

Planning Commission Meeting
April 18, 2013
Verbatim Excerpt

S12-CW-2CP – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (TELECOMMUNICATIONS
POLICY PLAN UPDATE)

Decision Only During Commission Matters
(Public Hearing held on March 27, 2013)

Commissioner Murphy: Mr. Chairman, I will have a motion on an Out-of-Turn Plan Amendment we had a public hearing on a couple weeks ago, Plan Amendment S12-CW-2CP, which is the Plan Amendment dealing with updating the Policy Plan, Objective 42, and the following – regarding telecommunication. Just as a few preliminary remarks – first, I want to thank Chris Caperton for the outstanding job he did not only during the public hearing and after with some follow-on actions, but for coming to all the Planning Commission Telecommunication Panel Committee meetings and getting us through this. This is a – this is a Plan Amendment that moves us forward. And I think after we had the Planning Commission seminar with the industry, we don't have to have something to knock us between the eyes all the time to tell us that we need to keep current with the trends in the industry and they're moving very rapidly. And in order to do that, we have to constantly review our Comprehensive Plan that's in the Policy Plan of the County to ensure that we have the right language in the Plan to support the motions we're going to make on individual applications, whether it's through the 2232 process or whether it's through the joint process of the 2232 and the Special Exception. Just to show you how important this is for the County – in a report by the Fairfax County Economic Advisory Commission a couple years, one of their strategies – and I'll read it – is, "Fairfax County should maintain and enhance its diverse economy for long-term economic health. The County should adopt policies conducive to attracting and retaining business." And one of those actions is to support public and private efforts to improve wired and wireless communication networks in the County that match or exceed industry standards for speed and reliability. In order to do that, we need the right language in the Plan to address that. But, moreover, since the Economic Development Authority is primarily discussing this in the context of business and commercial endeavors in the County, this also applies now to what is needed in the residential parts of the County as the proliferation of these electronic devices grows and grows and grows by the day. And just come out with a new i-4 or 5 and look at the lines on M-Street in Washington. They're ready to take a right up the next street to open the store at seven o'clock in the morning to buy the new iPad. And now in the residential homes many of them are now giving up their landlines and relying solely on wireless communication. And in order to do that we need to set up a network now that not only supports the industrial and the commercial need, but also supports the residential need as we boldly continue to move into the 21st century. There is a handout that, I believe, has been circulated around the horseshoe. And basically the motion is based on three inserts that you will find regarding the Plan Amendment S11-IV-MV1 (sic) regarding the institutional and quasi-public property language that was brought up during the public hearing – also, an objective that deals with omni-directional whips to keep residential and commercial criteria concentrated in this are regarding whips – whip antennas consistent with one another – with the commercial language and with the residential language – and also on whip antennas, something that deals with the minimal visual impact and an overall height of 3 feet or less than a diameter of 1.5 inches or less.

And I understand that when I get to the motion, one of my colleagues will introduce a friendly motion that I plan to accept if there's no objection. So having said that, Mr. Chairman, I WOULD MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR PLAN AMENDMENT S12-CW-2CP, WITH THE MODIFICATIONS SHOWN IN MY HANDOUT DATED APRIL 18, 2013. And this modification is based on the adopted Plan by the Planning Commission's Telecommunications Committee and ratified by the Planning Commission and passed onto the Board of Supervisors. THE MODIFICATIONS CLARIFY the location – THAT LOCATING TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITIES ON INSTITUTIONAL AND QUASI-PUBLIC PROPERTIES ARE consistent as a – CONSIDERED AS A "FEATURE SHOWN," – excuse me. AND SECONDLY, IT MAKES A CONSISTENT "FEATURE SHOWN" CRITERIA FOR BOTH RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL APPLICATIONS, AS IT APPLIES TO WHIP ANTENNAS. AND THIRD, THE OVERALL HEIGHT OF WHIP ANTENNAS WILL NOT EXCEED, IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE, 2.5 FEET (30 INCHES). And that is my motion.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Is there a second?

Commissioners Flanagan and Litzenberger: Second.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Seconded by Mr. Flanagan and Mr. Litzenberger.

Commissioner Litzenberger: I have a FRIENDLY AMENDMENT.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Mr. Litzenberger.

Commissioner Litzenberger: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Objective 44, Policy c, bullet 7, on page 8 – it reads, "Whip antennas with minimal visual impact and an overall height of 3 feet-" I WOULD LIKE TO AMEND THAT TO 5 FEET OR LESS, "-and a diameter of 1.5 inches," which I WOULD LIKE TO AMEND TO 2.5 INCHES OR LESS. This is keeping in the spirit of intent – spirit and intent of keeping up with the latest technological advances.

Commissioner Flanagan: Second.

Commissioner Murphy: I have no –

Vice Chairman de la Fe: It's a friendly – it's a friendly amendment.

Commissioner Murphy: Yes, I have no objection. I ACCEPT THAT.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Do you accept that?

Commissioner Murphy: Yes, I accept that.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay. Mr. Hart, you look like you want to say something.

Commissioner Hart: Well, I do, Mr. Chairman. I have a question and I'm sorry this is on the verbatim, but in tonight's handout we started out with S12-CW-2CP –

Commissioner Murphy: Yes, I just noticed that. Thank you.

Mr. Caperton: That's an error. I apologize.

Commissioner Murphy: Yes.

Mr. Caperton: IT SHOULD READ, AS IN THE MOTION, S12-CW-2CP.

Commissioner Hart: Take out the other numbers - that was my question.

Mr. Caperton: Yes.

Commissioner Murphy: Yes, thank you. I just – I read that one and I thought that's not MV. I suppose I was thinking of Mount Vernon. I had good thoughts, Earl.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay, you are correct and THAT AMENDMENT WILL BE NOTED SO THAT WE ARE VOTING ON PLAN AMENDMENT S12-CW-2CP –

Commissioner Hart: Thank you.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: -based on the motion made by Commissioner Murphy with the friendly amendment accepted by Commissioner Litzenberger. Any further discussion? All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Murphy: Just one final word. I do also want to thank the citizens who came in and testified and also, included in that, the citizens who are also members of the telecommunications industry. And they have been joining us, as we have – all our meetings are open to the public. Many members of the industry have been joining us at our Committee meetings and all are most welcome to do so.

//

(The motions carried unanimously with Commissioner Sargeant having recused; Commissioners Hall and Migliaccio absent from the meeting.)

JLC