

**MINUTES OF  
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2016**

**PRESENT:** Peter F. Murphy, Springfield District  
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  
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District  
Karen Keys-Gamarra, Sully District  
Janyce N. Hedetniemi, Commissioner At-Large

**ABSENT:** Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:19 p.m., by Chairman Peter F. Murphy, in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

**COMMISSION MATTERS**

Commissioner Sargeant announced that the Planning Commission's Schools Committee met earlier this evening for the first of several meetings to discuss policy language for urban/vertical school designs. He then said that the Schools Committee would meet again on Wednesday, May 4, 2016, at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center. He added that this meeting was open to the public.

//

**RZ 2014-DR-022 – BASHEER/EDGEMOORE-BROOKS, LLC**  
(The public hearing on this application was held on January 21, 2016.)

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Ulfelder stated that at the Planning Commission's meeting on Thursday, April 14, 2016, he moved to defer the decision only for RZ 2014-DR-022, Basheer/Edgemoore-Brooks, LLC, to a date certain of Thursday, May 12, 2016. However, he indicated that this meeting had been subsequently cancelled; 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 WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 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 Flanagan was absent from the meeting.

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

FS-P15-28 – VERIZON WIRELESS, 8200 Lee Highway

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Lawrence: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a “feature shown” to move this evening. Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH STAFF’S DETERMINATION THAT THE TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITY PROPOSED BY VERIZON WIRELESS, LOCATED AT 8200 LEE HIGHWAY, FAIRFAX, IS SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED A “FEATURE SHOWN,” PURSUANT TO VIRGINIA CODE SECTION 15.2-2232, AS AMENDED.

Commissioner de la Fe: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. de la Fe. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of the motion to concur with the “feature shown” determination in FS-P15-28, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Lawrence: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

PCA 84-L-020-25/CDPA 84-L-020-06/FDPA 84-L-020-02-14 – KINGSTOWNE M&N, LP AND KINGSTOWNE TOWNE CENTER, LP (Decisions Only) (The public hearing on these applications was held on April 13, 2016.)

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last week, we had a public hearing on a PCA case in the Kingstowne area of Lee District. Tonight, you – or this morning – you should have gotten a copy of the new set of proffers dated April 20<sup>th</sup> – or, sorry, April 19<sup>th</sup> – and a set of the modifications and waivers. And if you have any questions, now is the time. Otherwise, I’m ready to move on it this evening. Looks like no one has any questions so I will just dive right

into it. As I mentioned, last week we had a public hearing on the case for the last vacant five-acre parcel in Kingstowne. We're taking away four yet-to-be-built office buildings and replacing them with four residential buildings that will have up to 800 units and 64,000 square feet of retail space on the ground floor. The community is excited for this parcel to be built – to give us the last piece of the Towne Center to be actually built in the feel of a town center. The major amenity that the community was focused on – and I know County staff has been focused on – was the urban plaza. And that urban plaza has moveable tables, but most importantly, it has a seasonal ice skating rink and a – interactive water feature, which everyone seems to be very excited about and I'm hoping that this will get built in the very near future. The other item with the parks – there was discussion at the Lee District Land Use Committee about funding. I just want to point out that this applicant has agreed to the full part – full fair share contribution with parks, which will – if they build all 800 units will be \$1.25 million for off-site improvements. That's in addition to what they're going to do with the urban plaza on-site. Other discussions that we had at the Lee District Land Use Committee and at the Commission dealt with traffic. The applicant is doing what FCDOT has asked about the turn lanes by changing some of those in different intersections, which will hopefully help with the traffic. And the residential buildings will have a lot less traffic than the 1.2 million square feet of office would. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have a few motions to make this evening. This application does have the support of the Kingstowne – the Residential Owners Corporation – KROC – and the Lee District Land Use Committee and it has the support of our Fairfax County planning staff. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE FOLLOWING: APPROVAL OF PCA 84-L-020-25, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF proffers – of proffered conditions – PROFFERS, CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED APRIL 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2016.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Discussion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve PCA 84-L-020-25, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you. I move – I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE FOLLOWING: APPROVAL OF CDPA 84-L-020-06, subject – AND APPROVAL OF FDPA 84-L-020-02-14, SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE PCA – CONCURRENT PCA.

Chairman Murphy: I think you want to AMEND THAT MOTION TO RECOMMEND THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO APPROVE.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Oh, I'm sorry – APPROVE, yes.

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Commissioner Hart: And is there a development condition for either?

Chairman Murphy: Is there a development conditions?

Commissioner Migliaccio: No.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to approve FDPA 84-L-020-02-14, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve CDPA 84-L-020-06, subject to the Board's approval – to approve FDPA, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Migliaccio: And one last item, Mr. Chairman. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS, AS LISTED IN THE HANDOUT DATED APRIL 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, THAT WAS PROVIDED TO YOU TODAY AND WHICH SHALL BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD OF THIS CASE.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Discussion? All those in favor of that motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you very much.

//

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

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hart established the following order of the agenda:

1. AR 91-Y-001-03 – TOM V. RICHARDSON AND JOAN J. RICHARDSON
2. PCA 87-P-109 – DAVID PEETE, JR. & KAREN PEETE
3. FAIRFAX FORWARD PROCESS – FAIRFAX FORWARD 2016 PROCESS EVALUATION (Countywide)

This order was accepted without objection.

//

AR 91-Y-001-03 – TOM V. RICHARDSON AND JOAN J. RICHARDSON – &F District Appl. Renewal authorized by Chapter 115 (County Code), effective June 30, 1983 to permit renewal of a previously approved agricultural and forestal district. Located at 6001 Bull Run Post Office Rd., Centreville, 20120, on approx. 40.0 ac. of land zoned R-C, WS. The A&F District Advisory Committee recommended approval on February 23, 2016. Tax Map 42-4 ((1)) 15Z. SULLY DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra asked that Chairman Murphy ascertain whether there were any speakers for this application. There being none, she asked that presentations by staff and the applicant be waived, and the public hearing closed. No objections were expressed; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Keys-Gamarra action on this case.

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

//

Chairman Murphy: Without objection, the public hearing is closed. Recognize Ms. Keys-Gamarra.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: Thank you. As I stated, with respect to the Richardson Local Agricultural and Forestal District, I'd like to make a motion to recommend approval. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE AR 91-Y-001-03 AND AMEND APPENDIX – F, as in Frank, OF THE COUNTY CODE TO RENEW THE RICHARDSON LOCAL AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTAL DISTRICT FOR AN ADDITIONAL EIGHT-YEAR TERM, SUBJECT TO ORDINANCE PROVISIONS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE CONTAINED IN THE STAFF REPORT.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve AR 91-Y-001-03, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

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

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

PCA 87-P-109 – DAVID PEETE, JR. & KAREN PEETE – Appl.  
to amend the proffers for RZ 87-P-109 previously approved for residential development to permit modifications to proffers and site design. Located on the N. side of Oakton Station Ct., approx. 250 ft. from its intersection with Palmer St., on approx. 30,146 sq. ft. of land zoned R-2 and 12,746 sq. ft. of land zoned R-4. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential. Tax Maps 47-2 ((6)) 3(part) and 4(part); and 47-2 ((39)) 4A. PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Zachary G. Williams, Applicant's Agent, Bean, Kinney & Korman, PC, reaffirmed the affidavit dated January 19, 2016.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Commissioner Lawrence asked that Chairman Murphy ascertain whether there were any speakers for this application. There being none, he asked that presentations by staff and the applicant be waived, and the public hearing closed. No objections were expressed; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Lawrence action on this case.

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

//

Chairman Murphy: Without objection, the public hearing is closed. Recognize Mr. Lawrence.

Commissioner Lawrence: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a straightforward matter. The applicant has acquired some land and wishes to consolidate it so that he can build a sunroom. All the issues pending have been settled and staff is recommending approval. I concur with staff. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF PCA-87-P-109, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERED CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE dated – NOW

DATED APRIL 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, APPLICABLE TO AND pursuant – AND SUBSEQUENT TO THIS ACTION.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve PCA 87-P-109, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Lawrence: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: Is that? Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Lawrence: May I also thank members of staff? Casey, thank you very much for seeing this thing through.

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

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

Chairman Murphy announced that he would be handling the final public hearing; therefore, he relinquished the Chair to Vice Chairman de la Fe.

//

FAIRFAX FORWARD PROCESS – FAIRFAX FORWARD 2016  
PROCESS EVALUATION – *Code of Virginia*, Title 15.2, Chapter 22 – Fairfax County Adopted on July 9, 2013, Fairfax Forward is a three-year work program by which the Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan is reviewed. A retrospective evaluation of the efficiency, effectiveness, accessibility, and impact of the Fairfax Forward process, with recommendations for future process revisions. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

Commissioner Murphy requested that staff explain the scope of this item and the workshop that the Planning Commission would conduct on April 27, 2016. Aaron Klibaner, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), explained that the purpose of this item was to report the results of the evaluation of the Fairfax Forward process during its first two years of implementation and to prescribe recommendations for improving this process. He added that the Planning Commission's Land Use Process Review Committee had met on April 14, 2016, to discuss this item and the Board of Supervisors was scheduled to incorporate this evaluation into

an Action Item at its meeting on June 7, 2016. Mr. Klibaner then stated that the second part of Fairfax Forward included the 2016 Work Program Development and the workshop on April 27, 2016, would pertain to this item, adding that a Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors' public hearings for this item would be conducted on June 15, 2016, and July 26, 2016, respectively. In addition, Commissioner Murphy indicated that the Fairfax Forward 2016 Work Program Development Workshop would begin at 7:00 p.m. on April 27, 2016, and would provide an opportunity for the public to testify on this item with a three-minute time limit.

Commissioner Murphy announced his intent to defer the decision only for this item at the conclusion of the public hearing to a date certain of May 25, 2016.

Aaron Klibaner, PD, DPZ, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended the adoption of the recommendations articulated on page 13 of the staff report dated April 6, 2016, and those articulated in the handout dated April 20, 2016, which had been distributed to the Commission prior to the public hearing. (A copy of the handout is in the date file.)

Commissioner Strandlie commended staff for incorporating feedback from the Commission into the evaluation of Fairfax Forward. She then asked how staff disseminated the surveys to the appropriate stakeholders. Mr. Klibaner indicated that these surveys had been disseminated at community meetings and online at the County's official website for the Comprehensive Plan (<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan>). A discussion ensued between Commissioner Strandlie and Mr. Klibaner, with input from Meghan Van Dam, PD, DPZ, regarding the ability of stakeholders to find the surveys disseminated by staff and the specific meetings at which these surveys were disseminated wherein Ms. Van Dam explained that staff had requested that attendees at community meetings complete the surveys prior to the beginning of the meeting and that these surveys had also been distributed through an email mailing list.

Mr. Klibaner stated that staff had submitted a supplemental recommendation to develop additional guidance for the management of Plan Amendments that had been authorized by the Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Lawrence pointed out that Fairfax Forward utilized specific terminology associated with planning and noted that the public might not be familiar with such terminology. He then suggested that these terms be clearly defined to enhance coordination with the public.

Commissioner Hedetniemi said she concurred with Commissioner Lawrence's remarks regarding the terminology utilized in the planning process and expressed concern that such terminology was utilized too frequently. She also indicated she supported Commissioner Lawrence's suggestion to define these terms more clearly when coordinating with the public.

Commissioner Hurley echoed remarks from Commissioners Hedetniemi and Lawrence regarding concerns about the terminology utilized in the planning process, citing the differences in the definitions of a street compared to the definition of a road as they pertain to planning. In addition, she also expressed concern regarding the "Priority Two" terminology that staff and the Commission utilized to identify the phasing of a certain feature or development, stating that such



terminology might convey inaccurate information about the timeframe in which an issue would be addressed. Ms. Van Dam explained that this terminology was a tool that could be utilized by the community to submit a Plan Amendment and the amendments submitted with this tool would be reviewed at the Fairfax Forward 2016 Work Program Development Workshop on April 27, 2016, for possible inclusion in the 2016 Work Program. She added that this tool could still be utilized to submit subsequent Plan Amendments, but these submissions would not be considered until the 2018 Work Program. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hurley and Ms. Van Dam, with input from Marianne Gardner, PD, DPZ, regarding the methods utilized by staff to communicate to the public the timeframes involved for addressing these Plan Amendments, the manner in which this issue could be appropriately addressed, and the ability to include Plan Amendments in future Work Programs wherein Ms. Gardner said that staff's recommendations for Fairfax Forward included a yearly progress report for the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, adding that certain Plan Amendments would be subject to defined timeframes.

Commissioner Murphy suggested that nominators and members of a Work Group be given additional opportunities to provide input during the planning and review process.

When Commissioner Migliaccio asked about the schedule and frequency with which staff would report the state of the Comprehensive Plan to the Commission, Mr. Klibaner indicated that such a report would not be submitted on an annual basis and would be scheduled in a manner that would accommodate the review of time-sensitive studies. Ms. Van Dam added that staff had made a recommendation to schedule the state of the Comprehensive Plan report in conjunction with the Work Program Development that had been included with the original Fairfax Forward procedures. In addition, she said that this issue would be subject to further review.

Commissioner Migliaccio said that the Fairfax Forward process would be organized in two-year cycles in which citizens would be permitted to make submissions and staff would then determine whether these submissions would be included in the Work Program or subject to further study. He also stated that he had expressed concern during the original review of Fairfax Forward regarding the sufficiency of DPZ's staffing to review these submissions and asked whether staff was equipped to handle high volumes of submissions. Ms. Van Dam indicated that staffing issues would be considered during the review process in determining which submissions were added to the Work Program.

Commissioner Hart expressed concern regarding the public's unfamiliarity with the Fairfax Forward process. He then pointed out that the Fairfax Forward Work Program utilized a two-year timeframe and there were no restrictions on the ability of citizens to make submissions within these timeframes, noting that only a portion of these submissions would be subsequently included in the Work Program after a sufficient review was conducted. Ms. Van Dam concurred with this statement. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Ms. Van Dam regarding the manner in which the process for these submissions would be organized and the ability for citizens to track the status of submissions wherein Ms. Van Dam said that staff favored maintaining a flexible timeframe for permitting submissions from citizens and that the status of submission could be tracked through the Fairfax Forward website (<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/fairfaxforward>).

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Van Dam regarding the number of Task Forces that had been established since the adoption of Fairfax Forward in 2013 and the operation of these Task Forces wherein Commissioner Ulfelder noted the importance of these Task Forces and the various methods by which they operated, adding that he favored coordinating with the leadership of these Task Forces to improve their operation.

Commissioner Sargeant asked staff to provide the Commission with statistics regarding the staffing requirements for the Area Plan Review (APR) process compared to Fairfax Forward during the deferral period. He also pointed out that there was limited staffing available for certain planning processes and noted the importance of considering this issue when reviewing Fairfax Forward procedures.

Commissioner Sargeant aligned himself with remarks from Commissioners Hedetniemi, Hurley, and Lawrence regarding the importance of effectively communicating the Fairfax Forward procedures to the public in a manner that was concise and understandable. He then suggested additional coordination with the Fairfax County Office of Public Affairs to determine the extent of staff's outreach efforts for communicating with the public.

Vice Chairman de la Fe called the first listed speaker and recited the rules for public testimony.

Clyde Miller, 3436 Skyview Terrace, Falls Church, representing the Holmes Run Valley Citizens Association (HRVCA), expressed concern regarding the current procedures for Fairfax Forward, stating that the process was not sufficiently transparent and created opportunities for conflicts of interest between Supervisors and developers. He noted the importance of ensuring sufficient transparency in the planning process and indicated that the public was not provided with sufficient opportunities to participate in this process. Mr. Miller described scenarios where coordination between Supervisors and developers could create conflicts of interest. He then cited Bailey's Crossroads Elementary School as a project that had not been sufficiently transparent to the public, adding that a list of other developments in the Mason District requiring additional transparency had been included in his written statement. Mr. Miller said that he favored making opportunities for citizen participation in the Fairfax Forward procedures mandatory. Referring to the analysis conclusions articulated on page 6 of the staff report, he also stated that he did not support the conclusion that the area wide planning study conducted on Seven Corners was successful and recommended that Seven Corners be removed from this text. (A copy of Mr. Miller's statement is in the date file.)

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Murphy and Mr. Miller regarding the extent to which Mr. Miller represented the HRVCA, the extent to which his statement had been vetted by this organization prior to the public hearing, and the methods the HRVCA utilized in reviewing his statement wherein Mr. Miller indicated that the HRVCA concurred with the remarks articulated in his statement, but noted the challenges involved in reviewing this statement within an appropriate timeframe.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hedetniemi and Mr. Miller regarding the concern that the existing planning process and the Fairfax Forward process would create opportunities for

conflicts of interest between Supervisors and developers wherein Mr. Miller reiterated that he favored additional provisions to ensure such conflicts of interest did not occur.

Commissioner Strandlie addressed Mr. Miller's remarks regarding the procedures involved in the planning for Bailey's Crossroads Elementary School wherein she explained the following:

- The materials associated with this case had been posted online prior to the public hearings for the Plan Amendment and rezoning application;
- The process for approving this facility included multiple meetings with the Bailey's Crossroad Revitalization Corporation and the Mason District Land Use Committee;
- The Fairfax County School Board had been involved over the course of the planning process;
- The staff report for this facility had been published in a manner that provided sufficient time for review by the necessary stakeholders;
- The timeframes for the public hearings for both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors on this facility provided multiple opportunities for public input; and
- The review process for Land Use Committees were sufficiently thorough and provided multiple opportunities for community outreach.

Commissioner Strandlie said that she did not concur with Mr. Miller's statement regarding staff's conclusions on the area wide planning study conducted for Seven Corners, stating that this study had significant community support. She added that the review process for this study included a two-month timeframe for submitting comments and seeking assistance from staff.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Strandlie and Mr. Miller, with input from Vice Chairman de la Fe, regarding the procedures involved in the planning process for Bailey's Crossroads Elementary School, the extent that the staff reports had been finalized prior to the public hearing, and the community's overall support for this development wherein Vice Chairman de la Fe noted that the content of the staff report reflected review processes that included significant community input.

Commissioner Lawrence stated that he concurred with Mr. Miller's statement regarding the importance of community input during the planning process, but noted that he did not concur with Mr. Miller's characterization of staff, Supervisors, and Commissioners. He then suggested that Mr. Miller articulate his concerns regarding the planning process in a more comprehensive manner.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Sargeant and Mr. Miller regarding the procedures of the previous APR process, the manner in which this process was utilized by stakeholders, and the deficiencies of this process.

When Commissioner Sargeant asked for suggestions on how staff could increase citizen participation in the planning process, Mr. Miller recommended that this process include policies articulating appropriate standards, expectations, and enforcement mechanisms. He also suggested that the comments and input gathered by Land Use Committees be included during the review process by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Sargeant and Mr. Miller regarding the appropriate measures for gauging citizen participation during the planning process, the instances where citizen participation had been considered during the review of a proposal, and the methods the HRVCA utilized to encourage citizen participation wherein Commissioner Sargeant suggested that Mr. Miller provide documentation articulating his suggestions for increasing community participation.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Murphy and Mr. Miller regarding the availability of documentation detailing the activities of the HRVCA and the organizational structure of community associations like HRVCA.

Commissioner Hart addressed Mr. Miller's concern regarding the extent to which the input from Land Use Committees was considered by the Planning Commission during the review process, stating that applications brought before the Commission were subject to one or more meetings with these Land Use Committees. He then indicated that the Commission utilized the input provided by these Land Use Committees when rendering a decision for an application. Commissioner Hart also pointed out the opportunities for community input during the planning process, adding that staff and the Commission remained committed to making further improvements to Fairfax Forward. In addition, he aligned himself with remarks from Commissioners Hedetniemi, Lawrence, and Strandlie regarding Mr. Miller's characterization of the planning process and those involved in this process. He added that he favored Commissioner Sargeant's suggestion that Mr. Miller provide more constructive suggestions for improving the process. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Mr. Miller, with input from Commissioner Lawrence, regarding the extent to which the HRVCA community had reviewed his statement prior to the public hearing, the size of the HRVCA community, the level of resident participation within this community, and the extent to which review by a Land Use Committee was incorporated into the planning process wherein Mr. Miller said that the HRVCA had not conducted a meeting to review his statement and indicated he favored requiring a review by a Land Use Committee as part of the planning process prior to a decision being rendered by the Commission.

Commissioner Migliaccio echoed remarks from Commissioner Lawrence's previous comments regarding Mr. Miller's statement on the importance of community input during the planning process, stating that he favored policies that improved public participation in the planning process. However, he said that he did not concur with Mr. Miller's characterization of the manner in which staff, the Commissioners, and the Supervisors utilized this process. Mr. Miller reiterated that his statement had been reviewed by the HRVCA prior to the public hearing, but noted the outstanding challenges of the current planning procedures within Mason District and recommended that the Commission review these challenges.

Fred Costello, 12864 Tewksbury Drive, Herndon, expressed concern about the original Fairfax Forward procedures because these procedures did not provide sufficient opportunities for citizen participation. He then said that this concern had not been addressed in the staff report, adding that the procedures favored further development instead of preserving existing neighborhoods. Mr. Costello indicated that he favored implementing policies that encouraged additional meetings with the purpose of achieving a greater consensus between citizens and developers. (A copy of Mr. Costello's statement is in the date file.)

Referring to Mr. Costello's statement, Commissioner Hart pointed out that comments in this statement indicating that few meetings were held during the review process for an application was not accurate. He explained that items included in the Work Program were subject to significant review procedures and these procedures included opportunities for multiple meetings. Ms. Gardner concurred with Commissioner Hart's statement on the procedures. She added that while certain meetings were conducted to review the items in the Work Program, these items were subject to other meetings, citing the number of meetings conducted for the Fairfax Center study. Mr. Costello stated that he had attended some of these meetings, but expressed concern that such meetings were not sufficiently organized towards achieving a greater consensus between citizens and developers.

Commissioner Hurley echoed remarks from Ms. Gardner regarding the meeting procedures for reviewing items included in the Work Program and the number of meetings conducted for items such as Fairfax Center. She also aligned herself with remarks from other Commissioners regarding the importance of community input. In addition, Commissioner Hurley pointed out that certain Plan Amendments involved small parcels of land and were not subject to the same level of review compared to those involving larger parcels, but noted that such amendments were still subject to a review process that provided multiple opportunities for community input. Mr. Costello reiterated his concern regarding the amount of meetings conducted for reviewing certain items and the importance of organizing these meetings in a manner that achieved consensus between developers and citizens, adding that he favored improving the policies for informing the public about such meetings.

Vice Chairman de la Fe called for speakers from the audience.

Carol Turner, 3223 Sargent Drive, Falls Church, expressed concern that the public had not been sufficiently informed about Fairfax Forward procedures, noting that few meetings had been conducted to inform the necessary stakeholders of these procedures. In addition, she said that the process for submitting items for inclusion in the Work Program had not been sufficiently articulated to the public. Ms. Turner recommended that staff conduct additional outreach to stakeholders in each district to explain the process for Fairfax Forward to ensure that the public had sufficient opportunities to provide input.

When Commissioner Hedetniemi asked Ms. Turner whether she had attended the Planning Commission's Land Use Process Review Committee meeting on April 14, 2016, Ms. Turner indicated that she had attended this meeting. Commissioner Hedetniemi then pointed out that these meetings were open to the public and the topics of these meetings were made public, adding that Fairfax Forward was a potential topic of discussion.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Lawrence and Ms. Turner regarding the availability of information on Fairfax Forward on the County's official website and the effectiveness with which the material on this website explained Fairfax Forward procedures wherein Ms. Turner indicated that she had visited the website and reviewed the available information, but stated that the content of this site was not sufficient in explaining these procedures.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Lawrence and Ms. Turner regarding her involvement in the Mason District Land Use Committee wherein Ms. Turner stated that this committee had not discussed Fairfax Forward at any of its meetings to date.

Commissioner Migliaccio said that information on certain portions of the Fairfax Forward procedures had not been sufficiently conveyed to the community, noting that discussions regarding specific items, such as Fairfax Center, created difficulties in articulating these procedures. He also indicated that he favored conveying information about the components of Fairfax Forward in a manner that was easier for the public to understand.

Commissioner Strandlie stated that she supported efforts to improve the content of the portions of the Fairfax County website pertaining to Fairfax Forward, but noted the importance of communicating with stakeholders to improve citizen awareness of Fairfax Forward procedures.

Commissioner Sargeant echoed remarks from Commissioner Strandlie regarding the importance of communicating with the public on Fairfax Forward procedures, adding that he favored modifying existing policies for informing the public during the planning process to improve community awareness. He also noted the challenges associated with informing the public of the planning process. Commissioner Sargeant added that Catherine Ward, a representative of the Mount Vernon Council of Citizens Association, had submitted a statement prior to the public hearing that also encouraged implementing provisions that increased community awareness during the planning process, such as conducting charrettes and communicating more frequently with relevant stakeholders. In addition, he pointed out the effectiveness of existing policies for informing the public, but encouraged the submission of other recommendations to improve these policies. (A copy of Ms. Ward's statement is in the date file.)

Andrew Painter, 2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1300, Arlington, representing, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, PC, acknowledged the challenges associated with implementing the procedures of Fairfax Forward, but echoed remarks from Ms. Turner regarding the public's unfamiliarity with these procedures. He said that he concurred with staff's conclusions regarding the evaluation of Fairfax Forward, as articulated in the staff report. Mr. Painter suggested that Fairfax Forward's policies include provisions that ensure the public was sufficiently informed about the schedule of development for certain areas of the County. In addition, he recommended improvements to policies informing the public about the items that would be included in the Work Program and the timeframes for submitting Plan Amendments. Mr. Painter also stated that he favored retaining policies in Fairfax Forward that permitted the inclusion of site-specific recommendations, explaining that such policies were necessary to encourage development in certain area and maintain sufficient flexibility in developing these areas. He noted the benefits and deficiencies of the APR process and favored retaining certain processes for Fairfax Forward,

adding that the effectiveness of these processes would impact the economic development of the County.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Migliaccio and Mr. Painter, with input from Ms. Gardner, regarding the extent to which associates at Mr. Painter's organization were informed about the items in the Work Program and the organization's familiarity with Fairfax Forward procedures wherein Mr. Painter indicated that his firm was involved with multiple items in the Work Program and stated that his firm would submit additional recommendations for improving Fairfax Forward procedures.

Commissioner Hart explained that the Board of Supervisor retained the authority to authorize Out-of-Turn Plan Amendments under Fairfax Forward procedures, but noted the difficulty in processing these items in an appropriate and timely manner. He then said he favored improving this process. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Mr. Painter regarding the procedures for submitting items to the Work Program, the extent to which Mr. Painter's organization was familiar with these procedures, and the manner in which Fairfax Forward procedures improved on those utilized in the APR process wherein Mr. Painter echoed remarks from Commissioner Hart regarding the challenges associated with processing Out-of-Turn Plan Amendments.

Commissioner Lawrence pointed out that one of the goals of Fairfax Forward was to reduce the amount of site-specific developments in the County. He then added that the implementation of legislation from the Virginia General Assembly regarding proffers would affect the planning process. Mr. Painter concurred with Commissioner Lawrence's remarks regarding the effects of this legislation on planning procedures.

Daniel Aminoff, 6360 Hampton Court, Alexandria, said that he was the current chairman for the Mason District Land Use Committee and indicated that staff had attended a meeting of this committee to give a presentation on Fairfax Forward. He added that staff had attended subsequent meetings to provide updates on Fairfax Forward. Mr. Aminoff also stated that the Mason District Land Use Committee had reviewed multiple items within the Work Program at multiple meetings. In addition, he said that while the Mason District Land Use Committee made significant efforts to inform the community about these meetings, he favored implementing policies that improved this process and ensured that the public was sufficiently informed.

There being no more speakers, Vice Chairman de la Fe called for concluding remarks from Mr. Klibaner, who declined. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Vice Chairman de la Fe closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Murphy for action on this item.

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

//

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

Commissioner Murphy: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I got involved with the APR process four years before I got on the Planning Commission. Two years, I was a member of the Springfield District Task Force. And the next two years, I succeeded George Mason as the task force chairman. It was a long time ago and – I got really into the system as time progressed and then came along Fairfax Forward. I was not, as the staff knows, the biggest cheerleader on the street when that parade passed me by. But I realized that this was an opportunity for the County to move forward in a different direction. And to do that, we needed – like we did during the old APR process when went from hearing the entire County in one week and spending nights in the Massie Building until four o'clock in the morning – some of us got up at six to get to work the next day – to breaking it down to the north and south – and we improved the process as we went along. And one of the reasons were able to do that is because we did have citizen participation. And some of those – some of those citizens who participated were community leaders and others were just walk-ins on the street. But the most valuable participation we had are those citizens who came before us and testified in a professional way and addressed the issues that we wanted to hear them address – and not get sidetracked with other issues that don't affect the process whatsoever. And we learned from that and we were able to work with staff and other citizens that came along through the process to improve every process that's faced the County. Because without citizen participation, we're nothing – because we do – do this for the citizen. It's call the citizens' plan. The Comprehensive Plan is the citizens' plan. And that doesn't mean that all the citizens agree with every Plan Amendment we put forward because we're not dealing with mathematics. We're dealing with land use. And I learned a lot tonight about some good comments that came before us as to how to improve the process and this was what this meeting was all about. And hopefully, this is what the workshop is going to be when we get into another phase – as we evolve and the parade continues to go down the street because it's going to be here for a while. And we might as well make it good and the only way we can make it good is to have positive comments from the citizens that deal directly with the issues we want to face and address. And we always want more citizen participation. That's why we have Land Use Committees. That's why we vet our applications in the community, sometimes three and four times before they get here. We would rather hear it in the community than hear it here. When we hear it here, we would like to have those issues addressed, ameliorated, and ready for a decision by the Planning Commission to go to the Board of Supervisors with the best recommendation we can put forth. And that's why we're here. And I hope we can continue to do it that way. If we don't, we are down the tubes. So therefore, Mr. Chairman, I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER DECISION ONLY ON FAIRFAX FORWARD 2016 PROCESS EVALUATION REVIEW TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MAY 25<sup>TH</sup>, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR COMMENT.

Commissioners Hart and Lawrence: Second.

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

Commissioners: Aye.

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



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

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

At the conclusion of the case, Chairman Murphy resumed the Chair.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 10:08 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

