

4:00 p.m. Item - RZ-2000-SP-016 - BAUER DRIVE ASSOCIATES, LLC
Springfield District

On Wednesday, September 13, 2000 the Planning Commission voted to recommend that the Board of Supervisors take the following actions with respect to RZ-2000-SP-016:

Approval of the application, subject to execution of proffers consistent with those contained in Appendix 1 of the staff report (passed 9-0-1 with Commissioner Alcorn abstaining; Commissioners Kelso and Wilson absent from the meeting);

Approval of a waiver of the minimum district size requirement for the R-8 district (passed 9-0-1 with Commissioner Alcorn abstaining; Commissioners Kelso and Wilson absent from the meeting);

Approval of a modification of the minimum open space requirement (passed 7-1-2 with Commissioner Alcorn opposed; Commissioners Harsel and Moon abstaining; Commissioners Kelso and Wilson absent from the meeting);

Approval of a waiver of the 600-foot limitation on the maximum length of private streets (passed 9-0-1 with Commissioner Alcorn abstaining; Commissioners Kelso and Wilson absent from the meeting).

Planning Commission Meeting
September 13, 2000
Verbatim Excerpts

RZ-2000-SP-016 - BAUER DRIVE ASSOCIATES, LLC

After Close of the Public Hearing

Vice Chairman Byers: I'll close the public hearing and recognize Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think with the sensitivities of bringing infill parcels before the Planning Commission that are occurring all around the County, the absence of any citizens here this evening is testimony to the fact that citizens in the Springfield District who we've met with buy off on this application. It has some shortcomings; there's no question about it. But considering this application is inextricably connected with the Board's approval of the 456 to expand the Government Center and the police station and to have the land available for the County for access and -- into the Government Center and police station and also provide for additional parking for the police station and the Government Center to allow citizens to come to the various meetings, there were some tradeoffs with this application. And one thing that the citizens in this area were very strong about in their feeling was that they preferred to have single family detached since the parcels in question already have single family detached homes on those parcels. And quite frankly, if you're familiar with Bauer Drive, about half the units on that street as it exists right now are bordering on or have now surpassed the blighted stage. So they wanted a nice, single family detached development that would replace the blighted homes that are on Bauer Drive. And this development faces, most of it faces, the rear of a shopping center. With the expansion of the road and other amenities the applicant has built in, there were tradeoffs on the lot size to reach this accommodation, not jam this area with townhouses because it's a very sensitive area as far as traffic is concerned, as a cut through between Keene Mill Road and Rolling Road to avoid the lights. One of the things that was of deep concern to the citizens was the intersection of Bauer Drive and Rolling Road because there is no control device there. And we told the citizens that we would take a look at that intersection and see what the warrants would be for a traffic signal in the near future. VDOT made an on-the-spot survey of that intersection on the 30th of August and the results were quite interesting. According to VDOT the accidents that occurred at that intersection would not warrant a traffic light in and of itself. But the traffic volume at that intersection of Bauer Drive and Rolling Road is really close. And since the survey was done on the 30th of August, so we could have results for this public hearing, the survey was taken before West Springfield High School was in session. And I'm confident that if this were taken when West Springfield High School was in session you would see a larger volume of traffic at that intersection as opposed to the 27,000 cars that VDOT counted there. So we're getting back to the citizens and saying that if the volume of traffic would increase exponentially with opening of West Springfield High School, that there could in fact be warrants established for a traffic signal at that intersection in the near future. And that was really the main thrust of the citizens' concern. The applicant has also agreed to

continue working with the County to resolve the design and the applicability of the stormwater management facility. So it is sort of a joint effort between the developer and the County to give us all the things we need to have for the expansion of this Government Center and the expansion of the police facility. It is at the low end of the range. They have done the consolidation to reach the R-8 District. That was needed for the lots -- for the access in and out of the Government Center. The design of single home -- family detached took a little bit more of that open space that requires the waiver of the minimum open space requirement. So there were some tradeoffs. By and large the citizens are in support of the application. The only real concern was the one I've addressed this evening and that is the traffic at Bauer Drive and Rolling Road and we hope to do something about it. The other point that I would enter into this is the fact that the application at this end of the density range does not immeasurably affect the traffic flow onto the new section. You could put that application in there right now and that would not be considered in the warrants. The warrants are strictly traffic that's there on Rolling Road and on Bauer Drive as it stands right now. As far as the trust fund is concerned, we felt and the citizens felt--although I don't think they have very strong feeling about this, but we felt that a contribution, a substantial contribution to the Housing Trust Fund would be sufficient. And quite frankly I wasn't going to get into zoning for dollars. I just don't think it applies here. I think the zoning for dollars took place long before this application reached us with the agreements that the County made with the developer to enhance and to improve the Government Center and police station. And I want to thank you for that and also for not putting in townhouses and putting in single family detached. So therefore Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT APPROVE RZ-2000-SP-016.

Commissioner Koch: Second.

Commissioner Downer: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman Byers: Subject to the execution of proffers.

Commissioner Murphy: SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF THE PROFFERS THAT ARE IN THE STAFF REPORT. It very rarely happens but they're in there.

Commissioner Harsel: Yeah, that's great.

Commissioner Murphy: Yeah.

Commissioner Downer: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman Byers: Seconded by Mr. Koch. Any discussion?

Commissioner Downer: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman Byers: Ms. Downer.

Commissioner Dower: I'm not really pleased with this application but, after hearing the explanation of Mr. McDermott and Chairman Murphy of the citizen involvement and the constraints that they had and their desire for single family, I will support it. I can't say I'm thrilled with it. But if that's the wants of the community and because of the obstacles they've had to overcome, I wish it were different but I will reluctantly support it.

Vice Chairman Byers: Any comments? Ms. Hall.

Commissioner Hall: Now, Mr. Chairman, the one benefit the Planning Commission has is there is a Planning Commissioner assigned to each district. And because this is a large County and this is not a full time job, we have to rely very heavily on the District Commissioner to explain the rationale of what's acceptable and what isn't acceptable. I think it's clear that the Planning Commissioner considers it very important that applicants make contributions to the parks. They're bringing more people and the parks are going to be taxed and they do need the revenue. But I think Chairman Murphy did explain the situation adequately and I feel like I can support this application. Thank you.

Commissioner Alcorn: Mr. Chairman.

Vice Chairman Byers: Mr. Alcorn.

Commissioner Alcorn: I would just note that the statement from -- by the applicant on a couple of issues I considered relatively weak. I cannot support the waiver of the modification for open space. I would note that we have had P Districts with single family detached units for a density similar to this. That just because you have an R-8, or just because you have this density range, doesn't mean that you have to do townhouses or you do single family detached units without any open space. I don't buy that. But given the explanation of Commissioner Murphy, I'll just abstain on the main motion.

Vice Chairman Byers: Any comments? All in favor of the motion to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve RZ-2000-SP-016, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Vice Chairman Byers: Opposed?

Commissioner Alcorn: Abstain.

Vice Chairman Byers: Mr. Alcorn abstains. Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Chairman, I would MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT THEY APPROVE A WAIVER OF THE MINIMUM DISTRICT SIZE OF THE R-8 DISTRICT and a -- I'll just do them one at a time.

Commissioner Koch: Second.

Vice Chairman Byers: Seconded by Mr. Koch. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion to recommend the Board approve a waiver of the minimum district size of the R-8 District, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Commissioner Alcorn: Abstain.

Vice Chairman Byers: Opposed? Mr. Alcorn abstains. Motion carried. Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT APPROVE A MODIFICATION OF THE MINIMUM OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENT.

Commissioner Koch: Second.

Vice Chairman Byers: Seconded by Mr. Koch. Any discussion on that?

Commissioner Harsel: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman Byers: Ms. Harsel.

Commissioner Harsel: I will abstain because I usually feel something should be redesigned if we need both the waivers. But after listening to the explanation I will abstain on this. I usually don't go for both waivers but I'll just abstain rather than vote no.

Vice Chairman Byers: Other discussion? All in favor of the motion to recommend the Board approve modification of the minimum open space requirement, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Vice Chairman Byers: Opposed?

Commissioner Alcorn: No.

Vice Chairman Byers: Mr. Alcorn votes no.

Commissioners Harsel and Moon: Abstain.

Vice Chairman Byers: Ms. Harsel and Mr. Moon abstain. Motion carried. Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Chairman I would MOVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE 600 FOOT LIMITATION ON THE MAXIMUM LENGTH OF PRIVATE STREETS.

Commissioner Koch: Second.

Vice Chairman Byers: Seconded by Mr. Koch. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion to recommend the Board approve a waiver of the 600 limitation on private streets, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Commissioner Alcorn: Abstain.

Vice Chairman Byers: Opposed? Motion carried. Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: Thank you very much. Thank you Mr. McDermott. I appreciate your efforts. I would like to have seen that open space but to tell you if we had that we would have had townhouses and we would be here until about four o'clock in the morning. So you've got to appreciate the tradeoffs when the citizens are pretty loud about that when you have a constrained site. I don't even know whether we would probably qualify for P District. We might have had a fight with staff on whether or not this application would have fit into the criteria that we've established for P Districts.

Frank McDermott: Thank you.

//

(The first, second, and fourth motions carried by a vote of 9-0-1 with Commissioner Alcorn abstaining; Commissioners Kelso and Wilson absent from the meeting.)

(The third motion carried by a vote of 7-1-2, with Commissioner Alcorn opposed; Commissioners Harsel and Moon abstaining; Commissioners Kelso and Wilson absent from the meeting.)

MAP