

Docket Item #12  
Planning Commission Meeting  
January 5, 2017

Consideration of approval of the Planning Commission minutes of the public hearing meeting of December 6, 2016.

---

**\* \* \* M I N U T E S \* \* \***

**ALEXANDRIA PLANNING COMMISSION**

December 6, 2016

7:00 P.M., Council Chambers

301 King Street, City Hall

Alexandria, Virginia

**Members Present:**

Mary Lyman, Chair  
Nathan Macek, Vice Chair  
David Brown  
Stephen Koenig  
Mindy Lyle  
Melissa McMahon  
Maria Wasowski

**Members Absent:**

None

**Staff Present:**

Karl Moritz	Department of Planning & Zoning
Joanna Anderson	Office of the City Attorney
Kendra Jacobs	Department of Planning & Zoning
Nancy Williams	Department of Planning & Zoning
Jeffery Farner	Department of Planning & Zoning
Alex Dambach	Department of Planning & Zoning
Sara Brandt-Vorel	Department of Planning & Zoning
Anh Vu	Department of Planning & Zoning
Robert Kerns	Department of Planning & Zoning
Ryan Price	Department of Planning & Zoning
Maya Contreras	Department of Planning & Zoning
Jack Browand	Department of Recreation, Parks & Cultural Activities
Robert Garbacz	Department of Transportation & Environmental Services
Nathan Imm	Department of Planning & Zoning
Dirk Geratz	Department of Planning & Zoning
Gary Wagner	Department of Planning & Zoning
Emily Oaksford	Department of Planning & Zoning

## ALEXANDRIA PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES – DECEMBER 6, 2016

### 1. Call to Order.

The Planning Commission public hearing was called to order at 7:00 P.M. All members were present.

### 2 Discussion Item: Update on the Old Town North Small Area Plan process.

Nancy Williams and Jeffrey Farner presented a progress update on the Old Town North Small Area Plan update process. Staff reported on a need to extend the OTN SAP Update planning process to May or June due to the need to complete remaining technical analyses. With no objections to the extension, staff indicated that the revised schedule will continue to incorporate robust outreach to enable the Advisory Group and community to review and discuss chapters and topics prior to the May or June public hearing for the OIN SAP Plan Update.

## **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

---

3. Special Use Permit #2016-0077  
1508 Mount Vernon Avenue - Junction Bakery & Bistro  
Public hearing and consideration of a request for an amendment to SUP  
#2015-0102 to allow off-premises alcohol sales; zoned: CL/Commercial Low.  
Applicant: Noe Landini

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:** Without objection, the Planning Commission deferred Special Use Permit #2016-0077.

4. Special Use Permit #2016-0081  
5428 Eisenhower Avenue (parcel address: 5400 Eisenhower Av) - Team Red, White & Blue  
Public hearing and consideration of a request to operate a fraternal or private club; zoned: OCH/Office Commercial-High. Applicant: Team Red, White & Blue, represented by M. Catharine Puskar, attorney

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:** By unanimous consent, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of Special Use Permit #2016-0081.

5. Encroachment #2016-0008  
310 South Saint Asaph Street  
Public hearing and consideration of a request for an encroachment into the public right-of-way for a front stoop; zoned: RM/Residential Medium-Townhouse.  
Applicant: Cheryl Jaeger

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:** By unanimous consent, the Planning

Commission voted to recommend approval of Encroachment #2016-0008.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED:**

---

6. Special Use Permit #2016-0041  
1400 Duke Street J & S Restaurant  
Public hearing and consideration of requests to operate a restaurant and for a parking reduction; zoned: OCM (50)/Office Commercial Medium.  
Applicant: J & S Restaurant, LLC

Alex Dambach gave a brief update. He stated that since the November Planning Commission meeting, the applicant met with the community and decided to withdraw the request for live entertainment.

Speakers:

Jonathan Rak, attorney for Shiloh Baptist Church, spoke in opposition of the request, stating that the church believes a restaurant with a bar is not compatible between two church buildings. He added that the withdrawal of the live entertainment request did not represent a substantial compromise. The applicant did not choose to discuss the use of parking spaces on his property with church representatives at the meeting.

J. W. Stanton, a member of Shiloh Baptist Church, spoke in opposition. He expressed the need to protect children in the parking lot and to preserve parking options for congregants.

Yvonne Callahan, Old Town Civic Association (OTCA) President, expressed opposition to the request. The OTCA Board voted unanimously to oppose the application, citing parking, length of restaurant hours, and the sale of on-premises alcohol near a church.

David Chamowitz, attorney for the applicant, spoke in support of the application. He explained that the removal of live entertainment from the proposal was made to alleviate church concerns that the restaurant would become a nightclub. He added that the shared parking arrangement with the church on the applicant's property would continue until the opening of the restaurant. He stated that his client would place signage at the site to control patrons' parking use.

Chairwoman Lyman closed the public hearing.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:** On a motion made by Vice Chairman Macek and seconded by Commissioner McMahon, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the request with the deletion of Condition 7 and an amendment to Condition 29, subject to compliance with all applicable codes, ordinances, and staff recommendations. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

7. **CONDITION DELETED BY PLANNING COMMISSION:** ~~Limited, live~~

~~entertainment may be offered, and must comply with the city's noise ordinance. No outdoor speakers shall be permitted. No amplified sound shall be audible at the property line. No admission or cover fee shall be charged. All entertainment shall be subordinate to the principal function of the restaurant as an eating establishment. Any advertising of the entertainment shall reflect the subordinate nature of the entertainment by featuring food service more prominently than entertainment. (P&Z)~~

29. **CONDITION AMENDED BY PLANNING COMMISSION:** The Director of Planning and Zoning shall review the special use permit after it has been operational for three months, six months, and one year, and shall docket the matter for consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council if (a) there have been documented violations of the permit conditions which were not corrected immediately, constitute repeat violations or which create a direct and immediate adverse zoning impact on the surrounding community; (b) the Director has received a request from any person to docket the permit for review as the result of a complaint that rises to the level of a violation of the permit conditions, or (c) the Director has determined that there are problems with the operation of the use and that new or revised conditions are needed. (P&Z)(Police)(PC)

Reason:

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff recommendation.

Chairwoman Lyman asked if reduced hours of operation or number of seats were discussed in the meeting with church representatives. David Chamowitz, the applicant's attorney responded that these issues had not been discussed, citing that cutting early morning and late evening hours would eliminate hours of operation when church activities are not scheduled. In addition, he stated that the number of seats is consistent with nearby restaurants.

Vice Chairman Macek stated that the purpose of the deferral was to provide the applicant and the church with the opportunity to compromise on aspects of the SUP request. He appreciated the applicant's request to withdraw the live entertainment, however, he was disappointed that more compromise had not been accomplished overall. He believed that the number of proposed seats and hours of operation are reasonable and scaling back of the operation would not substantially reduce impacts or concerns.

Commissioner Koenig concurred with Vice Chairman Macek, adding that he had hoped the parties would have considered operational and safety-related compromises. He expressed support for the application.

Commissioner Lyle agreed with the comments made by fellow Commissioners and noted examples of daycare uses that operate near similar restaurant uses without adverse impacts. She stated that personalities could not be taken into account for Commission review and encouraged those in opposition to maintain an open mind. Commissioner Lyle recommended that Condition 29 include a three and six month review in addition to the one year review.

Commissioner Brown empathized with church concerns and expressed hesitations about the viability of a restaurant business at that location. However, he expressed support for the application based on its applicability to the Zoning Ordinance and a review of land use impacts.

Commissioner Wasowski appreciated the efforts of both parties to meet since the November hearing and expressed hope that relations between them would improve in the future.

Commissioner McMahon concurred with fellow Commissioners and indicated that the SUP conditions exist to protect the community and hold applicants accountable.

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

---

7. Text Amendment #2016-0007  
Location of Accessory Buildings and Free-standing Garages  
(A) Initiation of a Text Amendment; and (B) Public hearing and consideration of a Text Amendment to Section 7-202 and Section 7-2505 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding proximity of accessory buildings and free-standing garages located on single-family and two-family dwelling lots to buildings on adjacent lots.  
Staff: City of Alexandria Department of Planning and Zoning

Anh Vu and Alex Dambach gave a presentation and answered questions from the Planning Commission.

Speakers: No individuals requested to speak on this item.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:** On a motion by Vice Chairman Macek, seconded by Commissioner Wasowski, the Planning Commission voted to initiate Text Amendment #2016-0007. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

On a motion by Vice Chairman Macek, seconded by Commissioner Wasowski, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of Text Amendment #2016-0007 with amendments (shown in bold below) provided in staff's memorandum dated December 5, 2016. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

Section 7-202(A)(5) Arbors and trellises. If a wall on a dwelling on an adjacent lot has any windows or doorways **that have a sill lower than 8 feet measured from grade** facing the shared property line and ~~is~~ located within three feet of that shared property line, the new arbor or trellis' setback shall be five feet from that shared lot line. This setback **from that shared lot line** is required at the location of the affected window(s) or doorway(s) and is required to extend along the width of those window(s) or doorway(s) and shall extend for a minimum of five feet in each direction from that window or doorway.

Section 7-202(B)(3) Open and closed fences which do not exceed six feet in height. If a

wall on a dwelling on an adjacent lot has any windows or doorways **that have a sill lower than 6 feet measured from grade** facing the shared property line and ~~is~~ located within three feet of that shared property line, the new fence shall not exceed three and a half feet in height along the width of those window(s) or doorway(s). If the fence has a setback of five feet or more from that shared lot line, it is permitted to be taller than three and a half feet but shall not exceed six feet in height. This setback **from that shared lot line** is required at the location of the affected window(s) or doorway(s) and is required to extend along the width of those window(s) or doorway(s) and shall extend for a minimum of five feet in each direction from that window or doorway.

Section 7-202(B)(4)(c) If a wall of a dwelling on an adjacent lot has any windows or doorways **that have a sill lower than 8 feet measured from grade** facing the shared property line and ~~is~~ located within three feet of that shared property line, the new small shed or structure used for storage's setback shall be five feet, including any roof overhang, from that shared lot line. This setback **from that shared lot line** is required at the location of the affected window(s) or doorway(s) and is required to extend along the width of those window(s) or doorway(s) and shall extend for a minimum of five feet in each direction from that window or doorway.

Section 7-2505(B)(4)(c) If a wall of a dwelling on an adjacent lot has any windows or doors **that have a sill lower than 13.50 feet measured from grade** facing the shared property line and ~~is~~ located within three feet of that shared property line, the new garage's setback shall be five feet, including any roof overhang, from that shared property line. This setback **from that shared lot line** is required at the location of the affected window(s) or doorway(s) and is required to extend along the width of those window(s) or doorway(s) and shall extend for a minimum of five feet in each direction from that window or doorway.

Reason: The Planning Commission agreed with the staff analysis.

The Planning Commission asked staff to clarify the proposal to use the height of adjacent lot windows as one of the thresholds for the special setbacks for accessory structures. The Commission also discussed garage heights and the relationship of window heights to the permitted heights of accessory structures.

Vice Chairman Macek also commented on Section 7-202(B)(4)(a) and suggested that, at some point in time, the provisions for structures used for storage could be updated to align with the sizes and heights of commonly sold manufactured storage sheds. It was suggested that the height of sheds have a higher limit or be set at the mid-point of the roof slope instead of the highest point. Commissioners agreed this issue would need additional study and could be fully discussed at a future hearing.

8. Development Special Use Permit #2016-0009  
4643 Taney Ave - Patrick Henry School and Recreation Center  
Public hearing and consideration of a request for a Development Special Use Permit with site plan to construct a school and community center building, including Special Use Permit requests for additional height of a public school building; for an indoor and outdoor recreation facility and community center; for more than one mechanical

## ALEXANDRIA PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES – DECEMBER 6, 2016

penthouse; for a mechanical penthouse exceeding 15 feet in height; and to increase the number of parking spaces above those required by the Zoning Ordinance; zoned R-12/Residential. Applicant: Alexandria City Public Schools and City of Alexandria

Ryan Price, Maya Contreras, Robert Kerns and Jack Browand gave a presentation and answered questions from the Planning Commission.

### Speakers:

Michael Doney, resident of 315 N. Latham St and at-large member of the Patrick Henry Community Advisory Group, spoke in favor of the project. Mr. Doney provided insights into the concept design process from the perspective of the Community Advisory Group, noting that he feels they provided valuable contributions to the project team, and were effective in serving their role as community liaisons on the project. Mr. Doney also noted that consensus on a recommendation was not achieved during the April 27<sup>th</sup> Community Advisory Group Meeting. Commissioner Brown further questioned Mr. Doney about the split of opinion within the Community Advisory Group about a preferred site design option. According to Mr. Doney, 5 Advisory group members were in support of option “C1” and 3 were in favor of option “A1” at the April 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

David Beulke, 3213 Duke Street, spoke in opposition of the project. He noted issues with the design and community engagement process. Mr. Beulke also mentioned that the City Council, school representatives, and project representatives have presented a false narrative of the process. Mr. Beulke noted that the School Board switched their position on the preferred option. Regarding the design, Mr. Beulke noted that the height of the building, locations of the bus loop on a Latham street, and the turf field were not part of the Community Advisory Group recommendation.

Dan Liercke, resident of 120 N Grayson Street and parent of a student at Patrick Henry, spoke in favor of the project. He noted that the process was transparent for the community and that opposition to the project was only about the location of the bus loop on Latham Street which he feels is a good and safe location for the loop. Mr. Liercke referenced his experience with the existing conditions of the school and noted that in the morning it’s a mess and that the access points need to be spread out, as proposed with the recommended design.

Mark Huddle, resident of 141 North Grayson Street, President of the Patrick Henry PTA and member of the ACPS Redistricting Committee spoke in favor of the project. Mr. Huddle noted that the school board felt option “A1” was the superior option, specifically because the separation of bus and car traffic makes it safer than the alternative option “C1”, it has a better delineation of the school and recreation center, and it allows for a 3<sup>rd</sup> floor to be used for middle school grades which keeps the age levels separated similar to the approach used in Jefferson Houston. Mr. Huddle also noted that the Patrick Henry project is an important part of the redistricting process. Commissioner Koenig asked Mr. Huddle his perspective on civic engagement process for the school. Mr. Huddle noted that the process was very open, and that while there was a lot of information communicated, it was done so effectively.

Ken Dotele, resident of 451 Raleigh Avenue, spoke in favor of the project. As a member of the Patrick Henry PTA and parent of a student at Patrick Henry, Mr. Dotele noted that the proposed option is the safest choice in that it keeps the cars and buses separated. Mr. Dotele stressed that having buses and student drop-off intermingled as it is today is unsafe and needs to be changed.

Asa Orrin-Brown, resident of 12 S. Ingram Street and a parent of a student at Patrick Henry, spoke in favor of the project. Mr. Orrin-Brown noted his recollection of the community meetings where parents vocalized their preference for option A1, which he feels is safer and well suited for pedestrians. He noted specifically that it minimizes the amount of driveways and travel lanes the students would need to cross. Mr. Orrin-Brown was in favor of the tapered height approach and how it fits into the context of the neighborhood. Lastly, Mr. Orrin-Brown noted concerns with intersections around the Patrick Henry neighborhood that he felt needed some improvements (Taney and N. Jordan, and Taney and N. Howard).

Elizabeth Parker, resident of 700 N. Latham St. and member of the Patrick Henry Community Advisory Group, spoke against the project. Ms. Parker noted that she and other neighbors are in support of a new school on the site but not in the proposed configuration. According to Ms. Parker option “C1” was the recommended option of the Advisory group, and that the vote was 7 in favor of “C1” 2 in favor of “A1” and 1 abstaining. As a resident living across the street of the school, Ms. Parker noted that safety was considered closely with option “C1”. Ms. Parker noted 2 specific concerns with the design: the introduction of additional bus traffic on Latham and Peacock Streets which she feels is unsafe, and the recreation center which she feels is not in a suitable location for the residential zone. Commissioner Brown asked Ms. Parker follow up questions related to her concerns about the location of the recreation center. Ms. Parker noted she was concerned about the noise and light that will be produced by the recreation center. Mr. Brown also asked Ms. Parker about her concerns with safety at the Polk and Latham intersection, and the likelihood of parents dropping off students on Latham Street.

Angela DeVico, resident of 4533 Peacock Avenue, spoke against the project. She noted that the Community Advisory Group recommended option “C1” but felt that this was ignored by the School Board. Ms. DeVico noted that both options (C1 and A1) are safe. Ms. DeVico also referenced a petition with signatures from the surrounding neighborhood in opposition to the project. Ms. DeVico quoted an article from the Alexandria Gazette that spoke unfavorably about the Patrick Henry process.

James Durham, resident of 622 Fort Williams Parkway and Chair of the Alexandria Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee spoke in favor of the project. Mr. Durham noted that parent travel surveys suggest the number of students who walk to Patrick Henry is the second lowest in the school system. Mr. Durham noted that the proposed design is much better for pedestrians and he expects the number of students who walk to school to increase which will also help alleviate some of the traffic congestion during the pick-up and drop-off times. Mr. Durham referenced community polling that took place at

## ALEXANDRIA PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES – DECEMBER 6, 2016

community meetings in the spring of 2016 that placed pedestrian safety in the top 3 priorities, and that option A1 was preferred by 70% of polling participants at an April 2016 community meeting. Mr. Durham concluded in saying he believes this proposal promotes walking and biking. Commissioner Koenig asked Mr. Durham about his experiences with the community engagement process. Mr. Durham stated that the parents of the school, many of which speak languages other than English, thought the process worked though the community meetings but found later on that their preference for option A1 was preempted by others who appealed directly to the School Board for keeping buses off Latham Street. Mr. Durham mentioned that these parents became organized and made their opinions heard by the School Board which is part of the reason A1 was chosen by the School Board in May.

Nancy Jennings, resident of 2115 Marlboro Drive and President of the Seminary Hill Association spoke against the project. Ms. Jennings reiterated that the process was flawed and that the School Board chose a design that was not recommended by the Advisory group. Ms. Jennings commented on the topography of the neighborhood. Ms. Jennings requested that the bus loop be located away from Latham Street, and noted that the recreation center is too large.

Mimi Goff, resident of 1313 Bishop Lane, spoke against the project due to the location of the bus loop on Latham Street. Ms. Goff recounted how the School Board requested that the loop not be located on Latham in early April. Ms. Goff noted both options were safe, and that Latham Street is not suitable for bus traffic. Ms. Goff is also concerned with the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of the building, and questioned whether there was adequate access for fire trucks.

Ingrid Bynum, Principal of Patrick Henry Elementary spoke in support of the project. Ms. Bynum noted that the proposed site plan is the safest option for several reasons: it is safer for her staff who facilitate drop-off and pick-up out in the parking lot; it has better emergency egress and lock-down capabilities in that all students are clustered together in the academic wing instead of spread out in the school; the bus loop in the rear of the site hides the children from public view which provides safer and easier control, and the 3 level design allows them to keep the 3 developmental stages and different grade levels separated which is advantageous for safety and, from an instructional perspective, it creates distinct identities for each age group. Commissioner Brown asked Ms. Bynum her thoughts on option “C1” as it relates to safety and instruction. Ms. Bynum noted that students who walk from Foxchase Apartments would need to cross the bus loop in option “C1” which is less safe, and that option C1 was less safe for a lock down situation because the children would be spread throughout the building. Commissioner Koenig asked Ms. Bynum her thoughts on the community process. Ms. Bynum noted that there was not consensus within the Advisory group and that many of the parents in the community felt early on that their voices were not being heard by the Advisory group despite their attendance at the community meetings.

Richard Jackson, Director of Education Facility for ACPS, spoke in favor of the project and commented on the interior of the proposed building. He noted that it is a modern design that is flexible and arranged in a functional manner, allowing a clustering of specialty areas and academic areas, and direct access to modern recreation amenities. Mr.

## ALEXANDRIA PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES – DECEMBER 6, 2016

Jackson highlighted that the proposal includes amenities that are not currently provided at the school such as extended learning areas, a teacher's lounge, and team rooms. Mr. Jackson concluded by saying that ACPS is excited about the proposed design and looks forward to the project moving ahead.

Chairwoman Lyman closed the public hearing.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:** On a motion by Commissioner Koenig, seconded by Vice Chairman Macek, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of Development Special Use Permit #2016-0009, with amendment outlined in the staff memo dated December 6, 2016. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**Reason:** The Planning Commission agreed with the staff analysis and with the recommended changes to condition 4(q) and amendments to the Transportation Demand Model as noted below.

Condition 4(q): Provide a minimum four foot landscape buffer between the twelve (12) foot sidewalk and curb on Latham Street, to the greatest extent possible.

Attachment #1: Transportation Demand Model: Organization, Funding and Reporting, Section C

c. The TDM will be funded by the applicant at an annual rate of \$80 per full time equivalent (FTE) staff member with a one-time \$20,000 contribution, not including the transit benefit provided by the City of Alexandria with an annual increase consistent with the Consumer Price Index of the United States for the previous year. TDM funds will be used exclusively for the following TDM activities:

\* Annual survey and resulting zip code maps

\* Promotional materials

\* Supplement to transit benefits provided by the City of Alexandria

\* Quarterly mailers to school families

\* Incentives and prizes

\* Walk/bike to work subsidy program

\* Any other TDM activities as may be proposed by the TDM Coordinator and approved by the Director of T&ES as meeting goals similar to those targeted by the required TDM measures

Commissioner Lyle requested inclusion of an additional condition to require ongoing maintenance at the new school, noting that it was a particular issue at Samuel Tucker Elementary School. Chairwoman Lyman noted that she had also discussed this issue with staff, as it is a larger systemic issue, and was concerned about giving preference to a single school, particularly as this would be the newest school, and least in need of repair. She requested a response from ACPS about a maintenance agreement for all of the schools. Commissioner McMahon noted that Conditions #120-123 focus on maintenance agreements between the City and ACPS, and requested that the community have ease of access to these future agreements, so that they could better hold everyone accountable.

Commissioner Wasowski and Vice Chairman Macek discussed the proposed Taney Avenue landscape buffer noted in proposed Condition 4q with staff. Commissioner Wasowski noted that her intended purpose for the buffer was to limit noise, while Vice Chairman Macek intended it to be a visual buffer. Staff stated that the final design of the edge will be determined at the Final Site Plan, and would be dependent on grade issues at the site, but that a planted buffer would be required, as feasible. Staff also noted that a landscape buffer was unlikely to be able to serve as a significant noise barrier.

Commissioner Wasowski restated the City's commitment to an open and inclusive planning process, and that the overall goal was for a clean, safe school. She requested that T&ES staff look at safety at the intersections near the school, and asked ACPS staff whether the new building would provide enough future student capacity.

Vice Chairman Macek said that he does not find the proposal is too dense; that the amount of open space provided is impressive; that the A-1 site plan option is a better option than C-1, as it has fewer curb cuts and more contiguous open space; and that Latham Street is sufficiently wide for school buses. He stressed the benefits of the expanded recreation center, and praised the co-location, but expressed concern that perhaps it wasn't large enough. Vice Chairman Macek also stated that the field not being lit was a lost opportunity for maximizing its use. Finally, he noted that the overall review process was somewhat convoluted, and that City Council had to intervene. He requested that there be a review of the process and an opportunity to evaluate the lessons learned.

Commissioner Koenig noted that he was the Commission representative on the Advisory Group, and expressed support for the application and the excellent design solution, given the existing site and limited resources. He agreed with Vice Chairman Macek that the meeting between the City Council and the School Board was a key turning point for the project, and noted that the time pressure on the project was a significant factor for the Advisory Group. Overall, he found the project to be well thought out and noted that there were a series of conscious trade-offs to reach a more complete project.

Commissioner Brown thanked Commissioner Koenig for the background he provided about the process. He noted that he felt the staff report did not contain enough detail, particularly related to the difference between the two options, and that the public deserves a full discussion of all of the internal processes of the project. He said that he doesn't believe that a strong case can be made for the C-1 option, and finds the proposed design to be excellent.

Chairwoman Lyman agreed with Commissioner Brown that the C-1 option should have been explained more fully in the staff report. She thanked the community for coming to the meeting, and noted that the speakers were split evenly between supporters and opponents. She expressed support for the expertise of the school principal and said that she believed the proposal to be a good design in terms of land use.

Commissioner McMahon stated that she initially found the project to contain too much asphalt, but has found that the proposed parking numbers had been vetted and well-considered, and that the drive-aisles are wide but serve a purpose. She agreed that the A-1

option is better than the C-1 option, and that the separation of the bus loop and parking area is suitable. She noted the importance of sustainable transportation options, as schools have many teachers driving alone, and parents dropping children off. She noted that the TDM addresses some of these items, but does not include ramifications if the items aren't met. She encouraged the City and ACPS to work together on transportation alternatives. She noted the 16% overall open space reduction, but agreed that it was a reasonable trade-off, given the additional students and facilities. She pointed out the extensively flat roofs, which she felt were a lost opportunity for above ground open space.

Commissioner Koenig agreed with Commissioner McMahon that environmental performance and sustainability are important issues, and noted the amount of impervious pavement and flat roofs on the site. He wondered whether LEED Silver was a sufficient standard, and encouraged ACPS to consider green roofs, rooftop open space and photovoltaics, as examples. He expressed concern that the school would not be able to accommodate the potential for future student capacity without using portable trailers.

9. Development Special Use Permit #2016-0008  
Transportation Management Plan SUP #2016-0060  
930 North Henry Street - Carpenter's Shelter  
Public hearing and consideration of requests for: (A) a Development Special Use Permit and Site Plan, with modifications, to construct a multi-family residential building and homeless shelter, including Special Use Permits for an increase in the number of allowable penthouses; for increased density for mixed use pursuant to Section 5-305(C); and for increased density for affordable housing pursuant to Section 7-700; and (B) a Special Use Permit for a Transportation Management Plan; zoned: CRMU-H/Commercial-Residential Mixed Use (High).  
Applicant: Carpenter's Shelter, represented by Duncan Blair, attorney

Nathan Imm, Dirk Geratz and Robert Kerns (P&Z) gave a presentation and answered questions from the Planning Commission.

Speakers:

Duncan Blair, attorney representing the Carpenter's Shelter & Alexandria Housing Development Corporation (AHDC), spoke in support of the proposal and provided additional statements regarding addressing the needs of affordable housing and shelter in the City.

Judy Noritake, resident of 1119 Wythe Street and representing the Braddock Metro Citizens Coalition, spoke in support of the proposal, noting the provision of opportunities for a variety of residents and the appropriateness of the development in this neighborhood and proximity to the Braddock Metro station.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:** On a motion by Vice Chairman Macek, seconded by Commissioner Wasowski, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of Development Special Use Permit and Site Plan #2016-0008 with

## ALEXANDRIA PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES – DECEMBER 6, 2016

modifications and Transportation Management Plan Special Use Permit #2015-0081. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

Reason: The Planning Commission agreed with the staff analysis.

Discussion:

Commissioner Brown questioned whether the relief from height to centerline setback is needed, stating that he believed a different technical interpretation may not require the modification. However, he stated his support for the modification as requested.

Commissioner Brown further questioned whether the space for the Carpenter's Shelter, being the same space as currently provided, is sufficient to provide for their program and needs. Duncan Blair, attorney for the applicant, stated that the space is foreseen as sufficient.

Vice Chairman Macek stated that the project accomplishes everything the Small Area Plan expected for this site with no significant exceptions other than technical changes typical of this type of development, and the project is a success story for the community.

Chairwoman Lyman agreed with Vice Chairman Macek and stated she was proud to support this project.

Commissioner Wasowski stated that this is the type of development that we want and has been planned well. Commissioner Wasowski further stated that the applicants have been doing wonderful work in the City. Commissioner Lyle concurred with the statements.

Commissioner Brown stated that he was in agreement with staff's justification of the proposed modification to the zone transition setback in this case. Commissioner Brown explained that modifying the setback requirement is appropriate for this particular site and because of the compatibility with the future adjacent ARHA development.

10. Development Site Plan #2016-0016  
600, 600A, 601, 602, 603, 604, 606 President Ford Lane and 1416, 1418,  
1422, 1426 Janneys Lane - Oak Grove Amendment and Extension  
Public hearing and consideration of a request for an amendment to and extension of a previously approved Development Site Plan for eight single-family homes (DSP #2004-0005) to allow construction of the remaining undeveloped Lot 9 with a new unit type and to update lot and building tabulations; zoned R-20/Residential Single-family. Applicant: Oak Grove Estates, LC, represented by Jack Perkins

Emily Oaksford and Gary Wagner gave a presentation and answered questions from the Planning Commission.

Speakers:

Ken Wire, representing the applicant, spoke in favor of the request and answered questions from the Planning Commission.

Theresa Buchanan, representing the Oak Grove property owners, noted concern that the design of the remaining home will not be of the same style, size and quality of the other homes in the development. Ms. Buchanan noted the design differences between the proposed house and the existing homes. She stated that of greater concern is the difference in size of the proposed house in comparison with the existing homes and, requested that the developer be required to build the third floor so that it is compatible with the other homes. Ms. Buchanan also requested that the drainage issues be addressed before construction is completed.

Chairwoman Lyman closed the public hearing.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:** On a motion by Commissioner Brown, seconded by Vice Chairman Macek, the Planning Commission voted to approve Development Site Plan #2016-0016, with the amendment to conditions 10A and 48 as outlined in staff's December 6, 2016 memorandum. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

**Reason:** The Planning Commission agreed with the staff analysis.

10A. **CONDITION ADDED BY STAFF:** The applicant shall make the following improvements to the eastern portion of Cathedral Drive:

- a. Complete design work for the curb and gutter, pursuant to the "Cathedral Drive Grading Exhibit" by Bowman Consulting, dated 11/29/16.
- b. Complete all concrete work including curb and gutter, and impacted driveway, apron(s) to provide positive drainage southward in the gutter pan up to the existing high point of the curb at elevation 29.14.
- c. Install Erosion & Sediment Controls per the requirements of Chapter 4, Title 5 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Alexandria.
- d. All the City of Alexandria fees, if required for this scope of work, will be waived.

48. **CONDITION AMENDED BY STAFF:** The applicant shall submit ~~revised~~ architectural elevations for review and comment by the Director of P&Z. The ~~revised~~ elevations should generally present a more balanced facade appearance, orderly fenestration pattern and emulate the styles and scale of residential houses typically found in the City of Alexandria. Items to be considered by the applicant ~~in revising the elevations~~ include:

- a. ~~Revising the~~ The size, pitch and design of the roofs to reduce their size and mitigate the scale of the buildings;
- b. Establishing a ~~more~~ formal order on the elevations, particularly sides and rears, for a ~~more~~ symmetrical arrangement of appropriate sizes, proportions, and types of windows;
- c. Using window styles that conform with the historic style of the general design of the house;
- d. Using special windows, such as Palladian windows, only at focal points of the entire elevation;

## ALEXANDRIA PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES – DECEMBER 6, 2016

- e. Incorporating architectural elements typically found on houses in Alexandria such as the presence of covered porticoes and porches on at least the front facade and desirable on other elevations;
- f. Making chimneys more massive, reflecting load-bearing masonry construction typical of the historic houses depicted; and
- g. Using materials that are consistent with the traditional buildings in Alexandria that are predominantly brick or siding or a combination of the two. Stone was not often used as a general cladding material except in some Arts and Crafts style houses. (P&Z)(PC)

Commissioner Brown noted that the original approval did not require the developer to build a particular model on a particular lot. Commissioner Brown also asked Mr. Wire what has prevented the developer from building the house. Mr. Wire cited market conditions as reasons for not building the remaining house.

Vice Chairman Macek noted that the Planning Commission does not have the authority as part of this approval to require the developer to build a third floor.

Robert Kerns commented that the applicant has made the representation that the third floor exterior will be built as demonstrated in the elevations and staff can hold the applicant accountable.

### **OTHER BUSINESS:**

---

#### 11. Commissioner's Reports, Comments & Questions

Commissioner Lyle gave an update on the Eisenhower West/Van Dorn Implementation Plan and discussed a new mural project on Eisenhower Avenue.

Commissioner Koenig provided an overview of the Patrick Henry Advisory Group and asked Mr. Moritz if there would be a formal process to examine the lessons learned from this process. Mr. Moritz stated that, although there is not a formal process, he would pursue opportunities to review the process. Commissioner Koenig commented that would have been helpful for Planning Commissioners to have had a briefing or update on the project, particularly during the point when decisions were being made on the design alternatives.

### **MINUTES:**

---

#### 12. Consideration of the minutes from the November 1, 2016 Planning Commission meeting.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:** Without objection the Planning Commission approved the minutes of the November 1, 2016 meeting with the following amendments:

Page 4, docket item #3, J&S Restaurant:

Although Vice Chairman Macek voiced support for the application, he was also concerned that the applicant had not met with church members to discuss the request. He

## ALEXANDRIA PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES – DECEMBER 6, 2016

asked that the applicant consider sharing parking spaces, as well as ~~reducing hours of operation and~~ the number of seats.

Page 4, docket item #3, J&S Restaurant:

On a motion made by Vice Chairman Macek, seconded by ~~Chairman~~ Commissioner Wasowski, the Planning Commission voted to defer Special Use Permit #2016-0041 until the December 2016 public hearing. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

Page 5, docket item #4, Floor & Décor:

For condition 19, only the last two sentences should be deleted

19. All on-street parking controls and restrictions within the project area shall be determined by the City. Any such controls and restrictions which the applicant desires shall be shown on the Final Site Plan. ~~Within the project area, any parking meters which are placed on private streets with public access easements on public rights-of-way shall be acquired and installed by the applicant in accord with City specifications. The City reserves the right to enforce parking meters on private streets containing with public access easements.~~-(P&Z)(T&ES)(PC)

Page 8, Commissioner's Reports: Corrected bullet formatting.

### 7. Adjournment

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.