

**FAIRFAX COUNTY, VIRGINIA**

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Barbara Byron, Director  
Zoning Evaluation Division  
Department of Planning & Zoning

**DATE:** November 17, 2000

**FROM:** Barbara J. Lipka, Executive Director  
Planning Commission Office *BJL*

**SUBJECT:** Planning Commission Action Re: **CPA-86-C-121-4**, Mobil Oil Corporation,  
Hunter Mill District

On Thursday, November 16, 2000, the Planning Commission voted 6-1-4 (Commissioner Palatiello opposed; Commissioners Byers, Harsel, Kelso and Murphy abstaining; Commissioner Hall absent from the meeting) to approve CPA-86-C-121-4, based on the revised Conceptual Plan dated September 29, 2000.

For your information, a copy of the verbatim excerpts from the Commission's action on this item is attached. Should you have any questions on this action, please do not hesitate to contact me at 324-2865.

Attachment (a/s)

cc: Cathy Hudgins, Supervisor, Hunter Mill District  
John Palatiello, Commissioner, Hunter Mill District  
Leslie Johnson, Staff Coordinator, ZED, DPZ  
Marie Travesky, representing Mobil Oil Corporation  
November 16, 2000 Date File  
Y-1 file

Planning Commission Meeting  
November 16, 2000  
Verbatim Excerpts

CPA-86-C-121-4 – MOBIL OIL CORPORATION

During Commission Matters

Commissioner Palatiello: We have before us this evening an administrative review on a Town Center Concept Plan Amendment. Ms. Johnson, do you have any brief staff comments that you wish to make?

Ms. Leslie Johnson: Yes, I can briefly review that. I would note that the screen above us is not working. Your screen is working, but the overhead projector isn't. The concept plan that you have before you has been resubmitted by Mobil Oil Corporation for a service station/quick-service food store. You previously saw this conceptual plan back in November of 1999. The changes that have been made primarily deal with additional landscaping on this site. They have added additional landscaping along the frontage of Sunset Hills Road. To do so they have relocated several parking lot -- three parking spaces parallel to the service drive that goes around the southern portion of the property. They've also increased landscaping on the corner of their service travel aisle and Sunset Hills Road and have added some foundation plantings and decorative ornamental plantings and a bench to increase the visual aesthetics of the site. Those really are the only changes. We have determined that those changes are in substantial conformance with the Development Plan Amendment that the Board approved back in April of 1999 that showed pretty much this same layout. We also looked at sidewalks in the area to see if there was a way to increase pedestrian circulation. There are already existing sidewalks around the perimeter of the site along Sunset Hills Road and along the entrance road which also serves the Target site. Crosswalks have been provided along Sunset Hills Road from the other side which is the YMCA and the retail pads that are in the process of being constructed. There really was no other place to put anymore pedestrian linkages on this site. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Murphy: Are there any questions? Mr. Palatiello.

Commissioner Palatiello: Mr. Chairman, as the Commission knows, this site and this application has a long history. It is back before us with the modifications Ms. Johnson has described. In the staff memorandum, the history of this site is very well set forth. The verbatim of the previous Planning Commission action is included. I will not revisit that history here this evening. I would remind the Commission, however, that the reason why we have a conceptual plan or conceptual plan amendment before us is that that instrument was a creation of the original Town Center rezoning and the proffers thereto in the Reston Town Center. What was proffered was that the applicant, and in fact this applicant, is a contract purchaser of a parcel subject to the overall Town Center proffers. The relevant proffer reads: "The applicant proffers to cause to be prepared a conceptual plan to include a vehicular traffic circulation plan including approximate location of entrances, minor

streets in approximate location, pedestrian walkways and trails, landscaping and screening, open space, recreation and communication facilities, location of a time-transfer transit hub, floor area ratios, height limits, general location and type of housing units; general location of office and commercial buildings, and general location of parking structures." Then it goes on to say: "The applicant will afford members of the Reston community an opportunity to review and comment upon the conceptual plan prior to initial submission of the same to Fairfax County for review. Concurrent with the ongoing input process, the applicant will submit the plan to the Fairfax County Office of Comprehensive Planning for review and the Fairfax County Planning Commission for review and approval." And it is that review and our discretion on approval that is before us on this concept plan this evening. In my judgment there is an issue that has been long standing on this application. There has been an effort on the part of the applicant to deal with that issue, but I am not entirely satisfied that it has been resolved. That is the issue set forth in the proffers of the vehicular traffic circulation plan including approximate location of entrances. This is a pad site within a retail use. The main component of the retail center is a Target store that is in operation and this is an undeveloped portion of the parking lot and the travel aisles that serve the Target site. What I believe is problematic about this particular concept plan is the confluence of traffic in the Target parking lot and the ingress and egress to the Target with the circulation of vehicles into and out of this particular service station. In my judgment we are creating a dangerous situation because basically what we are doing is plopping down this service station in the middle of that retail center and creating ingress and egress that I think creates a traffic hazard and is not well thought out. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I WOULD MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DENY CPA-86-C-121-4.

Commissioner Kelso: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Kelso. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to deny CPA-86-C-121-4, say aye.

Commissioners Kelso and Palatiello: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed?

Commissioners Alcorn, Downer, Koch, Moon, Smyth, Wilson: No.

Chairman Murphy: The motion fails. Mr. Palatiello and Mr. Kelso voting aye. Chair abstaining. And Mrs. Harsel abstains. And Mr. Byers abstains.

Commissioner Alcorn: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Alcorn.

Commissioner Alcorn: Mr. Chairman, I MAKE A MOTION THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE CPA-86-C-121-4.

Commissioner Smyth: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Smyth. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of the motion to approve CPA-86-C-121-4, say aye.

Commissioners Alcorn, Downer, Koch, Moon, Smyth, Wilson: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed?

Commissioners Palatiello: No.

Commissioners Byers, Harsel, Kelso, and Murphy: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Motion carries. Mr. Palatiello votes no. Mr. Kelso, Ms. Harsel, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Byers abstain. Thank you very much.

//

(The first motion failed by a vote of 2-6-3, with Commissioners Palatiello and Kelso in favor; Commissioners Alcorn, Downer, Koch, Moon, Smyth, Wilson opposed; Commissioners Byers, Harsel and Murphy abstaining; Commissioner Hall absent from the meeting.)

(The second motion carried by a vote of 6-1-4 with Commissioners Alcorn, Downer, Koch, Moon, Smyth, Wilson in favor; Commissioner Palatiello opposed; Commissioners Byers, Harsel, Kelso and Murphy abstaining; Commissioner Hall absent from the meeting.)

LBR

Planning Commission Meeting  
February 10, 1999  
Verbatim Excerpts

CPA-86-C-121-4 - WESTERRA RESTON, L. L. C.  
DPA-86-C-121 - WESTERRA RESTON L.L.C.

Decision Only During Commission Matters  
(Public hearing held on November 4, 1998)

Commissioner Palatiello: Mr. Chairman, on November 4, 1998, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on two concurrent applications. The applicant is Westerra Reston L.L.C. The applications were DPA-86-C-121 and CPA-86-C-121-4. The purpose of the application was to move -- to approve -- to amend the approved development plan and conceptual plan to permit a service station and quick service food store as a pad site in the land unit where the Target store is currently located. I had some concerns about this application and deferred the decision twice and have met with the applicant since that time. This is within the Reston Town Center district. There are currently two service stations, excuse me, there is one existing service station within the Reston Town Center district that has a rather extensive quick service food store and fast food type restaurant within it. It is owned by the Exxon Corporation which is currently engaged in a merger with Mobil. Mobil has approval for a second service station already within the Reston Town Center with a quick service food store. This would make the third service station with a quick service food store within Reston Town Center and I think this is the straw that breaks the proverbial back of the camel. The Comprehensive Plan in -- for Area III in the section that discusses the Reston/Herndon Suburban Center on page 423, says: "The Reston Town Center represents the major focal point for the Suburban Center and integrates pedestrian scaled mixed use projects." I do not believe that this particular application meets that criteria for pedestrian scaled mixed use projects. Furthermore, the Ordinance for plans -- for PRC planned residential communities in Section 6-301 of the Ordinance establishes criteria and goals and objectives in the PRC Ordinance. Objective 2 says "...an orderly and creative arrangement of all the end uses with respect to each other and to the entire community." In my judgment this application fails to meet that standard as well. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DENIAL OF DPA-86-C-121.

Commissioner Alcorn: Second.

Commissioner Thomas: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Alcorn and Mr. Thomas. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it deny DPA-86-C-121, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed?

3/22/99

5:30 p.m. Item - DPA-86-C-121 - WESTERRA RESTON, L.L.C.  
Hunter Mill District

On Wednesday, February 10, 1999, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-3 (Commissioners Harsel, Murphy, and Wilson abstaining) to recommend to the Board of Supervisors a denial of DPA-86-C-121.

The Commission indicated that the application did not meet the criteria for a pedestrian-scaled mixed-use project nor the goals and objectives set forth in Objective 2 of the PRC Ordinance.

On Thursday, February 11, 1999, the Planning Commission also voted 9-0-2 (Commissioners Harsel and Wilson abstaining; Commissioner Coan absent from the meeting) to defer indefinitely its decision on CPA-86-C-121-4 pending Board action on DPA-86-C-121.

**RECEIVED**  
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ZONING

OCT 5 1998

ZONING EVALUATION DIVISION

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT/TOWN CENTER  
CONCEPT PLAN AMENDMENT  
RESTON, SECTION 937, PARCEL 2  
SEPTEMBER 30, 1998

1. This property is located on Fairfax County Tax Map No. 17-3((1)) Parcel 33A and is currently zoned PRC.
2. Owner/Applicant: Westerra Reston, LLC  
11450 Baron Cameron Avenue  
Reston, VA 20190  
(DB 9881; Pg. 1645)
3. Developer: Mobil Oil Corporation  
10617 Braddock Road  
Fairfax, VA 22032
4. This plan does not show all covenants, restrictions, easements or dedications which may exist in the chain of title.
5. Boundary information is based on a survey by Walter L. Phillips, Inc. dated February 1997.
6. Topographic information is taken from plans prepared by Urban Engineering & Associates, Inc. dated June 1996 and is assumed to be field run. Contour interval is 2 feet; datum is U.S.G.S.
7. All existing utilities, improvements and proposed landscaping are taken from Plan #9153-SP-01 and other existing plans and records and are not field verified. There are no existing buildings on this property.
8. This property is served by public water and sewer.
9. Flood plain limit and easement is taken from Plan #9153-FP-01-3, approved 4/26/96.
10. Based on available maps and records, there is no RPA or EQC on this property.
11. Based on existing records, there are no utility easements having a width of 25 feet [7.620] or more on this property.
12. Stormwater management and water quality requirements for this property have been provided with the development of a dry pond on Parcels 33B and 33C, immediately adjacent to this property on the west (Target).

13. There are no scenic assets or natural features on this property deserving of protection.
14. Based on available maps and records, there are no known burial sites on this property.
15. Based on the Comprehensive Plan, there are no trails required for this property.
16. It is expected that no adjacent properties will be adversely affected by this development.
17. There are no special amenities proposed with this parcel.
18. It is expected that construction will begin upon site plan approval.
19. All required on-site public improvements will be provided in conjunction with the development of the property.
20. This plan is conceptual only and is intended to be used in conjunction with land use approval process. It is not a construction drawing; and, minor deviations and adjustments may be required and are to be expected as part of the site plan approval process.

#### GENERAL

21. The parcel subject to this Development Plan Amendment ("DPA") and Town Center Concept Plan Amendment ("TCCPA") is known as Parcel 2, Section 937, Reston. The Town Center Concept Plan for Parcel 1 of Section 937, the Target site, remains in effect and is not altered by this application.
22. The property which is the subject of this application shall be developed in accordance with the Development Plan ("DP") and Town Center Concept Plan ("TCCP"), prepared by Walter L. Phillips, Incorporated, dated December 1997 and revised through September 30, 1998, provided that minor modifications may be permitted when necessitated by sound engineering and/or which may become necessary as part of final site engineering, as determined by the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services ("DPW&ES").
23. The proposed building and related structures shall consist of a maximum of 3,000 square feet and the maximum building height shall be no more than 20'. The Applicant reserves the right to alter building or structures footprints.
24. Parking shall be provided pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance, as determined by DPW&ES. The Applicant reserves the right to provide additional spaces, per the tenants' needs.
25. The Applicant shall provide a minimum of 15% open space and 10% tree cover on the site.

## LANDSCAPING

26. The Applicant shall provide landscaping consistent with the plan shown on Sheet 1 of the DPA/TCCPA, including the delineated tree save areas. The landscaping plan is subject to final review and approval by the Town Center Design Review Board ("TCDRB") and the Urban Forester.
27. All supplemental landscaping located within or contiguous to the Virginia Department of Transportation ("VDOT") rights-of-way shall be provided subject to VDOT approval. If VDOT does not permit the noted plantings within or contiguous to its rights-of-way, the Applicant shall relocate the supplemental landscaping within the application property, subject to review and approval by DPW&ES. These plantings shall be included within the submitted landscape plan, subject to final review and approval by the TCDRB and the Urban Forester.
28. All supplemental landscaping located within or contiguous to the Warner Cable of Reston easement located along the Dulles Airport Access Road and Toll Road right-of-way shall be provided subject to Warner Cable review and approval. These plantings shall be included within the submitted landscape plan, subject to final review and approval by the TCDRB and the Urban Forester.
29. The Applicant shall include foundation plantings, planters or similar and additional landscaping elements around all four sides of the buildings, subject to engineering constraints. The proposed location of the plants may be modified as necessary for the installation of utilities, VDOT requirements, and tenant requirements in coordination with DPW&ES, but shall, at a minimum, provide the quality and quantity of plantings depicted on the DPA/TCCPA. The plantings shall be included within the landscape plan, subject to final review and approval by the TCDRB and the Urban Forester.

## PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION

30. The external and internal pedestrian circulation system (including trails and sidewalks) shall be provided as generally shown on the DPA/TCCPA.

## TRANSPORTATION

31. All roads and road improvements shown on this plan have been or shall be provided in accordance with the site plans for Section 937, Parcel 1 (9153-SP-01) and the Sunset Hills Road improvement plan (5468-SP-04). These improvements include dedication of right-of-way and construction easements for a third eastbound lane along the property frontage, construction of a continuous right-turn lane/through land across the frontage along Sunset Hills Road to the easternmost entrance to the site, and installation of a signalized entrance with a consolidated median break and left-turn and right-turn lanes at the primary entrance

to the Target site. This entrance also provides access to the Property.

32. The Applicant shall, if requested by the Department of Transportation or VDOT, construct one (1) bus shelter (open, typical type) and pull-over area. The bus stop shall be located east of the primary entrance to the site in the location as generally shown on the DPA/TCCPA. The final location of this bus stop shall be determined by the Department of Transportation. The final location of this bus stop shall be determined prior to final site plan approval for the parcel. The Applicant shall install a covered trash receptacle within the bus shelter. The owner of the parcel shall be responsible for providing trash removal and pick-up services for the bus shelter.

#### LAND USES

33. The site may be developed as a service station and quick service food store.

#### SITE DESIGN

34. Landscaping, site design, pedestrian access, lighting, signage and architectural details are subject to final review and approval by the TCDRB.
35. Parking lot and building lighting shall be provided in accordance with Article 14 of the Zoning Ordinance and shall be directed inward and/or downward to avoid glare onto adjacent properties.
36. Trash and service areas shall be screened and landscaped, as approved by the TCDRB.
37. In order to provide a consistent and compatible architectural treatment with the balance of Section 937, the primary building materials and colors shall be the same or similar to those used on the adjacent Target building.
38. The site shall contain one ground-mounted sign in the location generally shown on the DPA/TCCPA of no more than 80 square feet and no more than 10 feet in height, in accord with the Zoning Ordinance. The building-mounted signage will meet the standards contained in Section 12 of the Zoning Ordinance.

#### TOWN CENTER CONCEPT PLAN AMENDMENTS

39. By securing approval of this Town Center Concept Plan, the Applicant is not limiting or waiving any of its rights pursuant to the approved Town Center rezoning and approved Development Plan. The Applicant reserves the right to subsequently pursue Town Center Concept Plan Amendment(s), Special Exception(s) and/or Special Permit(s)(on the whole or any portion of the site) to revise uses, increase heights and density and to pursue any and all modifications as permitted by the Town Center rezonings and the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance.

40. Any portion of the site may be the subject of a Town Center Concept Plan Amendment, Special Exception or Special Permit without joinder and/or consent of the owners of the other land areas, provided that such application does not affect the other land areas. Previously approved proffered conditions or development conditions applicable to a particular portion of the site which are not the subject of such an application shall otherwise remain in full force and effect.