercial construction law guidelines for commercial buildings, wood studs could not be used.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner inquired about the elevation and design issues and incentives made to employees for alternative means of transportation. Mr. Moon stated the applicant would not object to adding as part of the development conditions, incentives for alternative means of transportation for employees. The applicant's intent was to provide incentives to the employees. Mr. Moon stated there was no disagreement with the County staff regarding the elevation and design of the proposed building. The applicant would look into any future financial implications. He stated the applicant's goal was to mitigate any issues.

Commissioner Hart inquired about overflow parking in case of large events. Mr. Moon stated the client would comply with the development conditions. He stated for large events, there would be a limit to 150 guests and the extra parking would accommodate those guests. The original number of 300 guests was a calculation error. The number was reduced after consultation with County staff. Mr. Moon stated there were no written agreements in place with nearby property owners for overflow parking. He stated the applicant would comply with all limitations in place for the special exception. He stated the nearby parking, also owned by the applicant, had excess parking spaces. Those guests would be allowed to use the excess parking. However, the use of the excess spaces was not part of the proposed application. Commissioner Hart inquired about the dumpster access and location angle. Yogendra Maharjan, Applicant's Engineer, AMA

Engineers, LLC, stated the dumpster was located at the left corner of the lot and there would be sufficient space for the dumpster truck to make a 90-degree turn. Commissioner Hart asked whether the vans would remain on site. Mr. Moon said that they would. Commissioner Hart stated exterior of the building should be made of real brick and not a substitute material.

Commissioner Cortina asked whether the streetscape improvements included future bicycle lane improvements. Ms. Atkinson stated she would get back to the Commission regarding future bike lane improvements to Ravensworth Road. Mr. Moon stated he believed there was a bicycle lane on that portion of Ravensworth Road.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker and recited the rules for testimony.

Diane Lee, 4600 John Marr Drive, #201, Annandale, expressed her opposition to the proposed application. Ms. Lee stated parking was an ongoing issue. Complaints were made on several occasions to the Kids Choice Sports Center property owners informing them of parking space violations. Children ran around the parking lot unattended, and liability issues were of a concern. She stated parking would worsen with the addition of a banquet hall and adult daycare center.

Chairman Murphy asked for the location of Ms. Lee's property. Ms. Lee stated her property was to the rear of the gas station.

Commissioner Flanagan asked whether the inter-parcel access being required was between the applicant's property and Ms. Lee's property. Ms. Atkinson stated there was an existing inter-parcel access between the two properties that would remain. Commissioner Flanagan asked if a barrier was in place between the two properties without in inter-parcel access. Ms. Atkinson stated she could not answer the question.

Greg McGillicuddy, 4127 Meadow Court, Annandale, was in opposition to the proposed application. Mr. McGillicuddy also stated the following:

- The Annandale Central Business District Planning Committee met with the applicant in May of 2007. The applicant was not cooperative, and did not consider the suggestions of the committee;
- The applicant refused to offer a contribution to get their parking situation resolved;
- It would take more time to transport the adult daycare clients by shuttles. Most of those clients were picked up by family members;
- The applicant parking formulation was not accurate;
- Inexpensive materials would be used on the proposed 60-year old structure which did not correspond to the revitalization design guidelines;

- The applicant was required to have one enhanced American with Disabilities Act-compliant bathroom for every ten individuals. This requirement was not included in the applicant's plan; and
- The State of Virginia would not approve a license certification of the applicant because the proposed application did not meet the requirements for an adult daycare center.

Nicki Burton, 4127 Meadow Court, Annandale, was in opposition to the proposed application. Ms. Burton stated the following:

- The Annandale Chamber of Commerce studied plan in great detail for approximately nine months, tried to work with the applicant and made a number of useful suggestions. The applicant rejected every suggestion;
- The suggested building materials by the applicant was not part of the revitalization design guidelines. The most inexpensive materials were being used. Square and rectangular buildings with flat roofs were being constructed;
- The Annandale Chamber of Commerce objected to the lack of parking. There was no parking tabulation;
- Fairfax County was now in the process of addressing the needs of elder care. Elder care was now becoming a part of the for-profit business sector. In the past, this was only a municipal obligation and in some cases faith based organizations provided opportunities for drop-ins;
- The state guidelines required eighty-seven employee parking spaces. Staff could be incentivized, however there was no guarantee whether they would utilize mass transportation. There were no parking spaces for visitors, drop-off or delivery. Stacking space was limited and double parking would occur, which would cause additional parking issues on Ravensworth Road; and
- There was also an air quality concern. There was an outdoor space that was inadequate to the number of adults. There was a total of 27 square feet per person which was below average. The only compromise made by the applicant was for fifty adults to utilize the outdoor space at a time.

Otae Jones, 4600 John Marr Drive, #201, Annandale, opposed the proposed application. Mr. Jones stated he was the partial owner of the property at 4600 John Marr Drive, #201, Annandale. He stated he received the original plan for inter-access parking. Inter-access parking on the south side, toward the east would take away the dumpsters and parking spaces. The County was notified of the inter-access concern, to include access during demolition.

Commissioner Strandlie stated her intent to defer the decision on the application upon conclusion of the public hearing. She said there would be a significant amount of time for individuals to continue to submit written materials for the record.

Tim Baldwin, representing Annandale Smiles Dental Practice, 4322 Ravenworth Road, Annandale, stated the practice's hours of operation were from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday, and 8:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on Friday and Saturday. The problem was the Kids Choice Sports Center's Saturday operation hours. There were towing restrictions and signs which reflected same. However, there were still problems with overflow parking and parking violations on other properties.

Commissioner Sargeant made reference to Development Condition Number 9. He asked whether the passenger van buses were a requirement for purchase. Ms. Atkinson stated staff provided flexibility on the condition. The applicant would have to provide the same number of parking spots for the vans or an offsite parking location. Commissioner Sargeant stated during the deferral period there should be clarification regarding the ratio of shuttle trips verses individual passenger transportation. There should also be an illustration for traffic flow to and out of the site.

Commissioner Strandlie requested staff conduct a calculation of shuttle trips and not only a reduction in trips. She stated that vehicles coming the Interstate 495 Capital Beltway to Evergreen Street. Commissioner Strandlie inquired about parking locations for shuttles on the weekends and the impact to the amount of space available for large events at the banquet hall. Ms. Atkinson stated if there were no contracts with private providers, the shuttle buses would be parked on site. The spaces occupied by the buses were factored into the number of parking required for large events at the banquet hall.

Ms. Atkinson followed up on Commissioner Cortina's question regarding the bicycle lane. She stated there was room within the pavement for the lane.

Mr. Moon in his rebuttal testimony stated the parking issues with the Kids Choice Sports Center would be mitigated after the redevelopment of the property. The removal of the gas station and convenience store would also increase the number of parking spaces on the property. The 3.2 percent reduction derived from the operating hours of the banquet hall and the adult daycare center. There was no overlapping of operation hours. Mr. Moon stated interior design was conceptual and not the final design. The final design would be determined after the selection of an operator. The application would meet all state license requirements. Inter-parcel access was required by Fairfax County and not the applicant. The property owner in the south did not agree with the inter-parcel access relocation.

There being no additional speakers, further comments or questions from the Commission, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Strandlie for actions on this application.

//

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have – appreciate everyone's comments tonight. And thank you, Mr. Moon, and your clients for your presentation, and for staff's very hard work on this case. It has been going on for a while, we still have a lot more work to do. The

Mason District Land Use Committee did not approve of this application when it considered it on Tuesday evening. Therefore, I am going to defer the decision until March 1st to give us some time to work out these details, and to allow the land use committee to have another look at what we get. So, therefore Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR SE 2017-MA-001 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MARCH 1ST, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN – OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC COMMENTS.

Commissioner Flanagan: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Flanagan. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision on SE 2017-MA-001 to a date certain of March 1st, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Commissioner Migliaccio: I think there's a Board date attached to it that you may wanna recommend moving.

Commissioner Strandlie: Yes. Actually, I'd asked about that for my case last night too. So, we will have to RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO DELAY THEIR HEARING UNTIL AFTER MARCH 1ST.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Migliaccio. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.
The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Ulfelder was absent from the public hearing.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

SE 2017-BR-023 – DANIEL AND MATTHEW INVESTMENTS LP – Appl. under Sect. 3-104 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a child care center. Located at 11909 and 11917 Lee Hwy. and 4613 Holly Ave., Fairfax, 22030 on approx. 2.91 ac. of land zoned R-1 and WS. Tax Map 56-1 ((7)) 2, 3, 8 and 8A. BRADDOCK DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Inda Stagg, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, P.C., reaffirmed the affidavit dated January 16, 2018.

Commissioner Hart disclosed the law firm of Hart & Horan, P.C. had two cases where the attorneys in Ms. Stagg's firm represented an adverse party or adverse parties. He stated that matter and those parties were unrelated to application. Commissioner Hart stated the law firm of Hart & Horan, P.C. had no business or financial relationship and to his knowledge, did not believe this matter before the Planning Commission would affect his ability to participate in the case. Commissioner Hart also disclosed the law firm of Hart & Horan, P.C. had an ongoing attorney-client relationship with Professional Design Group, Inc. and Mr. Hamid Matin, Applicant's Engineer. Commissioner Hart further recused himself from the public hearing and the vote.

Commissioner Hurley announced her intent to defer the decision only on the subject application upon conclusion of the public hearing.

Kelly Atkinson, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She stated that staff recommended approval of SE 2017-BR-023.

Commission Hurley inquired about by-right uses for the proposed site. Ms. Atkinson stated three single family homes could be built on the property. Commissioner Hurley asked whether the right-turn lane would be constructed, the stormwater improvements be made, and service drive be installed. Ms. Atkinson stated they would not be. Commissioner Hurley asked for an approximate open date for the future retail center. Ms. Atkinson stated the site plan was in the bonds and permitting stage, and would be subject to the developer meeting those requirements. Commissioner Hurley asked if the sewer line concern that drove the configuration of the playground was dependent on the sewer line going through the shopping center. Ms. Atkinson confirmed. Commissioner Hurley inquired about the size of the proposed childcare center compared to the size of the retail center. Ms. Atkinson stated the childcare center was approximately 12,000 square feet and the retail center was approximately 15,000 square feet.

Commissioner Sargeant asked for the square footage requirements for outdoor space. Ms. Atkinson stated the square footage requirement was 100 square feet per child. Commissioner Sargeant asked whether there was sufficient space under that scenario for all children. Ms. Atkinson stated the required number applied to the total enrollment. There was a condition in place for the number of children allowed to be present outside at one time. That amount would total 83 children. The number of supervising adults would be subject to state licensing code. Commissioner Sargeant inquired about the concerns regarding the retaining wall and fence. Ms. Atkinson stated there would be a typical 6-foot board-on-board fence surrounding a play area. In this case, there was a retaining wall up to 7-feet tall in some places, which would require a 4-foot tall safety fence. Staff was concerned with the irregular shapes of the play area, coupled with the retaining wall, and the blockage of sunlight access. Ms. Atkinson stated a structured retaining wall was required. Cathy Lewis, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning stated the structure of the play area and its location, and limited area, dictated the play

area was somewhat in a hole. This was not an ideal situation; hence additional play area would be beneficial.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner stated staff noted in their conclusions, concerns were expressed regarding intensity and the applicant's willingness to address those concerns. He asked for further elaboration on the intensity issue. Ms. Atkinson stated the intensity concern ranged from the originally proposed enrollment of two hundred students. This dictated 42 parking spaces, more than what was required in the Zoning Ordinance, combined with the provision of a septic field verses extending sanitary sewer to the property. The applicant was asked to consider design changes to the site and the ability to add a second story. The applicant rejected the idea of a second story. The service drive and travel way was also a concern. The proposed retail center across the street as well as a childcare housed to the west, had a similar service drive connection, where the service drive went through the parking lot. Ms. Atkinson stated the service drive pushed the building further east and compromised the outdoor play area. As a result, there was not sufficient open space left. In terms of intensity, Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked how significant was the assessment of the sewer line verses the sewer connection. Ms. Atkinson stated if the applicant was able to connect to a sanitary sewer line, this would allow for a more regular outdoor play area. Discussions continued regarding the intensity and its significance.

Commissioner Carter stated the adjacent service parcels did not have a service drive. He asked for the likelihood the service drive would work. Ms. Atkinson stated there was no connection to the east at this time, and the applicant only had control over their property. The applicant provided the service drive as required by the Zoning Ordinance, in the event the parcel to the east redeveloped.

Commissioner Cortina asked whether traffic upgrades applied to the individuals on Holly Avenue or Lee Highway and were those for morning and afternoon periods. Ms. Atkinson stated Holly Avenue was a Level of Service (LOS) F. This would apply to the ante meridiem and post meridiem peak hours. This was analyzed in the applicant's transportation study. Without the development, it would also exist as a LOS F with future conditions. One of the concerns with Holly Avenue, was when travelling south, there would be cut-through traffic. Holly Avenue turned into Lee High Drive, which then connected to Village Drive, and would exit onto Lee High Way.

Commissioner Tanner inquired about the total number of revised changes, to include site changes since December 23, 2017. Ms. Atkinson stated there was a reduction in students from 200 to 150, the write-out only was removed from the applicant's proposal, and better diagrams were provided which showed the distinction between the sanitary sewer and septic options. Commissioner Tanner stated that deferring the application would allow for additional time to review the most recent changes. Ms. Atkinson stated an addendum to the staff report would also be submitted.

Ms. Stagg gave a presentation wherein she stated the following:

- The staffing ratio was the same for indoor and outdoor;

- This was a high-quality development. The façade of the property was brick with hardy plank material. The sign for the school faced Lee Highway;
- Parents were required to park their cars and walk the children into the classrooms which caused the parking ratio being higher than what was required by Fairfax County;
- The heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system was located on the roof of the building;
- A graphic was provided to the Commission which showed Holly Avenue in relation to the property and surrounding roads in the area;
- The maximum floor area ratio in the R-1 District for commercial uses was .15. The proposed structure was at a .10;
- Parking was one space per staff member, and one space per room;
- There was 100 square foot of outdoor play area per child. This was required by Zoning Ordinance;
- Sixty-five open spaces were provided;
- Option Number 1 was the preferred option. Sanitary sewer was available. There was a regularly shaped play area to the east of the building. Entrance access was off of the service drive and would be used on a daily basis. There was a portion of open space that remained the same;
- There were eight special standards that addressed harmony with the Comprehensive Plan, the general intent of the zoning district, and the developing neighboring properties. The applicant believed this was consistent with the Fairfax County Area Policy Plan location guidelines. The applicant acknowledged the proposed use was below the maximum permitted 1.5, and the development was consistent with the adjacent residential structures;
- Based on the transportation analysis conducted by the applicant, the proposed use would not worsen the current traffic situation. The road out of Holly Avenue onto Lee Highway was at a Level F and would remain the same;
- Modifications would be made to landscaping and screening. Those modifications would allow for existing vegetation to remain and be supplemented, in order to make transitional screening;
- There were no open space requirements for the R-1 District, however the applicant would provide sixty-five percent of open space;
- Staff and the applicant were in agreement with the utility drainage and signage; and

- The applicant provided 100 square feet of usable outdoor recreational area per child. The applicant compared intensity with the other surrounding three childcare centers, Lee Highway KinderCare, Sparkles at Fair Oaks Child Development Center, Horizon Child Development Center. The proposed development was comparable to all three childcare centers. The square footage of land area and building per child was also comparable. A drop in the development from 200 children to 150 children allowed for additional land area and building area per child.

Commissioner Hurley asked whether the service drive policy was a new County policy. Ms. Atkinson stated the service drive policy was in response to the concerns of the surrounding areas. This was also part of the access minimum guidelines for minimum separation between the primary highway and access to side streets. Ms. Atkinson stated this would be seen in future verifications on Lee Highway and across the Fairfax County. Commissioner Hurley stated one way of resolving the situation for allowing a larger playground area was to have parking on either side of the service drive. She asked why the applicant decided against that option. Ms. Stagg stated having vehicles coming through the parking lot of a childcare center was a safety issue. In the proposed application, parents would park their cars and take the child into the facility. Commissioner Hurley asked if the population of students was reduced by twenty-five percent, would the parking also be reduced by said amount. Ms. Staff indicated that would be the case. Parking was reduced to thirty-seven spaces. There was also a reduction of staff and rooms.

Commissioner Sargeant requested visuals of Option Number 1 service drive. Ms. Lewis noted the applicant's Option Number 1 was recently received by staff and have not been analyzed. Commissioner Sargeant requested the width of the ingress and egress entrance on Holly Avenue. Mr. Hamid Matin, Applicant's Civil Engineer, Professional Design Group, Inc., stated the width of the entrance on Holly Avenue was 20-feet wide; after development, would increase to 40-feet wide. Lanes would be decreased to two. One dedicated for right-turn and the other for through and left-turn. Commissioner Sargeant asked whether there was an analysis by the Fire and Rescue Department as to whether this would accommodate emergency vehicles. Mr. Matin stated the applicant had not yet received the analysis. Commissioner Sargeant requested the width of the curve road within the site. Mr. Matin stated from the service drive, there was an entrance into the parking lot. The width of the entrance was 30 feet. Commissioner Sargeant inquired about access to the septic site for maintenance and repair. Ms. Stagg stated there was a facility below the parking lot for septic maintenance. There was an area behind the school to drive to the maintenance site. There was a pumping station in case of a septic system failure. Wastewater would flow downhill to an area below the parking lot for containment, and would be pumped out on a daily basis until the septic field was repaired. Commissioner Sargeant asked about the status of sewer connections. Ms. Stagg stated the applicant was hopeful the commercial use would first construct the sewer. In this case, the site plan submitted would be Option Number 1.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked for the window of time for the commercial building toward the west. Ms. Stagg stated the timing of the commercial uses were a year ahead of the proposed development. The process for site plan averaged between nine and twelve months after which it would go through the bonding process followed by the construction process. Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked whether the issue of the playground would be resolved if a sewer connection was in place. Ms. Stagg stated if for some reason the playground was

constructed on a septic system, retaining wall would be needed to accommodate it. This would not be a cost-effective option. Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked whether the septic system drove the shape of the playground. Ms. Stagg stated the extension of the service drive drove the shape of the playground. Ms. Lewis stated staff never objected to the shape of the playground, but rather to the many retaining walls and little access to sunlight. Ms. Stagg disagreed.

Commissioner Flanagan made reference to the elevations of the buildings on Page 6 of the staff report. He stated there was a large attic and asked whether the school was on the first floor. Ms. Atkinson stated it was. Commissioner Flanagan proposed an option to cut the proposed building in half, using half as a footprint and have a second story constructed. This would allow for the same capacity with additional available outdoor space. He stated this option would turn the proposed application into an approval verses a denial from staff. Ms. Atkinson stated this was one of the suggestions proposed by staff, which the applicant opposed. Ms. Stagg stated the roof was somewhat deceptive where it hid the HVAC. With the height measurement, it was half way between the peek and the grade. The final result would be a building that was 28-feet high. The applicant rejected the two-story proposal because there was already a sixty-five percent open space, and a two-story building would require a second kitchen upstairs. This would become an unnecessary added expense.

Commissioner Tanner asked for the particular issue with the play area. Ms. Atkinson stated there were areas which were unusable due to the shape of the playground. Other issues were with the location of the play area being surrounded by retaining walls. Commissioner Tanner asked whether the sewer line with the commercial uses would resolve the issue. Ms. Atkinson stated it would allow for a more regular play area and minimize the retaining walls. Based on the discussions with the new Option Number 1, Commissioner Tanner asked whether staff was comfortable with the proposed new option. Ms. Atkinson stated staff had not had a chance to review the new option and could not provide an opinion.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker and recited the rules for testimony.

Nancy Hall, 9017 Ellenwood Lane, Fairfax, opposed the application. Ms. Hall stated the following:

- Attended the public meetings regarding the proposed daycare center. All of those meetings were dominated by the investment group in favor of the development. They were allowed to make presentations to the community and more speaking time. The Braddock District Land Use and Environment Committee in their meeting, stated there were lots of moving parts and struggled to make sense of the application;
- It was hard to understand why the applicant claimed they could not afford the small piece of property. The cost was minimal compared to their current cost;
- A community meeting was held with the Fairfax County Department of Planning and Zoning staff where it was noted that no development would be approved on the proposed site without the consolidation of all the lots. The staff report also stated that "staff

believes the lack of consolidation with the adjacent parcel to the east will further exacerbate existing transportation related issues and require mitigation to Holly Avenue;”

- The surrounding community opposed the application. They believed the proposed site was not large enough for development and could not accommodate the said number of children and staff;
- Traffic complications were a major concern. The no left-hand turn sign onto Holly Avenue would not remedy the traffic situation;
- The noise level from the children playing outside would be unimaginable; and
- The proposed daycare would hinder the future sale of Ms. Hall’s property.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked Ms. Hall whether her property was directly east of the proposed site. Ms. Hall stated it was. Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked whether there was a home on the property. Ms. Hall stated there was not. Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner stated based on Ms. Hall’s current address, the noise level from the proposed daycare facility would cause any adverse impact. Ms. Hall stated it would impact the sale of her property due to the close proximity to a daycare center.

Commissioner Hurley asked if the application were approved what Ms. Hall could accomplish with her property. Ms. Atkinson stated the property could still be developed. She stated the Comprehensive Plan provisions remained the same for the subject application, as the parcel was planned for residential development of one to two dwelling units per acre. The size of the parcel was limited and would be evaluated under a future submitted application. Commissioner Hurley asked whether the service drive could be developed if allowed by the applicant. Ms. Atkinson stated if any other use other than a single-family home was built, as part of the redevelopment, they would be required to build a service drive.

William Szymanski, representing the Roseglenn Homeowners Association, 4553 Rona Place, Fairfax, stated the following:

- Roseglenn development was located along Rona Place and bordered to the west on a portion of the applicant’s property;
- The community was concerned that Fairfax County and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) did not consider traffic safety and operational flow by designating an east-west service road from Holly Avenue to Lee Plaza as the preferred access to the proposed school; and
- It was noted on Page 10 of the staff report that “the current access management guidelines developed by VDOT discouraged the location of a service drive at the intersection of streets. The access management guide seeks to enhance safety and operation of the intersection.” The Lee Highway intersection was a dangerous intersection. Some of the neighbors that turned onto Lee Highway from the access service

road experienced near collisions with speeding cars from Lee Plaza. An increase in traffic would exasperate the unsafe situation and would add to the already significant commuter traffic in the morning and evening. The Roseglen Homeowners Association asked that the Fairfax County Planning Commission and VDOT with the consideration of the proposed application, acknowledge the traffic safety and operational constraints of extending the service road as preferred access and the development of a mitigation plan that would address those issues.

Commissioner Hurley asked if all the conversations were regarding the service road on the next exit from Holly Avenue. Mr. Szymanski stated the conversations were regarding the service drive on Lee Plaza, near the Starbucks coffee shop and M&T Banking center. Commissioner Hurley asked Mr. Szymanski whether he was opposed to the service road being extended to Holly Avenue. Mr. Szymanski stated if that were the preferred access, there were no mention of the issues or any mitigation efforts to allow the preferred access. Should Ms. Hall's property become available, the access road would be completed.

James Anderson, 4734 Holly Avenue, Fairfax, opposed the application. He stated a detailed written testimony was also submitted to the Planning Commission. Mr. Anderson also stated the following:

- Appreciated the efforts the applicant made to listen and engage the community and the efforts made to mitigate traffic concerns on Holly Avenue. Holly Avenue was a very narrow street and there were several blind hills, there were no shoulders nor sidewalks. If a school bus came down the street, the street traffic would have to pull over to allow the bus to pass. Any increased traffic generated by the school or retail, would potentially create safety issues;
- Opposed the staff's recommendation of making the current lane exiting Holly Avenue a right-turn only. Would prefer the installation of a right-turn only lane the full length of the property and also allow for a straight-thru or left-turn out of Holly Avenue. This would mitigate the increase traffic generated by the school as well as the surrounding retail; and
- The safety of the residents of Holly Avenue should be of the highest importance during the consideration of the application.

Stephen C. Karcha, 11642 Leehigh Drive, Fairfax, stated the following:

- At the Braddock District Land Use and Environment Committee, the applicant heard the community, and since then made a number of adjustments to the proposed application. Those adjustments swayed the opinion of some of the members of the community;
- The commitment to connecting to the sewer, and making the playground a more regular shaped area with access to sunlight, could easily be addressed;
- The traffic issues would be difficult to address, as was the case in Fairfax County or other jurisdictions. The applicant proposed several options that would mitigate traffic issues.

The option to provide a right-out lane would provide significant improvement to the traffic flow;

- There should be consistency from Fairfax County, the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors, the various committees, VDOT and representatives, where they listen to the various residents and communities. Labeling an intersection from an “F” to a “C” would help address traffic issues in the area. The voices of the residents regarding improvements to the traffic flow should be implemented and would satisfy the community’s needs; and
- The public hearing should be kept open until the next meeting, which would allow for the public to further comment on staff’s comments on the revised application.

Chairman Murphy stated the record would remain open for written comments, however, the public hearing would be closed.

Commissioner Hurley stated VDOT reviewed and approved both alternatives of either a right-turn out only on Holly Lane or allow the lane to continue ahead or left. She asked whether Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT) also reviewed and approved the options or was it only reviewed by VDOT. Ms. Atkinson stated both FCDOT and VDOT reviewed the two alternatives and approved both options. William Sugg, Transportation Planning Division, FCDOT, stated FCDOT supported any mitigation of by-right use.

Bonnie Clements, 9025 Ellenwood Lane, Fairfax, Mr. and Mrs. Hall’s Real Estate Agent, stated the following:

- Was puzzled by Commissioner Hurley’s comments regarding the developer’s proffer to put in a service road and not having this option by-right. The property would never be developed by right. There was a lack of land in Fairfax County;
- Was concerned about Mr. and Mrs. Hall’s welfare. They were elderly individuals and the impact on them was troubling and was overlooked;
- The suggestion of having the Halls put in a service road would add to their distress;
- The County had been chipping away at the frontage of their property along Lee Highway and how much could be built on that land would be questionable;
- Mr. and Mrs. Hall met with the Fairfax County Department of Planning and Zoning staff and were informed there would be no approval unless their lot was consolidated with the other lots;
- Mr. and Mrs. Hall had never been in a situation where they refused to consider an offer to their property. A value had been established by the contract price they currently have on the adjoining property and was willing to work with the developer; and

- The proposed application in current form, would make building on Mr. and Mrs. Hall's property by anyone else prohibitive, due to the service road requirement. This would also isolate their property and diminish its value. Consolidation of Mr. and Mrs. Hall's lot should be required with the approval of the proposed use.

Commissioner Hurley stated Ms. Clements required consolidation of the lots. She asked whether this was something the County could legally require. Ms. Atkinson stated the Comprehensive Plan did not recommend nor required consolidation.

Zoe Quebral, 4742 Holly Avenue, Fairfax, stated the following:

- The growth in traffic in the community had become a safety concern;
- There had been multiple school bus accidents in the year 2018. One student was hurt. The last accident occurred as a result of the street being narrow;
- Several cars landed in their front yard as a result of the turn in front of their home;
- Walking a dog became difficult as a result of the high intensity traffic. There were no street lights nor sidewalks;
- In order to try to control the speed of traffic in the neighborhood, traffic cones were placed in some areas to accommodate children who played outside;
- With the supervision of an adult, children left for the bus stop at 6:15 a.m. and had to use a flash light and whistle in order to be visible to traffic; and
- The proposed school would add almost 1,000 daily trips on Holly Avenue, in an area where there was also a shopping center across the street from the proposed facility. This addition of daily trips would add to an area where traffic was already of grave concern.

Chairman Murphy asked for school bus morning pick up time. Ms. Quebral stated pick up time was at 8:30 a.m.

Dianne Quebral, 4742 Holly Avenue, Fairfax, stated the following:

- Many members of the community were concerned with the proposed development. The staff of Fairfax County Department of Planning and Zoning denied the proposed application, and the community concurred;
- Holly Avenue in most places was 17 feet in width from the proposed development to the shopping center. This would be an estimated 15,031 trips per day, 925 trips per day from the proposed school and 2,500 more trips a day for Holly Avenue. Holly Avenue could not accommodate the increased volume of daily traffic;

- Safety was a major concern. These items would not be needed if the special exception was not permitted and the County maintained its original zoning decision to allow one to two single family dwelling units on the lot;
- The Slow Down campaign offered by the Fairfax County Police Department should be followed by the decision makers of the proposed application and slow down the decision process;
- The data on school bus accidents on Holly Avenue should be reviewed. Fairfax County Public School Board members were contacted. They requested this information be shared with the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors. This information should also be shared with the Planning Commission;
- Fairfax County School Safety and Security Division had been contacted. Was informed numerous bus stops have been added on Holly Avenue and Village Drive because of the roadway layout and hazardous conditions. When such dangers reach an unacceptable level, that was not corrected by engineering changes, parental supervision or walking route changes, then bus stops should be added; and
- Ms. Dianne Quebral echoed Ms. Zoe Quebral's concerns regarding previous accidents on Holly Avenue.

Tom Sowa, 4747 Holly Avenue, Fairfax, reverberated Zoe Quebral's concerns regarding traffic issues on Holly Avenue. Mr. Sowa encouraged the Planning Commission to drive over to Holly Avenue to view and experience the community's traffic concerns. He also stated there would be cut-through traffic which would also add to traffic backup.

Amber Siegel, 4756 Holly Avenue, Fairfax, echoed some of Zoe Quebral's and Mr. Sowa's concerns regarding traffic issues. She stated placing no-left-turn signs on Holly Avenue would not stop drivers from cutting through. Non-residents would not have a vested interest in keeping the community safe. The elderly in the community walked their pets in the evening and should feel safe especially during the winter months. Ms. Siegel noted two blind hills right before Holly Avenue. Limited parking added an additional hazard.

Nicole Pellicciotto, 11642 Leehigh Drive, Fairfax, stated her appreciation for the efforts of the Planning Commission regarding the proposed application. Ms. Pellicciotto stated she had been an early childhood special education teacher for the past twenty-six years. She voiced her support for Option Number 1 and that the Option Number 2 should not be implemented. Ms. Pellicciotto stated Option Number 2 had many blind spots within the corners of the daycare's playground. In those areas, teachers would need additional staffing. There were also concerns regarding bullying issues. Ms. Pellicciotto also echoed the previous speakers traffic concerns. The traffic concerns regarding Holly Avenue was the same for Leehigh Drive. A no-left-turn lane would be difficult to enforce. A residential development verses a commercial use, would be an ideal situation. The proposed development should be postponed in order to address the community's concerns.

Johnson Edosomwan, 4290 Chain Bridge Road, Fairfax, who stated his support for the application. He stated the applicant listened to the neighboring community and was willing to mitigate some of the concerns. The number of children was decreased from 200 to 150. Some of the concerns addressed by the community regarding Holly Avenue, could not be resolved by one application.

Vladimir Lutchenkov, 4505 Village Drive, Fairfax, stated that Holly Avenue, Leehigh Drive and Village Drive should also be a part of the conversation. The only way to turn onto Holly Avenue was either by using Village Drive or by turning onto Holly Avenue during the peak hours. Mr. Lutchenkov echoed the speakers concerns regarding cut-through traffic. A traffic signal at Holly Avenue would solve some of the traffic concerns.

Ms. Stagg in her rebuttal testimony stated there was a conflict between those in favor of the service drive and those who opposed. The service drive was being constructed with the application and at some point, would be approved. Once approved, the service drive would connect to a light which may cause some angst to the neighboring communities in the east. The applicant tried to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development with the special exception. The sewer connection to the east could not be utilized. This was a childcare center and not a school. The ages ranged from 6 months to 6 years. VDOT stated there could not be a light at Holly Avenue due to the close proximity of the current light. The building size would not exceed the extent of the footprint.

Commissioner Hurley inquired about possible evening and weekend increase of traffic. Ms. Stagg stated there were no plans to have large events during weekend, nor evening hours. The advertised hours of operation were listed in the statement of justification and staff report.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked if the other parcel would allow for the 200 students verses 150 students. Ms. Stagg stated the other parcel would not change anything on the site. The only change would be septic system verses sewer. The property to the east was higher than the site of the proposed development. The retaining walls would be much higher going uphill. Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked whether the applicant attempted to address the traffic speed concerns. Ms. Stagg stated many issues were outside of the scope of the special exception. The intersection at Holly Avenue and Lee Highway was being significantly improved by the applicant. Most of the traffic would be centered at that intersection. The applicant would endure one hundred percent of the cost of those improvements. The road would widen to three lanes, there would be curbs and gutters, lights and sidewalks.

There being no additional speakers, further comments or questions from the Commission, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Hurley for action on this application.

//

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Hurley: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We obviously have a lot to talk about. As been mentioned several times that the staff have not had a time to review all the changes that have been offered by the applicant. And I understand that it will take a couple of weeks which brings

us to February 8th. And, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR SE 2017-BR-023, TO 8 FEBRUARY, WITH THE RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC COMMENTS.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision only on SE 2017-BR-023 to a date certain of February 8th, with the record remaining open for comments, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioner Ulfelder was absent from the public hearing. Commission Hart recused himself from the public hearing and the vote.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

The Commission went into a recess at 11:21 p.m. and reconvened in the Board Auditorium at 11:39 p.m.

//

PA 2015-IV-MV1 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (EMBARK RICHMOND HIGHWAY) – 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 primarily involves the Plan recommendations for the Richmond Highway Corridor in the Lee and Mount Vernon Supervisor Districts and considers the land use and transportation recommendations for the areas within 1/2-mile of potential Bus Rapid Transit stations along the corridor. The adopted Comprehensive Plan for 7.5-mile segment of Richmond Highway Corridor, south of Interstate 495 to Fort Belvoir, recommends higher intensity, mixed-use redevelopment concentrated in six Community Business Centers (CBCs) along the corridor. The interstitial areas between the CBCs are recommends to include predominantly low to moderate residential uses. The Plan for Huntington Transit Station Area, which surrounds the Huntington Metrorail station, recommends new development be directed to areas proximate to the station. The Plan for Accotink Village generally recommends residential and neighborhood-serving retail uses with limited options for redevelopment.

PA 2015-IV-MV1 proposes to amend the Plan guidance for the Richmond Highway Corridor to enhance the vision for the corridor, supported by multi-modal improvements, including a Bus Rapid Transit system; pedestrian, bicycle, and roadway improvements; and ultimately, from Huntington to Hybla Valley, a three-mile extension of the Metrorail Yellow Line. The Plan amendment considers revisions the corridor-wide guidance, as well as the land use, urban

design, transportation, parks and recreation recommendations within the Penn Daw, Beacon/Groveton, Hybla Valley/Gum Springs, and Woodlawn CBCs. Additional recommendations relating to the transportation, parks and recreation, environment, heritage resources, and public facilities may also be modified, including those within the Huntington TSA, Accotink Village, and surrounding areas. MOUNT VERNON AND LEE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Meghan Van Dam, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She stated that staff recommended adoption of PA 2015-IV-MV1.

Walter Clark, Embark Richmond Highway Advisory Group, gave a presentation wherein he stated the following:

- The Embark Richmond Highway Advisory Group consisted of thirteen members. The advisory group was appointed by Supervisor Gerald W. Hyland, Supervisor Jeffrey C. McKay, Chairman Sharon Bulova, and Supervisor Daniel G. Storck. There were representatives from Southeast Fairfax Development Corporation, Planning Commission, Lee District, and Mount Vernon District citizens;
- The advisory group met twenty-four times over the course of two years, starting July 25, 2015 and ending November 2017;
- The project accelerated on a timeline to meet application scheduled for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) funding, which included ambitious deadlines;
- There were six community meeting between May 2016 and January 2018. These meetings were well attended and allowed members of the community to participate and provide feedback. An open house meeting in September of 2017, showcased concept plans for the Penn Daw, Beacon/Groveton, Hybla Valley/Gum Springs, and Woodlawn Community Business Centers (CBC), with sophisticated visualization of renderings;
- The plan was developed with collaboration of the process between staff and the advisory group. Feedback from staff was incorporated by the advisory group into the draft plan text;
- Several road connections were reexamined, as a result of ongoing discussions with the Attorney General, which resulted in the removal of the proposed grid connection between Sacramento Drive and Jeff Tod Way;
- The expanded environmental policy for the corridor based on the community's feedback, the view shed analysis, and Historic Huntley plantation impacted the building's heights and South Hybla Valley/Gum Springs and Woodlawn area, which avoided the impacts of the historic view shed; and

- The Embark Richmond Highway Comprehensive Plan Amendment created a new vision for the center of history culture and ecological of the corridor. The future plans extended the Metro Rail from Huntington, Virginia to Hybla Valley/Gum Springs area, with a future stop in Beacon and Groveton census-designated place. The focus development around the BRT stations would enhance ridership and would provide greater opportunities.

Chairman Murphy stated he appreciated all the work done by the Embark Richmond Highway Advisory Group.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker and recited the rules for testimony.

Terry Jemison, 2804 Boswell Avenue, Alexandria, stated the following:

- There was a concern with staff's change in Hybla Valley/Gum Springs CBC Sub Unit B-4 building height limits. The building should be changed to three stories, and should mirror the building height language of most of adjacent Gum Springs Land Unit E immediately south of these parcels. The current Comprehensive Plan language for Sub-Unit B-4 stated "...townhouse-style or well-designed retail and office use up to .50 FAR with maximum building heights of 40 feet;"
- Under the Building Massing and Height Section of the staff report, a 4-story building was envisioned as 52-feet to 61-feet tall, compared to the existing 40-foot recommended ceiling. The new proposed language could be flexible upwards calling for a maximum of approximately 4 stories. The proposed building height limits identified 4 stories for the huge commercial area in front of Mount Vernon Square Apartments, which was a reasonable transitional density between R-20 and the highway;
- The narrow strip of Sub Unit B-4 would not hold any promise of transitional density between a 4-story building and the immediately adjacent long-established R-2 stable neighborhood, where some families have lived since the early 1930s; and
- Comment on by-right heights under Zoning Ordinance, Appendix 7 would provide existing authority for a landowner by-right to 50 feet.

Commissioner Flanagan requested visuals on the location of the Hybla Valley Farms Civic Association. Mr. Jemison provided visuals. Commissioner Flanagan asked what was next to Sub Unit B-4 building. Mr. Jemison stated there were single family homes.

Mark Viani on behalf of Katherine Ward, 1029 Gladstone Place, Alexandria, stated the following:

- Resolution 2018-01 was submitted to the Planning Commission for the record;

- Infrastructure projects such as the extension of Metrorail involved multiple layers of government approval and financing. The community required that affirmative and definitive stances be taken with regard to the extension of the Metrorail;
- The proposed widening of Richmond Highway, impacted the vision Embark Richmond Highway;
- Regarding the undergrounding of utilities, along Richmond Highway, the Mount Vernon Council of Citizens Associations believed in providing the necessary funds to get the job done right. Opportunities may be available to seek funding from developers. Some of the properties within the suburban neighborhood residential areas would not be developed. Some of those properties were small balkanized properties and would not have the necessary financing support. Underground utilities were the preferred option;
- The Richmond Highway plan should keep the continuity in place. Visibility should remain with the widening of the roads. Sound barriers were important, however those walls blinded communities from each other. The “superstreet” concept would add to the confusion;
- As the County continued to densify, there would be a need for additional self-storage facilities. Self-storage should be intelligently designed with a modern look. The design should address environmental or other issues. A more urban design should be permitted with available parking; and
- The environment should be revitalized and streams should be reopened. The Mount Vernon Council of Citizens Associations was also in support of viewsheds.

Commissioner Sargeant asked for clarification on sound barriers. William Dunn, VDOT, stated a noise analysis was required with any project which included federal funding. The noise level was evaluated and the preliminary noise analysis showed a few short walls that required for noise mitigation based on federal and state policy. This was part of the widening project and was not directly associated with Embark Richmond Highway Comprehensive Plan Amendment project. Mr. Viani stated the association’s concern was impact to the vision of the plan.

Mary Paden, 6816 Duke Drive, Alexandria, represented the South County Task Force for Human Services. She stated the following:

- The task force was formed to address the issue of homelessness along Route-1 and had bi-monthly meetings and a steering committee comprised of people who live or work in South County with the expertise in affordable housing, health/mental health, and human services. The committee endorsed five positions on affordable housing related to plan amendment and the area surrounding it. The plan conformed to the One Fairfax Policy and promised a variety of affordable housing types under the vision item of economic development;

- The One Fairfax policy of equitable development should also be an Embark Richmond vision and should be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. The One Fairfax policy provided a framework to advance equity as an essential element in development. The policy called for equity in age, race, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, national origin, marital status, disability, socio-economic status or neighborhood of residence or other characteristics. Its vision of economic development helped all individuals reach their highest level of personal achievement, which was vital to our County's successful ability to compete in the global economy;
- Fifteen percent of affordable workforce housing should be required in Community Business Centers (CBC) where Metro stops were planned;
- Inventory rent burdens of tenants and affordable workforce housing in the areas surrounding the Embark, should be preserved. The Comprehensive Plan amendment for Huntington noted that "the preservation of affordable units embodies many of the best planning principles for a successful, sustainable community. Preservation of the county's existing affordable housing stock remains a key strategy for the region." Areas surrounding Embark included some of the County's most affordable workforce housing. Individuals who cleaned the schools, worked in retail, hospitality, homecare, and other jobs, resided in those areas. Those workers should not be gentrified out of the County as land values surrounding the Embark CBC continued to rise; and
- The Fairfax Housing Trust Fund should be increased. Developers are not able to fulfill the need for affordable housing for very low income residents, as a result, support from all government levels would be required. As the support from the federal government declined, local support become a necessity. New sources of contributions should also be solicited.

Monica Billger, 7636 Kingsbury Road, Alexandria, represented the Audubon Naturalist Society. She stated the following:

- According to the community health dashboard assessments, the life span for those living on the Route 1 corridor have decreased by six years;
- The 2015 National Equity Atlas map showed the socioeconomic disparities that faced Fairfax County communities. This data proved the need to address numerous outstanding issues through the proposed plan amendment. It is important the County lived up to its One Fairfax pledge to be a visionary between America's past, present and future as it redevelops the corridor;
- The current federal climate of environment regulation as well as proposed in recent budget cuts, made the County's investment and vision for environmental impacts in redevelopment projects increasingly critical. Sustainability of our natural habitats was essential;

- The County should consider adopting the same stormwater management capture goal created in the redevelopment of Tysons Corner. Redevelopment of Richmond Highway Corridor would bring many pre-regulatory development areas up to current standards. However, current standards of twenty percent reduction in redevelopment projects was inefficient. This standard would not improve stream health. Stormwater from runoffs remained the fastest source of pollution to the Chesapeake Bay. The County should be proactive in its vision of addressing health and state of the streams through a commitment of stormwater capture standards that would address existing and future concerns;
- The County should continue to work with local communities to identify opportunities that addressed seemingly non-environmental concerns with thoughtful green infrastructure and biophilic design;
- The County should designate the CBCs as green development zones so that the development described in the plan amendment could be realized efficiently and effectively. Green infrastructure could become competitive and even profitable for commercial property owners and developers. Research on urban business districts and strip malls showed that consumers were willing to spend more money on products, visit more often, and travel farther to shop in areas with attractive landscaping, good tree cover, or green streets, all of which green infrastructure could provide. Developers within each CBC should take advantage of opportunities to remove impervious surfaces wherever possible. Specifically, by identifying excess space in parking lots that could be transformed into local parks for socioeconomically disadvantaged communities with unsafe or zero access to walkable park space;
- The 2017 Comprehensive Plan staff report text should be revised with the suggest language submitted to the Planning Commission. This language addressed the ecological spine type 1 and type 2 regarding the building zone, and bioswale/water channel; and
- The society supported a number of resolutions set forth by the Mount Vernon Council of Citizen Associations, as well as positions stated by Friends of Huntley Meadows Park and Friends of Historic Huntley.

Carolyn Gamble, P.O. Box 7241, Alexandria, represented the Friends of Historic Huntley. She stated the following:

- Supported the overall vision, the seven vision elements, the eight guiding planning principles, and the legacy and environment themes;
- Commended the County's staff who produced the plan amendment and recognized the complexity of this undertaking;
- Supported the plan's stated desire to reflect the areas "rich history and diverse in visually interesting ways" through urban design and thereby giving each CBC a sense of place.

The best way to impart a sense of place was through retaining authentic character as much as possible;

- The Fordson Road and Richmond Highway connection should be retained. This was the historic gateway to the Gum Springs community;
- A coherent urban design treatment was preferred that reflected the history from Huntington to Woodlawn;
- Shared the concerns regarding trails, sensitive natural and cultural resource areas. Those trails should be designated as conceptual;
- The County should act forcefully on the plan amendment's recommendation that preference be given to redevelopment project that used innovative and inventive cutting edge green technologies; and
- Supported the County's conclusion that building heights in Land Unit D-4 of the Hybla Valley/Gum Springs CBC, be limited to 60 feet. Strongly supported the recommendation that prior to redevelopment, additional viewsheds analysis be conducted in Land Unit D-4. Additional viewsheds analysis should also be required for all the land units in the Hybla Valley/Gum Springs CBC.

Commissioner Flanagan asked that Ms. Gamble submit her written testimony to the Planning Commission.

Lisa Turcios, 4410 Briarwood Ct N #26, Annandale, stated that Friends of Accotink Creek was encouraged by the eight guiding principles of the Embark Richmond Highway project. She applauded the first vision element of the project which emphasized on the restoration of archeological resources to strengthen the relationship between people and nature. Steps should be taken to safeguard the corridor and given trash additional trash and recycling receptacles as soon as practical. Ms. Turcios stated as areas are redeveloped and revitalized, additional receptacles should be installed. Present conditions showed there were inadequate trash and recycling cans and that it appeared current owners were neglectful in emptying the bins in a timely manner. Some of the concrete channels along the western portion of Route 1, were not being maintained. Neither the County nor the property owner claimed responsibility to maintain trash cleanup on a regular basis. As a result, the trash flowed into Little Hunting Creek. A trash trap was proposed for the area and concerns with easements and access have caused a delay. The redevelopment process should mandate easements for access for County officials to conduct necessary cleanup and monitoring.

Commissioner Flanagan asked that Ms. Turcios submit her written testimony to the Planning Commission. Ms. Turcios stated the testimony was emailed to the Planning Commission. Ron Chase, 8100 Fordson Road, Alexandria, who represented the Gum Springs Historical Society. He also stated the following:

- Gum Springs was the oldest African American community in Fairfax County;
- Gum Springs was included with the Woodlawn Historic District due to the Historic Woodlawn Cemetery;
- Gum Springs was selected for the American Evolution™ Digital Trail;
- A revolutionary war hero was buried at the Peake Family Cemetery;
- The Bethlehem Baptist Church was nominated for a historical road marker and also part of the Natural Trust;
- The plan amendment did not reflect the historical value of the Gum Springs African American community;
- Building height was not referenced in the plan and there were major concerns within the Gum Springs community; and
- Mr. West Ford, founder of the Gum Springs community, was not referenced in the plan amendment.

Commissioner Flanagan stated it was his understanding Mr. Chase was a direct descendant of Mr. West Ford and related by marriage. Mr. Chase confirmed. Many of the descendants of Mr. West Ford resided within the Gum Springs community. Commissioner Flanagan asked whether the outline of the farm was the original homestead of West Ford. Mr. Chase confirmed. He stated a 240-acre tract of land would be designated as a historic district. Commissioner Flanagan asked that Mr. Chase submit his written testimony to the Planning Commission.

Catherine Ledec, 3701 Lockheed Boulevard, Alexandria, represented the Friends of Huntley Meadows Park. She stated the following:

- Activities in the area of influence of the plan amendment could impact Huntly Meadows Park. These impacts should be avoided, minimized and mitigated to the maximum possible extent;
- The Virginia General Assembly reenacted and amended legislation that would enable localities such as Fairfax County, establish local enterprise zones and local green development zones. This legislation has not been implemented in Fairfax County. This legislation would fit in well with the Embark Richmond Highway project CBC areas;
- Funding was one of the challenges with the plan's vision. Implementation of the green development zones offered a possible solution for funding of common area elements such as parks, stream restoration, and streetscape within the CBC areas. A suggestion was made in one of the advisory group meeting to include a section in the plan amendment on sustainability. This would attract business that build energy efficient buildings, uses

renewable technologies and innovative building designs. This was aligned with the legislation's definition of a green development zone;

- Supported undergrounding of utilities along the Richmond Highway Corridor. The undergrounding should be coordinated and timed with the widening of Route 1. Fairfax County should pursue partnerships with the utility companies who should invest in communities and cover a share of the undergrounding costs;
- Additional parks and recreational facilities should be developed in all of the CBC areas. Public and private partnerships should be developed;
- Streams should be daylighted wherever possible. Buildings should be tiered lower toward the daylighted stream, which would allow for sunlight to the streams and its banks. People benefited from connections to healthy natural systems; and
- Friends of Huntly Meadows Park would not support any changes proposed to the Comprehensive Plan that would add residential as an option to designated environment quality corridors resource protection areas and flood plains.

Commissioner Flanagan asked that Ms. Ledec submit her written testimony and written recommendations to the Planning Commission.

Edythe Kelleher, 6677 Richmond Hwy, Alexandria, represented SFDC. She stated the following:

- SFDC's memorandum of understanding with the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, called for SFDC to endorse those projects and initiatives deemed supportive of revitalization of objectives. The SFDC's Board voted to formally endorse the proposed plan amendment;
- Richmond Highway's 20th century legacy uses served the traveling public along Route 1. After Interstate 95 opened, those uses declined and Richmond Highway became the center of a suburban community;
- The proposed plan amendment would benefit business, land owners and residents of the corridor, by providing transportation options and the opportunity for housing, retail and office space in choice locations;
- New development was concentrated around future BRT and Metro Rail stations, and created hubs of activity hubs of activity for living, working, playing and shopping. The flexibility built into the plan provided a comprehensive vision and was adaptable to a changing market;
- Suggested revisions to the discouraged uses language was submitted to the Planning Commission; and

- SFDC was excited for the development opportunities, with the added marketing campaign for the corridor.

Sara Mariska, 2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1300, Arlington, stated the plan amendment provided flexible language, however, the interpretation and implementation of the plan once adopted was important. This was a long term ambitious plan, with each site being a balancing act to meet those needs. The discouraged uses would continue to have a place in the corridor and was vital to the community. Self-storage could be done in a way that met the goals of the plan. There were discrepancies with the images and text language in Subunit A-3 in the Woodlawn CBC. The thirty-five recommended dwelling units were not sufficient to generate redevelopment efforts of that location.

David DeCamp, 4500 Dexter Street, NW, Washington, DC, stated the plan amendment was bold and transformative. Mr. DeCamp stated Penn Daw Properties, LLLP was excited to work with staff. The Fenton Penn Daw Assemblage site on Richmond Highway, fell 50 feet in grade. As a result, there were concerns regarding livability. It would be hard to utilize the utility envisioned for the livability spine. The plan would be more successful with a clustered retail, verses extended in a linear fashion. Structured parking should be developed on the livability spine with the density within one block.

Chairman Murphy asked whether there were two types of buses on the BRT. Tom Biesiadny, Director, Department of Transportation, stated some of the details of the system were being resolved. They system was planned where express buses could move quickly down the corridor, with stops at nine stations. There were express buses on dedicated lanes.

Commissioner Cortina expressed her support for the plan. She stated there were key elements in the plan that addressed the ecological corridors and streams. She made reference to Seoul, Korea and level of sustainability of its residents.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner expressed his support for the plan. He stated he was impressed with Ms. Paden's testimony and echoed some of her comments. He questioned whether the comments regarding affordable housing was achievable. Commissioner Flanagan stated statistics were available and would provide this information to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Hart stated the mission of the Comprehensive Plan was somewhat difficult. He stated at times it was tempting to provide specific language in the Comprehensive Plan text. The Board of Supervisors required the flexibility to consider a range of possibilities. Commissioner Hart stated many of the suggestions received were sensible ideas and worth considering, however, may be inappropriate for Comprehensive Plan text and more appropriate for follow-on motions for consideration in other forums.

There being no additional speakers, further comments or questions from the Commission, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Flanagan for action on this application.

//

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Flanagan: Twenty minutes after one. That's kind of early for Mount Vernon.

Chairman Murphy: All those in favor, say aye.

Commissioner Sargeant: Make the motion.

Commissioner Flanagan: I want to mention in particular, the people who have remained here, and to thank them for their testimony. The twelve to fourteen people from Mount Vernon came out to testify are the people who follow, who are there every month for the last twenty-four months at the advisory group meetings. They came out very faithfully. They know this subject very thoroughly. So, I value their testimony because they are educated to the details that are in this sense and so it's very important that they – that I thank the speakers, you know, for sticking here. Obviously, their dedication – anybody who would stay here this late is got to be dedicated. With that I would like to offer a motion to defer, because I think that we now have our job to take all these, to categorize them and to provide responses to them. Staff and I have already talked about starting that process. Megan Van Dam at least and I have. And so we'll, you know, be working on that over the next month. So, with that I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ON PLAN AMENDMENT 2015-IV-MV1, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2018, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS.

Commissioners Migliaccio and Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Migliaccio and Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision on PA 2015-IV-MV1 to a date certain of February 22nd with the record remaining open for comments, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you for your testimony and your tenacity. Staff you didn't have much to say which is attribute to you actually. And you're probably saying to yourselves, "Oh no why the hell did we come?". But anyway, thank you so much it was a horrendous, herculean task and it was well worthwhile. We appreciate what you did.

The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Ulfelder was absent from the public hearing.

(End Verbatim Transcript)


//

The meeting was adjourned at 1:22 a.m.
Peter F. Murphy, Chairman Murphy
James T. Migliaccio, 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: Samantha Lawrence

Approved on: April 26, 2018



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