C 1

6/28/99

5:00 p.m. Items - RZ-1998-SU-067 - INOVA HEALTH CARE SERVICES
PCA-85-C-091-4 - INOVA HEALTH CARE SERVICES
SEA-84-C-076-5 - INOVA HEALTH CARE SERVICES
Sully District

On Wednesday, June 23, 1999, the Planning Commission voted 7-2-3 (Commissioners Byers and Harsel opposed; Commissioners Coan, Downer, and Hall abstaining) to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of PCA-85-C-091-4, subject to the execution of proffers consistent with those dated June 17, 1999.

The Commission also voted 7-2-3 (Commissioners Byers and Harsel opposed; Commissioners Coan, Downer, and Hall abstaining) to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of RZ-1998-SU-067, subject to the execution of proffers consistent with those dated June 17, 1999.

The Commission voted 7-0-5 (Commissioners Byers, Downer, Coan, Hall, and Harsel abstaining) to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of a modification of the transitional screening requirement and waiver of the barrier requirements along the western property boundary of the land area subject to RZ-1998-SU-067.

The Commission further voted 7-1-4 (Commissioner Byers opposed; Commissioners Downer, Coan, Hall, and Harsel abstaining) to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of SEA-84-C-076-5, subject to the development conditions dated June 21, 1999.

Planning Commission Meeting
June 23, 1999
Verbatim Excerpts

RZ-1998-SU-067 - INOVA HEALTH CARE SERVICES
PCA-85-C-091-4 - INOVA HEALTH CARE SERVICES
SEA-84-C-076-5 - INOVA HEALTH CARE SERVICES

Decision Only During Commission Matters
(Public Hearing held on June 2, 1999)

Commissioner Koch: A public hearing was held on June 2, 1999 on behalf of Inova Health Care Services for the Fair Oaks Hospital campus. At that time, there were concerns raised by the community concerning traffic on Rugby Road. Supervisor Frey and I have been working with the applicant and in response, Inova has submitted revised draft proffers in an attempt to address the concerns. Specifically, after a meeting with staff and the applicant last Wednesday, Inova revised the proffers to agree to submit a signal warrant study for the proposed traffic signal at the intersection of Rugby Road and Alder Woods Drive. This warrant study will also analyze coordinating the signal timing for the existing signal at the Fairfax County Parkway. Most importantly, Inova has agreed to improve the portion of Rugby Road between the Fairfax County Parkway and Alder Woods Drive prior to the issuance of the non-RUP for the first proposed office building. It is my understanding that this improvement will help alleviate some of the existing problems with this intersection. Inova has further agreed to improve the remaining portion of Rugby Road between Alder Woods Drive and Ox Trail prior to issuance of non-RUP for the second office building. The total cost of these improvements is anticipated to be over $1.5 million. Inova has also agreed to conduct a survey to determine which travel demand strategy may be effective for the hospital campus and will designate an employee transportation coordinator to coordinate a TDM program. In addition, it is my understanding that bus service is planned to be available in this area by the end of this year. Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF PCA-85-C-091-4, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED JUNE 17, 1999.

Commissioner Byers: Second. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Byers. Discussion? Mr. Byers.

Commissioner Byers: I'd like to ask the staff -- hello, staff -- with the new proffers, does staff withdraw it's recommendation for denial?

Ms. Leslie Johnson: No, we don't. We think we've come a long way, but we're still not -- we still have some concerns with the timing of the remainder of the improvements to Rugby Road being tied to the second office building.

Chairman Murphy: Further --

Commissioner Koch: Mr. Chairman, if I may. I think the bottom line is that staff doubts -- or would like to know when those improvements will be made. As I noted, they'll be made when the second office building is constructed. Of course, there's always that possibility that the second office building will never be constructed, but, looking at the past history of expansion of the hospital, I don't think that's a valid concern. I think we have come a long way. I think we addressed all the issues that can be addressed and the hospital has given a lot on this application.

Ms. Johnson: Mr. Byers, our position has been that those improvements should be done now rather than phased in. That was our initial position in the staff report. The applicant has agreed to do some of those improvements with the first office building and then the remainder with the second office building, but we believe they all should be done with the first office building.

Commissioner Byers: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Byers.

Commissioner Byers: I ask the staff again then, if Inova came up with a fixed schedule of dates, not dependent upon construction of the second office building, would that satisfy staff? Even though the dates might be phased?

Ms. Angela Rodeheaver: I'm Angela Rodeheaver, with the County's Department of Transportation. That gives me time to think.

Commissioner Byers: Well, the thing I'm concerned about -- staff wants to make sure the road gets fixed. The proffers say it'll get fixed if we build a second office building, and Mr. Koch points out, well, maybe the second office building won't get built. If the proffer were changed to say: "Yes, we're going to fix Rugby Road and we'll phase it in these specific dates." Would that meet the staff's requirements?

Ms. Rodeheaver: I think that gets us closer. If we had a date certain, like the by the second office building, or some time frame, that would be much better than where we are today.

Commissioner Koch: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Koch.

Commissioner Koch: I'd like to point out that where we started from was that the applicant was contending that the portion of Rugby Road that we would like them to construct is not really impacted by what they are doing. They have two entrances and the segment we're talking about is in between those two entrances. And they felt very

strongly that they should not be accountable for construction of that portion of Ox Road (sic). So we have come a long way. They have agreed to phase it in. It is a phasing according to their expansion of their campus. Again, I think Inova has bent over backwards to try to meet the concerns of staff. I can understand staff's position. I would like it to be done today. If you remember, the citizens didn't want it done at all. I don't think that's a good decision or wish on their part because the traffic is going to come whether that road's improved or not and I think it would be better if the road's improved. Again, I'd like to point out that the applicant will, upon building the first office building, improve Rugby Road from Fairfax County Parkway to Alder Woods Drive where the problem exists. So there will be relief for the citizens for their problems prior to all of West Ox Road being improved.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Harsel: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mrs. Harsel.

Commissioner Harsel: I have to get all this and get my things -- We're talking Rugby Road. And you're saying they'll build all the improvements when the first office building is built on Rugby Road --

Commissioner Koch: Second.

Commissioner Harsel: -- and the Parkway?

Commissioners Koch and Downer: Second.

Commissioner Harsel: That's what I thought. And then you brought up Ox Road. Are they going all the way out to Ox Road or Ox Trail?

Ms. Rodeheaver: Mrs. Harsel, Rugby Road changes names and it's Ox Trail where it intersects West Ox.

Commissioner Harsel: That's it. Maybe I should get the info on. Oh, it's not there.

Ms. Rodeheaver: Rugby Road at this point turns into Ox Trail.

Commissioner Harsel: Right.

Ms. Rodeheaver: And what is your question, regarding where the improvements would be?

Commissioner Harsel: Yes. And they're not doing anything until the second office building is built?

Ms. Rodeheaver: With the second (sic) office building, they will construct from Fairfax County Parkway to Alder Woods.

Commissioner Koch: The first.

Ms. Rodeheaver: The first office building. And with the second office building from Alder Woods to Joseph Siewick.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Harsel: My second question, Mr. Chairman, is what about the traffic warrant that Ms. Rodeheaver suggested when we got the new proffers? Has that been addressed to your satisfaction or not?

Ms. Rodeheaver: Yes, the applicant has agreed to provide a traffic warrant analysis that would look at both Rugby Road and Alder Woods and also the ability to time it with the signal at Fairfax County Parkway.

Commissioner Harsel: Okay.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve PCA -85-C-091-4, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed?

Commissioners Byers and Harsel: No.

Commissioners Downer and Hall: Abstain.

Commissioner Coan: Abstain, not present for the public hearing.

Chairman Murphy: Motion carries. Mr. Byers and Mrs. Harsel vote no; Ms. Downer, Ms. Hall and Mr. Coan abstain.

Commissioner Koch: Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF RZ-1998-SU-067, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED JUNE 17, 1999.

Commissioner Thomas: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Thomas. Discussion of that motion? All those

in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve RZ-1998-SU--067, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed?

Commissioners Byers and Harsel: No.

Commissioners Downer, Coan and Hall: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Motion carries. Same split. Mr. Koch.

Commissioner Koch: I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF A MODIFICATION OF THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING REQUIREMENT AND WAIVER OF THE BARRIER REQUIREMENTS ALONG THE WESTERN PROPERTY BOUNDARY OF THE LAND AREA SUBJECT TO RZ-1998-SU-067.

Commissioner Thomas: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Thomas. Discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed?

Commissioners Byers, Downer, Coan, Hall and Harsel: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Motion carries with five abstentions.

Commissioner Koch: Finally, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF SEA-84-C-076-5, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JUNE 21, 1999.

Commissioner Thomas: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Thomas. Discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve SEA-84-C-076-5, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed?

Commissioner Byers: No.

Commissioners Downer, Coan, Hall and Harsel: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: All right. Mr. Byers votes no; Mrs. Harsel, Ms. Downer, Ms. Hall and Mr. Coan abstain.

//

(The first and second motions each carried by a vote of 7-2-3 with Commissioners Byers and Harsel opposed; Commissioners Coan, Downer and Hall abstaining.)

(The third motion carried by a vote of 7-0-5 with Commissioners Byers, Downer, Coan, Hall and Harsel abstaining.)

(The fourth motion carried by a vote of 7-1-4 with Commissioner Byers opposed; Commissioners Downer, Coan, Hall and Harsel abstaining.)

GLW