

**MINUTES OF  
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
THURSDAY, MAY 5, 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  
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District  
Julie Strandlie, Mason District  
Karen Keys-Gamarra, Sully District  
Janyce N. Hedetniemi, Commissioner At-Large

**ABSENT:** John C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District  
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District  
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:21 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 Migliaccio announced that the Planning Commission's Policy and Procedures Committee had met earlier this evening to discuss the 2016 Zoning Ordinance Program. He then stated that he intended to make a motion on this matter at a future Planning Commission meeting.

//

Commissioner Hart announced his intent to move for approval of the minutes for the Planning Commission meetings from September 2015 to December 2015 at the Commission's meeting on Wednesday, May 18, 2016. He added that changes to these minutes should be forwarded to John W. Cooper, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

//

Chairman Murphy stated that the Planning Commission had conducted a public hearing for the Fairfax Forward Process Evaluation on Wednesday, April 20, 2016, and noted that he deferred the decision on this item to a date certain of May 25, 2016. He then said that the Planning Commission conducted a workshop for submissions to Fairfax Forward on Wednesday, April 27, 2016, and the public hearing for this item was scheduled for Wednesday, June 15, 2016. Chairman Murphy explained that during this process, it was determined that this process required additional improvements. Therefore, he announced his intent to defer the decision only for

Fairfax Forward Process Evaluation to an indefinite date. In addition, Chairman Murphy said that he had requested that Commissioner Hedetniemi and Commissioner Strandlie evaluate the communication processes utilized by Fairfax Forward, noting that certain stakeholders had not been sufficiently informed. He added that further comments regarding Fairfax Forward should be forwarded to Jill Cooper, Director of the Planning Commission.

//

On behalf of Commissioner Flanagan, Commissioner Sargeant MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR SE 2015-MV-019, CHARLES COUNTY SAND & GRAVEL COMPANY, INC., TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MAY 26, 2016, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC COMMENT.

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Flanagan, Lawrence, and Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.

//

2232-M15-26 – VERIZON WIRELESS, 4116 Braddock Road (plus 10 additional nodes)

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Strandlie: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a “feature shown.” It’s a case in the Mason District – Verizon Wireless DAS installations. And this was – just a little background – this was – for the staff memo – originally logged as a 2232, but upon review, it was determined to comply with a “feature shown.” We did have many meetings with the – we met with the applicant, we met with – also the Land Use Committee because this was something new in our district and they were very enthusiastic about it. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to concur with the staff’s conclusion that the proposal by Donohue & Stearns and Verizon Wireless to construct 11 telecommunications nodes in the Lincolnia area of the Mason District satisfies the criteria of location, character, and extent, as specified in *Virginia Code* Section 15.2-2232, as amended. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION FIND SUBJECT APPLICATION 2232-M15-26 SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH PROVISIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Migliaccio. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to concur with the “feature shown” determination in 2232-M15-26, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Yes. Mr. Sargeant abstains.

(The motion carried by a vote of 8-0-1. Commissioner Sargeant abstained from the vote. Commissioners Flanagan, Lawrence, and Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.)

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

2232-M15-30 – VERIZON WIRELESS, 6332 Indian Run Parkway

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you, and I have the paperwork. Thank you, Commissioner Sargeant. So let's go back to this. I concur with the staff conclusion about the – that the proposal by Donohue & Stearns and Verizon Wireless to construct – this is one telecommunication node in the Lincolnia area of the Mason District – satisfies the criteria of location, character, and extent, as specified in *Virginia Code* Section 15.2-2232, as amended. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION FIND SUBJECT APPLICATION 2232-M15-30 SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH PROVISIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to concur with the “feature shown” determination in 2232-M15-30, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman? Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Yes. Mr. Sargeant abstains.

(The motion carried by a vote of 8-0-1. Commissioner Sargeant abstained from the vote. Commissioners Flanagan, Lawrence, and Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.)

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Chairman Murphy established the following order of the agenda:

## 1. RZ/FDP 2015-HM-012/DPA-HM-117 – SEKAS HOMES, LTD

This order was accepted without objection.

//

RZ/FDP 2015-HM-012 – SEKAS HOMES, LTD – Appls. to rezone from I-5, PRC, and R-E to PDH-12 to permit residential development with an overall density of 9.56 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) and approval of the final development plan. Located in the NE quadrant of the intersection of Sunrise Valley Dr. and Roland Clarke Pl., on approx. 4.60 ac. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Office or Residential 30 du/ac. Tax Map 17-4 ((14)) 1B1 and 2. (Concurrent with DPA – HM-117). HUNTER MILL DISTRICT.

DPA-HM-117 – SEKAS HOMES, LTD – Appl. to permit an amendment of the Development Plan for RZ B-846 to permit deletion of land area. Located on the E. side of Roland Clarke Pl., 400 ft. N. of its intersection with Sunrise Valley Dr., on approx. 22,834 sq. ft. of land zoned PRC. Comp. Plan Rec: RPC. Tax Map 17-4 ((14)) 1B1. (Concurrent with RZ/FDP 2015-HM-012.) HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. JOINT PUBLIC HEARING.

Lori Greenlief, Applicant's Agent, McGuireWoods, LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated April 4, 2016.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Laura Arseneau, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that staff recommended approval of applications RZ/FDP 2015-HM-012 and DPA-HM-117.

Referring to the memorandums submitted by the Fairfax County Architectural Review Board (ARB) and the Fairfax County History Commission (FCHB), as shown in Appendix 5 of the staff report, Commissioner Hart pointed out that these organizations had expressed concern about the demolition of the existing building on the subject property because it might meet the criteria for being listed in the Fairfax County Inventory of Historic Sites and the National Register of Historic Places. In addition, he noted the importance of encouraging quality architecture within the Reston area. Commissioner Hart then asked whether the concerns of the ARB and FCHB had been addressed. Fred Selden, Director, DPZ, explained that during the planning process for Reston, the existing building on the subject property had not been determined to be one of historic or architectural significance. He also stated that this process had been reviewed by multiple stakeholders and pointed out that the Reston Plan did not identify the existing building as meeting the criteria to warrant preservation, noting that the Plan recommended redeveloping the site at a higher intensity. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Mr. Selden, with input from William O'Donnell, ZED, DPZ regarding the possibility for subsequent evaluations of the existing building on the site to evaluate its historical significance and the

extent of the concerns expressed by the ARB and FCHB wherein Mr. Selden and Mr. O'Donnell explained the following:

- The applicant and staff had assessed the existing building on the site for its historical significance and its potential for being renovated;
- The building was not listed as a historically significant site, nor was it recognized in the Comprehensive Plan as such;
- The State of Virginia prescribed guidelines for preserving historically significant buildings; and
- The applicant had evaluated the interior of the existing building on the site with the ARB prior to the public hearing.

Commissioner Hart expressed support for the modification to Proffer Number 6, Disclosure, in the revised set dated May 5, 2015, which included the dimensions of the garages as part of the information package that would be provided to prospective purchasers of the dwelling units. However, he also expressed concern about the size of these garages, citing another development in the Merrifield area where the garages for the units were not large enough to accommodate two vehicles and trash cans. Commissioner Hart noted the importance of ensuring that the garages could sufficiently accommodate two vehicles and informing prospective purchasers of the dimensions of the garages, stating that the use of these garages affected the parking provisions for the proposed development. He added that certain vehicles would not be capable of utilizing these garages. (A copy of the revised set is in the date file.)

Commissioner Hart expressed concern about the size of the alleys in the proposed development being sufficient to permit the turning of vehicles into the garages, citing another development in the County where such alleys had been too constrained. When he asked whether staff had evaluated this issue, Ms. Arseneau said that staff had reviewed the applicant's design for the alleys and concluded that these alleys could accommodate the turning of vehicles efficiently. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Ms. Arseneau regarding the manner in which vehicles would enter the garages in the proposed development from the alleys wherein Commissioner Hart noted that the size of the alleys and the garages affected the quality of life for prospective residents, adding that he favored modifying the language of the proffers to ensure that these residents were sufficiently informed about the dimensions of these features and the ability for these features to accommodate vehicles.

Commissioner Strandlie pointed out that issues pertaining to the size of garages had arisen with other proposals in the Mason District and indicated that one such proposal had included provisions requiring that the dimensions of garages be articulated in the sale and resale material for the dwelling units. She then recommended that similar provisions be utilized for the subject applications.

Answering questions from Commissioner Sargeant, Ms. Arseneau stated the following:

- The revised set of proffers had been distributed to the Commission prior to the public hearing;
- The existing pipeline easement that traversed the subject property contained four pipelines;
- The diameter of these pipelines ranged between 42 and 48 inches; and
- The existing pipelines within the easement were utilized as transmission pipelines.

Referring to page 19 of the staff report, Commissioner Sargeant pointed out that the applicant acknowledged the limitations for building on the pipeline easement. In addition, he noted that the applicant had also indicated that the owners of the existing pipelines within the easement required that these pipes be re-insulated. Commissioner Sargeant then noted the difficulties associated with re-insulating pipelines and suggested that this process be completed prior to the construction of the proposed development.

Referring to Proffer Number 28, Stormwater Management, Commissioner Hurley pointed out that the applicant was reserving the right to install an underground stormwater management facility underneath a tot lot. She then expressed concern about the impact that such a facility would have on the tot lot and asked whether such a feature was permitted. Clinton Abernathy, Site Development and Inspections Division, Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES), said that there had been previous instances in the County where parking lots and recreation facilities had been constructed atop a stormwater management facility. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hurley and Mr. Abernathy regarding the potential impact of the tot lot on the proposed stormwater management facility for the site, the design of the facility, and the ability of the facility accommodate such an impact wherein Mr. Abernathy noted that the design of the stormwater management facility on the site would be reviewed at the time of site plan review to ensure it could accommodate the impact of a tot lot and added that the impact of a tot lot was less significant than other features, such as a parking lot.

Commissioner de la Fe said that he concurred with Mr. Selden's comments regarding the efforts to determine the possible historical significance of the existing building on the site, adding that there had been surveys conducted of multiple properties in Reston to determine structures of historic significance. He then echoed Mr. Selden's remarks regarding the historical status of the existing building on the site, stating that it was determined that this building did not meet the necessary criteria to be identified as historically significant. In addition, Commissioner de la Fe asked that the applicant provide additional information on the surveys of the building that had been requested to determine whether this building could be repurposed for residential use, as had been requested by the ARB and FCHC.

Ms. Greenlief gave a presentation regarding the subject applications wherein she explained the following:

- The proposed development was consistent with the provisions for Transit Oriented Development (TOD), as articulated in the Reston Plan;
- The proposed development was located approximately a half-mile from the Wiehle Avenue Metrorail Station;
- The inclusion of single-family attached units and a multi-family residential building would provide an appropriate transition between the high-intensity mixed-use multi-family developments to the west and the lower-density commercial development to the east;
- The proposal included provisions that would preserve and maintain the existing environmental features on the property, such as the pond, the wooded areas, and the Environmental Quality Corridors;
- The provisions for preserving of environmental features on the site were consistent with the objectives for such features outlined in the Comprehensive Plan;
- The proposed development's environmental provisions included tree-canopy and tree-preservation measures that were greater than the amounts prescribed by the County;
- The proposed development reserved 37 percent of the site as open space, which exceeded the minimum requirement prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance;
- The design of the proposed development addressed the constraints of the site incurred by the presence of multiple environmental features, the pipeline easement, and the existing utility features located along Sunrise Valley Drive;
- The proposed development included provisions for pedestrian paths and bicycle paths, which were consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's recommendations regarding connectivity;
- The applicant had coordinated with the Initiative for Public Art (IPAR) to included provisions for the installation of public art, which was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's recommendations for the inclusion of such features in TODs;
- The applicant had distributed a letter from IPAR to the Commission prior to the public hearing that documented the efforts made to install public art with the proposed development;
- The subject applications had the support of the Reston Association and a letter of support had been distributed to the Commission prior to the public hearing;

- The applicant had included the size of the garages of the dwelling units in the language for Proffer Number 6 to ensure that this information would be included in the sales material for prospective purchasers, but additional modifications to this language could be made to address the concerns raised by Commissioner Hart;
- The garages for the dwelling units of the proposed development would be approximately 19 feet by 19 feet, which was greater than the space provided by a standard parking space, and these dimensions were sufficient to accommodate two vehicles;
- The proposed development's parking provisions included 32 surface parking spaces and these provisions were greater than the requirements prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance;
- The size and space of the alleys for the proposed development were sufficient to ensure effective internal circulation within the site;
- The applicant had coordinated with DPWES in utilizing the existing pond on the site for stormwater management;
- The provisions of Proffer Number 28 included an option for the applicant to provide an underground stormwater management facility and the applicant favored retaining this option; and
- The applicant had committed to reinsulating the existing pipelines that traversed the pipeline easement on the site and this process was not as intensive as replacing the pipelines; and
- The applicant did not object to scheduling the construction process in a manner to ensure that the reinsulating of the existing pipelines on the site occurred prior to the construction of the proposed development.

(Copies of the letters from IPAR and the Reston Association are in the date file.)

Continuing her presentation, Ms. Greenlief addressed Commissioner Hart's concern regarding the possible historical significance of the existing building on the site, pointing out that the subject property was not located within an Historic District. She added that the existing building was not included in the County's registry of historic sites. Ms. Greenlief stated that the applicant had coordinated with staff in evaluating the history of the existing building on the site, stating that a review of this evaluation was included in Appendix 10 of the Staff Report. In addition, she said that the applicant would coordinate with IPAR on the installation of public art for the proposed development. In conclusion, Ms. Greenlief indicated that the subject applications were consistent with the Residential Development Criteria and the recommendations articulated in the Comprehensive Plan.

When Commissioner de la Fe asked whether the applicant had considered repurposing the existing building for residential use, Ms. Greenlief explained that the applicant had concluded that repurposing this building for such use was not feasible.

Commissioner Hedetniemi said that a letter from a citizen had been submitted to the Commission prior to the public hearing that expressed concern about the impact of construction activity on neighboring properties and the safety of the existing utility pipelines on the site. She then asked for additional information on how the re-insulation process would improve the safety of these pipelines. Ms. Greenlief stated that the re-insulation process would improve the durability and longevity of these pipelines and indicated that this process would be completed prior to the construction of the proposed development. John Sekas, Applicant/Contract Purchaser, Sekas Homes, Ltd., explained that the applicant had coordinated with the owner of the existing pipelines on the re-insulation process, stating that additional fill would be installed atop these pipelines to improve the overall safety of this feature. He also echoed Ms. Greenlief's remarks regarding the re-insulation process, stating that this process would improve the durability, stability, and safety of these pipelines. He also confirmed Ms. Greenlief's comments regarding the timeframe for the re-insulation process, stating that this process would be completed prior to the construction of the proposed development. He added that an on-site representative would be present to monitor activity on the existing utility easement and the applicant would incur the cost of this service.

When Commissioner Sargeant asked whether the modifications to the existing pipelines would be certified by the appropriate staff, Mr. Sekas confirmed that these modifications would be properly certified. Commissioner Sargeant then expressed support for the applicant's intent to complete the modifications to the pipelines prior to the construction of the proposed development.

Responding to the concerns articulated earlier by Commissioner Hurley regarding the applicant's stormwater management provisions, as articulated in Proffer Number 28, Mr. Sekas explained that the applicant intended to supplement the existing pond on the site, but noted that additional provisions were included to address stormwater management issues generated by other sites. He added that the applicant reserved the right to install an infiltration trench, which was not depicted on the Generalized Development Plan, to supplement the existing stormwater management provisions on the site if necessary.

Referring to page 18 of the Staff Report, Commissioner Hurley pointed out that the proposed development would provide access to bicycle paths. She then asked where residents would store bicycles, noting the constraints of the garages for the dwelling units. Mr. Sekas indicated that the applicant would consider modifying the dimensions of these garages to ensure there was sufficient space to store bicycles, adding that the existing design for these garages could sufficiently accommodate trash cans. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hurley and Mr. Sekas regarding the methods for storing bicycles within the garage wherein Mr. Sekas indicated that the applicant had been informed about previous developments where the size of the garages had not been sufficient.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Sargeant and Mr. Sekas regarding the applicant's coordination with the owners of the existing pipelines that traversed the site and the installation

of surface parking on portions of the pipeline easement wherein Mr. Sekas indicated that the owners of the pipelines did not object to the applicant's plans for this easement, adding that documentation of the owners' endorsement would be obtained prior to site plan approval.

In reply to questions from Commissioner Hart, Mr. Sekas stated that the applicant did not intend for residents of the dwelling units for the proposed development to provide outdoor maintenance, such as landscaping. He added that a hired maintenance staff would be responsible for such activities. In addition, he concurred with Ms. Greenlief's statement regarding the feasibility of repurposing the existing building on the site, stating that such a repurposing was not feasible and the previous owner of the subject property had been unable to secure a lease for this building. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Mr. Sekas regarding the applicant's coordination with staff on determining the feasibility of repurposing the existing building on the site, the existing condition of this building, and the outstanding concerns regarding the possible historical significance of the building wherein Mr. Sekas noted the deficiencies for the interior of this building that precluded repurposing efforts, but indicated that the applicant would coordinate the Reston Museum to ensure that appropriate measures would be implemented to preserve historically significant artifacts.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker and recited the rules for public testimony.

Katrina Freedman, 1939 Rolland Clarke Place, Suite 400, Reston, said she was speaking on behalf of Raymond James, who owned a portion of a building located on a neighboring property. She stated that she objected to the subject applications because of the impact the proposed development would incur on the character, parking, and traffic patterns on the surrounding area. Ms. Freedman expressed concern that overflow parking from the proposed development would negatively impact the parking provisions and traffic patterns for the existing office development located near the site, stating that the development would incur additional traffic congestion at the intersection of Sunrise Valley Drive and Rolland Clarke Place. She noted that the area surrounding the site had been subject to significant traffic congestion and the proposed development would compound this condition. Ms. Freedman also expressed concern about the impact that construction activity would have on the surrounding properties and existing utility pipelines on the site, noting the potential safety issues associated with the pipelines. In addition, she said that such activity could incur disruptions to major utilities, which would negatively impact the operation of nearby office development. Ms. Freedman pointed out the existing character of the area around the subject property and noted the existing view from the nearby office development. She then stated that the proposed development would negatively impact this character. In addition, Ms. Freedman said that the proposed development would create security concerns for the existing office development near the site, which would negatively impact the operation of the businesses within these developments. (A copy of Ms. Freedman's statement is in the date file.)

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for a rebuttal statement from Ms. Greenlief, who declined. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner de la Fe for action on these cases.

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

//

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

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. As I said, I'm going to defer the decision. There have been a number of questions asked. We have received new proffers today and I think some of those need to be redone. And I would ask both the applicant and staff that, if possible – if we could have whatever it is that you come up with in response to what you have heard tonight and any changes that you want to make – if we could have them the week before the decision. I'm giving you enough time, I think, to come up with. That's so we can have them in writing ahead of time so that we don't have to be looking at things the night of the decision. With that, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING COMMENT, FOR RZ/FDP 2015-HM-012 AND DPA-HM-117 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MAY 26, 2016.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision only on these applications to a date certain of May 26, with the record remaining open for comment, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

(The motion carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Flanagan, Lawrence, and Ulfelder was absent from the meeting.)

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*


//

The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 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



---

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