**MINUTES OF**
**FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**
**THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2007**

PRESENT: Walter L. Alcorn, Commissioner At-Large
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District
Janet R. Hall, Mason District
Suzanne F. Harsel, Braddock District
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large
Nancy Hopkins, Dranesville District
Ronald W. Koch, Sully District
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District
Rodney L. Lusk, Lee District
Peter F. Murphy, Jr., Springfield District
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: None

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:16 p.m. by Chairman Peter F. Murphy, Jr., in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center at 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE DECISION ONLY ON RZ/FDP 2006-PR-022, VAN METRE HOMES AT SUNCREST, LLC, BE FURTHER DEFERRED TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MARCH 22, 2007.

Commissioner Lusk seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE DECISION ON SE 2006-PR-023, WONDER KIDS CHILD CARE, INC., BE DEFERRED INDEFINITELY.

Commissioner Lusk seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE JOINT PUBLIC HEARING ON RZ/FDP 2006-PR-027 AND SEA 00-P-050, TCR MID-ATLANTIC PROPERTIES AND FAIRFAX RIDGE DEVELOPMENT AND UNIT OWNERS ASSOCIATION, BE DEFERRED TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MARCH 22, 2007.

Commissioner Lusk seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

Commissioner de la Fe MOVED THAT THE PUBLIC HEARING ON RZ 2006-HM-024, SEKAS HOMES, LTD, BE DEFERRED TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MARCH 14, 2007.

Commissioner Hopkins seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

Commissioner Hart announced that a public workshop for the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment on Large Retail Sales Establishments, otherwise known as “big box” stores, would be held on Tuesday, February 27, 2007 from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. in Conference Rooms 4 and 5 of the Government Center.

//

Chairman Murphy congratulated Jimmie Jenkins, Director, Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, for celebrating his 30-year anniversary with Fairfax County.

//

Commissioner Lusk MOVED THAT THE JOINT PUBLIC HEARING ON RZ/FDP 2006-LE-026, EASTWOOD PROPERTIES, INC., BE DEFERRED TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MARCH 22, 2007.

Commissioner Lawrence seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

Commissioner Hall announced that the Planning Commission’s Policy and Procedures Committee would meet on Wednesday, February 28, 2007, at 7:30 p.m., in the Board Conference Room, to discuss the 2007 Zoning Ordinance Amendment Work Program.

//

FS-M06-116 - NEXTEL, 5596 Malone Ridge Street and 5573 Harrington Falls Lane

Chairman Murphy MOVED THE CONSENT AGENDA ITEM, WITHOUT OBJECTION.

The motion carried unanimously.

//

PUBLIC FACILITIES MANUAL AND COUNTY CODE AMENDMENTS (LIDS) (Decisions Only) (The public hearing on these proposed amendments was held on February 1, 2007. A complete verbatim transcript of the decisions made is included in the date file.)

Commissioner Alcorn MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC FACILITIES MANUAL AND COUNTY CODE AS ADVERTISED, WITH OPTION 2 AND WITH STAFF'S RECOMMENDED CHANGES DATED FEBRUARY 22, 2007. OPTION 2 WOULD PERMIT THE BOARD, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE APPROVAL OF A REZONING, PROFFERED CONDITION AMENDMENT, SPECIAL EXCEPTION, OR SPECIAL EXCEPTION AMENDMENT, TO APPROVE THE USE OF PERVIOUS PAVEMENT ON HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION "COMMON" PROPERTY IN BOTH SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED AND DETACHED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS.

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 11-0-1 with Commissioner Hopkins abstaining.

Commissioner Alcorn MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT ALL SUBDIVISION CONSTRUCTION PLANS, SITE PLANS, AND LOT GRADING PLANS SUBMITTED PRIOR TO THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE AMENDMENTS BE GRANDFATHERED.

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 11-0-1 with Commissioner Hopkins abstaining.

Commissioner Alcorn MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT STAFF, IN COOPERATION WITH THE PLANNING COMMISSION OR WITH A GROUP SELECTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, HOST A WORKSHOP OR OTHER PUBLIC MEETING TO GATHER INPUT FROM INTERESTED STAKEHOLDERS ON WHAT ADDITIONAL LID POLICY CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE A PRIORITY.

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Commissioner Lawrence MOVE TO AMEND THE MOTION TO ALLOW MORE THAN ONE WORKSHOP.

Commissioner Alcorn accepted this amendment, which was seconded by Commissioner Hart and carried unanimously.

//

ARCHITECTURAL RENDERINGS FOR METRO PARK, PHASE 8, PLAN 6836-SP-11

Commissioner Lusk MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION NOTIFY THE DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, OR HIS DESIGNEE, THAT THE SUBMITTED ARCHITECTURAL RENDERINGS FOR METRO PARK, PHASE 8, PLAN 6836-SP-11, AS REQUIRED BY PROFFER NUMBER 13, HAVE BEEN REVIEWED AND MEET OUR APPROVAL.

Commissioner Lawrence seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Harsel established the following order of the agenda:

1. SE 2006-MA-027 - JOANNE KRAUSE
2. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (PRC DENSITY)

This order was accepted without objection.

//

SE 2006-MA-027 - JOANNE KRAUSE - Appl. under Sects. 2-904 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit uses in a floodplain. Located at 8106 Accotink Dr. on approx. 23,825 sq. ft. of land zoned R-2. Tax Map 59-4 ((2)) 45. Water Quality Encroachment Request #6843-WRPA-001-1 and Water Quality Impact Assessment (WQIA) 6843-WQ-001-1, application for an exception to re-construct a single family dwelling within a Resource Protection Area (RPA), under the provisions of CBPO Section 118-6-7. MASON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Joanne Krause, applicant, reaffirmed the affidavit dated August 28, 2006. There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Tracy Strunk, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that staff recommended approval of the application.

In response to questions from Commissioner Hart, Ms. Strunk said the existing house that had a one-car, front-load garage and a one-car wide driveway was proposed to be replaced by a house that had a three-car, side-load garage and a longer driveway. She indicated that staff had proposed Development Condition Number 18 to require a garage door that would accommodate no more than two cars in order to ensure that additional pervious area would not be converted to pavement to allow access to the third garage space. Ms. Strunk explained that staff had discussed with the applicant changing the current design to a two-car, front-load garage, which would require a shorter driveway and less impervious surface; however, the applicant had preferred a side-load garage for aesthetic reasons. She stated that pervious pavers were proposed for the driveway to help mitigate the impact on the Resource Protection Area (RPA).

Commissioner Hart expressed concerns that the proposed three-car, side-load garage; driveway; and significantly larger house footprint would create excessive impervious surface and the proposed house configuration would not adequately minimize the intrusion into the RPA.

Responding to another question from Commissioner Hart, Ms. Strunk noted that the applicant had chosen a floor plan that placed living space above the garage, therefore, making it impossible to remove the third bay of the garage and shift the rest of the house forward so that it would be less intrusive on the seaward 50-foot line of the RPA. She said the proposed house footprint was relatively compact because the larger garage area would eliminate the need for a separate storage structure and allowed for additional floor area on the second floor rather than extending the ground level of the house.

Ms. Krause stated that she had lived in her house for over 15 years until it had been condemned on June 25, 2006, due to damage from flooding backwash from Accotink Creek. She requested that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the application to allow the reconstruction of her house. Ms. Krause thanked her neighbors for their support, noting that some of them had submitted letters of support to the Commission. She said that the application met all applicable Fairfax County regulations and conditions.

In response to questions from Commissioner Hall, Ms. Krause explained that the proposed garage would provide a safe area to store lawn equipment instead of a separate structure, which would create more impervious surface. She noted that the concrete pad that had previously held a storage shed would be removed. Ms. Krause said she had chosen a floor plan that placed living space above the garage in order to avoid a long and narrow footprint. She pointed out that the proposed house was located as far forward on the lot as allowed in the R-2 District, with a front yard setback of 35 feet.

Commissioner Hart indicated that the front rendering in the staff report illustrated how the bulk of the house could be shifted forward to cause significantly less intrusion into the seaward 50-foot line of the RPA. He said he was not opposed to the use of the third garage bay to store lawn equipment. Commissioner Hart suggested that the garage doors be oriented to face forward in order to allow a much shorter driveway with significantly less impervious surface.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Hart, Ms. Krause noted that the frontage of the proposed house had been evened out to allow the entire house to be shifted forward to the 35-foot setback line.

In response to questions from Commissioner Lawrence, Ms. Strunk explained that the proposed house would be built on a concrete slab and would not have a basement to allow the lowest floor elevation to be raised above the 100-year floodplain. She noted that approximately 460 cubic yards of fill would cover the area that had previously been the basement of the existing house. She said she would find out if there was a regulation regarding the height of a concrete slab in a flood area and verify if it would apply to this situation.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker and recited the rules for public testimony.

David Raden, 3801 Lake Boulevard, Annandale, expressed support for the application. He noted that he had submitted a letter to the Planning Commission, a copy of which is in the date file. He said the proposed increase in the house footprint and impervious surface was relatively small compared to the impervious area created by an adjacent asphalt path that had been constructed by Fairfax County, which was located only 10 to 20 feet from the Accotink Creek in many areas.

David Ball, 7014 Old Brentford Road, Alexandria, asked that the Commission defer the application to allow time to determine if the rear deck of Ms. Krause's house had been constructed in accordance with County regulations; the impact of the proposed development on upstream and downstream properties; and to resolve issues concerning flood proofing the Accotink Drive properties. (A copy of his remarks is in the date file.)

Responding to a question from Commissioner Hall, Mr. Ball said he would not oppose the development if the County would approve his special exception application to build a house on his lot. He expressed concern that filling in the basement and around the house would raise the elevation of the driveway and subject the house to flood damage. Commissioner Hall replied that she would follow-up with staff and the applicant on this concern.

Richard Washco, 3918 Millcreek Drive, Annandale, said he supported the applicant because she should have the right to rebuild her home, which would help maintain the integrity of the community.

Linda Friedman, 1229 North Taylor Street, Arlington, noted that her husband, Bill Friedman, owned the vacant lot at 8108 Accotink Drive. She said she was uncertain as to what extent staff had examined the possible effects of the proposed reconstruction on the neighboring properties and whether the raised grade would exacerbate the flooding problems in the area.

Shulamit Widawsky, 8104 Accotink Drive, Annandale, noted that her property directly neighbored the subject property. She stated that her house was relatively the same age as the applicant's house, but it had been built on higher elevation. She explained that during the flood, her house had been completed surrounded by water with approximately two inches in the

basement, but there had been no erosion and very little damage. Ms. Widawsky said that if the applicant's house was built the same way, damage from future flooding could be prevented.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for a rebuttal statement from Ms. Krause.

Ms. Krause stated that the civil engineer, with RC Fields, Jr. & Associates, had completed all the required floodplain studies and the proposed reconstruction met all applicable County requirements.

In response to questions from Commissioner Hall, Ms. Strunk noted that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) had established the floodplains in the 1960s after some houses had been built in the neighborhood. She explained that new development of the lots along the Accotink Creek and in the floodplain would require special exception approval for uses in the floodplain and a water quality exception approval for construction in the RPA. She said staff would review each case based on its merits, giving different consideration for reconstruction of existing structures that had been damaged or destroyed due to flooding and new construction on land that had never been developed. Ms. Strunk stated that the applicant was required to execute a Hold Harmless agreement with the County for all adverse effects which might arise as a result of the reconstruction within the floodplain area, obtain flood insurance, and ensure that the reconstruction would be in accordance with the FEMA flood-proofing standards and the living space would be raised above the 100-year floodplain elevation. She said staff would discuss with the applicant changes to the floor plan as suggested by Commissioner Hart and would provide the Commission with a recommendation prior to the Board of Supervisors' hearing on the subject application.

Commissioner Hall requested that staff address the concerns that had been expressed by Mr. Ball. She asked that the applicant present her proposal at the Mason District Land Use Committee meeting on Tuesday, February 27, 2007, which would be open to the public.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Hall for action on this case. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Hall MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ON SE 2006-MA-027 UNTIL A DATE CERTAIN OF FEBRUARY 28, 2007, WITH THE RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN FOR WRITTEN COMMENT.

Commissioner Koch seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Commissioner Hall MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION REQUEST THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DEFER ITS PUBLIC HEARING ON SE 2006-MA-027 UNTIL A DATE CERTAIN OF MARCH 12, 2007.

Commissioner de la Fe seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

The Commission went into recess at 9:26 p.m. and reconvened in the Board Auditorium at 9:41 p.m.

//

> ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (PRC DENSITY) - To amend Chapter 112 (the Zoning Ordinance) of the 1976 Code of the County of Fairfax, as follows: Modify the Planned Residential Community (PRC) District provisions to [1] clarify that only that land area included in the initial establishment of a PRC District shall be under single ownership or control; [2] revise the persons per dwelling unit factor for single family detached dwellings from 3.5 to 3.0 persons, for single family attached dwellings (townhouses) from 3.0 to 2.7 persons, and that new multifamily factor of 2.1 persons per dwelling unit replace the 2.5 persons per garden apartment and the 2.0 persons per elevator apartment unit; [3] delete the provision that the population factors be reviewed at least every three years and that within three years following the commencement of residential construction within a PRC community the factors be reviewed and become fixed for that community; [4] change the PRC plan process from an administrative approval by the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services to a legislative approval process that requires public hearings before both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors and delete the provision that an approved PRC plan is valid for three years unless a site plan is approved within that time. Further, pursuant to authority granted by *Virginia Code* Sect. 15.2-2286(A)(6), change the fee associated with PRC plan submission and review from $4275 for each plan submission to a base fee of $4410 plus $140 per acre. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

Elizabeth Perry, Zoning Administration Division (ZAD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that staff recommended approval of the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment.

In response to a question from Commissioner de la Fe, Ms. Perry said zoning density was generally measured by dwelling units per acre and not persons per acre, which was used within the Planned Residential Community (PRC) District.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Hart, Ms. Perry indicated that in the table on page 1 of Attachment A in the staff report, the first cell in the first row should read: “100 single

family detached dwellings" and the first cell in the second row should read: "200 single family attached dwellings."

In response to a question from Commissioner Alcorn, Leslie Johnson, ZAD, DPZ, stated that the timing of the steps in the PRC plan approval process were similar to rezonings and final development plans. She explained that the purpose of the proposal that the Planning Commission hold a public hearing on a PRC plan no later than six months from the date the plan had been accepted was to ensure sufficient time for the Commission to transmit the PRC plan to the Board of Supervisors with its recommendation, which would be consistent with other types of plans.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Alcorn, Ms. Perry indicated that staff had estimated the population within the Reston PRC District to be 50,000 based on 2000 Census data and extrapolations and analysis that had been taken after the Census.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker and noted that the rules for public testimony previously cited still applied.

Terrill Maynard, 2217 Wakerobin Lane, Reston, noted that he had submitted a series of papers to the Planning Commission about the impacts the proposed amendment would have on Reston, copies of which are in the date file. He said he supported the Reston Association (RA) Board's proposal for the County to form a task force to study the impact of additional population density on violent crime and other threats to the quality of life in Reston and Fairfax County and establish strategies and resources that would help ensure the orderly growth and development of the County, especially in Reston.

Mike Corrigan, 11214 Wedge Drive, Reston, President of the Reston Citizens Association (RCA), suggested that an ongoing process to review the PRC District regulations be implemented in order to prevent the possibility of the current density factors being declared invalid in court, which would permit Reston clusters to be redeveloped to their full potential density with a by-right justification by the developer. He commented that the proposed change to the density factors did not direct additional development to areas in Reston where they should occur, such as the Reston Town Center, village centers, and the Metro corridor. Mr. Corrigan said the current PRC District regulations did not require a review of the population factors. He pointed out that the proposed amendment had failed to address the concerns of Reston residents regarding the integration of transportation planning to mitigate the increased number of drivers, the lack of affordable housing requirement for high-rise apartments, and the absence of provisions or expectations for County assistance in mitigating the watershed and lake sedimentation impacts. Mr. Corrigan recommended that the proposed change to the population factors be deferred to allow time for a task force composed of Reston residents, developers, and staff to perform a complete review of the PRC District regulations and applicable Comprehensive Plan provisions. He said the cap in density factors should be replaced with more traditional zoning and the PRC District regulations needed to be updated into a sustainable community ordinance that would guide future development.

In response to a question from Commissioner Alcorn, Mr. Corrigan stated that the designated low, medium, and high densities needed to be revised, noting that there was already an overall density cap for the PRC District. He said improvements in public transportation, roads, and other factors associated with the proposed increase in density of 3,815 units needed to be considered.

Joe Stowers, 11448 Waterview Cluster, Reston, recommended adoption of the proposed amendment, with a condition that the County immediately establish a task force charged with performing a more comprehensive review of the PRC District regulations with a balanced representation among PRC community representatives, County staff, and developer representatives. He further recommended that the introduction and background sections in the staff report clarify that there had been a citizen involvement process.

Robert Goudie, 1892 Crescent Park Drive, Reston, representing ARCH, noted that he had submitted to the Commission a letter from the President of the ARCH Board of Directors, dated January 26, 2007, addressed to Hunter Mill District Supervisors Catherine Hudgins, a copy of which is in the date file. He indicated support for the proposed administrative and governance changes. He expressed concern that the proposed changes to the dwelling occupancy factors had disregarded the planned development in Reston near Metro rail and within the Reston Center of Industry and Government District. Mr. Goudie stated that the planned development combined with the proposed PRC change would add more than 35,000 people in the greater Reston area, which would exacerbate traffic and parking congestion. He recommended that a task force be established to examine the PRC density factors using a holistic approach, with consideration to the greater Reston area, planned development, and infrastructure improvements needed to address new residential and commercial development. Mr. Goudie noted that ARCH, RCA, and RA had all voted to oppose the proposed dwelling occupancy change due to the absence of a more holistic study. He said that a court would not be able to unilaterally interpose its judgment on the dwelling occupancy factors if a task force had been charged to address the matter in a relatively constrained timeframe.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Alcorn, Mr. Goudie said the task force for Greater Reston could follow an integrated planning process similar to the Tysons Land Use Task Force, with appropriate modifications, or through some better mechanism. He explained that the task force would initiate a comprehensive examination of the PRC District regulations, consider all planned changes in the Greater Reston area, and investigate the needed improvements in infrastructure and services. He commented that appointing a task force to examine these issues in a more holistic manner would help achieve consensus within the Reston community.

Jennifer Blackwell, 11270 Center Harbor Road, Reston, President of the RA, thanked County staff, Supervisor Hudgins, and Commissioner de la Fe for working with the Reston community during the review process of the PRC District regulations. She noted that she had written a letter concerning the amendment to Supervisors Hudgins, a copy of which is in the date file. She

spoke in favor of the immediate implementation of the proposed PRC plan approval process. Ms. Blackwell recommended that a community-based task force be convened to examine the PRC District regulations and other applicable Zoning Ordinance provisions. She said the population factors should be changed since they had not been reviewed since 1977 and failed to address redevelopment; however, it was a question of when this should happen.

In response to a question from Commissioner de la Fe, Ms. Blackwell stated that there needed to be an integrated review of the entire PRC Ordinance because it was outdated and consideration needed to be given to other issues aside from the population factors.

David Edwards, 11701 Blue Smoke Trail, Reston, expressed the need for a comprehensive review of the Zoning Ordinance as it pertained to Reston and the entire Reston Master Plan to determine what improvements should be made to the entire basis of zoning in Reston. He commented that many stable neighborhoods in Reston should not be subject to pressures for change. He indicated his support for the proposed amendment to the PRC plan approval process. (A copy of his remarks is in the date file.)

Bob Simon, 11400 Washington Plaza West, Reston, spoke in support of the proposed population factors, but urged the County to continue to honor the overall density cap of 13 persons per acre. He said the proposed amendment would facilitate the revitalization of Lake Anne by allowing an increase in density.

Benjamin Tompkins, Esquire, with Reed Smith LLP, voiced his objection to the provision that pending PRC plans, under review by the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services but not approved prior to the effective date of the amendment, would be subject to the PRC Plan approval process set forth in the proposed amendment. He recommended that pending PRC plans be grandfathered.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Alcorn, Mr. Tompkins said he was unaware of any pending or potential PRC plans that did not involve redevelopment.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for concluding remarks from Ms. Perry and Ms. Johnson, who declined.

In response to questions from Commissioner Lawrence, Ms. Perry explained that if the number of persons per dwelling unit decreased as set forth in the proposed amendment to reflect more modern population data, then the number of dwelling units allowed per acre would increase under the 13 persons per acre cap limitation.

Commissioner de la Fe said that the 13 persons per acre cap should be retained unless there was a desire to re-establish the entire PRC Ordinance. He stated that the updated population factors would result in a decrease in the calculated population for Reston, under the PRC provisions, from 72,700 persons to 64,277 persons; however, the 2000 Census data indicated that the population of the Reston PRC zoned area was only approximately 50,000.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner de la Fe for action on this case. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner de la Fe MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ON THE PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT ARTICLES 6, 16, AND 18, PRC DISTRICT REGULATIONS, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MARCH 15, 2007, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR COMMENT.

Commissioner Alcorn seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 10:49 p.m.
Peter F. Murphy, Jr., Chairman
Suzanne F. Harsel, Secretary

Audio and video recordings of this meeting are available at the Planning Commission Office, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Kara A. DeArrastia

Approved on: September 11, 2008

_____
Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission