

**MINUTES OF  
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2003**

PRESENT: Walter L. Alcorn, Commissioner At-Large  
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District  
Joan M. DuBois, Dranesville District  
Suzanne F. Harsel, Braddock District  
John B. Kelso, Lee District  
Ronald W. Koch, Sully District  
Iryong Moon, Commissioner At-Large  
Peter F. Murphy, Jr., Springfield District  
Linda Q. Smyth, Providence District  
Laurie Frost Wilson, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: John R. Byers, Mount Vernon District  
Janet R. Hall, Mason District

//

In the absence of Chairman Murphy, who arrived late, the meeting was called to order at 8:20 p.m. by Secretary Suzanne F. Harsel, in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center at 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

**COMMISSION MATTERS**

Commissioner Alcorn announced that he had distributed a draft of proposed revisions to various Ordinances concerning Chesapeake Bay regulations. He requested that Commissioners review and comment on these changes by close of business Friday, April 11, 2003, so the amendments could be readvertised and a public hearing date scheduled.

//

Commissioner Smyth announced that the Policy and Procedures Committee would meet on Wednesday, April 23, 2003 at 7:30 p.m. in the Board Conference Room, to discuss Area Plans Review procedures.

//

Commissioner Murphy announced his intent to defer the public hearing on SE-2002-SP-048, 11725 Lee Highway, LLC, from April 24, 2003 to June 11, 2003.

//

Commissioner DuBois announced her intent to defer the public hearing on SE-2002-DR-036, Daleview Nursery, LLC, and Maison Et Jardin, LTD, from May 1, 2003 to a date to be determined.

//

Citing affidavit problems, Commissioner de la Fe MOVED THAT THE PUBLIC HEARING ON SE-2002-HM-041, GREATER ATLANTIC BANK, BE DEFERRED TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MAY 7, 2003.

Commissioner Kelso seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioner Murphy not present for the vote; Commissioners Byers and Hall absent from the meeting.

//

Commissioner Harsel MOVED THE FOLLOWING MINUTES BE APPROVED:

- |                   |                   |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| November 7, 2001  | December 5, 2001  |
| November 8, 2001  | December 6, 2001  |
| November 14, 2001 | December 12, 2001 |
| November 15, 2001 | December 13, 2001 |
| November 28, 2001 |                   |
| November 29, 2001 |                   |

Commissioner Smyth seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 8-0-1 with Commissioner de la Fe abstaining, Commissioner Murphy not present for the vote; Commissioners Byers and Hall absent from the meeting.

//

Commissioner Harsel announced her intent to seek approval of the January 2002 minutes on Wednesday, April 30, 2003.

//

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (ELDERLY HOUSING) (Clarification)  
(The public hearing and decision on this application was held on April 13, 2003. A complete verbatim transcript of the decision made is included in the date file.)

Commissioner Alcorn MOVED TO CLARIFY FOR THE RECORD THAT THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (ELDERLY HOUSING), HEARD BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON APRIL 3, 2003, WOULD BE 12:01 A.M. FOLLOWING THE ADOPTION OF THE ORDINANCE BY THE BOARD.

Commissioner Kelso seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioner Murphy not present for the vote; Commissioners Byers and Hall absent from the meeting.

//

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (CONTRACTOR SIGNS) (Decision Only)  
(The public hearing was held on April 3, 2003. A complete verbatim transcript of the decision made is included in the date file.)

Commissioner Wilson MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT REGARDING TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTOR SIGNS AS ADVERTISED AND SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT DATED FEBRUARY 24, 2003, WITH A FEW CLARIFYING REVISIONS AND WITH THE EXCEPTION THAT SIGNS FOR HOME IMPROVEMENTS FOR DWELLING UNITS BE APPLICABLE ONLY TO SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING UNITS AND THE HEIGHT OF THE SIGNS BE LIMITED TO THREE AND A HALF FEET. THEREFORE, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF THE AMENDMENT AS SET FORTH IN ATTACHMENT 1, DATED APRIL 10, 2003.

Commissioner DuBois seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Alcorn and Murphy not present for the vote; Commissioners Byers and Hall absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Wilson FURTHER MOVED THAT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT HAVE AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF 12:01 A.M. THE DAY FOLLOWING ADOPTION BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

Commissioner DuBois seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Alcorn and Murphy not present for the vote; Commissioners Byers and Hall absent from the meeting.

//

APR-02-IV-4MV (Mt. Vernon District) (Decision Only)  
(The public hearing was held on September 25, 2002. A complete verbatim transcript of the decision made is included in the date file.)

In the absence of Commissioner Byers, Commissioner Murphy MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT ADOPT AREA PLAN REVIEW ITEM 02-IV-4MV, AS SHOWN IN THE HANDOUT DATED APRIL 10, 2003.

Commissioner Kelso seconded the motion which motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Byers and Hall absent from the meeting.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Harsel established the following order for the agenda items:

1. PCA-87-C-088/DPA-87-C-088 - JEFFREY FINANCIAL GROUP, INC.  
PCA-93-H-004/FDP-93-H-004-2 - JEFFREY FINANCIAL GROUP, INC.
2. SE-2002-PR-042 - FEDERAL REALTY INVESTMENT TRUST
3. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (Affordable Dwelling Unit Program)
4. S02-II-V1 - OUT OF TURN PLAN AMENDMENT (Providence District)

This order was accepted without objection.

//

PCA-93-H-004/FDP-93-H-004-2 - THE JEFFREY FINANCIAL GROUP, INC. - Appls. to amend the proffers and permit approval of the second final development plan for RZ-93-H-004 to permit offsite parking for residential development. Located on the E. side of Old Reston Ave., approx. 450 ft. N. of its intersection with Sunset Hills Rd. on approx. 4,797 sq. ft. of land zoned PDC. Comp. Plan Rec: Office. Tax Map 17-4 ((1)) 35D1. (Concurrent with PCA/DPA-87-C-088.) HUNTER MILL DISTRICT.

PCA-87-C-088/DPA-87-C-088 - JEFFREY FINANCIAL GROUP, INC. - Appls. to amend the proffers and development plan for RZ-87-C-088 to permit residential development at a density of 47.8 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). Located on the E. side of Old Reston Ave., approx. 500 ft. N. of its intersection with Sunset Hills Rd. on approx. 10,212 sq. ft. of land zoned PRC. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential Planned Community. Tax Map 17-4 ((1)) 5B. (Concurrent with PCA-93-H-004 and FDP-93-H-004-2.) HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. JOINT PUBLIC HEARING.

Mr. James Jeffrey, applicant, reaffirmed the affidavit dated February 4, 2003. There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Commissioner de la Fe announced that after the close of the public hearing he would defer a decision on this matter to April 24, 2003.

Ms. Cathy Belgin, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that although staff recommended approval of the applications in the staff report dated February 13, 2003, an addendum, dated April 9, 2003, recommended denial due to outstanding issues associated with off-site parking and access.

Mr. Richard Newlon, architect for the project, said the proposed development provided a unique opportunity to preserve an old structure, originally constructed in 1896, which had been used as a town hall, a church, and a warehouse for Virginia Gentlemen bourbon. He said the proposed development was an economically feasible use of the property and would preserve the building, which had been vacant for approximately 40 years. He said the applicant would diligently pursue a resolution of the outstanding issues.

Secretary Harsel called for speakers from the audience, but received no response. She noted that no rebuttal was necessary. There were no comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks, therefore, Secretary Harsel closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner de la Fe for action on this item. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner de la Fe MOVED TO DEFER THE DECISIONS ONLY FOR PCA-87-C-088, DPA-87-C-088, PCA-93-H-004, FDP-93-H-004-2, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF APRIL 24, 2003, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN.

Commissioner DuBois seconded the motion which carried by a vote 9-0-1 with Commissioner Murphy abstaining; Commissioners Byers and Hall absent from the meeting.

//

Secretary Harsel relinquished the Chair to Chairman Murphy.

//

SE-2002-PR-042 - FEDERAL REALTY INVESTMENT TRUST -  
Appl. under Sect. 9-620 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a waiver of certain sign regulations for Pan Am Shopping Center. Located in the S.E. quadrant of the intersection of Lee Hwy. and Nutley St. on approx. 25.25 ac. of land zoned C-6 and HC. Tax Map 48-4 ((1)) 12F. PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. JOINT PUBLIC HEARING.

Ms. Catherine Puskar, with Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Emrich and Terpak PC, reaffirmed the affidavit dated January 6, 2003. There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Ms. Lindsay Shulenberger, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), 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 application.

Ms. Puskar stated that the applicant was in the process of renovating and upgrading the Pam Am Shopping Center and desired to replace the existing pole-mounted sign with one consolidated monument sign with an attractive brick base, instead of installing two separate freestanding signs as permitted under the Ordinance. She noted that the applicant was in agreement with the proposed development conditions contained in the addendum to the staff report, and she requested favorable consideration.

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

Mr. Lincoln Rhoads, 3013 Winter Pine Court, Fairfax, expressed frustration with the enforcement of the sign Ordinance in Fairfax County, citing many examples of violations along Lee Highway from Merrifield to Fairfax Circle. He said he was concerned about the proliferation of illegal signs at the corner of Lee Highway and Nutley Street, and that tenants of the shopping center illegally posted signs in the Virginia Department of Transportation right-of-way. He said he would prefer no change to the present sign.

In response to a question from Chairman Murphy, Mr. Rhoads said that he was opposed to the names of tenants appearing on the sign. Chairman Murphy commented that he thought it was beneficial to both tenants and customers, who were not familiar with the area, to have signs identifying the stores located in a shopping center.

Commissioner Smyth said she shared Mr. Rhoads' concerns about the cardboard signs that littered this intersection and said she would ask the applicant's agent to address this matter.

In response to a question from Commissioner Smyth, Ms. Leslie Johnson, ZED, DPZ, said that temporary special permits were needed for firework stands, plant sales and other seasonal items sold in the parking lot.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Wilson, Ms. Shulenberger said that Development Condition Number 6 prohibited temporary signs on the back and side of the proposed sign, but said it could be revised to state that temporary signs were prohibited from the entire shopping center.

There were no further speakers; therefore, Chairman Murphy called upon Ms. Puskar for a rebuttal statement.

Ms. Puskar said the text on the proposed sign would be 151 square feet, which was within the square footage allowed for two free-standing signs, and that the majority of the square footage of the sign would be an architectural brick base which would have landscaping in front of it.

In response to a question from Commissioner Smyth, Ms. Puskar said that the applicant would be more vigilant about removing illegal signs. Commissioner Smyth said that she thought a development condition should address this issue.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Wilson, Ms. Puskar said the sign could have up to 16 individual tenant panels.

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 Smyth for action on this application. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Smyth MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY ON SE-2002-PR-042 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF APRIL 24, 2003, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN.

Commissioner Wilson seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Byers and Hall absent from the meeting.

//

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (AFFORDABLE DWELLING UNIT PROGRAM) - Appl. to amend Chap. 112 as follows: Revisions to the Affordable Dwelling Unit Program provisions for mid-rise multiple family dwellings. PUBLIC HEARING.

Ms. Donna Pesto, 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 approval of the proposed amendment as set forth in the attachment to a memorandum to the Planning Commission from Jane Gwinn, Zoning Administrator, dated February 20, 2003.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker.

Ms. Cheryl Cort, Executive Director, Washington Regional Network for Livable Communities, 1777 Church Street, NW, Washington, D. C., expressed strong support for the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment to bring mid-rise multi-family developments under the scope of the existing Affordable Dwelling Unit (ADU) Program. (A copy of her remarks is in the date file.)

Ms. Sharon Kelso, 5724 Crossgate Lane, Kingstowne, Executive Director of United Community Ministries, Co-Chair of the Homeless Oversight Committee, and a member of the ADU Task Force, expressed support for the proposed amendment. She said providing affordable and adequate housing for the approximately 2,000 homeless persons in Fairfax County, many of

whom were employed, was essential to attract and keep employers in Fairfax County. (A copy of her remarks is in the date file.)

Mr. Francis Steinbauer, President, Reston Interfaith Housing Corporation, 11484 Washington Plaza West, Reston, urged the Commission to recommend approval of the proposed amendment.

He said the health and well-being of the County was firmly linked to the availability of affordable housing for citizens, and that leadership, commitment, and resolve on the part of local government officials was necessary to help find economically feasible solutions to the housing crisis.

Mr. Stewart Schwartz, Coalition for Smarter Growth, 1777 Church Street, NW, Washington, DC, strongly endorsed the proposed amendment. He stated that the lack of affordable housing affected the ability of employers to attract employees to jobs in Fairfax County, and contributed to significant increases in long distance commutes into the County. He said affordable housing was a key strategy to reducing traffic congestion and was more effective than widening and expanding highways. He urged the County to do everything possible to create more pedestrian friendly mixed-use neighborhoods in close proximity to transit stations and employment centers. He noted that if more walkable communities were created, fewer structured parking spaces would be required. He said an assessment should be made of all vacant and under-utilized land in commercially zoned areas, low-density office parks, shopping centers, and industrial areas to determine if such areas could provide additional housing.

Ms. Patricia Nicoson, President, Dulles Corridor Rail Association, 11302 Fairway Drive, Reston, said the Association was working towards creating pedestrian friendly mixed-use development around transit stations. She said approval of the proposed amendment would be one step towards creating a balance in housing types in the County.

Mr. Stephen Cerny, Washington Regional Network for Livable Communities, 2011 Approach Lane, Reston, expressed support for the proposed amendment and said it would further the County's goals of increasing the availability of affordable permanent and supported housing.

Mr. Joe Stowers, 11448 Waterview Court, Reston, Chair of the Reston Planning and Zoning Committee, a member of the Dulles Corridor Rail Association Executive Committee, the Reston Citizens Association, and the Reston Association, endorsed the remarks of the previous speakers who supported the proposed amendment. He said, however, that he was disappointed that high-rise buildings were not included in the proposal, pointing out that high-rise developments were practically the only thing being built in Reston at the present time. He suggested that until there was an Ordinance addressing the requirement for ADUs in high-rise buildings, incentives other than bonus density should be considered such as tax relief and fee waivers. He pointed out that one solution to the traffic problem was to locate ADUs around employment centers and rail stations.

Barnes Lawson, Jr., Esquire, Lawson and Frank, 6045 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, said while he recognized that affordable housing is desperately needed in the County, the bonus density

recommended in the proposed amendment was insufficient when it was necessary to provide below-grade parking. He suggested a bonus density range of 17-30 percent.

Mr. Jim Butz, Affordable Housing Task Force member and multi-family builder, said builders were in favor of affordable housing, but the proposed amendment overlooked the fact that the

Ordinance should be revenue neutral to builders. He pointed out that multi-family buildings were more expensive to construct because of the need for structured parking. He said alternatives needed to be considered such as reducing fees, waiving sewer and water tap fees, taxing commercial properties, tax abatement, and purchasing existing housing stock in the County to be used as ADUs. He said a solution to this problem would be to require builders to provide 25 percent or less structured parking in a four-story building with ADUs, because above that amount, it was too expensive and complicated to justify the cost of construction.

Commissioner Kelso commented that there was a development in Lee District next to the Franconia-Springfield transit center of 350 units, primarily four story buildings with one eight-story building, with elevators and underground parking, and that the entire complex was affordable housing. In response, Mr. Butz said the cost of the land may have made this development economically feasible, but it should be studied to see how it was accomplished.

In response to a question from Commissioner Alcorn, Mr. Butz said in his opinion every project that was subject to the ADU Ordinance should either be revenue neutral or result in a positive return for the builder. Karen Harwood, Esquire, Office of the County Attorney, added that the term "revenue neutral" did not appear in the Ordinance, but stated that the owner/applicant "shall not suffer economic loss as a result of providing the ADUs."

Responding to a question from Commissioner Alcorn, Mr. Butz said that the cost of providing ADUs was determined by the cost of the land, construction costs, and soft costs.

In response to a question from Commissioner Harsel, Ms. Harwood said that economic loss referred to the cost of the whole project, not an individual unit, and that Section 2-810 of the Ordinance defined economic loss as "... that result, when the owner or applicant of a development fails to recoup the costs of construction and certain allowances as may be determined by the County Executive for the ADUs exclusive of the land acquisition cost and costs voluntarily incurred, but not authorized."

Mr. Eric Smart, Bolan Smart Associates, Mr. Butz, and Ms. Pesto responded to questions from Commissioner Harsel about revenue neutrality and how the number of bonus density units was calculated.

Mr. John Slidell, Bozzuto Group, residential multi-family rental and for-sale developers, read into the record a letter from Mr. Louis V. Genuario, Jr., President, Northern Virginia Building Industry Association, which expressed concern about the issue of surface versus structured parking, noting that it was not possible to use wood frame construction or add density/units without incurring the extraordinary costs associated with structured parking. In his letter

Mr. Genuario also expressed concern about condominium fees associated with for-sale four-story projects because those who might be income eligible to buy an ADU condominium might be unable to afford the fees required to live in the unit. (A copy of this letter is in the date file.) Speaking on his own behalf, Mr. Slidell said he agreed with the positions of Mr. Genuario and Mr. Butz.

In response to a question from Commissioner Smyth, Mr. Slidell said providing more than 25 percent structured parking would not be economically feasible for builders. Commissioner Alcorn said he was disappointed that the position of the building industry on this issue had not come to light during Task Force meetings.

Commissioner Wilson commented that the issue of condominium fees was irrelevant to the issue of revenue neutrality. In response, Mr. Slidell said that if a unit remained unsold because no one was qualified to buy it, the developer suffered an economic loss because he had to pay interest on construction loans.

In response to a question from Commissioner Wilson, Mr. Slidell said that five-story buildings were more expensive to build because they could not be constructed of wood framed combustible material, therefore, they should be excluded from the proposed amendment.

Mark Looney, Esquire, Cooley Godward, said that the building industry was concerned about the costs associated with providing structured parking. To illustrate his point, he said that the cost of a surface parking space was about \$2,000; an above grade parking space about \$8,000; and a below-grade space between \$15,000-\$18,000. He said revenue neutrality was a way to protect the integrity of the Ordinance from legal challenge because economic loss could be considered an illegal exaction or over-reaching of authority by a local government.

In response to a question from Commissioner Alcorn, Mr. Looney said one solution to the problem might be to require fewer ADUs if structured parking was required.

Commissioner Kelso said he thought the costs of structured parking was not an economic burden, because the parking was not given away free, but was sold, rented, or included in the purchase price of the unit. He emphatically stated that he did not agree with the position of the building industry on this issue.

Mr. Sean Caldwell, Trammell Crow Residential, said the cost of structured parking raised the cost of developing mid-rise multi-family units and one way or another, that cost would be shifted to the market rate units. He pointed out that high density development significantly raised condominium fees compared to a three-story product. He said more time was needed to fine tune these issues.

Lynne J. Strobel, Esquire, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Emrich & Terpak, PC, 2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Arlington, read into the record a letter from Todd Jacobus, Summit Properties, stating that the proposed amendment did not meet the stated objective of being revenue neutral to the developer/operator of a higher density multi-family product with all or partial structured parking,

and requested the Planning Commission not to recommend adoption in its current form and to consider further changes to ensure that units could be provided at no economic loss. (A copy of the letter was not provided for the date file.) Speaking on her own behalf, Ms. Strobel said she had been a member of the Task Force, and although much progress had been made and many alternatives considered, the Task Force concluded that bonus density was the best way to provide affordable units. She said, however, when it was applied to real situations, it did not work. She said residential developers, faced with rising costs and working within the new residential development criteria which created contributions and fees, were not supportive of the amendment as it was currently drafted. She noted that this was in stark contrast to the support the original ADU Ordinance received from the building industry. She also expressed a concern of the building industry that the requirement for additional units would make market rate units more expensive and would further widen the gulf between what was affordable and what was not.

In response to a question from Commissioner Smyth, Ms. Pesto said to her knowledge condominium fees had not been prohibitive in the past.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Alcorn, Ms. Strobel said that she was hopeful that a compromise could be reached by the County and the building industry on changes to the Zoning Ordinance Amendment.

In response to a question from Commissioner Harsel, Ms. Strobel said that the original Ordinance had been amended because it did not meet the standard of no economic loss.

There were no other speakers.

Chairman Murphy inquired if staff had any closing comments. Ms. Pesto stated that staff did not support the 25 percent proposal for structured parking. She reaffirmed staff's support for the recommendation contained in the memo dated February 20, 2003 from Jane Gwinn, Zoning Administrator, to the Planning Commission.

The Commission had no further comments or questions; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Alcorn for action on this item. (A verbatim transcript is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Alcorn MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER DECISION ON THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE AFFORDABLE DWELLING UNIT ORDINANCE, RELATING TO MID-RISE MULTIFAMILY DWELLINGS, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MAY 1, 2003, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN.

Commissioner Koch seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Byers and Hall absent from the meeting.

//

S02-II-V1 - OUT-OF-TURN PLAN AMENDMENT - To consider proposed revisions to the Adopted Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County, in accordance with the *Code of Virginia*, Title 15.2, Chapter 22 concerning approx. 3 ac. generally located N. of the Vienna Oaks subdivision and S.E. of the Flint Hill Rd. and Chain Bridge Rd. intersection (Tax Map 38-3((1)) 28 and 38-3 ((1)) 32). The area is planned for residential use at 3-4 dwelling units per acre. The Plan Amendment will consider the addition of Plan guidance indicating that infill development should not provide vehicular access from Route 123 to Whitecedar Ct. PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Ms. Clara Quintero, Planning Division (PD), 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 Plan amendment.

In response to a question from Commissioner Harsel, Mr. Sterling Wheeler, PD, DPZ, said development of only one parcel should not affect vehicular access to Route 123.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker.

Mr. Hays Gorey, 2622 Lemontree Lane, Vienna, spoke in general support of the proposed amendment, but requested that it be revised to ensure that traffic from Route 123 would not cut through the Vienna Oaks subdivision. (A copy of his remarks is in the date file.)

At the request of Chairman Murphy, those persons in the audience who aligned themselves with Mr. Gorey's position stood and were recognized.

Mr. Dennis Gerdovich, 2533 Flint Hill Road, Vienna, said he was opposed to the staff recommendation because he thought the two segments of Flint Hill Road should be connected. (A copy of his remarks is in the date file.)

Chairman Murphy commented that while interparcel access was a means to keep traffic moving, he was opposed to it in this particular case because traffic going to Route 66 and the Vienna Metro Station would cut through the Vienna Oak subdivision.

In response to a question from Commissioner Smyth, Mr. Wheeler said the proposed language was broad and only recommended that Whitecedar Court should not have a connection to Route 123, but it did not address design of the infill development.

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 Smyth for action on this item. (A verbatim excerpt is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Smyth MOVED THAT THE DECISION ONLY ON OUT-OF-TURN PLAN AMENDMENT S02-II-V1, FLINT HILL ROAD, BE DEFERRED TO A DATE CERTAIN OF APRIL 24, 2003, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN.

Commissioner Alcorn seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioner Kelso not present for the vote; Commissioners Byers and Hall absent from the meeting.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 11.15 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: Linda B. Rodeffer

Approved on: March 31, 2005

---

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