

5:00 P.M. Item - RZ-2000-MV-057 - LORTON VALLEY & LORTON VALLEY III  
Mt. Vernon District

On Thursday, May 24, 2001, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-2 (Commissioners Kelso and Moon abstaining; Commissioners DuBois and Murphy absent from the meeting) to recommend the following actions to the Board of Supervisors:

Approval of RZ-2000-MV-057, subject to execution of proffers consistent with those dated May 23, 2001;

Modification of the transitional screening and barrier requirements between the proposed townhouses and parcel 15 and between the proposed townhouses and the detached dwellings within the development.

The Planning Commission then voted 8-0-2 (Commissioners Kelso and Moon abstaining) to approve FDP-2000-MV-057, subject to the development conditions dated May 23, 2001 as well as Board approval of RZ-2000-MV-067 and the Conceptual Development Plan.

Planning Commission Meeting  
May 24, 2001  
Verbatim Excerpts

RZ-2000-MV-057 - LORTON VALLEY AND LORTON VALLEY III  
FDP-2000-MV-057 - LORTON VALLEY AND LORTON VALLEY III

Decision Only During Commission Matters  
(Public Hearing held on May 17, 2001)

Commissioner Byers: Lorton Valley South, another rezoning and final development plan 2000-MV-057, called Lorton Valley and Lorton Valley III. We heard that public hearing also on May 17. There were no serious objections to the Lorton Valley South. We had that one pretty well squared away. I would note, however, that last night, although the Mount Vernon Council's Planning and Zoning Committee had recommended approval of this particular application, last night the full Council of Presidents recommended denial. Their objection was that we are starting to see a proliferation, particularly in the Lorton area, of these residential communities of little houses six feet apart. I have to agree with them. But that is not a deniable issue. I have talked to the applicant's representative and told him to go back and talk to the developers and that we better find another way to come up with better designs in the Lorton area. With that said, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE RZ-2000-MV-057, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED MAY 23, 2001.

Commissioners Alcorn and Wilson: Second.

Vice Chairman Byers: Seconded by Mr. Alcorn and Ms. Wilson. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Vice Chairman Byers: Opposed?

Commissioners Kelso and Moon: Abstain.

Vice Chairman Byers: Mr. Kelso abstains. Mr. Moon abstains.

Commissioner Byers: I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDP-2000-MV-057, SUBJECT TO DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED MAY 23 AND SUBJECT TO THE BOARD'S APPROVAL OF THE REZONING, 2000-MV-057, AND THE CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

Commissioner Wilson: Second.

Vice Chairman Byers: Seconded by Ms. Wilson. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Vice Chairman Byers: Opposed?

Commissioners Kelso and Moon: Abstain.

Commissioner Byers: I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THE BOARD APPROVE A MODIFICATION OF THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING AND BARRIER REQUIREMENT BETWEEN THE PROPOSED TOWNHOUSES AND PARCEL 15 AND BETWEEN THE PROPOSED TOWNHOUSES AND THE DETACHED DWELLINGS WITHIN THE DEVELOPMENT.

Commissioners Smyth and Wilson: Second.

Vice Chairman Byers: Seconded by Ms. Smyth and Wilson. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Commissioners Kelso and Moon: Abstain.

Vice Chairman Byers: Opposed? Motion carries. Same abstentions. I would like the applicant's representative to come down for a minute. Mr. Martin, please identify yourself. I think there's one more motion.

Keith Martin, Esquire: Yes, sir. I was told by -- for the record, I am Keith Martin and represent the applicant -- that with the motion on 057, the Planning Commission will send it to the June 25th Board. They will advertise it for the June 25th Board. I would ask that since you deferred the 045 case, decision only, to June 14th, that the Board also hear that on June 25th as they will hear its sister case on the 25th also.

Commissioner Byers: Of course, that assumes that everything is going to be straightened out by the 14th of June.

Mr. Martin: You used the word "frantic." It's beyond frantic.

Commissioner Alcorn: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman Byers: Mr. Alcorn.

Commissioner Alcorn: Actually, I supported the motion, actually seconded the motion as well, but two issues on design. First of all, we do have development criteria currently that deal with design to some extent, but that is the first set of criteria that we are going to be reviewing as part of the development criteria review process. As a matter of fact we have a meeting on June 20th at 7:30 in the Board Conference Room to begin talking about this. I don't know where we go with it, but certainly it's one of the issues in terms of neighborhood compatibility and design, I'm sure we'll talk about. It would be good, I think, to bring some of the concerns of this group to this committee so we can have a full discussion of them at that point. The second issue on design is at the end of this year, I suppose, or in January of next year, we have the nomination period for Plan changes in South County. At that point, as well, I would hope that folks that have a concern about these types of issues, not just density, but design-type issues, could perhaps work to put together something to get it into the Comprehensive Plan to provide some sort of guidance so that the landowners, the community, the County, the Planning Commission, everybody, will have a little bit better understanding about what is desired and what is guided in terms of that. I don't know how specific that goes, but that's coming up and there will be a shot to put that into the Plan later this year.

Commissioner Kelso: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman Byers: Mr. Kelso.

Commissioner Kelso: Although I wasn't present for the public hearing, I think I should disclose that as a design professional, last year I bought a house with a six foot sideyard.

Commissioner Alcorn: Actually, I have no sideyard. I'm in a townhouse.

Commissioner Hall: We have our eyes on you.

//

(The first three motions carried by a vote of 8-0-2 with Commissioners Kelso and Moon abstaining; Commissioners DuBois and Murphy absent from the meeting.)

(The fourth motion carried by a vote of 9-0-1 with Commissioner Kelso abstaining; Commissioners DuBois and Murphy absent from the meeting.)

LBR