

Bock Farm Meeting
Supervisor Storck's Office
November 22, 2016

In Attendance:

Dan Storck (DS) Joe Francone (JF) Bill Bock (BB)
Mark Higgins (MH) Shahin Saloom (SS) Dean Moore (DM) Jay Whitton (JW)

Opening remarks: 7:00PM

DS A. Regarding purpose of meeting tonight; to discuss the major points of contention concerning the project as of today: **Density, Traffic and Height.**

B. Set up next meeting dates: either Thursday or Friday of next week; calendar to be submitted by DS soon to participants. **Purpose to submit other options for project.**

JW asked if other communities would be included at that time and DS was not sure that he could answer.

C. DS Stated that the County Attorney had provided another opinion regarding the 55+ status – it was legal and binding.

Transportation:

JF A. JF went into the summary of the mitigating issue surrounding the Traffic Impact Analysis [TIA]:

- Fairfax County [FFX Cty] roads are maintained by VDOT and ruled by VDOT code.
- Even though the development application did not trigger a TIA study, on request he had it performed.
- The results as analyzed by his consultants using the VDOT Code showed only a marginal impact on the intersections at Sherwood Hall / Parker Ln and Sherwood Hall / Holland Rd – each received a grade of "< C" or marginal degradation to current condition, not enough to warrant changes to signage or lights.
- DS reiterated that Gum Springs wanted and was granted a waiver request for a Stop Sign at Parkers Ln / Hinson Farm, however, that has not been approved by VDOT and it is their final decision. VDOT does not feel it is warranted under traffic flow projections as determined by study. DM / SS remarked that other Traffic Study Consultants used other Code Factors that would add to the daily counts.

JF Traffic impact is also based upon the FFX Cty Comprehensive Plan (1995) Units/Acre [CP= 5/8 un/ac] and is more stringent than FFX Zoning Code [PDH5 = 5 un/ac] and is the reason Long/Bock was told by Zoning to apply using R8 rather than PDH5; he was not allowed to seek this project under PDH5.

DM Asked "How will you convey a 'positive' spin on the increased traffic to the community at large who are opposed to the TIA findings?"

Density:

SS Opened the discussion with statement that most of community was against the proposed density; Could Long/Bock provide other options at next meeting that would be potential alternates to this 128 unit Condo?

- DS Brought up the future of the Comprehensive Plan being worked on under Embark 2020; that this project would fit into that model.
- SS Q: "How is it possible that Cty Zoning is willing to approve an R8 rezoning in a PDH5 area when they have never done that before?" This goes back to statement above about Z&P recommending the applicant use R8. It was NOT Long/Bock decision.
- DM Q: "How come you are seeking an exception to the base acreage from 5 ac to 4.38ac?"
- BB Response: "4.38 is what Cty carved out as developable and they suggested the exception application."
- JW Q: "Why not apply for an Amendment to Proffers on remaining 7 acres?"
- JF FFX Cty will not consider any changes to these proffers as the condensed Open Space is the minimum required for all the developments behind farm. This requirement cannot be further diminished. That means other projects greater than 3 houses are not considered.
- SS Q: "What can you propose vs planned project that will mitigate Density?" – visual renderings at next meeting.
- JF A: "I have another option, Townhouse Façade with hip roof at 49.3' height that has no "underground parking" but either front / rear loading garages. These TH Facades will enclose potentially 124 interior units with elevators and front lobbies." This would still be a 55+ community but a different appearance. Also, this would remove the requirement for Ladder Truck by Fire Marshall.

Meeting Adjourned at 8:25 PM