

**FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
PARKS COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 22, 2004**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

John R. Byers, Mount Vernon District  
Frank de la Fe, Hunter Mill District Commissioner  
Ronald W. Koch, Sully District  
Rodney L. Lusk, Lee District

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Laurie F. Wilson, At-Large

STAFF PRESENT:

Barbara J. Lippa, Executive Director, Planning Commission (PC)  
Norma J. Duncan, Associate Clerk, PC  
Edward Batten, Fairfax County Park Authority Board (FCPAB), Lee District  
David Marshall, Assistant Director, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning  
and Zoning (DPZ)  
Fred Selden, Director, PD, DPZ  
Winnie Shapiro, FCPAB, Braddock District  
Sandra Stallman, Long Range Planner, Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA)  
Lynn Tadlock, Director, Planning and Development Division (PDD), FCPA

OTHERS PRESENT:

James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large

//

Planning Commission Vice-Chairman John R. Byers constituted the first meeting of the 2004 Parks Committee at 7:33 p.m., in the Board of Supervisors' Conference room, 12000 Government Center Parkway, 1<sup>st</sup> floor, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

Pursuant to Section 4-102 of the Commission's *Bylaws & Procedures*, Vice-Chairman Byers indicated that the first order of business was to elect a committee chairman. Commissioner Koch MOVED TO NOMINATE FRANK DE LA FE AS CHAIRMAN OF THE 2004 PARKS COMMITTEE.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lusk, and carried unanimously with Commissioner Wilson absent from the meeting.

//

Lynn Tadlock, Director, Planning and Development Division, Fairfax County Park Authority, initiated the briefing on the FCPA needs assessment planning process. She referenced a map on

the first page of a handout entitled "Fairfax County Integrated Park System" which depicted all the park land within the boundaries of the County, representing less than 20% of the land base. (The handout is contained in the date file.)

To answer Commissioner Byers' concern about whether streamline parks were part of the assessment, Ms. Tadlock stated that they were included but did not appear clearly on the reproduction of the map. She emphasized that since finishing the needs assessment process, there was additional information and action by the Park Authority Board that could be included in the County's Comprehensive Plan. She said the handout explained the full needs assessment executed with all the reports which she was pleased to share with the Commission members.

Ms. Tadlock presented a short overview which described the process they used to determine community needs, develop County-wide service level standards, and build a 10-year Capital Improvement Plan. She said their original submission request for the 2004 bond was based on that 10-year plan.

Following the handout, Ms. Tadlock indicated the groups they had worked with to develop the needs assessment and described the facility standards (except for athletic fields) which they had determined as one playground per 2,800 residents and a lake front park for every 90,000 residents. In answer to a question from Chairman de la Fe, she explained the figures were based on both public and homeowner association playgrounds.

Commissioner Byers inquired as to whether there was data disclosing current facilities. Sandy Stallman, FCPA long range planner, responded that those figures had been incorporated into the formula used to determine the standards and that information had been previously provided on a compact disk (cd) to the Commission.

Ms. Tadlock referenced the standards for athletic fields on page two of the handout and the contribution goals on page three which the Park Authority hoped to achieve by 2013. She clarified for Commissioner Byers that these were all new facilities.

Ms. Tadlock also cited the goals outlined by FCPA for new facilities and athletic fields on page four of the handout, noting acquisition goals of 236 acres for District or County-wide Parks and 40 acres for Neighborhood/Community parks.

Continuing, Ms. Tadlock identified the funding needs illustrated on pages five and six of the handout that would be requested through the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and overall capital improvement needs through the year 2013. The total figure, she explained, was \$376,000,000 with a breakdown displayed by near-term, intermediate, and long-term years. Finally, she said, they wanted to discuss Comprehensive Plan Updates which make some Strategic Plan Revisions and develop a long-range financial plan to use in their Master Plan.

Chairman de la Fe posed the option of using the proffer system to help with funding, explaining that all contributions need not come from the bond referendum. He offered examples of how proffers had specifically been used previously.

Ms. Tadlock acknowledged reviewing cases with that in mind and noted FCPA staff had mapped the results showing deficiencies for specific types of facilities.

Winnie Shapiro, Park Authority Board, Braddock District, voiced her recognition that the entire program could not be funded through a bond referendum and agreed that the proffer system was a perfect example of a way to address the difference.

Commissioner Lusk sought clarification on page four, New Facility Goals by 2013, regarding the equestrian center and whether it was strictly a public or private facility. Ms. Tadlock confirmed that it could be either and due to new development, stated a need for a facility to stable horses and offer riding instruction to the general public. She noted that Frying Pan Park served a different market and confirmed that it could be a facility where a child could ride a horse.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hart, Ms. Tadlock stated that the location of the equestrian facility had not yet been determined since they were still looking for appropriate facilities. She added that their standard indicated one facility but that another could be added later. She indicated that one was planned for the Laurel Hill development, and an additional one was possible on the Hunter-Hacor property.

Ms. Shapiro asserted that the items listed by the Park Board were only goals and she did not believe them to be limiting. She added that although some commonly seen items in parks were not listed, it did not mean they would no longer be built. She said the intent was to give a broad picture of a larger type of facility, and develop a financial plan and other mechanisms that would result in a balanced parks system.

Hearing no further questions, Chairman de la Fe asked staff to discuss the Park Policy Plan.

Ms. Stallman explained that the Park Policy Plan had not been updated since 1990 although there was an effort in 1996 that was endorsed by the Commission but not adopted by the Board. She said they would use the needs assessment information as a basis for the new review and had devised a two-phase, system-wide approach.

Ms. Stallman stated that while the emphasis was on the policy portion of the Comprehensive Plan, staff had also reviewed recommendations in the Area Plans. She said they had identified draft changes to the Park element of the Policy Plan for Phase I, and would possibly incorporate some of the 1996 recommendations, using standards from the needs assessment, and reviewing the Park Classification Appendix. She mentioned that the Board had deferred an Out of Turn Plan Amendment and had asked for draft guidance on the types of land that might be designated for public park use. She added that they were also asked to clarify that park land did not have to be designated as such in the Area Plans to be acquired as Park property.

Ms. Stallman said they hoped to schedule the public hearings for Phase I before the Commission prior to the upcoming APR public hearings, which would begin in April 2005. In Phase II, she said they would review the Area Plans and park charts recommendations, using the Policy Plan as a guide.

Ms. Stallman identified process participants as including a staff team who working closely with DPZ and the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority (NVRPA). She said they had invited a group of stakeholders to review the draft language and mentioned that Commissioner de la Fe would represent the Planning Commission. She advised that there would be a lot of public input during the needs assessment and with the Resource Management Plan just adopted. She said the list of reviewers and proposed schedule was also provided in the handout on the last page.

In response to Commissioner Byers' timetable question, she said they were on schedule, that the staff team had been meeting since the middle of July, had already drafted some language, and that stakeholders had been appointed and would begin meetings next week.

Commissioner Hart posed a procedural question regarding citizen nominations. He noted that nominations regarding parks had not been allowed during the Area Plan Reviews, and it did not now appear that citizens could make park-related nominations in this process either. So, he inquired, when was the appropriate time?

Fred Selden, Planning Division, DPZ, said that there was a distinction between elements of the Comprehensive Plan that were County-wide in nature and site-specific nominations. He said the Department of Planning and Zoning had specifically set up the process so that the County-wide amendments would be drafted by staff for consideration at public hearing, to avoid the unproductive type of processing done in 1996. He said the currently-approved APR process was in two phases, with Phase I being County-wide policies. What they were proposing, he said, was that a draft be developed for the public to review and comment without being nomination-driven.

In Phase II, Mr. Selden added, there could be an opportunity for the public to present comments or recommendations, similar to the process with the Transportation Plan. He said they were making a clear distinction between the Area Plan Review process which encompassed site-specific land-use items and County-wide systems and elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Hart indicated that the distinction should be clarified before Phase II, and commented that a misrouted nomination might be moved into Phase II so that the public could still be heard.

Commissioner Byers recalled that during the last APR process, a number of nominations were supported regarding use as a park. Mr. Selden conceded that the only nominations accepted in the last APR round were those not changing the base land-use recommendation for the policy. He explained that the nomination that Commissioner Hart referenced was very specific as it related to Park Authority property and was not an "option." He added that his staff had advised that individual to revise the nomination because, as presented, it had not met submission requirements.

Chairman de la Fe expressed concern about the timing, and the description as Phase II, since it was the same period that the Commission would review the second half of the County's general APR process. Even though he acknowledged that the separation of Phase I and II was better, Chairman de la Fe thought there should be further discussion at the upcoming stakeholders meeting.

Mr. Selden agreed that the stakeholders could review it. He said his staff recognized the challenges of the APR processes, but had to slide in between APR various County-wide amendments, such as Transportation and Park Plans, but he held that although the schedule was ambitious, it was necessary to take advantage of that window before the South County task forces began in Fall 2005.

Ms. Shapiro stated her appreciation for expediting the process and her belief that Commissioner de la Fe's concerns on timing were valid. She also expressed concern that citizens might be confused trying to straighten out all the different threads of those processes. Ms. Tadlock asserted that those same concerns had been presented to Board Chairman Connolly.

Ms. Tadlock clarified a question from Commissioner Byers about the amount of funding that was available and reiterated that besides proffers, FCPA would search out public/private ventures in an effort to supplement their funding goals. One such venture, she noted, was to bolster an effort at Laurel Hill by developing a sports complex which was a part of the adopted master plan, with hope of acquiring a building partner.

There was some discussion of the amount of funding that would be needed and Chairman de la Fe reminded members that the 2004 bond proposal was originally supposed to be \$50M, with a recommendation from the Commission that it be increased to \$70M. He noted that the Board had only approved an additional \$15M rather than \$20M for that bond.

Ms. Shapiro acknowledged the search for non-traditional mechanisms such as the Park Foundation, which Chairman de la Fe had been instrumental in getting off the ground when he chaired the Park Authority. She said the Board was considering such things as naming rights, and what could be done to make parks attractive for corporate contributions to make up for the \$50M gap. Before adjourning, Chairman de la Fe mentioned that only twelve years earlier the gap was \$800M, so much progress had been made.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.  
Frank de la Fe, Chairman

An audio recording of this meeting is available at the Planning Commission Office, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Norma Duncan

Approved: April 28, 2005

---

Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk  
Fairfax County Planning Commission