Planning Commission Meeting
June 11, 2009
Verbatim Excerpt

SE 2008-HM-024 – TRUSTEES OF THE UNITED CHRISTIAN PARISH OF RESTON, VA
PRC A-502 – TRUSTEES OF THE UNITED CHRISTIAN PARISH OF RESTON, VA

Decision Only During Commission Matters
(Public Hearing on May 28, 2009)

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman, I have a decision only and I - - before I read my statement. Last night, you received a new set of development conditions and tonight you received a change to the ones that you received last night, which affect only Development Condition 11 to add an alternative to the parking requirement. It is a minor change. It was - - but, you know, all parking will be on-site as proposed, but this was requested. So, what I will be moving are the development conditions that you received tonight that are dated June 11. Mr. Chairman, the public hearing for this case was held on May 28, 2009. At the public hearing, several issues related to transportation, stormwater management, and impact on abutting neighbors were raised. The decision was deferred until tonight to clarify and address those concerns. Transportation issues raised at the public hearing mirrored those raised during the review process. There is no question that North Shore Drive, as is the case with many streets developed during Reston's early years, presents issues related to safety. These early streets are different from what is built under current VDOT standards. Generally, they were designed to conform with the topography rather than the reverse. Specifically, this section of North Shore Drive is hilly, curvy, and tree-lined. Parking is allowed. In recognition of this fact, the speed limit is 25 miles per hour. Development conditions provide that all parking be on-site, and as I mentioned, you received a revised Development Condition Number 11 today to provide for on-site parking but also with a possible reconfiguration to make it easier to maneuver in the parking lot. There is also a provision that a parking reduction request to permit the shared use of the church use and the nursery school/child care use be submitted since the uses will be at different times, but if the reduction plan is not approved, the intensity of use for either or both church and nursery/child care should be reduced. There currently are two access points. The current access point to the church will remain pretty much as is. The current access point to the parsonage will serve the entire property and increase its traffic volume. This access point will be an entrance only, unless an off-site sight distance easement agreement is obtained from the abutting homeowners' association. The applicant's on-site stormwater management plans include the provision of two bio-retention facilities generally around the access point I just mentioned. At the public hearing, one of the speakers presented photographs of a large stormwater management pond built elsewhere as representing what might be built here. As discussed at the public hearing, the photographs did not represent what was being proposed for this site. However, there is a development condition that provides that if the facilities shown on the SE Plat/PRC Plan do not satisfy DPWES requirements, the applicant must come back for an SE amendment. A development condition has been added that the applicant will maintain and keep free from litter the bio-retention facilities. One of the speakers at the public hearing raised objections concerning the impact of the development on her abutting property. Her concerns are legitimate. However, as I stated at the public hearing, her testimony surprised me because the plan that we were considering at that time and that we will be moving on tonight, reflected significant

changes from the applicant's original proposal, primarily in response to the input from her neighbors who had raised concerns similar to hers earlier in the process. There is one issue that has arisen subsequent to the public hearing, but which grows out of a statement made by the applicant. During his testimony, the applicant's representative stated that the Reston Association's Design Review Board had approved the plan. Upon review, which I confirmed this morning, the Reston Association's Design Review Board approved in concept an earlier version of the plan. As is normal under their procedures, the DRB does not give final approval on a proposal until later in the process, usually closer to County site plan approval. Under the Reston Covenants, the DRB must give its approval before a project can go to construction. To further clarify, or perhaps confuse the issue, the Reston Association's Planning and Zoning Committee did review and recommend approval of what we are considering tonight. The P&Z review and recommendation is separate and independent of the DRB actions. This application has undergone extensive and careful review. What we are being asked to act on, fundamentally, is an expansion of the church's sanctuary from its currently approved 192 seats to 350 seats. The nursery/child care uses are existent and do not change. The church has been in operation at this location for over 40 years. By all accounts, it is a good neighbor. As is always the case when conditions change after decades of use and new construction is involved, the removal of trees results. I believe that the plan before us is a good balance between new construction, tree preservation, and neighboring concerns. Staff has recommended approval, subject to numerous development conditions. As I mentioned before, the Reston Planning - - as I mentioned before, the Reston Planning and Zoning Committee has also recommended approval. I agree with both P&Z and the staff recommendation. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, if I can find it because I was given a version tonight. No, of the - - of my approval motions is what I need. I know, but I want to make sure I did the right ones. Could I? No, I know, I just found it. I thought. No, I didn't. I'm sorry. I should know it by memory, but since there have been so many questions on this, I want to make sure that I'm doing the right ones. Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF SE 2008-HM-024, SUBJECT TO DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS NOW DATED JUNE 11, 2009.

Commissioners Flanagan, Hart, and Lusk : Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Flanagan and Mr. Hart and Mr. Lusk. Is there a discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Harsel: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Ms. Harsel.

Commissioner Harsel: I will be abstaining since I was attending the graduation of my oldest grandchild on that date and missed the hearing, and I'm going to rub it in every time.

Chairman Murphy: Chair will also abstain. I was not present for the public hearing. All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to approve SE 2008-HM-024, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Harsel: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Abstain. Ms. Harsel and the Chair abstain.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF PRC A-502, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED MAY 14, 2009.

Commissioners Litzenberger, Hart, Flanagan, and Lusk : Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Litzenberger, Mr. Hart, Mr. Flanagan, and Mr. Lusk. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve PRC A-502, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Harsel: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Same abstentions.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE MODIFICATIONS OF THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING REQUIREMENT ALONG THE NORTHERN, SOUTHERN, AND EASTERN PROPERTY LINES, TO THAT SHOWN ON THE SE PLAT AND PRC PLAN.

Commissioners Flanagan, Litzenberger, Hart, and Lusk : Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Flanagan, Mr. Litzenberger, Mr. Hart, Mr. Lawrence [sic]. Is there a - - Mr. Lusk. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Harsel: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Same abstentions.

Commissioner de la Fe: And finally, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE WAIVER OF THE BARRIER REQUIREMENTS ALONG THE NORTHERN, SOUTHERN, AND EASTERN PROPERTY LINES, TO THAT SHOWN ON THE SE PLAT AND PRC PLAN.

Commissioners Litzenberger, Flanagan, Hart, and Lusk : Second.

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

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Harsel: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Same abstentions.

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank staff and the applicant and all the neighbors particularly that came out and all of those that participated over the last almost two years on this case and made this a better plan than originally submitted. Thank you very much.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you.

//

(The motions carried by votes of 8-0-2 with Commissioners Harsel and Murphy abstaining; Commissioners Alcorn and Hall absent from the meeting.)

KAD