

**FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
POLICY AND PROCEDURES COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 11, 2008**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Walter L. Alcorn, At-Large
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District
Janet R. Hall, Mason District
Suzanne F. Harsel, Braddock District
James R. Hart, At-Large
Kenneth Lawrence, Providence District
Timothy J. Sargeant, At-Large

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

OTHER COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
Jay P. Donahue, Dranesville District

STAFF PRESENT:

Barbara J. Lippa, Executive Director, Planning Commission Office
Kara A. DeArrastia, Deputy Clerk, Planning Commission

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

David Marshall, Assistant Director, Planning Division (PD)
David Jillson, PD
Sandi Smith, PD

//

Chairman Janet R. Hall called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m. in the Board Conference Room at 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

Commissioner Alcorn MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF MARCH 5, 2008 BE APPROVED.

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 4-0-1 with Commissioner Harsel abstaining.

//

Chairman Hall said the purpose of the meeting was to discuss procedures to handle approximately 90 applications for 2232 review that were expected to be filed over the next few months.

David Marshall, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), stated that the applications would be filed by a new cellular wireless provider, Cricket Communications, and should be forwarded to the Planning Commission between September and November 2008. He said Cricket would be collocating its facilities on existing monopoles, towers, and other suitable structures with three cylindrical antennas each measuring 72x6.2 inches with one equipment cabinet, 64x30x12 inches.

Mr. Marshall said staff had discussed several options to streamline the process. In response to a question from Chairman Hall, Mr. Marshall said the attorney for Cricket Communications, Catherine Blue, Esquire, with Donohue and Blue, did not want to submit them by district. Commissioner Lawrence suggested that the Planning Commission act on them by district regardless of the order in which they were submitted. Commissioner Hart pointed out that there were timeframes involved within which to act on the applications and if they were filed in a haphazard manner, they could be pulled for public hearing.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Sargeant, Mr. Marshall said based on a preliminary list provided by Cricket, 74 applications had been broken down by district as shown on page 2 of his memorandum to the Policy and Procedures Committee dated June 6, 2008. (A copy of the memorandum is in the date file.) He said grouping them by districts could present a problem for staff if they had to evaluate a large number of applications at one time. Mr. Marshall said eight applications for existing monopole sites owned by American Tower had already been received.

In response to a question from Commissioner Harsel, Mr. Marshall said Cricket provided a discount wireless system with no long-term contracts.

Commissioner Sargeant said that as an employee of a utility company he would have to recuse himself if facilities were collocated on a transmission line or utility pole. He said he would want them grouped in such a way that it would be easy for him to ascertain where they were being placed.

In response to a question from Commissioner Donohue, Mr. Marshall said the applications would probably be filed over the next several months and that the Planning Commission had 150 days to act from the date of acceptance.

Mr. Jillson said the applicant had informed staff that they needed all applications approved by December 2008 in order to meet their launch date of May 2009 and although they had not expedited the submission of the applications, they had not indicated a willingness to change their schedule.

Responding to a question from Chairman Hall, Mr. Marshall said Cricket Communications did not think it would be possible to group the applications by district. Chairman Hall said perhaps they could be grouped contiguously by district.

Commissioner Lawrence said he would like to see the staff reports contain a level of detail so that it could be determined if suitable alternate sites had been considered.

In response to a question from Commissioner de la Fe, Mr. Marshall said the applications could be handled as Consent Agenda items. Mr. Marshall said staff was trying to consolidate the existing staff reports as much as possible so that there were only a couple of pages rather than four or five. He also suggested that instead of providing every Commissioner with the attachments, which were usually 10-12 pages, they be given only to the district commissioner to reduce time and cost. He said they would be packaged by district if possible and suggested that only one motion be made for all of the applications which included each case number and address.

In response to a question from Commissioner Flanagan, Mr. Marshall said a district commissioner would get a staff report with attachments which could be reviewed by a land use committee and scheduled for a 2232 public hearing process if so desired.

Commissioner Alcorn said a single motion could be made for several cases indicating “without objection, Commissioner Sargeant recused himself from the vote” if a facility was located on a transmission tower. Mr. Marshall said perhaps all the transmission tower applications could be grouped together.

Chairman Hall said she would like all staffs report to show photo simulations of the current configuration and what the facility would look like with the proposed modification.

Commissioner Lawrence said he would like to get the same level of detail for applications in his district that was currently provided.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Harsel, Mr. Jillson said that most monopoles and towers were now owned by American Tower and one other large nationwide company, not individual carriers such as Verizon, Sprint, etc.

In response to a concern raised by Commissioner Harsel, Chairman Hall said complete information would be provided to the district commissioner and would be available to other commissioners upon request. Mr. Marshall agreed and said that the district commissioner would get an application within a week of filing and the staff report would be available within 35-40 days.

Commissioner Sargeant said it was imperative for him to know if a facility was to be located on a utility transmission or distribution pole and the identify of owner of the pole or easement so he could determine if he should recuse himself from voting. Mr. Marshall said staff could make sure that information was provided in the staff report and added that at-large commissioners would get a copy of the consolidated staff report but not the attachments.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Flanagan, Mr. Marshall explained that since Cricket Communications was a new company requesting collocation on existing structures, the applications would not be “Feature Shown” amendments.

Sandi Smith responded to a question from Commissioner Sargeant about the status of FS-L07-61, Fairfax County Park Authority.

Commissioner Alcorn requested that the staff reports be made available online.

Commissioner Alcorn suggested that staff and the applicant discuss an approach to be presented to the committee and another meeting scheduled if necessary.

Mr. Marshall requested that the committee clarify how it wanted these applications to be handled. Chairman Hall said to inform the applicant that the committee wanted them grouped and was willing to consider different approaches, such as by district, contiguous districts, or types. She also said to indicate to the applicant that it was necessary to identify those facilities to be located on a utility transmission or distribution pole and the owner of a pole or easement. Commissioner Alcorn requested that all property owners be identified.

Responding to another question from Mr. Marshall, committee members said they were comfortable with condensed staff reports. Chairman Hall reiterated her desire for photo simulations of the facilities.

Commissioner Lawrence suggested applications that could not be handled as part of a group be scheduled for individual review, similar to Area Plans Review nominations. Chairman Hall agreed. Mr. Marshall said it might be necessary for each district to have two packages of applications.

Mr. Jillson said since the applications might require interpretation of zoning issues; they all may not be returned at the same time.

In response to a question from Commissioner Harsel, Mr. Jillson said if a carrier wanted to collocate a fourth antenna on a pole that had only been approved for three, the carrier could file a “feature shown” application for the fourth one.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 8:18 p.m.
Janet R. Hall, Chairman

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

Minutes by: Linda B. Rodeffer

Approved on: September 24, 2008

Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk
Fairfax County Planning Commission