

**MINUTES OF  
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2014**

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

ABSENT: James T. Migliaccio, Lee District

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:16 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 Hart announced that the Planning Commission's Environment Committee had met earlier this evening with county staff to discuss an upcoming Public Facilities Manual (PFM) Amendment regarding sidewalk waivers. He added that the Committee would meet again at 7:00 p.m., in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center on Wednesday, December 3, 2014, at 7:00 p.m., to continue the discussion with staff on electric vehicle charging station infrastructure. He also noted that the Committee would meet on Wednesday, January 14, 2015. He said that that everyone would be welcome to attend.

//

Commissioner Flanagan announced his intent to defer the public hearing on RZ 2013-MV-015 PCA 1998-MV-032, PCA 1998-MV-033, and SEA 81-V-017-02 – Vulcan Construction Materials, LP and the Fairfax County Water Authority

//

Chairman Murphy announced that he and At-Large Commissioner Tim Sargeant had been reappointed to the Planning Commission during the Board of Supervisors' meeting held on Tuesday, November 18, 2014.

//

Chairman Murphy announced his intent to make a motion on Fairfax Forward on Thursday, November 20, 2014, and requested that staff send a copy of the motion to the Commissioners.

//

RZ 2014-LE-010/ SEA 2005-LE-028/ SEA 2005-LE-027-02 – PINEY RUN ELM INVESTMENTS, LC

Commissioner Hart: I move that the Planning Commission defer the public hearing for applications RZ 2014-LE-010, SEA 2005-LE-027-02, and SEA 2005-LE-028, all on behalf of Piney Run Elm Investments, LC, to a date certain of December 10, 2014.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion as articulated by Mr. Hart, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

//

SEA 2003-MV-020 – FOUNDATION FOR THE COLLINGWOOD LIBRARY AND MUSEUM ON AMERICANISM

Commissioner Flanagan: Mr. Chairman, I MOVE SEA 2003-MV-020, FOUNDATION FOR THE COLLINGWOOD LIBRARY AND MUSEUM ON AMERICANISM, BE DEFERRED FROM TONIGHT TO THE DATE CERTAIN OF 1/29/2015.

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 public hearing on SEA 2003-MV-020 to a date certain of January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2015, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hall established the following order of the agenda:

1. SE 2014-SP-037 – AIDA G. CHAVERA (AIDA’S DAY CARE)
2. SE 2014-HM-036 – ELAINE M. WHITEHURST d/b/a WHITEHURST FAMILY DAYCARE
3. 2232-P14-6 – VERIZON WIRELESS AND MILESTONE COMMUNICATIONS
4. RZ/FDP 2014-PR-012 – SEKAS HOMES LTD.

This agenda was accepted without objection.

//

Since the following case was in the Springfield District, Vice Chairman de la Fe assumed the chair.

//

SE 2014-SP-037 – AIDA G. CHAVERA (AIDA’S DAY CARE) –  
Appl. under Sect. 6-105 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a home child care facility. Located at 6616 Green Ash Ct., Springfield, on approx. 2,525 sq. ft. of land zoned PDH-3. Tax Map 88-2 ((9)) 63. SPRINGFIELD DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Aida G. Chavera, Owner, Aida’s Day Care, reaffirmed the affidavit dated July 26, 2014.

There were no disclosures by the Commissioners.

Commissioner Murphy asked that Vice Chairman de la Fe 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, Vice Chairman de la Fe closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Murphy for action on this case.

//

Vice Chairman de la Fe: I’ll close the public hearing.

Commissioner Murphy: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a solid application. I want to thank the Chavera Family – Mr. Chavera’s here – for your cooperation. We had a citizen’s meeting. No one showed up to object, including me because I went to the wrong location. I thought the meeting was in the Springfield office and I forgot the voting machines were in there for early voting, and I forgot that the meeting was at the Orange Hunt School, but Marlae Schnare from Supervisor Herrity’s Office was present and talked to the Chaveras, passed the word on to me. I’ve met earlier with them this evening and gone over the application. We’re going to add one development condition, which I will ask you to reaffirm when we get to the time that you understand the development conditions and this new development condition which I read to you earlier. It’s a solid application. It’s in conformance with the Plan. It successfully addresses all the criteria established in the Zoning Ordinance and the need for a daycare center, which in fact will be raised to a maximum of 12 children at any one time. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that the

planning – before I read the motion, do you reaffirm the development - did you understand the development conditions contained in the staff report and the one I’m going to read this evening?  
Aida G. Chavera, Owner, Aida’s Day Care: Yes, I understand everything.

Commissioner Murphy: Okay, thank you very much. So therefore, Mr. Chairman. I MOVE THAT PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT APPROVE SE 2014-SP-037, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 1 OF THE STAFF REPORT, WITH AN ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONDITION NUMBER 13: “APPROVAL OF THIS USE IS CONTINGENT UPON MAINTENANCE OF A STATE LICENSE OF A HOME CHILD CARE FACILITY FOR 12 CHILDREN.”

Commissioner Litzenberger: Second.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Seconded by Commissioner Litzenberger. Any discussion? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Opposed? The motion carries.

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

//

Chairman Murphy resumed the chair.

//

SE 2014-HM-036 – ELAINE M. WHITEHURST d/b/a  
WHITEHURST FAMILY DAYCARE – Appl. under Sect. 6-105  
of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a home child care facility.  
Located at 13174 Diamond Mill Dr., Herndon, on approx. 2,496  
sq. ft. of land zoned PDH-8. Tax Map 16-3 ((7)) 69. HUNTER  
MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Elaine M. Whitehurst, Owner, Whitehurst Family Daycare, reaffirmed the affidavit dated March 29, 2014.

There were no disclosures by the Commissioners.

Commissioner de la Fe 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 de la Fe for action on this case.

//

Chairman Murphy: Public hearing is closed; recognize Mr. de la Fe, please.

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a relatively simple application and it meets all of the requirements that we have established for SEs, and it has gone to the Hunter Mill Land Use Committee and no one objected. There was no one there to object and, frankly, the question from the Committee was why on earth are we looking at these things? But that, you know –

Chairman Murphy: Who said –

Commissioner de la Fe: Notwithstanding, we said - - I said, well, we are seeing these things because we have to. So, Ms. Whitehurst, could you - - Do you accept and - - the development conditions that are contained in the staff report regarding the –

Elaine Whitehurst, Owner, Whitehurst Family Daycare: Yes, I do.

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you very much. With that Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF SE 2014-HM-036, SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED development – subject - - approval - - and subject to the development - - proposed DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 1.

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 that it approve SEA 2003-MV - - I'm sorry, SE 2014-HM-036, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

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

//

2232-P14-6 – VERIZON WIRELESS AND MILESTONE COMMUNICATIONS – Appl. under Sects. 15.2-2204 and 15.2-2232 of the *Code of Virginia* to develop a telecommunications facility located at 8100 Wolfrap Road, Vienna. Tax Map: 39-2 ((8)) 2A. Area II. PROVIDENCE 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 approval of application 2232-P14-6.

Ed Donohue, Esquire, applicant's agent, Donohue & Stearns, PLC, concurred with staff's presentation and introduced to the Planning Commission Mr. Paul Dugan, P.E., Millennium Engineering, P.C., radio frequency engineer for this application, to address specific questions regarding coverage and capacity.

Commissioner Lawrence asked Mr. Donohue to confirm that the revenues from this application would outweigh the costs, given the expectation that more than one carrier would be located on the facility. Mr. Donohue agreed. When Commissioner Lawrence asked if there would be a demand for more of these structures, Mr. Donohue said yes, particularly given the number of subscribers for wireless service, the number of devices per subscriber, and the bandwidth required per device.

Commissioner Lawrence noted that the facility would be located on public property and asked what its approximate distance would be from the nearby residential communities. Mr. Hansen stated that it was approximately 1,000 feet from Wolftrap Court, adding that Arrowleaf Drive was the same distance from the facility.

Commissioner Lawrence asked what the height of the facility would be. Mr. Donohue noted that the structure would be 108 feet tall, which was under the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance limit of 199 feet. When Commissioner Lawrence asked what the highest RAD center location would be, Mr. Donohue stated that it would be 100 feet. Commissioner Lawrence noted that the 70-foot RAD center location would be below the tree line and asked if it would be a viable node. Mr. Dugan said that as long as 70 feet was sufficiently above the tree line in that area, it could provide service for a carrier, confirming to Commissioner Lawrence that while the structure might not collocate four carriers, there would be more than one carrier. Commissioner Lawrence asked Mr. Dugan to briefly explain how a search area was defined. Mr. Dugan said that carriers used industry-accepted propagation modeling to determine their current coverage and how a new facility might fit within their network to provide coverage and capacity relief. Commissioner Lawrence then asked Mr. Dugan to define a gap in coverage. Mr. Dugan explained that a gap did not necessarily mean that a user could not receive calls; however, data usage might be slowed down due to increased traffic on the network. When Commissioner Lawrence asked if the proposed structure would be heavily used over the next decade, Mr. Dugan stated that it would.

Commissioner Lawrence asked Mr. Donohue if the facility would be removed in the event that it became obsolete. Mr. Donohue said that Milestone Communications was obligated to remove the facility and restore the property under the terms of its lease with the Fairfax County Public Schools.

Commissioner Flanagan asked Mr. Donohue if a fifth carrier could collocate on this facility. Mr. Donohue noted that Section 6409 of the Spectrum Act allowed for the extension of an existing facility to add another carrier; however, he was unsure of county procedure on such an extension.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers, but received no response; therefore, he noted that a rebuttal statement was not necessary. He then called for concluding remarks from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Lawrence noted that he had asked staff to research the impacts of these facilities on property values in Fairfax County. He said that he had received an email noting that the Fairfax County Department of Tax Administration showed no conclusive evidence of negative impacts on nearby residential properties. He added that properties near one recently built structure had actually sold rather quickly and noted that tonight's discussion regarding the distance of this structure from the surrounding residential community would not diminish its character. In addition, he stated that while the service might currently be adequate, it would soon be over capacity and in need of an upgrade.

//

Chairman Murphy: Public hearing is closed; Mr. Lawrence.

Doug Hansen, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: Commissioner? Commissioner, just one thing, just to correct something for the record. It was stated that Verizon's antennas was going to be at 95 feet. That was not correct. According to their application, the antennas will be at 100 feet and the pole is 108 feet tall.

Commissioner Lawrence: That's what I saw in the staff report. Applicant, is that correct?

Chairman Murphy: Yes, it's correct. That's why they're laughing.

Commissioner Lawrence: I take the laughter to be assent.

Ed Donohue, Esquire, Applicant's Agent, Donohue & Stearns, PLC: For once, I had it right and the engineer had it wrong so, yes, 100 feet for Verizon Wireless.

Commissioner Lawrence: Oh, those engineers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I CONCUR WITH STAFF'S CONCLUSION that - - I've got to put my glasses on or I can't read this thing - - THAT THE PROPOSAL BY VERIZON WIRELESS AND MILESTONE COMMUNICATIONS, INC. TO CONSTRUCT A 108-FOOT TALL TREE POLE, LOCATED AT 8100 WOLFTRAP ROAD, VIENNA, VIRGINIA, SATISFIES THE CRITERIA OF LOCATION, CHARACTER, AND EXTENT, AS SPECIFIED IN *VIRGINIA CODE* SECTION 15.2-2232, AS AMENDED. THEREFORE, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION FIND SUBJECT APPLICATION 2232-P14-6 SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

Commissioner Flanagan: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Flanagan. Is there a discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Flanagan: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Commissioner Flanagan: I just - - I seconded it because we have a similar tree pole in Mount Vernon that was recently approved - - well not recently, but it's approved - - in Mount Vernon District, and Mount Vernon District is pretty picky about these locations.

Chairman Murphy: No, I can't believe that.

Commissioner Hall: You've had it in Mount Vernon and you have had it for 20 years.

Commissioner Flanagan: So I – I think this is a very good - - I think this is a very good application.

Chairman Murphy: They only have one pole in Mount Vernon, that's why.

Commissioner Hall: No, but it is –

Chairman Murphy: All those in favor of the motion to approve 2232-P14-6, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

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

//

RZ 2014-PR-012 – SEKAS HOMES LTD. – Appl. to rezone from R-1 and R-2 to R-3, to permit residential development with a total density of .43 du/ac., and a waiver, #6447-WPFM-004-01, to permit the location of underground stormwater management facilities in a residential area. Located on the S.E. intersection of Courthouse and Sutton Roads; 2719, 2721, 2723, Sutton Road, and 9637, 9633 Courthouse Road, on approx. 4.12 ac. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: 2-3 du/ac. Tax Map 48-1 ((1)) 65, 67, 68, and 48-1 ((5)) 1 and 4. PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Kelly M. Atkinson, AICP, applicant's agent, Land Design Consultants, Inc., reaffirmed the affidavit dated November 7, 2014.

There were no disclosures by the Commissioners.

Suzanne Wright, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that staff recommended approval of application RZ 2014-PR-012.

Commissioner Lawrence asked if the proffers contained provisions for documentation and recommendations for homeowners associations (HOA) on underground stormwater management facilities. Ms. Wright said that information would be provided in the proffers for the stormwater waiver, adding that they addressed setting up a fund to seed the maintenance costs incurred by the homeowners. She also noted that the stormwater facility and its maintenance would be recorded in the land records with the HOA documents for future owners. Additionally, Ms. Wright said that the Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT) had received a connectivity waiver from the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) earlier today, explaining that the continuation of the existing street to other adjacent developments would not be practical. Commissioner Lawrence asked Ms. Wright about pedestrian access to Nottoway Park, who stated that citizens had noted that they would like enhanced connectivity between the park and the new development.

Commissioner Hart referenced the second paragraph in Proffer Number 9, Architecture, of the revised proffers, dated November 18, 2014, and said that it should be clarified to say that the existing house on Lot 9 would not be subject to this proffer; however, new houses constructed on Lots 1 and 9 would be. He then referenced Proffer Number 3i, Transportation, and expressed concern about the decreasing value of escrow funds as monies sat unused over time and asked why the sidewalk, curb, and gutter could not be built now. Ms. Wright explained that a six-foot-wide asphalt walkway would be built, as was noted in Proffer Number 3g; however the curb and gutter would not. Commissioner Hart cautioned that there was nothing in 3i to state that the applicant would be absolved from complying with the requirements in 3g.

Commissioner Sargeant referenced Proffer Number 9 and asked whether the proposed façades for this development, particularly for the homes on Lots 1 and 9, would be consistent with those in the surrounding communities. Ms. Wright said that they would be, keeping with the goal of ensuring an attractive and consistent public street presence. Commissioner Sargeant referenced Proffer Number 14b, Other, regarding construction hours, and asked if the early Saturday start time of 8:00 a.m. was consistent with other applications. Ms. Wright said it was. When Commissioner Sargeant asked what the new residents of this development would be responsible for, Ms. Wright said the homeowners would be responsible for the maintenance of the stormwater facility. She noted that while there was tree preservation language in the application, homeowners would be responsible for the trees on their respective properties.

Commissioner Flanagan asked for clarification regarding Lot 9. Ms. Wright explained that the existing house would remain until such time as the homeowner chose to redevelop the property, noting that any new dwelling would be reoriented to access off the new public street.

Ms. Atkinson provided a brief history of the application and described the development, noting that the current owner of Lot 9 would remain on the property. She said that the applicant worked closely with the Fairfax County Urban Forester to meet the tree preservation target, particularly given the development's proximity to Nottoway Park. She added that the applicant would build additional trails and sidewalks to the park, as requested by nearby residents. She pointed out that

the applicant had initiated a crosswalk study, a draft of which was ready for submission to VDOT for review, adding that if it were approved, it would be submitted with the application. Addressing Commissioner Hart's question regarding the asphalt walkway, Ms. Atkinson explained that FCDOT had requested it on behalf of students from the nearby Oakton High School who ran daily and needed interim pedestrian access.

Commissioner Lawrence asked Ms. Atkinson if the public street and turnaround would be adequate to handle multiple visitors. Ms. Atkinson said yes, noting that there would be parking on both sides of the street. Commissioner Lawrence asked if the tree preservation plan would be part of the documentation provided to the HOA. Ms. Atkinson ensured Commissioner Lawrence that a proffer commitment for this provision would be included prior to the Board of Supervisors' hearing. When he asked her if she could also clarify the language in Proffer Number 9, regarding Lots 1 and 9, prior to the Board hearing, Ms. Atkinson said yes. Additionally, upon request from Commissioner Lawrence, Ms. Atkinson stated that the applicant would submit the crosswalk study to VDOT for review and, upon approval, would install the crosswalk as part of the application.

Chairman Murphy pointed out that the tree preservation information had already been included in the final paragraph of revised Proffer Number 5, titled Site Monitoring.

Commissioner Hart referenced Lot 7 and noted that the upper angle of the lot related better with Lot 8 and suggested that the lot line be adjusted to the angle point between the two lots. He then noted that the empty area behind Lot 7 could be used as additional yard space.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience and recited the rules for testimony.

Eric Wedum, 2733 Sutton Road, Vienna, spoke in support of the application. He said that the applicant had been very forthcoming with the community, having met with the residents to discuss the tree preservation and agreeing to build a fence along the property to minimize the visual impact. He expressed concern with regard to the 12-foot minimum side yard setback, but said that the plan was otherwise good.

Commissioner Litzenberger asked Mr. Wedum if he currently experienced any significant stormwater runoff issues during heavy rain events. Mr. Wedum said no.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for a rebuttal statement from Ms. Atkinson, who declined. He then called for concluding remarks from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Lawrence asked Ms. Wright if the setbacks were predicated upon the proposed residential district zoning, which she confirmed, adding that the applicant had met the requirements for an R-3 zoned district.

Commissioner Lawrence asked Ms. Atkinson if she agreed with the proffers, given the changes discussed during the hearing this evening. Ms. Atkinson said yes.

Commissioner Flanagan asked Ms. Wright if the changes to Lots 7 and 8, as suggested by Commissioner Hart, would be made prior to the Board of Supervisors' public hearing. Ms.

Wright said that while staff and the applicant would continue discussions with the applicant, the changes would not likely occur before the Board hearing.

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 Lawrence for action on this case.

//

Chairman Murphy: Public hearing is closed; recognize Mr. Lawrence, please.

Commissioner Lawrence: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I RECOMMEND THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE RZ 2014-PR-012, SUBJECT TO EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED NOVEMBER 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2014.

Commissioner Hall: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hall. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve RZ 2014-PR-012, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Mr. Lawrence.

Commissioner Lawrence: I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE A WAIVER OF THE SIDEWALK REQUIREMENT ALONG COURTHOUSE ROAD IN FAVOR OF THE WALKWAY DEPICTED ON THE GDP.

Commissioner Hall: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hall. Discussion? All those in favor, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Lawrence: Thirdly, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE A WAIVER OF THE SIDEWALK REQUIREMENT ALONG SUTTON ROAD IN FAVOR OF THE WALKWAY DEPICTED ON THE GDP.

Commissioner Hall: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hall. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Lawrence: And finally, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE A WAIVER OF THE REQUIREMENT TO CONSTRUCT CURB AND GUTTER ALONG THE SUTTON ROAD FRONTAGE IN FAVOR OF THE COMMITMENTS TO ESCROW FUNDS CONTAINED IN THE PROFFERS.

Commissioner Hall: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hall. Discussion? All those in favor, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Each motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Migliaccio was absent from the meeting.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

Peter F. Murphy, Chairman

Janet R. Hall, Secretary

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

Minutes by: Jeanette Nord

Approved on: June 24, 2015

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