

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.