

6:00 P.M. Item - RZ-2001-SP-003 - PULTE HOME CORP.

Springfield District *(formerly Sully District)*

On Thursday, July 26, 2001, the Planning Commission voted 5-0-2 (Commissioners Hall and Smyth abstaining; Commissioners Alcorn and Harsel not present for the votes; Commissioners Koch, Moon and Palatiello absent from the meeting) to recommend the following actions to the Board of Supervisors:

Approval of RZ-2000-SP-003, subject to execution of proffers consistent with those dated July 26, 2001;

Modification of the transitional screening requirement and waiver of the barrier requirement for the area south of the duplex units, in favor of the treatment shown on the Generalized Development Plan.

The Planning Commission voted 4-2-1 (Commissioners Byers and Smyth opposed; Commissioner Hall abstaining; Commissioners Alcorn and Harsel not present for the vote) to recommend waiver of the 200-foot setback requirement from interstate highways.

Planning Commission Meeting
July 26, 2001
Verbatim Excerpts

RZ-2001-SU-003 - PULTE HOME CORPORATION

Decision Only During Commission Matters
(Public Hearing held on July 19, 2001)

Commissioner Murphy: This is a decision only on RZ-2001-SU-003. Last night at the public hearing Mr. Byers, my dear friend and Commissioner from the Mount Vernon District, made some disparaging remarks about me because after the redistricting I bequeathed to him a very simple slam dunk, non-controversial special exception in the Springfield District. So hold on to your hats, because I am the beneficiary of a lot of applications that are now going on as far as Chantilly High School --

Vice Chairman Byers: You deserved every word I said.

Commissioner Murphy: I want to first of all take note of the fact that I was not here for the public hearing. This case was in the Sully District and since the application has been filed -- and actually a long time before that -- both Commissioner Koch and Supervisor Frey have had many meetings with the applicant and the citizens in the area. At that time I had no notion that this would eventually be part of the Springfield District and I had planned a business trip when this public hearing was scheduled. So Mr. Koch was kind enough to act in my stead at the public hearing, but returning from my business trip on Tuesday of this week, I did watch the video in its entirety and I did not, I will disclose, fast forward when Mrs. Harsel was asking questions. I watched the whole thing in slow mo. This application is a rezoning in the vicinity of -- actually it's on Westbrook Drive. It has gone through a lot of iterations. And it is a rezoning to the R-2 cluster. After listening to the citizens' testimony, and after receiving some letters as late as this evening, I had come earlier to the conclusion, and that conclusion still remains with me, that no matter what the decision is and what the approval is by the Board of Supervisors, not everyone is going to be happy, because even the citizens have some divergent opinions as to how construction traffic should be routed, where the tot lot should be. So there is an application here before me this evening where all the particular issues do not have a single answer. So, I'm just going to do my best and see how many people I can please tonight. This is an application which in my opinion is approvable. It has an affirmative recommendation from the staff. There were some issues that were brought up at the public hearing that have been addressed in the proffers. Now last night we received a set of proffers that were underlined. Tonight we received a set of proffers that were underlined, but they weren't underlined in the same places they were underlined last night. Last night the proffers were underlined with the major additions. Tonight the proffers you have before you are underlined to show some verbiage changes that the staff and applicant agreed upon today that sort of police up the language. The important issues that I think have been addressed by the proffers were issues that were discussed extensively by the citizens at the public hearing were first was the blasting issue. This brought back memories going back to my days when we had the Centreville District and we came up with the blasting proffer because we needed that kind of proffer out in the Centreville area because the land was such out

there that it needed to be blasted before construction took place. That blasting proffer, which I hadn't seen for ten years because we don't have any blasting in the Springfield District, the old Springfield District, has evolved into language that is in Proffer Number 23. One of the main concerns of the citizens, and we have the three ladies from Westbrook here this evening and I want to welcome you again in person, and I want to welcome you to the Springfield District, was the issue of the fence. The applicant has agreed in Proffer Number 24 to fence in the properties as they so desired. The construction traffic which is in Number 7 will still be routed I think the best way possible and the way I think a lot of the citizens wanted to see it, come in from Stringfellow Road right into the development instead of traversing down Westbrook Road and there is now an addition to that proffer which states that there will be no construction traffic during the hours when school buses are picking up children on Westbrook Drive. The application is in the Fairfax Center area. I appreciate the information that I received from the different citizens' groups that met and looked at this application in addition to the citizens who testified at the public hearing. I will announce now that Supervisor McConnell and I, during the August recess, will form a land use committee of our own in this area for future applications in the newly expanded go west, young man, go west, Springfield District. But the density is correct. It is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. The density is 2.2 dwelling units per acre and that includes the bonus density on the original density of 1.86 dwelling units per acre that was kicked in because of the affordable dwelling units. I want to commend the applicant. I know at the public hearing, I think Mr. Byers and the Commission were shown the pictures of the affordable dwelling units. I think this should be a model, in my opinion, of affordable dwelling units in the County. They are extremely good looking homes. They are duplexes but have the appearance of single family detached homes. I would be proud to live in one myself. They are beautiful home styles and I congratulate the applicant for doing all that. There is tremendous buffering and screening around the properties that did not choose to consolidate and go into this development and rightfully so, because this is a well-established neighborhood. But this is, I believe, the last parcel in this particular area of Fairfax County and this particular quadrant of 50/66, so what you see in this application is basically what you are going to get for a long time. So, having said all that, it is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. It does meet the checklist of the 50/66 area. It is in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, I WOULD MOVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT APPROVE RZ-2000-SU-003, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF THE DRAFT PROFFERS DATED JULY 26.

Commissioner Kelso: Second.

Vice Chairman Byers: Seconded by Mr. Kelso. Let me ask staff a question. The staff report titles this SP instead of SU. Which one is correct?

Ms. Barbara Byron: Since the redistricting came into effect, the cases that had not been advertised we've changed the designation to correctly reflect the new magisterial district. So it should be Springfield, SP.

Commissioner Murphy: Did I say SP?

Vice Chairman Byers: No, you said SU.

Commissioner Murphy: I'm sorry. I was reading it off the proffers. The proffers say SU. So we want to change that on the proffers.

Vice Chairman Byers: All right. All in favor of the motion --

Commissioner Hall: Mr. Chairman? I'm sorry, I was not present for the hearing and will be abstaining.

Vice Chairman Byers: All right. All in favor of the motion to recommend the Board of Supervisors approve RZ-2000-SP-003, say aye.

Commissioners Smyth and Hall: Abstain.

Vice Chairman Byers: Ms. Smyth and Ms. Hall abstain. Motion carried. Mr. Murphy.

Commissioners Murphy: Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS A WAIVER OF THE 200 FOOT SETBACK REQUIREMENT FROM INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS.

Commissioner Kelso: Second.

Vice Chairman Byers: Seconded by Mr. Kelso. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion to recommend the Board approve a request for waiver of the 200 foot setback, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Commissioner Hall: Abstain.

Commissioner Smyth: No.

Vice Chairman Byers: Opposed? Ms. Smyth and Ms. Hall abstain. Chair votes no. Oh, I'm sorry. Ms. Smyth votes no. The Chair votes no. Oops. Abstain, one, two -- all right, motion carries.

Commissioner Murphy: I MOVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE THE MODIFICATION OF TRANSITIONAL SCREENING AND WAIVER OF THE BARRIER REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AREA SOUTH OF THE DUPLEX UNITS IN FAVOR OF THE TREATMENT SHOWN ON THE GDP.

Commissioner Kelso: Second.

Vice Chairman Byers: Seconded by Mr. Kelso. Any discussion? All in favor of that motion to recommend the Board approve the modification of transitional screening and a waiver of the barrier requirements, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Vice Chairman Byers: Opposed?

Commissioners Hall and Smyth: Abstain.

Vice Chairman Byers: Ms. Smyth and Ms. Hall abstain. Motion carried. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Murphy: Excuse me just one moment. There are several letters I received and I would make mention of the fact that, without objection, they will all be submitted for the record.

//

(The first and third motions carried by a vote of 5-0-2 with Commissioners Hall and Smyth abstaining; Commissioners Alcorn and Harsel not present for the vote; Commissioners Koch, Moon and Palatiello absent from the meeting.)

(The second motion carried by a vote of 4-2-1 with Commissioners Byers and Smyth opposed; Commissioner Hall abstaining; Commissioners Alcorn and Harsel not present for the vote; Commissioners Koch, Moon and Palatiello absent from the meeting.)

LBR

