MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2007

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

ABSENT: Walter L. Alcorn, Commissioner At-Large
Ronald W. Koch, Sully District
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:20 p.m. by Chairman Peter F. Murphy, Jr., in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center at 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

Commissioner Hart noted that the Planning Commission's Environment Committee had met tonight and had received a presentation by Vicki Worden, Vice President for Commercial Buildings Product Development, on the Green Globes environmental assessment and rating system. He announced that the Committee would meet again on Thursday, October 4, 2007, at 7:30 p.m. to follow up discussion from the Green Building Workshop held on September 6, 2007.

//

Commissioner Harsel MOVED THAT THE FOLLOWING MINUTES BE APPROVED:

NOVEMBER 9, 2005	DECEMBER 1, 2005
NOVEMBER 16, 2005	DECEMBER 7, 2005
NOVEMBER 17, 2005	DECEMBER 8, 2005
NOVEMBER 30, 2005	

Commissioner de la Fe seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 8-0-1 with Commissioner Sargeant abstaining; Commissioners Alcorn, Koch, and Lawrence absent from the meeting.

//

Chairman Murphy announced that the Planning Commission's BRAC Fort Belvoir Committee would meet on Thursday, September 20, 2007, at 7:00 p.m.

//

Chairman Murphy noted that a Planning Commission Seminar would be held on Saturday, October 27, 2007, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., in the Board Conference Room, to discuss the Virginia Department of Transportation's new Traffic Impact Analysis requirements for Plan amendments and zoning applications.

//

Commissioner Hall MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR RZ/FDP 2007-MA-010, EASTWOOD PROPERTIES, INC., TO A DATE CERTAIN OF JANUARY 24, 2008.

Commissioner de la Fe seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Alcorn, Koch, and Lawrence absent from the meeting.

//

Chairman Murphy MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR PCA 87-S-039-06 AND FDPA 87-S-039-10, FAIRFAX CORNER RETAIL, L.C., TO A DATE CERTAIN OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2007.

Commissioner Lusk seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Alcorn, Koch, and Lawrence absent from the meeting.

//

<u>FS-S07-48 – VERIZON, 12111 BRADDOCK ROAD</u>

Chairman Murphy MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH THE "FEATURE SHOWN" DETERMINATION IN FS-S07-48.

Commissioner de la Fe seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Alcorn, Koch, and Lawrence absent from the meeting.

//

FSA-S96-25-1 – SPRINT NEXTEL, 9501 OLD BURKE LAKE ROAD

Chairman Murphy MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH THE "FEATURE SHOWN" AMENDMENT AND THE "FEATURE SHOWN" DETERMINATION IN FSA-S96-25-1.

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

//

FS-L07-46 – NEXTEL COMMUNICATIONS OF THE MID-ATLANTIC, 6601 TELEGRAPH ROAD

Commissioner Lusk MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH THE DETERMINATION THAT THIS PARTICULAR TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY LOCATED AT 6601 TELEGRAPH ROAD IN ALEXANDRIA IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED A "FEATURE SHOWN" PURSUANT TO SECTION 15.2-2232 OF THE *CODE OF VIRGINIA.*

Commissioner de la Fe seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Alcorn, Koch, and Lawrence absent from the meeting.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Harsel established the following order of the agenda:

1. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (WORKFORCE HOUSING PROGRAM)
2. PRC 87-C-088 – FOUR SEASONS DEVELOPMENT, LLC
3. SE 2007-SP-008 – SPRINGFIELD GOLF AND COUNTRY CLUB, INC.

This order was accepted without objection.

//

In Commissioner Alcorn's absence, Commissioner Lusk handled this case.

//

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (WORKFORCE HOUSING PROGRAM) – To amend Chapter 112 (the Zoning Ordinance) of the 1976 Code of the County of Fairfax, as follows: To establish a new

of price control of 50 years for rental WDUs and 30 years for for-sale Part 11 of Article 2 to set forth the Workforce Housing Program to facilitate the administration of workforce dwelling units ("WDUs") that are proffered through the rezoning process and are designed to be affordable to those households earning up to 120% of the area median income. WDUs are defined as the rental and/or for-sale dwelling units for which the rental or sale price and other matters are controlled pursuant to the new Part 11 of Article 2. The provisions of the new Workforce Housing Program will include: up to 3 tiers of income eligibility limits with the WDUs evenly distributed in each tier; a minimum gross floor area for such WDUs with a method for calculating such floor area; a requirement for a market rate unit of similar size for each WDU provided; a requirement for designation of WDUs on plats and plans and provisions for any changes to those designations; a provision stating that WDUs that are included on approved site plans and recorded subdivision plats shall be deemed features shown for (Board) shall acquire or lease such units; purposes of Section 15.2-2232 of *Virginia Code* Ann. and shall not require further approvals in the event the Board of Supervisors(Board) shall acquire or lease such units; regulations providing that in the event rental units are converted to condominiums the same number of for-sale WDUs as those originally identified as rental WDUs shall be offered for sale at a price determined by the County Executive, with the first priority to purchase the WDUs given to the current occupant of the rental WDUs and then to the Board, and such for-sale WDUs shall be identified as part of the recorded condominium declaration; establishes a 75% limit on the issuance of Residential Use Permits (RUPs) for the entire development until 75% of the WDUs have been issued RUPs, except for rental multiple family units, and providing that the required Notice of Availability and Sales Offering Agreement shall be submitted prior to the issuance of the first RUP for any WDU in the development; a requirement for the development of prototype unit specification minimums with which all building plans for WDUs must comply; granting the Director of the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) the right to regulate the sale of WDUs on behalf of the Board subject to reasonable rules and regulations to be adopted by the Board; granting the Board the exclusive right to purchase or rent up to 1/3 of the units at time of initial sale or rental of the WDUs and the right to purchase any WDU that is offered for resale; provisions stating that the remaining 2/3 of the WDUs shall be offered for sale or rent to persons who meet the income criteria established by DHCD, provided that if such units are not sold within periods of time set forth in the ordinance they shall be offered for sale first to nonprofit housing groups and then to the general public; a requirement for the development of a schedule of a cost calculation formula used to determine sales price; an allowance for marketing costs and a commission in computing the sales prices; a requirement for the monthly reporting of

tenant income information for rental WDUs, a provision requiring that rentals of WDUs may only be leased for a minimum 6-month and maximum renewable lease of one year to income eligible tenants, establishment of Countywide rental prices by the County Executive for WDUs with pricing to serve households earning up to 100% of the median income for the Washington Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, and a provision that allows a tenant who becomes overqualified in terms of income to remain in the rental WDU only until the end of the lease term; establishment of a term WDUs, with the 30-year term to be renewed upon each resale of a for-sale WDU during any price control period; a requirement that WDU purchasers must have received a Certificate of Qualification for the Program from DHCD; provisions establishing that the sale, transfer, or pledge of WDUs as security for more than the approved sales price during the period of price control is a violation of the ordinance; a provision establishing the right for the Board to purchase any WDU to be resold or conveyed to another owner; provisions establishing that in the event of expiration of a 30-year control period, the first sale of a WDU shall include a contribution of 50% of the difference between the net sales price and the owner's adjusted purchase price to the Housing Trust Fund; a limit on the financing secured by a WDU to the controlled price of the WDU; a requirement for 90 days prior notice of any foreclosure, during which time the Board or a nonprofit agency designated by the County Executive may acquire the WDU at a certain price; a provision that under certain conditions, an institutional lender of the first-lien purchase money loan on a WDU may sell a WDU at a foreclosure sale and the covenant restrictions would be released; a requirement for the contribution of 100% of the net sale proceeds from any foreclosure sale to be contributed to the Housing Trust Fund; a requirement for the recordation of covenants that are on the form prescribed by the DHCD; a requirement for reference to, and possible inclusion of, the recorded covenants with each sales contract for a for-sale WDU, giving notice of the property's designation as a WDU, the limitations on the total aggregate amount of indebtedness that may be secured by a WDU, the binding nature of the covenants on all assignees, mortgagees, purchasers, and other successors in interest, and the seniority of the covenants to all instruments securing financing for the WDU, subject to release for individual for-sale WDUs only in limited circumstances described in the ordinance; a requirement that for-sale WDUs must be owner-occupied, including an annual certification of such occupancy; establishment of penalties for non-reporting of rental tenant income information and for non-certification of owner-occupied units, including daily monetary penalties and automatic termination of the lease agreement, as well as criminal sanctions for submitting a false affidavit or certification; provisions requiring a renter who no longer meets the DHCD eligibility criteria to vacate the WDU at the end

of the lease term; provisions stating that if a renter fails to occupy a WDU for a period in excess of 60 days, the lease will be automatically terminated subject to limited exceptions; establishment of an appeal to the Board of Supervisors and then to the Circuit Court for Fairfax County for any person aggrieved by the WDU for-sale or rental prices or by the decision of any administrative officer in the administration and enforcement of the Workforce Housing Program; establishment of provisions in the Planned Development Districts to exclude the density or floor area associated with WDUs from the maximum density specified for such districts; provisions establishing that the Zoning Administrator shall have all of the enforcement authority provided under the Zoning Ordinance to enforce the Workforce Housing Program; and other changes regarding the administration and implementation of the Workforce Housing Program. The amendment also provides that developments with WDUs may utilize the density, bulk regulations, unit type, open space, and lot size requirements applicable to Affordable Dwelling Unit developments for the zoning district in which located. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

Donna Pesto, Zoning Administration Division (ZAD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that the Workforce Housing Program Amendment established standards by which the County could administer proffered workforce housing units.

Commissioner Hart expressed concern that Section 2-1118 of the proposed Ordinance, stating that an appeal of a decision by the Board of Supervisors regarding workforce housing may be appealed to the Circuit Court, could circumvent an appeal to the Board of Zoning Appeals and asked Ms. Pesto if that was the intent. Ms. Pesto said staff would further review this language and report back to him.

Commissioner Sargeant asked if the zero-dollar bottom should be deleted from the average median income figures since it was not practical. Ms. Pesto replied that the zero figure was included as part of the income range as an alternative to selecting a random low dollar figure.

Referring to the for-sale units cited under Section 2-1106, Paragraph C, Commissioner Sargeant asked how the County Executive set the price for conversions of the workforce units. Charlene Fuhrman-Schulz, Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), explained that there was a worksheet that detailed the specific costs for labor and materials and that upon review of the worksheet and receipt of documentation from the developer, the County Executive would then give his approval. When Commissioner Sargeant asked if it would be better to simply spell that out in the Ordinance, Ms. Schulz replied that it would be put into the Ordinance as the amendment went forward.

Responding to Commissioner Sargeant's follow-up question from Paragraph D of the same section, Ms. Pesto explained that if the units were converted from rental units to condominiums,

they would remain workforce housing units even if the County purchased them and would be administered as such. She went on to say that anyone buying the property would have to meet the guidelines for workforce housing.

In reference to Section 2-1108, Paragraph 1, Commissioner Sargeant asked what specifications were required for the workforce dwelling units. Ms. Pesto explained they would include things needed in order to comply with Health Department regulations, such as plumbing for bathrooms and kitchens. Commissioner Sargeant suggested adding more specific verbiage for clarification.

Referring to Section 2-1109, Paragraph 3, Commissioner Sargeant asked if there might be broader opportunities to advertise the units directly to those in service industries; perhaps in the County newsletter or on its website. Ms. Pesto said there were, and added that advertising was provided on Fairfax's Channel 16 programming as well as in training sessions for real estate associates. She also suggested that proffers could require the units to be marketed specifically for particular employers near a development.

In response to Commissioner Sargeant's question as to whether the workforce dwelling would remain such if sold to a non-profit organization, Ms. Pesto said that it would.

Referring to Section 2-1112, Paragraph 4, Commissioner Sargeant asked who would be expected to make the contribution to the Housing Trust Fund. Ms. Pesto explained that if an owner stayed in the unit for 30 yeas, the workforce covenant would expire and it would no longer be a price-controlled unit. She said that upon sale in the open market, one-half of the net proceeds would be contributed by the seller to the Housing Trust Fund.

Commissioner Hall asked how the County would ensure that requirement was fulfilled after 30 years' time. Ms. Pesto explained that it would be recorded in the covenants. When Commissioner Hall noted that covenants were not enforceable, Ms. Pesto explained these would be because Fairfax County would be party to them and would therefore enforce them.

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

Elizabeth Baker, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Emrich & Walsh, PC, noted that in Section 2-1101, the income levels for combustible types of construction seemed discriminatory for rental builders in that they had a lower rental threshold than that of other types of construction. She then referenced Section 2-1103, Paragraph 2, questioning why the County required that "for each workforce dwelling unit, there shall be at least one associated market rate unit of the same bedroom count that is of similar floor area," asserting that the builders and the market should judge what would be best in a particular development. In reference to Section 2-1106, Paragraph D, she expressed her concerns about the County Executive's determination of the unit prices and the rise in construction prices over the years. Ms. Baker added that she was equally concerned the Board had first claim to buy the unit before the general public. Furthermore, she noted a conflict between Section 2-1101 and Section 2-1110, Paragraph 5 concerning income levels.

Lastly, in reference to Section 2-1111, Paragraph 2, Ms. Baker expressed her concern that the 50-year price control for rental units discriminated against rental builders.

Addressing Ms. Baker's comments, Commissioner Lusk remarked that the Board's first claim for purchase was primarily because the workforce units would be proffered. As such, he said the Board would assess how the units might be allocated so that employees could live near their places of employments. Regarding the unit size, he said if both the market-rate units and the affordable units were similar in size, they would be comparable in price. He then asked Ms. Baker to put her points in writing.

In response to a question from Commissioner de la Fe Ms. Pesto explained that although it had not been specifically stated, the one-to-one rate applied to the bonus units only, and it was one of the issues staff planned to clarify.

Commissioner Sargeant reiterated that the time limitation before the Board purchased the property should compel the County to advertise as much as possible to nearby general workforce communities and employers.

Chairman Murphy asked if the percentages set up by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) were compatible with those of County employees such as policemen, fireman, teachers, and nurses. Ms. Pesto assured him they were, adding that she would provide data showing the information.

Chairman Murphy asked who would monitor this program and how it would be monitored. Ms. Pesto explained that in the rental project, HCD would receive monthly reports regarding tenants' salaries and/or items that might increase their salaries to exceed the limit allowable. If a tenant's salary were to exceed the limit, the tenant could remain until the end of the lease term, at which time, he or she would need to move into a market-rate unit or elsewhere. When Chairman Murphy questioned whether HCD would be equipped with the staff to handle such a work load, Ms. Pesto assured him the systems were currently in place and there should be no problem.

In response to Commissioner Harsel's request for clarification on the monthly reporting by tenants, Charlene Fuhrman-Schulz, HCD, explained that a building's management would in fact send an annual recertification report regarding the tenants living in the building.

When Commissioner Harsel asked if there was a written definition for construction types 1, 2, 3, and 4, Ms. Pesto said there was none in the Zoning Ordinance. She noted, however, that verbiage could be put in for clarification of "combustible" versus "non-combustible."

In response to Commissioner Harsel's question regarding price control terms, Ms. Pesto explained that a new 30-year term would start with each sale or re-sale of a condominium unit.

When Commissioner Flanagan questioned the methodology used in deciding which applicants would get a unit, Ms. Pesto explained that while a number of measures would be examined, a

scale had not yet been fully developed. She further explained that three income levels would be considered.

Commissioner Flanagan then brought up the "magnet" housing in Laurel Hill, asking if it would be subject to this particular Ordinance. Ms. Pesto explained that since that project had begun prior to the current proposal and was also proffered, it would not be subject to this Ordinance.

Commissioner Sargeant added that the magnet housing in Laurel Hill was particularly designed for police, teachers and firefighters who worked in that area.

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

//

Commissioner Lusk MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (WORKFORCE HOUSING PROGRAM) TO A DATE CERTAIN OF SEPTEMBER 27TH, WITH THE RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN FOR WRITTEN COMMENTS AS WELL AS ELECTRONIC COMMENTS.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Alcorn, Koch, and Lawrence absent from the meeting.

//

PRC 87-C-088 – FOUR SEASONS DEVELOPMENT, LLC – Appl. to approve the PRC plan associated with DPA 87-C-088 previously approved to permit the development of 11 dwelling units at a density of 47.8 du/ac. Located at 1890 Old Reston Ave. on approx. 10,212 sq. ft. of land zoned PRC. Comp. Plan Rec: 50 du/ac. Tax Map 17-4 ((1)) 5B. HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Chairman Murphy noted that an affidavit was not necessary for this application.

Commissioner Hart disclosed that the law firm of Hart and Horan, PC, had represented Four Seasons Development, LLC several years ago, but indicated that there was no business or financial relationship that would affect his ability to participate in this case.

Jack Thompson, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the file. He stated that staff recommended approval of the application.

Richard Newlon, agent for the applicant, said he had nothing to add to staff's presentation.

Chairman Murphy then called for speakers and recited the rules for public testimony.

Donna Sandin, 1711 Ivy Oak Square, Reston, stated that she was glad to see the project moving forward. She did however express her concern about the parking and also had questions regarding the easement on Lakeside Avenue.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for a rebuttal statement from Mr. Newlon.

Mr. Newlon explained that five parking spaces would be added onsite to the existing 16 spaces some 50 yards further down for a total of 21 spaces. He noted that the Lakeside Avenue easements had been renewed.

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

//

Commissioner de la Fe MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF PRC 87-C-088, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED SEPTEMBER 5, 2007.

Commissioners Flanagan and Lusk seconded the motion which motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Alcorn, Koch, and Lawrence absent from the meeting.

Commissioner de la Fe MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF A MODIFICATION OF THE TRAIL REQUIREMENT ALONG OLD RESTON AVENUE, IN FAVOR OF THE EXISTING FOUR-FOOT-WIDE SIDEWALK DEPICTED IN THE PRC PLAN.

Commissioners Flanagan and Lusk seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 8-0-1 with Commissioner Hall abstaining; Commissioners Alcorn, Koch, and Lawrence absent from the meeting.

//

The next case was in the Springfield District; therefore, Chairman Murphy relinquished the Chair to Secretary Harsel.

//

SE 2007-SP-008 – SPRINGFIELD GOLF AND COUNTRY CLUB, INC. – Appl. under Sects. 3-304 and 4-504 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit modifications to an existing golf course and country club. Located at 8301 Old Keene Mill Rd. on approx. 157.60 ac. of land zoned R-3, C-5, and HC. Tax Map 89-1 ((1)) 9. SPRINGFIELD DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Due to the late submission of two names on the affidavit, Commissioner Murphy MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION WAIVE ITS POLICY REQUIRING AFFIDAVITS TO BE RECEIVED AT LEAST SEVEN BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE OF THE SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARING AND PROCEED.

Commissioners de la Fe seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioner Hart abstaining; Commissioners Alcorn, Koch, and Lawrence absent from the meeting.

Robert Lawrence, Esquire, Reed Smith LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated September 12, 2007. Commissioner Hart disclosed that the law firm of Hart and Horan, PC had hired Tri-Tek Engineering, Inc., listed on the affidavit as a consultant, in a litigation matter within the past 12 months. Therefore, he said he would recuse himself from participating in this case.

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

//

Commissioner Murphy MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT APPROVE SE 2007-SP-008, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 1 OF THE STAFF REPORT.

Commissioners Lusk and Hall seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioner Hart not present for the votes; Commissioners Alcorn, Koch, and Lawrence absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Murphy MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING BE MODIFIED ALONG ALL BOUNDARIES TO THAT SHOWN ON THE SE PLAT REFERENCED BY THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS; THAT THE BARRIER REQUIREMENT BE WAIVED ALONG ALL BOUNDARIES OF THE PROPERTY; AND THAT THE TRAIL REQUIREMENTS ALONG OLD KEENE MILL ROAD BE MODIFIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS.

Commissioner de la Fe seconded the motion which carried by a vote of 6-0-2 with Commissioner Hart not present for the vote; Commissioners Hall and Harsel abstaining; Commissioners Alcorn, Koch, and Lawrence absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Murphy MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MODIFY THE REQUIREMENT THAT THE FIRST INDOOR TENNIS COURT BUILDING BE SET BACK 50 FEET FROM THE PROPERTY LINE WITH WEST SPRINGFIELD PLAZA (TAX MAP PARCELS 89-1 ((1)) 7 & 4) AND THAT THE SECOND INDOOR TENNIS COURT BUILDING BE SET BACK 50 FEET FROM THE RIGHT-OF-WAY OF ROLLING ROAD, AS SHOWN ON THE SE PLAT REFERENCED BY THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS.

Commissioners Sargeant, Lusk, Hall, and de la Fe seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioner Hart not present for the vote; Commissioners Alcorn, Koch, and Lawrence absent from the meeting.

//

Chairman Murphy resumed the chair and adjourned the meeting.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 9:36 p.m.
Peter F. Murphy, Jr., Chairman
Suzanne F. Harsel, Secretary

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

Minutes by: Jeanette Phillips

Approved on: April 30, 2009

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