

**MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, JULY 28, 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
Julie Strandlie, Mason District
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District
Janyce N. Hedetniemi, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: James T. Migliaccio, Lee District
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District
Karen Keys-Gamarra, Sully District

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:18 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

SE 2014-MA-012 – AAA MID-ATLANTIC, INC.
(Administrative Item)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have an administrative matter in the – in the Mason District related to a project that Triple A Mid-Atlantic building where some development conditions need to be addressed. Mr. Gorney is going to give us a very brief overview and then I am going to make a motion accordingly. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you, Mr. Gorney.

Mr. Joseph Gorney, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In October of 2014, the Triple A Mid-Atlantic project, a special exception was approved by the Board of Supervisors. One of the development conditions had a provision such that if the building did need to be demolished it would come back to the Planning Commission for review and affirmation that it does indeed meet the policies and objectives of the Seven Corners Community Business Center. They did find, due to structural and foundation problems, they had to demolish almost all of the building with the exception of a portion of one wall, such

that they are back before you tonight. We have worked with them to make some changes to the exterior of the building, the elevations which were in a package that was distributed to you. There are no changes whatsoever to the outline of the building or the various site elements that were conditioned with the approval of this back in 2014. Some of the things that have been added were outdoor lighting, some transparent glazing and various awnings. We feel that this enhances the project and that it does indeed meet the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.

Chairman Murphy: Okay.

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you. There are no questions. I'll go ahead and make a motion.

Chairman Murphy: Without objection.

Commissioner Strandlie: As provided for in Condition 2 of SE 2014-MA-012 approved by the Board of Supervisors on October 28, 2014, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION FIND THAT THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE ELEVATIONS PREPARED BY AI DESIGN GROUP DATED JULY 11, 2016, ENTITLED AAA CAR CARE CENTER CONSISTING OF TWO SHEETS FOR THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE ON PARCELS 51-3 ((1)) 35A POINT (sic) AND 35B POINT (sic) ARE IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE REVITALIZATION OBJECTIVES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE SEVEN CORNERS COMMUNITY BUSINESS CENTER SUCH THAT THE APPROPRIATE SITE PLAN APPROVAL MAY BE SOUGHT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC SERVICES (SIC), INCLUDING THE DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING BUILDING AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROPOSED BUILDING.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion, as articulated by Ms. Strandlie, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed. Motion carries.

(The motion carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Kays-Gamarra, Lawrence, and Migliaccio were absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

2232-M16-22 – PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS BRANCH, BBCD, DPWES
(Decision Only) (Public Hearing Held on July 20, 2016)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are here tonight for a decision. Tonight the Planning Commission will consider the decision on application 2232-M16-22, as submitted by the Public Private Partnership Branch of the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services to temporarily relocate a public facility, the Bailey's Crossroads Homeless Shelter, to County-owned property co-located adjacent to the Lincolnia Senior Center. Before we go on verbatim, I would like to ask County staff to provide an update on the permanent location, a construction and occupancy timeline for both the permanent and temporary locations and answer some questions or respond to information submitted to the record since the public hearing. I have some questions and, perhaps, some other Commissioners have some questions as well.

Chairman Murphy: Okay.

Commissioner Strandlie: I – I will then make a statement and make a motion for the Planning Commission's consideration. So, my first question relates – if you could give us an update on the purchase of the property proposed for the permanent shelter, including the due diligence application and the Comp Plan change authorization.

Robert Stalzer, Deputy County Executive, Office of County Executive: Rob Stalzer, Deputy County Executive. The Board of Supervisors has entered into a contract to purchase the permanent site at 5914 Seminary Road. We have completed the due diligence on that property and determined that we're ready to move forward with acquisition. The price that was negotiated for the property was 1.4 million. We will close when the owner of the property is actually back in the country which will be in approximately ten days to two weeks. So, the due diligence is done, we are ready to move forward. Supervisor Gross enacted a Board matter this past Tuesday authorizing us to move forward with the preparation of Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the parcel as well as moving forward with the special exception and the 2232 required for the location of the – the full shelter program that we envision on the site. That would include up to fifty-four beds, four of which would be specialty beds, fifty would be for singles. We are also going to include up to fifteen units of permanent supportive housing on that particular site. I am happy to answer any questions.

Commissioner Strandlie: That site is – is relatively smaller than some of the other sites. Can you explain how the building will be constructed? Some people have wondered how you're going to get a larger space out of that site.

Mr. Stalzer: Well we're going to – it's a 20,000 square foot site. If the Comprehensive Plan is amended and the special exception is granted, we're allowed to go up to a 0.7 FAR. We've done a test fit to determine that by going down into a cellar area and how many stories? Two on top of the cellar. So, basically, three floors. So we'll be able to accommodate what we need plus parking. I do not have a drawing that I can show you right now. We didn't distribute that to the

Commission but as we move forward, we'll be happy to do that. Three above grade, I apologize. One cellar, three above grade.

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you. Can you outline the expedited schedule for designing and constructing the permanent shelter?

Mr. Stalzer: Katayoon Shaya can speak to that in greater detail, but the bottom line is pursuant to yourself and the request of Supervisor Gross, we did go back and looked at the schedule and we have compressed it as much as we can. Our anticipated end date is fall of 2019. That will be to design and construct and then ultimately open and begin operating the shelter facility.

Commissioner Strandlie: Okay. If this application is – is approved tonight, when would the temporary shelter be anticipated to be online and how long would occupants be residing in that temporary shelter?

Mr. Stalzer: If approved, we would anticipate needing the temporary facility in the fall of 2017. The – we anticipate closing with the Avalon Bay and Landmark Atlantic. Atlas focused on Avalon Bay in late 2017, moving forward with construction assuming that the site plan and all the necessarily – necessary regulatory approvals are obtained in early 2018.

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you. One of the questions that we got was how can the modular building which is 800 square feet smaller than the current shelter location, how will that be an improvement to the current shelter which has been over thirty years old and is not ADA compliant and is in disrepair? How could this – how is the smaller site going to be an improvement?

Mr. Stalzer: Well the intent is not – obviously, we don't want to create something that's worse. It's newer. The facilities will be more modern but the intent, like a lot of the work that we do in the County, we've had temporary facilities that are smaller for fire stations, government centers, libraries, police stations. The purpose of a temporary facility is to give us an adequate amount of space in which to operate and to do our programmatic work while we're building the full – the permanent – at the permanent location for the full programmatic use. So, while we don't it to be worse, we're not saying in a temporary context it's going to be exactly equal to ultimately what will exist permanently. But a new – these will be new modular units that we will lease. We will return them when the lease is over, restore the – the site to its current state as we've said. The intent is to – to provide adequate space to be able to do programmatically what we do today with our singles population. The permanent facility will be much more than that and much bigger.

Commissioner Strandlie: I understand there won't be quite the fifty, it's down to forty-six residents?

Mr. Stalzer: Correct.

Commissioner Strandlie: And, also, I think, from what I understand, the configuration of the office space will be more conducive to a smaller space.

Mr. Stalzer: Correct.

Commissioner Strandlie: And ADA compliant?

Mr. Stalzer: Yes, it has to be.

Commissioner Strandlie: Okay. Exactly. Thank you. Can you discuss the security upgrades that have been made to the Lincolnia Senior Center property as a result of the renovation that was just complete?

Mr. Stalzer: I'm going to ask Katayoon to, we may have.

Katayoon Shaya, Chief, Public Private Partnerships Branch, Building Design and Construction Division, Department of Public Works and Environmental Services: Katayoon Shaya with Public Works. The senior center facility their different components. The senior center building it's run by Housing and Community Development and, as you are aware, recent renovation was just completed. So, the facility is programed or was programed to receive access control system and also additional cameras and equipment that head end equipment that go with camera monitoring and, you know, recording and – and as such. The adult day healthcare center is run by the Health Department and they were programed to actually have an access control system as well with - with a remote unlocking ability and the purpose of that is for the safety of clients with dementia that they have actually found wandering the – the site. The shelter, obviously, will have the security features that are – we've spoken about before pretty standard to what we provide in other facilities in the County and those include cameras and access control system and - and extra lighting. Fairly typical of – of other County facilities.

Commissioner Strandlie: This is a question for Dean Klein. Can – can you please discuss how the Advisory Committee will work which, I understand, will provide input on program operations and shelter design? And how will the Advisory Committee members be appointed and how can citizens volunteer to serve on that Committee?

Dean Klein, Director, Office to Prevent and End Homelessness: Sure. Good evening. Dean Klien, Director of the Office to Prevent and End Homelessness. Sorry, I'm behind the screen here. We anticipate the purpose of this Advisory Committee to be collectively these individuals will be working towards ensuring that those who are being served there would in the most effective way preventing and ending their homelessness or ending their homelessness more quickly or moving them in to permanent housing. In addition, the group would help to address and remediate any issues that would arise as it relates to the population being served on this particular site. The – the advisory group also would be available as we move towards the permanent site and could be a group a group that we could apply and would be educated and –

and understanding of the issues and would help us as we move towards the permanent site. There is a current Advisory Council for the Bailey's Shelter that is in existence and we anticipate that there could be some of those members that would be part of this, not necessarily for sure, but certainly might be available and interested in participating on this Advisory Committee. That group we intend to continue to operate even after the shelter moves to a temporary location. That group is really intended to support the overall efforts of ending homelessness through the shelter in Mason District and so that would just be a group that helps to bring in new partners and new resources as we move forward. We plan to have this advisory group formed and begin in the fall of this year. The composition of the group could include the following types of groups but that has not been finalized and we would want to ensure that Supervisor Gross and others have an opportunity to sort of understand what the final composition would look like. But we would anticipate that we would have homeowner presidents from contiguous homeowner associations, representatives from the Police, Supervisor Gross and a staff member of hers, a shopping center representative, Lincolnia staff representatives, representative from Neighborhood and Community Services, Northern Virginia Family Service, our non-profit provider. We anticipate that the shelter director and supervisor there would also be on that group. We'd have representation from the Office to Prevent and End Homelessness. We would have Community Services Board, homeless outreach staff who work directly with individuals and this population. We would also have representatives from the Consumer Advisory Council, a representative who has been formerly homeless to contribute to some of the plans as it relates to this group. We'd have faith representatives from different faith community groups and a representative from the Fairfax County Housing and Community Development. Again, that is, you know, not a confirmed group but a group that we would begin working and to implement this fall.

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you. Anyone else has any questions?

Chairman Murphy: Any questions? Mr. Sargeant.

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A little bit more on – on the issue of fencing between the temporary shelter and the surrounding residential areas. I know there is some existing fencing. Could you elaborate on any plans for additional fencing and the strength and security of that fencing?

Ms. Shaya: Katayoon Shaya with Public Works. The – the space between the shelter and the open field will receive board-on-board fencing, the specific type and style, and color is yet to be determined. The space between the shelter parking and the senior center parking will also have fence that would be vinyl coated chain link fence and that is based on the request from the shelter operators in a sense to contain the shelter area but also police has requested that it be see-through so that they can have – they can observe the parking lot in from kind of the – the sweep of the senior center. The fence to the north, there is an existing fence with the residential development. A large section of that is in bad shape and falling apart. We're proposing to install a new fence either in – within a very short distance of that on County property if the residences would like to keep that – that – the fence – existing fence, that fine. If not, we're happy to remove that and

replace that with a new fence that we want to put in. There's a fence – chain link fence to the west of the site that is not in great shape. Our proposal is to actually replace that fencing in the entire length of the field as well. We could definitely take a look at the details as we do further design to determine the – the specific – specifics of what more may be needed.

Commissioner Sergeant: Safety and security, I think, would – would help, would serve as a component of that so I could continue to examination for fencing, if you do it.

Ms. Shaya: Sure.

Commissioner Sergeant: This ingress and egress on either side of Lincolnia Center. It can be very fairly narrow and while you talked about access control systems. The opportunity for interaction, good or bad, between residents from these two facilities is there. What do you do to control that or to mitigate any problems with that should there be that kind of interaction that may result in something other than a desired outcome.

Ms. Shaya: The – each facility has access control and the shelter is staffed twenty-four hours. Actually, both facilities from what I understand, on the senior center side, they are staffed twenty-four hours. There's – there will be security walking the site to, basically, observe if there are any issue to address. And – and, I think, the staff at the center is – is pretty - pretty good about containing the potentially undesirable activities that – that may arise.

Commissioner Sargeant: And let's talk about staff at both facilities, Lincolnia and – and the temporary shelter. What kind of protocols, training, emergency response is in place or will be in place? I mean, it's fine to say we'll have 24/7 personnel on site. If they're not trained to handle the situations or don't know how to get back up quickly, that – having them there is not necessarily going to mitigate a problem. What kind of safety protocols, response protocols are in place and what kind of training goes with it?

Mr. Stalzer: I'd like for Dean Klein to address the shelter protocols. These – these will be countywide and then I'd like either someone from Housing and Community Development or Neighborhood Community Services to address the center protocols that are in place currently.

Mr. Klein: Again, Dean Klein. I – I would say, first, the shelter has been in existence for a long time. The current shelter provider is extremely capable in working with this population and has a lot of experience with this as has the staff. That is the mission and the focus of their work each and every day. This organization, Northern Virginia Family Services, comes to their work with a wide range of additional resources through training and other supportive services that can be applied based upon individual situations that occur. The staff and the shelter operate as – as a shelter currently. And we operate shelters countywide and have for many, many years. And so the best practices that are applied currently in Bailey's as well as other shelters we would be using in this new location. I'd say that we would be doing it in partnership with the police as well as this – this group and other neighbors that are interested in doing so to ensure that it is as

effective as possible. Every site is different. I think that that would be a key element to our success as developing a plan of action on this site with interested parties, with the staff and with leadership to ensure that it's an effective approach.

Commissioner Sargeant: To – to the extent that there is training. Is there training for these types of scenarios for your person – for your people on site and on duty 24/7?

Mr. Klein: I'm not sure exactly what scenarios you're referring to, but I – I can say that each and every day they're serving this population and they're pretty seasoned in terms of addressing issues that come up with individuals that come into the shelter. And they're used to addressing that in the most effective and safe manner possible.

Commissioner Sargeant: In terms of communication, in terms of immediate communication. Has any consideration been placed on, perhaps, some kind of quick response group email list or some other type of notification that residents can participate in? You – needless to say, you have a lot of anxious residents. There is no way around it.

Mr. Klein: Yes.

Commissioner Sargeant: And the more you to mitigate that, if this goes through, the much better off you are. A part of that is making sure they have an immediate response capability to somebody to say, "We've seen somebody who shouldn't be where they are." Should they wait? Should they just immediately call the police? Is there is some opportunity for them to interact and get something done? If an incident happens, is there an opportunity to immediately explain it through, perhaps, of some kind of listserv.

Mr. Stalzer: Mr. Sargeant, let me – let me provide a response and then ACD may want to provide additional information. Since we're recommending the formation of the advisory group this fall, which is roughly a year before the temporary facility, if approved, would be operational. Those are actually the types of questions and scenarios that we would like to share with them. We have a number of different ways to communicate the information both from residents to us and also from the County to residents. We do that now with some of our flood control areas, specifically the river watch in your District, in Mount Vernon. And it's – it's been very effective over the last seven or eight years. I don't know exactly what a communication system might look like in this particular instance. But I think that we're certainly open. The way we would probably do it is to use our existing citizen org network. It would be focused on these neighborhoods and this – this particular – these particular public uses. It's actually managed 24/7 though our Office of Emergency Management. There is a lot of ways that it can be deployed and we'd certainly be open to looking at all those options. But I would – I would want to engage the advisory group to help us do that. That's why we want the group.

Commissioner Sargeant: Okay. And one final question. We heard during the public hearing about future plans for interchange improvements which, from what I saw from the – from the

illustrations, may or may not interfere with the – with bus stops along that way. And I just wanted to clarify that if you could.

Kristin Calkins, Department of Transportation: Kristin Calkins, with the Department of Transportation, we're putting up a graphic of the intersection improvement located in proximity to the homeless shelter. There should not be any negative consequences for access and egress to and from the homeless shelter with this improvement. It will improve the ability of people to cross the North Chambliss connection to Beauregard Street as it removes the unsignalized, unprotected cross walk and creates a four-way intersection where all the crossings will be pedestrian signalized. So we're not anticipating any conflicts between the intersection improvement and the construction of the homeless shelter.

Commissioner Sargeant: And about – and the bus stops?

Ms. Calkins: And – and the bus stops – the bus stops will be fine. It will actually, probably, improve the ability for the buses to stop. As that free-flow movement will now come into control of the intersection.

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Before I recognize Ms. Hurley, I just want to clarify a point. We had a public hearing on this item and we closed the public hearing. And Ms. Strandlie was recognized to go into some preliminary discussion with staff on some new items that were not brought up at the public hearing. So, in order to be fair to everybody, I just have instructed our Chief Clerk that all the information that you are now hearing will be on verbatim starting with my recognition of Ms. Hanley – Ms. Strandlie rather on this – on this application. Ms. Hurley.

Commissioner Hurley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If a resident is refused access to the facility for some reason that doesn't rise to the issue – to the level of being arrested or calling an ambulance but is just not admitted where does he or she go? What happens to them?

Mr. Klein: We would be looking at a plan for that individual when that's happening. So, if in fact a staff person was stating that that person was not able to enter the shelter, we would be cognizant of that. The staff person would be. And a plan of action would be developed in terms of what that might look like. We would also be aware of the security issues that would, you know, would arise if – if they chose not to and the police would be contacted if they chose not to leave the area.

Mr. Stalzer: Mr. Klein.

Commissioner Hurley: So they would either...

Mr. Stalzer: Mr. Klein can you elaborate on specifically what happens today at Bailey's or Reston if in fact – because we do encounter that? Can you address that? Because the protocol will be the same in the future as it is today, so we need to make that clear.

Tom Barnette, Program Manager, Office to Prevent and End Homelessness: Good evening. My name is Tom Barnette, Program Manager at the Office to Prevent and End Homelessness. The emergency shelters are part of a housing crisis response system where there is a triage that happens at each of the shelters where individuals are prioritized based on their housing status and need. So, the priority is on sheltering people who are – would be unsheltered without the access to the shelter. Some people present to the shelter that have other options. And so in those cases where they do have other options, we encourage them to utilize those things and we provide services where they are for individuals that are unsheltered and are willing to come into shelter, we offer them a bed or coordinate with other shelters, or, depending on the season, other hypothermia prevention sites, that may be operating out of different houses of worship. It much depends on the season and the potential risk that the individual may be facing outside. There is no simple one answer to...

Commissioner Hurley: I'm sorry. I'm not – I didn't make my question clear.

Mr. Barnette: I'm sorry.

Commissioner Hurley: Some of the local residents are concerned about people who are refused at – residents who are refused admission that night because, perhaps, they've been drinking. Whatever – not in compliance with all the rules. What happens right now at Bailey's? What will happen to the new facility if somebody – a resident arrives and is refused admission? You know, it's not deserving of arrest, it's not deserving of calling an ambulance. Are they escorted offsite? What happens to them?

Mr. Barnette: The simplest shortest answer is that they're – they are turned away from the shelter. That's not the first option or choice for individuals that are in shelter, but some individuals when they don't – when we don't have the capacity to serve them, may be turned away.

Commissioner Hurley: And they just are turned away at the door and they stay – they might stay in the area?

Mr. Barnette: That – that triage and prioritization process ensures that people that need shelter can access it. Those that have other options, can go somewhere else. But in cases where someone is turned away, they may go either stay with friends or family, or may go to another shelter, or stay at some other location.

Commissioner Hurley: So they're not escorted offsite? They're not taken away from the immediate vicinity?

Mr. Barnette: I think it depends on each site and in this case we'll be certainly be working with the onsite security and the other facility staff to make sure that they're not loitering on the property.

Commissioner Hurley: And one last – one last question...

Chairman Murphy: Please, this is not an audience participation program. Ask you to please, maintain correct attitude.

Commissioner Hurley: And one last but four-part question. Mr. Stalzer, you talked about the timeline. But just four specific dates – if this is approved, when would construction start? Number two, when would residents start moving in? Number three, when do you anticipate the residents would leave? And, I think, you said fall of 2019. And four, when would the site be restored to current or better conditions?

Mr. Stalzer: I think I have all of your questions and timeline. We – we would anticipate having the temporary shelter facility ready for occupancy in the fall of 2017. Close with AvalonBay in late 2017. These are approximates. We would want to have the temporary facility ready in time. We're not going to occupy until the last possible minute. But there needs to be some transition period between the old and the new. We – we would anticipate AvalonBay beginning construction in early 2018. They would begin to clear the site. Obviously, we would have to be out of the shelter. The shelter would be utilized from – from that point. Let's say the end of 2017 until the time that the new shelter is online. And we're saying fall of 2019. So, roughly, a two-year period. It would, probably, take six months – three to six months. We haven't really looked at the demobilization of the modulares but it could be done quickly. They're modulares, they're temporary. We can get them moved quickly. The remediation of the site should be relatively basic. So that should happen three to six months after the new shelter is open. We can give you a more defined timeline, probably, down at the end of the week. So, I'm just giving you ball park.

Commissioner Hurley: And when would you start construction if this is approved?

Mr. Stalzer: Of the temporary or the permanent?

Commissioner Hurley: No, just the temporary. This what we're talking about. Just the temporary site. When would you start construction that people would lose access to the current field, etcetera?

Mr. Stalzer: We would begin the site work in February of 2017.

Chairman Murphy: Anyone else?

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. – Mr. Flanagan and then here you go.

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes, so, thank you, Mr...

Chairman Murphy: Oh, go ahead, Ms. Strandlie on the point.

Commissioner Strandlie: Yes, I just wanted to follow up. The whole point of having the Advisory Committee is to address the concerns that Commissioner Hurley raised about what would happen in a particular scenario. So, the answer that we received was a general answer but this Committee will start well over a year in advance to determine any – any solutions that need to be addressed that are workable for the community. So, I fully anticipate that these issues will be raised and resolved as they are ongoing.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Flanagan and Mr. Sargeant.

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. There were two pieces of information at the – provided at the public hearing that we heard. That – I now have been in contact with staff and I have had some answers that, I think, are satisfactory. The – the first one was the Land Use Committee – the Mason District Land Use Committee. The last meeting they had with County staff was on June 28. And at that time staff indicated that the closure date of the existing shelter was to be March 1st but that – that had now been – that was flexible. And that there was a chance that the current facility could remain there beyond that date of March 1st and, thereby, possibly not necessitate the construction of the temporary shelter. So, that – that prospect is lingered with some of those people who testified at the public hearing. And when I investigated with staff who pursued that – the answers to that unresolved issue, I was told that the staff did agree that it could be that the date of March 1 for closure was not fixed. And that they did go back to the developer and asked about delaying that closure date and they were told that the developer would not agree to a closure date beyond December 1 of 2017. So, therefore, the necessity for the temporary shelter was, you know, certain, and that the relocation would have to occur before the completion of the permanent shelter. The – now is that correct?

Mr. Stalzer: Can I – can I clarify, please?

Commissioner Flanagan: Can you – can you tell me whether that's correct?

Mr. Stalzer: I'll try. The March 2017 date was the correct date based on the original agreement that was approved by the Board of Supervisors and ultimately signed by AvalonBay in February of 2016. That was premised on the decisions that have taken longer than several weeks or months being made. Those decision including where we would locate the shelter temporarily as well as moving forward with the rezoning process have taken longer. So, as a result of that, the County and the developer have determined that it's in our – our individual and collective best interests to move the closing date from March of 2017 until December of 2017. Hence, the

schedule pushes out in terms of when we would need the temporary facility. So, generally, what you've described is accurate, but there are reasons why in fact the dates have changed.

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes, I appreciate the reasons but I was more interested in giving the community an explanation for why it couldn't be later than December of 2017.

Mr. Stalzer: And, depending on what the Commission decides tonight, if there is an approval of the application tonight, the County Executive will authorize a contract amendment with AvalonBay tomorrow extending that closing date to December 2017. If another decision is made, then we'll have to reevaluate that because, obviously, we need to have a place to locate the shelter before we can commit to moving forward with the project.

Commissioner Flanagan: The second question that I have was done – dealt with closure date. And during the public hearing – after the public hearing, I asked staff the question as to when the shelter – well then the park would be available again after the temporary shelter is removed. And I was told by staff the other day that, well, of course, I think, the reason why I got a fuzzy answer on the – at the public hearing was because you really didn't have the permanent site secure yet. I guess, you have secured that site for your testimony tonight and so you're ready to go forward with the construction of the permanent site.

Mr. Stalzer: If we get the regulatory approval, the Planning Commission has to adhere and then the Board has to approve it.

Commissioner Flanagan: Sure, I understand. But at the time, evidently, at the public hearing that was – that assurance was not there so consequently, I couldn't get that assurance from you at the public hearing but I, I think I can get it from you tonight. At least I was told that by phone from – with your staff. So, I have transmitted all that information to the other Commissioners in the meantime and, I think, that I just want to be sure that the information I gave them, you know, by email is correct. That the – that the – the – you anticipate, I would say, by 2020 that the – there will be no further need for the...

Mr. Stalzer: Actually, fall of 2019.

Commissioner Flanagan: 2019. Well, that's better yet.

Mr. Stalzer: The – the new shelter will be open and operational by fall of 2019. We anticipate returning the field to its original state also in fall of 2019.

Mr. Flanagan: And I understand the only thing that will not, that the improved the park once it's restored will be better than the condition that it is now. And the only remaining question is to whether the parking that is provided for the temporary shelter will remain as part of the park acreage. And that answer we don't have yet. Is that correct that the senior center will be

determined whether that – that – that parking will be kept or whether that will be returned to park as well?

Mr. Stalzer: We do not have a determination on that. We can, certainly, return that parking area to its original state. There may be some advantage either for the senior center or the senior housing facility for some additional amount of parking. But, again, that could be something we can talk to the facility managers about as well as the Advisory Committee. But we're – we're certainly willing and able to – to go in whatever direction we need to on that.

Commissioner Flanagan: Thank you for confirming my – my email to the other Commissioners.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Sargeant.

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One comment. Echoing Commissioner Hurley's comments and Commissioner Strandlie's response in terms of working things out later through the advisory group, which, I think, is – is a good plan. Having said that, it is just slightly frustrating that we are working with the 2232 process on three basic issues by which we make a call. So, I would ask, that as you consider those issues for the future, perhaps, memorialize them somewhere, so we all know what we're working from, including the residents. But also consider that this is not business as usual in terms of how this facility operates. This is – it may seem like that for those who are experienced and – and quite professional in responding to these concerns of residents and even the Planning Commission. But consider going beyond. Quite simply if there is a way of transporting somebody who is not admitted to this facility. Find a way to get them someplace else. That should be quite simple in this scenario. It's going to take just one incident and something's going to come back here or somewhere else even worse. So, I think, do not consider this from experience business as usual. It's not. And do everything possible that can be done if we do this to make sure that any of those concerns are addressed even ones you don't normally have to address.

Mr. Stalzer: We do understand that. I appreciate the Commission stating that clearly and we're happy to communicate as we move forward in any degree of detail both operationally and in the context of the 2232 parameters.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. Thank you. All right. Ms. Strandlie, for action.

Commissioner Strandlie: Okay. Thank you very much. I agree with Commissioner Sargeant and, if it's appropriate, I would be happy to serve as a member of the Advisory Committee or as an ex officio, or just to keep an eye on things.

Chairman Murphy: Please. I don't want to keep reminding you. Ms. Strandlie.

Commissioner Strandlie: Okay. Thank you. I will just make a statement and then we will go into the motion.

Chairman Murphy: Go ahead.

Commissioner Strandlie: It's okay? There have been many developments since the Land Use Committee meeting and the Planning Commission hearing. We've had the opportunity to examine the issues and come to a determination. One of the primary concerns was that the County intended to make the temporary shelter the permanent site for a new shelter. That was never a possibility and now that concern is completely off the table. Another concern was that the shelter residents were forced to leave the shelter during the day. That too has been addressed as residents will be allowed to remain in the shelter during the day. In addition, the County will assist with transportation as necessary and is determined through the – the Advisory Committee process. We also know there is no best practice of locating shelters 2500 feet away from schools, day cares or grouped homes. As we have learned, Fairfax County shelters are part of the community and not pushed aside into solely industrial areas. In fact, Fairfax County shelters are located next to day cares, libraries and residential developments. In Falls Church City, in fact, the shelter is located right behind Don Beyer Volvo and next to the residential developments. We also know that the senior center was upgrading security as part of the renovation process and not anticipating lock down as a result of a potential temporary shelter. The green space will continue to be usable by the seniors in the community. The seniors will not lose their gardens. There are many parks and open spaces within one mile of Lincolnia Senior Center for use by the community as well as a continued use of the field. While there will continue to be the need for ongoing conversations and adjustments, the Advisory Committee will provide programmatic input as well site plan comments. And I talked to staff about that. I think that's very important that that occurs. Many of the items in the staff report said they will be determined at site plan. So that will be an important part of the input. And the Committee will be in place until the permanent shelter is opened. Now just for some background on Land Use Process, the Planning Commission tonight's vote. As the Planning Commissioner for the Mason District, I have attended every public meeting, toured the senior center grounds on several occasions, including at the invitation of and with senior center volunteer Kathy Hoyt, inspected the current shelter site and surrounding land, researched other Districts experiences with shelter applications, including reviewing the Planning Commission hearing on the Kate Hanley shelter, where there like here, the community was almost uniformly opposed. I've asked tough questions of staff and have vetted the materials, statements and positions submitted by the community. I want to thank the residents who submitted very thoughtful questions as we did follow up and, hopefully, you can tell by the updates and answers offered by staff. There's also a long list of frequently asked questions that are posted on the – on the website. I can assure you that the Planning Commission take – we take our job very seriously. And it must be noted that the Planning Commissioners work closely with staff and if the magisterial district has one the District Land Use Committee. However, Planning Commissioners are not obligated to adhere to the recommendations of staff nor the Land Use Committees. We apply our independent judgment after great thought and research. The process of the land use – the purpose of the land use process is to seek public input, identify issues with applications and address them if possible. While I know many will disagree with the statement, the public process in this case worked. There were multiple

opportunities for input over a three-month period. The Planning Commission hearing ensured that all voices were heard. In addition, the County staff answered each and every question submitted independently by the public during the time period between the public meetings. We received a stack of correspondence. I read every single letter and, I'm sorry, I wasn't able to respond to everyone. But it was a quite a bit of information. Out of this public input process a permanent site was obtained and adjustments were made to the delivery of service to the homeless among many other – among many other things. Finally, after much reflection, I am going to make a motion to approve the application. Contrary to what I have read or heard, my motion and position were not predetermined. My first reaction to learning of this proposed location was how I would feel if my one hundred-and-two-year-old grandmother were a resident of the assisted living center or a participant in the adult day care. I took this very seriously. I also informed staff that a County 2232 application was not guaranteed approval and that all the t's must be crossed and all the i's must be dotted. It should also be noted that my vote is but one vote. Residents have communicated with every Commissioner who will vote on this matter. Further if I would to make a motion to deny, other Commissioners could decide to vote “no” and the application could still be approved. We have had several split votes in very difficult cases lately, as we can all attest. The outcome of tonight's decision will be the decision of the Fairfax County Planning Commission as a whole. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I move – I CONCUR WITH THE STAFF'S CONCLUSION THAT THE PROPOSAL BY THE FAIRFAX COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES TO CONSTRUCT A TEMPORARY FACILITY FOR THE BAILEY'S CROSSROADS COMMUNITY SHELTER AT 4710 NORTH CHAMBLISS STREET, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22312 SATISFIES THE CRITERIA, LOCATION – THAT 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 THE SUBJECT APPLICATION 2232-M16-22 SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion of the motion? Ms. Hurley.

Commissioner Hurley: I was ready to vote “aye” on this. I think the community has done...

Commissioner Hart: Mic, mic.

Commissioner Hurley: Sorry. I was ready to vote “aye.” I think the community, the staff have worked very closely finding the new site, on resolving the issue of residents that have had before (inaudible) I really wanted to vote “yes”; however, I remain concerned about what happens when a resident is denied admission. I still haven't heard what happens to them and I am forced to abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion of the motion. All those in favor of the motion to approve 2232-M16-22, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries with one abstention - Ms. Hurley.

(The motion carried by a vote of 8-0-1. Commissioner Hurley abstained. Commissioners Keys-Gamarra, Lawrence, and Migliaccio were absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

2232-D16-28 – SCHOOL BOARD OF THE CITY OF FALLS CHURCH
(Decision Only) (Public Hearing Held on July 21, 2016)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Ulfelder: I do, Mr. Chairman. We scheduled – we had a hearing a week ago, the 21st, concerning a 2232 for Mount Daniel Elementary School and, in a conversation with the applicant's representative yesterday afternoon, we discussed the need for some additional time in order to take a further look at some of the questions and issues that have been – were raised at the hearing by some of the Commissioners and others. And, therefore, they agreed that a deferral would be appropriate until – during our summer break. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER ITS DECISION – FURTHER DEFER ITS DECISION ON 2232-D16-28, SCHOOL BOARD OF THE CITY OF FALLS CHURCH TO A DATE CERTAIN OF SEPTEMBER 14TH, 2016, WITH A RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN COMMENTS.

Commissioners Hart and Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to continue the decision only with the record remaining open – on item 2232-D16-28 to a date certain of... What did you say? I'm sorry. September 14th, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

(The motion carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioner Keys-Gamarra, Lawrence, and Migliaccio were absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – SHAPE FACTOR IN THE R-C DISTRICT;
INCREASE IN RESIDENTIAL BUILDING HEIGHT; AND MINOR LOT LINE
ADJUSTMENT

(Decision Only) (Public Hearing Held on July 20, 2016)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Hart: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. On July 20, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the Zoning Ordinance Amendment regarding Shape Factor in the R-C District, Increase in Residential Building Height, and Minor Lot Line Adjustments. I, first, want to thank the citizens and industry representatives who testified at the public hearing and who submitted written comments which are included in the record. I also want to thank staff for their fine work on this Amendment, particularly, Lorrie Kirst and the Zoning Administrator Leslie Johnson. When we first adopted the Shape Factor Amendment, the R-C District was intentionally omitted. In November of 2006, when the Commission first acted on this topic, I made a follow on motion to recommend a later review of whether the R-C District could be included. Ten years later, here we are. To date, in the other residential districts, nobody has requested a special exception for shape factor, and we have seen relatively orderly development that has not been universally true in the R-C District. Much of the R-C District is not served by public sewer, some of it has poor soils, and we recognized in 2006 that some lots may need some irregular configurations to have a contiguous septic drain field site. Nevertheless, in the years since adoption of shape factor in the other districts, sanitation technology has evolved, and alternative septic systems have facilitated extensive additional residential development on land that might, otherwise, have been undeveloped. Problems have arisen in the R-C District with the by-right subdivision of land into freakishly irregular shapes, with long tentacles and unusable extensions, done not to locate septic drain fields but instead to maximize lot yield on land which was downzoned in 1982 to protect water quality in the Occoquan Basin. At the direction of the Board of Supervisors, staff developed an amendment to extend shape factor restrictions to the R-C District, with some flexibility allowed through a special exception process. Staff also has conducted extensive outreach with citizens and industry. The amendment, as advertised, has staff's favorable recommendation, with which I largely concur, although, I also agree to some extent with the industry concerns regarding flexibility. In an attempt to balance those points of view, I will recommend that we include language allowing environmental concerns as a further justification for special exception for shape factor, as well as raising the potential shape factor to 65 for the special exception process. I agree with staff that a shape factor of 35 is appropriate for by-right lots and is consistent with the other zoning districts. I also believe that a shape factor of up to 65, rather than 50, may be appropriate when we are into the special exception process. While going up to 65 may allow slightly more irregular lots in exceptional circumstances, including consideration of environmental issues, I believe that the special exception process, with two public hearings and case-by-case review, affords adequate protection from abuse of the system. I believe a shape factor of 65 is more than adequate to allow sufficient design flexibility, given the examples we have seen. As to the building height component of the amendment, I tend to agree that it is acceptable to allow home builders in three residential districts with larger lots, R-C, R-E and R-1, to go slightly higher than currently allowed, so long as the structure is 50 feet from the

lot lines. This flexibility will allow more opportunity for high ceilings, high rooflines and walkout basements. While it is true that a height variance theoretically can be requested, it can already be requested for that purpose, without any setback limitations, and we are not changing those existing provisions, which already have very rigorous standards. Very few height variances have ever been requested, and this amendment will not make that process any easier. Non-residential uses in the R-C, R-E and R-1 Districts also are outside the scope of this amendment. Special exception and special permit uses still go through a public hearing process with either the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, or the Board of Zoning Appeals, and are already subject to many other restrictions affecting height and impacts, such as angle of bulk plane, transitional screening and barrier requirements, among others. This amendment is not changing any of those restrictions, or affecting non-residential uses. The lot line adjustment provisions are logical and will facilitate better consolidations of railroad-type lots, leading to more orderly development and redevelopment. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I will have two motions. First, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT THE SHAPE FACTOR IN THE R-C DISTRICT, INCREASE IN RESIDENTIAL BUILDING HEIGHT, AND MINOR LOT LINE ADJUSTMENTS ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT BE APPROVED, SUBJECT TO THE JULY 20, 2016, PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDED PROPOSED AMENDMENT, WHICH WAS DISTRIBUTED TO THE COMMISSION LAST WEEK, AND WITH AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF 12:01 A.M. ON THE DAY FOLLOWING ADOPTION. THIS RECOMMENDED LANGUAGE INCLUDES A MAXIMUM SHAPE FACTOR OF UP TO 35 IN THE R-C DISTRICT AND A SHAPE FACTOR OF UP TO 65 IN THE R-C DISTRICT WITH SPECIAL EXCEPTION APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. IN ADDITION, THE RECOMMENDED LANGUAGE WOULD ALLOW THE BOARD TO APPROVE AN INCREASE IN SHAPE FACTOR IN THE R-C DISTRICT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION REASONS IN ADDITION TO A PORTION OF THE PROPERTY BEING REQUIRED FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A WASTEWATER OR STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITY AND/OR THE PROVISION OF A STREAM VALLEY TRAIL AS AN OUT-LOT.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Flanagan: Just a question.

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Commissioner Flanagan: Is your motion end at the word "adoption" on the first sentence?

Commissioner Hart: No. That whole...

Commissioner Flanagan: The rest of it seems to be an explanation.

Commissioner Hart: Well, that was an explanation suggested by staff, which I have included verbatim in that paragraph. So, I think, it's part of my motion. I have another motion too, but it's all – it's all there.

Commissioner Flanagan: Okay.

Chairman Murphy: All right. Further discussion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it adopt Zoning Ordinance regarding Shape Factor in the R-C District increase in residential building height, and Minor Lot Line Adjustments, as articulated by Mr. Hart, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Secondly, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT LOTS IN THE R-C DISTRICT THAT HAVE BEEN RECORDED IN THE FAIRFAX COUNTY LAND RECORDS ON OR BEFORE THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE AMENDMENT BE GRANDFATHERED FROM THE SHAPE FACTOR REQUIREMENT.

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.

(Each motion carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Keys-Gamarra, Lawrence and Migliaccio were absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

FS-V16-1 – DPWES, Lorton Volunteer Fire Station, 7707 Armistead Road

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a “feature shown” application listed on the agenda tonight as FS-V16-1. In the application, the Department of Public Works on behalf of the Lorton Volunteer Fire Station asked permission to build a temporary fire station structure, demolish the existing 16,000 square foot two-story fire station building, and build a new 23,000 square foot two-story fire station building, and redevelop two parking lots with new landscaping. The temporary fire station structure will then be removed. During the review by the South County Land Use Committee two changes were requested. One, to connect the two planned new parking lots, and the other, the removal of the engine room clerestory windows with ceiling lights twenty-four-seven that face the north-east overlooking residential buildings. The

staff report now reflects the future connection of the two parking lots, and I understand from staff that the clerestory windows facing the northeast have now been removed but after publication of the staff report. I understand that staff is prepared to confirm that the aforementioned clerestory windows no longer face to the northeast. I, therefore, CONCUR WITH STAFF'S CONCLUSION THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS' PLANS TO REPLACE THE LORTON VOLUNTARILY FIRE STATION – VOLUNTEER FIRE STATION AND TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION WITH STATION FACILITY DEMOLITION, AS REFLECTED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM DATED JUNE 16, 2016, AND IS SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED A "FEATURE SHOWN", AND MOVE – AND I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION FIND APPLICATION FS-V16-1 MEETS THE CRITERIA OF LOCATION, CHARACTER AND EXTENT, AS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 15.2-2232 OF THE *CODE OF VIRGINIA*, AS AMENDED.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor in favor of the motion to concur with the "feature shown" FS-V16-1, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

(The motion carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Keys-Gamarra, Lawrence, and Migliaccio were absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Murphy announced that the Planning Commission's Schools Committee would meet on Wednesday, September 14, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hart established the following order of the agenda:

1. PCA B-846-03/PRC-B-846-04/DPA-HM-117-02 – RP 11720, LLC
2. PA 2016-CW-1CP – PUBLIC SCHOOLS POLICY PLAN AMENDMENT

This order was accepted without objection.

//

PCA B-846-03 - RP 11720, LLC – Appl. to amend the proffers for RZ –B-846, previously approved for office use, to permit residential development at a density of 15.65 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) with associated modifications to proffers and site design. Located on the N.W. quadrant of the intersection of Sunrise Valley Dr., and Roland Clarke Pl., on approx. 3.45 ac. of land zoned PRC. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential Planned Community. Tax Map 17-4 ((14)) (1A) 1. (Concurrent with PRC B-846-04 and DPA HM-117-02.) HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

DPA HM-117-02 - RP 11720, LLC – Appl. to permit the second amendment of the Development Plan for RZ –B-846 to permit medium density residential. Located on the N.W. quadrant of the intersection of Sunrise Valley Dr., and Roland Clarke Pl., on approx. 3.45 ac. of land zoned PRC. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential Planned Community. Tax Map 17-4 ((14)) (1A) 1. (Concurrent with PCA B-846-03 and PRC B-846-04.) HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

PRC B-846-04 - RP 11720, LLC – Appl. to approve a PRC plan associated with RZ -B-846 to permit residential development at a density of 15.65 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). Located on the N.W. quadrant of the intersection of Sunrise Valley Dr., and Roland Clarke Pl., on approx. 3.45 ac. of land zoned PRC. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential Planned Community. Tax Map 17-4 ((14)) (1A) 1. (Concurrent with PCA B-846-03 and DPA HM-117-02.) HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

//

Lori Greenlief, Applicant's Agent, McGuire Woods LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated June 27, 2016.

There were no disclosures by the Commission members.

Laura Arseneau, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that the Park Authority had concerns regarding the proffer contribution to the construction and maintenance of athletic fields. She added that the applicant did not provide a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan with the neighboring properties. She indicated that the aforementioned issues could be adequately addressed and resolved if additional development conditions and proffers were submitted by the applicant. She concluded by saying that staff found the subject applications were in harmony with the Comprehensive Plan and in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance and recommended approval of applications PCA B-846-03, PRC-B-846-04, and DPA-HM-117-02.

Commissioner Hart noted Development Condition Number 2 of the Planned Residential Community application conflicted with Note 31 on the cover sheet. He further explained that the applicant contemplated that the homeowners association (HOA) was in charge of the roads maintenance unless the Reston Association would take over. He indicated that if the applicant had to do the maintenance it would require a Proffered Condition Amendment. Commissioner Hart expressed his concern about the absence of parking spaces along the Sunrise Valley Drive.

Answering Commissioner Hart's questions, Ms. Arseneau explained that the visitor parking would be available in the alley next to lots 32-46; although it would entail blocking a garage entrance.

Answering Commissioner Sargeant's questions, Ms. Arseneau explained that two neighboring properties were in the process of redevelopment and the owners were expected to commit to a shared TDM. She confirmed that the applicant had no intention to include a TDM in the proffers.

Answering Commissioner Ulfelder's questions, Ms. Arseneau explained that the dotted line on the plan represented a suggested pedestrian route to the metro station. She further noted that the applicant was requested to show the most direct route.

Commissioner Ulfelder indicated that staff had recommended to design a private street for the subject property to connect to the adjacent Reston Square Development which would provide an access to the metro station for future residents.

In response to Chairman Murphy's request to clarify why the TDM study was not included in the development conditions, Ms. Arseneau explained that the TDM study was initially suggested by the Department of Transportation staff and included by the Department of Planning and Zoning staff in the development conditions for the property application located across the street from the subject application. She added that the Bernstein Management Corporation property located to the north of the subject application was in the development process as well. Ms. Arseneau indicated that staff expected that the applicant would include in the proffers a commitment to a shared TDM with the aforementioned properties which did not take place.

Answering Commissioner Strandlie's questions, Ms. Arseneau responded with the following:

- Proffer 6 included a disclosure of the garages dimensions.
- The linear park was provided on the property.
- The approved application located to the east of the subject application had a number of amenities including green space, a tot lot and a recreation area.

Answering questions from Commissioner Hedetniemi regarding the projected area population, Ms. Arseneau explained that the property located across the street from the subject application was approved for 34 single-family attached and 10 multi-family units and the subject application included 54 single-family attached dwellings. She noted that since the Bernstein Management Corporation property located to the north had not yet submitted a formal plan, the number of

planned residential units was unknown. She further pointed out that the area FAR would be high and would entail an increase in traffic which was the primary reason to recommend a TDM.

Ms. Greenlief indicated that the modifications to proffers dated July 22, 2016 included a removal of the contribution amount cap to the Reston Road Fund per dwelling unit and a change of the Workforce Dwelling Units lower income tier from 80 to 70 percent. She confirmed Commissioner Hart's earlier comment by saying that it was the applicant's understanding that the trails would be maintained either by the HOA or the Reston Association. She provided a brief overview of the property location, use, and density. Ms. Greenlief noted that the applicant was willing to work with staff to include a TDM in the proffers. She further indicated that the Park Authority contribution stipulated in the proffers was based on the well-established calculation for new residents rather than gross square footage. Ms. Greenlief addressed the parking concerns and noted that the property had five tandem parking spaces and the garages were 19-foot wide. She also pointed out that those dimensions would be disclosed to the residents. Ms. Greenlief added that public parking was available on Roland Clark Place and the western side of the property.

Answering Commissioner Murphy's question, Ms. Greenlief said that a moving van could access the property without blocking an opposite lane.

Addressing Commissioner Hurley's concerns regarding the garage dimensions, Mr. Sekas, Applicant's Agent, Sekas Homes, Ltd, noted that the exact size of the garages was 19.5 feet.

Answering Commissioner Sargeant's question, Ms. Greenlief indicated that the Reston Road Fund contribution would be estimated in the amount between 2,500 to 8,000 dollars per unit.

In response to Commissioner Sargeant's question, Mr. Sekas indicated that the applicant was willing to participate in the TDM study if deemed necessary and contribute the pro-rata share with the neighboring properties.

Commissioner Hart concurred with Commissioner Hurley's comments regarding the size of the garages. He brought up a recently approved Tall Oaks Development Company LLC case where the garages were 20 and 24-foot wide. He explained that in that case staff added a development condition indicating that if the garages were considered as two spaces, the interior clearance would be 20 feet. He further suggested to change the wording in Proffer Number 6 from "exact dimensions" to "interior dimensions" or "interior clearance."

In response to Commissioner Hart's questions regarding the availability of space permitting a ninety-degree turnaround of a vehicle to get into the garage in lots 6 and 18, Ms. Greenlief indicated that the intention was to access the garage from another direction which would not require to make a turnaround. She added that lots 19 through 21 had driveways to make up for the lacking parking spaces and tandem spaces were 36-foot long to accommodate two cars.

Answering Commissioner Ulfelder's questions, Ms. Greenlief stated the following:

- The applicant provided an easement for a potential connection to the Reston Square Development; however, it was impossible to create a vehicular connection due to a severe topographic change of the adjacent property.

- Creating a pedestrian connection across the easement would be possible after the redevelopment of the adjacent property was completed.

There being no listed speakers, Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience, but received no response. 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 this item.

//

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

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

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I – I think we have agreement on the things that we need to address and – but I would like them at least to see the language before I recommend approval for this. And, you know, I don't think it's – I realize that we, you know, it's been long time and you have had, particularly, with the property to the east, we have had guidance from the Board of Supervisors that the fact that they approved that development. But I would like to see some language on the TDM on – I – I'm not as concerned about the pizza guy coming in. They have – you know, they have, unless you want to provide pizzas for everyone. But the – as far as the contribution for the road fund, you did take out the cap because we really don't know what that is going to be. There is a whole area working on that. I believe that the – the park contribution based on the traditional park contribution, and the fact that these units you will apply for Reston Association membership and that will open up great deal of open space for those folks. But I – I would like the issues, you know, that we can address and the changes. Yes.

John Sekas, Applicant's Agent, Sekas Homes, Ltd.: We're happy right now to add a development condition that we will participate in the area-wide TDM on the pro-rata share basis. I mean, I know what a TDM is. It's not that huge of a thing and we're happy to participate in it.

Commissioner de la Fe: You're willing to commit to that.

Mr. Sekas: I'm doing it on the record.

Commissioner de la Fe: Putting it on the record right now.

Mr. Sekas: I think that that was the question, "Would we participate?" That was the question that was asked and we said "Yes."

Commissioner de la Fe: Okay. And the...

Mr. Sekas: The only other issue was that changed the Development Condition for the – for the – for the maintenance. And Reston Association has already committed for the maintenance on 11690 and they want the maintenance on this as well. That's part of us joining RA. So, I don't

see any issue there either. Just trying to save a little time to the Board. I know you'll be very busy when you get back.

Chairman Murphy: Oh, you're very kind.

Commissioner de la Fe: Oh, you're very kind. I – I – I – I realize what you're trying to do but I would like to get these things, you know, on the record and I, you know, and – and to be – for us to be able to look at them.

Mr. Sekas: Okay.

Commissioner de la Fe: Before we make a recommendation.

Mr. Sekas: But I am committed to them now.

Commissioner de la Fe: I – I – I know the concern that you have, unless the building that you are planning to demolish was made by a world-famous architect.

Mr. Sekas: Please don't go there.

Commissioner de la Fe: I don't think we will have the problems that we had where the Board of Supervisors had to overturn our recommendation which they very seldom do. So – so, you know, if we – if we could address those things.

Mr. Sekas: Okay. We'd be happy to.

Commissioner de la Fe: Would the – the first time we meet after our recess is September...

Chairman Murphy: September 13th is Wednesday and 14th is Thursday.

Commissioner de la Fe: The 14th. I thought it was 14th and 15th.

Commissioner Hart: It was 14th or 15th.

Chairman Murphy: Is it 14th?

Commissioner de la Fe: Which would you prefer: 14th or the 15th?

Chairman Murphy: I said 13 and 14 before. Correction.

Commissioner de la Fe: No, you cannot count on the 13th.

Chairman Murphy: I'm not a math guy.

Commissioner de la Fe: I mean, you – you already wanted to have Tim Sargeant meet on Friday one day.

Laura Arseneau, Planner III, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning:
The 14th is fine with staff and the applicant as well.

Commissioner de la Fe: The 14th. And if we could have, you know, those distributed ahead of time.

Ms. Arseneau: Of course.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman, I, therefore, MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER ITS DECISION ONLY WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR DPA-HM-117-02/PCA-B-846-03 AND PRC-D-846-04 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF SEPTEMBER 14TH, 2016.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decisions only on these application to a date certain of September 14th with the record remaining open for written comments, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

(The motion carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Keys-Gamarra, Lawrence, and Migliaccio were absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

PA 2016-CW-1CP - PUBLIC SCHOOLS POLICY PLAN AMENDMENT – To consider proposed revisions to the Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County, VA, in accordance with the *Code of Virginia*, Title 15.2, Chapter 22. This Amendment considers the revision of locational and character criteria for public schools in the Public Facilities section of the Policy Plan element of the County's Comprehensive Plan. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

David Stinson, Planning Division (PD), DPZ, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He highlighted the key changes proposed to the Public Schools Policy Plan Amendment text. Mr. Stinson explained that since Fairfax County was targeting future growth in high density areas, there was a need for vertical schools and education facilities as well as co-location at different levels of education.

Answering Commissioner Sargeant's questions, Mr. Stinson stated the following:

- The Policy Plan Amendment provided schools with more flexibility for denser schools and activity centers as well as transitional schools.
- Changes to the Policy Plan Amendment did not rule out traditional schools.
- The Policy Plan Amendment did not prioritize certain types of design.

In response to Commissioner Sargeant's questions, Kevin Sneed, Special Projects Administrator, Design and Construction Department, Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS), indicated that during any renovation activities the construction had to conform to the current codes while the educational specifications were elective depending on building characteristics. He further explained that due to the lack of available land and its high cost, the Plan Amendment would provide a solution to locate appropriate school sites in proximity to students' residences.

Answering Commissioner Ulfelder's question about the future student growth related to activity center locations, Mr. Sneed explained that the projections showed no need for vertical schools within the next five years. He emphasized the importance of maximizing the existing sites prior to building vertical schools. In this regard, Mr. Sneed noted that a recommendation was made to the School Board to reopen older schools that were used as administrative centers.

Commissioner Flanagan indicated that a change of the Policy Plan Amendment would help the staff to consider alternate ways of meeting the increased demand for space. Mr. Sneed said that the FCPS were building to capacity in the anticipation of the development in the high density areas.

Commissioner Flanagan noted the Embark Richmond Highway initiative, which, among other efforts, was reviewing the permitted density in three Community Business Centers (CBCs): Penn Daw, Beacon Hill and Hybla Valley. He mentioned that there were only two elementary schools in that area and both of them were full. He further explained that increasing density in the aforementioned CBCs would require a review of the impact on schools. Mr. Sneed concurred with Commissioner Flanagan's concerns and indicated that in the mid-2020s the density pressure would be significant.

Commissioner Strandlie expressed an intent to ask follow on questions once public testimony was completed. She asked staff about the flexibility for introducing changes to the proposed Public Schools Policy Plan Amendment. Mr. Caperton, Public Facilities Planning Branch Chief, PD, DPZ, explained that the Planning Commission could propose changes to the text and staff would then review them. He also pointed out that the changes suggested should fall under the Board's authorization to specifically address the location and character of urban vertical schools.

Commissioner Hurley asked Mr. Sneed to clarify his previous testimony regarding the FCPS policy as it related to the administrative centers. Mr. Sneed explained that there were some older school sites that did not have sufficient population to support the school and were converted into administrative centers.

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

Clyde Miller, 3436 Skyview Terrace, Falls Church, VA 22042, Holmes Run Valley Citizens Association, spoke in opposition to the proposed Public Schools Policy Plan Amendment. He indicated that he had earlier provided a companion paper with fourteen specific recommended changes to the proposed Amendment language (included in the date file). He said that the County had sufficient funds and space necessary for quality school facilities. He highlighted the principal issues of the policies proposed in the Amendment and suggested changes. He pointed out the disadvantages of the urban-type Bailey's Upper Elementary School which had opened in 2014. Mr. Miller asked the Commission to delete all references to vertical or urban schools from the staff report and the Plan Amendment and refer to all the schools as "public schools." He concluded by saying that a policy had to be added instructing the County to identify and acquire school sites after the adoption of plan amendments for high-density residential developments.

Answering questions from Commissioner Hedetniemi, Ulfelder, Sargeant, and Strandlie, Mr. Miller stated the following:

- The policy should refer to "public schools" and the designation "urban" or "vertical" should be eliminated since there no sufficient definition was provided for those terms in the proposed Amendment.
- The inclusion of "vertical" or "urban" designation for schools would create a sense in the community of a lesser quality type of school.
- Mr. Miller did not present his comments earlier during the Schools Committee meetings, which he attended on a regular basis, since it was his understanding that no public questions or testimony were allowed.

Commissioner Flanagan disagreed with Mr. Miller's statement that the schools should not be built in commercial areas.

A conversation ensued between Chairman Murphy and Mr. Miller regarding the characteristics of residential and commercial areas.

Commissioner Hart noted that there was a misunderstanding of terminology. He explained that the Board had recognized that during the future redevelopment, higher density would be present in certain areas, specifically in proximity to transit stations; emphasizing the need for schools to be located close to residences. He noted that commercial areas might become the only available sites for schools.

Chairman Murphy pointed out that schools should not be tied down to the stereotyped school system and need to have options and flexibility which would be included in the Plan language.

Commissioner Strandlie asked if Mr. Miller had an endorsement from his HOA. Mr. Miller explained that he forwarded the paperwork to his HOA and their comments were incorporated in the documents submitted to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Strandlie said that she was aware of the correspondence between Mr. Miller and Superintendent Garza on the subject of the

Bailey's Upper Elementary School. She added that Supervisor Garza notified Mr. Miller that the elementary schools did not have auditoriums. Mr. Miller indicated that Supervisor Garza informed him that the County was in the process of putting auditorium capabilities in all the gyms. He added that his letter was addressed to Supervisor Cook and included suggestion to move the County offices into commercial spaces and use the County properties for schools.

Jeffrey Longo, 3068 Hazelton St, Falls Church, VA 22044, President of the Sleepy Hollow Manor Citizens Association, said that he didn't see any announcements about the Schools Committee meetings and for this reason he was not able to participate in them. Mr. Longo presented his concerns regarding the Plan Amendment and suggested changes (Mr. Longo's testimony and edited draft Plan are included in the date file). Mr. Longo indicated that he sent an email with the attached edited draft Plan to the Planning Commission. Inna Kangarloo, Senior Deputy Clerk, Planning Commission Office, confirmed that Mr. Longo's recommendations had been forwarded to the Planning Commission members via email.

Commissioner Hedetniemi indicated that the emphasis on the non-urban schools would be short-sighted. Mr. Longo clarified that he was not opposing urban schools but the different designation of schools.

Commissioner Sargeant thanked Mr. Longo for his detailed testimony. He mentioned that the term "urban" reflected flexibility in terms of facility identification and distinguished the type of design. He indicated that a certain designation of school design would help to work with developers in high density areas.

Commissioner Hart notified Mr. Longo about the regular schedule and location of the Planning Commission and Committee meetings and added that the meetings were open to the public. He further explained that announcements of the meetings were made in advance and the agenda was available on the Planning Commission website. Mr. Longo said that it was difficult to locate the Committee information, specifically the minutes. He mentioned that notifications through listserv and social media would be helpful in this regard. Chairman Murphy pointed out that the notification procedures were in the process of improvement.

Commissioner Strandlie concurred with Mr. Longo's comments regarding the availability of Planning Commission and Committee information. Commissioner Strandlie added that the meeting is scheduled with staff on August 2, 2016, to go over the ways for communication improvement. She further mentioned that she was willing to work with Mr. Longo and others to obtain their input.

Commissioner Strandlie inquired if the "vertical" designation for schools design was acceptable to Mr. Longo, who responded negatively. He concurred with Mr. Miller's comments by saying that the vertical designation would depend on the location, character and extent of the surrounding areas; otherwise, the designation of "schools" should be used.

Referring to Objective 9, Policy G, Commissioner Strandlie asked Mr. Sneed to provide more information on what the school system was looking for in terms of co-location of different levels of education and other types of programs in one structure. Mr. Sneed responded that the co-

location meant that some common spaces, such as a library or cafeteria, would be shared by the students of different age groups.

Commissioner Strandlie thanked Mr. Longo for his comments related to the School Age Child Care (SACC) facilities. She noted that last year language was added to the Comprehensive Plan, in the Sully District and the Seven Corners Commercial Revitalization District, to provide for off-site SACC locations. Commissioner Strandlie said that the Planning Commission subsequently removed that language from the Plan. She then brought up an email from a former Commissioner Litzenberger in which he expressed his concerns regarding the need for busing students from schools to SACC facilities.

Suzi Wells, 3058 Shadeland Dr., Falls Church, VA 22044, supported Mr. Longo's testimony, specifically his concerns regarding SACC and co-location of different levels of education in one structure. She mentioned various negative location characteristics of the Bailey's Upper Elementary School and pointed out that its location was approved despite the fact that the appropriate site was available within a walking distance from the school. She said that the community had limited time to review the staff report which was dated two weeks before the Commission meeting date. She thanked Commissioner Strandlie and staff for taking the time to review and discuss the citizens' concerns. Ms. Wells expressed her appreciation for the ongoing efforts to work on communication improvement and suggested to establish a questions and answers link on the Planning Commission website for contentious topics or topics of county-wide impact. She said she was fearful that the revised language in the Comprehensive Plan might result in providing the cheapest or most convenient solution in Mason District. Ms. Wells asked that green space in dense areas be reserved for the school fields and play areas. In conclusion she noted that the Plan Amendment should be written to address the entire County and not only its certain areas.

Answering questions from Commissioner Sargeant, Mr. Sneed said that the Bailey's Upper Elementary School construction was proposed in summer of 2014 and approved by the School Board in fall of 2014.

Mr. Caperton commented that in the case of Bailey's Upper Elementary School, the County was acquiring an already constructed building. Referring to Objective 6, he added that the acquisition policy was modified accordingly, "for future building" text was removed and the policy was expanded to include sites that might be in high density areas.

In response to Commissioner Sargeant's question about whether the addition of urban or vertical schools would preclude, exclude, or prohibit the utilization of boundary changes; Mr. Sneed answered that they would not. Mr. Sargeant further asked if there were any schools that incorporated multiple grade levels. Mr. Sneed responded that there were three such secondary schools with grades seven through twelve.

Commissioner Sargeant expressed his intent to defer the decision on this case and inquired about the next available meeting date. John Cooper, Clerk, Planning Commission Office, responded that the next meeting date would be September 14, 2016, and there were no available dates before then.

Chairman Murphy suggested to schedule the Schools Committee meeting on September 14 or 15, 2016, and the decision only on September 21 or 22, 2016.

Commissioner Hurley advised to avoid scheduling the Schools Committee meeting on Thursday nights since the School Board meetings were held on Thursdays. Mr. Sneed confirmed that the School Board was meeting every other Thursday.

Commissioner Hart suggested to schedule the Schools Committee meeting and Decision Only more than a week apart, so that the staff could incorporate any changes suggested by the Committee.

A conversation ensued between the Commissioners regarding the scheduling of the Schools Committee meeting and the Decision Only on the Public Schools Policy Plan Amendment.

Mr. Caperton pointed out that the staff report indicated that the Board's public hearing was on September 20, 2016. He said that if the Planning Commission did not finish the case review by the end of September 2016, it would go to the Board on October 18, 2016.

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 Sargeant for action on this case.

//

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Chairman Murphy: The public hearing is closed. Recognize Mr. Sargeant.

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well this has been a lively-spirited and an informative discussion. We do appreciate your input and participation. We have established some things. Schools Committee meetings are open to the public. Yes, you can raise your hand. I will call on you. So, with that said, I think it's been very helpful. I think we're going to take – take the input we have received and move forward. We will meet in Schools Committees on September 14th and 15th. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER A DECISION ONLY ON THE PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT 2016-CW-1CP TO A DATE CERTAIN OF SEPTEMBER 29TH, 2016, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.

Commissioners Hart and Strandlie: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Strandlie and Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion? I – I want to discuss the Committee meeting in just a second. Let's get this straight. All those in favor of the motion to defer decision on this application with the record remaining open for written comments, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed. Motion carries.

(The motion carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Keys-Gamarra, Lawrence, and Migliaccio were absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

The meeting was adjourned at 12:01 a.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: Inna Kangarloo

Approved on: January 12, 2017



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