

**MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 2015**

PRESENT: Peter F. Murphy, Springfield District
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large
Janyce N. Hedetniemi, Commissioner At-Large
Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District
John L. Litzenberger, Jr., Sully District
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large
Julie M. Strandlie, Mason District
John C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District

ABSENT: Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:17 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

Commissioner Flanagan announced that a packet had been distributed to the Planning Commission prior to the meeting, which detailed an administrative item pertaining to FDPA 2012-MV-007, Accotink Village. He then explained that the development conditions for this application stated that the applicant would submit details of the urban plaza design for review and administrative approval by the Commission. Commissioner Flanagan stated that he intended to move on this item at the Planning Commission's meeting on Thursday, June 25, 2015, adding that he did not intend to recommend any additional modification to the designs and that any proposed modifications must be submitted prior to this meeting.

//

Commissioner Hart announced that the Planning Commission's Environment Committee had met earlier in the evening to discuss with staff policies regarding building energy. He then stated that the Environment Committee would meet again to discuss electric vehicle charging station infrastructure on Wednesday, July 22, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center. He added that this meeting was open to the public.

//

Commissioner Strandlie announced her intent to further defer the decision only for PA 2013-I-B2, Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Seven Corners CBC Area), from Wednesday, July 8, 2015 to Wednesday, July 15, 2015.

//

MINUTES APPROVAL FOR OCTOBER 23 AND 30, 2014 AND NOVEMBER 2014

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Hart: Secondly – minutes – I MOVE APPROVAL of the minutes – OF THE FOLLOWING MINUTES: OCTOBER 23RD, OCTOBER 29TH, OCTOBER 30TH, NOVEMBER 5TH, NOVEMBER 6TH, NOVEMBER 12TH, NOVEMBER 13TH, NOVEMBER 19TH, AND NOVEMBER 20TH, 2014.

Commissioner de la Fe: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. de la Fe. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to support the recommendation to adopt the minutes of the aforementioned dates, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Strandlie: Mr. Chairman? I abstain. I was not on the Commission yet.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. Ms. Strandlie abstains – not on the Commission.

(The motion carried by a vote of 10-0-1. Commissioner Strandlie abstained. Commissioner Lawrence was absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

FS-P15-10 – AT&T C/O SMARTLINK LLC, 7701 & 7707 Shreve Road

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Hart: And, Mr. Chairman, I have a “feature shown” – make sure it’s on the agenda – yes.

Chairman Murphy: P15?

Commissioner Hart: I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH STAFF’S DETERMINATION FOR FS-P15-10, THAT THE PROPOSED

TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY BY AT&T LOCATED AT 7701 AND 7707 SHREVE ROAD, FALLS CHURCH, VIRGINIA, IS SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED A "FEATURE SHOWN," PURSUANT TO *VIRGINIA CODE* SECTION 15.2-2232 AS AMENDED.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to concur with the "feature shown" in FS-P15-10, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman – abstain.

Chairman Murphy: All right, Mr. Sargeant abstains.

(The motion carried by a vote of 10-0-1. Commissioner Sargeant abstained. Commissioner Lawrence was absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hart established the following order of the agenda:

1. PCA 85-P-037 – INTERNATIONAL PLACE AT TYSONS, LLC
2. CSPA 84-D-049-04 – TYE DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, LLC (Providence District)
3. PA 2015-III-UP1 – FORESTVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (LIMITED EXPANSION OF APPROVED SEWER SERVICE) (Dranesville District)
4. PA 2015-III-DS2 – DULLES SUBURBAN CENTER, LAND UNIT D-3, TIMBER RIDGE (Sully District)
5. FS-D14-53 – BC CONSULTANTS FOR THE FALLS CHURCH CITY SCHOOL BOARD AND THE CITY OF FALLS CHURCH

This order was accepted without objection.

//

PCA 85-P-037 – INTERNATIONAL PLACE AT TYSONS, LLC
– Appl. to amend the proffers for RZ 85-P-037 previously approved for vehicle sale, rental, and ancillary service establishments to permit retail sales establishment and associated

modifications to proffers and site design with an overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.15. Located S. of Leesburg Pike, N. of Boone Blvd., and W. of Gallows Rd., on approx. 5.40 ac. of land zoned C-8, SC and HC. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential Mixed Use and Park/Open Space. Tax Maps 39-1 ((6)) 38 and 39-2 ((2)) 39.
PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Jill Parks, Applicant's Agent, Cooley, LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated May 19, 2015.

There were no disclosures by Planning Commission members.

In Commissioner Lawrence's absence, Commissioner Hart asked that Chairman Murphy ascertain 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 Hart for action on this case.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Chairman Murphy: Without objection, the public hearing is closed. Recognize Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a very straightforward case. It would allow a furniture store as an interim use in a vacant car dealership in Tysons Corner, pending redevelopment. It has staff's favorable recommendation, with which I concur. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF PCA 85-P-037, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED JUNE 5, 2015.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Ulfelder. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to approve PCA 85-P-037, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

(The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Lawrence was absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

CSPA 84-D-049-04 – TYE DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, LLC –
Appl. under Sect. 12-210 of the Zoning Ordinance to amend the

previously approved Comprehensive Sign Plan associated with RZ 84-D-049 to permit sign modifications. Located in the N.E., N.W., S.E. and S.W. quadrants of the intersection of Galleria Dr. and Tysons Blvd., on approx. 57.80 ac. of land zoned PDC, SC, and HC. Tax Map 29-4 ((10)) B, 2 A1, 2 A2, 2 C, 2 D, 3 A1, 3 B1, 3 C1, 3 D1, 4 A, 4 B, 5A, 5B, 5 C, and 6. PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

In Commissioner Lawrence's absence, Commissioner Hart asked that Chairman Murphy ascertain 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 Hart for action on this case.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Chairman Murphy: Without objection, the public hearing is closed – Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Yes, Mr. Chairman, could the applicant's representative come down to the podium please?

Chairman Murphy: Would you identify yourself for the record please?

David Schneider, Applicant's Agent, Holland & Knight, LLP: Of course. Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission, my name is David Schneider – I'm an attorney at Holland & Knight – and represent the applicants in this application.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you very much.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Schneider, could you confirm for the record that you – your client has reviewed the proposed development conditions dated June 10, 2015 and agrees to them?

Mr. Schneider: Yes.

Commissioner Hart: Thank you.

Mr. Schneider: Thank you.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman, this also is a very straightforward case. It's a request to allow color on signs in Tysons II, except not for the mall or the Ritz Carlton. It's a reasonable request. It's probably something that should've been built into the original proffers 27 years ago or whatever and we're taking care of it now and – allowing color on the signs is not going to hurt anybody. It has staff's favorable recommendation and I would concur with that as well. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE CSPA 84-D-049-04, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JUNE 10, 2015.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Ulfelder. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of the motion to approve CSPA 84-D-049-04, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Oppose? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

(The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Lawrence was absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

PA 2015-III-UP1 – FORESTVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (LIMITED EXPANSION OF APPROVED SEWER SERVICE) –
To consider proposed revisions to the Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County, VA, in accordance with the Code of Virginia, Title 15.2, Chapter 22. This Amendment concerns approx. 50.6 ac. generally located on the east side of Utterback Store Road and north of Route 7 (Leesburg Pike), Tax Map No. 12-1 ((1)) 45A (1085 Utterback Store Rd.), and Tax Map Nos. 12-1 ((1)) 45, 35 (1149 Utterback Store Rd.). The area is planned for public facility and public park uses that do not permit public sewer service. The Amendment will consider limited expansion of the Approved Sewer Service Area to permit sewer service for Forestville Elementary School and Great Falls Nike Park. The proposed sewer line is anticipated to traverse Tax Map No. 12-1 ((1)) 36 (11000 Leesburg Pike), cross under Route 7, and terminate within the existing sewer service area south of Route 7. The 400' rule would not apply to this sewer service expansion. DRANESVILLE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Doug Hansen, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended adoption of the modifications to the Comprehensive Plan proposed by PA 2015-III-UP1, as articulated on page 4 of the staff report.

When Commissioner Ulfelder asked about the existing condition of the restroom facilities in Nike Park, Mr. Hansen said that the park only accommodated porta potty facilities. Commissioner Ulfelder then explained that the Fairfax County Park Authority had received numerous complaints from citizens regarding Nike Park's lack of appropriate restroom facilities, stating that the modifications articulated in the proposed Amendment would improve this condition.

In reply to questions from Commissioner de la Fe, Commissioner Ulfelder stated that the majority of the athletic fields in Nike Park were grass fields and Mr. Hansen indicated that the proposed Amendment would not permit these grass fields to utilize gray water. Commissioner Ulfelder then reiterated that the intent of permitted expanded sewer facilities was to address citizens' concerns regarding the insufficient restroom facilities at Nike Park.

Commissioner Sargeant asked how the Chesapeake Bay Supplement to the Policy Plan limited future expansions of the sewer system on the subject property. Mr. Hansen explained that this provision was intended to address areas where septic was deemed appropriate, citing a case involving a subdivision in Area IV of the Lower Potomac District where such a system was retained to preserve archeological and other natural resources in the area. In addition, he said that this provision addressed cases where septic systems were failing and public sewer systems were necessary, absent of any alternative solutions.

Commissioner Sargeant indicated that he supported the use of public sewer systems on the subject property, but expressed concern about setting a precedent for future expansions. Mr. Hansen explained that the County exercised an administrative policy that permitted facilities located within 400 feet of a sewer system to utilize that system, but indicated that the surrounding community had voiced concerns regarding such expansions to the sewer system. He then pointed out that the language in the proposed Amendment stipulated that this administrative policy would not apply on the subject property, adding that this language had been included in staff's recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Sargeant and Mr. Hansen regarding whether the proposed language was sufficient to preclude the implementation of this policy wherein Mr. Hansen stated that this language was sufficient and would be reflected in the County's sewer map that was maintained by the Department of Wastewater Management, adding that previous Plan Amendments involving sewer expansions utilized similar language.

Replying to questions from Commissioner Hart, Mr. Hansen indicated that Forestville Elementary and Nike Park were the only facilities that could utilize the proposed sewer expansion. He then reiterated that the recommended Plan text on page 4 of the staff report stated that the administrative policy permitting facilities within 400 feet of a sewer system to utilize this system would not apply to the subject property, adding that this language would apply to future developments in the area. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Chris Caperton, PD, DPZ, regarding the extent to which the Comprehensive Plan could enforce the language precluding the application of this policy and the process for changing the manner in which the sewer service area was utilized wherein Mr. Caperton said that changes to the utilization of sewer services were subject to the approval of the Board of Supervisors and authorization from the County Executive.

Addressing Commissioner Hart's concerns regarding the provisions precluding the application of the administrative policy permitting facilities within 400 feet of a sewer system, Mr. Hansen pointed out that there would be a Board of Supervisors Action Item that would be concurrent with the Board of Supervisors' review of the proposed Amendment. He then explained that this Action Item would specify the parcels of land that could utilize the proposed sewer expansion

and would be voted on by the Board of Supervisors' after the public hearing for the proposed Amendment.

Referring to the language in the proposed Amendment that precluded the application of the administrative policy permitting facilities within 400 feet of a sewer system, Commissioner Flanagan asked about County policies regarding the extension of sewer services. Mr. Hansen stated that this policy was in place and precluding its implementation required specific language in the Plan text, adding that the concurrent Action Item that would be submitted to the Board of Supervisors would specify the facilities that would be served by the expanded sewer system. He then indicated that the Action Item would include additional provisions to ensure the policy was not implemented.

When Commissioner Flanagan asked about the process by which citizens could apply to utilize the proposed sewer system expansion, Mr. Hansen said that while citizens could apply to utilize this system, such use was subject to authorization by the appropriate County authorities. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Flanagan and Mr. Hansen regarding the circumstances in which additional utilization of the expanded sewer system was authorized wherein Mr. Hansen confirmed that the Board of Supervisors could approve a modification to the Comprehensive Plan to permit such a use, but noted that such approval would be subject to a public hearing.

Addressing the concerns articulated by Commissioner Hart and Commissioner Flanagan regarding provisions to limit the use of the expanded sewer system, Mr. Hansen stated that the intent of the language in the proposed Amendment was to articulate these limits within the scope of the Comprehensive Plan. He added that the concurrent Action Item that would be reviewed by the Board of Supervisors would further articulate these limits.

Responding to questions from Commissioner Ulfelder, Mr. Hansen confirmed that the County Attorney had determined that a citizen seeking to utilize the expanded sewer system would likely be denied such a use. He added that some members of the Board of Supervisors had expressed concern about Washington Gas, which owned a small portion of the subject property, utilizing this expanded sewer system. However, he indicated that the County Attorney had determined that Washington Gas could not utilize this expanded sewer system. In addition, Mr. Hansen said that the County's official wastewater sewer map would denote the limitations on utilizing the proposed sewer system expansion.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker.

John McGranahan, 1751 Pinnacle Drive, Suite 1700, representing the Fairfax County School Board, indicated that he was speaking on behalf of the nominator for the proposed Amendment. He commended staff for addressing the Commission's concerns regarding the legal issues pertaining to this Amendment. He then explained that the Board of Supervisors authorized the proposed Amendment to ensure its consistency with the Amending Sewer Service Area (ASSA) map, which would be modified to reflect the proposed sewer system expansion. Mr. McGranahan indicated that this map was an official County document that designated the sites that would be served by the sewer system. He explained that the Action Item that the Board of Supervisors would review concurrently with the proposed Amendment would modify ASSA to ensure that

the subject property was within the service area of this expanded sewer system. He reiterated that this map would contain provisions that would preclude the implementation of the administrative policy permitting facilities within 400 feet of a sewer system. Mr. McGranahan also stated that the proposed sewer system expansion was necessary for the ongoing renovations at Forestville Elementary School, which had been approved and funded.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for concluding remarks from Mr. Hansen, who declined. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Ulfelder for action on this item.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Chairman Murphy: Public hearing is closed. Mr. Ulfelder.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Mr. Chairman, before we go on verbatim I would just like to say that the residents in Great Falls are very protective about any possible expansion of the approved sewer service area in their particular area – in that northern part of the Upper Potomac Planning District. In this case, however, the GSCA – the Great Falls Citizens Association – has made it clear that it supports the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and the proposed new sewer line that will follow. So with that, I would go on verbatim and –

Chairman Murphy: Okay.

Commissioner Ulfelder: I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR PLAN AMENDMENT 2015-III-UP1, FOUND ON PAGES 4 AND 5 OF THE STAFF REPORT DATED JUNE 10TH, 2015. The Amendment would modify the Plan language for Tax Map Parcels 12-1 ((1)) 45A, 12-1 ((1)) 45, and 12-1 ((1)) 35 to permit public sewer service for Forestville Elementary School and Great Falls Nike Park. The expansion of the Approved Sewer Service Area is needed to address the failing septic system at the school and also permit public restroom facilities at Nike Park. The proposed sewer line would serve only these two public uses. The sewer line will not set a standard for future expansion of the Approved Sewer Service Area or additional development unrelated to this proposal. This very limited proposal of the Approved Sewer Service Area will include a notation on Fairfax County's official Approved Sewer Service Area map that the 400-foot rule does not apply to this sewer line.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Migliaccio. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it adopt Plan Amendment PA 2015-III-DS2 [sic] as articulated by Mr. Ulfelder, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

(The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Lawrence was absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

PA 2015-III-DS2 – DULLES SUBURBAN CENTER, LAND UNIT D-3, TIMBER RIDGE – To consider proposed revisions to the Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County, VA, in accordance with the *Code of Virginia*, Title 15.2, Chapter 22. This Amendment concerns an approx. 18.7 acre parcel located between EDS Drive and Wall Road, west of Air and Space Museum Parkway, (Tax Map Parcel 24-4 ((1)) 6B4) in the Sully Supervisor District. The subject area is currently planned for campus style office uses at an intensity of .50 to 1.0 FAR, with an option for mixed use development up to 0.70 FAR south of EDS Drive. The amendment will consider replacing approved office uses with up to 150 residential townhomes, and the inclusion of a County senior center or other county facility, and a youth sports facility on the site. Recommendations relating to the transportation network may also be modified. SULLY DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Tarek Bolden, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended adoption of the modifications to the Comprehensive Plan proposed by PA 2015-III-DS2, as articulated on pages 12 through 14 of the staff report.

Referring to the language in the last bullet point on page 12 and continuing into page 13 of the staff report, Commissioner Strandlie stated that this language detailed the appropriate contributions for mitigating the impact of the recommended development on the school system. She then requested additional information on the possible contributions pertaining to after-school or County programs, such as Head Start, and asked if these after-school programs pertained to School Age Child Care (SACC) programs. Ajay Rawat, Facilities Services Planning, Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS), indicated that these programs had initially referred to SACC, but noted that references to SACC had been removed from the proposed Amendment.

Commissioner Strandlie indicated that she did not support this language because such contributions would incur a negative impact on the children involved in SACC. Commissioner Strandlie then announced that she would propose a friendly amendment at the conclusion of the public hearing to remove references to after school or County programs from the proposed Amendment. She added that she favored encouraging contributions that would not conflict with on-site after-school programs. Mr. Rawat said that the intent of moving certain after school programs off-site was to reserve space in school facilities for academic uses. Commissioner

Strandlie stated that she did not object to such use, but noted the importance of preserving the existing provisions for SACC and the potential conflicts of moving programs like SACC off-site.

Commissioner Hurley expressed concern regarding Commissioner Strandlie's friendly amendment, stating that addressing issues pertaining to off-site activities involving SACC was outside the purview of the proposed Amendment. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hurley and Commissioner Strandlie, with input from Mr. Rawat, regarding the extent to which the proposed Amendment affected SACC programs wherein Mr. Rawat indicated that the existing language in the proposed Amendment referring to after school programs was intended intended to refer to SACC.

When Commissioner Migliaccio asked whether the language referring to after school programs was currently present in the Comprehensive Plan, Leanna O'Donnell, PD, DPZ, said that this language was not currently included in the Plan text. In addition, she explained that staff had been informed about concerns regarding references to SACC programs, but indicated that these references had been removed from the proposed Amendment. However, she deferred to FCPS regarding the possibility that the mention of after school-programs in the proposed Amendment could apply to SACC. Commissioner Strandlie added that there were various after-school programs that utilized school facilities, but noted the SACC program utilized dedicated classrooms and favored additional coordination with FCPS to ensure that these facilities were appropriately utilized.

Commissioner Sargeant asked about the cumulative impact of the recommended development, citing neighboring properties, traffic patterns, and the school system as areas of potential impact. Ms. O'Donnell said that the impact of a previously-approved residential development in the surrounding area had been reviewed by staff during the last Area Plans Review process. She then indicated that the impact of the proposed Amendment on the school system had been evaluated and staff determined that the schools could accommodate this development. In addition, Ms. O'Donnell said that staff reviewed the transportation impact of the proposed Amendment and noted that the number of trips generated by this development would be less than the office development currently prescribed by the Comprehensive Plan. She said that staff would provide additional information on the impact of the proposed Amendment after further study was conducted. Commissioner Sargeant supported such studies to ensure that the development prescribed by the proposed Amendment could accommodate the necessary features.

Commissioner Sargeant expressed concern about the noise impact on the subject property caused by the operation of Dulles International Airport. He then asked whether there had been a study to determine the extent of this noise impact. Mr. Bolden said that the recommended development articulated in the proposed Amendment was consistent with the prescribed noise contours by the Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority, but noted that on-site noise measurements had not been conducted. Ms. O'Donnell added that noise impact would be considered if the subject property were subject to a Rezoning, but reiterated that the recommended development was consistent with the prescribed noise contours for the site.

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

Naveen Kammila, 13671 Neil Armstrong Avenue, Herndon, said that he resided in the Discovery Square Community, which was located near the subject property. He described the Discovery Square neighborhood, stating that it accommodated approximately 1,000 families. He then voiced opposition to the proposed Amendment because it would permit additional residential development to an extent that the community could not accommodate. Mr. Kammila said that the recommended development would create safety hazards and incur additional traffic congestion. He also stated that this development would not provide sufficient common spaces, citing an incident where an elderly individual had been injured due to the overcrowding at the existing common spaces. In addition, Mr. Kammila stated that the proposed Amendment would negatively impact the school zoning and land values for the surrounding community. He indicated that he favored retaining the existing recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan for an office development on the site. (A copy of Mr. Kammila's statement is in the date file.)

Answering questions from Commissioner Litzenberger, Mr. Kammila said that he had not attended any of the three community meetings regarding the proposed Amendment. He also stated that he had not been informed about staff's conclusion that this Amendment would reduce the amount of trips to the subject property.

Commissioner Litzenberger addressed Mr. Kammila's concerns regarding the recommended development's impact on the school system, stating that the system could accommodate the estimated 66 student increase that this development would incur.

Commissioner Litzenberger informed Mr. Kammila that the concerns listed in the petition that had been included in his statement could be addressed during the Rezoning process for the proposed development and addressing such concerns were beyond the scope of the proposed Amendment. In addition, he said that there would be additional community meetings regarding this development prior to the public hearing for a Rezoning application.

Narasimham Nimmagadda, 13675 Neil Armstrong Avenue, Herndon, aligned himself with the previous speaker, stating that he opposed the proposed Amendment due to concerns about the recommended development's impact on public safety, traffic patterns, and the school system. He also expressed concern that there had not been sufficient time for the surrounding community to evaluate the recommended development prescribed by the proposed Amendment. In addition, Mr. Nimmagadda pointed out that there was a lack of amenities in the surrounding communities and favored provisions that would ensure such amenities would be provided. He also indicated that he favored the existing recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan for an office development on the site, adding that a residential development would have a negative impact on property values in the surrounding area.

When Commissioner Litzenberger asked Mr. Nimmagadda whether he understood his response to Mr. Kamilla's concerns, Mr. Nimmagadda said that he concurred with this response. Commissioner Litzenberger reiterated that the recommended development in the proposed amendment would incur less traffic than an office development.

Commissioner Litzenberger addressed Commissioner Sargeant's concerns regarding the impact of the noise generated by Dulles International Airport, stating that this issue had been sufficiently

evaluated. He added that the noise contours for the subject property would be re-evaluated every five years.

Commissioner Hedetniemi echoed remarks from Commissioner Litzenberger regarding the recommended development's impact on traffic, stating that it would significantly reduce the number of trips to the subject property. She added that this trip reduction would improve the quality of life in the surrounding community. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Litzenberger and Mr. Nimmagadda, with input from Chairman Murphy, regarding the manner in which the recommended development would reduce the traffic impact on the subject property wherein Commissioner Litzenberger stated that modifying the recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan from commercial to residential would reduce the amount of trips generated by the development and Chairman Murphy pointed out that residential developments generated less trips than commercial developments.

Commissioner Hart informed Mr. Nimmagadda and Mr. Kammila that their concerns would be addressed during the Rezoning process for the subject property. He then suggested that they coordinate with the applicant for such a Rezoning application to voice their concerns and address the issues they raised in their testimony. In addition, Commissioner Hart said that the status of the school districts for the subject property or the surrounding neighborhood were beyond the purview of the Planning Commission, pointing out that Fairfax County School Board had the authority to modify these boundaries.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience.

Sara Mariska, 2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1300, representing Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, PC, said she represented an applicant that intended to pursue a Rezoning application on the subject property. She explained that the subject property and portions of the surrounding area had been originally approved in 2007 as a Planned Residential Mixed Use District that was to be developed with 1,159 multi-family dwelling units, 108,000 square feet of commercial space, and 600,000 square feet of office space. She then pointed out that this plan was modified in 2012 to reduce the overall number of units to 805 multi-family dwelling units in response to changes in the market. Ms. Mariska stated that there was a 350 unit multi-family development currently being constructed on the site. In addition, she indicated that the original and subsequent Rezoning applications for the subject property and the surrounding area included a \$15 million proffer package that included numerous transportation improvements and amenities, which had been installed prior to the construction of the multi-family development and was crafted to accommodate the previously-approved 600,000 feet of office development. Ms. Mariska added that this proffer package also included a park complex. She then explained that the proposed Amendment would provide additional benefits to the site, echoing remarks from Commissioner Litzenberger regarding the proposed development's provisions for reducing the traffic impact. She added that there was language in the proposed Amendment that permitted the inclusion of a community facility or a senior center on a portion of the site. Ms. Mariska addressed the concerns raised by previous speakers, stating that the reduction in trips generated by the recommended development would improve the safety of the surrounding area. She also addressed concerns regarding the recommended development's impact on the school system, saying that this would be addressed by proffers at the time of Rezoning. In addition, she

indicated that the proposed Amendment permitted the inclusion of other amenities, such as sidewalks, trails, and recreational facilities that could be articulated in the proffers for a Rezoning application. Ms. Mariska indicated there was already sufficient office space in the surrounding area.

Responding to questions from Commissioner Litzenberger, Ms. Mariska said that the vacancy rate for office space in the surrounding area was between 20 and 25 percent. She also confirmed that there was sufficient office space to accommodate businesses that could serve the surrounding community.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for concluding staff remarks from Mr. Bolden, who declined.

Referring to page 1 of the staff report, Commissioner Flanagan pointed out that the text in the first paragraph indicated that the Board of Supervisors asked staff to review the possibility of including a youth sports facility, a County senior center, or another County facility on the subject property. He added that Mr. Kammila's statement included a petition that detailed the communities concerns and one of these concerns pertained to a lack of youth sports facilities, such as community pools. He stated that while the existing Plan text mentioned recreation facilities, it did not mention community pools, a County senior center, or other facilities. Commissioner Flanagan then asked whether these uses would be precluded in the proposed Amendment. Mr. Bolden explained that the existing Sully Senior Center in the Sully District was scheduled to cease operation and sites for a new facility were being evaluated. He then said that this language had been included to evaluate the possibility of dedicating land for such a facility, but noted that staff favored language that was sufficiently flexibility to accommodate other facilities on the site.

When Commissioner Flanagan reiterated his questions regarding whether the proposed uses listed on page 1 of the staff report could be implemented, Ms. O'Donnell explained that staff had coordinated with the Fairfax County Department of Neighborhood and Community Services (FCDNCS) on developing the language for the proposed Amendment. She then stated that the FCDNCS favored retaining the proposed language to ensure sufficient flexibility with future development on the site and this language did not preclude the uses outlined in the petition included with Mr. Kammila's statement. Ms. O'Donnell added that the 2232 process could also be utilized to pursue these uses as the subject property was developed.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Litzenberger for action on this item.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Chairman Murphy: All right. Public hearing is closed. Mr. Litzenberger.

Commissioner Litzenberger: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to make a motion and Commissioner Strandlie is going to have an amendment on the schools language so – as staff indicated, the Amendment would modify the Plan language for Tax Map Parcel 24-4 ((1)) 6B4 to replace the approved office uses with up to 150 residential townhomes and land for County use, such as a community center. Staff has indicated that a residential development option for the subject property would align with existing character of the development within the land unit. Therefore, I MOVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR PLAN AMENDMENT 2015-III-DS2, AS SHOWN ON PAGES 12 TO 14 IN THE STAFF REPORT DATED JUNE 10TH, 2015 – and Ms. Strandlie.

Commissioner Flanagan: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Flanagan. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors –

Commissioner Litzenberger: Ms. Strandlie wants to make an amendment.

Commissioner Strandlie: I'm offering friendly amendment.

Chairman Murphy: Amendment – okay.

Commissioner Strandlie: A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO THE LANGUAGE ON THE BOTTOM OF PAGE 12 OF THE STAFF OF THE REPORT, CONTINUING ONTO PAGE 13 – DELETE THE LANGUAGE, “OR AFTER SCHOOL OR COUNTY PROGRAMS, SUCH AS HEAD START.” And that would be the deletion.

Chairman Murphy: Okay.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: All right, let's just second the entire package – the motion made by Mr. Litzenberger and the friendly amendment. All those in favor –

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Commissioner Hurley: Discussion?

Chairman Murphy: All right – discussion.

Commissioner Hurley: I am still uncomfortable with why there is any opposition to – I mean, those are just – as was said, the staff wants to have it as broad as possible – a senior center, a basketball court, a whatever – and there are after school programs – or County programs is what it says – SACC is a County program. So by saying “or,” that means they're different. After school program could be kinder-care. It could be all sorts of things. I don't see why there's – you

know, we're trying to make it – the staff's trying to make it as broad as possible – anything from kinder-care to an elder care and everything in between. I don't understand.

Commissioner Strandlie: Kinder-care is not co-located in the elementary schools.

Commissioner Hurley: But that's not what we're talking about. We're not talking about schools at all. They're talking – what this paragraph says is in this application – in this case – they want to set aside some acreage – about five acres – for some – some facility, whether it's for youth or seniors or whatever – a community use package. It has nothing to do with the school system or SACC or whatever.

Commissioner Strandlie: This – this just – this talks about opportunities for shared space in private buildings for activities such as community use, adult education, vocational training, academy programs, or after school or County programs such as Head Start.

Commissioner Hurley: Yes – County programs such as Head Start, which is different from SACC.

Commissioner Strandlie: The after school program is SACC.

Commissioner Hurley: Okay. I hear that differently. Maybe the staff can clarify it to me – after school or County say that's – SACC is a County program.

Leanna O'Donnell, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: The – if I –

Commissioner Strandlie: It's the same thing and that was my question to him.

Ms. O'Donnell: The – the second bullet from-

Chairman Murphy: Hold on. Go ahead.

Ms. O'Donnell: The second bullet from the bottom of – the second bullet up from the bottom of the page on page 12 discusses the five acres for the – to be dedicated to the County for use, such as a community center. Separate from that, we have a different recommendation that introduces flexibility to how the school contribution may be used so they're different. The – one condition is specific to the five acres for a community and the next one is the one that talks about the school – how the school contribution may be-

Commissioner Hurley: So this paragraph is about how it's ameliorating the impact upon the school system.

Ms. O'Donnell: Correct.

Commissioner Hurley: Okay. I understand now. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Ulfelder.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Would Commissioner Strandlie slowly go through what you're striking so I will fully – where you start?

Commissioner Strandlie: Certainly. I am striking from “or after – or County programs such as Head Start.”

Commissioner Ulfelder: So it's-

Commissioner Strandlie: It is at the top of page 13.

Commissioner Flanagan: 13 – the very first line.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Okay.

Commissioner Strandlie: So the school-age child care programs are run by the County and they utilize dedicated classroom space in the schools and it's part of our CIP recommendations every year. You'll see that in the line item. So the County runs those programs. They pay the staff. But they are located on-site for the schools and we are preserving those space – that space and that integrity.

Chairman Murphy: I think that memo I sent about verbatims just went down the tubes here-

Commissioner Hart: Yeah, we're past that.

Chairman Murphy: -or the sewers on that previous application. Mr. Migliaccio.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you. Just on that point for staff – does the last sentence give enough leeway in that bullet point for – if they need to do something with after school programs or anything else so it's not specifically marked on the sentence before?

Ajay Rawat, Facilities Services Planning, Fairfax County Public Schools: The last sentence talks about the school capacity piece and Commissioner Strandlie has a concern about the after school program.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Okay. I'll shut up because we're on verbatim.

Chairman Murphy: Go ahead. No, make your point, I mean.

Commissioner Migliaccio: But you're talking about additional resources to accommodate its growing student population. A creative person can read that many different ways. You have many attorneys at the Fairfax County Public School system that are hired to read and do – I understand Ms. Strandlie is talking about after school. I'm just trying to find a solution. I think the last sentence gives the school system enough leeway within the Plan Amendment here to allow Ms. Strandlie to strike what she's doing and allow anybody with a reasonable thought process to go ahead and implement it if they can get it to the Board.

Mr. Rawat: Absolutely.

Commissioner Migliaccio: So-

Mr. Rawat: Absolutely, yes.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Yeah, the verbatim is trashed already. I guess the objective of the amendment is to deprive the Board of Supervisors of the flexibility to consider an option that I guess Commissioner Strandlie is saying is a bad idea. My question for staff is – does staff prefer it the way it was with the flexibility in it? Or is staff okay with the amendment based on what Commissioner Migliaccio is saying – is that even if we cut out those 8 or 10 words, they can still do it anyways with that last clause?

Chairman Murphy: Or don't they care?

Mr. Rawat: Fairfax County Public Schools – it's staff's preference would be – to keep it the way it is because it puts it in exact words. More programs could be used off-site – off school site. But as Commissioner – Mr. James – I cannot repeat the last name –

Chairman Murphy: Hurley.

Mr. Rawat: -said that –

Chairman Murphy: Or Migliaccio.

Mr. Rawat: -there is enough flexibility in the language that could provide some opportunities to provide these programs off-site. But again, staff's preference would be to keep – in the language.

Commissioner Hart: The schools wants it the way it was. How about – how about Planning and Zoning?

Ms. O'Donnell: I think the language – it provides additional flexibility, but this is used as a guide and, you know, as a – as the zoning moves through the process, the details of the school contribution will be worked out for this particular case. So if the Commission – if the Commission wants to remove that language, I don't think that's going to cause a huge problem for us. It provides flexibility in the Plan, but the details are going to be worked out in the zoning and I think that last statement does provide some additional flexibility here.

Commissioner Strandlie: Just – just to clarify, I did not strike that to give them some flexibility. But the specific intention is that the SACC programs will not be moved off-site.

Commissioner Hart: Staff can live with the amendment because we think the Board could still end up there anyway. That's a yes?

Ms. O'Donnell: I think they could and I think, you know, if there's obviously a strong concern about SACC programs, in particular, you know that – that would come up during the zoning process too. I don't know that – you know –

Chairman Murphy: Why don't we just say SACC programs in-

Ms. O'Donnell: -that could be addressed at that point too.

Commissioner Hart: I'll be quiet.

Commissioner Litzenberger: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Who are you? Mr. Litzenberger.

Commissioner Litzenberger: I think it's important that this Commission have standardization on this issue. We already passed the exact same thing for a school in the Mason District. We ought to do the same thing in the Sully. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: All right. We'll vote on the amendment. All those in favor – I believe it was seconded by Ms. Hedetniemi.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: All those in favor of the amendment offered by Ms. Strandlie, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed?

Commissioner Hurley: Nay.

Chairman Murphy: Motion carries. Ms. Hurley votes no. All right, we'll go back to the main motion. All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it adopt PA 2015-III-DS2, as amended by the motion by Ms. Strandlie, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Ms. Hurley, do you abstain or-

Commissioner Hurley: No.

Chairman Murphy: You're going to vote – okay. All right so. Hey, we could've done that 20 minutes ago. All right.

(The first motion carried by a vote of 10-1. Commissioner Hurley voted in opposition. Commissioner Lawrence was absent from the meeting.)

(The second motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Lawrence was absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

The Commission went into recess at 9:40 p.m. and reconvened in the Board Auditorium at 9:59 p.m.

//

FS-D14-53 – BC CONSULTANTS FOR THE FALLS CHURCH
CITY SCHOOL BOARD AND THE CITY OF FALLS CHURCH
– Appl. for a proposed school expansion at Mt. Daniel Elementary,
located at 2328 N. Oak St., Falls Church. Tax Maps 40-4 ((1)) 22,
40-4 ((15)) A, 40-4 ((19)) (A) 41. Area II. DRANESVILLE
DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Chris Caperton, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended that the Planning Commission find that FS-D14-53 satisfied the criteria of location, character, and extent and should be considered a “feature shown,” pursuant to *Virginia Code* Section 15.2-2232 as amended.

In response to questions from Commissioner Flanagan, Mr. Caperton stated that the proposed school expansion would be constructed within the footprint of the existing building on the site. He then indicated that the existing building was one story and the proposed expansion would be three stories, but noted that there were portions of the existing building that would remain unchanged, adding that portions of this building were below-grade.

Referring to the memorandum in Attachment D of the staff report, which detailed the Fairfax County Department of Transportation’s (FCDOT) review of the proposal, Commissioner Ulfelder said that the City of Falls Church provided the transportation measures they utilized for the existing school facility on the subject property. He then asked if these measures would continue to be utilized after the expansion was completed. Kristin Calkins, Transportation Planning Division, FCDOT, confirmed that the use of these transportation measures would continue, explaining that the school’s bus system would expand from five buses to nine buses after the expansion was completed. She also stated that the parking provisions on the site would be modified to accommodate the expansion and these provisions would ensure that the park-and-ride traffic would be contained on-site. In addition, Ms. Calkins indicated that the school would continue to utilize a policy wherein parents attending events at the school would park off-site and be shuttled to the school to mitigate the impact on the surrounding neighborhood streets.

Commissioner Ulfelder pointed out that the facility on the site was neither owned by the County, nor did it serve County residents. He then asked about the process staff utilized to evaluate the subject application, given these circumstances. Mr. Caperton explained that staff utilized the Policy Plan's provisions for school facilities to evaluate the proposal. He said that the Policy Plan included language pertaining to the expansion of facilities on an existing property and provisions for making school facilities available for public use. He added that the proposed school expansion would permit opportunities for public use, which would benefit County residents. Mr. Caperton also indicated that staff's evaluation of the proposed expansion was similar to the evaluations conducted for similar facilities in the County. Commissioner Ulfelder pointed out that the process for evaluating schools within the County included opportunities to evaluate alternate sites, but noted that there were no such opportunities with the proposal because the City of Falls Church was responsible for evaluating these sites. He then expressed concern about the City of Falls Church's determination that the subject property could accommodate an expansion to the existing school and asked if staff accepted the City's conclusion. Mr. Caperton said that staff did accept their conclusion, but reiterated that the overall review process conducted by staff was consistent with evaluations conducted for similar facilities within the County. He added that while staff did evaluate alternative sites for new schools, such evaluations were not conducted for expansions to existing schools.

When Commissioner Migliaccio asked for a detailed rendering of the proposed school expansion, Robert Jones, Applicant's Agent, ARCADIS, said that there were renderings that could be provided to the Commissioners. He then described the design of the expansion, noting that portions of the school expansion would be built into the hilly topography of the site. He also echoed remarks from Mr. Caperton regarding the presence of below-grade areas at the facility. Mr. Jones then explained that while the expanded facility would consist of three stories, one of those stories would be within the below-grade areas. He added that the height of the expanded structure would be approximately 14 to 16 feet higher than the existing structure on the site.

Commissioner Ulfelder announced his intent to defer the decision only for the subject application at the conclusion of the public hearing and recommended that the applicant submit these renderings to the Commissioners during the deferral period.

Commissioner Hart expressed concern regarding the difficulty of evaluating the proposal without reviewing a rendering of the proposed school expansion. He then referred to a document submitted by the applicant depicting a map of the subject property that highlighted the areas where the expansion would occur, but noted that this document had not been included in the subject application. Mr. Caperton concurred with Commissioner Hart's statement, adding that the applicant provided this document for illustrative purposes. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Mr. Caperton regarding the reasons for not including this document or other renderings in the staff report wherein Commissioner Hart expressed concern about ensuring that the applicant abided by the provisions set forth in the staff report without the aid of a rendering, noting that the document provided by the applicant did not provide sufficient details about the proposed expansion. (A copy of this document is in the date file.)

Commissioner Hart said that he had visited the subject property. He also stated that he had been on the Commission when the existing school had been approved and noted that this development

had been subject to significant controversy due to the constraints of the site. He expressed support for Commissioner Ulfelder’s intention to defer the decision only for the proposal to provide time for the applicant to submit renderings for Commissioners to review. In addition, Commissioner Hart suggested that the applicant provide additional information to the Commission to ensure that the provisions of the proposed expansion were sufficiently detailed.

Referring to page 3 of the staff report, which addressed the anticipated impacts and mitigation measures associated with the proposal, Commissioner Hurley pointed out that the section pertaining to the noise impact of the proposed school expansion indicated that the parking lot would be 16 feet from the property line. She then asked whether staff had studied the noise impact of this parking lot. Mr. Caperton said that staff had concluded that the noise generated by the parking lot would not significantly impact the surrounding area, noting the site’s proximity to Interstate 66.

Referring to page 4 of the staff report, which included a section addressing the transportation impact of the proposal, Commissioner Hurley pointed out that the increase parking provisions for the proposed school expansion would reduce vehicular stacking along Oak Street. She then asked about the extent of this reduction and expressed concern that these provisions would not be sufficient due to the increased enrollment at the school that the expansion would permit. Ms. Calkins said that she had visited the subject property and did not observe any vehicular stacking along Oak Street under the existing conditions. She explained that these parking provisions were included to address the issue of vehicular stacking if it became a concern.

Referring to page 7 of the staff report, which addressed the applicant’s review of alternative sites for expanding the City of Falls Church’s school system, Commissioner Hurley asked about the areas the applicant evaluated for alternate sites for another school facility. Mr. Caperton stated that the applicant evaluated sites throughout the City of Falls Church.

Commissioner Sargeant pointed out that Objective 9 in the Comprehensive Plan recommended that schools be designed for maximum site utilization while providing optimum service to and compatibility with the local community. He then asked how the “local community” portion of this recommendation applied in the proposal, noting that the expansion of the school on the site would accommodate a larger student population. Mr. Caperton explained that due to the design of the school districts, the school on the site would not serve the nearby properties because these properties were located in Fairfax County. He then said that the school served students residing in the City of Falls Church. He also indicated that the use of a school on the site was consistent with the Policy Plan’s recommendation that school facilities be located within or near residential areas. Commissioner Sargeant expressed concern regarding the criteria by which staff determined that the proposal was consistent with Objective 9.

Referring to page 15 of the staff report, which outlined the parking provisions for special events that would occur on the site, Commissioner Sargeant pointed out that the proposed parking provisions were intended to ensure that the operation of the proposed school expansion would not impact the ability of the neighboring residents from parking on Oak Street. He then asked how this provision was accomplished and whether these provisions were within the scope of the 2232 process. Mr. Caperton explained that staff could not prescribe development conditions to

the applicant with the 2232 process or make recommendations that were beyond the scope of the application, but indicated that staff supported the conclusions of FCDOT that the applicant's proposed provisions would sufficiently address issues pertaining to parking.

Commissioner Flanagan asked whether the material submitted in the staff report was consistent with the County's policy regarding "feature shown" applications for school facilities, which required primarily informational items. Mr. Caperton indicated that the subject application was not fully consistent with this policy, explaining that this policy had been established by the County Attorney to address issues regarding language in the Policy Plan that had not been appropriately applied. He then stated that the process for reviewing school expansions was different from the process of reviewing new school facilities approved through the County's Capital Improvement Program. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Flanagan and Mr. Caperton regarding the review process for "feature shown" applications involving public facilities wherein Mr. Caperton said that such applications were still subject to approval by the Planning Commission.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Flanagan and Mr. Caperton regarding the existing parking provisions on the subject property, the use of these parking spaces, and the increase in parking that would occur under the proposal wherein Commissioner Flanagan stated that he supported these increased parking provisions, saying that such provisions would accommodate the planned increase in student population.

When Commissioner Flanagan pointed out the location of a strip of road on the existing parking lot on the site and asked about the function of this strip, Ms. Calkins said that this area functioned as parallel parking for the site and indicated that the applicant would continue to utilize this area for parking after the proposed expansion was completed.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Flanagan and Mr. Caperton regarding the depiction of athletic fields and off-street parking provisions in the renderings that would be submitted by the applicant.

Referring to the applicant's Statement of Justification, which was included in the staff report, Commissioner Hedetniemi said that the applicant indicated that the accommodations at the existing facility on the site were not sufficient, citing deficiencies in the facility's sprinkler system, handicap accessibility, and safety provisions. She then suggested that the applicant provide additional language in the staff report that detailed how these deficiencies would be addressed by the proposed expansion.

Gifford Hampshire, Applicant's Agent, Blankingship & Keith, LLC, echoed remarks from Mr. Caperton, stating that most of the proposed expansion would occur within the footprint of the existing school on the site. He said that the existing school had operated on the site since 1952 and the proposed expansion was part of a comprehensive effort to bring this school up to the appropriate standards. In addition, he stated that the total floor-area ratio (FAR) of the proposed expansion would be consistent with the R-4 zoning of the subject property.

Commissioner Ulfelder said that he supported efforts to improve the facilities at the existing school, but expressed concern that the proposed expansion went beyond the scope of such an

effort. He pointed out that the need for greater capacity at the existing school on the site came from the applicant's decision to relocate students from another school into this school after the expansion was completed. Commissioner Ulfelder then asked what the capacity of the school facility on the site would be if these students were not relocated. Toni Jones, Applicant's Agent, Superintendent of Falls Church City Public Schools, explained that the proposed expansion was part of a Master Plan for the City of Falls Church to accommodate projected increases in enrollment and noted that the existing school on the site had previously relocated its pre-kindergarten students to another site. She then indicated that the students that would be relocated to the expanded school on the site would be second graders and if these students were not relocated, then the capacity of this facility would be approximately 600 students. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Jones regarding the mention of students being relocated from other schools in the Statement of Justification and the content of the City of Falls Church's Master Plan for public schools wherein Ms. Jones stated the following:

- The relocation of students to the existing school facility on the subject property was part of the City of Falls Church's Master Plan to accommodate projected increases in enrollment;
- The City of Falls Church had relocated students from other schools to other facilities in a similar manner;
- The projected enrollment increases articulated in the City of Falls Church's Master Plan was updated on a yearly basis;
- The plan to expand the existing school on the site had been developed over a four to five year span; and
- The applicant adhered to the requirements prescribed by Fairfax County in pursuing the proposed school expansion and had coordinated with both staff and the surrounding community on the subject application.

Commissioner Ulfelder said that the Dranesville Supervisors Office had received complaints from neighbors regarding the construction activity on the site. He added that he visited the subject property and verified that there was ongoing construction activity on the site. He then said that the neighboring residents had expressed concern that the applicant had already begun construction on portions of the proposed expansion. Ms. Jones addressed these concerns, explaining that the applicant had informed the surrounding community that the applicant had obtained the necessary permits for this activity. She then indicated that the purpose of this construction was to update the existing facility on the site with features that would make it consistent with the standards prescribed by the Code of the City of Falls Church. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Jones regarding the citizens' concerns about the procedures by which the applicant had to abide for the proposed expansion wherein Ms. Jones stated that the applicant intended to comply with the standards prescribed by the 2232 application process in approving this expansion.

When Commissioner Hurley asked about the procedures for pursuing the improvements that would make the existing school facility on the site consistent with the Code of the City of Falls Church, Ms. Jones said that these improvements were not part of the 2232 process, adding that these improvements included features such as a sprinkler system and air conditioning.

Responding to questions from Commissioner Hurley, Ms. Jones stated that the City of Falls Church's pre-kindergarten had a maximum enrollment of approximately 110 students and the current enrollment for this program was at 55 students. She also said that the City of Falls Church Public Schools currently enrolled approximately 140 to 210 second graders, but noted that the enrollment at this grade level was expected to decline. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hurley and Ms. Jones regarding the disparity in the student enrollment figures at different grade levels and the enrollment capacity for the proposed expansion to the school on the site wherein Ms. Jones noted the difficulty of projecting future student populations and maintaining appropriate class sizes, adding that the maximum class sizes for early childhood grade levels in the City of Falls Church was 22 students.

Answering question from Commissioner Hart, Ms. Jones indicated that the existing school on the site had previously accommodated pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, and first grade level students. She then reiterated that the pre-kindergarten students had been relocated to another facility that had opened in December 2014. Ms. Jones stated that the applicant planned to relocate the second grade level students at another school in the City of Falls Church to the proposed expanded school on the site. She also said that the number of students from the second grade level that would be relocated to the expanded facility on the site would be greater than the number of pre-kindergarten students that it had previously accommodated.

Commissioner Hart expressed concern about the extent of the increased student enrollment at the school on the site. He also noted the challenges of the subject property, pointing out its irregular shape and the narrowness of the road that accessed it. He then said that the proposed expansion to the school would intensify the use on the site. When Commissioner Hart asked whether the proposed expansion and relocation of students was appropriate at the location, Ms. Jones stated that the City of Falls Church had conducted the necessary evaluations in its determination that this site was appropriate for this use at the proposed intensity. She added that alternative sites had been studied, but the City of Falls Church determined that these sites would not be appropriate, noting the limited availability of land and the constraints on existing schools in the City. In addition, Ms. Jones reiterated that the proposed expansion of the school on the site was part of the City of Falls Church's Master Plan to accommodate its growing student enrollment needs, noting the expansions that had occurred at other sites. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Ms. Jones regarding the expansions at other school facilities in the City of Falls Church wherein Ms. Jones stated that the proposed expansions to accommodate students at higher grade levels had been completed.

When Commissioner Litzenberger asked about the possibility that the applicant would request the ability to utilize trailers on the site due to unforeseen complications, such as the presence of asbestos, Mr. Jones said that the applicant had existing trailers that would accommodate students until the construction on the site was completed.

Commissioner Strandlie echoed concerns from Commissioner Ulfelder regarding the current construction activity on the subject application, pointing out that the website the applicant had established to provide updates on construction activities was worded in a manner that indicated the proposed expansion was farther along in the process than it actually was. Ms. Jones explained that the website was intended to keep parents and neighboring residents informed about activities on the site regarding construction. Commissioner Strandlie suggested that the language on this website be modified to specify that the proposed expansion had not yet been approved. Ms. Jones did not object to such a modification.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker.

David Wuehrmann, 2339 North Oak Street, Falls Church, spoke in opposition to the proposal. He said that the applicant had coordinated with the community to address their concerns about the proposed expansion to the school. He noted that efforts had been made to address concerns regarding the proposal's impact on traffic and parking in the area. However, he stated that the community still opposed the proposal because the commitments articulated by the applicant could not be sufficiently enforced, pointing out that a 2232 application did not include development conditions. Mr. Wuehrmann also indicated that the applicant did not have a history of abiding by every one of its stated commitments. In addition, he noted the narrowness of Oak Street, which was approximately 26 feet wide and was the only road that accessed the site. He said there had been incidents where the traffic generated by the school resulted in street parking on Oak Street, which created hazardous driving conditions for vehicles and buses. Mr. Wuehrmann stated that permitting an expansion to the school site would worsen these conditions. In addition, he indicated that the extent of the expansion on the site was inappropriate. He then stated that he did not support relocating second grade students to the site, adding that he favored expanding other existing school facilities in the City of Falls Church to accommodate these students, citing George Mason High School as a more appropriate location. In conclusion, Mr. Wuehrmann said that the extent of the proposed expansion to the school was not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan because the traffic and parking provisions at the site could not accommodate the increase in student population. He also stated that the location of the proposed expansion was not appropriate because it moved too many students towards the boundaries of the City of Falls Church.

Sarah Liberatore, 2335 North Oak Street, Falls Church, voiced opposition to the subject application. She said that while she did not object to expanding the facilities at the existing school on the site, she indicated that the extent of the proposed expansion was too great because Oak Street could not accommodate the impact of such an expansion. Ms. Liberatore pointed out that she resided near the subject property and her residence was often affected by the activities at the school. She also stated that while the staff report addressed the traffic generated by the proposed expansion during pick-up/drop-off periods, there was no mention of the traffic generated by activities beyond these hours or the impacts that this traffic incurred. She also noted that the buses for the school often picked up children along Oak Street, which added to the traffic impact on the surrounding community. In addition, Ms. Liberatore indicated that the site was frequently utilized for other community uses, such as sporting events and associated school activities, and the school had announced that these facilities would be available after the proposed expansion was completed. She then said that the staff report did not sufficiently address

the impacts of such uses. Ms. Liberatore stated that while Ms. Jones had made a concerted effort to coordinate with the surrounding community, the efforts of the applicant had not sufficiently addressed the community's concerns. She cited instances where the traffic generated by the school had incurred excessive street parking along Oak Street that led to blocked driveways and obstructed roads. She pointed out that the proposed parking provisions would not be sufficient to accommodate the increased enrollment at the school, which would generate more street parking on Oak Street. Ms. Liberatore echoed remarks from Mr. Wuehrmann regarding the narrowness of Oak Street, adding that there had been instances where emergency vehicles could not navigate due to the presence of parked vehicles. In addition, she indicated that the proposal did not offer a sufficient benefit to the County to warrant approval and the associated impacts would negatively affect the surrounding community.

When Chairman Murphy asked about the activities on the site that occurred on Sundays, Ms. Liberatore indicated that these activities were associated with a religious group. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Mr. Caperton regarding the possibility that permitting such uses on weekends at the site required a Special Exception or a Special Permit.

Adrienne Whyte, 6704 West Falls Way, Falls Church, spoke in opposition to the subject application because the proposed expansion of the school was not appropriate for the site due to its location and topography. In addition, she pointed out that while the applicant had stated that alternative sites for expanding school facilities had been reviewed, the determination that the subject property was the most viable had not been sufficiently justified. She also echoed remarks from Mr. Wuehrmann regarding other existing school facilities within the City of Falls Church that could accommodate an expansion. Ms. Whyte stated that the existing school on the site had been subject to issues regarding stormwater runoff and the proposed expansion would worsen this condition. She then noted that the applicant had not indicated that pervious surfaces would be utilized on the site, adding that the proposed underground retention facility was not sufficient. In addition, she said that the applicant's analysis of the traffic impact that the proposed expansion would incur on Oak Street was insufficient, stating that this analysis had not taken the impact of other nearby residential and commercial developments into consideration. Ms. Whyte explained that the existing traffic patterns on the roads surrounding the subject property were subject to congestion and the proposed expansion would worsen this condition, adding that the applicant's proposed mitigation measures were not sufficient. In addition, she said that the parking provisions for the proposed expansion were located too close to residential properties. She then pointed out that certain parking areas would be located within 16 feet of the property line, which would increase the noise impact on the nearby residential properties. Ms. Whyte stated that she supported the applicant's efforts to improve the existing school facility, noting the current conditions at this facility. (A copy of Ms. Whyte's statement is in the date file.)

Mark Zetts, 6640 Kirby Court, Falls Church, representing the McLean Citizens Association (MCA), voiced opposition to the proposal because it did not meet the necessary criteria for a "feature shown" application, saying that the location, character, and extent of the proposed expansion to the school was not appropriate. Mr. Zetts explained that the applicant had previously attempted to expand the school facility on the site, pointing out that the Board of Supervisors had rejected one such effort to acquire additional land from the County due to concerns that it would permit a school expansion that would negatively impact the surrounding

neighborhood. He also said that the surrounding community had opposed a previous expansion to the school facility on the site in 2006, which was subsequently approved. Mr. Zetts stated that he did not support the applicant's conclusion regarding the absence of alternative sites for expanding school facilities, as articulated on page 7 of the staff report. He pointed out that the applicant had acquired additional land in January 2014 at another site, a portion of which was planned for school facilities. Mr. Zetts said that the MCA did not object to the operation of a school on the subject property, but he indicated that the extent of the proposed expansion was too great and such an expansion was not compatible with the surrounding community. In addition, he noted that while the applicant had included traffic mitigation measures for Oak Street, these measures were not articulated in the staff report. Mr. Zetts echoed remarks from previous speakers regarding the narrowness of Oak Street, stating that it could not accommodate the expected traffic impact of the proposed expansion. He also said that Oak Street was too narrow to serve as the primary access point for the proposed expansion, saying that this street did not meet the standards prescribed by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) for traffic associated with schools. Mr. Zetts also echoed remarks from Mr. Wuehrmann regarding the inability to prescribe development conditions for a "feature shown" application, stating that commitments made by the applicant to mitigate the traffic impact of the proposed expansion were not legally binding. In addition, he pointed out that the applicant had no jurisdiction for managing the parking provisions for roads owned by the County. Mr. Zetts said that FCDOT had recommended additional monitoring of the following transportation issues:

- The applicant's drop-off/pick up procedures for students at the school;
- The traffic conditions on Oak Street;
- The shuttle program that would be utilized for events on the site;
- The Level of Service at the intersection of West Street and Oak Street; and
- The impact of events being conducted at the site on the ability of neighboring residents to park along Oak Street.

Mr. Zetts pointed out that extent of such monitoring indicated that the proposed expansion was not compatible with the surrounding community. He then said that the applicant had not submitted possible remedies to these transportation issues if the monitoring process identified a problem, noting the County could not require the applicant to meet any parking or traffic mitigation measures. Mr. Zetts indicated that the Policy Plan cited accessibility as a criterion for identifying a suitable location for public facilities. He then stated that the proposal did not meet this criterion because the school on the site did not utilize pedestrians and relied on busing for its students. Mr. Zetts also said that the proposed expansion was not consistent with the Policy Plan's recommended that a school facility be appropriately sized and sufficiently compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. In addition, he pointed out that updating the features at the existing school on the site to make it consistent with the necessary codes did not require a "feature shown" application. Mr. Zetts echoed concerns from multiple Commissioners regarding the absence of renderings of the proposed school expansion, adding that such renderings were necessary to assess the expansion's impact. Referring to the minutes from the Planning Commission meeting on March 16, 2005 regarding the public hearing for the application for the previous expansion to the school on the site (2232-D04-13), Mr. Zetts pointed out that staff had indicated at the time that a school expansion on the site could not be a "feature shown" because it

was not included in the Fairfax County Capital Improvement Program. A discussion ensued between Chairman Murphy and Mr. Zetts regarding whether this policy was still in place. (A copy of Mr. Zetts' statement is in the date file.)

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience.

Pam Vargo, 2329 Highland Avenue, Falls Church, voiced opposition to the proposal because the extent of the proposed school expansion was too great and such an expansion was not consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood. He echoed concerns from previous speakers regarding the traffic impact of the proposed expansion. In addition, she expressed concern about the limited opportunities for the public to provide input on the proposal. She pointed out that the proposal was funded and administered by the City of Falls Church, but the residents of Fairfax County would incur most of the impact of this expansion. Ms. Vargo also echoed remarks from previous speakers regarding the inability for the County to prescribe development conditions for the proposal. She added that proposed school expansion would not accommodate students residing in Fairfax County. In addition, she expressed concern about the future management of the proposed school.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy asked for a rebuttal statement from Mr. Hampshire, who reiterated that the proposed school expansion would be consistent with the FAR recommendations prescribed by the Comprehensive Plan. He also indicated that the decision to relocate students to the proposed expanded facility on the site had been made by the City of Falls Church School Board and this issue was outside the scope of the subject application. Mr. Hampshire stated that that analysis of the transportation impact, as articulated in page 4 of the staff report, concluded that the provisions outlined in the proposal were sufficient to mitigate this impact. He then noted that the school on the site was an elementary school and this type of school facility generated fewer trips and traffic impact than a high school. Mr. Hampshire stated that the most significant traffic impact would be incurred by events that would be conducted at the facility on the site. He then said that the City of Falls Church School Board had submitted a letter of commitment articulating the measures that would be implemented to mitigate the traffic impact generated by the proposed expansion. Addressing concerns from Mr. Zetts regarding the appropriateness of permitting the proposed expansion through a "feature shown" application, Mr. Hampshire indicated that the scope of the previous expansion in 2232-D04-13 had been approved and the proposed expansion fit the criteria for a "feature show." In conclusion, Mr. Hampshire stated that the proposed expansion would not significantly increase the footprint of the existing school on the site and was consistent with the provision prescribed by Zoning Ordinance. (A copy of the City of Falls Church School Board's letter of commitment is in the date file.)

Commissioner de la Fe indicated that he did not support the applicant's conclusion that the expansion of the school was not significant, stating that the increased enrollment for the school facility constituted a substantial expansion. He then said the proposal was not consistent with the criterion for extent of a "feature shown" to warrant approval.

When Chairman Murphy asked about the activities conducted at the site on Sundays, Mr. Hampshire indicated that these activities did not include Church services.

Referring to the City of Falls Church School Board's letter of commitment that Mr. Hampshire had cited during his rebuttal, Commissioner Flanagan pointed out that one of the commitments in this letter included closing portions of Oak Street to permit only local traffic. When he asked how this commitment would be implemented, Ms. Jones said that the applicant would coordinate with the City of Falls Church and the surrounding community to close portions of the road to manage traffic during events conducted at the site. She added that this policy had been implemented with previous events at the site. A discussion between Commissioner Flanagan and Ms. Jones ensued regarding the ability of the applicant to close portions of Oak Road and the parking provisions for the residents along Oak Street wherein Ms. Jones said the following:

- The applicant would utilize gates to filter local traffic into the neighborhood and into the subject property;
- The community had supported the applicant's traffic mitigation efforts during events conducted on the site; and
- The City of Falls Church School Board had reaffirmed, at the request of the community, its commitment to managing traffic generated by events at the site in a manner that would not negatively impact the surrounding community.

When Commissioner Hurley asked for more information on the applicant's policy of staggered arrivals and departures from the site, as articulated on page 15 of the staff report, Ms. Jones noted that the bus routes utilized by the school were short and the number of buses utilized was minimal. She also indicated that students were encouraged to utilize the buses. In addition, she stated that the amount of vehicular traffic generated by the site was minimal, noting that most of the vehicular traffic was generated by parents dropping children off for before-school care.

Commissioner Hurley aligned herself with remarks from Commissioner de la Fe regarding the extent of the proposed expansion being significant, citing the increase in student enrollment for the proposed school expansion. She also echoed remarks from speakers regarding the narrowness of Oak Road, adding that the Zoning Ordinance and VDOT required a wider road to accommodate the proposal. Mr. Hampshire addressed Commissioner Hurley's concern regarding the width of Oak Road, reiterating that the FAR for the proposed expansion was consistent with the recommendations prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance and VDOT. He also addressed concerns raised regarding the extent of the expansion, reiterating that the expansion would not significantly modify the footprint of the existing school on the site. Commissioner Hurley then reiterated her concern regarding the extent of this expansion.

When Commissioner Ulfelder asked about the amount of square footage that would be added to the existing school, Tom Liam, Applicant's Agent, Samaha Associates PC, stated that the proposed expansion would add 47,303 square feet to the facility. He then indicated that while the school on that site was three stories, the second story was the main entrance and the lower story was built into the topography of the site.

Mr. Liam also addressed concerns from Ms. Whyte regarding the stormwater management provisions on the site, stating that the proposed expansion was consistent with the standards and guidelines prescribed by the State of Virginia.

When Commissioner Ulfelder asked about the square footage of the school on the site before and after the proposed expansion was completed, Mr. Liam said that the square footage of the facility prior to the expansion was approximately 43,000 square feet and the proposed expansion would increase this amount to approximately 90,000 square feet. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Liam regarding the extent of the proposed expansion.

Commissioner Migliaccio aligned himself with remarks from Commissioner de la Fe regarding the excessive extent of the proposed expansion, stating that the increases in square-footage and student enrollment constituted a significant modification to the existing structure that did not warrant approval. He added that the absence of a detailed rendering of the proposed expansion made it difficult to assess the impact it would have on the surrounding community.

Commissioner Hart recommended that the applicant provide the following information during the deferral period:

- A plan for accommodating trailers on the site, if such features were necessary;
- A more detailed description of the stormwater management provisions for the site;
- A more detailed description of the transitional screening that would be implemented under the proposed expansion;
- A more detailed description of the air conditioning and ventilation features that would be installed on the site; and
- A review of the noise impact that would be generated by the air conditioning and ventilation features on the site.

Commissioner Hart commended the applicant for coordinating with the surrounding community to address their concerns. However, he expressed concern about the extent to which the City of Falls Church School Board's letter of commitment, which Mr. Hampshire had cited during his rebuttal, was legally binding. Mr. Hampshire concurred that the commitments articulated in this letter were not binding and were a statement of goodwill to the community on behalf of the applicant. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Mr. Caperton regarding possible mechanisms for making the commitments articulated in the City of Falls Church School Board's letter legally binding and potential issues that might arise if this letter did not have any legally binding provisions wherein Mr. Caperton indicated that, after discussions with the County Attorney, this letter could not be incorporated into the subject application.

Commissioner Ulfelder addressed Commissioner Hart's concerns regarding the methods by which the City of Falls Church School Board's commitments could be made legally binding,

stating that a Memorandum of Understanding between the City Falls Church Public Schools and Fairfax County could be submitted. He added that such a document could make the provisions articulated in the letter legally binding, but noted the challenges of pursuing and enforcing these provisions. In addition, he said that such an agreement would not address the Commission's concerns regarding the extent of the proposed school expansion.

Commissioner Sargeant supported Commissioner Ulfelder's intent to defer the decision only for the proposal. He then suggested that the applicant provide additional language regarding the extent of the proposed expansion to the school on the site and methods of addressing concerns raised by the Commissioners. He also recommended that the Planning Commission review the scope of the proposal to ensure that it was consistent with the criteria for being considered a "feature shown."

Commissioner Flanagan aligned himself with Commissioner Sargeant's statement. He also expressed concern regarding whether the subject application was consistent with the criteria for a "feature shown" application because the existing school on the site was not part of the Fairfax County Capital Improvement Program. When he asked whether the City of Falls Church utilized a similar program that had approved the proposed expansion to the school, Mr. Hampshire stated that the City did have such a program. Commissioner Flanagan suggested that the applicant provide additional information on this program during the deferral period and Mr. Hampshire expressed no objections.

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 Ulfelder for action on this item.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Chairman Murphy: Public hearing is closed. Mr. Ulfelder.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The considerable number of questions, issues, concerns – have been raised this evening. And I had announced my intention to defer, which I still plan to do, but I think we're going to need a little bit more time so I'm going to move the date a little bit further along than the – my original proposal of July 8th, particularly because of the intervening July 4th holiday. So with that, I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ON APPLICATION FS-D14-53 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF JULY 15, 2015 TO ALLOW ADDITIONAL TIME FOR STAFF AND THE COMMISSION TO REVIEW BOTH THE APPLICATION, PUBLIC TESTIMONY, AND TO ADDRESS the number of – THE ISSUES THAT WERE RAISED HERE TONIGHT AND THAT THE PUBLIC RECORD REMAIN OPEN FOR WRITTEN COMMENTS DURING THIS TIME.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer the decision only on FS-D14-53 to a date certain of July 15th, with the remaining open for comments and pictures and drawings, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

(The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Lawrence was absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

The meeting was adjourned at 11:47 p.m.

Peter F. Murphy, Chairman

James R. Hart, 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: October 21, 2015



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