



FAIRFAX COUNTY

APPLICATION FILED: February 5, 1999
PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING: September 8, 1999
PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION: October 13, 1999
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS: October 25, 1999
@ 3:30 P.M.

V I R G I N I A

September 29, 1999

STAFF REPORT ADDENDUM 1

APPLICATION RZ/FDP 1999-MA-006

MASON DISTRICT

APPLICANT:	The Ryland Group, Inc.
CURRENT ZONING:	C-4 and HC
REQUESTED ZONING	PDH-12 and HC
PARCEL(S):	72-2 ((1)) 44B
ACREAGE:	4.21 acres
DENSITY:	10.6 DU/AC
OPEN SPACE:	30%
PLAN MAP:	Multi-Family Residential, 12-16 du/ac; or single-family attached development up to 12 du/ac
PROPOSAL:	Rezone the subject property from C-4 to PDH-12 to allow the development of 45 single-family attached dwelling units.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of RZ 1999-MA-006, subject to the proffers contained in Attachment 1.

Staff recommends approval of FDP 1999-MA-006 subject to the Board of Supervisor's approval of RZ 1999-MA-006 and subject to the proposed development conditions in Attachment 3.

Staff recommends approval of a waiver of the 600 foot maximum length of private streets requirement.

It should be noted that it is not the intent of staff to recommend that the Board, in adopting any conditions proffered by the owner, relieve the applicant/owner from compliance with the provisions of any applicable ordinances, regulations, or adopted standards.

It should be further noted that the content of this report reflects the analysis and recommendation of staff; it does not reflect the position of the Board of Supervisors.

For information, contact the Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, 12055 Government Center Parkway, Suite 801, Fairfax, Virginia 22035-5505, (703) 324-1290.



Reasonable accommodation is available upon 7 days advance notice. For information call (703) 324-1334.

BACKGROUND

The applicant, The Ryland Group, Inc., is requesting approval to rezone the subject property from the C-4 District to the PDH-12 to permit the development of single family attached residential units. The staff report for RZ/FDP 1999-MA-006 was dated August 25, 1999.

As stated in the staff report, the proposal was for 48 single family attached units at a density of 11.4 du/ac with 30% of the property to remain in open space. An ingress/egress point was proposed along Beauregard Street and interparcel access was proposed to the Lincolnia Senior Center which is the adjacent property to the north.

The August 25, 1999, staff report recommended denial of the application because of numerous outstanding transportation, land use and design issues. On September 8, 1999, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the application and deferred the decision until October 13, 1999.

DISCUSSION

The applicant has submitted revised proffers and development plans since the publication of the staff report, with the most recent plan submission dated January 12, 1999, as revised through September 28, 1999, and the most recent proffers dated September 29, 1999, contained in Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Revisions to the proffers and development plans include:

- a reduction in the number of units from 48 to 45 with a corresponding decrease in the density from 11.4 du/ac to 10.6 du/ac;
- the provision of 20 foot wide landscaped buffers, including a 6 foot tall board on board fence, along the west property line, adjacent to Orleans Village apartment complex, and along the south property line, adjacent to McDonald's;
- realignment of the interparcel access across the Lincolnia Senior Center property to the north, which provides for construction of a new travel lane and parking lot improvements on the Lincolnia Senior Center property;

- commitment to construction of a four foot wide trail from the application property to the Lincolnia Senior Center property, and including a four foot wide trail around the playing field located behind the senior center;
- a landscape plan which commits to minimum plant sizes that exceed the PFM requirements;
- a contribution to the Housing Trust Fund, equal to 1% of the sales price of each of the proposed units, per the Board of Supervisors' policy.

In the staff report, staff concluded that the proposed infill development did not address the "P" District design quality standards, buffering and screening from the adjacent higher intensity uses, future roadway improvements or site access issues. The proposed development did not satisfy sufficient applicable criteria to merit favorable consideration of the requested density and did not satisfy the Board policy which states that rezonings should not be approved for densities above 60% of the base range without an appropriate contribution of 1% of the projected sales price of the units to the Housing Trust Fund.

Listed below are the outstanding issues outlined in the August 25, 1999, staff report, with a discussion of the current status of each of the issues. A discussion of how the plan has been reevaluated using the Residential Density Criteria is also included.

Site Access

Access to and from the subject property is limited due to the site's proximity to the North Chambliss Street and Beauregard Road intersection. The planned interchange of Route 236/Beauregard may eliminate direct street access to the property, which would result in limiting access solely to the interparcel connection through the adjacent Senior Center. In response to safety concerns from the senior center, the applicant has committed to realign the interparcel travel way through the senior center property and to construct a separate travel lane along with parking lot improvements on the senior center property, provided such plans are approved for the senior center property. The Lincolnia Senior Center was developed in accordance with a Generalized Development Plan that was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1986, without proffers. Revisions to this plan will be subject to the provisions of Article 17, Site Plans, as may be determined by DPWES.

Staff has requested that the applicant provide for the re-orientation of the site access on the subject property to the northern portion of the property and to commit to implement this re-orientation once the construction of the planned

interchange occurs. The revised development plan provides for the re-orientation of the entrance to the north at such time as the interchange is constructed. The revised proffers state that the applicant shall dedicate and convey ingress/egress and temporary construction easements at the two locations but shall not be required to escrow the funds for the closure and opening of these entrances. Staff has requested that an escrow of funds be provided for the opening and closing of the entrances; therefore, this issue has only been partially addressed.

Landscaping

The landscape plan included with the development plan in the staff report depicted a row of trees along the periphery of the site. Staff stated that the proposal would be greatly enhanced by the inclusion of a comprehensive landscape plan that included diverse native species inclusive of ground cover, shrubs and trees. Although a proposed development condition required a comprehensive landscape plan at the time of site plan review, staff requested additional information on the landscape plan for this review in order to address the P district design standards. In response, the applicant has provided additional information on the landscape plan including plant sizes that exceed the PFM requirements, an enlargement of a typical front yard has been included which depicts landscaping proposed for the individual units, and supplemental landscaping within the landscape buffer along the west and south property lines. Groundcover and shrubs are depicted in front of the brick wall along the eastern property line. With the implementation of a proffer commitment to provide a comprehensive landscape plan, which utilizes native species, at the time of site plan submission, and with the additional information provided on the development plans, staff believes this issue has been addressed. -

Residential Density Criteria

As stated in the staff report, the Comprehensive Plan recommends a density not to exceed 12 du/ac for single family attached development on this property. On page 47 of the 1990 edition of the Policy Plan, amended April 8, 1991, Appendix 9 of the Land Use element states the following:

"Criteria for Assignment of Appropriate Residential Development Density

In instances where a range is not specified in the Plan, the density cited in the Plan shall be construed to equate to the upper limit of the Plan range, and the base level shall be the upper limit of the next lower Plan range.

..." base level" is defined as the lowest density recommended in the Plan range; the "high end" is defined as the base level plus 60% of the density range."

Therefore, as stated in the staff report, staff assumes a density range of 8-12 du/ac for calculating the number of relevant development criteria to be satisfied in order to recommend approval of the application. The applicant has reduced the density of the proposed plan from 11.4 du/ac to 10.6 du/ac. This density is still greater than 60% above the base density of 8 du/ac, so the application should satisfy three-quarters (75%) of the applicable Residential Density. Staff's evaluation of these criteria is as follows:

1. Provide a development plan, enforceable by the County, in which the natural, man-made and cultural features result in a high quality site design that achieves, at a minimum, the following objectives: it complements the existing and planned neighborhood scale, character and materials as demonstrated in architectural renderings and elevations (if requested); it establishes logical and functional relationships on- and off -site; it provides appropriate buffers and transitional areas; it provides appropriate berms, buffers, barriers, and construction and other techniques for noise attenuation to mitigate impacts of aircraft, railroad, highway and other obtrusive noise; it incorporates site design and/or construction techniques to achieve energy conservation; it protects and enhances the natural features of the site; it includes appropriate landscaping and provides for safe, efficient and coordinated pedestrian, vehicular and bicycle circulation. (HALF CREDIT)

Staff continues to believe that a different unit type could provide a more efficient use of the land, more open space and provide more areas for planted landscape buffers and/or amenities on the subject property; however, the applicant has revised the development plan to address several of the issues discussed in this criterion. The density has been reduced from 11.4 du/ac to 10.6 du/ac with the elimination of three units. This reduction in density did not result in an increase in open space as along with the reduction in the number of units came an increase in the size of many of the units. The revised development plan includes 20 foot wide landscaped buffers with board on board fences along the southern and western property lines; accommodation for a realignment of the development entrance at such time as the interchange at Rt. 236 and Beauregard is constructed; a realignment of the access through the Lincolnia Senior Center property to the north; additional landscape information, including a commitment to minimum plant sizes; and a proposed walking trail around the playing field on the senior center property to the north. With these additional commitments, staff believes half credit can be given for this criterion.

2. Provide public facilities (other than parks) such as schools, fire stations, and libraries, beyond those necessary to serve the proposed development

to alleviate the impact of the proposed development on the community.
(NOT APPLICABLE)

3. Provide for the phasing of development to coincide with planned and programmed provision of public facility construction to reduce impacts of proposed development on the community. **(NOT APPLICABLE)**
4. Contribute to the development of specific transportation improvements that offset adverse impacts resulting from the development of the site. Contributions must be beyond ordinance requirements in order to receive credit under this criterion. **(HALF CREDIT)**

Access to and from the subject property is limited due to the site's proximity to the North Chambliss Street and Beauregard Street intersection. The planned interchange of Route 236/Beauregard may eliminate direct street access to the property which would result in limiting access solely to the interparcel connection through the adjacent Senior Center. In response to safety concerns from the senior center, the applicant has committed to realign the interparcel travel way through the senior center property and to construct a separate travel lane along with parking lot improvements on the senior center property. Staff has requested that the applicant provide for the re-orientation of the site access to the northern portion of the property and implement this re-orientation once the construction of the planned interchange occurs. The development plan has been revised to accommodate the re-orientation of the site access to the north and has included a proffer that states that ingress/egress and temporary construction easements shall be conveyed at both access points; however, the applicant has not proffered to implement the re-orientation of the entrance when the interchange is constructed. Without the implementation of the access re-orientation when the interchange is constructed, staff believes that only half credit can be given for this criterion.

5. Dedicate parkland suitable for active recreation and/or provide developed recreation areas and/or facilities in an amount and type determined by application of adopted Park facility standards and which accomplish a public purpose. **(NOT APPLICABLE)**
6. Provide usable and accessible open space area and other passive recreational facilities in excess of County ordinance requirements than those defined in the County's Environmental Quality Corridor policy. **(HALF CREDIT)**

The majority of the proposed on-site open space encompasses the stormwater management facility, with a small passive recreation area depicted in

the center of the site and a possible seating area adjacent to the stormwater facility. The original request included a request for a waiver of the 200 square foot privacy yard requirement for single family attached units. The applicant has withdrawn this waiver request, which ensures that each unit will include some private open space. The applicant has proffered to construct a trail from the application property through the senior center property to the north and around the playing field located on the senior center property. Proffer commitments also provide for a contribution for recreational improvements to the playing field behind the Lincolnia Senior Center only if additional funds (from the required \$995.00/unit contribution) are remaining after the on-site recreation facilities and the off-site trail are constructed. Staff believes half credit can be given for this criterion.

7. Enhance, preserve or restore natural environmental resources on-site (through, for example, EQC preservation, wetlands preservation and protection, limits of clearing and grading and tree preservation) and/or reduce adverse off-site environmental impacts (through, for example, regional stormwater management). Contributions to preservation of and enhancement to environmental resources must be in excess of ordinance requirements. **(HALF CREDIT)**

Much of the subject property contains mature trees and implementation of the proposed plan includes clearing the entire property. In the August 25 staff report, staff recommended that a comprehensive landscape plan that utilizes native species be included with the proposal to help restore the natural environmental resources on site. The applicant has provided a revised landscape plan with the development plans which includes additional plantings and minimum plant sizes that exceed the PFM requirements. A detail has also been provided that depicts typical unit landscaping and landscaping within the passive open space area proposed in the center of the development. With this additional information, as well as the proffer commitment for a more comprehensive landscape plan, utilizing native species, to be provided at site plan review, staff believes this criterion has been partially satisfied.

8. Contribute to the County's low and moderate income housing goals. This shall be accomplished by providing either 12.5% of the total number of units to the Fairfax County Redevelopment Housing Authority, land adequate for an equal number of units or a contribution to the Fairfax County Housing Trust Fund in accordance with a formula established by the Board of Supervisors in consultation with the Fairfax County Redevelopment and Housing Authority. **(FULL CREDIT)**

The application is for 45 dwelling units; therefore, it is not subject to the Affordable Dwelling Unit Ordinance. As stated in the staff report, the Board of Supervisors has established a policy that specifies that applicants should not achieve a density above 60% of the base limit of the Plan absent a contribution of land or units for affordable housing. Alternatively, this can be achieved by providing a contribution to the Housing Trust Fund. An appropriate contribution, as adopted by the Board, requires a contribution in an amount equivalent to 1% of the sales price of each of the proposed units. The proposed density of 10.6 du/ac exceeds 60% of the base limit of the Plan range of 8-12 du/ac; therefore, a contribution equal to one percent of the projected sales price of the proposed units is appropriate. The applicant has provided a proffer commitment to contribute 1% of the projected sales price of each unit which satisfies this criterion.

9. Preserve, protect and/or restore structural, historic or scenic resources which are of architectural and/or cultural significance to the County's heritage. **(NOT APPLICABLE)**
10. Integrate land assembly and/or development plans to achieve Plan objectives. **(FULL CREDIT)**

Plan language for this property speaks to transportation and recreation issues that should be addressed in order to develop single family attached units on the subject property. As stated above, the revised development plans and proffers now adequately address the Plan language including: accommodation of the proposed interchange; access to the site oriented to take into account the interchange; interparcel access; and enhancement of the recreational area behind the senior center in lieu of on-site recreation. In staff's evaluation, this criterion has been satisfied.

SUMMARY:

With the revised development plans and proffers, the applicant has satisfied 4 of the 6 applicable criteria. Staff believes that the proposed development now satisfies sufficient applicable criteria to merit favorable consideration of the requested density. The development now also satisfies the applicable regulations in Article 6, Planned Development District Regulations and Article 16, Development Plans, and staff believes that sufficient justification has been provided for development as a P district.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Although staff continues to believe that a different unit type could provide a more efficient use of the land, more open space and provide more areas for planted landscape buffers and/or amenities on the subject property, staff believes that with the proposed revisions to the development plans and proffers, the applicant has provided a design that conforms with the Comprehensive Plan recommendations for use and intensity in the vicinity and satisfies the plans policies and objectives. With the proposed proffers and development conditions, all Zoning Ordinance requirements have been addressed. All other land use, transportation, environmental and public facility issues have been addressed.

Recommendations

Staff recommends approval of RZ 1999-MA-006 subject to the proffers contained in Attachment 1.

Staff recommends approval of FDP 1999-MA-006 subject to the Board of Supervisor's approval of RZ 1999-MA-006 and subject to the proposed development conditions in Attachment 3.

Staff recommends approval of a waiver of the 600 foot maximum length of private streets requirement.

It should be noted that it is not the intent of the staff to recommend that the Board, in adopting any conditions proffered by the owner, relieve the applicant/owner from compliance with the provisions of any applicable ordinances, regulations, or adopted standards.

It should be noted that the content of this report reflects the analysis and recommendation of staff; it does not reflect the position of the Board of Supervisors.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Proffers dated September 29, 1999
2. Conceptual/Final Development dated January 12, 1999, as revised through September 28, 1999
3. Proposed Development Conditions

ATTACHMENTS

1. Proffers dated September 29, 1999
2. Conceptual/Final Development dated January 12, 1999, as revised through September 28, 1999
3. Proposed Development Conditions