MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 2009

PRESENT: Walter L. Alcorn, Commissioner At-Large
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
Jay P. Donahue, Dranesville District
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District
John L. Litzenberger, Sully District
Rodney L. Lusk, Lee District
Peter F. Murphy, Jr., Springfield District
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: Janet R. Hall, Mason District
Suzanne F. Harsel, Braddock District

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:15 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

On behalf of Commissioner Hall, Commissioner Hart MOVED TO DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR SEA 84-M-012, QUAN Q. NGUYEN & NGAN T. NGUYEN, FROM THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 2009, TO THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 2009.

Commissioner Lawrence seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Hall and Harsel absent from the meeting.

//

PCA/FDPA 2004-LE-012 – REDBRICK DEVELOPMENT GROUP, LLC & MDP GROVETON, LLC (Decision Only) (The public hearing on these applications was held on February 26, 2009. A complete verbatim transcript of the decision made is included in the date file.)

Commissioner Lusk MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF PCA 2004-LE-012, SUBJECT TO THE PROFFERS AND CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED MARCH 11, 2009, AND THE CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT.

Commissioner Alcorn seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 7-0-3 with Commissioners Donahue, Flanagan, and Sargeant abstaining; Commissioners Hall and Harsel absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Lusk MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDPA 2004-LE-012, SUBJECT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' APPROVAL OF PCA 2004-LE-012.

Commissioner Alcorn seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 7-0-3 with Commissioners Donahue, Flanagan, and Sargeant abstaining; Commissioners Hall and Harsel absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Lusk MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE WAIVER OF THE SERVICE DRIVE REQUIREMENT ALONG RICHMOND HIGHWAY.

Commissioner Alcorn seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 7-0-3 with Commissioners Donahue, Flanagan, and Sargeant abstaining; Commissioners Hall and Harsel absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Lusk MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE MODIFICATION OF THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING YARD REQUIREMENTS, AND WAIVER OF THE BARRIER REQUIREMENTS ALONG THE EASTERN AND WESTERN PROPERTY LINES.

Commissioner Alcorn seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 7-0-3 with Commissioners Donahue, Flanagan, and Sargeant abstaining; Commissioners Hall and Harsel absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Lusk MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT PFM SECTION 6-0303.8 BE WAIVED TO PERMIT THE USE OF AN UNDERGROUND DETENTION FACILITY, AND A SEPARATE UNDERGROUND WATER QUALITY CONTROL FACILITY IN A RESIDENTIAL AREA, SUBJECT TO DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS ENTITLED: "WAIVER #22564-WPFM-002-1 CONDITIONS, DATED DECEMBER 2, 2008."

Commissioner Alcorn seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 7-0-3 with Commissioners Donahue, Flanagan, and Sargeant abstaining; Commissioners Hall and Harsel absent from the meeting.

//

FS-S08-128 – CRICKET COMMUNICATIONS, 9220 Old Keene Mill Road

Chairman Murphy MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH THE "FEATURE SHOWN" DETERMINATION IN FS-S08-128, CRICKET COMMUNICATIONS, AT 9220 OLD KEENE MILL ROAD.

Commissioner Litzenberger seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Hall and Harsel absent from the meeting.

//

FS-L09-3 – VERIZON WIRELESS, 3816 Javins Drive

Chairman Murphy MOVED CONSENT AGENDA ITEM FS-L09-3, Verizon Wireless.

Without objection, the motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Hall and Harsel absent from the meeting.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

In Secretary Harsel's absence, Chairman Murphy set the following agenda:

1. FDPA 78-C-118-17/SE 2008-SU-032 – LB FRANKLIN FARM LLC
2. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
3. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (ZONING FEE SCHEDULE)
   CODE AMENDMENTS (FEES FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES)
4. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PUBLIC HEARING

This order was accepted without objection.

//

FDPA 78-C-118-17 – LB FRANKLIN FARM LLC – Appl. to amend the final development plans for RZ 78-C-118 previously approved for mixed-use development to permit a fast food restaurant and changes to site design and development conditions. Located in the N.E. quadrant of the intersection of Franklin Farm Rd. and Stone Heather Dr. on approx. 35,895 sq. ft. of land zoned PDH-2 and WS. Tax Map 35-1 ((4)) (22) 2B. (Concurrent with SE 2008-SU-032.) SULLY DISTRICT.

SE 2008-SU-032 – LB FRANKIN FARM LLC – Appl. under Sect. 6-105 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a fast food restaurant. Located

at 13354 Franklin Farm Rd. on approx. 35,895 sq. ft. of land zoned PDH-2 and WS. Tax Map 35-1 ((4)) (22) 2B. (Concurrent with FDPA 78-C-118-17.) SULLY DISTRICT. JOINT PUBLIC HEARING.

Inda Stagg, Land Use Planner, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Emrich & Walsh, P.C., reaffirmed the affidavit dated February 26, 2009. Commissioner Hart disclosed that his law firm, Hart & Horan, PC, had two pending cases with Ms. Stagg's law firm but indicated that there was no financial relationship and it would not affect his ability to participate in this case.

On behalf of Commissioner Litzenberger, Chairman Murphy asked whether there were any speakers for this application. There being none, he asked that presentations by staff and the applicant be waived and the public hearing closed. No objections were expressed; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Litzenberger for action on this case. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Litzenberger MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDPA 78-C-118-17, LB FRANKLIN FARM LLC, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED FEBRUARY 25, 2009.

Commissioners Flanagan and Hart seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Hall and Harsel absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Litzenberger MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF SE 2008-SU-032, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED MARCH 10, 2009.

Commissioner Flanagan seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Hall and Harsel absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Litzenberger MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF A MODIFICATION TO THE PERIPHERAL PARKING LOT LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE LANDSCAPING SHOWN ON THE FDPA/SE PLAT.

Commissioner Flanagan seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Hall and Harsel absent from the meeting.

//

PUBLIC FACILITIES MANUAL AMENDMENTS (FEES FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES) – To amend Chapters 2, 61, 101, 104, and 112 of the Code of the County of Fairfax, Virginia, as follows: Pursuant to authority granted by *Virginia Code* Sections 15.

2-107, 15.2-2204, 15.2-2241(9), 15.2-2286(A)(6), 10.1-562(I), 36-105 (A), 36-98.3, and/or 13 VAC 5-31-75, the amendments propose to increase fees charged under Chapter 2, Art. 1, Sec. 2-1-4 (Property Under County Control), Chapter 61, Art. 1, Sec. 61-1-3 (Building Provisions), Chapter 101, Art. 2, Sec. 101-2-9 (Subdivision Ordinance), Chapter 104, Art. 1, Sec. 104-1-3 (Erosion and Sedimentation Control), Chapter 112, Art. 17, Part 1, Sec. 17-109 (Zoning Ordinance) of the County Code for the review of plans, processing of permits, and performing site and building inspections. Fees charged by the Fire Official are not being adjusted. The amendments increase all fees related to site plan review and site inspections under County Code Chapter 101, Chapter 104 and Article 17 of Chapter 112, with the exception of fees associated with inserts, waivers and bonding. Site related fees will increase by up to 40 percent, except the fees associated with grading plans ("infill" grading plans) for existing lots that are not within a subdivision currently bonded with the County and parcels with lots of 5 acres or more will increase 100 percent. The amendments to Chapter 2 increase the fees for work or construction on property under County control by up to 40 percent. No increase is being proposed for site related fees associated with inserts, waivers, and bonding fees. The amendments to County Code Chapter 61 increase the building code related fees for buildings, additions, or enlargements to single family detached dwellings and townhouses by up to 51 percent. All other building code related fees will increase by up to 28 percent with the exception of the base fee applying to building, electrical, mechanical, and plumbing permits which will increase by up to 31 percent. No increase is being proposed for building fees associated with vertical transportation equipment (escalators, elevators, etc.), and home improvement contractor licensing fees. Fees for amusement devices increase to match the fees currently set by the State as specified in the Virginia Amusement Device Regulations for kiddie rides ($25), circular rides, or flat-rides less than 20 feet in height ($35), spectacular rides ($55), and a separate fee is being established for roller coasters which exceed 30 feet in height ($150). In addition, Section 61-1-(d)(2)(E) is being revised to clarify the distinction between the fees for partial and entire demolitions. The proposed fee for a permit to demolish an entire structure is the base fee and the fee for a permit to partially demolish a structure is proposed at the rate of 1.9 percent of the estimated cost of demolition. Section 61-1-3(d)(1)(B)(5) regarding non-permitted work is being altered to reflect an additional fee when an individual is cited for failure to obtain a permit as required by the Uniform Statewide Building Code (USBC). An additional fee of $85.00 is being established for those permits obtained pursuant to a written directive or order from the Building Official or designee for failure to obtain a permit required by the USBC. This fee will be in addition to all permit fees otherwise required. Sections 61-1-3(d)(2)(C), 61-1-3(d)(2)(D), and 61-1-(d)(2)(K) are being revised to authorize the Building Official or his designee to require

verifiable cost data in support of estimated costs for the construction of new single family detached dwellings and townhouses related to new structures, basement finishing, and repairs and alterations, respectively. The amendments to County Code Chapter 61 also propose various editorial changes. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

James Patteson, Director, Land Development Services, Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He stated that staff recommended approval of the amendments.

In response to questions from Commissioner Alcorn, Mr. Patteson confirmed that the amendments in this proposal would not change the policy on cost recovery. He said the last fee adjustment had occurred during fiscal years 2005-2006, and another had occurred ten years earlier. He noted that the Board of Supervisors had called for two-year intervals for future adjustments.

Responding to questions from Commissioner Lawrence, Mr. Patteson confirmed that the cost recovery fees would be generated from services associated with private development.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers but received no response. 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 Alcorn for action on this item. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Alcorn MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTERS 2, 61, 101, 104, AND 112 OF THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA, REGARDING ADJUSTMENT OF THE FEES CHARGED FOR PLAN REVIEW AND INSPECTION, AND PERMIT SERVICES CHARGED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES LAND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, AS ADVERTISED AND SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT, DATED FEBRUARY 9, 2009, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF STAFF'S RECOMMENDED CHANGE TO PROPOSED SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AMENDMENT, SECTION 101-2-9, FEES, PARAGRAPH (a)(3), AND PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT, SECTION 17-109, FEES, PARAGRAPH 7, DATED MARCH 12, 2009, DISTRIBUTED TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION TONIGHT.

Commissioners de la Fe, Lawrence, and Lusk seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Hall and Harsel absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Alcorn MOVED THAT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS BECOME EFFECTIVE AT 12:01 A.M. ON JULY 1, 2009, AND THAT THE REVISED FEES SHALL BE APPLICABLE TO ANY SUBMISSION, OR SUBMISSIONS, AFTER THIS DATE.

Commissioners de la Fe, Lawrence, and Lusk seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Hall and Harsel absent from the meeting.

//

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (FEES FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES) – To amend Chapter 112 (the Zoning Ordinance) of the 1976 Code of the County of Fairfax, as follows: Pursuant to authority granted by Paragraphs 15.2-107 and 15.2-2286(A)(6) of the *Code of Virginia*, the amendment increases the application fees for, variances, special permits, special exceptions, rezonings, PRC plans, comprehensive sign plans, and modifications to the requirements of the affordable dwelling unit program, and amendments thereto by up to 200%. The amendment also increases the fee for appeals of the zoning administrator's decision from $375 up to and including $2455, the fees for zoning compliance letters for single family lots from $90 up to and including $110, the fee for all other zoning compliance letters from $265 up to and including $310, the fee for non-residential use permits from $40 up to and including $65, the fee for temporary special permits administratively approved from $130 up to and including $200, and the fee for sign permits from $50 up to and including $90. In addition the amendment establishes the following: a fee of up to and including $50 for home occupation permits, a fee of up to and including $500 for interpretation of approved zoning applications, a fee of up to and including $130 for applicant requested deferral of a public hearing before the Board of Zoning Appeals, a fee of up to and including $1000 for applicant requested deferral of a public hearing before the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, and application fees for conceptual plans and amendments thereto of up to and including $13,230, plus an acreage fee of up to and including $420 per acre that are consistent with the fees for final development plans. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

Donna McNeally, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She stated that staff recommended approval of the amendment. Ms. McNeally noted that at the direction of the County Executive, fee increases would provide a 75 percent cost recovery rate for the County's land development services. She said that calculating the fees involved looking at previous increases, ensuring conformance with *Virginia State Code*, and comparing current fees to those of surrounding jurisdictions. She also noted that three new fees would be

proposed for conceptual plans, applicant-requested deferrals, and interpretations of approved zonings.

Leslie Johnson, Planning Division, ZED, reviewed the proposed fee increases associated with zoning administration, noting that fees for appeals and home occupation permits would be significantly increased.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lawrence, Ms. Johnson confirmed that the proposed fee increases were based on the time required by staff to perform the services.

Responding to questions from Commissioner Hart, Regina Coyle, ZED, DPZ, explained that the cost to readvertise after a deferral included staff processing time and preparation of additional reports. She said the proposed fees were comparable to those in Chesterfield County.

Commissioner Hart expressed opposition to fees for appeals, noting that the calculations included all appeal cases without taking into account cases that might be dismissed.

Ms. Johnson explained that appeal fees would be refunded only if a violation notice were to be rescinded by the County. She also noted that the County would assess a flat fee rather than categorizing the fees according to appeal types.

Commissioner Hart said that since the appeal process was a different aspect of zoning administration, it would be inappropriate to impose fees.

Chairman Murphy noted that application deferrals had been a long-standing issue and that charging fees could be problematic, adding that the Land Use Process Committee should review this issue further.

Commissioner de la Fe opposed fees for deferrals because they would have a negative impact on the application process. He said if the fees must be instituted, they should be phased in incrementally. He then questioned how fees for conceptual plans would affect Reston. Additionally, Commissioner de la Fe expressed concern regarding the fee for interpretations, noting that the high volume of requests regarding bridges in Reston could be resolved with a phone call.

Kevin Guinaw, ZED, DPZ, explained that the fee for interpretations had been intended to address interpretations that would be substantive with regard to conformance with the Zoning Ordinance and agreed with Commissioner de la Fe in that the requests regarding bridges in Reston could be handled by the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services.

Commissioner Litzenberger noted that a fee should be imposed if an applicant waited until the public hearing date to request a deferral.

Chairman Murphy commented that deferrals occurred for a variety of reasons and asked if a fee would be charged if a Commissioner initiated the deferral. Ms. Coyle said in that case there would be no fee.

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

Thomas Davis, JCE Incorporated, 5350 Shawnee Run, Suite 310, Alexandria, read into the record a letter from John E. Cowles, Manager and General Partner, Springfield Garden Apartments, dated March 9, 2009, in which Mr. Cowles expressed opposition to the proposed amendment. He said the fees would be detrimental to property owners and developers, especially given the current economic climate. Mr. Cowles also pointed out that Springfield Garden was currently in the midst of a redevelopment project located within a revitalization area and explained the fee increase would triple the cost to file the zoning application for Springfield Garden Apartments.

In response to questions from Commissioner Lusk, Mr. Davis said costs could be recovered in the rental rates. Commissioner Lusk and Mr. Davis also discussed fees for projects in revitalization districts.

Commissioner Lawrence and Mr. Davis discussed the filing date for Springfield Garden Apartments and grandfathering applications filed prior to the effective date of the amendment.

Lynne Strobel, Esquire, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Emrich & Walsh, PC, 2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1300, Arlington, spoke in opposition to the amendment because of the amount of the increase in the fees. She advocated a tiered phasing of the fees to mitigate the impact on developers, adding that smaller developers and private landowners would be especially hard hit. She also said the fees would add a layer of cost on top of the current proffers and Zoning Ordinance contributions and exacerbate the current housing and commercial building difficulties. Ms. Strobel pointed out that non-profit organizations would also be hard hit as they would be called upon to provide more services with fewer resources and could not afford to improve existing facilities. She then agreed with earlier remarks that the deferral fees should be reconsidered.

Commissioner Lawrence and Ms. Strobel discussed setting “freeze” dates for applications that would be based on the public hearing date, thus setting the clock for fees should an application be deferred.

Sara Mariska, Esquire, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Emrich & Walsh, PC, 2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1300, Arlington, opposed the amendment, echoing Ms. Strobel’s remarks in that she did not oppose the fees, but would prefer that they be phased in over time.

Ms. Coyle said the new fees would become effective on July 1, 2009, adding that they would apply to applications that had not been accepted by that date. She pointed out that the current land development process contained a "freeze" date of six weeks prior to the public hearing, which allowed staff adequate time to review applications.

Chairman Murphy remarked that he thought the six week "freeze" date was excessive.

In response to questions from Commissioner Alcorn, Ms. Coyle said that an increase in fees had been factored into the proposed FY 2010 budget.

Commissioner Hart noted that fewer applications might be filed due to fee increases, yet staff would still need to be paid. Eileen McLane, Director, Zoning Administration Division, DPZ, said in that case, staff could be reassigned to other departments where they were sorely needed to work on projects such as Ordinance amendments.

Commissioner Alcorn stated that since significant issues had been identified, he would defer the decision until March 25, 2009.

Commissioner Litzenberger suggested that fees for non-profit organizations be reconsidered and Commissioner Lawrence requested that the "freeze" date be further examined.

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

//

Commissioner Alcorn MOVED THAT THE DECISION ONLY ON THE PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (ZONING FEE SCHEDULE) BE DEFERRED UNTIL MARCH 25, 2009.

Commissioner Lusk seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Hall and Harsel absent from the meeting.

//

FAIRFAX COUNTY ADVERTISED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) – A public hearing will be held on the Fairfax County Advertised Capital Improvement Program (CIP), Fiscal Years 2010-2014 (with future Fiscal Years to 2019). COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

David Jillson, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff summary of the Fairfax County Advertised Capital Improvement Program (CIP), noting that this year's five-year program contained eight functional areas in the CIP, including program elements

for public/private partnerships, schools, parks, housing, revitalization, stormwater management, neighborhood improvements, community development, police, fire and rescue, courts, libraries, facility management, capital renewal, human services, solid waste, sanitary sewers, water supply, transportation, and pedestrian initiatives. He added that the CIP included County-managed projects totaling $2.82 billion, with schools and transportation accounting for over half of the total amount.

Martha Reed, Capital Programs Coordinator, Department of Management and Budget, noted that while no programs would be eliminated from this year's CIP, some adjustments had been made to delay the opening of new County facilities and other projects. She then announced the schedule for the CIP Markup and Committee meeting.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker.

Bill Bouie, Chairman, Fairfax County Park Authority Board, Herrity Building, 9th Floor, Fairfax, described current park projects and cost-saving initiatives. He said that the proposed reduction in capital funding, the loss of the bond premium, and the extensive operational cuts would seriously impact Park Authority initiatives.

In response to a question from Commissioner Litzenberger, Mr. Bouie said he would favor releasing escrowed funds to expedite trail development.

Commissioner de la Fe cautioned against reducing capital projects without careful consideration and said that some agencies had reported lower costs for projects due to the current economy.

Commissioner Lusk agreed with Commissioner de la Fe, adding that while the County needed to maintain its excellent bond rating, it should not sacrifice good quality for low cost.

Chairman Murphy said he opposed the user fees for lakeside parks and expressed concern about how the fees would be collected. He added that locating telecommunications facilities on parkland would provide a more suitable alternative to user fees and improve cellular service.

Upon request from Commissioner Murphy, Mr. Bouie said he would provide additional information regarding Patriot Park in the Springfield District.

Commissioner Flanagan and Mr. Bouie discussed the Park Authority's funding received from telecommunications facilities and tax revenues.

Commissioner Lawrence expressed his opposition to the park user fees.

Commissioners Hart and de la Fe discussed charging higher fees to non-county residents as a means to recover revenue needed for replacements and renovations.

Woody Witt, Fairfax-Falls Church Community Services Board, 10409 Towlston Road, Fairfax, requested a grant of $1.5 million for a handicapped accessible group home to serve as a model for future facilities. He added that this item had come before the Planning Commission in previous years, but had never been funded. Mr. Witt also noted that the group home had the support of the Fairfax Long Term Care Coordinating Council and the Fairfax Area Disability Services Board. (A copy of the letters Karen Brown, Fairfax Long Term Care Coordinating Council, and A. Pimley and P. Barrett, Fairfax Area Disability Services Board, is in the date file.)

Commissioner de la Fe pointed out that while the Planning Commission supported Mr. Witt's request, it could not grant funds.

Commissioner Lusk noted that the group home had a Number 2 ranking in the Advertised CIP and requested a feasibility study on giving it priority ranking. He further noted the item had been allocated $2 million, rather than the $1.5 million requested by Mr. Witt, and requested that it be discussed at the CIP Committee meeting on March 18, 2009.

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

//

Commissioner Lusk MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION AND MARKUP FOR THE ADVERTISED CIP COVERING FISCAL YEARS 2010 THROUGH 2014, WITH FUTURE YEARS TO 2019, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MARCH 25, 2009, WITH THE RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC CORRESPONDENCE.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Hall and Harsel absent from the meeting.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 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, VA 22035.

Minutes by: Jeanette Nord

Approved: July 29, 2010

_____

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