MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 2013

UNAPPROVED
JUNE 10, 2013

PRESENT: Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
Jay P. Donahue, Dranesville District
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District
Janet R. Hall, Mason District
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large
Janyce N. Hedetniemi, Commissioner At-Large
Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District
Peter F. Murphy, Springfield District
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: John L. Litzenberger, Jr., Sully District.

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:21 p.m., by Chairman Peter F. Murphy, in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

Chairman Murphy recognized Jeff Salmon in the audience, who had been recently appointed to the Loudoun County Planning Commission as a representative of the Dulles District and was attending tonight's meeting as part of the Virginia Certified Planning Commissioner Program. In addition, Commissioner Lawrence pointed out that Bryan Katz, a member of the Montgomery County Planning Commission, was also in the audience.

//

Chairman Murphy announced that Christopher Remer, Communications Specialist II, would be leaving the Planning Commission Office after six years of service to work in the private sector and recognized his contributions to the Commission.

//

Commissioner Sargeant announced that the Planning Commission's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Committee had met earlier to discuss the CIP for Fiscal Years 2014 through 2018. He noted that the Committee had voted to recommend approval of the proposed CIP. He added

UNAPPROVED

that the Commission's CIP Markup would occur at its meeting on Wednesday, March 27, 2013, at 8:15 p.m. in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center.

//

Commissioner de la Fe announced that the Planning Commission's Parks Committee would meet on Wednesday, March 27, 2013, at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center to discuss the upcoming Parks Comprehensive Plan Amendment and said everyone was welcome to attend.

//

FSA-M03-30-3 – SPRINT, 6066 Leesburg Pike (Maroney Building)
FSA-M04-40-2 – SPRINT, 3100 South Manchester Street (Woodlake Towers Condominiums)

Chairman Murphy MOVED APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS.

Without objection, the motion carried unanimously with Commissioner Litzenberger absent from the meeting.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Chairman Murphy established the following order of the agenda:

1. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – HOME CHILD CARE FACILITIES

This order was accepted without objection.

//

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – HOME CHILD CARE FACILITIES – To amend Chapter 112 (the Zoning Ordinance) of the 1976 Code of the County of Fairfax, as follows: (1) Increase the maximum number of children allowed to be cared for in a home child care facility by special permit from ten to twelve; (2) Revise the additional standards for home child care facility special permits contained in Sect. 8-305 to (a) require the home child care facility limitations for by-right uses contained in Par. 6 of Sect. 10-103 be met, except for the numbers of children and non-resident employees; (b) require the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) to review access to the site; and (c) allow the BZA to consider the

UNAPPROVED

availability of on-street parking and/or alternative drop-off and pick-up areas located in proximity to the site; (3) Allow home child care facilities that have more than seven children in a single-family detached dwelling and five children in all other dwelling types to be allowed in any P-District with Special Permit approval by the BZA; and (4) Pursuant to authority granted by Sections 15.2-107 and 15.2-2286 (A) (6) of the *Code of Virginia*, reduce the current Special Permit application fee of $1,100 for home child care facilities to as low as $435. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Murphy stated that this Amendment would be handled by Commissioner Hart.

Commissioner Hart announced his intent to defer the decision only on this item at the end of the public hearing and noted that written and electronic testimony could be submitted during the deferral period. He also addressed concerns that had been raised by numerous citizens regarding the scope of the proposed Amendment, pointing out that it would not change the by-right limit for the number of children permitted in a home child care facility. In addition, he explained that the proposed Amendment would address only the following issues:

- increasing the maximum number of children permitted within a home child care facility by Special Permit (SP) from 10 to 12;

- changing the application process for home child care facilities located in P-Districts to mirror the process for R-Districts, which involved a single public hearing before the Fairfax County Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA);

- allowing the BZA additional flexibility to assess the parking provisions for a home child care facility; and

- reducing the fee for a home child care facility application from $1,100 to as low as $435.

Cathy Belgin, Zoning Administration Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that staff recommended adoption of the Amendment.

Answering questions from Commissioner Hart, Ms. Belgin confirmed the following:

- The licensing process conducted by the State focused primarily on the interior conditions of a proposed child care facility, such as safety issues and background checks for the providers, whereas the zoning approval process conducted by the County focused primarily on traffic patterns and impacts on neighboring properties;

UNAPPROVED

- The County did not count the provider's children against the maximum number of children permitted in a child care facility;

- The proposed Amendment would allow for additional children to be cared for at staggered times, provided that there were no more than 12 children within a home child care facility at a time;

- The procedure for obtaining a Special Exception (SE) for home child care facilities in a P-District was not warranted in staff's opinion and should be changed to reflect the procedure required for residential districts;

- The BZA's most common reason for denying an SP application was safety concerns and such issues would be assessed on a case-by-case basis;

- The surrounding community would be notified of public hearings for SP applications for home child care facilities through advertising, notification letters, and a sign posted in front of the subject property;

- The current $1,100 fee for home child care facility applications did not cover the administrative costs to the County;

- The Commission was not authorized by the Board of Supervisors to change the number of children permitted by-right in a home child care facility;

- The expected increase in SP applications could be managed by the County;

- The Board of Supervisors would likely permit a grace period after adoption of the proposed Amendment to allow home child care facilities licensed by the state to continue operation while they filed for an SP, but Zoning Enforcement staff would continue to investigate violations;

- The need for the proposed Amendment was a result of the Virginia Department of Social Services (DSS) changing the requirements for renewing licenses for child care providers; and

- The County allowed a greater number of children in home child care facilities than allowed in neighboring jurisdictions.

When Commissioner Lawrence asked Ms. Belgin to explain Paragraph 6 of Section 10-103 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding use limitations for accessory and accessory service uses, she stated that there were separate restrictions on home child care facilities operating within the by-

UNAPPROVED

right limits compared to facilities operating with an SP, noting that the BZA applied additional standards to SP applications. She also confirmed that details regarding these restrictions were publicly available.

In response to questions from Commissioner Hurley, Ms. Belgin said that there were currently three pending SP applications for home child care facilities. She indicated that the current fees would apply; however, she noted that staff had informed the applicants that fees might be reduced.

Ms. Belgin responded to an additional question from Commissioner Hurley regarding the need to modify the Zoning Ordinance to permit on-site assistants within home child care facilities beyond standard working hours.

Responding to questions from Commissioner Donahue, Ms. Belgin reiterated that a provider's children would not be counted against the number of children permitted in a facility. She also confirmed there were numerous facilities licensed by the State within the County that cared for 12 children, but indicated that enforcement of these limits was conducted on a basis of complaints because there had previously been no requirement for licensed providers to conform with local zoning regulations. She added that this method of enforcement would continue under the new provisions prescribed by the Amendment and noted that a provider would also be required to renew the SP on a regular basis. Referencing the chart on the back of the last page in the staff report, Mr. Belgin compared the by-right and SP regulations for home child care facilities between Fairfax County and neighboring counties.

In reply to a question from Chairman Murphy, Ms. Belgin said that Commissioner Hurley's concern about assistants at home child care facilities working extended hours was beyond the scope of the proposed Amendment.

Commissioner Sargeant pointed out that increasing the number of children allowed by Special Permit would bring the Zoning Ordinance in line with state regulations.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sargeant, Ms. Belgin indicated that home child care facilities were required to comply with covenants prescribed by homeowners associations and that open space requirements were evaluated by the state during the licensing process. In addition, she stated that the County was authorized to restrict the number of children permitted in a facility to a lower number than that permitted by the state.

Commissioner Hart asked for clarification regarding Item Number 6D and Item Number 6G in Section 10-103 of the Zoning Ordinance, which pertained to nonresident staff for child care centers. In response, Ms. Belgin explained that Item Number 6D limited home child care facilities operating by-right to one non-resident staff and Item Number 6G permitted more than one non-resident staff, subject to the approval of a SP.

UNAPPROVED

Commissioner Flanagan noted that neighboring jurisdictions use Special Exception applications to approve child care facilities. Ms. Belgin explained, however, that Fairfax County used the SE process to approve the facilities in P-Districts. She reiterated that this Amendment would ensure that the majority of applications involving child care facilities would only need approval by Special Permit; however, an SE would be required for certain facilities.

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

Wynne Busman, 11166 Fairfax Boulevard, Suite 206, Fairfax, representing Infant Toddler Family Day Care, voiced opposition to the Amendment, stating that the County should maintain more stringent regulations on child care services. She added that Fairfax County was one of three jurisdictions with stricter regulations than the state and cited deficiencies in some state-licensed home child care facilities that she had visited while emphasizing the importance of quality child care. She expressed concern that increasing the number of children from 10 to 12 would negatively affect the quality of care and, while she acknowledged the concerns of providers regarding the impacts of this limit, she stated that demand for child care services could be met by other means. In addition, she noted an incident of a home child care provider that failed to notice a child in peril and encouraged the Commission to consider the impact the proposed Amendment would have on the quality of child care. (A copy of Ms. Busman's statement is in the date file.)

Susan Gallier, 9754 Oatley Lane, Burke, voiced support for the proposed Amendment, saying that the County's policy on home child care services should be in harmony with the state. She stated that there were numerous state-licensed child care facilities operating with 12 children and described the difficulty of obtaining an SP, noting that she favored simplifying the application. She also expressed support for allowing additional flexibility for parking at such facilities and decreasing the application fee. In addition, she pointed out that DSS evaluated the impact of the provider's children during the licensing process, which sometimes resulted in fewer children being permitted. Ms. Gallier addressed Commissioner Hurley's concern regarding on-site assistants staying after hours. She briefly described the quality of home child care facilities in the County and asked that members of the audience stand and be recognized to represent the number of children that would be displaced if the limit on the number of children were not raised. (A copy of Ms. Gallier's statement is in the date file.)

Kirsten Lukas, 8704 Norfolk Avenue, Annandale, spoke in support of the proposed Amendment, citing safety concerns for children under the care of unlicensed providers, which she said would increase if the Amendment were not adopted. She also expressed concern about the economic impact on providers by reducing the number of children permitted in a facility, the potential increase in rates, and the cost of bringing a facility into compliance. She also pointed out the growing demand for child care services and the current deficits in the County's child care services. (A copy of Ms. Lukas's statement is in the date file.)

UNAPPROVED

CeCe Holman, 2241 Halter Lane, Reston, representing the Herndon Reston Family Child Care Association, addressed Commissioner Hurley's concern regarding on-site assistants, noting that certain child care providers offered 24/7 service. She also pointed out that there were ongoing efforts in other nearby jurisdictions to increase the number of children permitted in home child care facilities. Ms. Holman gave a presentation detailing a survey regarding the intentions of home child care providers should they be unable to continue operating and the number of children that would be displaced as a result. She also described the children and the activities offered at her home child care facility. (A copy of Ms. Holman's statement is in the date file.)

Jessica Daniels, 1621 Poplar Grove Drive, Reston, representing Fairfax County Home Daycare Centers, noted the challenges for parents seeking quality child care services and described the facility that her children attended. She also expressed concern that the requirements for an SP would create a greater financial burden for providers and parents. In addition, she encouraged the Commission to consider the impact of the Amendment outside its intended effects and favored consistent guidelines for enforcing the Zoning Ordinance. (A copy of Ms. Daniel's statement is in the date file.)

Suma Rajanna, 2852 Cedarest Road, Fairfax, stated that she was a home child care provider and described the activities she offered at her facility and indicated that her neighbors had not submitted any complaints about her facility. She added that the arrival and departure of the children was staggered to mitigate traffic impacts. In addition, she noted the importance of providing quality care to children and said that she favored raising the by-right limit of children permitted in home child care facilities. (A copy of Ms. Rajanna's statement is in the date file.)

In response to questions from Commissioner Flanagan, Ms. Rajanna stated that she cared for 12 children in her home child care facility and while she did not have an SP from the County, she was licensed for this number by the state. In addition, she clarified that she was in favor of the proposed Amendment.

Responding to questions from Commissioner de la Fe, Ms. Belgin reiterated that the Amendment would not change the by-right limit for children permitted in a facility.

Elizabeth Hijar, 2360 Albot Road, Reston, spoke in support for the proposed Amendment, noting that she was a home child care provider licensed by the State to care for 12 children. She also expressed concern that she would have to reduce the number of children at her facility if the limit were not raised.

Jennifer Larkin, 10120 Walnut Wood Court, Burke, voiced support for the proposed Amendment. She echoed remarks made by previous speakers regarding the difficulty of finding suitable child care services, the economic impact on parents and providers if the Amendment were not adopted, and the growing demand for child care services. She also addressed concerns about parking, noting the effectiveness of staggered arrival and departure times.

UNAPPROVED

Susan Edwards, 5537 Belle Pond Drive, Centreville, representing the Child Care Alliance, stated that she was a home child care provider and echoed remarks made by previous speakers regarding the effectiveness of staggered arrival and departure times for the children. She also addressed Commissioner Donahue's concerns about enforcing the limit on the number of children permitted in a facility, noting that the state conducted regular unannounced inspections. Referring to photographs she had taken of her driveway, she described how parking issues were addressed at her facility and another facility in her neighborhood. In addition, she listed the training offered by the County for child care providers. (A copy of Ms. Edwards's statement and photographs is in the date file.)

Kathy Zatt, 6800 Hamilton Road, Lorton, pointed out the challenges she encountered when she started a home child care facility and described the operation of her facility. She addressed the incident cited by Ms. Busman, stating that she believed this did not occur in a facility licensed by the state. She also noted that approximately 50 percent of the County's SP applications were denied and said that if the state recognized a provider's ability to care for 12 children, then the County should take that into consideration when reviewing that provider's application, thereby streamlining the process. She also recommended that the signs advertising the public hearing for an SP not mention that the application was for a child care facility due to safety concerns. (A copy of Ms. Zatt's statement is in the date file.)

Commissioner Hart addressed Ms. Zatt's concern about advertising signs, noting that County followed the policies prescribed by the state. He also addressed her remark about the frequency of denials by the BZA, describing his experience with applications involving home child care facilities and echoing his previous remarks regarding the state's areas of focus when assessing an application. In addition, he stated that the BZA did consider an applicant's history with state licensing when evaluating an SP for a facility.

Commissioner Hall echoed Commissioner Hart's remarks regarding advertising signs. She also responded to a remark in Ms. Zatt's statement regarding a provider's right to apply for an SP, noting that everyone could apply for the maximum number of children. In addition, she reiterated that the scope of the Amendment was limited to increasing the number of children permitted by Special Permit from 10 to 12. She also said that she supported the sanctioning of child care facilities by the County and state, but encouraged parents to conduct due diligence when seeking a provider.

Commissioner Flanagan also reminded Ms. Zatt that increasing the number of children permitted by-right was outside the scope of the Amendment and only the children permitted in a facility by Special Permit would be increased.

Replying to questions from Commissioner Flanagan, Ms. Zatt said that her facility was licensed for 12 children by the state and explained that the children attended her facility at staggered time periods. She also clarified that she supported the proposed Amendment. A lengthy discussion

UNAPPROVED

followed regarding the forms and standards associated with home child care facilities wherein Ms. Zatt encouraged greater coordination between the County and state to streamline the process. Commissioner Flanagan then informed Ms. Zatt that policies regarding the advertising signs for SPs and the format of the application forms were also outside the scope of the proposed Amendment.

Lourdes Alvarez, 8018 Diving Cliff Lane, Springfield, spoke in support of the Amendment. She said she supported raising the number of children permitted by Special Permit from 10 to 12 and expressed concern about the impact on communities from providers having to reduce the number of children. (A copy of Ms. Alvarez's statement is in the date file.)

Elisa Joyner, 21102 Joseph Terrace, Sterling, spoke in support of the Amendment. She echoed remarks from previous speakers regarding the difficulty of finding quality child care services and the negative impacts of not increasing the number of children permitted in a facility. She described her experience with her child care provider, noting the high quality of the care provided and the nurturing environment that encouraged learning. She also favored greater coordination between parents, providers, and neighbors to address parking concerns.

Tanja Hauter, 2417 Alsop Court, Reston, spoke in support of the Amendment because it would align County guidelines for home child care facilities with the state. She indicated that she was a state-licensed home child care provider and said that the evaluations conducted by DSS should not be superseded by zoning regulations. She gave a brief PowerPoint presentation that detailed DSS's evaluation process for providers, the potential consequences of children being displaced if the number of children permitted was not increased, the current trends in birth rates within the County, the current capacity of child care services within the County, and the difference in service between home child care facilities and commercial daycare centers. (A copy of Ms. Hauter's statement and PowerPoint presentation is in the date file.)

David Zatt, 6800 Hamilton Road, Lorton, spoke in support of the Amendment and noted that his wife operated a home child care facility. He described the care provided at her facility and the associated operating costs. He supported increasing the number of children permitted by Special Permit, increasing flexibility for parking, and reducing the application fee. He pointed out that the current $1,100 fee for an SP also applied to commercial child care centers and suggested a different fee structure for home child care providers. He also echoed previous remarks about streamlining the application process. (A copy of Mr. Zatt's statement is in the date file.)

Commissioner Lawrence responded to remarks made by speakers regarding coordination between the County and the state, noting that the state had not informed the County of the new requirements for home child care providers.

Mr. Zatt replied to a question from Commissioner Flanagan regarding the application fee for home child care providers, noting he favored lowering it to $435. A brief discussion ensued

UNAPPROVED

regarding the possibility of having a sliding scale for the application fee wherein Mr. Zatt pointed out the difference in cost between home child care providers and commercial daycare providers.

Monica Jackson, 5201 Heming Avenue, Springfield, stated that she was a state-licensed home child care provider and described the licensing process, the guidelines for child care facilities, and the level of scrutiny given to prospective facilities. She also pointed out the benefits of home child care facilities and the educational services provided by certain facilities. In addition, she addressed concerns about parking, noting the efficacy of staggered arrival and departure times. She also echoed previous remarks about streamlining the application process and recommended that the application fee for home child care providers be eliminated. (A copy of Ms. Jackson's statement is in the date file.)

//

The Commission went into recess at 10:38 p.m. and reconvened in the Board Auditorium at 10:59 p.m.

//

Chairman Murphy called the next listed speaker.

Marie Mosby, 2810 South 20th Street, Arlington, voiced support for the proposed Amendment because not increasing the number of children permitted would result in children being displaced from existing facilities, increase the burden on commercial daycare centers, and negatively impact the education of children. (A copy of Ms. Mosby's statement is in the date file.)

Michelle Cain, 7808 Kincardine Court, Alexandria, spoke on behalf of parents whose children attended Lucky Stars Preschool Academy. She voiced support for the Amendment, stating that 12 children in a home child care facility was optimal because it fostered a positive environment for children and prepared them for elementary school. In addition, she described her experiences with home child care facilities, noted the benefits of home child care facilities over commercial daycare centers, and commended the providers for their work.

Sherry Noud, 10845 Split Oak Lane, Burke, spoke in support of the Amendment. She indicated that her children attended a home child care facility and described the parking provisions at the site, noting that she supported greater flexibility for parking. She also addressed concerns regarding the potential stacking of vehicles outside a facility. She echoed previous remarks regarding the negative impact of providers reducing the number of children and the increasing demand for child care services. In addition, she pointed out the standards that state-licensed child care providers were required to meet. (A copy of Ms. Noud's statement is in the date file.)

UNAPPROVED

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience.

Dr. Muhammed Munir, 8913 Grist Mill Woods Court, Alexandria, spoke in support of the Amendment, but advocated simplifying the application process, increasing the number of children permitted by-right, and eliminating the application fee. He echoed previous comments about the quality of care offered by home child care facilities and described the challenges they faced. In addition, he expressed concern about imposing zoning restrictions on these facilities and compared these restrictions to other businesses. (A copy of Dr. Munir's statement is in the date file.)

Christopher Goodman, 13565 Mellville Lane, Chantilly, expressed support for the Amendment, noting that his wife was a home child care provider. He briefly described the care offered by her facility, noting that it catered to special needs children, and compared the quality of care to commercial daycare centers. He also aligned himself with previous speakers and supported increasing the number of children permitted by-right at a facility. In addition, he expressed concern about how the BZA would evaluate child care facilities in terms of additional children, parking, and screening. He also echoed previous remarks regarding the different operational costs and fee structure between home child care facilities and commercial daycare centers.

Commissioner Hart addressed Mr. Goodman's concerns regarding the BZA's evaluation process for additional children permitted in a facility, reiterating that the process would be streamlined for applicants in P-Districts because it would require only one public hearing. He also pointed out that the standards utilized by the BZA would be similar and that child care facilities operating by Special Permit might be more appealing in some instances because SPs had development conditions. Additional discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Mr. Goodman regarding the BZA's evaluation of the impact of the number of children permitted at a facility, the potential need for additional screening at a facility, and the process of gathering public input to determine the impact of an application.

In reply to questions from Commissioner Flanagan, Mr. Goodman stated that he favored the lowest possible application fee for home child care facilities. He also pointed out the cost of complying with state standards and the difference in rates charged by home child care facilities and commercial daycare centers. In addition, he expressed concern about the negative impacts of having more home child care providers operating unlicensed.

Replying to a question from Commissioner Hall, Ms. Belgin said that the process for evaluating a home child care facility and a commercial daycare center was similar. In addition, Commissioner Hall pointed out that the administrative costs for evaluating the two facilities was similar, but noted that she supported lowering the fee for home child care facilities.

Sally DiGiovanni, 2603 Lasswade Lane, Oakton, stated that while she supported home child care facilities, she expressed concern about their impacts on the surrounding communities and the

UNAPPROVED

possible precedent the Amendment might set for increasing the number of children permitted in a facility by-right.

Chairman Murphy responded to Ms. DiGiovanni concerns, reiterating that the by-right limit of children was outside the scope of the proposed Amendment.

Continuing her testimony, Ms. DiGiovanni expressed concern about parking issues for home child care facilities and described an instance where parking for a home child care facility caused conflicts with a tenant at one of her properties. (A copy of Ms. DiGiovanni's statement is in the date file.)

Christina Viscomi, 4133 Meadow Field Court, Fairfax, spoke in support of the Amendment, noting that her son attended a home child care facility. She said that women-owned businesses would be negatively affected if the proposed Amendment was not adopted and echoed previous remarks regarding the importance of home child care services and the quality of the care provided. She added that licensed home child care providers operating without any complaints should not be required to obtain an SP.

Anil Asthana, 1522 Goldenrain Court, Reston, stated that he operated a state-licensed home child care facility for 12 children, which also accommodated special needs children. He briefly described the operation of his facility, the quality of the care provided, and the demand for his services. He also noted the standards and scrutiny of the state licensing process, and the parking provisions at the site. (A copy of Mr. Asthana's statement is in the date file.)

Michael Bober, 7937 Bolling Drive, Alexandria, spoke in support of the Amendment, aligning himself with parents who utilized home child care facilities. He echoed previous remarks regarding the need for home child care services and the negative impact of providers reducing the number of children under their care. He also favored reducing the application fee to the lowest possible rate.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for a rebuttal statement from Ms. Belgin, who declined. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Hart for action on this case. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Hart MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY ON THE PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT REGARDING HOME CHILD CARE FACILITIES TO A DATE CERTAIN OF APRIL 4, 2013, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC COMMENTS.

UNAPPROVED

Commissioner Lawrence seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioner Litzenberger absent from the meeting.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 11:42 p.m.
Peter F. Murphy, Chairman
Janet R. Hall, 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: Jacob Caporaletti

Approved on: _____

_____
John W. Cooper, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

UNAPPROVED