3:30 p.m. Items - RZ-88-P-100 - VIRGINIA CENTER LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
RZ-88-P-101 - VIRGINIA CENTER LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
SEA-86-P-006 - VIRGINIA CENTER LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
Providence District

On Thursday, April 13, 1989, the Planning Commission voted unanimously (Commissioner Byers and Hubbard absent from the meeting) to recommend the following actions to the Board of Supervisors pertinent to the subject applications:

1) Approval of RZ-88-P-100, subject to the execution of proffers consistent with those contained in Appendix 1 of the staff report, amended as follows:

   -- Delete Proffer #13.

2) Waiver of the 600-foot maximum length for private streets requirement.

* 3) Approval of RZ/CDP-88-P-101, subject to the execution of proffers consistent with those contained in Appendix 2 of the staff report, amended as follows:

   -- Modify Proffer #8 to delete the words: "...or if it is not installed before initial occupancy of the second office building..." ;

   -- Delete Proffer #18.

* 4) Approval of FDP-88-P-101, subject to Board approval of CDP-88-P-101.

** 5) Modification of the transitional screening requirements and waiver of the barrier requirements in favor of those shown on sheets 5 and 6 of the landscape plan.

* 6) Approval of SEA-86-P-006, subject to the proposed development conditions contained in Appendix 33 of the staff report.

(<u>Note</u>: * Commissioner Harsel abstained on these motions; ** Commissioner Harsel opposed this motion.)

Planning Commission Meeting
April 13, 1989
Verbatim Excerpts

RZ-88-P-100 - VIRGINIA CENTER LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
RZ/FDP-88-P-101 - VIRGINIA CENTER LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
SEA-86-P-006 - VIRGINIA CENTER LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

After Close of the Public Hearing

Chairman Murphy: Public hearing is closed. Recognize Mr. Hanlon.

Commissioner Hanlon: Mr. Chairman, in a moment I'm going to do what will no doubt shock everybody, and that's recommend to the Planning Commission that we approve these applications. I think that we have to start at the beginning. This was actually one of the first cases that I had. It was not nearly as amicable a hearing when I was first here. Actually, I was first here sitting there in the audience watching Mrs. Annunziata deal with this. I'd just been told that I would be her successor, if not her replacement. And I got an opportunity to see the Planning Commission in, in action. It was a dreary night in December, and a long night. And then I got a chance to do it all over again in February, when the development plan came back. As some of you may remember, I was not an admirer of that development plan. In fact, as I recall, Mrs. Harsel was one of the few people on the Commission who shared my views on that at that time. So, it was with some pleasure that I saw this come back at the time of, of the Plan amendment for this case. Now, it would be possible to dwell a little bit on the basic policy choices that were made in the Plan amendment. Basically, we knew what we were doing. That there was, there was some sacrifice certainly in being able to locate density of housing near Metro. There was a major gain in community acceptability. And there was also the fact that as sort of down planned, this project would fit better into what became the ultimate vision for development all around this Metro station. Be that as, as it may, and, and not all of us agreed on that, and maybe sometimes when I wake up in the night I wonder whether that was the right thing, but we did that. The Board of Supervisors did that. And the Plan for this area currently calls for a project that amazingly looks almost exactly like this one. I think that when you go through the list of issues in Miss Chianese's excellent staff report, and you go through the particular language of the Plan, I believe that it -- with one -- except in one respect that nobody has brought up until now, but I'm going to do it just because I want to get this out in the open. This matches very much what was envisioned at the time that the Plan amendment came by a couple of months ago. That respect has to do with pre-tree preservation. At the time I knew, and I believe it appeared on the record, there were a few larger trees in the western portion of this site. It was questionable whether those trees could be preserved. I asked Mr. Donnelly if he'd be willing to go along with language asking him to do his best, and to try to make sure -- try to get those trees preserved if it was practicable to do so. And the answer was that he would do that, but everybody understood one, that it was not clear that those trees were really specimen quality; and two, it was not clear that it would be practical to preserve them. And I'm sorry to say that those trees

have not been preserved. That the density of the townhouse development here, which was ba -- one of the basic assumptions of the general downing -- down planning of this area, made it essentially impractical to do that. On the other hand, there is a considerable amount more open space on the area that is being developed in conjunction with this community that is located immediately to the west of it. And to some extent that mitigates our inability to achieve that Plan objective at the ti -- that, that we put in there. In general, this -- it seems to me clear, that, that this plan that we have before us tonight, meets what we were looking for in the Plan amendment with this po -- with that one exception. I do want to draw your attention, since it was -- so much work went into it, to the housing proffer in this case. We have a $350,000 proffer for 152 units, which in my experience on this Commission, is somewhat on the high side. It would have been, I think from a planning point of view, better if we could have gotten units actually put on this site. But because of the value of the land that is here, and because of the difficulty of working out the design of putting affordable units on this site, we were not able to do that. It has always been one of the least attractive features to me, at least, of the other plan. That while we're, we're getting a fairly large number of residential units there, they were units that were so expensive that when we had the Department of Housing and Community Development here in February of 1987, and we had worked out a tentative proffer to give some actual units to HCD, or to RHA, I guess, Mr. Clark from HCD said, "Please don't do that, because we can't afford to buy them. They're too expensive." This never was an area where there was ever going to be any affordable housing. That was not an issue. And what we had was a $50,000 proffer on 1200 units that Mr. McDermott, who at that time was representing the applicants, said was essentially a negligible proffer for what he regarded an illuso -- as an illusory commitment a number of years before. We've now addressed that. I thought it was very important to address that on this site. And I think that we have done much, much better with the hous -- Department of Housing and Community Development. It asked for $350,000, and that's what they've gotten. And I will ask many of the members who sit up here on the horseshoe, when exactly is the last time HCD has actually gotten exactly what it asked for? This may be as much of a red-letter day for Mr. Clark as I hope it will be for Mayor Robinson. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I think on balance this application is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and is otherwise approvable, and I would MOVE THAT THE -- TO -- FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OR RZ-88-P-100, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 1 OF THE STAFF REPORT, WITH THE EXCEPTION THE -- THAT PROFFER #13, RELATING TO SEPARABILITY WOULD BE DELETED AND --. Is this the one that has the trail -- one? I'm getting confused.

Ms. Chianese: No. P-101.

Commissioner Hanlon: All right, we'll get to that in a minute.

Commissioner Murphy: P-100.

Commissioner Murphy: No.

Commissioner Hanlon: No, I've got several others.

Commissioner Harsel: No, he's got more.

Commissioner Lockwood: Wait until you finish this.

Commissioner Murphy: You're just seeing the tip of the iceberg.

Commissioner Sell: Too big a case for him.

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Hanlon.

Commissioner Hanlon: Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION -- wait a minute, I -- this is one -- I got -- we get to approve the FDP, don't we?

Ms. Chianese: (Unintelligible.)

Commissioner Hanlon: We've already done the CDP. All right. I RECOMMEND THAT THE -- THAT FDP-88 -- THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDP-88-P-101, SUBJECT TO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

Commissioner Lockwood: Second.

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

Commissioners: Aye.

Commissioner Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Harsel: Abstain.

Commissioner Murphy: Mrs. Harsel abstains.

Commissioner Hanlon: Mr. Chairman, I --

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Hanlon.

Commissioner Hanlon: -- I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL THAT IT DIRECT DEM TO MODIFY THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING, AND TO WAIVE THE BARRIER REQUIREMENTS IN FAVOR OF THOSE SHOWN ON THE LAMPLATE -- LANDSCAPE PLAN, SHEET 5 OF 6.

Commissioner Lockwood: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Lockwood. Discussion of that motion?

Commissioner Harsel: Mr. Chairman?

Commissioner Murphy: Mrs. Harsel.

Commissioner Harsal: I'm going to switch off. I'm going to vote no on this ona. I cannot -- although the people moving into the townhouses will know the parking garage is there, cannot support with intense parking garage and buildings, a waivering of the barrier for the screening and barrier between townhouses and the parking garage. So, I'm not gonna support this. I'll vote no on this one.

Commissioner Murphy: Further discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Harsel: No.

Commissioner Murphy: Mrs. Harsel votes no.

Commissioner Hanlon: Mr. Chairman?

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Hanlon.

Commissioner Hanlon: I RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE SEA-86-P-006, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 3 OF THE STAFF REPORT.

Commissioner Lockwood: Second.

Commissioner Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Lockwood. All those in favor of the motion made by Mr. Hanlon to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve SEA-86-P-006, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Commissioner Murphy: Opposed. Motion carries.

Commissioner Harsel: Abstain.

Commissioner Murphy: Mrs. Harsel abstains.

Commissioner Hanlon: Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION FORMALLY THANK MS. CHIANESE FOR DOING SUCH A GOOD JOB OF SCRIPTING ME IN ALL THESE MOTIONS.

Commissioner Murphy: Excellent job. Excellent job. Mr. Lockwood.

Commissioner Lockwood: Mr. Chairman, Mayor Robinson made e statement something to the effect that the Metro rail station here, the line, was not or will not be hurting, and weren't going to miss this office development that was more intense before, and so forth. And I was just wondering if the staff could let us have a little information, perhaps next week give us a couple of sentences, or a couple of figures, as to what the ridership is there, as opposed to the ultimate, or maximum ridership. I thought we were hell-bent for trying to get increased ridership on Metro Rail. And if community leaders like him think we're about there, and we don't have to push it, why I'd like to get a little guidance, and at least see some figures.

Commissioner Murphy: All right. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Lockwood: I'd like to make that a motion, THE STAFF GIVE US A LITTLE MEMO ON THAT.

Commissioner Murphy: Well.

Commissioner Harsel: There, there.

Commissioner Murphy: So directed, if that's necessary.

Commissioner Thomas: What (unintelligible)?

Commissioner Lockwood: Depends on which way you're going, though.

Commissioner Thomas: Umm, hmm.

//

(The first motion to approve RZ-88-P-100; the second motion to request that DEM waive the 600 foot maximum length for private street requirement; and seventh motion to thank Ms. Chianese, were passed unanimously with Commissioners Byers and Hubbard absent from the meeting.)

(The third motion to approve RZ-88-P-101; the fourth motion to approve FDP-88-P-101; and the sixth motion to approve SEA-86-P-006, passed by a vote of 8-0-1 with Commissioner Harsel abstaining; Commissioners Byers and Hubbard absent from the meeting.)

(The fifth motion, to modify the transitional screening and waive barrier requirements, passed by a vote of 8-1 with Commissioner Harsel voting no; Commissioners Byers and Hubbard absent from the meeting.)

(The last motion, to request information from staff concerning Metro ridership, passed by unanimous consent; Commissioners Byers and Hubbard absent from the meeting.)

MAP