

**FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
POLICY AND PROCEDURES COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, MAY 12, 2005**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Walter A. Alcorn, At-Large
John R. Byers, Mount Vernon District
Janet R. Hall, Mason District
Suzanne F. Harsel, Braddock District
James R. Hart, at-Large
Nancy Hopkins, Dranesville District
Laurie Frost Wilson, At-Large

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

None

OTHER PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District

OTHERS PRESENT:

Fred Selden, Director, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)
Alison Kriviskey, PD, DPZ
Charlene Fuhrman-Schultz, PD, DPZ
Sara Robin Hardy, Assistant Director, Planning Commission Office
Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk, Planning Commission Office

//

Chairman Janet R. Hall called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Conference Room, Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

Chairman Hall noted that tonight the Committee would be briefed on the on-going review of the Policy Plan.

//

Fred Selden, Director, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), announced that Alison Kriviskey was retiring at the end of June and that Charlene Fuhrman-Schultz had would assume lead responsibilities on the 2005-2006 South County Area Plans Review (APR).

Mr. Selden distributed a copy of the Board of Supervisors Consideration Item from 2001 with the Planning Commission's recommendations regarding the Comprehensive Plan Review Process 2001 to 2005 (Countywide), a copy of which is in the date file. He called the committee's attention to page 2, item 3, Policy Planning, concerning the process for updating the Policy Plan, noting that the Board of Supervisors had endorsed the Planning Commission's recommendation that amendments to the County's Policy Plan be considered as a result of policy studies or other initiatives on an on-going basis rather than awaiting a particular year. He said reviews of stream protection, revitalization, telecommunications, and other modifications of the Policy Plan had been done in accordance with this initiative. He pointed out that a review of three elements of the Policy Plan, public facilities, parks, and transportation, had also been undertaken.

Mr. Selden also distributed another Board of Supervisors Information Item dated November 19, 2001, concerning the schedule for review of the public facilities, parks and recreation, and transportation sections of the Policy Plan with an update attached dated April 12, 2005, a copy of which is in the date file. He said review of all sections had been completed, as shown on the attachment, except the following:

- Drainage and stormwater management review – postponed based on watershed planning and other ongoing initiatives;
- Parks and recreation review – scheduled for a Planning Commission recommendation tonight;
- Schools review – not as heavily tied to standards as other sections and no completion date has been determined.
- Transportation review – to be completed in late 2005.

Mr. Selden noted that this schedule did not preclude staff from looking at other Policy Plan elements, such as the Housing section based on the recent Affordable Preservation Committee and their recommendations.

Mr. Selden agreed with Commissioner Alcorn's request that staff contact either the Policy and Procedures Committee or the Housing Committee before advertising amendments to the Housing section.

Commissioner Hart cautioned against a piecemeal approach and said staff should ensure that Plan reviews took place within the legally established time frame.

Commissioner Alcorn commented that a State statute required localities to review their Comprehensive Plans every five years, but that "review" was not defined. Chairman Hall pointed out that a review could be a determination that the Plan did not need to be amended.

Mr. Selden commented that now was the time to discuss the Plan review process, specifically what had been achieved as well as what had not been achieved, and to recommend changes to the process. He noted that a Draft of "Plan Amendment Activity" had also been distributed, listing activity which had taken place on Area Plans, 2000-2005; Policy Plan, 2000-2005; and Area Plan Review 2001-2002, to give the Committee some sense of what had taken place in a five year period. (A copy of this document is in the date file.)

Mr. Selden stated that in the past the term "Out-of-Turn Plan Amendment" had been used to identify anything that was being considered outside of the regular APR cycle, including special studies on specific areas, such as Merrifield, and policy initiatives such as the Chesapeake Bay supplement. He said reviews would now be specifically identified, for example, policy initiatives or amendments associated with special studies.

Responding to a comment from Chairman Hall, Mr. Selden agreed that the Planning Commission did not certify to the Commonwealth of Virginia that a review of the Comprehensive Plan had been conducted.

Commissioner Alcorn suggested that perhaps a hybrid of both the old and the new process would be best. Chairman Hall agreed because she said it was the Commissioners, Supervisors, and staff who knew best when a review was needed, but at the same time citizens needed to know when a review was scheduled if they had specific concerns.

In response to a question from Commissioner Harsel, Ms. Kriviskey said that there were approximately 15 or 16 elements in the Policy Plan. Commissioner Harsel said if those elements were reviewed at the same time as the Area Plans were reviewed, perhaps the At-Large Commissioners could handle them.

Responding to a question from Chairman Hall, Mr. Selden said reviewing both Area Plans and the Policy Plan at the same time could be labor intensive and non-productive because often the nominator of a Policy Plan change was never heard from again after a detailed review and analysis had been done by staff. Chairman Hall commented that, even so, a review had been done on that portion of the Plan.

Mr. Selden cautioned against reviewing the Policy Plan too frequently because policies, which were meant to provide a framework for decision making and were tied to the goals of the Board of Supervisors, should be broad and given enough time to be implemented. He said this was especially true of Countywide initiatives.

Commissioner Wilson expressed concern that recommendations for transportation improvements could not be included in nominations for the most recent APR cycles. Mr. Selden pointed out that citizen comment on the Transportation Section was open until May 31 and that each comment received would be summarized and responded to by Department of Transportation staff.

Commissioner Alcorn suggested that when recommendations for changes to elements of the Policy Plan were solicited, a new process should be established for evaluation, without detailed staff analysis, and those with merit presented to the Planning Commission for review. Mr. Selden agreed with this approach, pointing out that it would provide a screening process. He added that feedback on the current transportation comment period might be useful in developing a new approach.

With regard to a hybrid system, Commissioner Wilson said that because some of the elements, such as transportation, schools, and trails, might need to be amended more frequently, perhaps a nomination process was needed and could be part of the APR cycle review but identified by a different name.

Commissioner Harsel suggested that perhaps meetings could be held around the County to address specific elements of the Policy Plan as had been done in the past.

Commissioner Hart concurred with the approach suggested by Commissioner Alcorn and said the current review of the Transportation element did not allow citizens to actually nominate changes. He said perhaps there should be a procedure whereby citizens could suggest changes which would be vetted at the committee level and those with merit would go forward.

Ms. Kriviskey said from staff's perspective, it was critically important that a hybrid system allow staff the opportunity to review the entire element, even if comments/nominations were not received for specific sections.

Summarizing the discussion, Chairman Hall said the Committee was recommending that the APR cycle consist of three parts, North County review, South County review and Policy Plan review. She said new procedures would have to be established which would allow staff to review an entire element which would then be vetted before the Committee after which the Planning Commission would determine which elements would be included for review during the APR process. She added that this would not require a detailed staff analysis but would ensure that worthwhile changes could be made.

Responding to a question from Ms. Kriviskey, Chairman Hall said that this process would allow staff to make suggestions.

Mr. Selden said staff would like to begin a dialogue with the Committee in the fall because there were aspects of the Comprehensive Plan, other than use, density, and intensity, which needed attention, such as editing the character section of Area Plans and updating recommendations which had been implemented. He pointed out that had been done in the past as part of the APR process and that a recodification might be necessary which would include redrafting, receiving input, and adoption. He added that he thought it needed to be treated the same as a major Plan review.

Chairman Hall requested that Mr. Selden's staff provide the Committee with a list of those areas that need to be reviewed and recommendations for how they should be reviewed.

Sara Robin Hardy, Assistant Director, Planning Commission Office, pointed out that tonight's discussion was the beginning of a dialogue and policy changes did not have to be adopted immediately. She also said that recommendations for changes to the review process would have to be presented to the full Planning Commission as well as the Board of Supervisors.

Chairman Hall agreed, but said it would be helpful to narrow the focus and have written recommendations that Committee members could review before the next meeting.

Mr. Selden agreed with Ms. Hardy and said this was the beginning of a lengthy dialogue. Chairman Hall commented that she realized staff time to work on this might be limited, but at least the Committee would have an idea of what needed to be accomplished. Commissioner Alcorn pointed out that if changes were made now, they would not become effective until 2007-08.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.
Janet R. Hall, Chairman

For a verbatim record of this meeting, reference may be made to the audio recording which can be found in the Office of the Planning Commission of Fairfax County, Virginia.

Minutes by: Linda B. Rodeffer

Approved: November 16, 2005

Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk
Fairfax County Planning Commission

Attachments:

Board of Supervisors Consideration Item dated March 19, 2001 – The Planning Commission's Recommendations Regarding the Proposed Plan Review Process, 2001-2005 (Countywide)

Board of Supervisors Information Item dated November 19, 2001 – Schedule of Policy Plan Review For Public Facilities, Parks and Recreation, and Transportation Sections

Draft Plan Amendment Activity dated May 11, 2005

Editor's Note: The Planning Commission recommended approval of OTPA S01-CW-15CP (Parks) on May 12, 2005 and it was approved by the Board of Supervisors on June 20, 2005.

Memo to the Board
March 19, 2001

CONSIDERATION

THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS
REGARDING THE PROPOSED PLAN REVIEW PROCESS,
2001 TO 2005 (COUNTYWIDE).

ISSUE:

In the Fall of 1999, the Planning Commission, with support from Department of Planning and Zoning staff, began an examination of the process used by the County to review its Comprehensive Plan. This examination looked at the full range of activities related to the review and amendment of the Comprehensive Plan (the four Area Plans as well as the Policy Plan).

On March 1, 2001 the Planning Commission voted unanimously (Commissioner Alcorn not present for the vote; Commissioner Murphy absent from the meeting) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors endorse a proposed Plan review process for the time period 2001 through 2005. This process is outlined in the memorandum and attachments, dated March 2, 2001, from John Byers to the Board of Supervisors. As recommended by the Planning Commission, Plan review would consist of the following components:

1. **Area Plan Review (APR)** - The APR process would be divided so that half the County is the subject of APR in each of two consecutive years. The County would be divided along Supervisor district lines. The North County APR cycle would include the Dranesville, Hunter Mill, Providence and Sully districts. The public process for this cycle would begin in mid-May 2001 with the submission of nominations. The South County APR cycle would begin in January 2002 and include the Braddock, Lee, Mason, Mt. Vernon and Springfield districts. The APR process would be repeated with a North County cycle in 2004 and a South County cycle in 2005. A draft "Citizen's Guide to the 2001 North County Cycle" has been prepared and is being reviewed by the Planning Commission. This

Memo to the Board
March 19, 2001

guide which outlines the procedures that will be used in preparing, submitting and reviewing nominations will be forwarded to the Board following its endorsement by the Planning Commission.

2. **Plan Monitoring** - Plan Monitoring would take place from January 2003 through December 2003. Staff would be assemble data to assess the cumulative effects of planning decisions made in prior years and identify planning initiatives that may be needed in future years.

3. **Policy Planning** - Amendments to the County's Policy Plan would be considered as a result of policy studies or other initiatives authorized by the Board of Supervisors on an on-going basis rather than awaiting a particular year. The Policy Review Year previously featured in the Plan review process would be replaced with this more dynamic and responsive approach to addressing policy issues. In addition, a review of the County's public facilities would be conducted on a scheduled basis designed to review all of the public facilities sections of the Policy Plan in a five-year period. A proposed schedule for this review will be developed by the Planning Commission, in consultation with staff, based upon the complexity and the need to revise the particular public facility component. This schedule will be forwarded to the Board for its endorsement, prior to beginning the activity. A similar approach is proposed for reviewing the Countywide Transportation Plan. This review would occur every three or four years and would most likely be conducted in conjunction with the analysis of the regional transportation network by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

4. **Special Planning Studies** - Special Studies would continue to be authorized by the Board of Supervisors when issues of great complexity or scope need to be addressed. These types of planning efforts will usually involve a Board-appointed community task force.

Memo to the Board
March 19, 2001

5. **Out-of-Turn Plan Amendments** - The Planning Commission proposes to change the name for Plan amendments that are considered outside of the APR cycle from "Out-of-Turn" to "Proposed" Plan amendments. As recommended by the Commission, these Proposed Plan amendments would be based on an identifiable public benefit and the willingness of a property owner to provide specific details when a change in use, density or intensity is requested. A statement of justification would be provided whenever an administrative or technical correction to the Plan is proposed. A detailed discussion of this concept, along with a set of draft guidelines, will be prepared by staff for consideration and endorsement by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

TIMING:

The Planning Commission's recommendation for Plan review would result in the following schedule of activities:

North County APR	2001
South County APR	
2002	
Plan Monitoring	2003
North County APR	2004
South County APR	2005

Policy studies, special land use studies and proposed Plan amendments would be conducted on an on-going basis throughout this proposed Plan review time period. A schedule for public facilities and transportation plan review will be developed and forwarded to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for consideration at a later date.

BACKGROUND:

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

ENCLOSED DOCUMENTS:

Memo to the Board
March 19, 2001

Attachment 1 - Memorandum to the Board of Supervisors from John Byers, Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission, dated March 2, 2001
Attachment 2 - March 1, 2001 Planning Commission verbatim.

STAFF:

Anthony H. Griffin, County Executive
Robert A. Stalzer, Deputy County Executive
James P. Zook, Director, Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)
Fred Selden, Director, Planning Division, DPZ
Robert L. Moore, Chief, Transportation Planning Division, Department of Transportation

Memo to the Board
November 19, 2001

INFORMATION -

SCHEDULE OF POLICY PLAN REVIEW FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES, PARKS AND RECREATION AND TRANSPORTATION SECTIONS.

On September 19, 2001, the Fairfax County Planning Commission approved staff's recommended schedule for the review of public facilities, parks and recreation and transportation sections of the Policy Plan. This action was taken as part of the Planning Commission's review of the Citizen's Guide for 2002 Area Plans Review (see the Planning Commission verbatim, Attachment 1). The order of review by functional area is shown in Attachment 2.

Subsequent to the Planning Commission's approval of this schedule, the public hearing for the proposed Plan Amendment on trails was deferred by the Planning Commission to early 2002. Staff has modified the schedule to reflect this deferral. Staff has also modified the schedule for the review of the telecommunications section as additional time is needed for Telecommunications Task Force's deliberations. The public hearing on the proposed Plan Amendment on telecommunications is now anticipated to occur in mid 2002.

The schedule takes into consideration complexities of anticipated issues, current and future studies and coordination with interested groups. The schedule identifies a target for when each functional area will be considered and heard before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. The review time preceding the public hearings will vary among functional areas in order to be responsive to individual agency needs and to provide an opportunity for review by appropriate task forces.

The schedule anticipates beginning with consideration of the trails component in early 2002 and concluding with the transportation section in late 2004. The schedule is in accordance with the approved Comprehensive Plan Review Process, 2001 to 2005, which prescribes a review of public facilities, parks and recreation and transportation sections of the Policy Plan within a five-year period.

Unless otherwise advised, the Department of Planning and Zoning will proceed to implement the review of the public facilities, parks and recreation and transportation sections of the Policy Plan in accordance with the schedule approved by the Planning Commission and further modified by staff, as previously described.

Memo to the Board
November 19, 2001

ENCLOSED DOCUMENTS:

Attachment 1 - Planning Commission Verbatim for September 19, 2001
Attachment 2 - 2001-2005 Proposed Schedule of Policy Plan Review for Public Facilities, Parks and Recreation and Transportation Sections

STAFF:

Robert A. Stalzer, Deputy County Executive
James P. Zook, Director, Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)
Fred R. Selden, Director, Planning Division (PD), DPZ
David B. Marshall, Chief, Facilities Planning Branch, PD, DPZ
Pamela G. Nee, Planner III, Facilities Planning Branch, PD, DPZ

**2001-2005 Schedule of Policy Plan Review
for Public Facilities, Parks and Recreation and Transportation Sections
(As of 4/12/05)**

Functional Area	Staff Contact	Consideration(s)	Anticipated Review/Revision *	Public Hearing Target
Trails	Sheng Leu	Coordination w/ Trails Committee	major	Completed 2002
Telecommunications	David Marshall	Coordination w/ Telecommunications Task Force	major	Completed 2003
Water	Jamie Bain	Coordination with Water Authority	minor	Completed 2002
Solid Waste	Jeff Smithberger		minor	Completed 2003
Sewer	Richard Gozikowski		minor	Completed 2002
Equipment Management	Frank Knapp		minor	Completed 2002
Electrical Supply	Pamela Nee	Coordination with Dominion Va Power & NOVEC	minor	Completed 2003
Libraries	Sam Clay	Coordination with Library Board	minor	Completed 2002
Police	Major Chuck Peters		minor	Completed 2005
Animal Shelter	Diane Townsend-Cook		minor	Completed 2004
Sheriff	Capt. Bill Heston		minor	Completed 2004
Courts	Jane Deliee, Circuit Court & Suzy Swain, General District Court		minor	Completed 2004
Fire and Rescue	Susan Herbert	Completion of revised Fire and Rescue Master Plan	major	Completed 2004
Drainage & Stormwater Management	Scott St. Clair	Completion of Strategic Plan and Tactical Plan; coordination with EQAC	major	late 2003 TBD
Parks and Recreation	Ted Zavera Sandy Stallman	Completion of Needs Assessment Study, FY 2002; coordination with Park Authority	major	early 2004 early 2005
Schools	Gary Chevalier	Completion of proposed Schools Proffer Study; coordination with School Board	major	early 2004 TBD
Transportation	Bob Moore Leonard Wolfenstein	Completion of Plan Monitoring; Coordination with Transportation Advisory Commission	major	late 2004 late 2005

* It is estimated that a "minor" review/revision will take approximately three-six months from initiation to adoption. "Major" reviews/revisions are expected to take more than six months to complete.

Plan Amendment Activity - Area Plans
2000 – 2005

Year	OTPA	Deferred APR	Special Study	Policy Plan/ Countywide	CRD	Total
2001	8	0	4	0	1	13
2002	3	0	2	5	1	11
2003	4	2	0	1	3	10
2004	3	1	1	3	3	11
2005 (Jan.-Apr.)	4	0	0	1	0	5
Total	22	3	8	9	8	50

Plan Amendment Activity - Policy Plan
2000 – 2005

Year	Policy Plan Amendments
2001	0
2002	8
2003	2
2004	4
2005 (Jan.–Apr.)	1
Total	15

Plan Amendment Activity – Area Plans Review
2001 – 2002

Year	Area Plans Review
2001 North County Review	48
2002 South County Review	44
Total	92