

**MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2016**

PRESENT: Peter F. Murphy, Springfield District
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commission At-Large
Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District
John C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District
Julie M. Strandlie, Mason District
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District
Karen A. Keys-Gamarra, Sully District

ABSENT: Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District
Janyce N. Hedetniemi, Commissioner At Large

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:22 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

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Ulfelder: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have a decision only this evening on a matter in Great Falls that was heard on October 19th, involving a special exception application on a site that is already split-zoned commercial and residential for a drive-thru window for picking up prescriptions at a proposed CVS at that site. We had a number of speaker – we had several speakers at our public hearing who raised issues, primarily some issues about the traffic at that – at the intersection of Seneca Road and Georgetown Pike where this particular site is located. And we heard from the applicant's consultant who had done a – an analysis of the traffic expected – the current traffic, the expected traffic, and even a sensitivity analysis to look at what might happen if there was a significant increase in the amount of traffic than other – than was predicted based on the International Traffic Engineers studies. I'm familiar with that intersection. I served on the Georgetown Pike Traffic Calming Study in the late 90's, was also - the issue came up in the mid – about 2005 when the current site plan was approved for a large office facility on that site. And it was something that was debated significantly as part of the Route 7 widening and the decision is how best to try to re-engineer what is, at best, a complicated and somewhat difficult interchange between Georgetown Pike, Route 7, and Seneca Road coming down from the north.

With all that being said, I think that the – we have to remember that this is just an SE for a drive-thru. It's not a rezoning. And, based on the studies, it shows that there would not be a significant impact on traffic from the proposed facility. I also hope after this, as we move forward with this, that the Virginia Department of Transportation will be encouraged to keep an eye on that intersection, particularly after the new facility, if it's approved, is built. And I think the other part of some of the complaints that we heard from the speakers is the lack of enforcement at that intersection in terms of particularly evening rush hour traffic and blocking the box and other violations or other problems that create problems for people who live further up Seneca Road and they're trying to get down onto Georgetown Pike or Route 7 in the evening rush hour. And so I think that another step we can take is to work with the police department to make sure that there's an adequate enforcement presence to try to address some of those problems as well. Since the Planning Commission hearing, the applicant has met with the Great Falls Citizen Association representatives. As well as, representatives of the Great Falls Woods Homeowners Association, which is the subdivision immediately to the west and adjacent to this site. They have made a number of changes to the proposed development conditions which were, I believe, sent out to the Planning Commissioners yesterday and are reflected in the new, newest version of the proposed development conditions. And we've heard from the Great Falls Woods HOA by email that they feel that their issues have been addressed. And I've also had some email correspondence with the Great Falls Citizen Association, who feel that their key issues have been addressed as well. And so I'm going to move forward with this. I think we need a representative of the applicant to come down. Sara?

Sara Mariska, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley and Walsh, PC: Good evening. I'm Sara Mariska.

Commissioner Ulfelder: You are not Lynne Strobel.

Ms. Mariska: With the law firm of Walsh, Colucci, here in Lynne Strobel's place this evening. And we have reviewed, and are in agreement with, the conditions dated November 1st, 2016.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Thank you very much. With that Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF SE 2016-DR-009, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED NOVEMBER 1st, 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 recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve SE 2016-DR-009, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Strandlie: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Ms. Strandlie?

Commissioner Strandlie: I would like to abstain, please.

Chairman Murphy: Okay, Ms. Strandlie abstains.

Commissioner Sargeant: I'm going to abstain, too. Not present for the public hearing.

Chairman Murphy: Okay, Mr. Sargeant abstains.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Second motion, I ALSO MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS, AS LISTED IN THE HANDOUT DATED NOVEMBER 2ND, 2016, THAT WAS PROVIDED TO YOU TODAY AND WHICH SHALL BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD OF THIS CASE.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion as articulated by Mr. Ulfelder, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries, same abstentions.

Commissioner Strandlie: Yes, I was here.

Chairman Murphy: So noted.

The motions carried by a vote of 8-0-2. Commissioners Sargeant and Strandlie abstained. Commissioners Hedetniemi and Lawrence were absent from the meeting.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hart established the following order of the agenda:

1. PA 2016-II-T2 – JERMANTOWN ROAD I-66 BRIDGE
2. PA 2016-CW-2CP – PLANNED INDUSTRIAL USES (HIGHER FAR FOR DATA CENTERS AND SELF-STORAGE FACILITIES)
3. PA 2016-II-F1 – KENA TEMPLE

This agenda was accepted without objection.

//

PA 2016-II-T2 - JERMANTOWN ROAD I-66 BRIDGE – 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 concerns the Jermantown Road Bridge over Interstate (I-66), located in the Providence Supervisor District. The adopted Plan does not indicate a transportation improvement for the existing two-lane Jermantown Bridge over I-66. The Amendment will recommend revising the Comprehensive Plan to indicate improving Jermantown Road Bridge over I-66 to four lanes. Additional recommendations relating to the transportation network may also be modified. (PROVIDENCE DISTRICT) (PUBLIC HEARING)

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

//

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

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

Commissioner Hart: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. On July – on July 26th, 2016, the Board of Supervisors authorized Plan Amendment 2016-II-T2. The authorization directed staff to consider planning a four-lane improvement for the existing Jermantown Road Bridge across I-66. In accordance with the recommendation of staff and in order to improve multimodal mobility along the Jermantown Road corridor relating to both the City of Fairfax and Fairfax County and to move – to improve mobility, consistent with the County’s enhanced public transportation corridor recommendation for the Transform I-66 Project that is recommending a bridge improvement that would not preclude any future upgrade managed lanes on I-66 underneath the Jermantown Road Bridge and the possible extension of Metro Rail in the I-66 median, also underneath the Jermantown Road Bridge. Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF PLAN AMENDMENT 2016-II-T2.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve...I'm sorry?

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: Now...

Chairman Murphy: Yes, okay, go ahead.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: I just have a question because they mention that there is a school farther down the road. I didn't know whether this would also include some provisions in terms of how it would impact kids' abilities to cross the street further down. Whether it would – would impact traffic further down Jermantown Road, which is – Providence Elementary is about a block further down.

Commissioner Hart: The amendment is dealing only with the bridge, but I'll let Mr. Burke and Mr. Kessler address that.

Alan Kessler, Fairfax County Office of Transportation, Planning Division: The improvements on the Jermantown Road Bridge will have pedestrian amenities – will have on road bike lanes, like 10-foot trail and another 5-foot sidewalk on the other side. Basically, I don't think that'll impact what's happening at the school down the road.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: You don't think it will impact the amount of traffic going further toward – from between 123 and 50?

Mr. Kessler: Well, the plan amendment is for four lanes, but VDOT is going to come in and construct a two lane bridge, at this point in time. So the four lane construction will be at some time in the future...future date. And at the same time, the City of Fairfax is working on improving Jermantown Road, in that section you are talking about, sort of the gateway into the City of Fairfax. So, they will – may be adding one more lane to make it a four-lane road at some point also.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: I understand. My concern is there are a number of walkers in that neighborhood and right now the traffic is constrained to some extent. I'm wondering if opening it up would possibly make this - increase the speed, as well as impact their ability to walk to school?

Mr. Kessler: I think if the improvement, for the City of Fairfax, they are going to be working with Fairfax County and what not. So I would think that there would be some more pedestrian amenities in and around the school, if they can provide it.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: But to be clear, this particular amendment doesn't address those issues?

Mr. Kessler: No, it does not.

Thomas Burke, Fairfax County Office of Transportation, Planning Division: It's strictly the bridge.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion of the – Mr. Hart?

Commissioner Migliaccio: Oh, I'm sorry.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman, I – I was going to ask if staff could confirm that nothing in the amendment is precluding pedestrian amenities by others elsewhere on the road. Is that right?

Mr. Burke: No, this is just strictly speaking to the bridge. This – there is nothing to say that we can't make improvements up or downstream.

Commissioner Hart: I think also that there is not – does school board have policies regarding walkers and not putting walkers on roads that don't meet certain criteria?

Mr. Kessler: I would hope so.

Mr. Burke: Safe rides to school, things like that.

Chairman Murphy: You are going to have to speak up because we can't hear the reply.

Mr. Burke: I'm not sure if there are policies in place to, but it's...it makes sense.

Chairman Murphy: Okay.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Mr. Chair?

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Mr. Migliaccio?

Commissioner Migliaccio: My question for staff – reading the conclusion in the plan amendment staff report and then hearing what you just said and – to answer Commissioner Keys-Gamarra's question, the bridge is going to be planned for four lanes, yet only built for two lanes? As I read the conclusion in the staff report, it seems to implicate that it's going to be four-lane because that would make the most sense to build the four lanes now with the Transform 66 Project. Is that not the case?

Mr. Burke: Currently, VDOT is planning to design a four-lane bridge, but construct a two-lane bridge. If we can get VDOT's attention quick enough to change their current trajectory, hopeful...maybe we can get them to build a four-lane bridge, but I don't think we are banking on that. But we still want the plan to reflect the four-lane so they can be.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Okay, I – I understand that. Just the wording in the staff report leaves me to believe that it's going to be a four-lane bridge in the conclusion so that...

Mr. Burke: Be planned as a four-lane bridge.

Commissioner Migliaccio: And then the next sentence?

Mr. Burke: In the conclusion? Bridge should be shown as a four lane improvement in the Countywide Transportation Plan Map.

Mr. Kessler: We are looking forward – for the improvement in the future. What had happened was, VDOT looked at the study area and it's basically two years before and the Comp Plan did not show an improvement. So they assumed that the bridge would not need an improvement in - in their study and so they sent out RFP's to – to bring in consultants to design and construct the improvements. But that was two years ago so they didn't realize that the possibility to turn around and provide a four-lane bridge would be part of the RFP's – part of the contracts that are coming in for review.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Okay, I'm a little more confused than when we started. Then I can understand Commissioner Keys-Gamarra's question about the additional traffic, thinking that we are going to have a four lane bridge there and that – that's what I had thought. Reading the conclusion, if we put them in the Comp Plan and then with Transform 66 Project, I – I'm going to support the Plan Amendment, but I thought we were getting the four-lane bridge now because it makes little sense to go back and disrupt I-66 ten years from now – five years from now. Especially when we have Hot Lanes and other things going on there and it will impact not just that part of the county, but farther west. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Mr. Ulfelder? We are on verbatim.

Commissioner Ulfelder: We are?

Chairman Murphy: Go ahead.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Can I look – look at Figure 2, in the staff report? Typical Section. What I think we are discussing now is width; whereas, I think what the – what VDOTs trying to do is create a longer bridge in order to accommodate what they are going to be doing on 66 underneath this bridge. But, in reading – looking at Figure 2, Typical Section, I assume they are going to build it to 93 feet, 8 inches, but they are going to leave only operational to 51, whatever it is, feet that is shown on the left side of that figure. Is that correct?

Mr. Kessler: We don't know that. At this point, they could come across with two-spans, but the - the construction of the two-lane bridge will just, it will not preclude a four-lane bridge at a later time. So it could be two-spans. I'm not sure exactly how they are going to construct the four lane bridge at this time.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Okay.

Commissioner Flanagan: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Flanagan?

Commissioner Flanagan: I think I understand it. The Comprehensive Plan at the present time calls for a two lane bridge at this location.

Mr. Burke: There is – there is no improvement called for, so you would assume it.

Commissioner Flanagan: There is none at all?

Mr. Burke: There is none at all. So you would assume it would stay a two lane bridge.

Commissioner Flanagan: So, we're – at this particular time, we're planning for a four-lane. Although, VDOT is only planning to build a two lane there and your hope is to convince VDOT that they should go and build a four-lane at this particular time rather than a two-lane. And the reason why they are building a two lane is because of the reason that Commissioner Ulfelder just stated, that they have to have a new bridge. And, as long as they're going to build a two lane bridge, why not build a four lane bridge now? And having it in the Plan as a four lane bridge encourages them to do that and allows you to agitate for that, shall I say? Thank you.

Citizen: Mr. Chairman, can I just speak just to say...

Chairman Murphy: No, I'm sorry. We are passed that stage now, public hearing is closed. All right, further discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve – or adopt Plan Amendment 2016-II-T2, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yeah?

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: I abstain.

The motions carried by a vote of 9-0-1. Commissioner Keys-Gamarra abstained. Commissioners Hedetniemi and Lawrence were absent from the meeting.

//

PA 2016-CW-2CP - PLANNED INDUSTRIAL USES (HIGHER FAR FOR DATA CENTERS AND SELF-STORAGE FACILITIES) – 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 proposes to add Policy Plan guidance to be used in the review of certain proposals within areas planned for industrial uses as shown

on the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map. The proposed amendment, which addresses uses such as data centers and self-storage facilities, includes proposed performance criteria to facilitate development above the Comprehensive Plan recommendation if conditions related to minimizing vehicle trips, mitigating noise and other impacts, building design, lot size, parcel consolidation and site design are met. (COUNTYWIDE) (PUBLIC HEARING)

Katrina Newton, Planning Division (PD), 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 PA 2016-CW-2CP.

Commissioner Sargeant and Ms. Newton discussed the Board of Supervisor's initiative for revitalization in industrial areas; wherein, Ms. Newton confirmed that although this was a Board initiative, there was still staff review and public input.

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

David Gill, Agent for CoreSite, McGuire Woods, LLP, spoke in support of the application stating that Fairfax County has been one of the largest sites of data centers in the country due to its close proximity to resources in Washington, D.C. Mr. Gill said his client had purchased a site, Sunrise Technology Drive, which was zoned and planned industrial, with the intention of reinvesting in the County. He said this plan amendment would be good for the community due to the low impact generated from data centers and would preserve the commercial tax base in the County.

Commissioner Ulfelder asked Mr. Gill to confirm the typical size of a data facility and the number of employees required to manage it. Mr. Gill explained that most facilities were comparable to a four or five-story suburban office building and would require approximately twenty employees.

Commissioner Migliaccio discussed with Mr. Gill the minimum lot size that would be required for a data center wherein Mr. Gill said that under the current zoning a by-right data center use would require eight acres.

In response to questions from Commissioner Flanagan regarding noise and lighting generated from data centers, Mr. Gill said that the cooling towers would run throughout the day along with security lighting required at night. Commissioner Sargeant confirmed with Ms. Newton that the noise ordinance and regulations would be applicable to this use as well as other allowed uses in industrial areas.

Commissioner Hart noted that some data center locations required a dedicated circuit connected to electrical power lines from a tower and asked Mr. Gill if that was a requirement for all data

centers. Mr. Gill explained that it was a cumulative need; therefore, if you had several in one location that could become a requirement. He noted that the data centers in Fairfax County were a smaller scale and located in individual buildings than the ones located in Loudoun County, and therefore would not require an extra power line. In response to further questioning from Commissioner Hart, Mr. Gill said he would need to consult with his client in order to determine at which point a dedicated line would be required for these data centers.

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: Public hearing is closed. Mr. Sargeant, please.

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I get to this motion, let me begin by thanking Leanna O'Donnell and Katrina Newton for their diligent work in preparing this Plan Amendment. They have carefully woven the proposed amendment into the fabric of our Comprehensive Plan. As staff indicated, the policy plat amendment will add a new appendix to the Policy Plan. The new appendix would provide guidance to consider intensity above the base line recommendation for uses such as data centers and self-storage facilities within areas planned for industrial use, as shown on the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map. The higher intensity option would be subject to performance criteria that address transportation impacts, mitigation of noise and other impacts, building design, lot size and parcel consolidation, and site design. The proposed amendment will not eliminate the need for zoning approvals, per the Zoning Ordinance, including staff and including the public input. This amendment would also not allow for consideration of intensities above what the Zoning Ordinance currently allows. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR PLAN AMENDMENT 2016-CW-2CP, AS FOUND IN THE STAFF REPORT DATED OCTOBER 19TH, 2016.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Migliaccio. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it adopt PA 2016-CW-2CP as articulated by Mr. Sargeant, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motions carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Hedetniemi and Lawrence were absent from the meeting.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

PA 2016-II-F1 - KENA TEMPLE – 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 concerns approx. 27 ac. generally located at 9001 Arlington Boulevard, Fairfax, on the south side of Arlington Boulevard between Bear Branch and Barkley Drive (Tax Map Parcel: 48-4((1))42A) in the Providence Supervisor District. The site is planned for private open space, public facilities, governmental, and institutional uses. The Amendment will consider residential use with a density range of 0.5-1 dwelling unit per acre. Recommendations relating to the transportation network may also be modified. PA #2016-II-F1 is concurrently under review with Rezoning application RZ 2016-PR-012. (PROVIDENCE DISTRICT) (PUBLIC HEARING)

Michael Van Atta, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended approval of PA 2016-II-F1.

Commissioner Hurley and Mr. Van Atta discussed the options for direct access onto Arlington Boulevard from this site wherein Mr. Van Atta explained that currently there was access from the service drive that intersected with Barkley Drive just south of Arlington Boulevard. He said there was also a right-in only from Arlington Boulevard into this site but it had not been approved by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and it would need to be reconstructed with the filing of a zoning application. Mr. Van Atta said that staff recommended leaving the plan language open so at the zoning stage the best options for access to and from this site can be evaluated prior to it going before the Virginia Commonwealth Transportation Board.

Commissioner Hart confirmed with Mr. Van Atta that the proposed plan amendment would not preclude an access point from Karen Drive through the Resource Protection Area which would allow it to be evaluated during the rezoning stage.

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

Fran Wallingford, 3311 Mantua Drive, Fairfax, Chair of the Mantua Citizens Association (MCA) Planning and Zoning Committee, voiced a concern over transportation safety. She said that they would support language being adopted that would allow for full evaluation of all access options so the safest plan could be implemented. In addition, Ms. Wallingford highlighted the current issues with traffic congestion on Arlington Boulevard and explained why Karen Drive was closed off as an access point several years ago.

Commissioner Hart discussed with Ms. Wallingford the new proposed language that was distributed yesterday by staff wherein Ms. Wallingford said that the MCA had briefly viewed it but was unsure what was precluded as access options. She reiterated her request that the plan language be broad enough for all access options to be evaluated to determine the best location for traffic safety.

Commissioner de la Fe discussed with staff the proposed language wherein Leanna O'Donnell, PD, DPZ, explained that staff's goal was to keep the plan language general and not to list every potential access point to the site. Commissioner Migliaccio pointed out that because staff did list one possible access point it could be construed that the developer was being directed to that option only. He suggested amending the language to remove that specific access point and inserting more general language.

Commissioner Hart announced his intention to defer the decision only in order to allow more time for the Commission to consider the proposed language.

Lisa Shankman, 3130 Barkley Drive, Fairfax, spoke in support of the plan amendment but voiced concern over traffic safety, specifically for the school buses that traveled through the neighborhood. She also stated her support for other access options.

In response to a questions from Commissioners Hurley and Hart, Ms. Shankman clarified that if a new residential development were to go in at the site, it would be difficult for school buses to make the right turn onto the service road; therefore, she was in support of other access options for safety reasons.

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 Hart for action on this case.

//

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Chairman Murphy: The public hearing is closed. Mr. Hart?

Commissioner Hart: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank the – the folks who came out and spoke tonight. I – I want to thank, also, the folks that submitted written comments. I think we need to reflect on the revised language we got yesterday and – and the comments we got tonight. I'd like to talk to staff again about, perhaps, the suggestions that have come up – Commissioner

Migliaccio's and others. And therefore Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR PLAN AMENDMENT 2016-II-F1, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF NOVEMBER 16, 2016, WITH THE RECORD REMAIN OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC COMMENT.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision only on PA 2016-II-F1 to a date certain of November 16th, with the record remaining open for comments, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Excuse me, motion carries.

The motions carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Hedetniemi and Lawrence were absent from the meeting.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

The meeting was adjourned at 9:58 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: Teresa M. Wang

Approved on: May 4, 2017



John W. Cooper, Clerk
Fairfax County Planning Commission

