

12/15/86

3:30 p.m. Items - RZ-81-S-058 - THE POMEROY COMPANIES, INC.
RZ-86-S-096 - THE POMEROY COMPANIES, INC.
Springfield District

On Thursday, December 11, 1986, the Planning Commission voted unanimously (Commissioner Koch not present for the vote; Commissioners Fasteau, Thillmann and Thomas absent from the meeting) to recommend the following actions to the Board of Supervisors pertinent to the subject applications:

- 1) That the Board of Supervisors amend the Zoning Ordinance, as it applies to RZ-81-S-058, from the R-1 District to the PDH-12, PDH-20 and PDC Districts, subject to the execution of the draft proffer statement dated 12-11-86;
- 2) Recommend approval of the conceptual development plan and recommend that the Board direct the DEM Director to waive the service drive requirement along the site's Route 28 frontage and the 600-foot private street length requirement;
- 3) Approval of Final Development Plans 81-S-058-1, 81-S-058-2, 81-S-058-3 and 81-S-058-4, subject to the Board of Supervisors's approval of RZ-81-S-058 and the conceptual development plan;
- 4) That the Board of Supervisors amend the Zoning Ordinance, as it applies to RZ-86-S-096, from the R-1 District to the PDH-2 District, subject to the execution of the draft proffer statement dated 12-11-86;
- 5) Recommend approval of the conceptual development plan and that the Board direct the DEM Director to waive the 600-foot private street length requirement;
- 6) Approval of FDP-86-S-096, subject to Board approval of RZ-86-S-096 and its conceptual development plan.

Planning Commission Meeting
December 11, 1986
Verbatim Excerpts

RZ-81-S-058, FDP-81-S-058-1, FDP-81-S-058-2, FDP-81-S-058-3, FDP-81-S-058-4,
RZ-86-S-096 and FDP-86-S-096 - THE POMEROY COMPANIES, INC.

Decision Only During Commission Matters

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Chairman, I have two decisions only scheduled tonight in the Springfield District. I'm going to do one now and I'm going to do one, if I may, later on in the evening. The one I would like to do now is RZ-85-S-058 (sic) and RZ-86-S-096 and those applications' final development plans. The decision only was deferred pending further resolution of some of the issues that were addressed at the public hearing and some of the issues that were still concerning staff. Staff has subsequently published an addendum dated December 10, 1986, and the staff is recommending either that these cases be deferred or denied. However, after close analysis of what exactly the applicant has submitted by way of proffers in addressing the issues, it is my opinion at this time that we must look at the totality of the application and judge it on its merits. I believe that the applicant has done everything in his power to address the issues that the staff has raised, that the citizens have raised and that the Planning Commission has raised. Not only in the public hearing, but also in the many citizens meetings we've had in the Springfield District on these applications for many, many months. I guess everyone, at one time or another, can be guilty of the sin of omission. And when we closed the public hearing, I thanked a lot of people for their time and their tenacity while these meetings were going on dealing with these applications and I neglected to mention that Commissioner Koch, who was not able to vote on this application, was of great assistance to me and to the citizens in coming to a resolution of some of these issues. I am going to move affirmatively on this application. I think, as I've said before, it does address the issues that were raised to my satisfaction. I think the three issues that were still burning in my mind were the phasing issues, the transportation issues and the issue of the applicant donating a sufficient amount of money voluntarily to a fund to improve the roads in the Centreville area. As you can see in the proffer statement, the applicant has agreed to phasing and has also agreed to put in place the transportation amenities that would be required, if you will, under a typical rezoning of this particular, of this particular nature. But in addition to that, the applicant, in my opinion, has gone far and above the call of duty and has, in fact, proffered a total of almost nine million dollars in road improvements. And that is in pavement, not in dollars. I would like at this time to name the ten major transportation improvements, but I'm not going to do that because we are on verbatim and this has to go to the Board on Monday. But I do have a copy of them, of these transportation improvements if anyone would like to see them. So those three issues, I think, have been addressed. Also, the applicant has addressed most of the development issues that the staff has raised, including, on page 5, the applicant has addressed the multi-family rental units as far as affordable housing is concerned by proffering that at least ten percent of the multi-family rental units in Land Bays 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 11 will be offered at rental rates affordable by households with 80 percent of the Washington, D.C. SMA median household income as published and adjusted periodically by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for a minimum period of twelve

RZ-81-S-058, FDP-81-S-058-1, FDP-81-S-058-2, FDP-81-S-058-3,
FDP-81-S-058-4, RZ-86-S-096 and FDP-86-S-096

years from the date of zoning approval. The application also has a number of other amenities, to include a school site, parks, recreational facilities, which I think makes it, in its total, a good application that should go forward to the Board. It is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. It has 3,350 dwelling units, which is mid-range in the Plan, with a density of 7.47 dwelling units per acre, and in addition has 200,000 square feet of commercial space. This is all on a parcel of 448 acres. Having said all that, Mr. Chairman, and reiterating the fact that this is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and the adopted Centreville Core Study---and adding to that also that I felt that during the public hearing one of the things that impressed me was that there was almost total support by the citizens in the West Fairfax Citizens Association, both its Land Use Committee and its total membership who were represented here. And they all came to the podium and supported the application. I would also like to enter into the record at this time a letter from Mrs. Karen Hogan who has some issues listed in her letter that have been raised, and the applicant has told me that he will address these issues with Mrs. Hogan prior to the Board of Supervisors meeting. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have a series of motions. First, I would like to move on RZ-81-S-058 and I would MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT THE ZONING ORDINANCE, AS IT APPLIES TO THE PROPERTY WHICH IS THE SUBJECT OF RZ-81-S-058, BE AMENDED FROM THE R-1 DISTRICT TO THE PDH-12 DISTRICT, PDH-20 DISTRICT AND THE PDC DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF THE DRAFT PROFFER STATEMENT DATED DECEMBER 12, 1986.

Commissioner Sparks: Second.

Chairman Lilly: Seconded by Mr. Sparks. Is there discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Harsel: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Lilly: Mrs. Harsel.

Commissioner Harsel: Just glancing---and I must admit, Mr. Murphy, I'm going very quickly through these, but two things that were brought up at the public hearing that I don't seem to find that the applicant did agree upon was, number one, the Isaac Walton League. And also the fact that the dedicated, but not built, part of Braddock Road would be so designated. Have I missed that somewhere?

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Lilly: Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: Yes, all the disclosures have been made. I can't put my finger on the exact number of the proffer right now, but it has been disclosed. Braddock Road Extended has been disclosed. The school site has been disclosed and the Isaac Walton---proximity to the Isaac Walton League has been disclosed. The hang up that I had, and the applicant has addressed this,

RZ-81-S-058, FDP-81-S-058-1, FDP-81-S-058-2, FDP-81-S-058-3,
FDP-81-S-058-4, RZ-86-S-096 and FDP-86-S-096

with the Braddock Road Extended to the east, the parcel that was needed for right-of-way, they have agreed to take care of that issue.

Commissioner Sell: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Lilly: Mr. Sell.

Commissioner Sell: Can we have a viewgraph of the conceptual development plan?

Mr. Theilacker: This is the conceptual development plan for RZ-81-S-058.

Commissioner Sell: Okay. Take me to---there's a proffer in here under "Public and Community Facilities", the last page of the new proffers, number 6, "The applicant will erect an interpretative sign to mark the site of the Civil War military railroad terminus and will maintain the immediate area as open space as shown on the conceptual development plan." Where is---

Mr. Theilacker: That's the historic---that's the site of the historic site and where the interpretative sign will be located. It's on rezoning application RZ-86-S-096.

Commissioner Sell: Okay.

Mr. Theilacker: It's in Land Bay 12 of the Centre Ridge development.

Commissioner Sell: Okay. I just---I wanted to get an idea of what they were talking about, the immediate area as open space on that. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Lilly: Mr. Sell.

Commissioner Sell: Although this public hearing was conducted on December the third and I was not here, I have, obviously, read the staff report. I have read the verbatim of the citizen testimony, the addendum and the latest proffer statement. And my opinion of this case is that in the Centreville area we keep talking about ideas that can improve the quality of life. It appears to me that this application, as proffered, would do that. And I intend to support Mr. Murphy's motion.

Commissioner Annunziata: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Lilly: Mrs. Annunziata.

Commissioner Annunziata: Let me simply associate myself with the remarks of Commissioner Sell from his first statement that he was absent on the evening of the hearing, through his statement about reading all the materials, to his support, for the same reasons. Thank you.

Chairman Lilly: Anyone else? Well, I am in the same position as Mr. Sell.

December 11, 1986

RZ-81-S-058, FDP-81-S-058-1, FDP-81-S-058-2, FDP-81-S-058-3,
FDP-81-S-058-4, RZ-86-S-096 and FDP-86-S-096

I wasn't here either, but I have read the material, the verbatims and the information, the staff report addendum, and so forth and so on. And it's my intention to support Mr. Murphy's motion. All right. All those in favor of the motion say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Lilly: Opposed? The motion carries.

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Lilly: Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: I also MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN BE APPROVED AND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DIRECT THE DIRECTOR OF DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT TO WAIVE THE SERVICE DRIVE REQUIREMENT ALONG THE SITE'S ROUTE 28 FRONTAGE AND THE 600-FOOT PRIVATE STREET LENGTH REQUIREMENT.

Commissioner Annunziata: Second.

Chairman Lilly: Seconded by Mrs. Annunziata. Discussion of the motion? If not, all those in favor say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Lilly: Opposed? The motion carries. Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Chairman, lastly, on this application I recommend that the Planning Commission approve---I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS 81-S-058-1, 81-S-058-2, 81-S-058-3 AND 81-S-058-4, SUBJECT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' APPROVAL OF RZ-81-S-058 AND THE CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

Commissioner Annunziata: Second.

Chairman Lilly: Seconded by Mrs. Annunziata. Discussion of the motion? If not, all those in favor say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Lilly: Opposed? The motion carries. Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Chairman, now moving to RZ-86-S-096, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT THE ZONING ORDINANCE, AS IT APPLIES TO THE SUBJECT PROPERTY OF RZ-86-S-096, BE AMENDED FROM THE R-1 DISTRICT TO THE PDH-2 DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF THE DRAFT PROFFER STATEMENT DATED DECEMBER 12, 1986.

RZ-81-S-058, FDP-81-S-058-1, FDP-81-S-058-2, FDP-81-S-058-3,
FDP-81-S-058-4, RZ-86-S-096 and FDP-86-S-096

Commissioner Annunziata: Second.

Chairman Lilly: Seconded by Mrs. Annunziata. Discussion of that motion? If not, all those in favor say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Lilly: Opposed? The motion carries. Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Chairman, I further MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT APPROVE THE CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND DIRECT THE DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT TO WAIVE THE 600-FOOT PRIVATE STREET LENGTH REQUIREMENT.

Commissioner Sparks: Second.

Chairman Lilly: Seconded by Mr. Sparks. Is there discussion of that motion? If not, all those in favor say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Lilly: Opposed? The motion carries. Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: One more, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN 86-S-096, SUBJECT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' APPROVAL OF RZ-86-S-096 AND ITS CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

Commissioner Annunziata: Second.

Chairman Lilly: Seconded by Mrs. Annunziata. Is there discussion of that motion? If not, all those in favor say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Lilly: Opposed? The motion carries. Is that it?

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Chairman, just one other---

Chairman Lilly: Mr. Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: Thank you to Mr. Theilacker for hanging tough through this entire process and for his professionalism and a fine staff report.

Commissioner Annunziata: Second.

Chairman Lilly: All right. Anything else

Mr. Theilacker: Mr. Murphy? I'm sorry---Mr. Chairman?

Planning Commission Meeting
December 11, 1986

Page 6

RZ-81-S-058, FDP-81-S-058-1, FDP-81-S-058-2, FDP-81-S-058-3,
FDP-81-S-058-4, RZ-86-S-096 and FDP-86-S-096

Chairman Lilly: Mr. Theilacker.

Mr. Theilacker: The proffers are dated December 11th---just to make a note of that for the record.

Commissioner Murphy: All right. I'm sorry. Can I change that? I'm sorry. Yeah. Thank you.

//

(All motions carried unanimously with Commissioner Koch not present for the vote; Commissioners Fasteau, Thillmann and Thomas absent from the meeting.)

GW