

**FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
POLICY AND PROCEDURES COMMITTEE  
WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 2007**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Walter L. Alcorn, At-Large  
Janet R. Hall, Mason District  
Suzanne F. Harsel, Braddock District  
James R. Hart, At-Large  
Kenneth Lawrence, Providence District  
Rodney Lusk, Lee District

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District  
Nancy Hopkins, Dranesville District

OTHER PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Peter F. Murphy, Jr., Springfield District  
Timothy J. Sargeant, At-Large

STAFF PRESENT:

Marianne Gardner, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)  
Clara Quintero Johnson, PD, DPZ  
Anna Bentley, PD, DPZ  
Barbara J. Lipa, Executive Director, Planning Commission Office  
Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk, Planning Commission Office

OTHERS PRESENT:

Daniel Rathbone, Chief, Transportation Planning Division, Fairfax County Department of Transportation  
Paul Kraucunas, Manager, Land Development Section, Northern Virginia District, Virginia Department of Transportation  
Lynne Strobel, Esquire, Walsh, Colucci, Emrich, Lubeley, and Walsh

//

In the temporary absence of Chairman Janet R. Hall, Planning Commission Vice Chairman Walter L. Alcorn called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. in the Board Conference Room at 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia. He noted that the first order of business was approval of minutes.

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 24, 2007 POLICY AND PROCEDURES COMMITTEE MEETING BE APPROVED.

The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

//

Vice Chairman Alcorn announced that the committee would be briefed by Paul Kraucunas, Manager, Land Development Section, Northern Virginia District, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), on recently passed legislation that would impact the land use application process, followed by discussion of the upcoming Area Plans Review (APR) and Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) schedule.

Mr. Kraucunas explained that legislation had been approved in 2006, Senate Bill 699, Chapter 527 of the 2006 Acts of Assembly, to provide localities with factual information about the impact of land use decisions on the transportation network. He explained that it was up to jurisdictions to decide if applications should be sent to VDOT and that the regulations were not intended to give VDOT more authority, but were for information purposes only.

Mr. Kraucunas distributed a "Traffic Impact Analysis Regulations Training" manual, a copy of which is in the date file, noting that criteria for establishing thresholds included: (1) submission type; i.e., Comprehensive Plan amendments, i.e., zoning applications, special use permits; (2) traffic volume generated by the development; (3) type of development; and (4) location.

Mr. Kraucunas explained that a proposal that would generate 5,000 additional vehicle trips per day on state-controlled highways would be considered a "substantial impact."

In response to a question from Commissioner Alcorn, Mr. Kraucunas said for the purpose of determining thresholds, raw data would be used.

Chairman Hall said she did not like to use a figure such as 5,000 because it implied that 4,999 trips would not have a substantial impact. Mr. Kraucunas said that had been recognized but a benchmark had to be provided. He said the County could request review of a proposal that would generate less than 5,000 additional trips.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Harsel, Mr. Kraucunas said thresholds would not include by-pass trips.

Mr. Kraucunas said a substantial change would be a proposal that would alter future transportation infrastructure, travel patterns, or the ability to improve future transportation facilities, including expansion of agricultural or forestal districts. He explained that in a case where open space would be reserved, VDOT review would be important if it was adjacent to a roadway that was likely to be widened in the future.

Chairman Hall commented that identification of a potential negative impact on transportation would not prohibit approval of an application. Mr. Kraucunas agreed.

Marianne Gardner, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), and Daniel Rathbone, Chief, Transportation Planning Division, Fairfax County Department of Transportation, responded to questions about the current VDOT review procedure.

In response to a question from Commissioner Alcorn, Mr. Kraucunas said VDOT would review the recommendations of the Tysons Task Force because it would be a substantial change.

Mr. Kraucunas said if a rezoning application was filed subsequent to a Plan Amendment, the rezoning request would be reviewed by VDOT.

Mr. Kraucunas commented that in residential development, the threshold was an additional 100 vehicle trips in a peak hour and in non-residential development, 250 additional trips.

Commissioner Alcorn said that when the residential development criteria had been developed several years ago, it was realized that Fairfax County had a surplus of jobs and a deficit of housing; therefore, it didn't make sense to try to offset the impact of new residential construction on the transportation system because in many cases it was taking cars off overly congested regional roads and putting them onto more localized roads where there was more capacity. He asked if that would be a consideration in the review process. Mr. Kraucunas replied that it could be and reiterated that the County did not have to follow VDOT's recommendations.

Mr. Kraucunas that if a residential site were to generate more than 200 vehicles per day and double existing traffic, the proposal would be required to be submitted to VDOT.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Alcorn, Mr. Kraucunas said even if a road was not under VDOT's jurisdiction, it would still be subject to the threshold.

Mr. Kraucunas noted that if redevelopment would result in a denser or different use, trips currently generated by the existing development that would be removed could be deducted from the total trips generated by the proposed use.

Mr. Kraucunas reviewed the fee schedule as shown on pages 19 and 20 of Module 1 of the training manual.

In response to a question from Commissioner Alcorn, Mr. Kraucunas said there would be no fees for submissions on behalf of government entities.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Hart, Ms. Gardner said if an APR nomination met the threshold, a fee would be required.

In response to a question from Commissioner de la Fe, Mr. Kraucunas said if VDOT requirements changed after the original submission which required additional fees, it could be appealed.

Mr. Kraucunas said the required elements of a Comprehensive Plan Transportation package included: a cover sheet with contacts and a summary of major changes; an inventory of the existing transportation system; an explanation of planning assumptions; a needs assessment; and recommendations. He said VDOT could assist localities in this process.

Mr. Kraucunas reviewed study elements, scoping meetings, and the required elements of a traffic impact analysis as shown on page 5 of Module 2.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Lawrence, Mr. Kraucunas said both VDOT and the County would comment on Travel Demand Management measures. Mr. Kraucunas added that VDOT wanted to know if the measures were enforceable and if penalties would be imposed. Mr. Kraucunas said additional information was contained in the training manual and would be available on the VDOT website.

//

Clara Quintero Johnson, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, distributed a timeline for the upcoming Area Plans Review cycle and said it could be approved by the full Planning Commission tonight. (Note: The timeline was approved by the Planning Commission on July 26, 2007, a copy of which is in the date file.)

In response to a question from Commissioner Hart, Marianne Gardner, PD, DPZ, said a delay in implementation of BRAC would not force a delay of the South County cycle.

Commissioner Lusk commented that the task force would have to review both BRAC and regular APR nominations at the same time.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Harsel, Ms. Johnson said that the proposed timeline met the State requirements for Plan review.

Commissioner Sargeant pointed out that if a VDOT review suggested substantial changes, additional task force meetings would be required. Chairman Hall proposed adding "Task Force/VDOT review of nominations as needed." Staff agreed.

In response to a question from Commissioner de la Fe, Chairman Hall said that a decision had not yet been made regarding submittal of nominations that had been subject of a special study.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Sargeant, Ms. Gardner said that special studies, such as the Annandale Central Business Center study, would not impact the APR schedule.

The Committee agreed to present the proposed timeline to the full Commission tonight for approval.

//

ADJOURNMENT

July 26, 2007

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 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: October 3, 2007

---

Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk  
Fairfax County Planning Commission