Note – For a more detailed summary of the meeting, please see pages 3 - 6 for the Task Force Secretary’s meeting minutes.

The members from the Task Force in attendance were:

- Charlie Hall, Chair
- Fran Wallingford, Vice-chair
- Barry Christopher
- Kevin Warhurst
- Michael Downey
- Al O’Neill
- Edith MacArthur
- Ken Quincy
- Alison Barkan
- William Kyburz
- Julie Hirka
- Sue Kovach Shuman
- William Smith
- Michael Hayes
- John Elzroth
- Flint Webb
- Howard Albers
- Meg Irish
- Dwayne Jefferson

In addition to the Task Force members, Tim Sampson and Dave Sittler, representing Inova; and, Elizabeth Baker and Tara Berger representing Fairview Park were present. Staff from Fairfax County included Aaron Klibaner, DPZ; Meghan Van Dam, DPZ; William O’Donnell, DPZ; Sharon Williams, DPZ; Corinne Bebek, DPZ; John King, FCDOT; and Michael Wing, Providence District Office.

Tabling of Meeting Minutes from Meeting #7 (02/05/19): A motion was made to table discussion of the February 5th Task Force meeting minutes until a summary of Antonio Oliver’s presentation is added to the document. The motion passed with no objections.

Approval of Meeting Minutes from Meeting #5 (01/08/19): A motion was made to adopt the meeting minutes from January 8. The motion passed with no objections. Fran Wallingford abstained.

Charlie Hall, Chair of the Task Force briefly went over the itinerary for the meeting and reminded Task Force members that discussion of transportation topics was scheduled to take place at an upcoming meeting, and would not be encouraged during this meeting.

Sharon Williams and William O’Donnell, planners with the Fairfax County Department of Planning & Zoning (DPZ) gave a presentation discussing zoning concepts and terms relevant to Proffered Condition Amendment (PCA) process. Content included definitions for Conceptual Development Plans (CDPs) and Final Development Plans (FDPs). Some details of the Inova PCA application were shared, including the proposed square footage, Floor Area Ratio (FAR) concentration on the nomination site, and the proposed uses.

Tim Sampson, outside counsel for Inova gave a follow-up presentation elaborating on changes that have been made to their PCA submission, which will be updated in the next few weeks. Mr. Sampson took some time to compare older versions of the concept plans to the most recent
versions. Details about the land uses on the site, the proportion of uses, and the planned building programming were provided. Several concepts for park spaces, frontage along Gallows Road, and a section showing building heights on the site were shown. Mr. Sampson summarized what the development consists of, what elements were important for the design, and the future of the ongoing work regarding transportation impacts analysis.

Elizabeth Baker from Walsh Colucci and Tony D’Agostino from CallisonRTKL, presented a conceptual plan for development of Fairview Park. The guiding goals and principles for the design were discussed, highlights include maintaining the natural character of the site and fostering an “18-hour community” that would see numerous activities throughout the day. Several conceptual renders, diagrams, and images were shown to explain the various complexities of the design. Mr. D’Agostino took time to explain that building heights were lowered to make the environment more comfortable for pedestrians. A central plaza featuring a community event space dubbed as the “shed” forms the active core of the development. Parks, artistic opportunity spaces, and both pedestrian and bike trails seek to create and reinforce connections as well as movement through the site.

Questions & Comments from the Task Force:
Task Force Chair Charlie Hall encouraged Task Force members to share any unanswered questions regarding either the Inova or Fairview Park nominations. Common themes included concerns regarding the amount of new residential units, the types of housing present on the site, and the impacts that new residents will have on local schools. A question about the effect on taxes was raised. Task Force members generally expressed their appreciation of the nominator’s presentations, which created some additional clarity on the scopes and visions for both projects.

Start: 7:00 PM
Adjourn: 9:18 PM
Notes from Merrifield Suburban Center Study Task Force Meeting #8
February 26, 2019

**Votes:**

Unanimous approval of Jan 8th minutes; Fran Wallingford abstention

Approval of Feb 5th minutes tables until Antonio Oliver’s presentation is added

**Task Force Questions following Sharon Williams’s presentation on Proffer Amendment process:**

Fran Wallingford: Requesting a clarification on the stated purpose of the conceptual plan
   County response: The purpose is included in the handouts presented to the Task Force

Charlie Hall: What is the relationship of the proffer amendment to the work of the Task Force?
   County response: The two processes working in parallel. The challenge is how to review
   the amendment request without the latest Plan text. Decision on zoning could inform
   policy

**Task Force Questions following Tim Sampson’s presentation:**

Fran Wallingford: Is the property using any right-of-way?
   TS response: No, all development will occur on INOVA property

Howard Albers: More detail on the overpass trail plans?
   TS response: Could take part of the break-down lane over 495. The goal is to avoid
   power lines

Flint Webb: How is the streetscape along Gallows being affected? Take away lanes on Gallows
   for new bike lane?
   TS response: No, using INOVA property

John Elzroth: Looks like 8,000-10,000 people on the site on a daily basis. How many people
   visiting per day? How many living on the property?
   TS response: Not sure of exact numbers, but the goal is for it to be community-friendly,
   not insular

Charlie Hall: For the PCA language, will it stipulate specific building heights?
   TS response: Yes, proposing to reduce building heights and increase footprints

**Task Force Questions following FVP presentation**

Edythe Kelleher: What would the increase of the FAR to 0.65 look like?
FVP response: If we add an office block, that would increase to 0.65. It would replace part of the plaza.

Fran Wallingford: Where is the parking in the new design? Are proposed buildings included in the current comprehensive plan?
   FVP response: Parking is embedded in buildings whenever possible.

Meg Irish: Concerned that if paths come on later, it impacts the intended flow of pedestrian traffic away from the existing neighborhood. Would like to see paths as early as possible in the process.

Howard Albers: What is the size of the amphitheater?
   FVP response: Limited by space between the lake and the existing road.

Michael Downey: We heard commitments from the INOVA team. Is the FVP team prepared to make commitments?
   FVP response: Our focus is on adding park areas and arts elements. We’d like to include a civic components as well as affordable housing and stormwater management as required. Our vision is for a mix of uses.

Michael Hayes: What is the connection between the amphitheater and the retail space?
   FVP response: It will be at-plan, crossing FVP Drive.

Barry Christopher: What is the deciding factor between adding new office space vs new retail space?
   FVP response: Market conditions.
   Fran Wallingford: Might be an opportunity to include options in the Plan amendment recommendations.

Flint Webb: Issue on the site is that if there’s an accident on the site, there’s no way to evacuate. Propose building a bridge where the dam is.
   FVP response: Talked with Lakeford residents about that and their preference is to not do that.

**Task Force Reflections, Unanswered Questions:**

Bill Kyburz: Question about the flexibility requested on the INOVA property. The requests all ask for flexibility, but that limits the guidance we can provide.

Barry Christopher: At INOVA, the size of the development is a question. What does the final site look like?

Meg Irish: We don’t really have a definition for “suburban feel.” With the sheer volume of people who will use the sites, it almost feels like it’s “urban with a tree lining.”
Sue Shuman: Like the idea of the community garden! On the housing front, is it possible to create intergenerational communities rather than segregating them?
   FVP response: Likes the idea, that is the intention

Keven Warhurst: Trusts that county staff will fulfill the county’s vision. Likes this mix of uses and the development plans at both sites

Bill Kyburz: Would like to see more adult recreation, programming for an adult community, more than just a few running paths

Al O’Neill: All open questions have to do with transportation

Mike Hayes: Concerned about pros and cons of people with regards to the tax base. What are the tax implications of filling the space with commercial vs residential? At INOVA, what will happen to the trees in the future?

Howard Albers: Also interested in tax implications. The bike trails over 495 need further study. Likes the focus on arts in FVP

John Elzroth: FVP comes into balance with the mixed use. Seem like it could be contained, where people live, work and play. Would like to see the same mirrored at INOVA.

Julie Hirka: Concerned about the undeveloped areas at INOVA

Flint Webb: Tax question for the 3/26 meeting during budget discussion. Presentations helped me understand the vision for each of the sites. Liked the school impact discussion for the INOVA site, would like to see the same consideration given at the FVP site.

Alison Barkan: Likes the parks at INOVA. Would like to see a sidewalk to cross over 495 and 50. At FVP, likes the vision for the site but concerned about fairness to existing residents and the lack of access points.

Fran Wallingford: At FVP, concerned about the # of residential units, would like to see fewer. With flexibility requested, it leaves a lot of questions (e.g., “what will the specific uses be in the future?”)

Dwayne Jefferson: Request that INOVA consider using some of the academic spaces for high school-level programming. There are some open questions about the number of kids who will move to the area as a result of these developments.

Michael Downey: Likes the visions presented but the high-level detail required for the Comprehensive Plan doesn’t leave room for ensuring that the developers stick to these visions/commitments in the long term. How can Task Force structure recommendations that
simultaneously grant the flexibility requested by the developers while also retaining the commitments they are making during this process?

Charlie Hall: At INOVA, doesn’t understand how mixed use is needed for the site’s primary uses. Would like to see a more holistic look at the impacts on traffic. At FVP, understand the focus on residential but wants to see a reduction in the number of units.

Community member: Curious about how these developments will impact stormwater downstream