

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF FAIRFAX
CITY HALL, FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA
April 23, 2018**

After determining that a quorum was present, Chairman Cunningham called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Members Present: Chairman Paul Cunningham and Commissioners Mark Angres, Tom Armstrong, Tom Burrell, Joseph Harmon, Janet Jaworski and Karen Wheeler-Smith.

Member(s) Absent: None.

Staff Present: Brooke Hardin, Director Community Development and Planning; Jason Sutphin, Division Chief; Paul Nabti, Acting Planning Division Chief and Tina Gillian, Secretary.

1. Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Cunningham led the Commission in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Discussion/Adoption of Agenda.

MS. JAWORSKI MOVED TO ADOPT THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED, SECONDED BY MR. BURRELL, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Presentations by the public on any matter not calling for a public hearing.

a. Presentation by the Student Senate of George Mason University of a Resolution concerning the City of Fairfax Comprehensive Plan.

Three members from the George Mason student government came forward to present the resolution. Below are the recommendations included in the resolution:

- The following points of the plan be left unchanged: Neighborhoods Goal 2, Housing Goal 2, Multimodal Goals 1 and 2 and Cultural Arts Goal 2.
- That Cultural Arts Goal 1 be changed to emphasize the utilization of George Mason University as a cultural hub right on the city's doorstep.
- That a goal or outcome be added to the Economic Vitality section to encourage student discounts amongst Fairfax City businesses.

4. Approval of Minutes:

Consideration of April 9, 2018 Meeting Minutes.

MR. HARMON MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED, SECONDED BY MR. ARMSTRONG, WHICH CARRIED 6:0 WITH MS. JAWORSKI ABSTAINING.

5. Consent Agenda – None.

6. Items Not Requiring a Public Hearing – None.

7. Public Hearings –

- a. **Z-17040060 - Request from IDI Fairfax, L.C., applicant, by Enrico Cecchi, manager, for consideration of a Zoning Map Amendment (Rezoning) from CR – Commercial Retail, RM – Residential Medium and John C. Wood House Historic Overlay District to PDM – Planned Development Mixed Use, pursuant to City Code Section 110-6.4, a Planned Development Review pursuant to City Code Section 110-6.6, and a Comprehensive Plan Amendment from Institutional and Residential – Low to Business Commercial, Transitional and Residential High, on the premises known as 10675 Fairfax Boulevard, 10600 and 10606 Cedar Avenue and more particularly described as Tax Map Parcels 57-1-02-112, 113 and 114.**

Mr. Nabti presented the staff report which has been incorporated into the record by reference. He reviewed the site location and surrounding properties. He reviewed the history of the property and said in 2015 the current owner announced their intention to relocate Paul VI High School to Loudon County. He said the site is 18.5 acres and includes school buildings, parking areas and athletic fields. He said there are a total of three parcels - the school parcel and two single family lots located along Cedar Avenue. He said approximately 12.9 acres are currently zoned commercial retail and 5.6 acres are zoned residential medium - with the school site itself being split zoned. He said the site includes the John C. Wood House Overlay District that was created in 2010. He displayed images of the site. He said consideration for development is partially provided by the Fairfax Boulevard Master Plan Appendix which designates the site as being located within a connector along the Fairfax Boulevard corridor. He said specific guidance for connectors call for Fairfax Boulevard to be a linear and aesthetically enhanced boulevard with lower scaled buildings, have an emphasis on accessibility, have improved architecture and site designs, have appropriate transitions to surrounding neighborhoods, and have higher quality commercial uses. He said the guidance language is targeted toward smaller sites that are not large enough to accommodate a unified development or appropriate transitions to adjacent areas. He said the applicant is requesting a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to divide the site into approximately 3.7 acres of commercial uses, 1.5 acres of transitional uses and 13.65 acres of residential high uses. He reviewed additional land use actions that will be heard by City Council. He said the applicant is also requesting modifications to the landscape yards, street trees,

multifamily parking, paving requirements, parking islands and block length through the planned development process.

Mr. Burrell asked for clarification of what actions will occur automatically.

Mr. Nabti said modifications are permitted in the Planned Development Districts (as opposed to special exceptions) so overall approval of the Planned Development application assumes approval of the modifications as well.

Mr. Nabti said the plan submitted proposes 167 condominiums, 134 townhomes, 20,000 sf. of retail space, 24,000 sf. of commercial and/or community space and 15 live/work townhome units. He reviewed building heights and site lines along McLean Avenue and Cedar Avenue. He reviewed the proposed architecture of the buildings. He said the original portion of the Fairfax High School building will be retained. He said there are no local, state or federal historic districts that provide historic protection for this site. He said the Comprehensive Plan encourages support for property owners if protection is sought for buildings such as the school. He displayed the building elevation for the high school and said the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) approved this elevation in March. He said the proposed modifications may deem the school building ineligible for listing on the National Register. He said the plan for this building is supported by the Department of Historic Resources and Historic Fairfax City Inc. because it maintains the spirit of the community's desire for preservation of the building. He reviewed the elevations for the proposed retail space and said the BAR has asked the applicant to provide revised designs for the two buildings. He said the applicant has requested for the Overlay District to be removed from the John C. Wood House parcel and the BAR has supported this request.

Mr. Burrell asked who has the authority to remove the designation.

Mr. Nabti said City Council will ultimately have the authority, however, the removal will be part of the recommendation from the Planning Commission because it is part of the rezoning.

Mr. Nabti then reviewed proposed trip generations, pedestrian circulation, parking, and open space and floodplain areas. He said staff recommends support for the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map. He said staff recommends support for the proposed rezoning subject to revisions to the Master Development Plan in the areas listed below:

- Landscaping near park
- Open space standards
- Info on live/work units
- Sidewalks on all streets
- Phasing plan
- Parking analysis
- Utility undergrounding

- Sanitary analysis
- Affordable housing
- Community benefits
- Construction management
- Panther Place realignment

Ms. Jaworski asked for clarification on the total number of trips generated during peak hours of the day and whether the totals listed are supposed to add up to the 1,646 number.

Mr. Nabti said the total anticipated number of trips generated throughout the day is 1,646. He said the -789 and +294 trip numbers are only during a single peak hour. He said the numbers are not meant to add up to 1,646.

Mr. Harmon asked how many homes could the developer build by-right on this property.

Mr. Nabti said staff estimates that thirteen single family homes could be built.

Mr. Harmon asked if the thirteen homes would be in addition to any commercial uses built on the property.

Mr. Nabti said yes. He said the commercial areas consume about 2/3 of the total site. He said it would be hard to determine the extent of the commercial development because there are a wide variety of uses that could be proposed. He said staff has not done a thorough analysis on this part of the site.

Mr. Harmon clarified that 2/3 of the property (minus the floodplain) could be commercial uses and the remaining 1/3 could be residential uses improved with thirteen single family lots. He said it is important to understand what the developer can do by-right. He asked if there is a graphic that depicts the view from Fairfax Boulevard of the condominium building positioned behind the school.

Mr. Nabti said he did not have that graphic in this presentation, however, the applicant will have one.

Mr. Armstrong asked if the floodplain delineation is the same as the Resource Protection Area (RPA).

Mr. Nabti said no, the RPA is a 100 foot buffer around all exposed water bodies, including streams, and there is a portion of the site located within the RPA. He said floodplain is based on topography and does not necessarily have to follow along stream banks. He said the applicant was required to provide a RPA delineation study.

Mr. Armstrong asked if the development plan requires the floodplain area to be moved.

Mr. Nabti said yes.

Mr. Armstrong asked if this will require an application submission to FEMA.

Mr. Nabti said that is correct.

Mr. Armstrong asked if the developer performs the analysis.

Mr. Nabti said the analysis is done by the developer and reviewed by FEMA. He said FEMA provides a letter to the City and then city staff also performs a review. He said the applicant believes they will have the FEMA letter before they present to City Council.

Mr. Burrell asked whether approval of this Comprehensive Plan Amendment will preclude the Planning Commission from discussing the site during their evaluation of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Nabti said the Planning Commission can discuss it, however, it would probably not be in their best interest to suggest changes to a map amendment that was just approved.

Mr. Burrell asked if the applicant has had an opportunity to address the eighteen stipulations listed on staff's recommendation for approval.

Mr. Nabti said the conditions were shared with the applicant late last week and the applicant is ready to discuss all of the conditions.

Mr. Angres asked if the fiscal impact estimate listed in attachment eight was generated by staff or the applicant.

Mr. Nabti said attachment eight was submitted by the applicant, however, in the staff report there is a fiscal summary that was generated by staff.

Mr. Angres asked if a fiscal impact analysis has been conducted on the by-right commercial uses.

Mr. Nabti said staff has not conducted an analysis on by-right commercial uses.

Mr. David Houston, 1825 I Street, NW, Washington, DC, land use council for the applicant, came forward to address the Planning Commission. He said meetings for this project have been ongoing since October of 2015. He said the site is currently designated as institutional use. He said the applicant is asking for the designation to be modified in order to support the mixture of uses generally proposed tonight. He said the applicant is trying to honor the commercial nature of Fairfax Boulevard. He said they are introducing live/work townhouse units on the eastern side

of the property as a transitional use. He said the residential units behind the live/work units will be considered residential high. He said the land use chapter of the plan states it should not be considered an unalterable document. It should be evaluated and changed as appropriate. He said the Boulevard Plan speaks to promoting housing and activities along the Boulevard. He believes the applicant is meeting the vision of the Fairfax Boulevard Mater Plan and he requests the Planning Commission's support of the map change application.

Mr. Enrico Cecchi, applicant, came forward to address the Planning Commission. His presentation has been incorporated into the record by reference. He reviewed the original plan and said the community had expressed concerns regarding density, open space and the commercial component of the site. He then reviewed the proposed plan and said density has been reduced by 45% (from 550 units to 301 units). He said the multifamily rental component was removed in its entirety. He said the condominiums were reduced to 134 units. He said the southern portion of the condo buildings were reduced to three or four stories. He said open space increased by 35% (5.5 acres). He said the retail space has been increased and is now 20,000 sf. that consists of two new retail buildings. He said fifteen live/work units were added along Fairfax Boulevard. He displayed the neighborhood transition plans for the entire site and said height and density will be tapered for transitioning to the single family neighborhood. He reviewed the site lines along Oak Street and McLean Avenue and said they are doing their best to make the appearance of height significantly better and to present a positive streetscape. He reviewed the visual impact from the condominium building. He reviewed the community benefits for this project and displayed slides depicting what could be built on the property by-right. He said the current plan has been forged during a 2 ½ year public process. He is proud that staff is recommending approval. He said this is a tremendous opportunity for the City and the plan brought forward today has been through significant public engagement and input and has been vetted thoroughly by city staff. He asks for the Planning Commission's approval tonight and to forward the application to City Council.

Mr. Burrell asked if the property referred to as the extension of the Pat Rodio Park property will belong to the common community.

Mr. Cecchi said that is correct.

Mr. Burrell asked if the common community will be responsible for maintenance of this piece of the property.

Mr. Cecchi said they envision one master association that will govern and control the maintenance and upkeep of the property - with three sub associations for the commercial use, the condominiums and the townhomes.

Mr. Burrell's concern is with the use of terminology stating this is an extension of the Pat Rodio Park since the property is private property.

Mr. Cecchi said the entire property will be subject to a public access easement. He said all of the open areas, except for the area within the condo courtyard, will be accessible by the public.

Mr. Burrell asked for clarification on the live/work units and how the units are transitioning.

Mr. Cecchi said the intent is to transition north/south (residential/commercial). He said this was a request made by staff in order to retain some commercial aspects along the entire length of Fairfax Boulevard.

Mr. Burrell said it looks as if the internal street grid has access points fronting on Fairfax Boulevard - so that all the traffic is focused on one light.

Mr. Cecchi said the light will be the primary access/egress point, however, with four access points along Fairfax Boulevard the trips should be distributed evenly.

Ms. Jaworski asked if the applicant considers any of the staff's eighteen conditions to be deal breakers - or do they believe the conditions are realistic and are willing to accept them.

Mr. Cecchi said they were not expecting eighteen conditions, however, none of the conditions are deal breakers. He said they anticipate they will move to address all of the conditions prior to final submission to City Council.

Ms. Jaworski asked if the applicant will provide accessible or universal design elements.

Mr. Cecchi said the elements were included in The Enclave project. He said the elements are in many ways already included in building codes and federal law. He said a large majority of their units will be adaptable.

Ms. Jaworski asked how the construction of the units will be phased.

Mr. Cecchi said they are currently working on a phasing plan, however, all three components of this project will proceed concurrently.

Ms. Jaworski asked for clarification on whether the live/work units have to be owner occupied.

Mr. Cecchi said that is correct.

Ms. Jaworski asked if the business portion of the live/work units will remain available to future buyers should the original owner decide to forego the business portion.

Mr. Cecchi confirmed the business portion would remain available.

Mr. Armstrong asked why senior housing was removed from the original plan.

Mr. Cecchi said the senior housing units were rental units within the multifamily building that was removed from the plan.

Mr. Armstrong asked for the percentage of seniors who occupy The Enclave development.

Mr. Cecchi said approximately 60-65%.

Mr. Angres asked how enforcement would work for the live/work units.

Mr. Cecchi said this would be enforced by the zoning department.

Mr. Angres asked staff if enforcement would be carried out by the zoning office.

Mr. Hardin said if approved as part of the master development plan then zoning will enforce - ensuring the business license is held by the owner.

Mr. Angres asked if all the units fronting onto Route 50 can remain as just townhomes without the possibility of a live/work arrangement.

Mr. Cecchi said potentially, however, the intent is to provide an opportunity for a demand to be met. He said the units will be marketed as live/work units.

Mr. Angres asked if there is a demand for this type of unit.

Mr. Cecchi said there are examples of these type of units in Loudon County, however, the applicant has not performed a market study on this subject.

Mr. Angres said in 1979 he went to a pediatrician that lived upstairs, however, he does not see something like this being useful today. He is concerned the City will end up with just townhomes that front onto Route 50 without the commercial component.

Mr. Cecchi said he does not believe that would be a bad thing since there is a significant commercial component to this project and commercial properties are located along the street. He said he believes the demand does exist, however, it is not an adverse condition to have the townhomes occupied by residents only.

Mr. Harmon asked for clarification on the percentage of commercial space for the proposal.

Mr. Cecchi said the commercial aspect would be approximately 20%.

Mr. Harmon said 80% remains residential - which is a pretty significant departure from what is available by-right. He asked for confirmation that a single family home would not be as wide as the stick of townhomes proposed along McLean Avenue.

Mr. Cecchi said that is correct. He said they are not proposing single family transitions, however, the development will still be very attractive to the community.

Mr. Cunningham said he will defer his questions for the applicant until after the members of the audience have had an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Douglas Stewart, 10822 Maple Street, Fairfax, VA, came forward to address the Planning Commission. He presented a letter from the Fairfax City Citizens for Smarter Growth, dated March 29, 2018, which has been incorporated into the record by reference. He said he is speaking for the group tonight and their observations are neither for nor against the project. He said the project has excellent internal street designs, trail connections and traffic calming measures. He said the group is concerned with the connectivity and flow for vehicles and they suggest an additional access point be considered for the site. He said the applicant has eliminated rental options from the project and he reminded the planning commission that rental options were also removed from the Mount Vineyard project. He said it will be expensive to restore the school building. He said this is a great reminder of why the comprehensive plan is important – especially for major sites that may turn over in the future.

Mr. Jeffrey White, 10848 Fairchester Drive, Fairfax, VA, came forward to address the Planning Commission. He is the Commander of Fairfax Post 177 of The American Legion and is here in that capacity tonight. He read a letter from Post 177 which has been incorporated into the record by reference. He said various organizations use their facility and the Chilcott ball field. He said Post 177 will remain vigilant that the development and construction of the Paul VI Campus does not affect the safety of the children and families using Chilcott field or the LePort Montessori School. He said the development is an appropriate step forward for the city and the rezoning is supported in principal. They seek only that the development does not disrupt Post 177's mission nor preclude the development of The American Legion property in the future.

Mr. Anthony Osborne, 4128 Orchard Drive, Fairfax, VA, came forward to address the Planning Commission. He originally had a number of concerns about the project but after seeing the presentation tonight he is in support of the rezoning. He still has concerns regarding the safety of ball players who use the Panther Place facility. Speaking as a member of Post 177, he concurs with the remarks and concerns just expressed by the commander.

Ms. Liz Wellborn, 4118 Chestnut Street, Fairfax, VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. She said recent developments have crammed apartments and townhomes into spaces with no open space for trees to grow. She said the tree canopy that is being lost needs to be replaced. She is concerned about the view from Fairfax Boulevard when the five story condos

are built behind the two story school building. She feels the vision for the school will be lost. She said better parking is needed for Rodio Park and that on-street parking is not feasible. She would like the creek to be brought back to life and the city should be thinking about the environment and keep the open spaces and natural resources. She said the development has a potential to be a scenic neighborhood. She said most interested residents do not agree with the current plan and zoning should not be changed until a suitable plan is presented.

Mr. John Norce, 10809 Second Street, Fairfax, VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. He is in support of the proposed project and after meeting with IDI has confidence the project will be a success. He said the city needs to address current traffic issues on Oak Street and Walnut Street. He said the site lines work. In regards to the mixed use proposal to combine living spaces above the retail uses – he is concerned about what will happen to the retail space if the original business goes under.

Mr. Jim Wyckoff, 10305 Wood Road, Fairfax, VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. He said the development team involved with this project is excellent and it is time to move forward on the project. He said the Woody's Ice Cream building is a type of live/work arrangement. He said he knew of a family that lived above their feed store in the city years ago, so the live/work concept is not new and should be given a chance.

Mr. Rand Gaber, 0614 Ridge Avenue, Fairfax, VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. He said this project is one of the better ideas he has heard for this piece of property. He concurs with the statements the commander of Post 177 made in support of the project.

Ms. Sue Cavaliere, 3807 Keith Avenue, Fairfax, VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. Her major concern is the visual transition from four to five story condominiums at the back of the development to Pat Rodio Park and single family homes along Keith Avenue. She said the current view of Mount Vineyard makes it evident the proposed heights will be too high given the proximity to single family homes. She asks that the Planning Commission insist on a more appropriate transition to Keith Avenue and to the park.

Mr. Scott Pierce, 3223 Brookings Court, Fairfax, VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. He lives just outside of the City of Fairfax and is the president of the Fairfax Little League. He said the League has used the three ball fields for sixty years. He said the League needs 120-125 parking spaces at any time for the games. He said one All-Star game alone can take up 125 parking spaces. His concern is not enough parking spaces will be available for the Pat Rodio field.

Mr. Benny Leonard came forward to address the Planning Commission. He lives outside of the City of Fairfax. He is a member of the Fairfax Historical Society and said they like the proposal with the school being left as it is with the old front. He said he met with members from the 1956

graduation class and they would like the name on the school building to read Fairfax High Center.

Mr. Chris Dominick, 10825 Second Street, Fairfax VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. He supports the proposed zoning amendment. He said the project has come a long way from its original three proposals. He thanked everyone on the Planning Commission, staff, and residents and also thanked IDI for their work on the proposal. His concern is with current traffic safety and said IDI has addressed traffic flow issues within the proposed community so that traffic is directed toward Fairfax Boulevard. He said this is a tricky project because there are many competing interests involved. He said he likes the transition styles. He is excited about the project and looks forward to walking down the street and enjoying the restaurants and the new project.

Mr. Terry Fowler, 3505 Mavis Court, Fairfax, VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. He supports the new development as proposed and hopes that changes will not be made to the project after it receives approval.

Mr. Michael Pierson, 10518 Cedar Avenue, Fairfax, VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. He said all of his concerns have been met except for one. He is unclear as to whether there is access to and from the development from McLean Avenue. He also believes there will be limited access at Cedar and Keith.

Mr. Cunningham said there will be no access along McLean Avenue unless you are walking or riding a bicycle. He said Cedar Avenue will remain as it is with a parking lot at the end but no cut through.

Mr. Pierson asked if people using the Pat Rodio Park will have access to the parking lot.

Mr. Cunningham said yes, there will be no barrier between Pat Rodio Park and the development.

Mr. Pierson said he would like to endorse the concerns of the Little League regarding the parking situation.

Ms. Margaret Pierson, 10518 Cedar Avenue, Fairfax, VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. She said her main concern is that traffic from the new development will use Cedar Avenue as a cut through. She said there is already a backlog of traffic that cuts through from Route 123 to Route 236 now. She asked if the street will eventually be widened and ruin their front yards. She believes this would be the inevitable conclusion because the city is over developing.

Mr. Cunningham said there will not be a curb cut on McLean. He said people coming through there from this development will have to go out onto Route 50, turn right onto McLean Avenue

and then left onto Cedar Avenue. He said there will not be more traffic from this development, it will be the existing traffic that comes through now.

Mr. Lee Hubbard, 10412 Cleveland Street, Fairfax VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. He has seen many historic buildings lost in the City of Fairfax so his main concern is saving the high school building. As long as they save this building he cannot see any opposition to the new development as proposed with reduced density of housing units.

Mr. David Gessert, 10605 Cedar Avenue, Fairfax VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. He reviewed the setbacks of homes located in the neighborhood and said he is concerned about the continuity of the neighborhood. He said his view will be eleven townhomes with smaller setbacks and he is not convinced the design of the townhomes are going to fit with the design of the older community. He could agree with single family homes being located there. He agrees with Ms. Cavaliere's earlier comments.

Mr. Andrew Margrave, 10114 Cornwall Road, Fairfax VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. He said this project fails the smell test. He congratulates the applicant for trying to convert a hopelessly lousy idea into a merely bad one. His concern is with traffic gridlock. He said nothing will move during rush hour and the gridlock will spread into Fairfax County. He said there is a danger the 301-601 units will create a slum neighborhood in the midst of the City of Fairfax and bring drugs and prostitution and all other downsides of a slum neighborhood into the city. He said the city cannot do justice to its current retail spaces such as the Northfax area and Fairfax Circle. He suggests either selling the property back to George Mason, allowing another school or church to occupy the site or turning the property into a large park with ballfields and trails. He asks for the Planning Commission to shoot the measure down tonight and not forward it on to City Council.

Mr. John Keith, 10524 Cedar Avenue, Fairfax VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. He thanked the Planning Commission for the work they do. He supports the project enthusiastically. He said the by-right alternative would be worse than what is being proposed. The traffic would be worse and the streetscapes would be worse. He said the idea of a shopping center being located on that site would not be a good idea for the neighborhood. He thinks the project will improve the streetscapes on McLean and Cedar Avenue. He said the city is lucky to have IDI as the developer of this property.

Mr. Steve Oldfield, 10530 Cedar Avenue, Fairfax VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. He said the site consists of one large lot and two single detached lots on Cedar Avenue. He said the two single lots should remain as single lots. He lives three houses from the corner of Cedar Avenue and McLean Avenue and he does not think it is an unreasonable request to maintain single family homes along Cedar Avenue and McLean Avenue. He said he supports 80% of the redevelopment and his comments pertain to Cedar Avenue and McLean Avenue. He said if an owner on Cedar Avenue is allowed to develop their single family lot into townhomes,

why should he not be able develop his own lot with townhomes, sell the property and leave the city - which is what the Diocese is doing.

Ms. Lynn Thompson, 10814 First Street, Fairfax VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. She said the developer is in business to make money, however, she asks the Planning Commission to remember that residents live in this neighborhood every day. She said residents expressed their concerns as the project moved forward about the entrance at Cedar Avenue and Oak Street and asked for the traffic to be shared with the historical neighborhood. She said they were told that side of the neighborhood had been promised there would be no additional traffic. She said additional traffic will be generated from the combined 510 units generated by the approved and proposed developments (Mount Vineyard, Paul VI and Breezeway). She said no other neighborhood has had to endure such development or traffic. She is not trying to pit neighborhood against neighborhood but she believes the additional traffic load should be shared. She suggests shutting the entrance at Panther Place, leaving it open for the park only. She said the streets in that area are not going to support more development. She asked for site lines to also be considered.

Ms. Joyce Cusack, 3905 Keith Avenue, Fairfax VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. She is not opposed to smart growth and she is happy IDI is not developing a strip mall on this site, however, the proposed development remains too dense. Her main concern is safety for her children. She said the neighborhood is full of families, dog walkers, walking groups and neighbors who like to visit outside. She said many fear for the safety of their children because of the cut through traffic problem that currently exists. She said many mornings she is unable to back out of her driveway safely. She said there are no sidewalks on Keith Avenue so walkers are at the mercy of the cut through drivers. She said the traffic problem will become significantly amplified with the density of this development and she cannot see how 1700 more cars per day can go through their neighborhood. She said people in support of the density of this development do not see the traffic or experience the problems the children have on these roads.

Ms. Karen Grycewicz, 3508 Winston Place, Fairfax VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. She is concerned about the cut through traffic as well. She said the proposed sidewalks are not wide enough to accommodate two wheelchairs at the same time. She said this development will increase the number of students in the city and Providence School is experiencing overcrowding already. She asks for the Planning Commission to not approve anything that would require an expansion to school capacity until City Council will start accepting proffers again to pay for the expansion. She is also disappointed the stream is not being considered an asset.

Mr. Joe Belsan, 10514 Cedar Avenue, Fairfax VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. He agrees with the other speakers about the cut through traffic on Cedar Avenue and McLean Avenue. He said there is going to be a terrible increase in traffic with all the new developments in the area. He said it is impossible to get out onto Route 123 from Cedar Avenue

during the morning and evening rush hours. He said density of the project should be taken into consideration.

Mr. Brian Cute, 10507 Cedar Avenue, Fairfax VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. He said he is the president of the Historic Fairfax Neighborhood Association (HFNA). He said HFNA has submitted consensus concerns for the Planning Commission's attention. He said HFNA would like the lots on Cedar Avenue to maintain their single family home designation. He said HFNA requests that single family homes also be considered for McLean Avenue. In a personal capacity, as a resident of the neighborhood, he asks that the Planning Commission provide adequate weight to the HFNA comments and concerns regarding IDI's revised plan.

Ms. Julie Knight, 3805 Keith Avenue, Fairfax VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. She said the primary responsibility of the Planning Commission is to prepare and review the comprehensive plan. She reviewed the portion of the comprehensive plan that states if a site is developed within an existing neighborhood that the site should be developed to be compatible with the characteristics of the surrounding area. If the site is between neighborhoods with different characteristics then the development should be designed with an effective transition. She said the 18.5 acres in question are clearly within the boundaries of the HFNA Neighborhood. She said the proposed density and heights for this project are not consistent with the neighborhood it is planted in. She said there are no three, four or five story housing units in the existing neighborhood. She asked the Planning Commission to please consider the compatibility of this project with the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Russ Combs, resident of The Enclave located Fairfax VA, came forward to address the Planning Commission. He voiced his strong support for IDI as the developer of The Enclave. He said IDI has worked closely with The American Legion to be a good neighbor and he strongly endorses the project moving into that site.

Ms. Kate Attkisson, 10632 Springman Drive, Fairfax, VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. She said her driveway backs onto Keith Avenue. She said she has a full view of the existing school from her home. She said she works in a five story office building in the City of Fairfax and cannot imagine a five story building being built in her back yard. She applauds IDI for working with the community, however, just because they have made reductions to an outrageously over dense plan, that does not make it appropriate for her neighborhood. She asks for the Planning Commission to take into consideration the comments made regarding transitioning. She suggests transitioning from single family homes to three story condominium buildings. She said pictures she sent to City Council of the Mount Vineyard project show how it looks like a cruise ship has been dropped into the neighborhood. She said to think about that same thing bordering both sides of Rodio Park. She asks for the Planning Commission to ask IDI to take into consideration comments from the residents and make this a more reasonable development.

Mr. Rick Dickson, 10414 Main Street, Fairfax VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. He asked staff to fix the audio speakers because the audience in the back of the room cannot hear anything. He fully endorses the application as submitted. He does not like the transportation situation with non-connecting roads. He does not like pushing all the traffic out onto Oak Street and Route 50. He asks how the commercial and residential portions of the mixed use buildings will be assessed. He thinks the mixed use entity of the project is a good thing and there will be enough people available to fill the small number of mixed use units. He said everyone complaining about transportation, sidewalks and safety should be talking to City Council about doing their jobs instead of trying to get a developer to solve the ills of the country. He asked for the Planning Commission to please pass the project tonight.

Karen Habitzreuther, 10421 Breckinridge Lane, Fairfax VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. She asks for the Planning Commission to consider how the city is going to use the 20,000 sq. ft. of retail space. She does not want the two proposed single story buildings to become a mirror of the single story retail that currently exists in the city. She fully endorses bringing more commercial properties into the city, however, the city needs to think about the paradigm shift in how consumers buy goods these days. She said the city needs to look at how the commercial property is developed - whether it becomes more of a professional space and not lean so much towards the concept of retail. She said we should be thinking about what the vision is for the city in order to become a destination and vibrant city. She said we need to look at all the infrastructure and public services the residents on this site will need. She said we should use the city's Environmental Sustainability Committee for ideas on keeping Fairfax greener.

Ms. Cynthia Cute, 10507 Cedar Avenue, Fairfax VA came forward to address the Planning Commission. She said the traffic issue is the number one priority for her. She created a traffic calming committee for her neighborhood in 1998, so there has been a concern for traffic safety back then as well. She said she cannot get out of her driveway because of cut through traffic backed up on Cedar Avenue waiting to get onto Route 123. She said Cedar Avenue is the only street you can make a left turn onto (from Route 123) between the Courthouse and Route 50 which makes Cedar Avenue a funnel street. She said 1700 extra cars during peak hours will make a bad problem tremendously worse. She asked the Planning Commission to consider this when making their decision.

Mr. Cunningham asked for clarification on the waiver of 75% of ground floor space to be used for work and whether the two car garages will take up most of the space on the first floor in order to keep a person from having 75% or more available for business space.

Mr. Cecchi said the garage will not take up most of the ground floor space. He said the idea would be for the two spaces in the garage to be used as residential use and the driveways for the commercial use. He said the total parking spaces for the commercial use would be 30. He deferred to staff for clarification on the 75% work requirement.

Mr. Nabti said if a certain amount of owners decide to use their ground floor for residential uses, then at a certain point the zoning ordinance would prohibit any other owners from doing the same.

Mr. Cunningham said the 75% ground floor live/work space is intended to ensure there will be working units in relation to the total of the fifteen units.

Mr. Nabti said that is correct.

Mr. Cecchi said staff has recommended a modification so the intent of the applicant and staff are in line that the work aspect is one that is voluntary and up to the owner of the units.

Mr. Hardin said the live/work units would be deemed upper story residential/mixed use types and the zoning ordinance for that use type states that 75% of the ground floor be dedicated for commercial use. He said what is being proposed in this application is that the ground floor would be optional for commercial use - so the requirement will need to be modified.

Mr. Cunningham asked if different construction companies will be involved with the project and he asked what the timing will be for the phasing of the project.

Mr. Cecchi said the applicant will be developing a phasing plan if the application is approved tonight, however, all of the components will be developed at the same time. He anticipates a different development entity for the townhouse component.

Mr. Cunningham asked if the project can be completed in two or three years or will there be delays for market conditions or changing financial conditions.

Mr. Cecchi said they anticipate the development can be completed within two to three years. He said the City can take into account their track record on other projects built within the city.

Mr. Cunningham asked whether moving Panther Place has been discussed.

Mr. Cecchi said the applicant has looked at moving Panther Place to accommodate a request by The American Legion. He said they can accommodate an entrance located north of the La Porte School as requested and still maintain the same open space, parking and street connection.

Mr. Burrell said this sounds like a significant modification to the master development plan.

Mr. Cecchi said they are not modifying any portion of the development plan tonight. He said if any change were to be made to that entrance it would come back before the Planning Commission as a separate item.

Mr. Burrell said that is still a significant change and he doesn't know how the applicant will be able to do this.

Mr. Cecchi said from an engineering standpoint there is no impingement to doing it. He said this may be part of a future application, however, this is not before the Planning Commission tonight.

Mr. Cunningham said his concern with a change to the entrance would be the volume of traffic that would go onto Oak Street.

Ms. Karen-Wheeler Smith asked for clarification of where at Panther Place the chairman was referring to.

Mr. Cunningham said he is referring to the entrance on Oak Street from the back parking lot being moved between the Montessori School and McDonalds.

Mr. Cecchi reiterated there is no plan on the table to do that at this time. He is only saying there have been discussions.

At this time, Mr. Cunningham closed the public hearing.

Mr. Angres said tonight is the first time he heard about the Little League parking issue and asked staff to elaborate on the issue.

Mr. Nabti said early on in the process the applicant proposed a certain amount of parking spaces onsite to be available to users of the Park, however, state legislation made it clear this could not be accepted - so staff asked for this specific citation to be removed from the plan. He said with the Planned Development text amendments that passed last month, staff believes the applicant can now show these spaces as available for Park users again. He said the applicant does intend to show the spaces on the plan before going to City Council.

Ms. Wheeler-Smith asked if this means more parking is available than what the Planning Commission is being shown tonight.

Mr. Nabti said the number of parking spaces will not change – he said it is just a matter of how they will be designated.

Ms. Wheeler-Smith said this may not necessarily solve the Little Leagues parking problem.

Mr. Nabti said the applicant intends to provide parking spaces to support the Little League fields, however, the applicant cannot provide the number of parking spaces suggested by tonight's speakers.

Mr. Angres asked what the city's response has been previously regarding traffic on Cedar Avenue.

Mr. Hardin said there have been no traffic calming measures to staff's knowledge. He believes the applicants traffic engineer could provide traffic impact responses if Mr. Angres is interested.

Mr. Angres said the traffic analysis did not come across clearly as to the impacts to Cedar Avenue.

Mr. Chris Turnbull, applicant's traffic engineer, came forward to address the Planning Commission. He said traffic counts were conducted at McLean Avenue and Cedar Avenue. He reviewed the traffic counts received during the peak a.m. and p.m. hours.

Mr. Armstrong asked if Mr. Turnbull was able to differentiate between cut through traffic and residential traffic.

Mr. Turnbull said this would be hard to determine unless you do a license plate survey. He suspects maybe 50% of the traffic going up Keith and onto McLean and Cedar was cut through traffic.

Mr. Armstrong asked if this project would affect cut through traffic.

Mr. Turnbull said not based on the road network and how traffic is going to be distributed to Fairfax Boulevard. He said they didn't see any cut through traffic coming from Fairfax Boulevard to Main Street during the traffic study.

Mr. Angres asked if this is the first traffic study Mr. Turnbull has conducted for IDI.

Mr. Turnbull said he conducted the traffic study for The Enclave project.

Mr. Angres asked if these are the only two projects.

Mr. Turnbull said he has worked on four or five projects with IDI.

Mr. Armstrong asked for confirmation there will be a planned contribution to the school system.

Mr. Nabti said in the current plan there is no planned contribution to the schools.

Mr. Armstrong asked if it would be a condition of approval.

Mr. Nabti said it has been suggested as something for the applicant to explore.

Mr. Armstrong asked if this would be a monetary contribution.

Mr. Nabti said it could be.

Mr. Burrell said he cannot support the Comprehensive Plan Amendment because he does not agree with the residential high designation and he is not sure he understands the transition piece. He said if the amendment is approved tonight it is locked into the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and the Planning Commission has not had a chance to discuss the implications of that change.

Mr. Harmon said he likes the increase to the commercial aspect of the proposal and he likes the preservation of part of the Paul VI building. He appreciates IDI's effort to reduce the density. He does not care for the live/work arrangement along Fairfax Boulevard since it is optional. He said the commercial aspects proposed on each side of Paul VI is really another revised strip mall and he believes we have enough strip malls in the city. He said there is no single family housing along McLean Avenue or Cedar Avenue and he believes the transition along those roads should be in keeping with the neighborhoods that currently exist. He said this is mostly a residential project in a commercial space. He said staff has added eighteen conditions to the approval and he has never seen this many conditions added before. He does not believe the application is ready to move forward tonight.

Ms. Jaworski said this is a tricky situation because the Planning Commission has never had to review an 18 acre tract development or contemplated that this property would be anything other than a school. She is generally in support of this project. She said nothing is ever going to be perfect, however, the by-right option would be terrible. She said the benefit of a master development plan is that coordination has to be involved in the project. She likes the open space. She would like to keep the stream, however, she thinks it would be cost prohibitive to try and restore the stream without affecting the floodplain. She is in support of the project. She said she walked Keith Avenue and tried to picture the heights of the buildings. She said change can be good and this is a start. She said she does not want to see strip malls either. While it's not perfect, she is going to vote in support of the application and to forward it on to City Council.

Mr. Angres said he received emails from residents in support of the project and there seems to be a lot of support for the application tonight. He believes the applicant has done a good job regarding open spaces, setbacks, commercial spaces and the village green. He agrees with Ms. Jaworski that it's not perfect. He thinks Fairfax Boulevard should remain commercial. He thinks this fits this space. He will vote to send this on to City Council.

Mr. Armstrong said there were comments regarding traffic and children's safety tonight. He hopes traffic calming devices can be accomplished between the city and the developer in this area. He said comments were made regarding the views from different aspects of the neighborhood. He said Fairfax City is changing and density is growing. He thinks this is an organized plan. He said parking availability for the Little League field may change with the

expansion of the Panther Place parking lot. He agrees it's time for something to happen on this site and for the plan to be sent forward.

Ms. Wheeler-Smith agrees with Ms. Jaworski and Mr. Angres. She is more worried about a by-right development than with this plan. She is worried about the parking situation for the Little League. She encourages any form of traffic calming that can be done. She will vote to pass the application through.

Mr. Burrell said the Planning Commission should not let the by-right option scare them. He said if a developer could develop this property by-right this application would not be before them tonight. He said the project is revenue positive by relying heavily on the residential component and not the commercial component.

Mr. Cunningham said the applicant's material states the city is dealing with a junky street and an old school that will be vacated. He said other ideas for this property have been floated since 2015. He said IDI has taken the time to do community outreach and work through a process to get us where we are now. He said this project is setting precedence because we are talking about redoing the boulevard in the connector areas and redeveloping the three nodes. He said by-right the applicant can have five story buildings that would impact the skyline. He said the Planning Commission needs to look at the development of the entire boulevard. He said getting commercial space in this project is a plus. He said at this time this development is the best it can possibly be. He said we need to protect the neighborhoods. He discussed the cut through traffic that goes through his neighborhood and said it is a challenge to remedy the situation.

At this time, MS. JAWORSKI MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPT THE ATTACHED RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING AMENDMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF THE CITY OF FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA TO CLASSIFY AS BUSINESS – COMMERCIAL, TRANSITIONAL AND RESIDENTIAL - HIGH ON THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP THE PROPERTY IDENTIFIED AS CITY OF FAIRFAX TAX MAP PARCELS 57-1-02-112, 113 AND 114.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Angres.

Vote:

Mr. Burrell	<u>No</u>
Ms. Armstrong	<u>Aye</u>
Ms. Jaworski	<u>Aye</u>
Mr. Angres	<u>Aye</u>
Ms. Wheeler-Smith	<u>Aye</u>
Mr. Harmon	<u>No</u>
Mr. Cunningham	<u>Aye</u>

At this time, MS. JAWORSKI MADE A MOTION THAT BASED ON THE PUBLIC CONVENIENCE, WELFARE AND GOOD ZONING PRACTICE, WITH RESPECT TO REZONING APPLICATION Z-17040060, WHICH HAS BEEN FILED FOR THE LAND KNOWN AS 10675 FAIRFAX BOULEVARD, 10600 CEDAR AVENUE AND 10606 CEDAR AVENUE AND MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS TAX MAP PARCELS 57-1-02-112, 113 AND 114, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REZONING APPLICATION Z-17040060 TO REZONE THE SUBJECT PROPERTY FROM CR – COMMERCIAL RETAIL, RM – RESIDENTIAL MEDIUM AND JOHN C. WOOD HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICT TO PD-M – PLANNED DEVELOPMENT MIXED USE TO ALLOW DEVELOPMENT OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN, WHICH HAS BEEN PREPARED AND SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT, IF THE MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN IS SUFFICIENTLY AND SATISFACTORILY REVISED AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. Provide a statement in the MDP Narrative that clarifies that the narrative is a part of the MDP and should be read in coordination with the MDP;**
- 2. Remove the statement from the MDP Narrative that suggests and/or relies upon City participation in the floodplain control project;**
- 3. Revise the landscape plan in the area near the southwest corner of the site, near Pat Rodio Park to provide overstory and ornamental trees in place of evergreen trees;**
- 4. Provide at least one crosswalk across the private street near the southwest corner of the site, allowing a connection between the open spaces on the north and south sides of that street.**
- 5. Extend the multi-use trail along the southern property line from the Cedar/Keith intersection to the southwest property line near Panther Place and provide a connection between the trail and the intersection of Mclean Avenue and Cedar Avenue;**
- 6. Comply with the Zoning Ordinance by adding a request for a modification to Section 3.5.1.D.1(b) pertaining to the required percentage of ground floor area allocated to non-residential uses in an upper-story residential mixed use building;**
- 7. Specify the limited non-residential uses that would be permitted on the ground floor of the upper-story residential mixed use buildings considering potential adverse impacts to the community;**
- 8. Comply with the Zoning Ordinance by adding a request for a modification to Section 4.4.4.A.1, which requires that sidewalks must be located on both sides of all streets;**
- 9. Provide a phasing plan to clarify when project improvements such as public amenities and infrastructure would be constructed in relation to the timeframe for**

- the overall development, in accordance with the requirements of Section 3.8.2.H of the Zoning Ordinance;
10. Indicate on the MDP whether accessible units or universal design strategies will be provided;
 11. Adjust parking calculations and discussion on parking for the MDP as follows:
 - a. Remove modifications requests pertaining to requirements for parking quantities in the Zoning Ordinance. Such modifications are not necessary based on the proposed parking quantities indicated in the MDP;
 - b. If the applicant intends to provide parking in support of Pat Rodio Park, such parking must be identified on the MDP and considered in the parking calculations;
 - c. Provide a shared parking analysis inclusive of commercial and appropriate residential uses to support inclusion of commercial parking spaces within the multifamily parking garage;
 - d. Indicate that time restrictions will be applicable to all on-street parking to ensure turn-over during daytime hours. Indicate that amendments to such parking restrictions may be approved by the Director of Community Development and Planning subject to supporting analysis having been submitted by the applicant or Community Association.
 12. Clarify how utility service would be continued to existing residences on the east side of McLean Avenue if existing utilities are relocated underground;
 13. Provide a preliminary sanitary capacity analysis prior to City Council hearings as specified by the Department of Public Works;
 14. Include a provision in the MDP that addresses the City's goals and objectives as they pertain to affordable housing, including those set forth in the Comprehensive Plan;
 15. Provide for sufficient community benefits in the MDP as they pertain to schools, public parks and transportation;
 16. Provide for temporary signage identifying the project in the Construction Management Plan;
 17. Identify measures to protect the existing historical marker along Fairfax Boulevard in the Construction Management Plan;
 18. Add a note to the MDP stating that any realignment of the private accessway near the southwest corner of the site that results from an approved plan for the relocation of Panther Place, which is not a part of this application, shall be deemed in conformance with the approved MPD provided there is no decrease in recreation and open space, no decrease in the quantity of parking spaces and there are no other significant modifications to the plan.

Ms. Jaworski suggested the addition of a condition to have the applicant work with Fairfax Little League on the parking issue to increase the available parking spaces.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Armstrong

Vote:

Mr. Angres	<u>Aye</u>
Ms. Wheeler-Smith	<u>Aye</u>
Mr. Harmon	<u>No</u>
Mr. Burrell	<u>No</u>
Ms. Armstrong	<u>Aye</u>
Ms. Jaworski	<u>Aye</u>
Mr. Cunningham	<u>Aye</u>

8. Staff Report.

Mr. Nabti said City Council held a work session on Fairfax Gateway and a pre-application work session on a mixed use building at 10426 Main Street during their April 10, 2018 meeting. He said the 10426 Main Street proposal may or may not come before the Planning Commission. He said City Council will hear initial concepts on proposed improvements to Jermantown Road, Chain Bridge Road and Eaton Place at their meeting tomorrow night. He said staff hopes to have the draft comprehensive plan to the Planning Commission soon for discussion at the next Planning Commission meeting.

9. Commission Comments.

Mr. Burrell - No comments.

Mr. Armstrong – No comments.

Ms. Jaworski – No comments.

Mr. Angres – Thanked everyone for their diligence and time spent this evening.

Ms. Wheeler-Smith – No comments.

Mr. Harmon – No comments.

Mr. Cunningham – He encouraged everyone to come out and vote at next Tuesday's election for City Council. He thanked staff for their hard work on tonight's presentation and said it is gratifying to see all the input received from the public tonight.

10. Adjournment.

Meeting Adjourned at: 11:14 p.m.

ATTEST Tina Gillian
Tina Gillian, Secretary