

Occoquan District Land Use Advisory Committee  
 Prince William County, Virginia  
 Meeting Minutes  
 January 22, 2007

<b>Date:</b> January 22, 2007	<b>Time:</b> 7:30 pm to 9:30 pm
<b>Location:</b> McCoart Building, Potomac Room	
<b>Chairperson:</b> Gail Burda	
<b>Present:</b> Jim Brighton; Gail Burda; Christy Curtin; Kim Hosen; Bill Lewis; Bob Lyons; Eileen Sheridan	<b>New Members/Guests:</b> Carl Land (Representation for Greater Woodmont Neighborhood) Rev. Clyde Ellis, Sr. Pastor, and Members (Mt. Olive Baptist Church)
	<b>Presenters:</b> Lori Murphy (Bean, Kinney & Korman) Kathy Waters (Compton and Duling) Bob Waglano (Builder for Sullins Property)
<b>Agenda:</b> 1. Springhill Suites Hotel on PW Parkway – Lori Murphy 2. Mt. Olive Baptist Church SUP – Kathy Waters 3. Sullins Property Subdivision and Rezoning – Bob Waglano 4. General Discussion 5. Set next meeting – date and place 6. Set next agenda	

**Discussion:**

**Item 1.**

Springhill Suites Hotel (Marriot) on PW Parkway:

Located adjacent to existing 2 Marriot-operated motels (Courtyard, Residence Inn)

Rezoning of 1.29 Acres from A-1 to OH for construction of a 6-story, 80-suite hotel with conference room for 50-80 persons. No on-site restaurant.

Parking: 71 space surface, and 23-25 understructure.

Located adjacent to VEPCO substation, separated by a 30-ft waterline easement.

\$19,000 will be proffered contribution to the Horner/Catons Gateway Bridge program in lieu of landscaping adjacent to VEPCO.

Exterior to be EFIS, with brick base, metal roofing.

**Dates: PC hearing scheduled April 4; BOCS in May.**

Initial Observations:

1. security concern at underground parking facility – will cameras be used.
2. request for re-evaluation of retaining walls (potential graffiti surfaces).
3. concern for access into an already difficult shopping center.
4. request for proffer statement indicating future exterior modifications cannot be made without review of ODLUC/LOCCA.

See subsequent correspondence in Attachments A and B.

**Item 2.**

Mt. Olive Baptist Church SUP:

Application to consolidate 4 parcels into a single 14.5-acre parcel for construction of new church facility.

- SUP is requested for religions use – immediate need.
- SUP is requested to operate a 100-person day care center – phased need.
- SUP is requested to operate a 25-person adult day care center – future need – requested now so that the process will not have to be repeated several years forward when facility is actually incorporated.

Occoquan District Land Use Advisory Committee  
Prince William County, Virginia  
Meeting Minutes (Cont'd)  
January 22, 2007

RPA is located in eastern (rear) end of lot and will be preserved. Church proposes to use RPA as recreational area such as walking trails and picnic/meditation areas. Remainder of site will be clear-cut. SWM wet pond, fenced, will be utilized for on-site sheet flow.

30-ft landscaped strip along Minnieville Rd. Proposed trees to have height ~ 5ft max.

Single point of access off Minnieville Road without signal. Left turns from southbound Minnieville will be restricted by traffic control island. TIA conducted and VDOT indicates no improvements will be required.

**Dates: PC hearing scheduled March 7; BOCS in April 17.**

Initial Observations:

1. insufficient landscaping throughout entire property.
2. request for planting of perimeter landscaping as soon as practical after site preparation.
3. despite VDOT claims of minimal impact, traffic flow will greatly impact Minnieville due to forced u-turns. Applicant's engineer says light cannot be installed due to close proximity of nearby intersections less than design spacing between signalized intersections.

See subsequent correspondence in Attachments C thru E.

**Item 3.**

Sullins Property Subdivision and Rezoning:

Bob Waglano, builder, presented plans to subdivide the existing 3-acre Sullins property into 3 ~0.9-acre parcels. Existing dwelling to be retained. Two new single family homes to be built on new lots.

LOD preserves vegetation along back lot line and along side lot line. No vegetation in the middle has been identified for protection, but every effort will be made to preserve as much as possible.

Carl Land, resident of nearby Woodmont community, voiced no initial concerns, though later amended his position to be against subdivision due to precedence set in rezoning attempts in the Greater Woodmont communities.

Proposal was deferred from previous PC hearing to garner community input and to re-evaluate LOD.

Initial Observations:

1. adjacent parcel are 1-acre, thereby consistent with neighborhood
2. VDOT requirements dictate ROW for Russell Road currently not dedicated. This forces remaining parcels to be less than 1 acre in size.
3. ROW forces the rezone to be R-2 to permit single family houses on lots < 1 acre, not the preferred SR1. However, R-2 permits ½ acre lots. Great concern this sets bad rezoning precedence.

See subsequent correspondence in Attachments F thru H.

**Item 4.**

General Discussion:

POD Storage Container – ordinance variance

Discussion led by Bob Lyons expressing concern about the loosening of restrictions governing the placement and duration of POD containers. Bob will follow up on topic and report to committee as additional information is available.

**Item 5.**

Next Meeting Date:

Revise room and date changes to avoid Presidents Holiday. >>> February 26<sup>th</sup> Neabsco Room

**Item 6.**

Next Agenda:

Ebenezer Baptist Church REZ PLN 2007-00260

Prince William Kennels SUP #PLN2007-00190

Occoquan District Land Use Advisory Committee  
Prince William County, Virginia  
Meeting Minutes (Cont'd)  
January 22, 2007

**Attachment A:**

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Lori Murphy [mailto:LMurphy@beankinney.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 08, 2007 3:52 PM  
**To:** Brighton, Jim; Eileen Sheridan; Gail Burda  
**Subject:** Baywood Hotels - Potomac Mills (SpringHill Suites)

ODLUC Committee Members,

As you know, I represent Baywood Hotels in its request for a rezoning of that parcel of land located off of Prince William Parkway (and near I-95). Our client plans to construct a Marriott brand, SpringHill Suites hotel. I wanted to take this opportunity to respond to discussion points raised at the January 22, 2007 ODLUC meeting.

Tree Save

One of the questions raised was whether the applicant would be willing to make efforts to save existing vegetation and trees on the site. In response, the applicant has revised the plan to reduce the limits of clearing and grading. This has the effect of saving existing vegetation at the point nearest the Prince William Parkway, a little bit along the property edge to the north and the back corner. I have attached a copy of the new plans so that you may view this change.

Landscaping

Another question raised was to what extent would the applicant landscape the site. The County's requirement for landscaping is 10%. Due in part to the extensive buffers provided, the applicant is landscaping 18.5% of the site.

Compatibility

Several members raised the question of how the proposed hotel was similar or different to the two adjacent Marriott brand hotels. I have attached a copy of the colored elevations for your review. The applicant's architect reviewed the adjacent hotels and has provided me the following information:

"Our building is 6 stories (higher than other adjacent hotels) with red brick up to first floor and rest is EIFS finish, color is a combination of snow (at the entrance front and back tower and all around top floor) and parchment (please see elevations attached). Most of the roof area is shingles (color barkwood), front and side towers with standing seam metal roof (color aged copper). We do have a drive through canopy with flat roof and the same color as the building. Our hotel is a combination of both hotels in terms of color and material (brick, EIFS, shingles, metal roof)."

"Residence Inn – 4 stories with red brick on the first floor with exceptions at few areas (where the brick is to the top of third floor window). Rest of exterior is siding (color looks close to snow). Slope roof and the material is shingles."

"Courtyard is also 4 stories with EIFS finish on the exterior. It has combination of three colors for the ext. and slope roof with shingles. It has a drive through canopy with standing seam metal roof."

Lighting

The applicant is agreeable to use compatible parking lot lighting, similar to those located at the Residence Inn and Courtyards.

Stormwater

Also, I wanted to confirm that the applicant's stormwater outfall will be served by the existing pond located north of the site. At the time of our meeting with ODLUC, we did not yet have the calculations complete but indeed the pond is sized to serve this site as well.

Thank you again for allowing us to present this application to you. The proffers will require another presentation before ODLUC prior to site plan. (I've also added to the proffers language about removing graffiti, additional plant units in the buffers, and the \$19,000 contribution to the Prince William gateway project). Jim, I'd be happy to forward you a copy of the proffers after the County has had an opportunity to provide me its comments..

Very truly yours,  
Lori

**Attachment B:**

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Lori Murphy [mailto:LMurphy@beankinney.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 12, 2007 11:28 AM  
**To:** Brighton, Jim  
**Subject:** RE: Baywood Hotels - Potomac Mills (SpringHill Suites)

Occoquan District Land Use Advisory Committee  
Prince William County, Virginia  
Meeting Minutes (Cont'd)  
January 22, 2007

Hi Jim,

Thank you for the reminder. Upon resubmission, I neglected to change the proffer regarding exterior modification to the site. However, I do have plenty of time to change the proffers. The proffer currently provides:

"The Applicant agrees to make a courtesy review presentation to LOCCA/PELT and the Occoquan Land Use Committee prior to the final site plan, certification of which shall be provided as a condition of final site plan approval."

How about we add another proffer that says something like "the Applicant agrees to make a courtesy review presentation to Occoquan Land Use Committee or the then-active land use community advisory committee each time the Applicant or subsequent developer submits a plan for the subsequent exterior modification of the building prior to County approval of such request."

**Attachment C:**

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Brighton, Jim

**Sent:** Monday, February 19, 2007 8:13 AM

**To:** Gail Burda; Jack Kooyoomjian

**Cc:** Eileen Sheridan; 'Christy Curtin'; Bob Lyons; Bill Lewis; Mike May; 'Kim Hosen'; Matt Arcieri

**Subject:** Mt Olive Church

Gail and Jack, committee members et al.

I appreciated reading Katherine Water's letter to Matt Arcieri. Of particular interest was the interesting discussion of the "indigenous/drought tolerant" plant material and the roofing product.

Regarding the roofing product, I too have some concerns about the selected material. I did some quick Google searching for the product at <http://www.starbuildings.com/Products/StarShield.aspx> and frankly, it does no better in allaying my concerns than when my mind initially conjured an image of metal roofing.

I understand that this may be the most economical for the church, but I have a hard time believing that it provides them with the best architecture. It looks so industrial, and there is so much of it to observe. According to the renderings, the majority of this facility is roof. The brick base of the single story building represents a mere foundation on which this massive, imposing roof will sit.

This structure reminds me of one of the many architecturally significant buildings constructed in my hometown of Columbus Indiana. See the following <http://www.northchristianchurch.com/Architecture.htm> and <http://www.bluffton.edu/~sullivanm/colsnxian/colsnxian.html>

While in no way does it match, it certainly seems to take distant inspiration. The website contains pictures of how imposing the roof is, and the structure is a hexagon (vs octagon). The roof is slate, and the spire, though described to be copper, has a lead gray patina. Affectionately nicknamed the "Oil Can" by us locals, this church designed by Eero Saarinen is unbelievably beautiful in its simplicity.

That being said, I think the Mt Olive church would be well served by their architect if he could reconsider the roof material selection. I understand that the slate is out of the question due to enormous cost, but perhaps Eileen's researched product is within their means. And, I believe Eileen noted that that product was a 40-year shingle. Should there be no change in selection, I do think the color selection of gray is good in that it may have the appearance of a lead shingle roof. But, still very industrial.

As always, food for thought.

Jim

Occoquan District Land Use Advisory Committee  
Prince William County, Virginia  
Meeting Minutes (Cont'd)  
January 22, 2007

**Attachment D:**

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Kim Hosen [mailto:khosen@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 20, 2007 3:27 PM  
**To:** Eileen Sheridan  
**Cc:** Brighton, Jim; Gail Burda  
**Subject:** Re: Mt Olive Church

We have a meeting with Mt. Olive scheduled for Monday, February 26, 4:00 p.m., at Mike's office.

The intent of the meeting is to resolve outstanding environmental issues, i.e., we want them to save more land. There are an extraordinary number of specimen trees on this site, according to the proposal. Julie Flanagan is walking the site Wednesday or Thursday and we'll hear what she has to say about the condition of the trees. Mt. Olive claims the county's stormwater requirements prevent them from saving more of the property, this may or may not be the case. The stormwater system can be changed to save more land in its natural state after the property is built. The problem may be with adequate stormwater management during the development phase. Patty Dietz is checking into options.

Mt. Olive has been unwilling to commit to native plants, which is important if we want to make sure the buffers have a good chance to survive and is also a requirement. Regarding the trail, this is in the conditions and should also be on the MZP. We do not want to give the trail away, per Eileen's excellent comments. There is also the outstanding traffic issue.

I will forward information from Julie when I receive something. I am hoping that at least one of you can attend, let me know!

Kim

**Attachment E:**

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Arcieri, Matthew [mailto:marcieri@pwcgov.org]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 21, 2007 1:29 PM  
**To:** Brighton, Jim; Eileen Sheridan; Gail Burda  
**Subject:** Mt. Olive Roof

mentioned to Kathy in passing that ya'll had some ideas about a different roof, but I deleted the email that contained the links to what product you were thinking of suggesting. Can I get those and pass them onto the applicant so they can discuss it with us on Monday?

Thanks!

Matthew Arcieri, Planner  
Prince William County, Planning Office  
5 County Complex Court, Prince William, VA 22192  
Phone: (703) 792-6830

**Attachment F:**

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Kim Hosen [mailto:khosen@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 06, 2007 3:53 PM  
**To:** Brighton, Jim

Occoquan District Land Use Advisory Committee  
Prince William County, Virginia  
Meeting Minutes (Cont'd)  
January 22, 2007

**Cc:** Mike May; Gail Burda; Eileen Sheridan; Carl Land

**Subject:** Re: FW: Occoquan District Applications

Thanks for sending this message, Jim. I talked to Curt Spear, County Attorney's office, who said it is unlikely an approval of the Sullins proposal would set a legal precedent that would compel the county to approve other subdivisions intended to increase residential in this area. It would, however, establish a framework where a future applicant - in Woodmont or other nearby area - could use this to claim there was a fairness issue, which could set a precedent when viewed from a political perspective. Kim

**Attachment G:**

Subject: Rezoning of the old Sullins Property  
Date: Thu, 8 Feb 2007 21:17:51 -0500  
From: clandva <clandva@comcast.net>  
To: Kim Hosen <khosen@comcast.net>

Hello Kim,

I appreciate the information and the discussion of the various individuals concerning the rezoning of the old Sullins Property. After studying the concerns of the various individuals and studying the plan of the developer at the Land Use Committee meeting, I now have some serious reservations that I will express at the Planning Commission Hearings.

First, rezoning for a lower density from A-1 would be inconsistent with the surrounding area, in fact all of Woodmont I, Woodmont II, and all of the properties accessible from the entire Russell Road are currently zoned A-1 with the exception of two properties along Russell Road (GPIN 8192-87-8991 & 8192-98-0309) which are zoned SR-1. This is notwithstanding the fact that there are a number of properties in immediate area that are about 1 acre in size.

Second, the request for rezoning from A-1 to SR-2 based on the taking of some of the property by the Russell Road Right of Way leaving less than three one acre lots is specious at best. Once the property is rezoned to SR-2, there would be nothing to stop the developer from tearing down the existing Sullins house and building 6 houses on the three lots. Third, the house plans, as presented to the Land Use Committee, are

inconsistent with the Sullins home and all of those in immediate vicinity, i.e. the Sullins home is about 2500 sq ft, including basement, while the developer is planning to build two homes of approximately 3600 sq ft not including the basement and are not architecturally compatible with the existing community.

Finally, the builders stated purpose for building the two additional homes for his children are suspect at best, and is designed solely to develop sympathy for the project. Once the rezoning is approved there is no mechanism to prevent the developer from placing the properties on the market to the highest bidder. In fact, he is an upscale builder, and that is what he does for a living, build and sell homes. My hope is that you and your supporters will continue to resist the rezoning effort.

Feel free to forward this to anyone you think might have an interest in this rezoning request.

Thanks,

Occoquan District Land Use Advisory Committee  
Prince William County, Virginia  
Meeting Minutes (Cont'd)  
January 22, 2007

Carl Land

**Attachment H:**

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Kim Hosen [mailto:khosen@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Friday, February 16, 2007 3:14 PM

**To:** clandva; mcmay@pwcgov.org

**Cc:** Gail Burda; Brighton, Jim; Eileen Sheridan

**Subject:** Re: Meeting with Carl Land

Hello Carl,

Thanks! How about this coming Monday at 10:00 a.m. at the Occoquan Supervisor office? I think this is okay with Mike and we'll hear from everyone else...

Here's some info from the proffers that would protect the neighborhood from future subdivisions at the Sullins site:

**USE AND DEVELOPMENT**

3. Residential development on the Property shall not exceed a maximum of three (3) lots for the development of single family detached dwelling units. Minimum lot size shall be .9 acres. Single family attached units shall not be developed on the Property.

4. Development of the Property shall be in substantial accordance with the GDP.

Attached are copies of the most recent proffers and GDP. Look forward to hearing your comments! Let me know if Monday works you you...

Kim