

4:00 P.M. Item - RZ-2001-DR-014 - PROPERTY PROFESSIONALS, INC.
Dranesville District

On Wednesday, November 14, 2001, the Planning Commission voted unanimously (Commissioner Harsel absent from the meeting) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve RZ-2001-DR-014 and the conceptual development plan, subject to execution of proffers consistent with those dated November 14, 2001.

The Planning Commission then voted unanimously (Commissioner Harsel absent from the meeting) to approve FDP-2001-DR-014, subject to Board approval of RZ-2001-DR-014 and the conceptual development plan, and subject also to the development conditions dated November 14, 2001.

Planning Commission Meeting
November 14, 2001
Verbatim Excerpt

RZ/FDP-2001-DR-014 - PROPERTY PROFESSIONALS, INC.

After Close of the Public Hearing

Chairman Murphy: The public hearing is closed. Recognize Ms. DuBois.

Commissioner DuBois: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. New proffers and revised development conditions were distributed to Commission members this evening. They really include minor changes to clarify a change in the Parks contribution, some clarification of tree preservation issues and architectural features; in fact, some comments that citizens requested. So, therefore, it would be my intention to go forward this evening. I think the citizens have worked long and hard and I think they are kind of anxious to see a recommendation move forward on this one. There is now only one development condition. I think the Commission will note that all previously proposed conditions have now been incorporated into the proffers so we've made a lot of progress there. I would say this is a classic infill parcel and one where we are even connecting a street. That seems to be rather rare these days, and especially to have a citizen come out and say he supports the street going through. That's even more rare these days. As staff noted, this is an environmentally sensitive parcel. It has steep slopes, EQC, it's wooded. With regard to the comments raised by Ms. St. Germain and Mr. Eckert, I know Ms. St. Germain had some comments with respect to the previous proffer that talked about benches and picnic tables that were proposed to be located along the stream valley. I would note that these have been deleted. The plan now, or the intent and the proffers state, that since it is likely that this property will be brought into the Wolf Trap Woods Homeowners Association when completed, these funds will be utilized and contributed to the Wolf Trap Woods Homeowners Association and they will be installing some picnic tables and benches on their off-site property. I think there was the issue again of the density, the size of the lots. I would note from Mr. Eckert's clarification that they are rezoning to a PDH category. The PDH category actually allows some flexibility in lot size and in this particular situation, a large area will be actually preserved. Infill development is always sensitive and often very challenging. However, it is important to note also that this property could be developed by right resulting in significantly more impact to the site itself and to the adjacent neighborhoods. I applaud the neighbors and Wolf Den and Wolf Trap Woods and the homeowners associations for their cooperation and willingness to work through the issues and for their patience as we worked with staff to address a number of matters and even individual concerns. As noted by Ms. Kroll, the applicant held a number of neighborhood meetings, several meetings with the Wolf Trap Woods Association, meetings with individual neighbors to address their concerns. I'd like to thank the citizens who came out this evening. It looked like some were here earlier and gave up and went home. So I'd like to thank them as well. All the parties are to be congratulated for their extensive coordination and cooperation on the project, as well as the staff, and in particular Bruce Douglas, Mary Ann Godfrey, Valerie Tucker and Jerry Stonefield. The individual concerns such as setbacks, architectural guidelines,

tree preservation, building materials, stormwater management, buffers and retaining walls were all discussed extensively with the applicant and is noted by the level of neighborhood support for this application. These have been addressed. In addition, one of staff's concerns was the receipt of a letter of permission from the two adjacent landowners where some off-site improvements would be needed to the stream channel in conjunction with the stormwater management waiver request. That letter of permission has been received. The major proffers do address tree preservation and protection, stormwater management is extensively addressed and as noted, a waiver of stormwater detention is being requested. I might add to this that staff is reacting very favorably to the waiver conditions that the applicant is working on. There have also been contributions to the Park Authority and the housing contribution has also been met. The sign proffer is also included. With that, Mr. Chairman, I have two motions. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RZ-2001-DR-014 AND THE CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED NOVEMBER 14, 2001.

Commissioners Hall and Byers: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hall and Mr. Byers. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve RZ-2001-DR-014, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Ms. DuBois.

Commissioner DuBois: I FURTHER MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF FDP-2001-DR-014, SUBJECT TO THE BOARD'S APPROVAL OF RZ-2001-DR-014 AND THE CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND THE ATTACHED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED NOVEMBER 14, 2001.

Commissioners Hall and Byers: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hall and Mr. Byers. Discussion? All those in favor of the motion to approve FDP-2001-DR-014, subject to the Board of Supervisor's approval of the rezoning and the conceptual development plan, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

//

(The motions carried unanimously with Commissioner Harsel absent from the meeting.)

LBR