

**MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 2016**

PRESENT: Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large
Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District
John C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District
Julie Strandlie, Mason District
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District
Karen Keys-Gamarra, Sully District
Janyce N. Hedetniemi, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: Peter F. Murphy, Springfield District

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:20 p.m., by Vice Chairman Frank A. de la Fe, in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

Commissioner Sargeant announced that the Board of Supervisors had requested that the Planning Commission's Schools Committee develop locational and character criteria for urban school facilities for potential inclusion in the Public Facilities Section of the Policy Plan element of the County's Comprehensive Plan. He added that the Board requested that this task be completed prior to October 1, 2016. Subsequently, Commissioner Sargeant stated that he had coordinated with staff to schedule the following meeting dates for the Schools Committee:

- Thursday, April 28, 2016
- Wednesday, May 4, 2016
- Wednesday, May 25, 2016
- Wednesday, June 15, 2016
- Wednesday, June 29, 2016
- Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Commissioner Sargeant indicated that these meetings would occur at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government and noted that these meetings were open to the public.

//

Commissioner Lawrence announced that the Planning Commission's Tysons Committee had met earlier in the evening, stating that the Committee had completed the first phase of the review of the Tysons Plan. He then said that during the second phase of review, the Committee would review the transportation issues associated with the editorial update to the Tysons Plan.

Commissioner Lawrence stated that he would announce the date of future Committee meetings at the Planning Commission's next meeting. Vice Chairman de la Fe added that the next meeting of the Tysons Committee was scheduled for 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 13, 2016, at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center.

//

Commissioner Ulfelder stated that the applicant and representatives of the surrounding community required additional time to make the necessary modifications to the proffers for RZ 2014-DR-022, Basheer/Edgemoore-Brooks, LLC; therefore, he MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR RZ 2014-DR-022, BASHEER/EDGEMOORE-BROOKS, LLC TO A DATE CERTAIN OF APRIL 14, 2016, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC COMMENT.

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Murphy was absent from the meeting.

//

Commissioner Lawrence said that the applicant for PCA 75-7-004-03 and SE 2015-PR-021, Meridian Science 7980, LP, required additional time to coordinate with staff to address issues regarding noise abatement and mitigation; therefore, he MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR PCA 75-7-004-03 AND SE 2015-PR-021 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF APRIL 13TH, 2016, WITH THE RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC COMMENT.

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Murphy was absent from the meeting.

//

FS-V15-18 – EXTENET SYSTEMS, 1504 Wake Forest Drive

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Flanagan: Mr. Chairman, I have a "feature shown" application listed on the agenda tonight as FS-V15-18. ExteNet Systems on behalf of Verizon Wireless asks permission in a 2232 application to locate an antenna on top of 25 replacement utility poles located in the electrical utility easements to serve the large residential neighborhood in the – in that part of Mount Vernon District, north of Fort Belvoir between Richmond Highway, Little Hunting Creek, and Potomac River. As such, the antennas satisfy the "feature shown" guideline policies on pages 37 through 48 of the Public Facilities section of the Policy Plan. I concur with staff's conclusion that the new antenna facility locations by ExteNet and Verizon Wireless are substantially in

accord with recommendations in the adopted Comprehensive Plan and should be considered “feature shown.” I THEREFORE MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION FIND APPLICATION FS-V15-18 MEETS THE CRITERIA OF LOCATION, CHARACTER, AND EXTENT, AS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 15.2-2232 OF THE *CODE OF VIRGINIA*, AS AMENDED.

Commissioner Lawrence: Second.

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

Commissioners: Aye.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Yes.

Commissioner Sargeant: I abstain.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay.

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

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

2232-D15-22 – CROWN CASTLE/VERIZON WIRELESS, VDOT ROW: I-495 Ramp/NE
Corner of I-495 and Route 123

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Ulfelder: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Yes, Commissioner Ulfelder.

Commissioner Ulfelder: I have a “feature shown” and I also have a decision for deferral again this evening. I’ll go with the “feature shown” first, which is – involves a group of three small antennas stuck on the side of a 55-foot wooden pole within the I-495 and Route 123 Interchange. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH STAFF’S DETERMINATION THAT APPLICATION 2232-D15-22 ON VDOT RIGHT-OF-WAY 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 Migliaccio: Second.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Seconded by Commissioner Migliaccio. Is there any discussion?

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Yes, Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: I think it's D14 rather than D15 on mine – this one.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: It says D14 – yes, D14 on the-

Commissioner Flanagan: -14-22.

Commissioner Hart: Make sure we got the right one.

Commissioner Ulfelder: We're going to make sure we got the right one. Correct.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: So this-

Commissioner Ulfelder: The correct number is 2232-D15-

Vice Chairman de la Fe: It says D14.

Commissioner Hart: I have 14.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: -on the agenda. But is it 15?

Commissioner Ulfelder: Based on the cover of my memo with the recommendation from the staff, it says D15.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: D15. So it is – so this is a “feature shown,” 2232-D15-22?

Commissioner Ulfelder: Correct.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay. It was seconded by Commissioner Migliaccio. 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.

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, abstain.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Yes.

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

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

2232-P15-20 – CROWN CASTLE/VERIZON WIRELESS, 8338 Leesburg Pike

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Lawrence: And now I have a couple of “features shown” I want to do. Mr. Chairman, I recommend that staff – I’m sorry, I RECOMMEND THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH STAFF’S DECISION THAT, IN THE MATTERS OF 2232-P15-20 AND 2232-P21-20 [sic] BY CROWN CASTLE/VERIZON WIRELESS AT 8338 LEESBURG PIKE AND 8293 WATSON STREET ARE SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED “FEATURES SHOWN,” PURSUANT TO THE *VIRGINIA CODE* SECTION 15.2-2232, AS AMENDED.

Commissioners Flanagan and Hedetniemi: Second.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Seconded by Commissioners Flanagan and Hedetniemi. Is there any discussion?

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, I will abstain.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay.

Chris Caperton, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Yes?

Mr. Caperton: Chris Caperton from the Department of Planning and Zoning. I believe that one of these items was listed wrong in the agenda. It is – there’s no P21. That nomenclature refers to the year that it was submitted so it should be P15-21. I believe it was written in error on the agenda.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay so of the two – the two 2232s that we are considering now are 2232-P15-20 and 2232-P15-21?

Mr. Caperton: Correct.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay. Everybody understands that? Hearing – and it’s been moved and seconded. 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 and Commissioner Sargeant abstains.

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

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

2232-P15-21 – CROWN CASTLE/VERIZON WIRELESS, 8293 Watson Street

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Lawrence: And now I have a couple of “features shown” I want to do. Mr. Chairman, I recommend that staff – I’m sorry, I RECOMMEND THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH STAFF’S DECISION THAT, IN THE MATTERS OF 2232-P15-20 AND 2232-P21-20 [sic] BY CROWN CASTLE/VERIZON WIRELESS AT 8338 LEESBURG PIKE AND 8293 WATSON STREET ARE SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED “FEATURES SHOWN,” PURSUANT TO THE VIRGINIA CODE SECTION 15.2-2232, AS AMENDED.

Commissioners Flanagan and Hedetniemi: Second.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Seconded by Commissioners Flanagan and Hedetniemi. Is there any discussion?

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, I will abstain.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay.

Chris Caperton, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Yes?

Mr. Caperton: Chris Caperton from the Department of Planning and Zoning. I believe that one of these items was listed wrong in the agenda. It is – there’s no P21. That nomenclature refers to the year that it was submitted so it should be P15-21. I believe it was written in error on the agenda.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay so of the two – the two 2232s that we are considering now are 2232-P15-20 and 2232-P15-21?

Mr. Caperton: Correct.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay. Everybody understands that? Hearing – and it’s been moved and seconded. 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 and Commissioner Sargeant abstains.

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

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

PCA 74-5-158-03 – DRW, INC. (Mason District) (Decision Only)
(The public hearing on this application was held on March 9, 2016.)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to call the applicant up and, also, there have been significant changes and refinements since our Planning Commission hearing on March 9. And I'd like to call on Kelly Atkinson from the staff to go over these refinements.

Kelly Atkinson, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: Thank you, Commissioner Strandlie. I'm Kelly Atkinson with the Department of Planning and Zoning. On March 9, 2016, a public hearing was held in regards to the proposed redevelopment of the subject property known as Monticello Mews, Section Two, Phase Two, with 99 single-family homes. The decision for this hearing was deferred for one week to address minor proffer revisions and provide additional details regarding the proposed building elevations and open space amenities. In response, the applicant has provided revised proffers dated March 15th, 2016, and an additional exhibit addressing these outstanding concerns. This information was distributed to you prior to this hearing and hard copies are provided tonight for your review. The highlights of these revisions include clarifying that restrictions and items noted in the initial sales documents, such as garage dimensions, use of the garage, stormwater management maintenance responsibilities, and prohibition against rooftop storage will be noted in the resale documents in addition to the initial sales documents. The interior dimensions of the garage have been noted, which will be suitable for an average-size family vehicle and an alcove will be provided, subject to final design. Per feedback from VDOT, the existing crosswalk will remain and the applicant has proffered to either a pedestrian-activated crosswalk or flashing warning signs, subject to VDOT approval. This crosswalk language has been further revised from the proffers dated March 15th and the proposed language was passed out to you tonight. The applicant has agreed to incorporate this change between Planning Commission and Board. Limiting the maximum height of any future retaining walls not currently shown on the GDP and providing an exhibit illustrating the proposed building elevations, which now include additional articulations such as shutters and architectural trim – which staff believes provide additional interest to the buildings. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay.

Commissioner Strandlie: Any questions?

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Go ahead.

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you very much, Kelly. I think we're ready to move ahead. Mr. McGranahan, if you could come up and affirm that – the affidavit and the proffers?

John McGranahan, Jr., Applicant's Agent, Hunton & Williams, LLP: Yes, I don't think that I need to-

Vice Chairman de la Fe: You don't have to do the affidavit.

Mr. McGranahan: -reaffirm the affidavit.

Commissioner Strandlie: Sorry.

Mr. McGranahan: And with respect to the proffers, I do confirm the proffers that were distributed to you all and I just received the language about the pedestrian signal – well, at four o'clock today, I guess, by email. So that was one that – the concept is certainly something – now that I understand it, that makes sense. And we would need to incorporate between any decision by you all and the Board of Supervisors, but I've – I don't know – and I haven't discussed it with the client, but it's actually providing an option that would be cheaper than what they already agreed to do. So I don't think it's an issue, but the language – we'll work out with staff between any action you all would take and the Board of Supervisors. But otherwise, the proffers that have been circulated – we confirm that they are the final proffers.

Commissioner Strandlie: Okay. Thank you. And this was something that I thought was very important. There's the option – the – for the traffic signal – and if that were approved, there would be a signalized crosswalk. But if the traffic signal were not approved, it would just be a marking that you would not be able to see after dark so this option provides for a flashing crosswalk sign so that people will be able to see anyone who's in the crosswalk in the evening – dark conditions there. So-

Vice Chairman de la Fe: I can't recall. Are there any development conditions in this case at all?

Ms. Atkinson: No sir.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Yes, Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: I have one question. Is Proffer 7 resolved or is that going to be debated between now and the Board? I understood from Ms. Atkinson's memo we hadn't quite gotten closure on that.

Mr. McGranahan: Mr. Hart, I believe that one is resolved. It's the one that talks about the garages and the one thing that we added, in response to Commissioner Strandlie's suggestion, was that they're going to try in the final design to incorporate some sort of a – you can call it a recessed

area or an alcove so that you can move the trash and recycling bins in even farther away from the car. That's the objective. We-

Commissioner Hart: Right. Right. And your – but yours said 6 to 12 inches and staff has in bold, "Please note that staff recommends this area be increased to 18 to 24 inches."

Mr. McGranahan: And the applicant wants to stick with 6 to 12 inches and this is why.

Commissioner Hart: That's my question. If we don't have-

Mr. McGranahan: Oh. Okay.

Commissioner Hart: Are we-

Mr. McGranahan: We're at 6 to 12 inches because we think it works without the recessed area. I think we have anywhere from two-and-a-half to three-and-a-half feet, depending on the size of the car. But I think it's a good idea that Commissioner Strandlie had that if you can inset those – and this is a minimum. We're trying to set a minimum here because we're trying to avoid an interpretation when we get to site plan. So if it could be bigger, it would be bigger, but that gives you an additional six inches to a foot on top of the two-and-a-half to three-and-a-half feet that we think is adequate.

Commissioner Flanagan: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. McGranahan: Mr. Flanagan.

Commissioner Flanagan: Just – if you could come back – I think what the Commission would like to know is going – is this going to be resolved before it gets to the Board of Supervisors?

Mr. McGranahan: I believe so, yes. But I – because we feel like we've got the right number in the current proffer that's in front of you. We're not – the units haven't been engineered and designed yet so if we were to go with the higher number that staff mentioned, there's a concern that you're going to begin impacting the interior space that hasn't been designed, which you might not be able to do. And then we'd be back here in front of you because we were only able to get 12 inches and not 18 inches and so we're erring on the conservative side. I have not discussed this with the Supervisor, but I – I mean I – we think it's a good idea that the Commissioner raised and that's what we've put in here.

Commissioner Strandlie: So last week, when we looked at the drawings, the trash can extended into the – the area where the car was and over the – the garage door opening is eight feet wide and it extended into that area. So, having measured trash cans today, the typical large trash can is 21 by 24. So adding an additional 12 inches does push that back into the area that would be within the opening, I believe.

Mr. McGranahan: The wall. Yeah. Yeah. And we also confirmed, when we discussed it, that the – the opening on these garages is – is the 9-foot opening-

Commissioner Flanagan: And-

Mr. McGranahan: -for the vehicle.

Commissioner Strandlie: Right. Did I say eight? Nine.

Mr. McGranahan: Yeah, you said eight, but that's – yeah.

Commissioner Flanagan: So the 24 inch that staff is recommending would actually completely-

Mr. McGranahan: Completely conceal.

Commissioner Flanagan: -recess the garbage container.

Commissioner Strandlie: Yes.

Mr. McGranahan: It will.

Commissioner Strandlie: The longer side on the trash can that I have – that had one of the large totes – you can turn them around in a different angle, but it measures 20 – 21 by 24 inches.

Commissioner Flanagan: The container would be totally out of the way with 24 inches, but not totally out of the way with 12 inches – but it wouldn't interfere with traffic – I mean, with the car getting into-

Commissioner Strandlie: I don't believe so. I mean, I think this is – this is a 12-inch change over where we were-

Mr. McGranahan: Oh yeah.

Commissioner Strandlie: -last – last week? But if – if Supervisor Gross in moving this forward thinks it needs to have a further indentation-

Mr. McGranahan: We'll be discussing it with her.

Commissioner Strandlie: You continue to work on that, but we have moved it 12 inches.

Mr. McGranahan: Yeah.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Let me remind you that we are on verbatim.

Commissioner Hart: I didn't realize that we were on the verbatim yet. I don't think that this is a denial issue, but staff is kind of making faces and I wondered if – if there's a response.

Ms. Atkinson: I'm trying to get a word in.

Commissioner Hart: Yeah. The concern that I had – I don't know whether it should be 12 inches or 24 inches. I do know that on those ones in Merrifield where they didn't fit at all – they were all outside – and I think we want the trashcans to fit in the garage, whatever it is. Ms. Atkinson, is there – you wrote the memo, I guess, that's got the bold sentence in it.

Ms. Atkinson: Yeah, we just wanted to point out that it was a recommendation from staff to increase the depth of the alcove area. I think we've talked ad nauseum last week about car sizes and this is really our attempt to ensure that you can get a car in the garage, you can adequately get around the – get around the car. There is no issues, like you mentioned, with the Merrifield garages. It's a recommendation. Like you said, it's not a denial issue for us. It is something that we'd like the applicant to strongly consider between PC and Board.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Anything else? Okay. It's yours.

Commissioner Strandlie: Okay. I'll go ahead and make the motion then. And I have a little background to go with this. Mr. Chairman, tonight we have before us a decision on the Monticello Mews development – the last portion of a two-section neighborhood that was zoned R-12 in 1976. Since the initial Mason District Land Use Committee meeting last fall through the March 9th Planning Commission public hearing and up until the meeting tonight – and a few minutes ago – the applicant has continued to work with the community, with Supervisor Gross, with staff, and with me to further refine the application and the proffers. Changes have been made to address our collective concerns, some of which were already included in the proffers in the March 2nd, 2016 addendum, but which have been further fine-tuned during this deferral period. To summarize the staff presentation, significant modifications and revisions include the following:

- Number one, the density was reduced from 108 to 102 and then finally to 99 units;
- Two, green space and amenities were added to where the three units were removed, adding even more buffering;
- Three, significant buffering was added along Edsall Road in front of the stormwater retention pond and this was a very significant concern and request from the community;
- A traffic light shall be installed by the applicant, pending approval from VDOT and if the traffic light is not approved by VDOT, a flashing crosswalk signal or flashing warning sign shall be provided by the applicant – again, pending approval from VDOT;
- There shall be specific language in covenant sales and resale materials requiring and notifying owners that garages must be used for the intended purposes of parking a car and no storage shall occur on potential roof decks;
- Further, the garage dimensions will be included in these materials and we have made sure that typical family vehicles, such as a minivan, an SUV – such as pilot or a CRV – and mid-sized sedan fits in the garages;

- The driveways will also be of sufficient length to ensure that parked cars do not block sidewalks;
- As a result of density reductions and reconfigurations, there will now be 79 visitor parking spaces for 99 units – I think the applicant has gone a good ways in addressing the parking concerns; and finally
- The applicant will provide a \$99,000 voluntary contribution toward Bren Mar Elementary.

A schools contribution was not required in this case because the application does not result in an increase in density. Schools contributions are only required when there is an increase in density and then the amount in the proffer is based on Fairfax County Public Schools' estimate of students generated by that density increase. Some members of the community requested interparcel access to Plaza 500, the neighboring commercial development. This was not included as it would cut through a Resource Protection Area and floodplain, require a bridge, and turn a private street into a public thoroughfare. This land use has a somewhat complicated history and to make this more clear, I would recommend referral to Page 1 of the January 20th, 2016 staff report for a description of the application. You'll be able to see how this application evolved over the years and you can run the numbers to see that this application is significantly under density allowed for this parcel. Responding to some community concerns, this case is not a rezoning. This is a Proffer Condition Amendment for an R-12 density originally granted in 1976, prior to the adoption of the current Comp Plan. Even so, the proposed density at 9.52 units per acre is very close to the current Comp Plan recommendation of 5 to 8 units per acre. Some have asked that we just say no to any development. That's not possible under Virginia law, as the applicant has the right to develop their property under legal guidelines and pursuant to previous zoning entitlements and this action – this application complies with that and staff has recommended approval. Indeed, this has been an excellent example of community-based land use planning. Mr. McGranahan and his colleagues have worked with staff, the Planning Commission, the District Supervisor, and they have listened to community concerns, as already discussed. We believe this application does significantly address community needs and concerns. On a separate but related note, in the future, however, this type of community-based planning may not be possible for applications filed after July 1st, as a result of the proffer legislation that was recently signed into law on March 8th. Finally, I would like to thank the staff, especially Kelly Atkinson and Kris Abrahamson for their outstanding work. I can't say – give enough compliments to Kelly on how thorough she has been on this application. I'd also like to thank the Mason District Land Use Committee, which recommended approval of the application, for their thoughtful input. And with that, I WILL MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF PCA 74-5-158-03, SUBJECT TO THE PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED MARCH 15TH, 2016.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Seconded.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Seconded by Commissioner Hedetniemi. Is there 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.

Commissioner Strandlie: I FURTHER MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE THE WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS PROVIDED UNDER A SEPARATE ATTACHMENT AND DATED MARCH 16TH, 2016 AND AS NOTED IN THE STAFF REPORT AND THE STAFF REPORT ADDENDUM.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Seconded.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Seconded by Commissioner Hedetniemi. Is there 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. Anything else?

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you very much.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Thank you very much.

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

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

FDP 2011-PR-023-04 & PCA/CDPA 2011-PR-023 – RENAISSANCE CENTRO TYSONS, LLC AND CITYLINE PARTNERS LLC (Decisions Only)

(The public hearing on these applications was held on February 4, 2016.)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Lawrence: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I'm going to ask to do something unusual tonight. Ordinarily, at the end of a deferral period, the motion is made – up or down on the application. Tonight, I would like to take a few minutes, with your indulgence, to detail the highlights – the key points of what has happened in proffer revisions. If that's okay, I'd like to do it that way.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay.

Commissioner Lawrence: It will take me a few minutes. Everybody should now have a copy of the – what the applicant sent in on March the 15th. It's the redline version of proffers – including the proffer in question, which is 92.2. What I'm going to do is to look at the key points of that revision and a couple of subsequent changes – I will say that I was on the phone today with staff

on this. I – I ask your patience because I believe we have solved the problems. I will make a motion at the end of this explanation. Commissioners will remember we had the public hearing on February 4th and the application received very good support, except for one thing – which was that the applicant claimed bonus density for including WDUs, but the proffers read such that we could end up – the County could end up with no WDUs and instead money. What that amounts to or – it's a crude way of putting it, but what that would have amounted to is dollars for density. And that is not what the Plan contemplates at all. The Plan states specifically that money is not desired. We spent some time working to get that out of the proffer and I think I can demonstrate tonight that we have done that. If you look at the – the printouts you got of the – of the proffer in question – it begins on page 9 of quite a few pages – but don't worry, I'll be doing high points only. The applicant has now moved from a – I think it was a 16 percent bonus density to 20 percent, which is – from my point of view – okay in this situation. They're going to build a range of units from 110 to 140 and if they convert some of the live/work units to residential units, it could go to 150. On page 9, there's a – an example – I think it shows up in blue – I hope it does on you all's copies – at the bottom of 92.1 – showing how the 20 percent would be calculated. It's calculated off the base units, right – and not off the total units that would be constructed. And that's okay. That's how the Plan envisions it. So that's all right. What that means is they'll end up with some calculated number of WDUs to be provided. If we go to the next page – page 10 – we get into a lot of red lines and blue lines. And what they're saying there is that these units may be in the building, not in the building, or in some combination. If they're not in the building, they will be in Tysons, okay? And probably, it could end up with them all being not in the building, but we would still get the WDUs and they would still be in Tysons and that's the whole point. Notice the big letter B there, about two-thirds of the way down the page. The applicant shall provide no less than 65 percent of the proffered 20 percent – now that proffered 20 percent is the number they got by dividing their total number of units by 1.2 – so they're going to provide 65 percent of that either on-site or off-site or a combination. No qualification. It's a complete commitment – a complete statement. Let's see, the next point that matters – there is a reference in the statement – a statement made earlier on that the 20 percent is going to be 20 percent, as may be adjusted. There was formerly in this proffer – and I think it's in your copy – a little Roman three – Romanette three – and what it talks about is the idea of redistributing, among the various income stages, these units. And in that happening, there would be a reduction of units – one unit for these redistributions. That's gone. There will be no reduction of the number of units once calculated – none. We have, then, a – the rest of the proffer really concerns itself with – okay, how are we going to know that we're going to get these units that you've committed to? And there are several different methods to be employed. One method is if it's going to be off-site, then it's going to be in a building that has been entitled – in other words, it will be in a future building that does not yet have its entitlement in Tysons. It'll be in a building that has been zoned and there will be contractual arrangement – a four-cornered contractual arrangement with the builders of that building to include a number of WDUs in satisfaction of this proffer for this building. And there are various assurances that those kinds of things will be for life. There are several events in the proffer that matter. One of them is at site plan. So if they get entitlement, then the next big event is going to be at site plan. And at site plan, they need to be able to demonstrate what they've done in the way of WDUs. If, at the time of site plan, they can demonstrate that they've got all 20 percent of it – however they got it – to the County's satisfaction, then they're done. More realistically, they'll probably be somewhere in process at site plan so the proffer continues with, "Okay, what if we haven't got them all by site plan time?" And under those circumstances, the applicant proffers to do a diligence for the remainder of the

WDUs and to come to arrangements, which – when furnished with the evidence they describe in the proffer – should satisfy the County that, in fact, there will be a WDU. Then, we have – at prior to the first RUP being issued – so site plan is in now – probably a year or so from entitlement, maybe more, and the first RUP might be issued – maybe two years after that for construction. So we're talking about a fairly extended period of time for them to do their searching. And prior to first RUP, they need to be able to demonstrate that they have what units they have and they need to provide the bonifides for each of these units that they say they're going to provide to the County. If they get all 20 percent at that point, prior to the first RUP, then they're done. But if they don't have all 20 percent at that point, then the search goes on. And what happens then is – if they end up after a period of three years with something less than 80 percent of that number we ended up with – if it was 20 units, then it would be 80 percent of 20. They end up with something less than 80 percent of that number we arrived at, then they're going to give a demurrage to the County in the amount of – I think it's \$85,000 per unit that they haven't provided. Now that – it's 80 percent of 20. We're talking about maybe seven units that are left so if it's less than 80 percent, it would be 7 times the – times the amount demurrage. Suppose they did better than that. Suppose they got 80 percent, but not 100 percent. If they got 80 percent but not 100 percent, then the demurrage goes down. It would be \$75,000 per unit, according to the proffer. So in the event that we don't get WDUs, we do get money, but there is no situation in which they get the density and we get nothing but money. And there's fairly good reason to believe that they're incentivized to produce – not money for us because we don't want that – but WDUs. The proffer spends a lot of words making that clear. I went over it as best I could. We have also looked at it with staff. I had a conversation today with the County Attorney. I think I haven't said anything that isn't true, per the proffer. I believe I condensed it and church-leagued it, but I think I've done that accurately. I think we have every reason to believe that this will take care of the apparent conflict we had with McLean. Also, this applies only to steel-and-concrete, high-rise condominiums in Tysons in the magic circle. So this is not a – this is not a – we're not creating that's going to – people are going to come in from all over the County and say, "Well you did this here, why can't you do that with us. So, I know this is very last minute and I don't very easily – or like – take any position that is different from the staff's. Please understand that the staff has had essentially zero tolerance to fully assess the proffer. So when I make my motion, it's going to be – it's going to contain a proviso that staff will continue its assessment between this time and the Board date of this proffer and may well have additional comments and suggestions. We are not leaving it here altogether. Now I need a couple of things from the applicant's representatives. Ms. Strobel, thank you.

Lynne Strobel, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, PC: Good evening. Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, my name is Lynne Strobel. I represent Renaissance.

Commissioner Lawrence: First, have I presented a reasonable depiction of the new Proffer 92.2?

Ms. Strobel: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Lawrence: Thank you. Secondly, will your client agree to this proffer? We don't have a signed example of it. We need to have that by the time it gets to the Board.

Ms. Strobel: Yes, sir. That is understood.

Commissioner Lawrence: Thirdly, do you understand that staff needs to continue its assessment of this proffer between now and the Board date?

Ms. Strobel: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Lawrence: Fourthly, do you accept the development conditions that are included with this – this package.

Ms. Strobel: Yes. The applicant accepts the development conditions.

Commissioner Lawrence: Thank you very much.

Ms. Strobel: Thank you.

Commissioner Lawrence: I'm going to do something that's not ordinarily done. I'd like to acknowledge the efforts of the applicant and the applicant's representatives. We have had – we've formed a late Friday evening let's-peruse-proffers-and-burn-the-midnight-oil club at one point. They have done good work in – in converting the thing. I'd like also to recognize the efforts that have been put in by key members of staff that are here present tonight, whose faces I'm sure you're all familiar with – and a couple of faces that aren't here tonight and they are Suzanne Wright and Cathy Lewis. This is not a small matter, but I think we have reached a reasonable position on the matter. I will differ from staff's conclusion that they recommend denial. That recommendation is there because they have no time to assess what we have here, but they have seen and have had time to be exposed to it – what it is we have here – and I haven't heard anyone jumping from the eighth floor window. So I think we're – I think we've got what the Planning Commission needs to have to make a sensible recommendation to the Board. Okay, does anybody have any questions?

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Yes, Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Yes, thank you. Before we – before we go on the verbatim – or are we on it?

Vice Chairman de la Fe: We are.

Commissioner Hart: Two minor edits. On page 13 at the top in that Paragraph X, first line – there's a misplaced apostrophe – it's the Board of Supervisors. On page 15, toward the bottom, that Paragraph little I – in the first line, the comma should be deleted. I hope somebody else has gone through every bit of this, but I did want to say one other thing following on Commissioner Lawrence's comments. I think we appreciate, collectively, Commissioner Lawrence's efforts and patience to straighten this out before we send it up to the Board. I thought the night of the public hearing, we had some pretty tense moments. This was a – it's – it puts us in a difficult situation to make a decision on a very complicated issue where we don't have all the information. I think we depend on staff and an applicant both – two applicants, in this case – to work constructively together to try to – to resolve the differences. It doesn't always work out. On this one, I wasn't sure that it would, but it seems to have and I think that's thanks to Commissioner Lawrence's

patient efforts and his reliable wisdom on this sort of thing. And I certainly appreciate that and I think the rest of us do as well. Thank you.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay. Anything else?

Commissioner Lawrence: Along the line of typos, in the beginning of the proffer, you liked the big A so well, you used it twice so you may want to check your outline again when you go through to finalize.

Commissioner Flanagan: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Yes, Commissioner Flanagan.

Commissioner Flanagan: I listened as carefully as I could, but I thought I heard a contradiction so I'd like to have that clarified, if you would, please. You originally stated that it was unacceptable to have dollars for density. That was stated, I believe.

Commissioner Lawrence: I did. I did say that.

Commissioner Flanagan: And we're doing is not – will not result in dollars for density.

Commissioner Lawrence: That's right.

Commissioner Flanagan: But then, later on, you said in the event that we only wind up with cash – could you explain that last statement? Why – if we – is it possible we could only wind up with cash?

Commissioner Lawrence: Thank you, Commissioner Flanagan. If I said that, I misspoke. In fact, I think the last correction – major correction we did to this proffer was to eliminate some language, which could be construed in such a way that we would only end up only with cash. There is now no way – I think I did say that – in which we will end up only with cash. They get the density all right, but we get at least 65 percent – and hopefully better than that – of WDUs – maybe not in the building, but in Tysons.

Commissioner Flanagan: Thank you. I think that answers that.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Anything else? Yes, Commissioner Ulfelder.

Commissioner Ulfelder: I would like to second Commissioner Hart's remarks and just say this appears complicated, but the thrust is clear, which is to honor the WDU policy that is in effect for Tysons and do it in the context of a – what I think everyone agreed at the time of the public hearing – is an exciting and very positive project that will come into Tysons. And to try to keep that process moving while we are also going to be engaging in a review of the WDU policy for Tysons specifically, as it relates to these kinds of buildings – this kind of situation. And I very much appreciate Commissioner Lawrence's very hard work to try to get us to this – to get us to this point and I will be supporting the motion.

Commissioner Lawrence: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Yes.

Commissioner Lawrence: Thank you, Commissioner Ulfelder. And you've touched on a subject that I'd like to speak on a little bit. There is, in fact, a committee, which is engaged in revisiting the proffer so – I'm sorry, the WDU policy in Tysons. It's headed by someone who nobody here ever knew. It's a man named Walter Alcorn, who had nothing to do with the Tysons Plan whatsoever. That committee has started its work, but – of course – there's no way they're going to finish by the time – it's time to do something about this work here, which is why it was so important to get this resolved now rather than simply say, "Well, we'll just wait a few months and keep deferring." I couldn't do that. It wouldn't have been fair to the applicant at all. But it is in process and there will be some result from that. That's – there's language in the proffer you may have noticed that says the applicant can enter into new policies and that's what that refers to. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay. Are you ready? Oh, I'm sorry.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: And I do appreciate all the hard work. I know we have been talking about this process and I know that we've come a long way. You did mention that the staff will continue to work with, I believe, the applicant and there may well have – they may well have additional requirements. Can you give me – or anyone give me some explanation of how those requirements, if staff does have additional concerns, will be handled.

Commissioner Lawrence: What they will do is work through their suggestions and comments with the applicant – and along with the Supervisor – and make sure that the proffers, by the time the thing gets to the Board, reflect staff's considered judgment.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay.

Commissioner Lawrence: Now there may be issues on which they agree to disagree and that has happened in the past and will in the future, but that gives staff a chance to weigh in on the thing – which they have not had because everything has happened so fast and so late.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Anything else? Okay.

Commissioner Lawrence: All right. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF FDP 2011-PR-023-04 AND, IN THE EVENT OF SUCH APPROVAL, PCA/CDPA 2011-PR-023 FROM RENAISSANCE CENTRO AND CITYLINE PARTNERS, RESPECTIVELY.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Seconded by Commissioner Hedetniemi. Is there 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.

Commissioner: Thank you all very much. And I repeat, thanks to the applicant. Thanks to staff. We have preserved the integrity of the Plan. Well done.

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

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

RZ 2015-HM-010 – CHRISTOPHER W. AND MARY J. WARNER (Decision Only)

(The public hearing on this application was held on February 17, 2016.)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The public hearing for RZ 2015-HM-010, in the name of Christopher W. and Mary J. Warner was held on February 17th, 2016. At that time, there were a number of folks that appeared – some in support – some opposed. And the – I would say that the major issue was how many additional housing – houses would be built, based on this rezoning, whether one or two. We are being asked to provide two additional houses. The third house would be the one that the Warners live in and they would remain there. The configuration of the two new houses presented a great deal of angst among the neighbors, particularly the ones across the street, in that they felt that the houses would be stacked one on top of the other and they – as one – more than one person said it would create a more urban feel to their neighborhood. I, frankly, don't think that these two additional houses would create, what I would consider, an urban feel, but that is their belief. The other major issue had to do with the modification being requested as being a very significant modification to the front lot line to permit a – Lot 3 to have a minimum width of 10 feet along Clarks Crossing Road. The issue of lot shape factor was brought up and I believe staff has – they have issued two addenda to this report, one dated March 9th and one dated February 10th. But I believe that the issue of shape factor has been adequately resolved. The houses have been moved so that, in effect, they're not straight – lined up straight. There have been a number of other changes with the addition of plantings and a number of other things. And staff has recommended approval for this. I – the public hearing for this case was deferred. First, it was partly – it was partly weather, but it was also to permit the Hunter Mill Land Use Committee to make a recommendation. They – after the public hearing, they – before – rather before the public hearing, they did not have a quorum to make a recommendation. I deferred the decision until tonight so that they could make a recommendation one way or another at their meeting last night. Their meeting last night was also cancelled because they did not have a quorum. I don't believe that it is fair or equitable to the applicant to continue to defer decision for a case to await a recommendation of the Land Use Committee when I can't guarantee that they will have a quorum at their next meeting. And they – whatever we decide tonight, the Land Use Committee can look at it again before it goes to the Board of Supervisors with our recommendation. I realize that – that there is a great deal of concern amongst some of the neighbors about the – particularly the severity of the lot width modification. However, I – after looking at a number of possible reconfigurations, I believe that this – this modification permits the best way to save as many trees as possible and to reduce the

impervious surface that would be required in some of those models – as well as the fact that, even in those models, there would probably have to be waivers and modifications of the lot width – not as severe as this one, but – you know, they would be required for modifications. I believe that the applicants have a right to develop their land. The staff has recommend approval and, although I do not have a recommendation and there is no recommendation from the Land Use Committee – since I can't guarantee that they will have a quorum at their next meeting, I have decided that I agree with staff with the recommendation and will move on this case without the Land Use Committee recommendation. I know that this is something that I – I'm not sure that I have ever done it before, although I may have. I've been in the Commission a long, long time. But I really don't think it's fair – I mean, in effect, the Land Use Committee has had – I think you have – the applicant has appeared at least three times and the Land Use Committee has had an opportunity to consider this at least four times. And they just have not been able to come up with a quorum for this, but it has been presented. So I just don't think it is fair to continue to defer this case. So Mr. Chairman, I – as I said – I believe that, in this case – let me look at my – RZ 2015-HM-010, in the name of Christopher Warner and Mary J. Warner – I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF RZ H – 2015-HM-010 AND THE GENERALIZED DEVELOPMENT PLAN, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERED CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED, I BELIEVE IT'S JANUARY 29TH, 2016 [sic].

Secretary Hart: The motion has been made by Commissioner de la Fe. Is there a second?

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Laura Arseneau, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: Mr. Hart? It should – the development condition should be – I'm sorry, proffer should be March 7th, 2016.

Commissioner de la Fe: MARCH 7TH, 2016.

Secretary Hart: Is there a second of the motion?

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Secretary Hart: Second by Commissioner Sargeant. Is there any discussion? Commissioner Lawrence.

Commissioner Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I cannot support this motion. Let me say why. The existence of the new home on the property means that it turns its back on the new houses. The necessity for access for a third house on the property ends us up, no matter what we do, with a situation in which there isn't a convivial grouping of the houses. If you look at the patterns of groupings around this property on other sites, you see such groupings in clusters that are there. The applicant sent in a memo showing why a suggested seconded design for the thing wouldn't work. I agree they wouldn't work. I don't think the first design would work. I don't think it fits into the fabric of the community. Therefore, I cannot support the motion. Thank you.

Commissioner Hart: Further discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we'll move to a vote. All those in favor of the motion, as articulated by Commissioner de la Fe, please say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Secretary Hart: Those opposed?

Commissioners Flanagan, Keys-Gamarra, Lawrence, and Strandlie: No.

Secretary Hart: A division. All right. Commissioner Ulfelder?

Commissioner Ulfelder: Aye.

Secretary Hart: Commissioner Hurley?

Commissioner Hurley: Aye.

Secretary Hart: Commissioner Migliaccio?

Commissioner Migliaccio: Aye.

Secretary Hart: Commissioner Sargeant?

Commissioner Sargeant: Aye.

Secretary Hart: Commissioner de la Fe?

Commissioner de la Fe: Aye.

Secretary Hart: Commissioner Lawrence?

Commissioner Lawrence: No.

Secretary Hart: Commissioner Flanagan?

Commissioner Flanagan: No.

Secretary Hart: Commissioner Hedetniemi?

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Aye.

Secretary Hart: Commissioner Strandlie?

Commissioner Strandlie: No.

Secretary Hart: Commissioner Keys-Gamarra?

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: No.

Secretary Hart: Someone count.

Commissioner de la Fe: Four to Seven.

Secretary Hart: Seven to four?

Commissioner de la Fe: Six.

Secretary Hart: All right. Chair votes aye, motion carries. Commissioner de la Fe?

Commissioner de la Fe: Okay, thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I MOVE APPROVAL OF A MODIFICATION OF SECTION 9-610 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE TO PERMIT THE WIDTH OF LOT 3 TO BE A MINIMUM OF 10 FEET WIDE.

Secretary Hart: Is there a second?

Commissioner Ulfelder: Second.

Secretary Hart: Commissioner – the motion’s seconded by Commissioner Ulfelder. Discussion on that motion? Seeing none, we’ll move to a vote. All those in favor of the motion, as articulated by Commissioner de la Fe, please say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Secretary Hart: Those opposed?

Commissioners Flanagan, Keys-Gamarra, Lawrence, and Strandlie: No.

Secretary Hart: I’ll assume it’s the same division. That motion carries.

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you very much. I am sorry that I could not wait for the Land Use Committee to render a decision, but I think it would not be fair to do so. Thank you.

(Each motion carried by a vote of 7-4. Commissioners Flanagan, Keys-Gamarra, Lawrence, and Strandlie voted in opposition. Commissioner Murphy was absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

MARKUP FOR FAIRFAX COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FY 2016 – 2020 (With Future Fiscal Years to 2025) (Decision Only)

(The public hearing on this item was held on March 2, 2016.)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have some narrative and several motions that I’d like to read. Before we go, I have a second and then a discussion, if that would be all right. The Fiscal Year 2017 to 2021 Capital Improvement Program serves as a planning

instrument to identify needed capital projects and to coordinate the financing and timing of these improvements. With this in mind, the Planning Commission kicked off the review of the CIP by hosting a workshop on Wednesday, March 3rd. The Commission had the opportunity to hear from 12 speakers about CIP projects and also held a public hearing that night to solicit feedback from residents of the County. On March 9th, the Planning Commission hosted a committee meeting about the CIP program to provide an opportunity for Planning Commissioners to ask questions and clarify the status of projects within this year's program. With this background in mind, Mr. Chairman, I'd now like to make a series of motions regarding the CIP. To begin, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE THE ADVERTISED FAIRFAX COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEARS 2017 THROUGH 2021, WITH FUTURE FISCAL YEARS TO 2026. I FURTHER MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONSIDER ALTERNATIVES TO INCREASING THE ATHLETIC SERVICE FEE, AS PROPOSED IN THE 2017 ADVERTISED BUDGET PLAN. The athletic services fee is proposed to be increased from \$5.50 to \$9.50 per participant per season and from \$15 to \$25 per team per tournament for rectangular field users. Planning Commission members have expressed concern regarding this increase and recommend the alternative options be considered. In addition, the Planning Commission notes that medical studies have been inconclusive with regard to the health impacts from the use of crumb rubber on synthetic turf fields. However, there are increasing concerns regarding the possible health and environmental effects. The Planning Commission recognizes that there is a coordinated federal government study scheduled to examine this issue, but this may take time. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I FURTHER MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT COUNTY STAFF REVIEW THE LONG-TERM FINANCIAL AND RISK IMPLICATIONS OF THE USE OF CRUMB RUBBER ON SYNTHETIC TURF FIELDS, SHOULD FUTURE HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS CONCLUDE THAT THE USE OF CRUMB RUBBER ON SYNTHETIC TURF FIELDS IS HARMFUL TO PUBLIC HEALTH AND/OR THE ENVIRONMENT. In addition, the Planning Commission had a number of questions related to the School Board's CIP, indicating a need for further understanding about the long-term formula used to determine school capacity requirements and the implication of this formula on both future and existing school sites. The Planning Commission would like to see – have further discussion and discuss the definition of capacity and how it influences CIP decision-making in the future. And the Planning Commission shares and supports the goal of providing excellent school facilities for residents and would like to provide sound recommendations regarding long-term planning. Therefore, I FURTHER MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS STAFF MEET WITH THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S SCHOOLS COMMITTEE IN ADVANCE OF NEXT YEAR'S CIP WORKSHOP. And finally, while the Planning Commission supports the Human Services' top priority projects, including the shelters and community centers proposed for the 2016 Bond Referendum, it also recognizes the need for renovation and/or expansion of the CSB's residential treatment facilities. There are currently more than 100 individuals on the waiting lists for these facilities. The Planning Commission appreciates the plans for renovating these facilities in the future. However, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION ENCOURAGE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO EXPLORE OPTIONS TO SUPPORT INTERIM OUTPATIENT SERVICES TO ASSIST WITH THE WAITING LIST AND THE IMMEDIATE NEED FOR RESIDENTIAL SERVICES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner Migliaccio: I second his motion, Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner Strandlie: Second.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Seconded by Commissioner Migliaccio and – I’m sorry – Ms. Strandlie. Let’s see, do we have any discussion? Yes.

Commissioner Hurley: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I support the motion, but with three specific comments. First, I understand the need for school renovations, but I question keeping in the CIP planning and construction of school in areas in which current data show no significant projected overcrowding. Second, the definition of “overcapacity schools” may become a critical issue if the new proffer law is interpreted to mean new housing will only provide school proffers if local schools are overcrowded. And third – and perhaps, most critically – additional data from the Community Services Board indicates 102 people are currently on the wait list for inpatient treatment and, I quote, “in Fiscal Year 2015, three people died who are on the waiting list for services and one experienced a serious suicide attempt,” end of quote. But to me, these numbers indicate an urgent need for additional CSB residential treatment facilities. Thank you.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay, thank you. And Commissioner Strandlie?

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you very much. I concur with Commissioner Hurley’s comments regarding the school capacity. This has been a very challenging and complex conversation. We don’t feel that we have quite the exact answers that we are looking for and I’m looking very much forward to having a conversation with the Schools Committee. I would like to ask Commissioner Sargeant if he would be open to a FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO SAY, “RECOMMEND THAT THE FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL STAFF AND SCHOOL BOARD REPRESENTATIVES MEET WITH THE PLANNING COMMISSION’S SCHOOL COMMITTEE IN ADVANCE OF NEXT YEAR’S CIP WORKSHOP.”

Commissioner Sargeant: I AM CERTAINLY OPEN TO THAT. The meetings are public anyways so they’re more than welcome.

Commissioner Strandlie: Great. Thank you. Well we – you know, we’d like to-

Commissioner Sargeant: Absolutely.

Commissioner Strandlie: -give them a personal invitation-

Commissioner Sargeant: They are more than welcome.

Commissioner Strandlie: -and hope that they – they are able to attend. And I also appreciate the effort on the crumb rubber. I’ve expressed strong concerns about both the health – the unknown health effects, the environmental effects, and the fact that parents have expressed to me – whose children play significant amounts of time on these fields – that they don’t really like them anyway. So I appreciate your effort in this regard and I support all the work. Thank you.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Commissioner Keys-Gamarra.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: Yes. Well first of all, I'd like to thank Commissioner Sargeant for putting together such a detailed motion. I did want to speak specifically with respect to the school capacity requirements and the concerns that we had, with respect to the differences between the numbers that were provided last year, as opposed to this year. And I think that the public expects us to have sufficient information and make decisions and I don't believe that that was provided, despite the fact that questions were submitted. So I look forward to having a discussion so that we can meaningfully participate in this process.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Okay. Anyone else? Mr. Migliaccio.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to say that I share the concerns of my fellow Commissioners that were stated just a few minutes ago. The Planning Commission asks, in our due diligence, simple questions of many agencies. All but one gave adequate answers. It is frustrating to hear Mr. Sargeant need to ask and recommend that the Fairfax County Public Schools and – now with Ms. Strandlie – the School Board meet with the Planning Commission's School Committee next year to get answers. An entity that receives more than 50 percent of the County budget and spends hundreds of millions in capital expenditures should be more responsive. It is not an us versus them. We should be collaborative in our effort on this and I wish that they would come to the table a little bit sooner so we can have all the information we need to make an educated vote and decision. Thank you.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Yes, Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Yes, thank you. I agree largely with the comments of my colleagues. My perspective is that on matters of policy concerning the schools, we ought, generally, to defer to the elected School Board representatives. At the same time, our function in making a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors on the Capital Improvement Program depends on our independent analysis of what's been given to us about money that's going to be spent over the next several years. And I think this year, compared to prior years, was one filled with question marks – and questions that, I think, were not clearly answered in a way that gives me confidence in where we're going with this. I hope that these comments are received by the people that need to receive them and that, in that spirit, we would get more comprehensive information for next year that I think would support the numbers that are requested, rather than necessarily expecting us to just take their word for it. Thank you.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Thank you. Anybody else? Okay. Is there any further discussion? Hearing and seeing none-

Commissioner Flanagan: Mr. Chairman?

Vice Chairman de la Fe: -the motion – yes?

Commissioner Flanagan: I didn't attend the public hearing or the Committee meetings so I'm going to be abstaining. But I would like to endorse some of the comments – particularly Commissioner Hurley because what she's talking about is good planning. In other words, we're

not interfering in the operation of the school system or the decisions that they make in their – in scholastic issues. But I think that the concerns that I heard expressed her are suitable for the Planning Commission to be concerned about.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Thank you. Any further discussion? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor of the – let's vote on all of them together – the motions – the various motions made by Commissioner Sargeant. Seconded by Commissioner Strandlie with the-

Commissioner Migliaccio: I seconded the motion.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: -with the friendly amendment that – and the one that recommends that the Fairfax County Public School staff and members of the School Board-

Commissioner Hart: Migliaccio seconded.

Commissioner Migliaccio: And I second.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: I said that seconded too. Okay you – so it's been accepted as a friendly amendment. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Opposed? The motion carries. Thank you very much.

(Each motion carried by a vote of 10-0-1. Commissioner Flanagan abstained from the vote. Commissioner Murphy was absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hart established the following order of the agenda:

1. PRC 86-C-023-02 – CHICK-FIL-A, INC. (Hunter Mill District)
2. PCA 89-D-007 – FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

This order was accepted without objection.

//

The first public hearing was in the Hunter Mill District; therefore, Vice Chairman de la Fe relinquished the Chair to Secretary Hart.

//

PRC 86-C-023-02 – CHICK-FIL-A, INC – Appl. to approve a PRC plan associated with RZ 86-C-023 to permit a fast food restaurant with drive-through. Located W. of Reston Pkwy. and N. of Lake Newport Rd., on approx. 33,505 sq. ft. of land zoned PRC. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential Planned Community. Tax Map 11-4 ((12)) 1B (part). HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Mary Ann Tsai, 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 PRC 86-C-023-02.

Brian Winterhalter, Applicant's Agent, Cooley LLP, stated that the subject application had received the support of the Reston Planning and Zoning Committee and the Reston Association Design and Review Board. He indicated that the proposed Chick-Fil-A restaurant would alleviate traffic at an existing restaurant located farther south near the Reston Town Center.

Secretary Hart said that a resident at a Hunter Mill Land Use Committee Meeting had expressed concern that vehicles would utilize U-turns while accessing the drive-through for the proposed Chick-Fil-A restaurant. Mr. Winterhalter explained that the entrance and exit points for the existing drive-through on the site would not be modified under the proposal. He described the existing route that vehicles utilized to access Reston Parkway after exiting the drive-through and noted that the proposal would not affect this route, adding that such a route had not incurred a significant impact on the surrounding properties. A discussion ensued between Commissioner de la Fe and Mr. Winterhalter regarding the routes vehicles utilized when exiting the drive-through wherein Commissioner de la Fe pointed out that vehicles were able to make both left turns and right turns when exiting the site.

Answering questions from Commissioner Ulfelder, John Martinez, Applicant's Agent, Mid-Atlantic Director for Chick-Fil-A, said the following:

- The maximum on-site staff for the proposed Chick-Fil-A restaurant would be between 12 and 15 employees;
- The proposed Chick-Fil-A restaurant would have a total employment of approximately 75 to 80 employees;
- The employees for the proposed Chick-Fil-A restaurant would utilize various methods of transportation, such as private vehicles and public transportation;
- The employees of the proposed Chick-Fil-A restaurant would not park in the spaces located near the restaurant and would utilize the parking spaces located within the existing commercial development to the north and west of the site; and

- The employees for the proposed Chick-Fil-A restaurant were authorized to utilize the parking spaces located within the existing commercial development to the north and west of the site.

Secretary Hart called for speakers from the audience, but received no response; therefore, he noted that no rebuttal statement was necessary. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Secretary Hart closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner de la Fe for action on this case.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Secretary Hart: Seeing none, we'll recognize – we'll close the public hearing. Recognize Commissioner de la Fe.

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. This is one drive-through building replacing another drive-through building for different kinds of food. Mr. Chairman, I request that the applicant confirm for the record agreement to the proposed PRC development conditions dated March 9th, 2016.

Brian J. Winterhalter, Applicant's Agent, Cooley LLP: We are in agreement with the development conditions.

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you very much.

Mr. Winterhalter: Thank you.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF PRC 86-C-023-02, SUBJECT TO THE PRC DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED MARCH 9, 2016.

Commissioner Lawrence: Second.

Secretary Hart: Motion has been seconded by Commissioner Lawrence. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion, as articulated by Commissioner de la Fe, please say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Secretary Hart: Those opposed? That motion carries.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF A MODIFICATION OF THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING AND BARRIER REQUIREMENTS TO THAT SHOWN ON THE PRC PLAN.

Commissioner Lawrence: Second.

Secretary Hart: Motion seconded by Commissioner Lawrence. Any discussion on that motion? Seeing none, we'll move to a vote. All those in favor of the motion, as articulated by Commissioner de la Fe, please say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Secretary Hart: Those opposed? That motion carries.

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you very much.

Secretary Hart: Thank you.

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

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

At the conclusion of the case, Vice Chairman de la Fe resumed the Chair.

//

PCA 89-D-007 – FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD –
Appl. to amend the proffers for RZ 89-D-007, previously approved for a public school, to permit an increase in GFA to permit site modifications and building additions with an overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.24. Located on the N. side of Bennett St. and E. side of Dranesville Rd., on approx. 40.67 ac. of land zoned R-3. Comp. Plan Rec: Public Facilities, Governmental, and Institutional. Tax Map 10-2 ((1)) 6A. DRANESVILLE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Susan K. Yantis, Applicant's Agent, Hunton & Williams, LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated February 11, 2016.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra disclosed that she had received contribution from members of the Fairfax County School Board who were listed in the affidavit; therefore, she recused herself from this case.

Bob Katai, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), 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 PCA 89-D-007.

When Commissioner Ulfelder asked whether the 0.24 floor-area ratio (FAR) articulated in the subject application for the proposed school expansion was consistent with the text in the

advertisement for this public hearing, Mr. Katai confirmed that this stated FAR was consistent with the advertisement.

Referring to Proffer Number 8, Future Modular Classrooms, which permitted the applicant to install modular classrooms on the subject property, subject to the approval of the Zoning Administrator and the fulfillment of the requirements prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance, Commissioner Hart expressed concern about permitting such a modification on the site without a public hearing or a 2232 application. He then asked whether the language of this proffer had been sufficiently reviewed by the County Attorney. Mr. Katai indicated that the County Attorney had not reviewed this language. Subsequently, Commissioner Hart reiterated his concern about delegating the authority to approve such modifications, citing another case where an applicant utilized a similar proffer. Barbara Berlin, Director, ZED, DPZ, stated that staff would coordinate with the County Attorney to ensure that the language in Proffer Number 8 was appropriate, adding that the proffer was intended to permit temporary trailers on the site. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Ms. Berlin regarding the designs of temporary trailers compared to modular classrooms and the ability of the Zoning Administrator to approve such modifications wherein Ms. Berlin indicated that the temporary trailers would not increase the enrollment at the school.

When Commissioner Migliaccio asked about the impact the modular classrooms referenced in Proffer Number 8 would have on the 0.24 FAR for the proposed school renovation, Mr. Katai stated that these classrooms would count towards the FAR for the site.

Commissioner Flanagan noted that the staff report did not include information on the parking provisions for the proposed school renovation, but noted that the designs for this renovation, as depicted in Exhibit 4 on page 6 of the staff report, depicted significant changes to these provisions. He then asked whether the proposed renovation to the school would significantly increase the amount of impervious surface on the site. Mr. Katai deferred to the applicant for additional information about the amount of impervious surface on the site that would be installed, but noted that the applicant would implement additional stormwater management provisions to mitigate the impact of additional impervious surfaces.

Ms. Yantis gave a presentation on the subject application where she explained the following:

- The subject application would permit a significant renovation for Herndon High School;
- The proposed renovation would remove 11 existing temporary trailers on the site and would accommodate additional enrollment capacity;
- The proposed renovation would incur an increase in impervious surface on the property;
- The amount of parking would increase from 557 spaces to 750 spaces;
- The access points for the site would remain unchanged;

- The existing bus parking lot on the site would be expanded to accommodate additional visitor parking and would utilize angular parking for the buses;
- The proposed renovations for the school included a two-story addition to accommodate a library and administrative office, a one-story addition to accommodate an art facility, a two-story addition for science and performing arts, and a one-story addition for the gymnasium;
- The interior of the existing school facility would be renovated under the proposal;
- The existing angular parking spaces located on the eastern portion of the site would be converted into traditional parking spaces;
- The kiss-and-ride would be moved to the rear of the site to improve internal circulation;
- The existing tennis courts would be relocated to accommodate the modifications to the school and the modifications to the parking provisions on the site;
- The existing athletic facilities would be retained, but certain structures, such as the press box; concession stand; and lighting fixtures, would be replaced;
- The proposed renovation of the school would add approximately 130,000 square feet to the facility;
- The previously-approved rezoning for the site, RZ 89-D-007, permitted expansions on the site, but these expansions were limited to approximately 80,000 square feet and the applicant had determined that additional square-footage was necessary;
- The modular classrooms referenced in Proffer Number 8 were intended to be temporary and such features had not been counted towards FAR in previous instances of their use;
- The applicant had determined that the modular classrooms referenced in Proffer Number 8 would not be needed after the completion of the proposed renovation, but this provision was necessary to ensure sufficient flexibility to accommodate increased enrollment; and
- The existing school facility was overcapacity and the proposed renovations to this facility would increase the capacity to 2,500 students, which would accommodate the projected enrollment up to the year 2021.

Ms. Yantis stated that the applicant had met with the Town of Herndon to address concerns regarding the proposal's traffic impact on the surrounding area, the need for an improved pedestrian signal at the intersection of Dranesville Road and Bennett Street, the provisions for bicycle lanes near the site, and the need for additional street lights along the north side of Bennett Street. She then addressed these concerns by explaining the following:

- The traffic impact of the proposed renovation would not be significant;

- The cost of installing an improved pedestrian signal at the intersection of Dranesville Road and Bennett Street was significant;
- The Town of Herndon had adopted the Fairfax County Bicycle Master Plan and while this plan did not include bicycle lanes along Bennett Street, the applicant did not object to install shared lane markings;
- The applicant intended to provide the necessary street lights for the north side of Bennett Street.

(A copy of the Town of Herndon's letter is in the date file.)

When Vice Chairman de la Fe asked whether the modular classrooms referenced in Proffer Number 8 were referencing temporary trailers, Ms. Yantis confirmed that this language referred to temporary trailers. Vice Chairman de la Fe then suggested that the term "modular classrooms" be modified to "temporary trailers." Ms. Yantis said that she did not object to this modification, reiterating that the intent of the proffer was to provide flexibility to accommodate additional students if necessary.

When Commissioner Hurley asked whether the proposed renovation to the school would permit additional natural daylight for the classrooms, Ms. Yantis confirmed that the renovation would incorporate such a feature. Commissioner Hurley then expressed support for this feature and commended the applicant for including it.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hurley and Ms. Yantis regarding the parking provisions for the proposed renovation to the school, the ability for this facility to accommodate the parking demands for major events, and the potential impact of overflow parking for such events on the surrounding community wherein Ms. Yantis confirmed that only senior students were permitted to park at the school and indicated that the residential streets located near the school utilized permit parking, adding that the parking policies for the surrounding community would be sufficiently enforced to minimize the impact on the neighborhood.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hurley and Ms. Yantis regarding the extent to which the cafeteria of the school would be modified under the proposed renovation, the current capacity of the cafeteria, and the impact of the increased enrollment on the usage of the cafeteria wherein Ms. Yantis indicated that the cafeteria would be subject to renovations, but the extent of these renovations had not been finalized.

Commissioner Hurley stated that she supported the renovation of the school on the site, noting that there was a need for such renovations for this facility. However, she also echoed concerns from Commissioner Hart regarding the impact of modular classrooms on the FAR of the facility.

Commissioner Sargeant asked for additional information on the applicant's outreach to the surrounding community regarding the subject application. Ms. Yantis said that the applicant had sent letters to the residents and homeowners associations of the surrounding community in February 2016. She then indicated that the applicant had met with the Royal Elm Estates

community, which was located across Bennett Street, to address their concerns. Ms. Yantis stated that the community had not expressed significant opposition to the proposal, noting that the applicant had addressed the concern raised by a resident regarding the presence of a storage shed.

Commissioner Hart expressed support for Vice Chairman de la Fe's suggested revision of Proffer Number 8 to clarify that the modular classrooms were referring to temporary trailers. He then asked whether the possibility of such features had been included in the advertisement for the subject application, noting that these features might generate a significant impact on the surrounding residential community. Ms. Yantis explained that the applicant did not intend to install the modular classrooms referenced in Proffer Number 8 as part of the proposed renovation, but reiterated that this provision was included to provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate future increases in enrollment, adding that this provision had been included in similar applications for school renovations. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Ms. Berlin regarding the impact of including the provisions in Proffer Number 8 on the Commission's decision for the subject application, the impact of these provisions on the advertisement for the application, and the extent to which citizens were sufficiently informed about the possibility of temporary trailers on the site wherein Ms. Berlin indicated that the installation of temporary trailers for a school were consistent with the minor modifications provisions articulated in Chapter 18 of the Zoning Ordinance and such structures could be installed without a public hearing.

Commissioner Hart asked whether the proposed 0.24 FAR for the proposed renovation of the school on the site would be sufficient and why this proposed FAR had been lowered from the previously-proposed 0.30 FAR. Ms. Yantis explained that the proposed FAR for the proposed renovation had been lowered from 0.30 FAR to 0.24 FAR to ensure that this renovation reflected the proffers and the Generalized Development Plan. She then explained that the design for the renovations had not been finalized, but noted that the 0.24 FAR would provide sufficient flexibility for these designs.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Katai regarding the amount of flexibility that the proposed 0.24 FAR for the proposed renovation would provide, the final square-footage of this renovation, and the extent the renovation was required to conform with the FAR articulated in the subject application wherein Mr. Katai indicated that the final design of the renovation was required to be close to the proposed 0.24 FAR, but this FAR could not be exceeded.

When Commissioner Ulfelder asked whether the proposed 0.24 FAR for the proposed school renovation would provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate temporary trailers, Ms. Tsai noted the applicant's ability to provide such structures into the proposed FAR would be limited. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Tsai, with input from Ms. Yantis, regarding the circumstances in which the applicant would be permitted to install temporary trailers and the impact of these circumstances on Proffer Number 8 wherein Ms. Tsai confirmed that if the applicant were to install temporary trailers, then these structures could not add square-footage to a level that would exceed the 0.24 FAR for the site and Ms. Yantis noted the applicant's commitment to maintaining this FAR.

Replying to questions from Commissioner Ulfelder, Ms. Yantis stated that the school on the site would continue operating during the renovation. In addition, she said that a portion of the existing parking provisions would not be usable during this renovation. She then indicated that the applicant would provide sufficient parking provisions for the school on the site, as prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance. She added that the amount of parking spaces reserved for students would be modified to ensure that these provisions were met during the renovation process.

Commissioner Strandlie expressed support for revising the language in Proffer Number 8 to clarify the use of temporary trailers on the site and suggested that additional analysis be conducted to determine the effect of these structures on the FAR of the facility during the deferral period.

In reply to question from Commissioner Flanagan, Ms. Yantis explained the following:

- The majority of the residential neighborhoods located near the subject property utilized restricted parking, which precluded students from parking in these neighborhoods;
- The students were required to utilize the school's parking provisions if they wanted to park on-site;
- The proposal would provide 750 parking spaces for approximately 2,500 students, which amounted to 3 students per parking space, and this was an increase over the existing 557 parking spaces at the facility;
- The proposal would provide angular parking for the buses that utilized the site;
- The existing parking spaces for the buses were located in the rear portion of the site and the proposal would move these spaces to the front of the site; and
- The capacity of the auditorium of the facility was approximately 500 and the proposed parking provisions for the site were sufficient to accommodate this capacity.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Flanagan and Ms. Yantis regarding the capacity of the gymnasium within the school facility wherein Ms. Yantis stated that the designs for the interior of the facility had not been finalized, but more information about this area could be provided to the Commission during the deferral period.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Lawrence and Ms. Yantis regarding the amount of flexibility the proposal provided by permitting the possible installation of temporary trailers, the impact of these trailers on the FAR of the facility, and the scope of the advertising for the subject application wherein Ms. Yantis indicated that the applicant did not intend to request additional FAR to accommodate temporary trailers and such features were not required to be included in the advertisement for the proposal.

Commissioner Hedetniemi echoed concerns from Commissioner Hurley regarding the capacity of the cafeteria, noting the difficulty of scheduling lunch periods for the students at the school.

She then suggested that the applicant provide additional information about the capacity of the cafeteria and how the lunch periods would be scheduled during the deferral period.

Vice Chairman de la Fe called for speakers from the audience, but received no response; therefore, he noted that no rebuttal statement was necessary. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Vice Chairman de la Fe closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Ulfelder for action on this case.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Public hearing is closed. Mr. Ulfelder.

Commissioner Ulfelder: I – Mr. Chairman, I think we have at least one issue we may want to spend a little more time on here. And therefore, I think we're – I – we need to defer the decision on this matter and provide time to get some answers to some of the questions that were answered – the questions that were asked this evening, as well as to dig deeper into the – Proffer Number 8 and its implications and connection with the advertised hearing that was here this evening. So I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR PCA 89-D-007 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF APRIL 13TH.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Opposed? Motion carries.

(The motion carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioner Keys-Gamarra recused herself from the vote. Commissioner Murphy was absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

The meeting was adjourned at 10:33 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 6, 2016

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "John W. Cooper", is written over a horizontal line.

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