

7/20/87

4:30 p.m. Item - RZ-86-S-071 - C.F. CENTREVILLE, INC.
Springfield District

On Thursday, July 9, 1987, the Planning Commission voted unanimously (Commissioner Thomas not present for the vote; Commissioner Sparks absent from the meeting) to recommend to the Board of Supervisors the following actions pertinent to RZ-86-S-071:

- 1) Approval of the rezoning from the C-7 District to the PDC District, subject to execution of the draft proffer statement dated July 9, 1987, amended as follows:

At the end of proffer #3, change the word "motel" to "hotel";

In proffer #23, change the reference from "paragraph 21" to "paragraph 22";

Amend proffer #32 to read: "From the date of approval of the rezoning and through site grading, the County Archeologist will be allowed to enter the subject property to conduct archeological assessments and remove artifacts, provided that the removal does not unreasonably hold up the construction process."

- 2) Approval of the conceptual development plan, subject to execution of the draft proffer statement dated July 9, 1987, as previously amended.
- 3) Waiver of the service drive requirement along the property's Route 29 frontage; waiver of the 600-foot private street length requirement; waiver of the barrier requirements along I-66; and modification of the transitional screening area requirements along I-66.

The Planning Commission also voted unanimously (Commissioner Thomas not present for the vote; Commissioner Sparks absent from the meeting) to approve FDP-86-S-071, subject to the Board's approval of the rezoning and the conceptual development plan.

The Commission voted 8-1 (Commissioner Lilly opposed; Commissioner Thomas not present for the vote; Commissioner Sparks absent from the meeting) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors direct the applicant to submit all architectural renderings and elevations to the Planning Commission for review, comment and approval, concurrent with the submission of the site plans to the Department of Environmental Management; and further, that the site plans be returned to the Planning Commission for review and comment prior to approval by the Director of Environmental Management.

Finally, the Planning Commission voted unanimously (Commissioner Thomas not present for the vote; Commissioner Sparks absent from the meeting) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors direct the County Executive to

Planning Commission Meeting
July 9, 1987
Verbatim Excerpts

RZ/FDP-86-S-071 - C.F. CENTREVILLE, INC.

After Close of the Public Hearing

Chairman Lilly: The public hearing is closed. We turn to Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe when you look at these three applications, from Cadillac Fairview, Artery, and the Centreville United Methodist Church, you are looking at what many have called the centerpiece of Centreville. I've referred to it many times as the center piece of Centreville, because of its location at the key intersection of Route 28 and 29. And although I'm going to make my motion now on the first application, with two others to follow, I believe that some general comments apply to all three. First of all, the beginning of this centerpiece did not take place when this application, or any of these applications, were filed. The actual beginning of this odyssey began in 1983 when the Centreville Core Study Task Force was assembled -- a task force which consisted primarily of citizens, many of whom were from the Centreville area, who for many, many months hammered out the language, hammered out the words, and came up with the concepts that formed the Centreville Study Plan amendment, which was approved by the Board of Supervisors, and was recommended favorably to the Board of Supervisors, by the Planning Commission. It was a citizen plan. So we see a direct result of that citizen plan tonight when we look at these applications. In all three applications, the staff has made the comment that they are all in conformance with that Comprehensive Plan, that includes the Centreville Plan, which was the direct result of the Centreville Core Study and the citizens' effort. I think another key factor that applies to all three applications is the fact that in all instances the developers and the applicants have worked closely with the citizens in the Centreville area, and particularly with the citizens of the West Fairfax Citizens Association's Land Use Committee. They have worked closely with myself, with Supervisor McConnell, with Chairman Herrity. And I think this meeting of the minds causes us to see what we're seeing here this evening, and that is general support for this application. And I'm sure we'll see that same support in the applications that follow. I think one of the key factors that has made the staff change its recommendation from negative to positive, has been the result of the applicant, in this particular application, making great strides in improving the transportation amenities that are so necessary at this particular site. If this is going to be the centerpiece, then the traffic has just got to work or the centerpiece is not going to work -- and if the centerpiece is not going to work, Centreville is not going to work. I think, with what the applicant has proffered here this evening in this application, the traffic is going to work. I'm particularly pleased with the proffer whereby the applicant has agreed to provide for the full design of the planned Route 28/29 interchange, either as the County's agent or by escrowing funds for such work to be conducted by the County. That, the time phasing, the improvements at 28/29, all add up, in my opinion, to a total package of a transportation plus for the Centreville area. And I will be referring to this designed interchange in one of my motions. So again, I thank the citizens for coming out this evening and

through the entire process. We've come a long way since 1983. We've come a long way since the adoption of the Centreville Plan and I think we're moving in the right direction. And it's only that embodiment of citizens and developers and staff and elected and appointed officials working together that we reach these positive ends. So therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to MOVE -- and I have a series of motions -- THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT THE ZONING ORDINANCE, AS IT APPLIES TO THE PROPERTY WHICH IS THE SUBJECT OF RZ-86-S-071, BE AMENDED FROM THE C-7 DISTRICT TO THE PDC DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF THE DRAFT PROFFER STATEMENT DATED JULY 9, 1987.

Commissioner Koch: Second.

Chairman Lilly: Seconded by Mr. Koch. Discussion?

Commissioner Harsel: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Lilly: Mrs. Harsel.

Commissioner Harsel: Um -- I'm dropping my whole ball of wax here -- I wonder if Mr. Murphy is going to go along with the applicant saying on page 2, THAT "MOTEL" SHOULD BE "HOTEL".

Commissioner Murphy: Yes, I'll AMEND THAT.

Commissioner Harsel: And then also, just for the record, on page eight, proffer 23, midway down it refers to paragraph 21. I discussed with staff -- that should be 22, and I saw them mention paragraph 22 to the applicant and the applicant shook his head. But I would like it on the record, THAT SHOULD BE PARAGRAPH 22 INSTEAD OF 21.

Commissioner Murphy: All right.

Commissioner Lockwood: Mr. Chairman?

Commissioner Thillmann: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Lilly: Mr. Lockwood.

Commissioner Lockwood: Mr. Murphy, I'm happy to support your motion. And since it's a rather major proposal that has a number of complications, I especially commend you for not making a motion for deferral.

Chairman Lilly: Mr. Thillmann.

Commissioner Thillmann: Mr. Chairman, I will also support the motion. And for the record, I'd also like to indicate that the applicant, during questioning, agreed to amend proffer number 32 to deal with the archeological

language that I hope he considers seriously before it goes to the Board. Let me just read it. I would amend 32, if I were him, along the following lines: FROM THE DATE OF APPROVAL OF THE REZONING, AND THROUGH SITE GRADING, THE COUNTY ARCHEOLOGIST WILL BE ALLOWED TO ENTER THE SUBJECT PROPERTY TO CONDUCT ARCHEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENTS AND REMOVE ARTIFACTS, PROVIDED THAT THE REMOVAL DOES NOT UNREASONABLY HOLD UP THE CONSTRUCTION PROCESS. Thank you.

Chairman Lilly: Anything else?

Commissioner Harsel: Yes, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Lilly: Mrs. Harsel.

Commissioner Harsel: This -- Mr. Murphy, you'd better hold on to your chair. I think the applicant should be commended without one single fight. We are providing affordable housing for support workers and I think that is admirable.

Chairman Lilly: Anything else? If not, the motion is to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of this application. All those in favor say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Lilly: Opposed? The motion carries. Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: I'm still holding onto to my chair.

Chairman Lilly: Yes, yes.

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Chairman, I further MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT APPROVE THE CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR RZ-86-S-071, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF THE DRAFT PROFFER STATEMENT DATED JULY 9, 1987.

Commissioner Koch: Second.

Chairman Lilly: Seconded by Mr. Koch. Discussion?

Commissioner Thillmann: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Lilly: Mr. Thillmann.

Commissioner Thillmann: The same caveat I had before.

Chairman Lilly: All right.

Commissioner Harsel: And the changes.

Commissioner Thillmann: Ditto.

Chairman Lilly: All right. All those in favor of the motion say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Lilly: Opposed? The motion carries. Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Chairman, I further MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR RZ-86-S-071, SUBJECT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISOR'S APPROVAL OF THIS APPLICATION AND THE CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

Commissioner Koch: Second.

Chairman Lilly: Seconded by Mr. Koch. Discussion of the motion? If not, all those in favor say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Lilly: Opposed? The motion carries. Anything else?

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Lilly: Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: I further MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT DIRECT THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT TO WAIVE THE SERVICE DRIVE REQUIREMENT ALONG THE PROPERTY'S ROUTE 29 FRONTAGE, WAIVE THE 600-FOOT PRIVATE STREET LENGTH REQUIREMENT, WAIVE THE BARRIER REQUIREMENTS ALONG INTERSTATE-66, AND MODIFY THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING AREA REQUIREMENTS ALONG INTERSTATE-66.

Commissioner Koch: Second.

Chairman Lilly: Seconded by Mr. Koch. Discussion of the motion? If not, all those in favor say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Lilly: Opposed? The motion carries.

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Lilly: Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: I also MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT DIRECT THE APPLICANT TO SUBMIT ALL ARCHITECTURAL RENDERINGS AND ELEVATIONS TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR REVIEW, COMMENT, AND APPROVAL, CONCURRENT WITH THE SUBMISSION OF THE SITE PLANS TO THE

RETURNED TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT PRIOR TO APPROVAL
BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT.

Commissioner Thillmann: Second.

Chairman Lilly: Seconded by Mr. Thillmann. Discussion?

Commissioner Thillmann: Mr. Chairman, let me congratulate Mr. Murphy on what
I consider to be an excellent proffer and --

Chairman Lilly: An excellent what?

Commissioner Thillmann: Motion.

Chairman Lilly: The last one, you mean?

Commissioner Thillmann: I'm sorry. Yes. And the citizens of downtown
Centreville ought to be very appreciative of that, whether they know what they
just got or not.

Chairman Lilly: All right. All those in favor of the motion say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Lilly: Opposed? Mr. Lilly votes no. The motion carries.

Commissioner Sell: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Lilly: Mr. Sell.

Commissioner Sell: Just a follow-up on what Mr. Murphy said -- and having sat
here through a lot of things in Centreville -- my first thought tonight is I
wondered where all those people were who said it couldn't be done. And I want
to pass on my compliments to the citizens of that particular area who worked
so hard on the Comprehensive Plan, the staff, the applicant, and Commissioner
Murphy I think deserves some special recognition for his leadership in this.
You've done a good job. Thank you.

Commissioner Murphy: I appreciate that. Thank you.

Chairman Lilly: Anything else?

Commissioner Murphy: I have one more motion, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Lilly: Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: Let me preface this by saying something I said in the
Centreville Plan calls for an interchange at 28 and

to MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT DIRECT THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXPEDITE THE DESIGN PROCESS OF THE INTERCHANGE AT ROUTE 28/29, SO THAT THIS DESIGN BE COMPLETED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

Commissioner Koch: Second.

Chairman Lilly: Seconded by Mr. Koch. Discussion of the motion? If not, all those in favor say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Lilly: Opposed? The motion carries.

Commissioner Harsel: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Lilly: Mrs. Harsel.

Commissioner Harsel: Mr. Murphy, I think they also said that the -- the design I think is super, but also alot of proffers go concerning funds.

Commissioner Murphy: Right.

Commissioner Harsel: Is this on the six-year plan, the funding?

Mr. Theilacker: No, it's not.

Commissioner Murphy: No, it's not.

Commissioner Harsel: I don't know. I'd like to say if we're going to design it, let's sort of look for funds too quickly, so we don't lose it.

Commissioner Sell: Be careful, Mrs. Harsel.

Chairman Lilly: Anything else pertaining to this application? All right. Thank you very much.

//

(With the exception of motion #5, all motions carried unanimously with Commissioner Thomas not present for the votes; Commissioner Sparks absent from the meeting. The fifth motion passed by a vote of 8-1 with Commissioner Lilly opposed; Commissioner Thomas not present for the vote; Commissioner Sparks absent from the meeting.)